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Israeli towns, most of which cause mild damage. Israeli warplanes destroyed Gaza’s main power plant and sewage treatment plant, creating a critical public health crisis. Many of Israel’s European allies have denounced the Israeli siege and economic blockade as disproportionate responses to the threats against Israel’s security. The Israeli human rights group B’tselem states that over four years 13 Israelis were killed by rockets while in only the last two years over 1,000 Palestinians died, almost half of them civilians. B’tselem claims that withdrawal of the military from Gaza did not mean a fundamental change in the occupation because Israel maintains “effective control” of Gaza. Many groups consider this to be collective punishment or ethnic cleansing in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention. Israel’s vindictive policy against the civilian population is summed up in a wry statement by Prime Minister Ehud Olmert: “We will not allow them to lead a pleasant life.”

The anger of Gazans boiled over in January of this year when protesters broke down the barriers at the Rafah crossing to Egypt and hundreds of thousands rushed over the border to secure food and other necessities. This forced an easing of the Israeli siege and has led to promises by Israel that some border checkpoints would be lifted.

Will Gaza Be The First Bantustan?

The siege of Gaza is bad enough in itself, but it appears to be Israel’s test case for a two-state solution that would produce a string of Palestinian urban prisons with the formal trappings...
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In June of 2006, Mexico did what many progressive policy advocates and social activists have been demanding for many years now—it finally recognized in the new housing law (Ley de Vivienda) the fundamental role of the “social production of housing” in providing shelter for the poor. By omitting the social production of housing from the previous housing law (1983), the government was effectively ignoring the 63 percent of Mexicans who access housing in this manner while supporting those sectors of the population with more resources at their disposal. In contrast, the new housing law specifically states that “the federal government should support the social production of housing through the development of judicial, programmatic, financial, administrative and capacity-building tools” (Article 85).

While the inclusion of the social production of housing in the new housing law represents progress, at least on paper, it also raises a number of important policy shortcomings that have yet to be addressed in regard to improving the housing and living conditions of the poor and planning for more just and sustainable communities and cities.

The majority of housing in Mexico—and almost all affordable housing—is developed through what is referred to as the social production of housing, a “self-help” housing process in which all or part of the construction of a dwelling is built and/or managed by the occupants on an incremental basis over time. In some cases, the process is more collectively-driven, including different forms of cooperation among community members, and with the support of other social actors. The participation of owner-occupants in the shelter-building process is a defining feature of self-help housing, which John Turner coined as “housing as a verb” in his 1972 book Freedom to Build (co-edited with R. Fichter). Depending on income and other constraints, it can take ten years or more to finish a house and fully consolidate a housing plot in an informal settlement—an arduous process that requires lower-income households to live in often deplorable conditions without access to urban services for considerable periods of time.

From Words to Action?

According to Article 4 of the Mexican Constitution, “every family has the right to dignified housing.” Article 25 specifically mentions that Mexican law should establish mechanisms to support forms of social organization for the production of essential assets and services. Despite these constitutional provisions, national housing policies have adhered to an increasingly neoliberal trajectory since the early 1990s, with the federal government promoting market-oriented policies and a prominent role for the private sector. Consistent with the World Bank Housing Policy Paper Housing: Enabling Markets to Work (1993), such policies have focused on the provision and purchase of a finished housing product through the formal housing market, rather than the incremental housing process deployed by most Mexicans to create housing over time in consonance with available household resources. In this regard, the recent inclusion of the social production of housing in the new housing law appears to create an opening to provide more state support for lower-income households and a more balanced approach to housing provision, if implemented. At the very least, this represents an acknowledgement that the state has a role in supporting affordable housing and underlines that housing is not only a social good, but also a social right.

Social policy activists and academics in Mexico City seized this political opening by organizing a forum in which to discuss how the new housing law can be implemented—instead of being mothballed on the proverbial shelf of legislative inaction. At the end of November 2007, the Mexican National Housing Commission (CONAVI),
the Iberoamericana University (UIA) and Habitat International Coalition-Latin America Regional Office (HIC-AL) came together to organize a conference in Mexico City, “The Social Production and Management of Habitat.” Over 300 people attended this two-day event, including officials from national and state-level government agencies in Mexico, academics and university students and representatives from both Mexican and other Latin American non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

The goal of the conference was to generate proposals to support the social production and management of habitat and to propel forward the implementation of the new housing law. To this end, conference presentations and debates covered a range of themes, including: specific national policies to support the social production of housing; financing issues; citizen participation in housing improvement programs; the role of technical assistance and appropriate building technologies; social and spatial management in new settlement areas; and strategies for housing consolidation and improvement in existing urban areas.

Given that self-helping housing is such a pervasive phenomenon in Mexico and other parts of Latin America, presenting community organizations and NGOs had much to share with the government representatives in attendance. The challenge now, in the words of conference organizer and former HIC President Enrique Ortiz Flores, is to “manage complexity” in harnessing the vast experience of the community and social organizations that have worked in the social production of housing for decades while also expanding the scale and impact of this extremely varied, mostly community-based work. To this end, the conference generated a number of key recommendations integral to translating the intent of the new housing law into action, such as:

- Definition of an inclusive and comprehensive housing policy that includes a role for the state, takes into account the needs of rural and urban residents and promotes institutional coordination in the housing sector (i.e., urban development, land, housing);
- Democratization, expansion and strengthening of participative spaces for interaction and decision-making among diverse actors in the housing sector;
- Development of a wide range of interventions which support and facilitate the existing diversity and flexibility in the social production of housing, rather than promoting generic or “one-size-fits-all” solutions;
- Support for training and capacity-building among key social actors working in the social production of housing, especially for those occupying key public policy posts; and
- Articulation of a land policy that meets the needs of the
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diverse forms of the social production of housing and habitat.

The range of these recommendations highlights the diversity of interventions and measures needed to support the social production of housing. This translates into the need for considerable inter-sectoral and inter-governmental policy coordination and creativity, one of the prominent policy challenges raised by the inclusion of the social production of housing in the new federal housing law.

The Right to Housing and the Right to the City or Habitat

As suggested by its title, conference discussions adopted a broader perspective than simply the social production of housing, focusing instead on the planning and management of communities and cities, or “habitat.” Such an integrated perspective is not only a departure from the individual focus of the housing-as-product approach emphasized by market-driven policies, but also consistent with the “right to the city” campaigns promulgated by a number of international agencies, including UN-HABITAT and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). UNESCO defines the “right to the city” concept in the following manner: “The primary objective of the city is viewed as one of fulfilling a social function and, in pursuit of sustainability and social justice, guaranteeing equitable access to all the opportunities it has to offer.” This initiative is linked with and supports similar work undertaken in Brazil (i.e., the City Statute initiated by the National Forum for Urban Reform) and by international NGOs and civil society networks, such as HIC, which has been working to develop a “World Charter on the Right to the City,” something discussed in the World Social Forum on an ongoing basis.

At a fundamental level, such campaigns stress that improved access to the city cannot be achieved simply by focusing on low-income settlements as specific places in isolation from cities at a broader scale. These related campaigns also emphasize a rights-based approach to development which extends beyond the right to shelter to include a fuller range of social and political rights, such as the right to employment, education and health care. They also highlight the importance of participatory planning and decision-making, as well as the social function of property and urban space in constructing a more sustainable and socially just city. Similar to the range of interventions needed to support the social production of housing, this more holistic perspective of cities or habitat will also demand more systematic cooperation between policymakers at federal, state and local levels, and meaningful collaboration and shared decision-making with communities and civil society organizations.

Although the conference adopted a comprehensive view of building
habitat and not just housing, the new housing law is limited by its stricter adherence to the “social production of housing” per se. The problematic nature of such a singular focus on housing was highlighted during the conference. It is also in full view on the periphery of many Mexican cities. It is here where the federal government’s housing-as-product approach is perhaps most conspicuous—vast tracts of homogenous housing built by the private sector and whose purchase is facilitated by 20- or 30-year loans provided through the banking sector and housing funds of private- and public-sector workers. This large-scale, big-capital model of housing production churned out 560,000 new houses in Mexico in 2006, with the financial and institutional backing of the Federal Mortgage Society (Sociedad Hipotecaria Federal). It has also produced astounding profits for private developers. Despite indications that segments of this market are saturated, the current administration plans to guarantee an estimated 6 million housing loans between 2007 and 2012, twice the amount made during the presidency of Vicente Fox (2000-2006). Notably, a majority of Mexicans do not earn the income required to qualify for these housing financing schemes, while those who are eligible face high personal debt loads and increased socio-economic vulnerability.

This kind of housing policy has also induced the development of car-dependent, single-use and remote new housing complexes, contrary to sustainable forms of urban development and inclusive cities. In addition, this model of housing production has contributed to land speculation and higher land prices at the urban periphery, making access to land and housing even more difficult for lower-income households. This situation also underlines contradictions in the government’s approach to housing, which purports to support the social production of housing on the one hand, while facilitating the expansion of the private real estate development sector and a housing-as-product model on the other. This model undermines efforts to enhance “rights to the city” by focusing on the production of housing for certain sectors of the population with little consideration of the broader planning implications. More precisely, this model not only excludes the poor, but also contributes to the development of less inclusive and livable cities.

From Best Practices to Best Policies

The conference featured detailed case studies of the experiences of architects, planners, community leaders, cooperative members and housing and environmental activists working in the social production of housing and habitat in Argentina, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Paraguay, Uruguay and different parts of Mexico. Government representatives attending the event heard...
about an array of best practices in community participation, ecological design, cooperative management models and financing schemes in both rural and urban areas. The presentations highlighted the sophistication and complexity of different initiatives as community-based responses to specific local contexts.

Among others, these experiences included Mexico City’s housing credit improvement program (Programa de Mejoramiento de Vivienda), which is designed to enhance the quality of self-built houses for some of the city’s lowest-income households. The program is targeted at marginal neighborhoods in the city, providing small housing loans to improve existing homes or reconstruct structurally unsound homes. First spearheaded in 1998 as a pilot project by the city’s urban social movement (Movimiento Urbano Popular), a number of housing NGOs (FOSOVI, Casa y Ciudad, CENVI and COPEVI with the support of FEDEVIVIENDA -Colombia- and HIC) and the Popular Savings Society (Caja Popular Mexicana), the program was institutionalized by the Mexico City government in 2001. As of 2006, the program had supported approximately 147,000 housing actions.

Although the pilot project initially had incorporated community organization and political mobilization through linkages with the urban social movement, the institutionalization of the program in the city’s Institute of Housing (Instituto de la Vivienda) has minimized this participatory component and practically reduced the role of NGOs to one of providing technical assistance in matters of housing design. The relegation of NGOs and civil society groups to technical roles working only at a local or neighborhood scale is typical of broader regional changes in the nature of collective action. This relates to the adoption of a more neoliberal model of development in Latin America, identified by Roberts and Portes in their 2006 article, “Coping with the Free-Market City: Collective Action in Six Latin American Cities at the End of the Twentieth Century” (Latin American Research Review, 41(6): 57-83). Partially in response to pressure by the urban social movement and other activists, the Mexico City government recently introduced a new related program (Programa de Mejoramiento de Barrio) to focus on neighborhood-wide improvements in marginal areas of the city. This example shows some of the inherent challenges of incorporating community-based social innovations into institutional settings better suited to implementing more normative approaches to community planning.

Summary

With the new housing law in effect, the challenge now is to move from the isolated implementation of “best practices” to the development of “best policies” that can support the social production of housing without stifling existing participatory and innovative strategies. Or, in other words, to match the so-called “freedom to build” with state commitments to provide dignified housing for lower-income households. This will necessarily include significant resource commitments and a reinvigorated role for the state in enabling housing rights rather than simply housing markets, as well as ongoing dialogue and joint decision-making among policymakers, researchers, advocates and activists. In this regard, this conference represents a point of departure for what will hopefully be the beginning of far more concrete progress towards achieving adequate housing for the poor in Mexico and more just and sustainable cities. CONAVI has committed to supporting a similar conference next year, when it will be possible to better assess steps taken to support the social production of housing and to implement this crucial part of Mexico’s new housing law. A key part of making this happen includes the involvement of planners working with other social actors to defend and realize the right to the city in building more sustainable and just communities.

Jill Wigle (jill_wigle@carleton.ca) is a SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) postdoctoral fellow at the Urban Planning and Metropolitan Policy Program at the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (Azcapotzalco) in Mexico City.

Lorena Zárate (info@hic-al.org) is the coordinator of the Habitat International Coalition Regional Office for Latin America (HIC-AL) based in Mexico City. HIC is an international network of more than 400 organizations, academics and activists working on housing and human settlement issues in 100 countries. More materials on the social production of housing and habitat and the right to the city can be found at www.hic-al.org (in Spanish) and www.hic-net.org (in English and French).
At the entrance to the squatter camp sits a bright green chemical toilet, accented with a gray top and door. A narrow lane winds past it to a collapsing building where three young men lean against two pay phone booths with no phones. The door and windows are gone, and the tin roof protects only half the interior. The path leads into the heart of a cluster of improvised shelters—called an “informal settlement” in South Africa—where poverty confronts a visitor at every turn. From one shack, a young boy around three years old wanders into the tiny dirt yard amidst a few freshly sprouting weeds. He walks up to the bent chain-link fence and grabs hold, just inches from a twist of barbed wire. He wears no shoes, despite the fact that it is winter.

During the past few days, plunging temperatures have shattered fifty-four records across the country, according to the Mail & Guardian, South Africa’s main weekly newspaper. More than 15 people have died. In nearby Johannesburg, South Africa’s largest city, expecting temperatures to drop to freezing. The boy stands and stares as 11 students from Simmons College snap photographs of him while they shiver under their jackets, sweaters, hats, and socks. The dirt path, sprinkled with shards of glass and cigarette butts, winds past improvised wood and metal shelters—none with an internal source of heat—deep in the heart of Soweto (South West Township), which was created during the 1890s gold rush to house poorly paid black laborers and is now a magnet for impoverished rural migrants. Yet less than a mile away in Diepkloof, known as the Beverly Hills of Soweto, there are gated mansions owned by black families who have risen into the middle and upper classes.

**Stark Housing Disparities**

Despite the new Constitution’s guarantee of access to housing for all, the stark class disparities in the townships that ring all the country’s largest cities reveal the uneven process of remedying the inequalities institutionalized under apartheid, as a small number have benefited from “black empowerment” programs while the vast majority are still waiting their turn. When the African National Congress (ANC) came to power in South Africa’s first democratic elections in 1994, more than 7 million people—almost all of them black—lacked adequate housing, according to the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), itself a product of the new constitution. The ANC pledged to change this.

South Africa’s Department of Housing now claims on its Web site that it has built almost 2.4 million houses in the past twelve years. “Our annual production has grown from 252,000 (which in itself was a record we were proud of), to 272,000 (and still counting), for the past year,” says Housing Minister Lindiwe Sisulu. “We need to tell this good news, it portends a good future for millions still trapped in poverty, and it attests to the fact that the inhospitable firmament is clearing, and there will be better days.”

But while most South Africans say there has been progress under the ANC government, some are growing impatient with what they see as the slow pace of housing delivery, and a growing number worry that the promise of universal access to housing will not be met. “I’m too much of a realist to think that it’s possible,” says Kim Dennett, a white South African tour guide. “People have been waiting for five years on a waiting list for housing. People are made promises of being next on the list, and it’s broken time and time again.”

“I know a lot has been done,” she adds, “but it’s a drop in the ocean of what is needed.” Dennett also criticizes the quality of government-built housing,
calling it “rubbish.” Meanwhile, new community organizations are protesting the government’s slow progress and pressuring it not only to fulfill the promise of adequate housing but to provide everyone with affordable basic services like electrification and sanitation.

Apartheid is being de-racialized but not dismantled….Resources are monopolized by fewer and fewer people.

The fact that the rickety shacks in Soweto’s informal settlements lack such services, while a few blocks away Winnie Mandela’s three-story home sits behind a tall brick wall guarded by high-tech surveillance cameras, is not lost on these activists.

“South Africa actually is the most unequal society in the world,” says Trevor Ngwane, a leader of the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee, which is one of more than a dozen new protest groups that have banded together in a coalition called the Anti-Privatization Forum. “There’s more inequality now than under apartheid,” he says, arguing that apartheid is being de-racialized but not dismantled. “By and large, people are growing poorer, and most resources are being monopolized by fewer and fewer people.”

Apartheid’s Economic Exploitation

Part of the problem, according to ANC critics, is that apartheid was not just a political system that favored some and discriminated against others—one that could be fixed by taking down the “whites-only” signs and giving everyone the chance to vote. It was also an intricate system of economic exploitation that penetrated all levels of South African society and created self-perpetuating extremes of wealth and poverty. Communities like Soweto were used as dumping grounds to relocate black, “colored,” and Asian South Africans driven out of neighborhoods reserved for whites under the Group Areas Act of 1950. This was part of the National Party’s policy of complete racial separation—the essence of apartheid—after it came to power in 1948. Each of the four racially defined groups was given its own designated place to live. Blacks were further classified according to ethnic origin and assigned citizenship in remote tribal “homelands,” which reduced them to the status of temporary migrants while living or working in the cities. But this was not all.

Blacks were shunted into the most difficult and dangerous jobs, from construction to gold-mining, paid bare subsistence wages and blocked from organizing themselves, even as the best jobs were officially “reserved” for whites. Much the same was true for education, which was designed to prepare each group for its station in this draconian social experiment. The continuing impact of these policies and the economic gaps they entrenched is evident on the walk through the Soweto settlement. Along the dirt path, cushioned by overgrown grass and brush, the Simmons students come to a bridge over a small stream. To one side are red shirts, blue jeans, dingy white underwear, and other items hung out to dry in the cold, fall air. More wet clothes are rolled in a ball to the side, awaiting space on the line.

The tour guide, a Sowetan himself, calls this an example of the relationships among the different classes in Soweto: lower class families wash the clothes of the middle and upper classes to make money. Each group depends upon the other. What he does not say is that this was also true of the symbiotic relationship between whites and blacks throughout apartheid. Now, as then, the contrasts in the living standards produced by this skewed relationship are dramatic.

From the bridge, visitors gazing in one direction look back at a sea of tumbledown shacks, surrounded by overgrown grass, one with the clothesline tied to its side. On the other side of the bridge, within 50 feet, is a prosperous middle-class community of paved streets, well-tended lawns, and spacious two-story wood and brick homes. At one house, Joshua, a pensioner, unlocks the 10-foot high gate to his yard and invites the students to enter. His sits on a stool on his back porch, which is itself more than
twice the size of a typical shack. He does not wear a jacket, but keeps warm with a paraffin lamp. He says that a small outbuilding nearby—his summer kitchen—now serves as storage with winter on its way. Inside the freshly painted, four-room house, which has electricity and running water, the students peer into one of the bedrooms where a woman watches over a sleeping baby, its bare feet sticking out from beneath a soft cotton blanket. “I was surprised by some of the better areas, like Diepkloof,” says Dennett later. “It looks like mine or some of my neighbors. The squatter camps got me the most. You see those shacks and children. I mean, it’s cold outside. Imagine living in a shack.”

**The Promise of the Right to Housing**

Its insistence that access to housing is a right makes South Africa’s Constitution one of the most progressive in the world. It also stokes high expectations among South Africans for what their government should do for them—and when. While the focus on human rights in the West is often limited to individual civil and political rights, South Africa has embraced a commitment to a broad range of economic, social, and cultural rights, from housing to education, health care and a safe environment—what human rights professionals often term second and third generation rights—to mark the evolution in the global human rights movement. The difficulty comes in determining how to interpret the government’s performance.

Some, like the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee, say the government has done nowhere near enough. SAHRC Chair Jody Kollapen says it is more complicated than simply counting the houses that have been built and the number of people waiting for them because what has been promised is not houses themselves but access. “When you use the term access, it’s wider,” he says. “If it was housing, it would suggest that you have the right to housing, and therefore the state has an obligation to make housing available, whether it’s now or progressively. The right to have access to housing is interpreted as being the right to have an environment that enables you to acquire a house—whether it’s a house that’s built by the state, whether it’s access to a housing subsidy, whether it’s access to land. So it’s broader in terms of providing the enabling environment for someone to have access to a home, as opposed to limiting it to the right to housing.”

Nearly 900 miles to the southwest—just outside Cape Town, the country’s legislative capital—lies Langa, one of the oldest black townships in South Africa. Like Soweto, it houses people of radically different social classes, where the government is challenged...
to move people out of informal settlements and into permanent housing. An empty field is littered with garbage and the remnants of dismantled shacks, torn down to make way for new government-built housing. To one side are the five drab two-story wooden apartment buildings, which look even dingier beneath the dark, rolling clouds that signal an impending storm. On the other side is a massive, sprawling shack settlement. Two young men stand in the dark in their 15-by-10 foot tin shack. Black garbage bags and pieces of tarp are tacked on the roof and sides to keep the rain from leaking inside. There is no running water. Meanwhile, only 100 yards to the rear and closer to the heart of Langa, stands an evenly-laid brick road lined with homes that would not seem out of place on the Mediterranean-bright yellow and orange townhouses with late model cars in front of almost every one. The glow of an overhead light spilling over the edges of one window frame reveals a family whose members appear at ease and comfortable.

It is these kinds of stark contrasts, visible to most South Africans on a daily basis, that fuel the growing impatience among the poor for fulfillment of the promise of safe and secure housing for all. But government officials say they may have a long wait. “The right to access to housing can be realized only subject to the availability of adequate resources. Given the limited funds allocated every year in the budget for this purpose, it will take many years before the housing backlog will be eradicated,” says the SAHRC in a recent report. “Moreover,” the report says, “the large number of people who live in informal housing, or who have no access to housing whatsoever, also poses a serious challenge to the state, which is constitutionally obliged to formulate programs taking account of this reality.”

Beth Maclin is a graduating communications and political science student at Simmons College in Boston. She traveled to South Africa in May-June 2007 as part of the Human Rights in South Africa class. The article was previously published in The Simmons Voice, of which she is editor-in-chief, and appears in Old Wrongs, New Rights: Student Views of the New South Africa, edited by Dan Connell and available from Africa World Press.
Almost fifty years ago, Jane Jacobs shook the planning establishment with her book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. While neither explicitly feminist nor oriented to women, Jacobs' perspectives were rooted in the life experiences, sensitivities and issues of women. So were her solutions.

The second wave of feminism started forty years ago and soon thereafter introspective consciousness-raising turned outwards. One way this change was manifest was that women started to critically evaluate their built environments. At the 1976 UN-HABITAT Conference in Vancouver, women delegates met and focused on how male experiences and values had shaped and dominated urban planning and architecture and how these fields had failed to meet the needs of women. By then, women from North and South, at both ends of the social scale, had entered the paid workforce in droves to become primary and secondary breadwinners in their households. Despite this, women, especially those from vulnerable minority groups, remained overwhelmingly responsible for human nurturing and domestic work, laboring as unpaid homemakers, nannies or maids. Some women, of course, also achieved spectacular careers. Juggling multiple roles, however, has forced women to constantly multitask and live with very fractured timeframes. Women also started to leave abusive domestic environments, raising their families alone, often only to trade the emotional and physical violence of their spouses for the economic humiliation and cruelty of poverty.

In the mid-1970s, activist groups such as Women Plan London, Women Plan Toronto, Women’s Design Service (UK) and many rape crisis centers organized. Five major planning issues emerged: mixed-use planning, public transit, safer cities, social services planning and the role of women in decision-making. *Women & Environments International Magazine* was started to document these developments—and it continues to do so today.

**Mixed-Use Planning**

In 1933, the International Congress of Modern Architecture, held on board a ship that sailed from Marseilles to Athens, adopted segregated land use planning as the crowning conclusion of the industrial revolution. Urban planning reflected the experiences, perspectives and visions of the overwhelmingly male professions of the time. Segregated land uses, especially at low densities, increase the need to transport goods and people. This strains public and private budgets, the environment, public health and time schedules—especially for women, with their multiple roles, lower incomes and fractured timeframes. Feminists called for mixed-use planning and greater densities to render home, jobs and services more accessible and affordable.

The vitality, beauty and diversity of towns and cities built prior to the era of land use segregation still testifies to the validity of mixing urban functions. Jane Jacobs, too, demanded mixed and intensified land uses. Later, the environmental movement realized the benefits of mixed-use and intensified planning, proclaiming it “smart growth” and better planning, but never acknowledging or endorsing the gendered implications.

Land use segregation and low densities still prevail in North America. Big box stores with huge parking lots in ever-larger assemblies keep sprouting in the countryside far from communities. Municipal councils, craving the employment and tax revenue expected to flow from commercial and industrial uses, fail to force developers to change. While there is some mixed-use development—usually in older, already mixed-use and dense neighborhoods—society becomes more dependent and addicted to the car. Woe to those too old to drive and/or too poor to own a car—mostly women!

**Public Transit**

Around the world, women are generally poorer than...
men. They rely more on public transportation, walking or biking. Inappropriate pricing, design, routing and scheduling of transit becomes a stressful problem for women as they escort children or elderly dependents and shop and run errands during their lunch hours and commutes, and when they become frail or disabled.

In the 1980s, the Toronto Transit Commission pioneered a safety audit, “Moving Forward: Making Transit Safer for Women.” The resulting changes greatly improved safety for women. Women can now ask bus drivers to let them off anywhere along a bus route after hours. Subways have strategically located mirrors, emergency phones and monitored waiting areas. Elevators for wheelchairs greatly help elderly people, most of whom are women, as well as mothers with strollers or heavy shopping bags.

In the 1990s, senior levels of government started to download their responsibilities and amalgamate cities and towns into unwieldy monsters. Under the motto that public services have to pay their own way, transit systems were forced to raise fares, thereby losing riders, many of whom were poor women without alternative means of transportation.

Safe Cities

Wars, genocide, patriarchal religions, diseases such as HIV/AIDS and extremes of poverty and wealth victimize women, often denying them their most basic human rights. Poor aboriginal and minority women are particularly vulnerable.

Public safety for women is therefore increasingly seen as a reflection of economic, cultural, social and environmental injustice. The pervasiveness and horror of domestic violence against women of all ages only became a public issue with the second wave of feminism. For the first time, women started to speak up and question the prevailing attitude of blaming the victim. Safety audits were done, police and criminal justice practices were questioned and rape was prosecuted as a crime. “Take Back the Night” campaigns reinforced women’s demand for safety. Jane Jacobs was the first to point to the safety that “eyes on the street” provide in mixed-use and socially diverse neighborhoods, and in 1994 Gerda Wekerle and Carolyn Whitzman offered planners Safe Cities: Guidelines for Planning, Design and Management.

Social Service Planning

With the exploding urbanization that followed World War II, suburbs developed everywhere, usually without social services such as health, elderly and child care. Women were still expected to perform these functions in the home without getting paid.

By definition a social service is one that transcends individual responsibility and need. The short-lived social democratic government in Ontario, Canada, therefore revised its Planning Act to mandate that social services be planned for. The succeeding conservative government quickly reversed this—as well as the requirement that major residential developments provide a certain portion of affordable housing. That government also shifted responsibility for many social services onto the shoulders of municipalities that could not afford to pay for them. Many services were therefore cut—and again, women were affected the most.

In Southern countries, loans from the North often mandate
privatization or closure of the limited public infrastructure that exists, including for water, electricity and sewage, as well as schools and hospitals. What services remain end up out of the reach of most people, especially the poor, most of whom are women. This feminization of poverty has spread in both the North and South. As social justice is key to sustainable development, this means that a public commitment to planning for social services, from education to child, elder and health care is critical.

**Women’s Role in Decision-Making**

Though more women have won seats on councils and parliaments over the years, they rarely occupy more than 30 percent. Even when elected, women are likely to speak for a non-gendered community and deal with “family needs” rather than women's issues. Official jargon, inconvenient locations—especially in large amalgamated municipalities—and meeting times tend to discourage women from becoming active citizens or candidates. Women's multiple roles and the lack of child care, time, energy and resources further inhibits involvement.

Local governments can no longer afford the time and money to reach out to and stay in touch with their citizens, especially minority and disempowered groups of women. Jane Jacobs noted this trend in her last book, *Dark Age Ahead*. The token mandatory public consultation for urban planning decisions needs to evolve into participatory planning that ensures a fair share in the decision-making process, especially for disempowered groups.

**Four Major Changes Over the Last Half Century**

New technology, neoliberalism, globalization and climate change are changing the world. Since women are still the primary caregivers in the world, they are directly and differently affected by these changes. How do these changes relate to the above gendered planning issues?

**Women and New Technology.**

Men still dominate the world of computers and automation, though this world affects women quite differently. Low-skill clerical and assembly line jobs held mostly by women have fallen to automation. Call centers and other high-tech/low-skill industries are being outsourced to women in low-wage areas and in the South. Of course, technology also confers access to an unprecedented amount of knowledge and communication, which benefits women.

Many jobs are moving from the office, factory or even storefront into the home, allowing closer integration of nurturing and domestic responsibilities...
with paid employment—for both men and women, though women prevail. While employers save in office or industrial space, the home-employed often feel isolated and stressed by insufficient or inappropriate space. Home employment challenges the traditional planning notion of segregating residential from employment functions, reintegrating two fundamental aspects of life. Urban planning should acknowledge and embrace this. It is time that scale and environmental criteria replace the inane traditional land use labels and definitions which have straight-jacketed our communities through official plans and zoning laws.

Women and Neoliberalism.
In the 1960s and 1970s, many believed the days of capitalism were numbered. Instead, capitalism was repackaged as neoliberalism and came back with a vengeance. It devalued the social in favor of the individual, the public in favor of the private, cooperation in favor of competition and gentleness in favor of aggressiveness. Only that which makes profit or earns income is of value. Almost everywhere public services, housing, institutions and budgets are being cut, eliminated or privatized. Hard-won women’s centers, services and child care facilities are closing. Nurturing and domestic work is still assumed the responsibility of “real” women to accept out of love or with minimum financial reward. Most of this work in fact still has no place in conventional economic data and is therefore not valued. Women, especially the elderly, poor or otherwise vulnerable, as well as single parents, bear the brunt of neoliberalism.

In the 1970s, affordable housing was still considered a public responsibility. Non-profit, cooperative and social housing was being built in most cities in the North. Women focused on expanding housing opportunities, improving security of tenure and reversing discriminatory design and financing. Since then, social housing has been privatized or downloaded. Funding for new housing is almost nil, and waiting lists are enormous. Women in the South still have to struggle for an equal right to own land.

Maybe the pendulum is starting to swing back, reaffirming the importance of the public, the social, the cooperative and the gentle. In some countries, neoliberalism resulted in so much suffering, desperation and outrage that citizens elected governments committed to providing public and social infrastructure. Several countries in Africa, Latin America and Europe are seriously trying “bottom-up” governance and budgeting, and “gender mainstreaming,” giving women equality on councils and in legislative bodies.

Women and Globalization.
Throughout history, the struggle to survive and to improve ones economic situation has forced people to seek refuge or fortune elsewhere, thus bringing their cultures, beliefs, energies and diversity to other lands. For
women, especially singles, single parents or visible minorities, such transitions are especially difficult as neoliberalism takes advantage of vulnerabilities. Many poor women have to relinquish their own families to serve others as nannies, caregivers or cleaners, often suffering harassment, exploitation and abuse. Again, Jane Jacobs stressed the need for planning for social diversity in her critique of standard practice. The more urban planning integrates diverse populations and functions, the more misconceptions and hatred of the unfamiliar will give way to interdependence, cooperation and acceptance.

Regula Modlich (rmodlich@evdemon.ca) is a retired urban planner. She was a founding member of Women Plan Toronto and Toronto Women’s City Alliance and a longtime board member and managing editor of Women & Environments International Magazine.

Women and Climate Change. Coping with climate change will require tremendous changes in human values, behaviors, lifestyles and economies—nothing short of a revolution. Corporate thinking needs to change its bottom line from profitability to sustainability. Guilt-tripping women into reducing, reusing, recycling and being responsible for the health of their families and the earth will no longer suffice.

Government procrastinating and dickering about Kyoto formulas and trade-offs will have catastrophic consequences, jeopardizing our environment and species. New ideas about travel and transportation are needed. Maybe the twentieth century planner Hans Blumenfeld’s idea of free public transit will be placed back on the agenda, and with it should come a review of transit’s design, scheduling and routing to ensure that it serves new lifestyles and priorities. Suburban and ex-urban shopping malls, with unused parking during much of the night, could be more intensely used by incorporating multi-unit housing, while existing housing could be allowed to incorporate commercial functions. All arable land will need to be protected and utilized. Food production and urban agriculture will become an important part of planning.

The planning profession must therefore ensure that intensification, integration and reclassification of urban functions based on social and environmental criteria will meet the challenge of climate change and support human nurturing and domestic roles. Then, maybe, men too will value, share and enjoy these essential and existential aspects of life.
On the last day of July 2007, the homes and workplaces of four urban studies scholars in Berlin were raided and searched by German police. All four scholars were charged with “membership of a terrorist association.” One of these scholars, Dr. Andrej Holm, was arrested and imprisoned. In addition, three anti-military protestors suspected of being members of a particular “militant group” under observation by the German authorities were also arrested for attempted arson on German army vehicles.

The persecution of our colleagues in Germany occurred because of the critical nature of their research, teaching, writing and activism against gentrification in German cities and towns. The arrest warrant accused the academics of using similar “phrases and keywords” in their writings as those used by the militant group accused of the arson attack. A particular keyword that was cause for suspicion was “gentrification,” while others included “complexity,” “diffusion,” and “Marxist-Leninist.” The scholars were also under suspicion because they were seen as having the intellectual capacity and institutional support (like access to a library, office and computer) to author the texts used by the militant group, and because they had been involved as activists in a variety of “left-wing scene” activities and protests in Germany over many years.

Dr. Holm was released from prison in late August of 2007. In October, the German Federal Court declared his arrest to have been unlawful, heightening criticisms of the Federal Prosecution’s actions. In this context, the accusations were downgraded for rather technical reasons, from §129a “terrorist organization” to §129 “criminal association.” Though the charges have been watered down, the accused are still fighting proceedings against them, and all remain under observation by the German authorities, who spy on them, check their emails and tap their phones. Friends and colleagues are also being pressed to act as witnesses against the accused.

The actions of the German authorities in this case drew widespread criticism from both sides of the Atlantic, and many organizations, networks and individuals wrote letters of protest. Such criminalization of research and academic activity is a menace to academic freedom and intellectual liberty. It is a rather chilling reminder of the power of the state to condemn criticism and criminalize the work of actively engaged and socially conscious researchers and teachers. The actions of the German state are the antithesis of the foundational qualities of proper academic research and endeavor: an open but critical and inquiring mind; the ability to freely publish the results of research undertaken with rigor and integrity; and the right to live in freedom so long as those responsibilities have been upheld.

Alarming effects of these events on academic research are already being felt. In an article in The Chronicle of Higher Education on 29 October 2007, Professor Margit Mayer at the Free University of Berlin reflected:

I just had some students who came up for their final master’s exams. Some of them wanted to focus on gentrification. They came into my office hours (sic) and they were very concerned. They said, ‘I don’t know if I can choose this topic anymore. I don’t want to endanger myself.

If research in the social sciences is to effectively and accurately illuminate social problems and phenomena, and be relevant and timely for practice and policy, then it must surely be politically active and continuously engaged with its subjects of interest. The actions of the German state in this case undermine this by branding such political and civic engagement as “terrorism.”

Further information on the case can be found at http://einstellung.so36.net/en. Donations can be made to fund the fight on behalf of the four accused scholars, and the campaign to overturn Germany’s terrorism laws, at http://einstellung.so36.net/en/donations.
a sovereign state. While Palestinian negotiators following the U.S. “road map” to peace have in mind a sovereign state with towns and cities in the West Bank and Gaza that are connected to each other, Israeli policy has produced “facts on the ground” that would make these connections impossible. Israel already has 580 military checkpoints in the occupied territories that make movement from one town to another, and within some towns, an ordeal. Israeli settlers, on the other hand, move about the occupied territories on an exclusive highway system. 

Land use and building regulations administered by Israel, and the wall built around the occupied territories, are instruments that came out of the urban planner’s toolkit for the creation of apartheid regimes. Land use and building codes create obstacles for Palestinian residents to build and rebuild, and are a pretext for Israeli confiscation of Palestinian land. According to the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHD), between 1967 and 2006, Israel has demolished 13,147 Palestinian homes. Israel continues to build the giant Separation Wall, most of it on land that belongs to the Palestinians. The wall separates Israel and the West Bank in a way that produces significant advantages to Israel, including 85% of the territory and most of the water supply in the West Bank.

ICAHD’s Jeff Halper believes that Israel is moving towards the “cantonization” of the occupied territories, which would mean three isolated and self-contained enclaves in the West Bank and one in Gaza, all of them completely dependent on Israel for their sustenance and subject to periodic military incursions. According to Halper, “The problem in the Middle East is not the Palestinian people, not Hamas, not the Arabs, not Hezbollah or the Iranians or the entire Muslim world. It’s us, the Israelis. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the single greatest cause of instability, extremism and violence in our region, is perhaps the simplest conflict in the world to resolve. For almost 20 years, since the PLO’s recognition of Israel within the 1949 Armistice Lines (the “Green Line” separating Israel from the West Bank and Gaza), every Palestinian leader, backed by large majorities of the Palestinian population, has presented Israel with a most generous offer: A Jewish state on 78% of Israel/Palestine in return for a Palestinian state on just 22% – the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza.”

The intransigence of Israel and its policies of apartheid have been met with acquiescence by the U.S. Planners in the U.S., even many...
who opposed the uprooting of viable communities by the federal urban renewal program in the 1960s, have also failed to raise their voices against the use of U.S. aid to support these policies. Therefore, it is important that Planners Network members revive the call we made at our 2004 conference to build bridges and not insurmountable walls. One way of doing this is to support the courageous work of ICAHD (for more information go to www.icahdusa.org).

The Green Zone: Gated Community and Imperial Bunker

As if following the model of the illegal Israeli settlements in Palestinian territory, the U.S. set up its own luxurious enclave in Baghdad. After the 2003 invasion by the U.S., the Green Zone became a luxurious oasis of peace in a country that the U.S. military proceeded to devastate over a five-year period. This miniature Disneyworld is a slice of Northamerican life, a few square miles of quiet office buildings, shopping and night life, while the rest of the city goes without power and safe drinking water much of the time. Tightly protected by high concrete walls and military checkpoints, this modern version of an imperial city is the command center for an occupation that has destroyed the fabric and infrastructure of a modern Arab nation, resulting in the deaths of over 100,000 Iraqis and two million refugees. It has been referred to as “the bubble,” more Midwest than Mideast. It is home for the largest U.S. Embassy staff in the world, and a new embassy building now under construction will be a giant fortified bunker, the largest in the world. It will have 21 buildings, its own power, water and waste water facilities, a gym, cinema and swimming pool.

There were urban planners in the U.S. who thought that working on rebuilding projects in places like Iraq could make a small contribution to a change in U.S. priorities. But the evidence is all too clear that reconstruction funds made contractors rich and Iraq’s urban infrastructure is still worse than it was a half decade ago. And it is impossible to engage in any open, transparent and democratic planning process as long as you’re part of an occupying force with the most powerful military in the world, a force that is on display every day on the streets and in the air.

In the U.S. long-term strategic plan for Iraq, the Green Zone is to be the political and administrative center for a permanent occupation, eerily similar to Israel’s occupation of the Palestinian territories. Despite criticisms from a minority in Congress, the U.S. is preparing to stay by hunkering down on 14 “enduring bases” throughout the country. While the bases would play a strategic role in maintaining U.S. power in the Middle East, replacing some of the bases in Saudi Arabia, they would also allow for the continuing sorties that have destroyed the fabric of towns and cities such as Fallujah throughout the country. City planners should be outraged that the military has built entire Northamerican cities in the Middle Eastern deserts – with Burger Kings and Pizza Huts, shopping centers, hospitals, miniature golf courses, and distinct neighborhoods – behind walls that shelter its residents from the rage caused by the utter destruction of Iraqi urban life.

But the grass may not be so green in the imperial command posts. Rockets and mortars have now reached Baghdad’s Green Zone. Reports are there are squatters and perhaps 5,000 poor Iraqis hanging on there, according to Time Magazine. The Iraqi government may change and maybe, just maybe, a new administration in the U.S. will not only get out of Iraq but stop supporting apartheid throughout the Middle East and the world. Progressive planners should continue to demand it.

Gentrification, Social Struggles and Academic Freedom

When professors and students adopt a friendly and supportive attitude towards urban social movements struggling to come to grips with gentrification and displacement resulting from speculative real estate markets and pliant local governments, they sometimes face risks themselves. They are considered to be on the fringe, not serious, too radical and too “political.” This is especially true when the urban movements are militant in their resistance – for example, the Black Panthers and Young Lords in the 1960s. Research that engages urban social movements that challenge local and national centers of economic and political power is rarely funded, and foundations never anoint them with accolades for being “best practices.”
In this issue we are printing the article by Libby Porter that describes the situation of Andrej Holm and Matthias Bernt, two scholars who were recently arrested by German authorities. Both have ties to urban social movements and engage in research on gentrification. The Planners Network Steering Committee has sent a letter of support for these two researchers to the Attorney of the German Federal Supreme Court, which can be viewed on www.plannersnetwork.org.

The arrest sparked protest from scholars and activists from around the world because it undermines academic freedom. Even more important, however, it has the effect of restricting access by social movements to support from friendly individuals within academia who understand the importance of developing knowledge through engagement in social change. As universities throughout North America and Europe move towards a corporate model of governance, these opportunities are diminishing. University administrators from the corporate world are hired not as educational, ethical or civic leaders but as image-makers and fund-raisers. They are less willing to protect academic freedom when governments allege “terrorist” ties with faculty and students, just as previous generations of administrators hounded out socialists and communists.

Progressive planners inside and outside the walls of academia should struggle to lower the walls and keep military checkpoints from throttling the flow of ideas.
Bounded Tourism: *Plaza Mexico in California*

by CLARA IRAZÁBAL AND MACARENA GÓMEZ-BARRIS


Conceived and owned by Korean investors, the shopping mall Plaza Mexico in Southern California embodies a unique case of invention and commodification of traditions for locally-bound immigrants and U.S. citizens of Mexican descent. The Plaza is an architectural recreation of Mexican regional and national icons that make its patrons feel “as if you were in Mexico.” As such, it produces a space of diasporic, bounded tourism, whereby venture capitalists opportunistically reinvent tradition within a structural context of constrained immigrant mobility. While most of the contemporary theory of tourism, travel and place emphasize the erosion of national boundaries and the fluidity of territories, the case of Plaza Mexico brings us to appreciate this phenomenon and its opposite as well—the strengthening of national borders and their impact on the (in)mobility of millions of individuals.

Plaza Mexico reproduces the plaza experience of Latin America in the heart of southeast Los Angeles—in Lynwood, California. The mall’s architecture, store offerings and event programming have created a successful formula to attract a large number of Mexican and Mexican-American clientele, and increasingly a broader Latina/o clientele. Plaza Mexico capitalizes upon consumer identification with homeland within a structural context where its mostly immigrant clientele has little capacity to make return trips to Mexico. Indeed, in the aftermath of a U.S. immigrant backlash with increasingly stringent state immigration policies and anti-immigrant political climate, Plaza Mexico produces a physical and cultural space that imitates “the best” of Mexico without requiring the increasingly impossible journey of return. Both because of socio-economic limitations, and due to the increased U.S.-Mexico border fortification, surveillance, deportation sweeps and political climate that define immigrants as “aliens,” the prospect of mobility across the border has decidedly declined. The structural shifts in immigrant policies facilitate capitalist enterprises that market nostalgia and local tourism within transnational contexts. Plaza Mexico is thus a new form of venture capitalism that targets specific ethnic market niches, mostly composed of diasporic subjects trapped in place.

**Plaza Mexico, USA**

The plaza’s façades and architectural motifs, such as plazas, kiosks, fountains and monuments, are characteristic of several Mexican cities; among them, the Angel of Independence of Mexico City and a kiosk of the Zocalo of San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato, which show up as replicas in Plaza Mexico. The physical arrangement of the mall emulating open streets and plazas has enhanced its atmosphere as a “traditional” Mexican town. Plaza Mexico is easily reached from the majority-Latino cities in east and south Los Angeles. It thus functions as a social gathering space in an area where there are not many other options of “public” open space available to its residents. The mall allows for the possibility of self-perception as individuals who appreciate Mexican “traditions” and as agents that reproduce them. In a neighborhood that otherwise has been economically deprived for years and that shows signs of decay in its built environment, Plaza Mexico is a source...
ABOVE: Plaza Mexico shopping mall in Lynwood, California. People strolling in the private space as if in a public plaza in Mexico. In the background, there are the replicas of the kiosk of San Miguel de Allende and the façade of the Palace of Jalisco.
of community pride and enjoyment, and provides a gathering space with multiple potentials.

Under single ownership and rupturing with the existing urban grid in Lynwood, Plaza Mexico is organized as a detached, inward-oriented island surrounded by parking space. The typology of the plaza thus constitutes a corporate co-optation of the traditional ethnic strip model, which has been recreated within a private shopping center. Plaza Mexico functions as a “miniature park” of sorts in which an assortment of Mexican façade architecture, open space landscaping, patriotic symbols and religious icons create a setting in which an idea of Mexican national authenticity has been repackaged for mall patrons.

Most emblematic of the attempt at architectural authenticity is the scaled-down reproduction of Mexico City’s Angel of Independence, one of the primordial symbols of the Mexican nation, which currently marks the major entrance to Plaza Mexico. Plaza Mexico’s Angel has become an important site of congregation for recent political rallies, replicating its traditional role in Mexico City. The Angel of Independence is but one of the replicas, imitations, incorporations and reworkings of Mexican national architecture and symbolism at the mall. In general, there is a selective editing of traditions and values that are deemed worthy of portraying at the Plaza, based on historical (pre-Hispanic, colonial and folkloric), Catholic, familial, patriotic, heterosexual and patriarchal values. These symbols reify the myths of both a shared Mexican national identity and a homogeneous Mexican community in the Southern California region.

The Tourism of Staying Put

Unlike Olvera Street, a Mexican-themed tourist destination in the birthplace of Los Angeles for mostly Anglos, but also Asian, African-American and Latino patrons, Plaza Mexico is a notably “brown” and Mexican retail and cultural space. In the heart of a global city, the plaza activates a distinct phenomenon of diasporic, bounded tourism, where the plaza is an available surrogate for a Mexican homeland. Many plaza visitors do not have the legal or economic resources to travel to Mexico, even if desired. In effect, most plaza visitors...
are of low or middle-low income and their families are larger than the average for the state of California or the U.S., and those without legal U.S. permanent residency or citizenship rights face exceedingly harsh border conditions. For these reasons, traveling to Mexico constitutes an onerous proposition for large segments of the Los Angeles immigrant population. Plaza Mexico cleverly targets this expanding, yet previously unrecognized, niche for tourism and consumption: forcefully bounded-in-place individuals with a desire for ethnic consumption and leisure, great nostalgia for an idealized homeland they cannot easily return to and some time and money to spare.

For diasporic and immigrant populations that have their permanence in the host nation under threat, time- and place-based nostalgias can be more eagerly engaged, a context that in part explains the popularity and draw of Plaza Mexico for Mexican immigrants. The threat of deportation hangs very heavily in the minds of unauthorized immigrants in the United States and greatly conditions many aspects of their lives, including opportunities for housing, education, labor, driving privileges and citizen rights. Also, as is true for all immigrants, for Mexican immigrants there are usually long periods of adjustment, nostalgia and need to reterritorialize a sense of Mexicanness, perhaps over a period of multiple generations, so that it becomes a defining characteristic of identification on the U.S. side of the border. Plaza Mexico responds to these increased external pressures by providing a place of solace, gathering and the reterritorialization of individual and collective identities of its mostly Mexican immigrant clientele.

The construction of tourist enclaves is a common urban strategy used for neighborhood revitalization and the promotion of economic development. Plaza Mexico expands those opportunities for opening a new tourist and commercial market niche because it constitutes a tourist enclave that primarily serves an emplaced diasporic population. Furthermore, it is a tourist enclave for a low-income ethnic class in a global city. Thus, not only does it capture an ethnic segment of the market previously under-targeted, but also a socio economic one. Catering to people in lower income brackets in the region of Los Angeles, Plaza Mexico does away with commonly held assumptions about tourism not being an activity of the poor. Disproving this axiom, Plaza Mexico is successfully appropriating a strategy that has served corporate giants such as Walmart, and thus may constitute a new frontier for the development of the corporate tourist industry.

Material mobility may be severely diminished for the unauthorized immigrants trapped in place in the United States, but social and imaginative mobility are not. These other dimensions of mobility allow for Plaza Mexico to be a profitable commercial enterprise and a place where many visitors can imaginatively re-inhabit the homeland. In effect, the regional community has developed an emotional connectedness with the Plaza as a spatial expression of Mexicanness.
Fixing Tourists In-Place and Dis-Placing Tourist Sites

In the case of Plaza Mexico, the tourist is permanently away from the homeland, longs to visit it but is prevented from doing so and sees connection to the Mexican nation as a quintessential feature of her own identity (and what gets actualized at Plaza Mexico).

Thus, tourism in Plaza Mexico caters to a trapped diaspora, which brings to its hosted land the longed for, “authentic” traditions and commodities of the homeland for their consumption away from home. This kind of tourism upsets the conventional roles assigned to tourists and places, whereby tourists are the ones to travel to “fixed” locales. In this case, tourists are fixed in their host locale, and the place they long to visit is virtually brought to them through simulations of architecture and media, and the reproduction of commodities—the fixation of tourists in place and the displacement of tourist sites. It is a special type of “diasporic tourism”; neither is it constituted by tourists coming from afar to visit a diaspora in a foreign region or country (such as New York tourists visiting “Little Italy” or any such ethnic enclaves populated by diasporas in the city), nor by tourists from diasporas visiting their homelands (such as Chinese Americans visiting China). In this new twist of “diasporic tourism,” neither the diasporic subjects of Mexican Lynwood inhabit a place that has become a tourist site (i.e., they are not recognized as constituting an ethnic enclave worth visiting), nor do they have the choice—because of legal or economic constrains—of visiting the homeland. Trapped in this uncommon condition, where they are neither tourists abroad nor the objects that foreign tourists come to enjoy at home, they have been reinvented by the tourist industry as a total package in situs: as both the performers and the objects of tourist gazes at their diasporic home—a reflexive tourism. The plaza visitor becomes both a subject and an object of the exhibition of Mexicanness. Her role as an object becomes paramount at special events, through the performance of Mexican artistic traditions.

In Plaza Mexico, Mexican national identity is recreated by a private corporation run by Korean entrepreneurs because it is good for sales. The side effect of this move, however, is the creation of a place that can enhance cultural capital and community-building opportunities. Fortunately in the case of Plaza Mexico, these capabilities have been embraced both by the owners and managers of the mall and by the community. This case thus provides a perfectible partnership model to emulate for entrepreneurs, city officials and community leaders interested in advancing economic and community development objectives in tandem through cross-sectoral collaboration among the public, private and non-profit arenas. Apart from the monetary benefits, the plaza has become a cultural, artistic and even political hub for the Mexican community in the region. The Mexican states of Puebla and Durango have established their hometown associations there, and Mexican representatives that visit Southern California visit the plaza for official events.
Not only is the phenomenon of ascribing meaning to Plaza Mexico’s symbols and events the prerogative of the mall’s owners, designers and managers. Meanings at the plaza, as in any other social space, are socially constructed. Examples abound, from the appropriation of the place for the reenactment of traditions (e.g., folk dances and religious festivities) to the more politically subversive ones, such as the workshops for immigrant rights education or the gathering of pro-immigrant rallies. The de/recontextualization of meaningful symbols of the Mexican past in Plaza Mexico produces an illusionary field on which both to construct a collective identity around a shared notion of Mexicanness and to imagine and mobilize towards a different common future. The latter opens up venues for agency and political engagement based on ethnic solidarity.

Conclusion

Olvera Street provides a critical historical precursor in the City of Angels for how tourism and Latina/o subjectivity are bound up with questions of nostalgia, homeland and belonging. At the same time, Plaza Mexico represents a critical departure from places like Olvera Street, especially in terms of the specialization of its planning, the heightened reification of foreign national symbols and the intense cultivation of a specifically local market clientele whose sense of contemporary homeland, culture and nation are all on “post-modern” offer at the Plaza. Structural shifts in immigrant policies, a generalized culture of fear and immigrant backlash and an increasingly militarized border produce conditions of staying put, a phenomenon under-explored in comparison to the conventional transnational circuits of movement across borders widely recognized by the globalization literature.

Plaza Mexico has a hold over hearts, minds and memories, not only because of its elicitation of feeling of being “there” rather than “here,” but for its ethnic commercial offerings. More importantly, Plaza Mexico tries to reimagine the nation for immigrants who are structurally but not imaginatively constrained and look for ethnoscapes of escape. Plaza Mexico, as a mall and multi-layered architectural project, and even projected as a cultural center of ever greater possibilities, offers a privatized “public” space that both controls and releases the promises of future forms of social being and belonging in the urban landscape.

Clara Irazábal, PhD., is an assistant professor in

Gómez-Barris, PhD., is an assistant professor in Sociology and American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California.

CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

Planning in Challenging Climates


PN2008 will bring together an array of planning practitioners, community and economic development professionals, organizers, policy analysts, designers, students and faculty. They will discuss strategies addressing social and environmental justice in challenging climates - including social, political and economic climates.

Topics of interest to the conference include, but are not limited to: models for community economic development; inner city community development; art and the city; planning and aboriginal communities; neighbourhood revitalization; downtown redevelopment; housing and homelessness; promoting active transportation; urban ecology; green buildings and sustainable communities; social impacts of sprawl; heritage planning; progressive planning and the media; age-friendly communities.

A range of session types are encouraged, from conventional panels to participatory workshops and “how-to” sessions. Please send proposals for individual contributions or full sessions to: PN2008Sessions@pnmb.org. Deadline for proposals is April 30, 2008. Space is limited. Please include the proposed session content, format and a list of potential speakers or participants.
The Postcard and Reinvention of Puerto Rico

by LUIS APONTE-PÁRESES

Tourism is one of the largest industries in the world today. Its impact on the environment, national economies, technology, social mores, health, culture and an array of other areas is very large and difficult to capture. In the academic world, the study of tourism and leisure has become a major focus of several disciplines. Of these, one area that is still in need of attention is the history of tourism and its nexus with colonialism.

The United States as Imperial Republic

In my research I am exploring the relationship between tourism, colonialism and empire, in particular the U.S. as an imperial republic. Although this is not the venue to fully examine the history of the U.S. as empire, the case of Puerto Rico, one of a handful of U.S. tropical possessions, is illustrative of the way imperial metropolises “invented” their colonies and their people. In contrast to European nations, the imperial designs of which were celebrated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially in the case of the British Empire, the United States has been in denial about its imperial goals, and for that matter its imperial history. The acquisition of Florida, the Louisiana Purchase and the taking of Texas and the northernmost provinces of Mexico through war provided the bases for a transcontinental nation. The final wars of expulsion—of the native inhabitants of North America from their land—were completed during the same period. To these conquests, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Cuba and an assortment of other Pacific Islands were added at the end of the nineteenth century.

These latter acquisitions had one thing in common: they were the lands of people whose racial and cultural identity was considered suspect in a period when the United States was defining itself as a nation. Although the establishment of the republic was an eighteenth century affair, the nineteenth century was clearly the period when the narrative “inventing” the United States was completed, using Benedict Anderson’s well-established concept of an “imagined community.”

Inventing the societies and people of the newly acquired lands as “other” served to define the United States and its people as being in contrast. This “invention” was narrated in consumption venues, like magazines, travel guides and textbooks. Explaining the new lands and their people was key to maintaining the narrative of the U.S. as a country whose “manifest destiny” was to “better” the “other” less civilized societies through conquest. Notions of racial superiority and the blessings of a Christian God became defining characteristics of this Anglo-Saxon nation.

The acquisition of Puerto Rico in 1898 required an “explanation” to U.S. society. Reviewing the way other lands became part of the U.S. suggests that at each juncture, the need to “explain” the new lands and the populations already living in them was key to their inclusion/exclusion, and it placed in a cultural/racial hierarchy the ongoing narrative of U.S. society. The “imperial archives,” the historical record found in non-fiction and fiction publications of the period, suggests that to the conqueror it was clear that all populations living in newly acquired lands were considered inferior and thus needed to be either exterminated (First Peoples, a.k.a. American Indians), debased and humiliated (Mexicans, Hawaiians, Alaskans) or enslaved (people from Africa in the southern territories). Even the “white” populations that were part of these lands were considered suspect since most were from southern European stock (Spanish, Portuguese, French) and Catholic. The invention of these “other” societies was added to the overall understanding of the U.S. as a “unique” experiment in history, thus differentiating U.S. history further from the rest of the Americas, similar post-colonial societies also going through their own invention project as nations. Latin America and Anglo America became totally different twins.

Tourism and Postcards of Invention

Tourism and its attendant corollaries played an important role in inventing the Puerto Rican as “other” through representations of the Island and its inhabitants in pop culture venues like travel guides, mass consumption
magnivues, postcards and purported scientific magazines like *National Geographic*. Tropicalizing Puerto Rico was critical to the creation of a clearly inferior subject people, and to achieve this, two key elements needed to be invented: the “tropics” and the “tropical subject.”

The tropics, somewhat contradictorily, were all of the following: places of disease; wonderful places to get cured; very productive land leading to a society lacking incentives for development; good for agriculture and a provider of raw materials; and great places for tourism and sex. Similarly, the tropical subject was: child-like; innocent and naive; sensuous; lazy; untrustworthy; and passive. As Frantz Fanon wrote in *Black Skin, White Masks*, “A white man addressing a Negro behaves exactly like an adult with a child and starts smirking, whispering, patronizing, cozening.”

Over the years, I have collected hundreds of early postcards representing Puerto Rico. Although postcards were a relatively new medium, their role was powerful in shaping the images of the colonized by different metropolises across the globe. In dialogue with my postcard collection, I like to pose questions. Who took the photo and why was the subject chosen? Who were the “models” (subjects)? Did they “volunteer”? If so, why? Who sent the postcard and why this or that particular postcard? And finally, Who received the card, and what message(s) did they get from the postcard?

Postcard “reading” is contextualized by reviewing the multitude of venues—for example, postcards, books, other publications and theater—utilized by the U.S. acting as a traditional “metropolis” while in the process of nation-/empire-building. The use of postcards, a relatively new technology, would be a harbinger of the development of a visual culture that permeated society in the twentieth century. The case of Puerto Rico was not unique. Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines and other islands across the Pacific, along with Mexico and the rest of Latin America, were part of a nascent travel industry.

To briefly illustrate, let’s look at a postcard sent to Yonkers, New York, from Puerto Rico in 1905. Tourism in Puerto Rico was not yet developed. Those who came to the island were usually related to a commercial, governmental, military, religious or scientific group. These early visitors, especially those involved in the early tourism industry, were key to developing images of Puerto Rico for the general U.S. population.

What does this postcard tell us about early twentieth century Puerto Rico and those whose “gaze” gave the “others” an understanding of us? Whose gaze should I interrogate? The gaze of the young Puerto Rican(s) whose identity is “captured” forever in a postcard, or the gaze of the photographer, who perhaps was commissioned by commercial or “scientific” sponsors?

The photo was taken in Old San Juan. My reading explores early stages of the “imperial gaze” during the first decade of U.S. colonial rule in Puerto Rico. During this period, a very large number of publications were produced. Some were government publications dealing with information relevant to the imperial enterprise,

LEFT: A postcard sent to Yonkers, New York, from Puerto Rico in 1905.
while others, like the postcard, were part of an array of venues serving many purposes and audiences. Among these were a large number of images published in books, magazines and postcards sent to common folks in the U.S.

This particular photo uses common people as subjects, which served many purposes, one of which was to depict Puerto Ricans as non-whites. This racialization of Puerto Ricans was essential to the construction of a colonial people deemed inferior to the colonizer. The photo may have been taken at the corner of Cristo and Luna streets, right across from the cathedral in Old San Juan. Thus the “stage” for the photo was Spanish colonial architecture. The use of this architecture as background will become one of the three foundations for Puerto Rican tourism throughout most of the twentieth century: celebration of a dead empire (Spain), the tropical characteristics of the island and Puerto Rican culture. The last two, lo tropical and the national Puerto Rican culture, were two sides of the same coin.

In the photo we can see a group of children of varying ages. It is not clear if two of the figures are adults, or just older children. All the children are black except for one. I am not sure if the “white” girl is local or the daughter of a visitor, perhaps a traveler from the United States. The younger children are naked, while the older ones are clothed. Except for the “white” girl, all the children are barefoot, and all are definitely posing for the photographer. Two of the young children are looking at the older figure dressed in white wearing a Panama hat and holding a young child by his arms. Of the two looking at her, the “white” girl is clearly looking at the older girl, while the other child seems to be gazing past the figures. Perhaps the handwritten message on the back of the postcard says it all: “The whole Darn family of P.R. 8/11/05.” Was the sender using the euphemistic phrase for damned?

**Porto Ricans and African-Americans**

Another card entitled “Porto Rico: A Bunch of Pickaninnies” was sent to Yonkers, New York, in October 1905. The use of the “pickaninny” label, not common in the island, suggests that to some folks in the U.S., Puerto Ricans were similar to southern blacks. In fact, another card sent from New Orleans to Ohio in 1940, “Eight Little Pickaninnies Kneeling in a Row,” is a portrait of eight young men kneeling in front of a fallen palm tree. The similarities between both cards are puzzling, and the composition of the photos is almost identical. Labeling the kids pickaninnies and using a “tropical” landscape suggests either the same photographer or at least the same distribution company. The Porto Rico card was mailed in 1905 and was licensed and published by Waldrop Photo Co. in San Juan. The card, however, was printed in Germany and the photo seems to be owned by Raphael Tuck & Sons, “Art Publishers to their Majesties the King and Queen.” The New Orleans card was published by the Detroit Publishing Co. Of the three companies, Raphael Tuck & Sons and Detroit were unique in the industry for combining the printing, publishing and distribution of their wares.

Using pickaninny as a descriptor for U.S. African Americans was quite common, but in the case of Puerto
Rico, its use was very limited and perhaps of lesser circulation. Other similar cards, “On the Shore, Porto Rico” (1911), “They Have No Stocking to Hang, Puerto Rico” (undated) and “A Dinner Party, Puerto Rico” (undated) were faithful to the overall theme of “tropical” Puerto Ricans. Some travel guides of the period made an effort to point to the “natural” lifestyle of Puerto Ricans during the period. The postcards could be understood as being “tongue and cheek” and quite innocent, however, they follow a common pattern most metropolises utilized in their portrayal of their subjects. Reviewing the Puerto Rican cards, it is uncanny that these photographers could “find” so many black kids, “pickaninnies” if you will, in a population that was only 38 percent “colored” (of which 83.6 percent were mulattoes) according to the U.S. Census of Porto Rico (1899).

Although not represented as “primitive” as were the Filipinos, and not exhibited in early twentieth century fairs in the U.S., the association of Puerto Ricans with the “natural” world was an attempt to connect both societies to another key theme of the U.S. Empire: the civilized and the uncivilized. Assuming that the societies that were conquered “needed” to be “civilized,” their portrayal as “uncivilized” and worthy of exhibition in the popular museums of “natural history,” so important in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, was necessary.

I would like to complete this short sketch of Puerto Rican postcards with another card, “Waiting for Uncle Sam,” published in 1900. A stereographic postcard, the photo is emblematic of the overall attempt to explain Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans to U.S. society. What could be clearer than the statement printed on the back of this card?

...and on the Porto Rican soil, where all tropical verdure thrives with great luxuriance under the sun’s warm rays, the colored children multiply and flourish without much attention or care, and are seen swarming about in all their native simplicity and innocence. Whether scrambling up the trunk of the cocoanut palm for a drink of the liquid from the nut, or playing on the beach where they watch Uncle Sam’s stately ships come to anchor, thronging about the city gates, or playing around the rude cabin doorway, they live the same free, Topsy-like life. But under the new regime, among these little natives, are we to look for the future citizens and statesmen of the island, and one of the first duties of the United States will be to establish some sort of system of compulsory education that will raise the people from the present state of woeful ignorance and provide better things for the coming generations.

Luis Aponte-Paires is associate professor of community planning at the College of Public and Community Service and director of Latino Studies at the University of Massachusetts Boston. He is in the process of completing a book, Inventing Puerto Rico.
One of the many issues planners have to face about tourism is that it privileges elite settings, elite architecture and elite histories. This privileging has been a response to both the tastes of tourists and the desire of local communities to connect with popular mainstream, and often romantic, tourist settings.

The literature on tourism and historic preservation has particularly focused on southern mansions over slave cottages; historic courthouses and town squares over declining mill towns and other industrial centers; and the dominance of a fabricated Spanish Colonial image throughout California, Texas and other Southwestern states since the 1900s. In his 2002 article on Mission Revival architecture in the *Journal of Urban History*, for instance, Roberto Lint Sagarena argues that the public articulation of Spanish Colonialism by California architects such as Myron Hunt and Reginald Jackson has not only romanticized Spanish history in the Southwest, it has obscured the exploitative relations between Mexicans and whites. In *The Tourist City* (1999), Dennis Judd and Susan Fainstein trace the incentives of tourist promoters to cordon off a showcase downtown, often leaving adjacent neighborhoods underserved, crime-ridden and hampered with escalating prices. Many tourist cities have become contested battlegrounds as rival groups struggle for equity and cultural recognition. The suburbs of Phoenix, Arizona, exemplify these tensions.

**Desert Tourism**

Tourism grew in Arizona in the late 1800s and early 1900s as medical practitioners pronounced the desert climate an ideal cure for pulmonary diseases. Growing popular tastes for desert scenery, Indian ruins and American Indian artifacts further contributed to a growth in tourism. Starting in the 1960s, developers such as Del Webb and Walter Bimson used skillful marketing to promote desert living for retirees and holidaymakers. This was followed by the growth of high-tech industries starting in the 1970s, which further increased prosperity (and tourism) in the Salt River Valley in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

Tourism in Arizona today broadly follows Southwestern themes, which blend the state’s pioneering Wild West history, American Indian culture, unique Sonoran desert landscape and Hispanic architecture. In the case of architecture, it ranges from well-preserved historic Spanish missions and settlements around Tucson, which mark a military, mission and farming presence since the late 1600s, to a more pervasive but less historically authentic Mexican style of building around Phoenix, typically expressed through courtyards, stucco and tiled roofs. As cities have expanded in Arizona, particularly around Phoenix, downtown renovation has adopted the Southwestern theme.

This theming of the old Southwest gives scant recognition to the economic and social realities of Hispanic settlement in Arizona. Mexican workers began migrating to the Salt River Valley after the opening of the railroads in the late 1800s. Work accelerated following the end of the Mexican War in 1917, and after the opening of the Roosevelt Dam north of Phoenix, completed in 1911, guaranteed a continual supply of water for desert farmers. As migrant workers and small businesspeople, Mexicans left few lasting landmarks in Arizona during this time period, despite their substantial contributions to the state’s economy. Land ownership for Mexicans was not allowed prior to the 1940s. Most lived in small shacks along rivers during the early migration years, moving later to *barrios* south of existing towns, where they found more stability and solidarity. Living arrangements
remained simple, typically in small adobe cottages with scant services. The enduring lack of physical landmarks has left contemporary Latino communities with few cards to play in today’s tourist initiatives, and many are adversely affected by downtown development schemes and local tourist initiatives.

Tourism and the Isolation of Latino Communities

In the city of Chandler, twenty miles south of Phoenix, tourist initiatives have so far threatened the local Hispanic community’s struggle to establish a foothold in the political and social arena. Chandler was founded by the developer Alexander Chandler in 1912, partly as a farming town for white settlers, but also as a tourist mecca for wealthy visitors from northern and eastern states. The town is built around the architecturally impressive Hotel San Marcos, a “hacienda-style” hotel modeled on contemporary Mexican Revival lines, and also features a Mexican-style arcaded central square.

Mexican and other Hispanic workers have a long history in Chandler going back to the 1880s, when they began laboring on Chandler’s ranch. A 1954 work by the local historian A. Stevens notes a Mexican population of 40 percent in Chandler in 1913. By the 1930s, a small barrio had emerged south of the town square consisting partly of homes built by the Chandler Development Company, and partly of adobe homes built by residents. Barrio residents worked on farms and built roads and homes; some had independent businesses; still others worked for white residents or for the hotel. Oral histories recorded in the 1990s by staff of the Chandler History Museum tell of residents growing their own produce around the local “Mexican Town,” bartering horses for houses or cars, surviving hard times during the Depression years and suffering exclusion from some stores and places of entertainment on the square. A 1989 biography of early resident Tillie Montenegro relates how discrimination against Mexican students by whites in the school cafeteria played out around the 1920s.

Between the 1970s and the 1990s, the town of Chandler expanded from less than 30,000 residents to 185,000. With new growth in high-tech industry and retirement living, the town had also developed its tourist industry. Following the Chandler Redevelopment Element plan of 1995, the central square was refashioned as the “Spanish Colonial Plaza,” and the Hotel San Marcos, now the Crowne Plaza San Marcos Golf Resort, was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. City leaders have encouraged high-end galleries and boutiques in the square, the styles of which are popular southwestern styles. In 2001, the city sponsored a competition to develop statues of Chandler and the architect Frank Lloyd Wright to honor their acquaintance in the 1920s and 1930s. As the downtown expands to accommodate growing administrative, civic and traffic needs, many of the nearby barrio homes and businesses have been demolished.

Chandler’s local Hispanic community has expressed resentment toward the town’s focus on the new “Spanish Colonial Plaza,” complaining of a neglect of its cultural identity and contribution to the town’s growth. In a 1999 letter to the local Arizona Republic, a Latino resident commented, “Whether through culture or agriculture, or education or business, the Hispanics were there.” Further complaints are recorded in the press about rising downtown housing prices, the discriminatory city hiring policies and police brutality towards suspected undocumented workers. Overall, Chandler’s Latino residents have had little bargaining power in today’s tourist arena. The relics marking a Mexican presence are for the most part fragile and scattered, ranging from a small
graveyard with few identifiable graves in the south of town, small adobe cottages within the barrio and a few surviving businesses traceable to earlier days. More affluent Latinos have avoided the barrio altogether in recent years.

Community leaders and downtown developers have sought to remedy these discontents by promoting Latino artworks and sponsoring cultural festivities, including an annual Mariachi festival and Chandler’s participation in the nationwide Hispanic History Month. Reports from a series of focus groups sponsored in 2001 by the Chandler Human Relations Commission, however, showed concerns among members of the Latino community and government employees about the capacity of sponsored events to remedy what they saw as an overall climate of alienation.

The elite nature of Chandler’s recent tourist agenda has resulted in a loss of opportunities for a more nuanced and comprehensive cultural identity for the town. As homes and businesses from the old Mexican town are destroyed to make way for burgeoning downtown (and tourist) development, much of the town’s richer history is disappearing. Particularly regrettable is the loss of buildings to the rear of the square, marking a transition between Anglo and Mexican settlements. The effective “cordonning off” of the showcase Spanish Colonial plaza has resulted in many of the far-reaching negative effects described by Dennis Judd and Susan Fainstein in their work on tourist cities. Planning studies as well as studies by cultural historians suggest a number of strategies whereby growing towns might include ethnic communities within their tourist agenda. Clues may be found, for instance, in contributions to a 1993 edition of Places addressing the survival of Hispanic neighborhoods in East Los Angeles, or in Harry Margulis’ study in the Journal of Architectural Education on resilient Asian villages in Canada and the U.S. Common recommendations include promoting local businesses and restaurants; adjusting local zoning codes to encourage ethnic gathering places, local landmarks and street vending; and enforcing guidelines that encourage ethnically sensitive design of streets and public spaces. Of particular importance is that businesses and landmarks be shared by ethnic communities and visitors alike, and corridors and thruways encourage circulation between ethnic neighborhoods and the more affluent mainstream. Cities promoting a tourist agenda should take care to avoid the negative impacts of the showcase tourist downtown.

Katherine Crewe is an associate professor in the School of Planning at Arizona State University.
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Condos, villas and subdivisions are popping up along the once pristine beaches and untamed natural surroundings of the Mexican Pacific Coast. This development, the result of unchecked real estate speculation and foreign investment, as well as nonexistent comprehensive land use planning, is eating up land once held in the public trust and challenging environmental regulations in the name of “sustainability.”

Real Estate Speculation

Puerto Vallarta, once a sleepy village in the state of Jalisco, is now Mexico’s second largest tourist destination after Cancun. It attracts over 2.5 million visitors a year, many of whom are now buying properties in the area. Tourism, which represents the second largest industry in Mexico, has been turning from a hotel-based industry to one based on condo and vacation home development.

A real estate boom in the Puerto Vallarta region has sparked unprecedented economic growth based on land speculation and an invented real estate market, very much in the way that Southern California was “invented” in the early 1900s. Today Puerto Vallarta extends deep behind the hills that once served as both a barrier to urban expansion and a backdrop to the city’s picturesque charms. Land speculation has triggered development along the coast, where subdivisions ravenously consume agricultural land, rain forests and wetlands.

The real estate boom has triggered speculation hundreds of miles both north and south of the tourist center. The towns of Sayulita and San Francisco to the north in the bordering state of Nayarit have become substantially gentrified in the past ten years. Land without infrastructure starts at USD$100,000 per hectare and peaks around $600,000 per hectare depending on views and beach access. Average home prices are around $300,000, but they can exceed $1 million.

These prices may sound like they would be attached to award-winning design homes, but they belong to rustic local homes turned into fixer-uppers aimed at foreign buyers looking to invest in a market where property values are still rising. There is a tremendous disparity between the prices of these properties and the minimum wage in Mexico (equivalent to $5 a day). Much of the land is bought at low prices from locals and then inflated up to twenty times its original value. Brokers and developers are making most of the profit and hasty development is creating a burden on existing infrastructure, the water supply and the environment.

From Communal to Private Lands: Post-Ejido Development

A significant portion of non-urban land in Mexico falls under the regime of the ejido, a form of ownership instituted after the Mexican Revolution. Ejidos were traditional communal demarcations in rural areas where community members were entitled to use land but not to sell it. Up until 1992, the Mexican Constitution protected the communal nature of ejidos as a form of public trust.

In order to accommodate urban expansion through most of the twentieth century, local and state governments would expropriate ejido land near cities and turn it into urban land reserves. The change of land use from ejido to urban was only possible through direct government intervention in pursuit of a public benefit. This process proved effective up until the early 1980s, accounting for the fairly controlled and relatively well-planned growth of Mexican cities.

Things changed in 1991 when then-President Carlos Salinas de Gortari pushed through an amendment to the Mexican Constitution allowing the privatization of ejido land. This was linked to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which would ensure that private capital could...
eventually acquire agricultural land for corporate farming in Mexico. Throughout the country, the amendment had the unexpected effect of increasing land speculation. Plans in most cities addressed the issue of development in urban land reserves, but failed to consider the future uses of *ejido* land outside urban reserves should they become privatized and developed. This oversight, along with a growing mortgage system that previously did not exist in Mexico, spurred urban sprawl in almost every city in the country.

Sprawl is most evident in large cities and places with an influx of foreign dollars, like Puerto Vallarta and Cancun, where patch-like development occurs because an institutional void leaves land that has been privatized unregulated. Most of the available land for sale along the Pacific Coast is in fact recently privatized *ejido* land stretching along the shoreline and up the hills, and in many cases covered with subtropical forests.

**Environment, Planning and Tourism Development**

Tourism policy in Mexico is pro-development, but there is no institutional mechanism for deciding how and where it should occur. The criteria for development should be that it is integrally planned, cohesive and sustainable; instead, development occurs piece by piece, with standards dictated by the developers and the markets they are targeting.

Environmental groups and many local inhabitants are protesting the lack of regulation. Many of the tourist destinations in the coastal regions are in fragile ecosystems, and the adverse effects of overdevelopment are starting to kick in, especially in terms of water shortage, change in local micro-climates and destruction of the natural landscape.

In recent months, a legal controversy was resolved by a federal judge who granted development rights to landowners of recently privatized *ejido* land in the biosphere reserve area of Sierra de Vallejo, some fifty miles north of Puerto Vallarta, reducing the protected area by 30 percent. The area is one of the few pockets of jaguar presence remaining along the Mexican Pacific Coast.

As of January 2008, heavy machinery in the area was being used to build roads and subdivisions up the mountains, tearing up much of the tree canopy in the process. The developer is not from the local community, and when interviewed by a local newspaper he argued that “growth is inevitable, and it has to be accommodated somewhere.” This development, however, is not being driven by local population growth or mobility into newer areas, but by speculation and foreign dollars used to purchase second and third investment homes.

**Sustainable Development: An Oxymoron?**

Chamela-Cuixmala, a two-hour drive south of Puerto Vallarta, is one of the most bio-diverse subtropical deciduous forests in the Americas, and a UNESCO-accredited Biosphere Reserve. Much of the land is privately owned, yet strict regulations—legal agreements between landowners, the United Nations (UN), local, state and national governments and scientific and academic institutions—guarantee its preservation as a natural sanctuary. It is one of very few of its kind in Mexico.

In 2007, a controversy arose over the development of two multi-million dollar resort developments in the Chamela-Cuixmala area. After protests sparked by local communities, environmental activists and academic institutions, the planned developments of Tambora and Marina Careyes became the center of a national controversy. The issue focused on the Mexican Wildlife Law of 2005 (the Mangrove Law), which bans all development from areas covered by mangrove trees, an endangered species in Mexico. Both projects required the removal of hundreds of hectares of deciduous tropical forest and mangrove trees, and had higher densities than allowed in the area.

Under the banner of “sustainable development,” and by pulling a few political strings, the developers—two of Mexico’s wealthiest men—were granted special approval to develop by the Mexican Environmental Agency, the government body nominally in charge of enforcing the no-development policy in naturally protected areas such as Chamela-Cuixmala.
Tambora and Marina Careyes would have included several polo fields, an 18-hole golf course, a marina for 161 yachts, over 1,000 hotel rooms, commercial space and a residential subdivision of approximately 204 hectares, which would require the removal of virgin forest. Development was to occur along one of the main turtle nesting beaches in the Mexican Pacific, and on several wetlands designated by the UN as environmentally significant. Experts argued that development of this density in the area would significantly impact the ecology of the Biosphere Reserve. It became very clear that the “sustainable” element of these developments was nothing more than an opportunistic use of a popular buzz word.

Development was halted thanks to a lawsuit initiated by environmental groups and the National University of Mexico, which is in charge of managing the Biosphere Reserve. The binding legal argument was that of mangrove protection under the Mangrove Law. Development of Tambora and Marina Careyes would have required the removal of over 180 hectares of mangrove trees and have had a significant impact on wetlands.

**Planning: A Missing Ingredient**

In late 2007, and under pressure from large resort developers, including senators with personal economic interests in tourism development, a special senate commission was organized to modify the Mangrove Law to allow development on mangrove-covered areas where approved by the Mexican Environmental Agency. This would have then reversed the development ban on Tambora and Marina Careyes and on several other developments in fragile ecosystems in the Mexican Caribbean. The argument being used to modify the law is that it is too prohibitive and thwarts development of the Mexican tourism industry.

The Mangrove Law was among a new generation of Mexican laws that were based on serious studies with clear rationales and elaborated in such a manner that made them easy to enforce. It is ironic that the law came about as a result of an institutional void that impedes making clear, sound and consistent decisions about development in natural areas. Given this institutional void, changing the law to one that allows decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis is the same as making the law unenforceable.

The public discussion of the Mangrove Law is considering what is more relevant in the long term: quick tourist-based economic development tied to land speculation and the rolling inertia of a real estate boom, or securing the sustainability of fragile natural regions for local residents and the country as a whole. In other words, who will determine the parameters of sustainable development in a manner that is consistent, accountable and equitable?

In either scenario—the existing “prohibitive” law or the initiative for a future “permissive” law—planning has been erased from the equation. Sustainable, equitable development had been possible in the past through strict government regulation and top-down planning, years before the real-estate frenzy of the privatized ejido land started. While top-down planning is neither possible nor desirable anymore, planning should be more prominent in the debate, and in the management of non-urban land. It almost seems like a coastal planning commission should be in place, but it’s not, and neither is there talk about creating one.

The current administration of President Felipe Calderón has emphatically stated its intention of continuing to support the expansion of the tourism industry along the coastal regions of Mexico. His discourse also mentions sustainability as a priority for the country. It seems that until the institutional void is filled, and planning as a discipline is brought on board as a key element to guide and regulate development, the course of environmental preservation and the development frenzy will keep clashing with each other while the boom continues on the Mexican Riviera.

Oscar Moran is an associate planner with AC Martin Partners in Los Angeles, California. He has a master’s degree in planning from USC and a bachelor’s degree in architecture from ITESO University in Mexico, and has conducted planning research in the U.S., Germany and Mexico.
Tourism as a Development Strategy: How Industry Uses Forecasting

by PETRA L. DOAN

During the twentieth century the growth in tourism around the world has been enormous. Some argue that tourism has become the world’s largest industry in terms of total employment, amount of capital invested in specific locations and number of people served by tourism services. In less developed areas it has often been considered a powerful engine of economic development as well as an influence (both positive and negative) on the people and locations exposed to tourism.

Although tourism has often been proposed as a development strategy—and sometimes a panacea—its potential consequences are not always considered. The global tourism industry paints a rosy picture of tourism even when local conditions contradict that picture.

Optimistic Forecasting Promotes Industry

The tourism industry is composed of a number of global corporations and a host of smaller firms and individuals based in various countries. As in most planning endeavors, a critical piece of any tourism planning effort is the prediction of numbers of potential visitors—a highly complex task. Since most countries lack the capacity to predict tourist flows, this task has been largely taken over by a United Nations agency, the World Tourism Organization (WTO), and its private-sector partner, the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC). These institutions play an important role in predicting global tourist flows, which are then applied by local tourism groups to predict tourist flows at a country level, often ignoring the frequent instability in the tourism sector. Who benefits from such predictions?

The tourism industry is increasingly dominated by several global corporations with annual profits that exceed the budgets of many less developed countries. In July of 2003, the WTO, formerly known as the International Congress of Official Tourist Traffic Associations and later the International Union of Official Travel Organizations, was recognized as an official specialized agency of the United Nations. The basic philosophy of the organization is that the private sector is the driving force behind tourism growth and that a partnership approach is key to development on the local and national level. The WTTC is the private-sector counterpart to the United Nations agency and includes among its members the presidents, chairs and CEOs of 100 of the world’s foremost tourism companies.

The WTTC assembles data on international arrivals and provides regular projections of tourism and its impacts (in terms of gross revenues) using estimates of predicted tourist demand and the propensity to travel internationally. These predictions, generally appropriate for regional and worldwide estimates, often do a poor job predicting local and regional fluctuations because of global patterns of instability. At the regional level, such macro predictions give an indication...
of broad trends but are less useful for predicting local impacts. For countries in regions experiencing regular or even intermittent instability or civic unrest, predicting the future is extremely risky. It is clear that tourism is extremely sensitive to political and social instability and the effects of dramatic fluctuations—due to perceptions of instability related to terrorism, international conflicts and civil unrest—can be severe.

Key world events that have had a marked affect on travel behavior in the past ten years include bombings in 1998 (U.S. Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam), 2001 (World Trade Center), 2002 (Mombassa, Bali and Moscow) and 2003 (Istanbul, Riyadh, Casablanca, Jakarta and Mumbai), as well as the SARS Epidemic and the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003. While the WTO and the WTTC acknowledge these difficult conditions, their macro-level predictions are rarely changed to account for such instability.

**Lessons from Jordan**

The tourist industry in Jordan provides a clear example of these problems. This industry is based on a rich archaeological heritage symbolized by the city of Petra, recently named one of the New Seven Wonders of the World. (Figure 1 about here) Tourism in Jordan has become a major economic sector, accounting for approximately 10 to 11 percent of its Gross Domestic Product. In the wake of the Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty of 1994, the number of tourist visits expanded dramatically. These trends were further fueled by the optimistic projections included in the Japanese International Cooperation Agency-funded *Tourism Master Plan* of 1995, which used the WTTC Middle East regional projections to suggest that the government should encourage investments in hotel development to meet high levels of predicted demand. This report projected tourist flows ranging from one million visitors in the year 2005 to over two million visitors by the year 2010. Accordingly, as I have shown in a 2006 article in *The International Development Planning Review*, during 1995 local investments in tourist hotels totaled $75 million while international investments totaled $54 million.

The case of Jordan highlights a significant downside to such high levels of local investment in tourism during periods of international instability. The city of Wadi Musa, adjacent to Petra National Park, Jordan’s premier tourist destination, experienced a period of intensive and unplanned growth in the mid-to-late-1990s to take advantage of the presumed influx of tourists (Figures 2 and 3 about here). When international terrorism and regional instability caused a marked drop-off in tourist arrivals, multinational hotel and travel companies were able to “buy into” several important local tourist ventures at fire sale prices with significant consequences for locally-owned and operated tourism enterprises. In Jordan, highly optimistic predictions of tourist flows encouraged over-investment in the tourism sector on the part of Jordanian private investors, which in turn forced the allocation of considerable public-sector and international donor funds to tourism.
In the face of several severe crises, the profitability of many of these private investments was undermined so that many hotels were either shut down or taken over by multinational enterprises with sufficiently deep pockets to withstand the short-run drought of tourists.

The Taybet Zaman Hotel & Resort project illustrates the costs of this instability. This project has won several international awards for its ecological reuse of traditional architecture and its commitment to the inclusion of village residents in the planning and operation of the facility (approximately 125 of the 171 total employees in 1998 were Taybeh residents, and thirty-six of them worked in administrative roles in the hotel). In 2003 it was taken over by a major European chain and the status of the local employment agreement is unknown.

Furthermore, because these new hotel construction projects were approved by the centralized Ministry of Tourism without local consultation, local government has been required to play catch-up in the provision of basic infrastructure. Without large-scale investments in basic infrastructure (especially sewage treatment systems)—from the World Bank, USAID (Agency for International Development) and other donors—there could have been an environmental disaster in these fragile ecosystems. Ironically, these investments also made it possible for large multinational firms to more easily take over hotels developed by local investors (see Box 1). The long-term social and economic impacts of the internationalization of the hotel sector on local employment and income from tourism is not clear.
The Critical Role for Planning

The critical lesson for other developing countries is that the key to reducing the negative effects of instability may lie in the preparation done during the planning phases of tourism development. There are likely to be serious consequences to the uncritical adoption of tourism projections generated by the multinational tourism industry, especially when these figures are used to stimulate domestic support for and investments in tourism development. Developing countries need to develop tourism planning capacity at the local and regional level that can generate and use more realistic projection figures to develop local linkages to the tourism industry.

Countries dependent on tourism must continue to develop a planning process that encourages broader involvement and empowerment of local populations. These communities are likely to feel the greatest impact of large-scale tourism investments and deserve to have a more significant say in the shape and direction of development in their localities. More than lip service must be paid to allowing these populations to participate in decisions which will directly affect their livelihoods as well as ensure that tourism projects are sustainable and unlikely to damage the environment. In addition, effective local participation in planning processes is the only means of maintaining the integrity of the social and cultural fabric of the country.

The central question remains: Who will benefit from tourism investments in the long run? Will large-scale outside investments ultimately overwhelm and absorb local investments, or can local capacity be developed to ensure that some portion of tourist dollars remain local and provide benefits to local communities?

Petra L. Doan is an associate professor at Florida State University.
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