URBAN PLANNING IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY
In the Shadows
by June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf

If urban planning is to support the equitable distribution of public goods and services, it must recognize and address the dismal conditions of millions of Americans who are poor or people of color.

The primary focus of contemporary planners and planning students should be on finding and advocating solutions that help eliminate the problems of today's cities. Any meaningful solution will need to be grounded in a thorough understanding of the race, gender, and class inequalities of American life.

see COVER STORY page 4

RACISM AND PLANNING
Still Around

Racism continues to present the thorniest challenges to progressive community development planners. The problems that were on the front burner for decades — residential and school segregation, housing and job discrimination — remain unsolved, and what limited progress has been made promises to be rolled back in the face of the dismantling of affirmative action, the privatization of housing and services, growing restrictions on immigrants, and the end of welfare.

At the same time, new challenges are raised by globalization. In the U.S. and world-wide, income and wealth inequality is increasing at an alarming rate; given racism and educational disadvantage, people of color are hit hardest. Workers, particularly workers of color, from other countries are forced to leave their communities in search of economic survival in the United States. Increasingly mobile capital seeks the most exploitable work force and in order to keep jobs in our communities, many of us are forced to endure working conditions similar to our brothers and sisters in the third world. Meanwhile, a whole segment of the U.S. working class has been written off and relegated to the criminal justice system: one-third of young black males between 20-29 are either on parole, on probation, or incarcerated.

Workers in low-wage service sector jobs around the world are increasingly pushed to become interchangeable. On the bottom of the scale employers care less if you are black, Latino, Asian or white. They care more that you dress, speak and smile right while delivering hamburgers. The cultures that make up this multiracial, multiethnic workforce are stripped from people when they're on the job, and they are increasingly commodified. The well-to-do can buy cultural artifacts, attend cultural events and wear "ethnic" clothing unaffordable to the people from which these cultural commodities were appropriated.

Beyond the Black-White Divide

While continuing to grapple with "traditional" race-related problems such as segregation, progressive planners need to develop a more complex analysis of race relations in order to effectively support movements for racial and economic justice in today's changing world. Historically, discussion of race relations has been framed as a black-white question in the U.S. Aside from the fact that race is a social, not a biological construct, this characterization was never strictly correct.

see 7TH GENERATION page 11

Planners Network Steering Committee Annual Meeting
Visions of Hope for People of Color by Mel King
PN '99 Lowell, MA: Conference schedule; Registration forms

New Policy CONTRIBUTIONS NOW A MUST FOR PN MEMBERS
see page 11 for details...
Welcome…
new PLANNERS NETWORK members!

Judy Brandman, Penny Gropp, Kirk Heinman, Jennifer Helmsley, Kecia L. James, Barbara Lynch, Josh Mantangalo, Katherine Miller, T.J. Mondeles, Jeff A. Schwartz, Melissa S. Townsend, Nicolette Wagoner.

Thank You
renewing members!


...and Special Thanks
sustaining members!

Louise J. Elving, Anne McLaughlin, Ruth Yabes.

Thanks for supporting PN! …Since we did not hold a national conference last year, your support is especially critical!

PN at APA
Members and friends of Planners Network and Planners for Equal Opportunity will meet at the APA's opening reception between 7:30 and 8:00 pm to go to dinner together. This ad hoc session is organized by Alan Rabonowitz, who will be away until April 15 but after that can be reached at (206) 525-7941; fax (206) 524-3074, <arabonowitz@igc.org>.

APA HOUSING POLICY GUIDE
The American Planning Association will be taking action on a national housing policy during the upcoming APA Conference in Seattle April 24-28. Representatives from each of the organization's chapters will be debating and voting on the Housing Policy Guide during the Delegate Assembly on Sunday, April 25 from 1-1.5 pm.
The guide was drafted by a task force that included PNer Matti Barker and is dedicated to the memory of the late Marsha Ritzdorf, who was active in APA's work on housing and women's issues. PNers Dan Lauber and Steve Barton have also been providing the work of the task force. PNer Vivian Kahn, who serves on APA's national board and chairs the APA Legislative and Policy Committee, will chair the Delegate Assembly.

PN members who plan to attend the Seattle conference and are interested in serving as delegates to the assembly should contact their chapter presidents. Those who are unable to attend but would like to participate in review of the draft Policy Guides can download the draft documents from the APA website at <www.planning.org/govt/policygrp.htm>. Policy guides are used as a basis for APA's legislative programs at the State and national levels and are made available to planners, elected and appointed officials, who are interested in planning issues. In addition to the Housing Policy Guide, the Delegate Assembly will be considering proposed policies on Sustainability, Endangered Species, and Farmland Preservation.

For further information contact Vivian Kahn, AICP at <vain@kmort.com> or call her at (919) 482-1051.

PLANNERS NETWORK
UPDATES

Birgit van Birnum <blmy@flash.net>
writes: I have been active on insurance redlining and availability issues. Also on credit insurance — generally a bad deal pushed onto low-income consumers. I work with a group called the Center for Economic Justice (Austin, TX), we've produced reports on insurance redlining and credit insurance. We also participate in contested care hearings before state agencies on insurance, utility and credit issues. I typically serve as an expert witness, economist and actuary.

Issued in this section is a brochure for a Summer Institute on "Racism in America," organized by PN founder Chester Hartman <chairman@prac.org>, now at the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. The Institute commemorates the 35th Anniversary of the momentous 1966 Civil Rights Act and is being held at American University in Washington, DC. Please post the brochure, and for more information email or call Chester at (202) 387-9887.

Olga Kahn <okahn@mfa.com> writes: I'm still an archivist at the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency working on a Demonstration Disposition Project for HUD.

Jordan Yin <jyin@cornell.edu> sent in this note: Since leaving the board of PN in early 1998, I've been hard at work finishing a dissertation on community development where I'm writing up a comparative case study using Cleveland and Minneapolis. I hope to wrap up this summer and move onto something else in late 1999. I recently paid my membership dues for the American Planning Association and realized that I write them a check every year just like I do for Planners Network. But, this year I'm sending in a check to PN equal to my APA dues and look forward to getting members who value PN to consider contributing as much to PN as they do for their professionalism or other membership dues. I personally get more out of the PN newsletter and the contacts I make through PN than I get from the other organizations to which I belong (so a few extra dollars seems like a fair deal).
Welcome... new PLANNERS NETWORK members!

Judy Brautman, Penny Gaposchkin, Karla Heffernan, Jennifer Harley, Kekeia L. James, Barbara Lynch, Josh Mastrangelo, Katherine Miller, T.J. Mordeks, Je A. Schwartz, Melissa S. Townsend, Nicolette Wagoner.

Thank You
renewing members!


...and Special Thanks
sustaining members!

Louise J. Elving, Anne McLaughlin, Ruth Yabes.

Thanks for supporting PN... Since we did not hold a national conference last year, your support is especially critical!

Michael Zamm, Director of Environmental Education, Council on the Environment of the New York City Environmental Education Council. This past year Training Student Organizers (TSC) passed its 30th year as a program offering of the Council on the Environment of New York City. Hundreds of classes of high school and some elementary, intermediate and college age youth have organized and/or participated in environmental improvements in their neighborhoods, schools and homes. During the 1998-99 school year TSC youth are involved in a citywide coastal restoration effort including beach cleanups, water quality monitoring and public education. At the same time TSO staff and students in schools in Greenspoint-Williamsburg, Brooklyn, a heavily polluted “environmental justice” community, are focusing on the storage, use, release and disposal of toxics in the community. A number of symposia are being organized to educate community residents about their “Right to Know” about community toxics, how to find out about them and what action to take if any threat to public health is suspected. I’ve also become involved once again in helping the High School for Environmental Studies to train its staff to infuse curricula with environmental concepts. Through my work at CENY I prepared the concept paper for the school under a grant from the SUDRONA Foundation and have been involved with the school from its inception. During the past year I also stepped down as Chair of the Environmental Education Advisory Council (EEAC), a consortium of environmental education individuals and organizations in NYC, that I had been chairman since 1993. I will remain active as an honorary member of the Steering Committee and hope to focus my efforts on environmental education in pre-service teacher training.

Chapter News: a group of Toronto PNeers gathered at the River Cafe, 413 Roncesvalles, on Monday, March 29, from 7:30 - 10 p.m., for an evening of presentations and discussions around the topic of forming a Toronto chapter. For more information, contact Barbara Rahder at (416) 736-2100 ext. 22612 or via email at <rahder@yorku.ca>.

PN at APA

Members and friends of Planners Network and Planners for Equal Opportunities will meet at the APA opening reception between 7:30 and 9:00 pm to go to dinner together. This ad hoc session is organized by Alan Rabinowitz, who will be away until April 15 but after that can be reached at (206) 525-7941; fax (206) 524-3074, <arabinowitz@ic.org>.

APA HOUSING POLICY GUIDE

The American Planning Association will be taking action on a national housing policy during the upcoming APA Conference in Seattle April 24-28. Representatives from each of the organization’s chapters will be debating and voting on the Housing Policy Guide during the Delegate Assembly on Sunday, April 25 from 1-5 p.m.

The guide was drafted by a task force that included PNer Mitti Barker and is dedicated to the memory of the late Marsha Ritzdorf, who was active in APA’s work on housing and women’s issues. PNers Dan Lauber and Steve Barton have also been prodding the work of the task force. PNer Vivian Kahn, who serves on APA’s national board and chairs the APA Legislative and Policy Committee, will chair the Delegate Assembly.

PN members who plan to attend the Seattle conference and are interested in serving as delegates to the assembly should contact their chapter presidents. Those who are unable to attend but would like to participate in review of the draft Policy Guides can download the draft documents from the APA website at <www.planning.org/govt/policyguides.htm>. Policy guides are used as a basis for APA’s legislative programs at the State and federal levels and are made available to planners, elected and appointed officials, who are interested in planning issues. In addition to the Housing Policy Guide, the Delegate Assembly will be considering proposed policies on Sustainability, Endangered Species, and Farmland Preservation.

For further information contact Vivian Kahn, AICP at <vkhahn@kmart.com> or call her at (510) 482-1051.

What do you do? I teach Geography at Hofstra University in Hempstead, L.I.

How did you learn about PNA? A socially responsible classmate in grad school (Rutgers) turned me on to it.

What is your definition of progressive planning? I guess my conception of the progressive part of planning reaches beyond the planning realm. I think that to accomplish anything approaching progressive requires a much broader social effort that includes civic education and access for everyone, especially an awareness of our rights under the law. I also think a basic understanding of capitalisms and its attendant power hierarchies is fundamental for any group trying to access the planning process.

Eve Baron
Brooklyn, New York

What do you think are obstacles to progressive planning? At the city level, privatization and a narrowly defined approach to economic development pull the planning process out of the public sphere. Nationally, the shift to the non-profit sector to provide for the social good has sparked some remarkably creative efforts, but a lack of funding and information exchange limits its scope and scale.

What would you say are some hot button issues in planning? In general, the scramble for investment capital that pits cities against cities and pulls local government further away from a commitment to social welfare. Also, increasing income and power stratification.

PN PROFILES

Who’s in Planners Network and What Do They Think?

Send your PN Update or news to us today! Email Steve Johnson <sjohnso2@pratt.edu>, fax him at (718) 636-3709, or send him a postcard or letter at the PN national office:

Send your PN Update or news to us today! Email Steve Johnson <sjohnso2@pratt.edu>, fax him at (718) 636-3709, or send him a postcard or letter at the PN national office:
COVER STORY
continued from first page

One of the most significant and dramatic stories in the history of twentieth-century U.S. cities has been the growth and evolution of the African American population. In the early 1900s, the African American population was simply one of many ethnic and racial groups living in U.S. cities. By the 1950s, massive emigrations from the rural South to the urban North had changed the complexion of cities. By the 1990s, successive waves of in-migration by rural African Americans and out-migration by mobile/whites had created several predominant black cities.

African Americans became so visible in many central cities that some scholars defined their predominance and spatial isolation as the urban segment of a new African American culture. Indeed, throughout the twentieth century, racial prejudice shaped the lives of Blacks as surely as it shaped the lives of Whites. Physical deterioration became the norm.

The twentieth-century also witnessed the evolution of pressures that were dedicated to improving urban life and reducing urban decline. Prominent among these was urban planning. Branching off from the municipal reform movement, and away from the social work and housing reform movements, urban planning aimed to create well-planned, orderly cities that allowed people to live free of slums, blight, and physical disorder. As the planning profession evolved, its practitioners attacked various maladies affecting urban areas. They joined efforts to remedy social problems, and they created initiatives designed to redevelop specific areas, such as the central business districts. From the early part of the century, when planning focused on creating land use controls and regulating growth, to the end, when planners did these things plus many more, the profession’s stated goal was to improve the experience of urban life for all residents. However, the reality was often far different.

Throughout the twentieth century, the community of urban African Americans connected with the community of urban planning professionals. At times those connections were sources of conflict and oppression, at other times sources of reform and cooperation. Planning tools were and are often used for the purpose of racial segregation. Examples are exclusionary zoning laws and separatist public housing programs. Urban renewal clearance projects that bulldozed black communities into oblivion could also be classified as oppressive. But these were not the only interactions between the black urban population and the profession.

During the 1960s, the black community generated basic changes in urban planning practices as well as in national policies. Some planners — whose ranks gradually became more diversified racially — dedicated their lives to fighting for the rights of the poor and disadvantaged. Such dedication took the form of “social” or “advocacy” planning, neighborhood planning, or equity planning.

The precise nature of this dualistic relationship of conflict versus cooperation needs further clarification. Few historians of urban African Americans give full and impartial treatment to the role of urban planning. Few historians of U.S. urban planning acknowledge the full influence of race and racial injustice on the profession.

Contributions made by African American women to urban planning efforts are underappreciated.

In general, what is needed is an overview of the critical linkages between the urban planning profession and the nation’s most visible racial minority. Race and racial injustice influence all efforts to improve urban society. Urban planning, an active profession, purports to help improve civic life in metropolitan areas. It cannot do so unless its practitioners more clearly understand the historical connections between this people and this field. Planning and Public Policy

The period after World War II saw two simultaneous processes: (1) the movement of the White middle and working classes to the suburbs, a movement spurred by the return of World War II veterans and the assistance of home mortgage insurance programs, and (2) the consolidation of ghetto boundaries. It is for this era that we have the best documentation concerning the relationship between African American urban life and planning decisions. As several scholars have demonstrated, political leaders’ desire to shape black residence patterns profoundly influenced public housing and urban renewal policies. Just as urban migration of rural blacks and other ethnic minorities was the demographic motivation for racially exclusionary zoning and restrictive covenants during the period between the world wars, the need to contain blacks in restricted sections of cities influenced public policy decisions after World War II.

The movement to the suburbs by the white middle and working classes, which one author calls a true “metropolitan revolution,” clearly established decentralization as the dominant urban pattern for the following decades. This decentralization, however, was exclusionary. For example, Levittown, New York, a well-known suburban community that set the pattern for numerous others, housed 82,000 residents in 1960, not one of whom was African American. Although white families found new opportunities opening up in freshly constructed suburbs, African American families experienced disproportionate overcrowding and limited mobility within the central cities left behind.

A series of federal policies set the stage for these conditions. Urban renewal was one of the most invidious. Often called “Negro removal” by critics, it provides countless examples of the intersection of racial change with local policy. Urban renewal systematically destroyed many African American communities and businesses, and, for most of its history, failed to safeguard the rights and well-being of those forcibly relocated from those homes and businesses. That clear ance for urban renewal worked in conjunction with clearance for highway construction only made matters worse.

Backed by the federal government, cities simultaneously cleared out slums and displaced racial minorities from prime locations for redevelopment and highway construction. Those policies shaped and defined the black ghetto.

The 1960s, the era of civil rebellion, brought several important changes. The widespread civil disorders, which were volatile but predictable responses to long-standing racial oppression, forced significant alterations in federal policies. President Lyndon Johnson, attempting to build a “Great Society,” initiated new programs that focused on eliminating poverty and empowering low-income communities. With the War on Poverty’s community action agencies, citizens gained the power to supervise community improvement directly. Under Model Cities, local citizen governing boards also helped direct local redevelopment and made their own contributions to the redefinition of urban planning.

Well-known planning practitioners began to question the assumptions of traditional land use and redevelopment planning as well as the racial bias inherent in the profession. Proponents of advocacy planning suggested that the appropriate response to inner-city conditions was for planners to stop trying to represent public interest — an impossible task, leading planners to represent the status quo — and to work instead to help empower underrepresented groups. Another response was for planners to develop “urban action” programs promoting racial and income integration. Paul Davidoff, premier advocate planner and champion of suburban integration, urged planners to champion non-exclusionary fair housing laws, low and moderate income housing, and progressive zoning and subdivision requirements.

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 killed the oppressive urban renewal program, but it also brought the promising Model Cities experiment to a halt. With the 1974 act, which created Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs), the federal government withdrew from high-profile attempts to target funds to distressed central-city areas defined by local citizens. Instead, in city after city, citizens who had just begun to exercise some control over the redevelopment of their neighborhoods experienced the shock of government withdrawal. Although in later years the CDBG program somewhat improved on its record of participation, in general the program placed decision making in the hands of city government and dispensed national funding via a formula that spread increasingly scarce redevelopment funds to populous suburbs as well as to a wide range of cities.

Previous efforts to mesh social, economic, and physical development strategies, a mixture allowed under Model Cities, succumbed under the pervasive “bricks and mortar” orientation of the CDBG program. Any illusions that inner-city residents might have had that a benign federal government would “gild” their ghettos died quickly with the unstable funding, unpredictable longevity, and strong downtown focus that characterized urban-related programs such as action grants and economic development assistance.
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Levittown, New York, a well-known suburban community that set the pattern for numerous others, housed 82,000 residents in 1960, not one of whom was African American.

Long after officially sanctioned racial prejudice subsided, racial oppression and inequality lingered.
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One of the most significant and dramatic stories in the history of twentieth-century U.S. cities has been the growth and evolution of the African American population. In the early 1900s, the African American population was simply one of many ethnic and racial groups living in U.S. cities. By the 1950s, massive emigrations from the rural South to the urban North had changed the complexion of cities. By the 1990s, successive waves of in-migration by rural African Americans and out-migration by mobile/white had created several predominantly black cities.

African Americans became so visible in many central cities that some scholars defined their predominance and spatial isolation indicators of city decline. Indeed, throughout the twentieth century, racial prejudice shaped the lives of Blacks as surely as it shaped metropolitan areas. Long after officially sanctioned racial prejudice subsided, racial oppression and inequality lingered.

Poverty grew more concentrated, and the quality of social life unraveled. Physical deterioration became the norm.

The twentieth century also witnessed the evolution of professions that were dedicated to improving urban life and reducing urban decline. Prominent among these was urban planning. Branching off from the municipal reform movement, and away from the social work and housing reform movements, urban planning aimed to create well-planned, orderly cities that allowed people to live free of slums, blight, and physical disorder. As the planning profession evolved, its practitioners attacked various maladies affecting urban areas. They joined efforts to remedy social problems, and they created initiatives designed to redevelop specific areas, such as the central business districts. From the early part of the century, when planning focused on creating land use controls and regulating growth, to the end, when planners did these things plus many more, the profession’s stated goal was to improve the experience of urban life for all residents. However, the reality was often far different.

Throughout the twentieth century, the community of urban African Americans connected with the community of urban planning professionals. At times those connections were sources of conflict and oppression, at other times sources of reform and cooperation. Planning tools were and are often used for the purpose of racial segregation. Examples are exclusionary zoning laws and segregated public housing programs. Urban renewal clearance projects that bulldozed black communities into oblivion could also be classified as oppressive. But these were not the only interactions between the black urban population and the profession.

During the 1960s, collective public interest generated basic changes in urban planning professionalism as well as in national policies. Some planners—who rank gradually became more diversified racially—dedicated their lives to fighting for the rights of the poor and dispossessed. Such dedication took the form of "social" or "advocacy" planning, neighborhood planning, or equity planning. The precise nature of this dualistic relationship of conflict versus cooperation needs further clarification. Few historians of urban African Americans give full and impartial treatment to the role of urban planning. Few historians of U.S. urban planning acknowledge the full influence of race and racial injustice on the profession.

Contributions made by African American women to urban planning efforts are underappreciated. In general, what is needed is an overview of the critical linkages between the urban planning profession and the nation’s most visible racial minority. Race and racial injustice influence all efforts to improve urban society. Urban planning, an active profession, purports to help improve civic life in metropolitan areas. It cannot do so unless its practitioners more clearly understand the historical connections between this people and this field.

Planning and Public Policy

The period after World War II saw two simultaneous processes: (1) the movement of the White middle and working classes to the suburbs, a movement spurred by the return of World War II veterans and the assistance of home mortgage insurance programs, and (2) the consolidation of ghetto boundaries. It is for this era that we have the best documentation concerning the relationship between African American urban life and planning decisions. As several scholars have demonstrated, political leaders’ desire to shape black residential patterns profoundly influenced public housing and urban renewal policies. Just as urban migration of rural blacks and other ethnic minorities was the demographic motivation for racially exclusionary zoning and restrictive covenants during the period between the two world wars, the need to contain blacks in restricted sections of cities influenced public policy decisions after World War II.

The movement to the suburbs by the white middle and working classes, which one sociologist calls a true "metropolitan revolution," clearly established decentralization as the dominant urban pattern for the following decades. This decentralization, however, was exclusionary. For example, Levittown, New York, a well-known suburban community that set the pattern for numerous others, housed 82,000 residents in 1960, not one of whom was African American. Although white families found new opportunities opening up in freshly constructed suburbs, African American families experienced disproportionate overcrowding and limited mobility within the central cities left behind.

A series of federal policies set the stage for these conditions. Urban renewal was one of the most insidious. Often called "Negro removal" by critics, it provides countless examples of the intersection of race with urban policy. Urban renewal systematically destroyed many African American communities and businesses and, for most of its history, failed to safeguard the rights and well-being of those forcibly relocated from those homes and businesses. That clearance for urban renewal worked in conjunction with clearance for highway construction only made matters worse.

Backed by the federal government, cities simultaneously cleared out slums and displaced racial minorities from prime locations for redevelopment and highway construction. These policies shaped and defined the black ghetto. The 1960s, the era of civil rebellion, brought several important changes. The widespread civil disorders, which were volatile but predictable responses to longstanding racial oppression, forced significant alterations in federal policies. President Lyndon Johnson, attempting to build a "Great Society," initiated new programs that focused on eliminating poverty and empowering low-income communities. With the War on Poverty’s community action agencies, citizens gained the power to supervise community improvement directly. Under Model Cities, local citizen governing boards also helped direct local redevelopment and made their own contributions to the redefinition of urban planning.

Well-known planning practitioners began to question the assumptions of traditional land use and redevelopment planning, as well as the racial bias inherent in the profession. Proponents of advocacy planning suggested that the appropriate response to inner-city conditions was for planners to stop trying to represent public interest — an impossible task, leading planners to represent the status quo — and to work instead to help empower underprivileged groups. Another response was for planners to develop "suburban action" programs promoting racial and income integration. Paul Davidoff, premier advocate planner and champion of suburban integration, urged planners to champion non-exclusionary fair housing laws, low and moderate income housing, and progressive zoning and subdivision requirements.

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 killed the oppressive urban renewal program, but it also brought the promising Model Cities experiment to a halt. With the 1974 act, which created Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs), the federal government withdrew from high-profile attempts to target funds to distressed central-city efforts defined by local citizen initiatives. Instead, in city after city, citizens who had just begun to exercise some control over the redevelopment of their neighborhoods experienced the shock of government withdrawal. Although in later years the CDBG program somewhat improved on its record of participation, in general the program placed decision making in the hands of city government and dispersed national funding via a formula that spread increasingly scarce redevelopment funds to populous suburbs as well as to a wide range of cities.

Previous efforts to mesh social, economic, and physical development strategies, a mixture allowed under Model Cities, succumbed under the pervasive "bricks and mortar" orientation of the CDBG program. Any illusions that inner-city residents might have had that their benign federal government would "fix" their ghettos died quickly with the unstable funding, unpredictable longevity, and strong downtown focus that characterized urban-related programs such as action grants and economic development assistance.
tance funds in the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s. The mid-1990s brought promising federal program initiatives, such as Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities. But by that time African American families, even those in suburbia, remained highly segregated. They earned less money than others per capita and per family, and experienced much narrower options of resi-
dence than did other Americans.

African American Initiatives and Responses

Unfortunately, much of the writing about the relationship between the African American community and urban planning has focused on victimization. Of course, victimization, injustice, and oppression are important parts of the story. But throughout the twentieth century, African Americans have refused to be passive actors in this process. They documented their situation, built indigenous institu-
tions, and undertook initiatives designed to improve community life. Scholars such as W.E.B. DuBois carried out path-breaking research, and organizations such as the National Urban League and the National Association of Colored Women made major contributions — which, while documented in other ways, are undocu-
mented in the annals of planning history — to planning efforts in their own com-
munities.

Early in the century, African American women often focused on the civic improvement of their communities. While they, like white women, had no legal or voting rights in the public world of poli-
tics, they were very active. Yet they, like their African American brothers, are invis-
able from the records of their time that planning historians commonly consult. For example, The American City, a peri-
odical that began publication in 1909, was "the" source of information about urban issues, problems, and projects throughout the early part of this century. Between 1909 and 1920, only one article in any way related to African Americans, and it concerned the creation of a segregated low-income housing project. In 1912, an entire issue reported on white women's organizations. Future work will need to

Rather than wallow helplessly in defeatism, black politicians, faith-based groups, and community-based organizations in some cities have carried out remarkable, heroic efforts to preserve and improve their communities.

Planners Network

continued from page 5

PN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

February 27, 1999

Barbara Rahder reported on progress organizing a Toronto chapter. The group has discussed the possibility of incorpo-
rating as a Canadian non-profit. The Toronto chapter would collect dues for PN. This would relieve individuals of having to send money orders in U.S. dol-
ars to the national office. We discussed the possibility of having the newsletter sent to Toronto digitally where it could be printed.

Cathy Klump, a University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) stu-
dent, and Ken Reardon reported on the Spring PN Lecture Series, which featured presentations by Dennis Keating, Sue Schwartz, and Ray Bromley. The UIUC chapter hopes to bring a van-load of stu-
dents and faculty to the Lowell Conference. The East St. Louis Action Research Project will cover the costs of the van(s) to and from the conference.

Tom Angotti and Peg Seip reported on the ongoing success of the New York Planners Network Forum. Over 1,000 individuals are on the local PN mailing list. PN organized a successful workshop at the recent conference of the Metro Chapter of the APA. We discussed the potential for a chapter in Boston.

There was discussion about transforming PN from a loose-knit network into a more organized direct action organizing group. While there was some interest in moving PN in this direction, limited resources make this impractical in the short-range.

We then discussed when and how we, as a National Steering Committee, should take positions on important public policy

 issues. Should we act as a conduit for information on important social justice issues and not take a formal position or should we also state a PN position on behalf of our membership? We discussed the process by which we might take a position. Should we facilitate a democratic consensus-building process on an issue before we take a stand or should we con-
sider our election as Steering Committee members as a mandate allowing us to take positions, as an organization, on issues?

In general, we take responsibility for reviewing major policy positions before recommending action by our members.

Tom Angotti reported on the proposed meeting to be held in Porto Alegre, Brazil in December. PNers involved are: Peter Mareene, Ken Reardon, Jackie Leavitt, Barbara Lynch, Marie Kennedy, Bill Goldsmith, Tom Angotti and Johanna Looye. Each will be responsible for preparing an article on the topic covered by a Brazilian counterpart. Participants will cover their own travel to Brazil. It is expected that a publication will emerge from this meeting. We are inviting someone from Brazil to speak at the Lowell conference.

Alan Rabenstein is getting PNers together at the upcoming APA meeting in Seattle. Patricia Nolan, Ken Reardon and Cathy Klump agreed to organize a small PN reception and a panel, if possible, at the upcoming ACSAP meeting in Chicago. The New York representatives on the Steering Committee volunteered to orga-
nize one or more events at the APA 2000 Conference in New York City. Chester Hartman and Winston Pitcock encour-
aged us to have a presence at other planning-related national meetings.

We then discussed the rather sobering state of PN finances. We decided to send an additional membership appeal to those who have never sent us money or who have not done so in several years. We also agreed to include an appeal in the next issue of the newsletter. A vote was then taken to reaffirm our sliding scale dues policy. In the future, individuals will have to make a regular financial contribution to PN if they are to receive the bi-monthly publication. Non-financial contributions will not be considered. The staff agreed to create a list of people who are “at risk” of being dropped; PN Steering Committee members will then call these individuals, encouraging them to send in their annual dues contribution. Ken Reardon and Cathy Klump agreed to identify “fallow travelers” on each graduate planning fac-
culty and draft a letter asking them to encourage their colleagues and students to join us, invite a PN speaker to their cam-
pus, and help interested students attend our annual conference.

The Steering Committee voiced strong support for the direction in which the bi-
monthly publication has been moving — more in-depth planning articles. Marie Kennedy and Chris Tilly updated the group on the tremendous progress in organizing the June PN Conference in Lowell. Marie and Chris reviewed a pre-
liminary list of potential conference topics. Individual PN Steering Committee members volunteered to organize a total of twenty panels. Marie also discussed the progress in organizing cultural activities and possible PN participation in a local demonstration. We discussed the best way to incorporate Planners for Equal Opportunity into the event. Finally, there was a discussion of a “memorial” session to be held in memory Bennett Harrison, who recently died of cancer.

—Submitted by Ken Reardon, 3/31/99
tance funds in the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s. The mid-1990s brought promising federal program initiatives, such as Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities. But by that time African American families, even those in suburbia, remained highly segregated. They earned less money than others per capita and per family, and experienced much narrower options of resi- dence than did other Americans.

**African American Initiatives and Responses**

Unfortunately, much of the writing about the relationship between the African American community and urban planning has focused on victimization. Of course, victimization, injustice, and oppression are important parts of the story. But throughout the twentieth century, African Americans have refused to be passive actors in this process. They documented their situation, built indigenous institu- tions, and undertook initiatives designed to improve community life. Scholars such as W.E.B. DuBois carried out path-breaking research, and organizations such as the National Urban League and the National Association of Colored Women made major contributions — which, while documented in other ways, are undocu- mented in the annals of planning history — to planning efforts in their own communities.

Early in the century, African American women often focused on the civic improvement of their communities. While they, like white women, had no legal or voting rights in the public world of poli- tics, they were very active. They, like their African American brothers, are invisible from the records of their time that look at the contributions of women who participated in projects linked to tradition- al urban planning, such as housing, parks, land projects, and sanitation, or who made a place for themselves in male-dominated organizations such as the Urban League. The Urban League exemplified African American leadership and response to planning throughout much of the twen- tieth century. During the years of migra- tion, local chapters actively sponsored day camps, food drives, employment pro- grams, and numerous other activities. In the 1980s, they were often leader- ers in the efforts to document the initial abuses of the urban renewal program. The Chicago branch's 1968 report, *The Racial Aspects of Urban Planning: Critique on the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Chicago*, clearly identified the role of institutional racism in the planning process and offered proposals for change. As they noted, "Abstract statements about the goal of equality, while welcomed, are no substitute for technical work dealing with the realities of racism."

By the 1970s, African American com- munities began to realize that environ- mental problems in their communities were related to discriminatory exposure to both toxic substances and unwanted land uses. Lead poisoning, especially from exposure to lead-based paint in substan- dard urban housing, was an issue of social justice that demanded their attention. The combined efforts of inner-city activists and a small group of physicians/sociologists ultimately forced the issue onto the public agenda. A Philadelphia coalition brought a lawsuit against the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to ensure that HUD property was inspected, and if neces- sary, cleaned of all offending lead. Over the next two decades, groups identified myriad other urban environmental issues and added environmental justice to their civil rights agendas. A range of other kinds of African American self-help efforts have persisted in recent years, particularly community development. Rather than wallow help- lessly in defeatism, black politicians, faith-based groups, and community-based organizations in some cities have carried out remarkable, heroic efforts to preserve and improve their communities. These initiatives addressed a myriad of issues, including but not limited to redevelopment, housing rehabilitation, redefining by financial and insurance institutions, com- mercial development, and social improve- ment programs for youth and families. This article is excerpted from Urban Planning and the African American Community, by June Manning Thomas and Marcia Ritzdorf. It is reprinted by permission of Sage Publications.

Manning Thomas is Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at Michigan State University. Marcia Ritzdorf was Associate Professor of Urban Affairs and Planning at Virginia Polytechnic and State University until her death last year.

---

**PN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

**February 27, 1999**

Barbara Raider reported on progress organizing a Toronto chapter. The group has discussed the possibility of incorporating as a Canadian non-profit. The Toronto chapter would collect dues for PN. This would relieve individuals of having to send money orders in U.S. dol- lars to the national office. We discussed the possibility of having the newsletter sent to Toronto digitally where it could be printed.

Cathy Kump, a University of Illinois/Illinois-Champaign (UIUC) stu- dent, and Ken Reardon reported on the spring PN Lecture Series, which featured presentations by Dennis Keating, Sue Schwartz, and Ray Bromley. The UIUC chapter hopes to bring a van-load of stu- dents and faculty to the Lowell Conference. The East St. Louis Action Research Project will cover the costs of the van(s) to and from the conference.

Tom Angotti and Peg Selip reported on the ongoing success of the New York Planners Network Forum. Over 1,000 individuals are on the local PN mailing list. PN organized a successful workshop at the recent conference of the Metro Chapter of the APA. We discussed the potential for a chapter in Boston.

There was discussion about transforming PN from a loose-knit network into a more organized direct action organizing group. While there was some interest in moving PN in this direction, limited resources make this impractical in the short-run.

We then discussed when and how we, as a National Steering Committee, should take positions on important public policy issues. Should we act as a conduit for information on important social justice issues and not take a formal position or should we also state a PN position on behalf of our membership? We discussed the process by which we might take a position. Should we facilitate a democrat- ic consensus-building process on an issue before we take a stand or should we con- sider our election as Steering Committee members as a mandate allowing us to take positions, as an organization, on issues?

In general, we take responsibility for reviewing major policy positions before recommending action by our members.

Tom Angotti reported on the proposed meeting to be held in Porto Alegre, Brazil in December. PNers involved are Peter Marenco, Ken Reardon, Jackie Leavitt, Barbara Lynch, Marie Kennedy, Bill Goldsmith, Tom Angotti and Johanna Loosy. Each will be responsible for preparing an article on the same topic covered by a Brazilian counterpart. Participants will cover their own travel to Brazil. It is expected that a publication will emerge from this meeting. We are inviting someone from Brazil to speak at the Lowell conference.

Alan Rabinowitz is getting PNers together at the upcoming APA meeting in Chicago. Patricia Nolan, Ken Reardon and Cathy Kump agreed to organize a small PN reception and a panel, if possible, at the upcoming ASCP meeting in Chicago. The New York representatives on the Steering Committee volunteered to orga- nize one or more events at the APA 2000 Conference in New York City. Chester Hartman and Winston Pitcock encour- aged us to have a presence at other plan- ning-related national meetings.

We then discussed the rather sobering state of PN finances. We decided to send an additional membership appeal to those who have never sent us money or who have not done so in several years. We also agreed to include an appeal in the next issue of the newsletter. A vote was then taken to reaffirm our sliding scale dues policy. In the future, individuals will have to make a regular financial contribution to PN if they are to receive the bi-monthly publication. Non-financial contributions will not be considered. The staff agreed to create a list of people who are "at risk" of being dropped; PN Steering Committee members will then call these individuals, encouraging them to send in their annual dues contribution. Ken Reardon and Cathy Kump agreed to identify "fellow travelers" on each graduate planning fac- ulty and draft a letter asking them to encourage their colleagues and students to join PN, invite a PN speaker to their cam- pus, and help interested students attend our annual conference.

The Steering Committee voiced strong support for the direction in which the bi- monthly publication has been moving — in deeper in-planning articles. Marie Kennedy and Chris Tilly updated the group on the tremendous progress in organizing the June PN Conference in Lowell. Marie and Chris reviewed a pre- liminary list of potential conference topics. Individual PN Steering Committee members volunteered to organize a total of twenty panels. Marie also discussed the progress in organizing cultural activities and possible PN participation in a local demonstration. We discussed the best way to incorporate Planners for Equal Opportunity into the event. Finally, there was a discussion of a "memorial" session to be held in memory Bennett Harrison, who recently died of cancer.

—Submitted by Ken Reardon, 3/31/99
RESTRICTING OCCUPANCY, HURTING FAMILIES

By Ellen Pader

While much has been written about federal legislation designed to dismantle public housing, relatively little has been written about legislation designed to eviscerate the Fair Housing Act (FHA), which gives legal protections against discrimination in housing choice.

Much of what has been written deals with the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) and modern versions of redlining, steering and other means of discrimination on the basis of the homeowners’ race, ethnicity, sex, religion, disability and/or because they have children. Another assault on the FHA that rarely makes it to newspapers takes the form of legislative attempts to severely limit the number of people who may share a unit by codifying overly restrictive occupancy standards. If successful, this “reform” would make housing choice even more precarious for low-income households.

Occupancy Standards

Occupancy standards have had a large influence on the ethnic, racial, social and economic structure of cities. Occupancy standards govern the acceptable number of people per-unit or acceptable household composition. They directly impact the availability and affordability of housing and, by extension, homelessness, coercive racial, ethnic and class segregation and access to quality education, jobs, recreation, transportation and other services.

While appearing to be neutral, and purported by their supporters to be in the interest of protecting the physical and mental health and safety of all, property owners and municipalities have long used overly restrictive occupancy codes explicitly to keep out unwanted populations and maintain a particular ethnic status quo in a community. Two popular ways that occupancy standards are used for discriminatory purposes are by writing zoning policies that restrict the number of non-nuclear or unrelated people who may share a rented or self-owned home, and setting restrictive person-to-room ratios. The standards are purposefully designed to be biased against certain groups by legislating away the right to have extended or large nuclear families live together. Once the regulations are in effect, there is often uneven enforcement, targeting those unwanted groups, generally based on their ethnicity or the presence of children in the household.

What we’re really talking about here is a culturally constructed definition of appropriate family composition and the apportionment of domestic space masquerading as a neutral, and even healthy and necessary, social policy — a social policy which can only have a disparate cultural and economic impact on low-income households. What makes this more insidious is that the history of current occupancy standards derive from racist and ethnocratic beliefs and attempts to control, contain and assimilate non-white and “not-yet-white” populations.

The history of current occupancy standards derives from racist and ethnocratic beliefs and attempts to control, contain and assimilate non-white and “not-yet-white” populations.

New Bills Would Gut Fair Housing

As I write this in late January, 1999, two anti-Fair Housing bills have already been introduced in Congress by Representative Bill McCollum (R-FL).

H.R. 190, “Credit Opportunity Amendments Act of 1999” would, if passed, severely weaken the enforcement powers of the Department of Justice to uphold the Equal Credit Act (and hence access to mortgages) and the Community Reinvestment Act.

The second bill, which I will discuss here, is Rep. McCollum’s H.R. 176, “The State Occupancy Standards Affirmation Act of 1999.” As part of a major legislative priority of the National Multi Housing Council in Washington, D.C., the lobbying organization for large residential rental owners and managers, this bill would, in essence, set a federal occupancy standard of no more than two people per bedroom plus an infant under six months old, who must sleep in the same room as the parent or other guardian. Under this law, a state could set its own “reasonable” standard, with the two person per bedroom limit kicking in if a state does not have an occupancy standard. (See <http://www.thomas.gov> for the full text of these bills.)

The stated purpose of the legislation is to limit the number of residents a housing provider can “manage” (not a word used about the middle- and upper-income renters) and still provide a “decent home and services,” enhance “livability for all residents, including the dwelling for each particular resident;” (italics mine) and claim the physical deterioration of the dwelling property.” On a superficial reading, this bill seems to provide good protections, ensuring that no one has to live in the severely crowded tenement conditions of nineteenth century New York City or San Francisco’s Chinatown, conditions that lead to the first occupancy standards in 1879 and 1870, respectively (not without their own discriminatory intentions). The implications of H.R. 176, however, are troubling. It assures renting families are irreparable and inconstant, and in need of being managed. It further assumes that a family of five is intrinsically more destructive than a family of four. If this low-or moderate-income family of five or six cannot find someone who will rent them a two-bedroom home in a neighborhood of color and households, jobs, transportation and recreation, often they will have to either move to a large home in a less desirable area or spend 75% or more of their income on a three-bedroom home.

While the text of H.R. 176 has been rejected twice before, with a fight, HUD and many courts have tended to accept the proposed two person per bedroom (2:1) ratio as reasonable, and thus not discriminatory under the Fair Housing Act, even though it has a disparate impact on households of color and households with children, two protected categories.

Many states use a different method of measuring, calculating the number of people per square foot (rather than per bedroom), including both the overall person-to-dwelling size and person-to-bedroom size, a system the rental industry argues is too complex. HUD will sometimes take room size into consideration as well as number of bedrooms.

None of the supporters of restrictive standards have ever been able to justify their preferred standards on the basis of business necessity, health or safety concerns. Nor have they found an objective standard for “livability.” This is important because this 2:1 standard has a distinctly northern European, upper class lineage, and therefore, profound implications for being legally discriminatory on the basis of national origin (ethnicity), race and familial status.

Cultural Bias and Occupancy Standards

There are significant cultural differences concerning what constitutes comfort, crowding and appropriate use of domestic space. In countries as different as Japan and Mexico, household members commonly choose to share bedrooms while leaving others unused. Sharing sleeping and other spaces is often part of a cultural emphasis on interdependency as a personal and political goal, while sleeping alone and other emphases on physically bounded private domestic space help cultivate a greater emphasis on individualism.

The 2:1 occupancy standard is so much a part of the dominant ideology of arrival, that a politically active friend berated me for my insistence on a more lenient occupancy standard with: “I want others to have what I want for my own family.” He didn’t consider that having one’s own bedroom is not only a personal choice, but a sociocultural one.

Since restrictive covenants were deemed illegal in 1948, some municipalities continue to find creative new ways to reconstitute some facsimile of their discriminatory power through occupancy standard regulation. A number of municipalities have attempted to rewrite zoning bylaws to rid themselves of unwanted populations. For example, since the mid-1980s some locales have tried — and unfortunately lost in court — to redefine the minimum space per person ratio to stop Latino households from moving in, many of whom had larger families than the established residents and/or extended families. Examples include Wildwood, N.J., Cicero, IL (where the Department of Justice found the new ordinance enforcement to be targeted only at potential Latino home buyers), Waukegan, IL, and Santa Ana, CA.

There is a sad irony not to be missed here. Every year Congressional Republicans introduce regressive housing legislation that can only have the effect of legislating away the fundamental means by which some people have traditionally helped one another through hard times. In the Republican’s selective approval of over-regulation, such legislation ensures the continuation of the urban structure the same policy makers purport to want to dismantle, and promotes the antithesis of the traditional family value of mutual assistance.

The proposed occupancy standards legislation, H.R. 176, resonates with the moralistic and paternalistic policies of the ninetenth century; it totally ignores regulating owners who do not properly maintain their property and gives no heed to the many low-income tenants who work hard to maintain a high quality environment, despite non-responsive property owners. The FHA is an important part of the Civil Rights Act, and certainly an important tool for planners interested in social equity.

Ellen Pader is Associate Professor of Regional Planning at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and is on the Board of Directors of the Housing Discrimination Project in Holyoke, MA.
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While much has been written about federal legislation designed to dismantle public housing, relatively little has been written about legislation designed to eviscerate the Fair Housing Act (FHA), which gives legal protections against discrimination in housing choice. Much of what has been written deals with the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) and modern versions of redlining, steering and other means of discrimination on the basis of the homeowners’ race, ethnicity, sex, religion, disability and/or because they have children. Another assault on the FHA that rarely makes it to newspapers takes the form of legislative attempts to severely limit the number of people who may share a unit by codifying overly restrictive occupancy standards. If successful, this “reform” would make housing choice even more precarious for low-income households.

Occupancy Standards

Occupancy standards have had a large influence on the ethnic, racial, social and economic structure of cities. Occupancy standards govern the acceptable number of people-per-unit or acceptable household composition. They directly impact the availability and affordability of housing and, by extension, homelessness, coercive racial, ethnic and class segrega-

The history of current occupancy standards derives from racist and ethnocratic beliefs and attempts to control, contain and assimilate non-white and “not-yet-white” populations.

New Bills Would Gut Fair Housing

As I write this in late January, 1999, two anti-Fair Housing bills have already been introduced in Congress by Representative Bill McCollum (R-FL), H.R. 190, “Credit Opportunity Amendments Act of 1999” would, if passed, severely weaken the enforcement powers of the Department of Justice to uphold the Equal Credit Act (and hence access to mortgages) and the Community Reinvestment Act.

The second bill, which I will discuss here, is Rep. McCollum’s H.R. 176, “The State Occupancy Standards Affirmation Act of 1999.” As part of a major legislative priority of the National Multi Housing Council in Washington, D.C., the lobbying organization for large residential rental owners and managers, this bill would, in essence, set a federal occupancy standard of no more than two people per bedroom plus an infant under six months old, who must sleep in the same room as the parent or other guardian. Under this law, a state could set its own “reasonable” standard, with the two person per bedroom limit kicking in if a state does not have an occupancy standard. (See: <http://www.thomas.gov> for the full text of these bills.)

The stated purpose of the legislation is to limit the number of residents a housing provider can “manage” (not a word used about the middle- and upper-income renters) and still provide a “decent home and services,” enhance “livability for all residents, including the dwelling for each particular resident;” and “address physical deterioration of the dwelling property.” On a superficial reading, this bill seems to provide good protections, ensuring that no one has to live in the severely crowded tenement conditions of nineteenth century New York City or San Francisco’s Chinatown, conditions that lead to the first occupancy standards in 1879 and 1870, respectively (not without their own discriminatory intentions).

The implications of H.R. 176, however, are troubling. It assures renting families are irresponsible and inconsiderate, and in need of being managed. It further assumes that a family of five is intrinsically more destructive than a family of four. If this low-or moderate-income family of five or six cannot find someone who will rent them a two-bedroom home in a neighborhood of color and households, jobs, transportation and recreation, often they will have to either move to a large home in a less desirable area or spend 75% or more of their income on a small bedroom home.

While leaving others unused. Sharing sleeping and other spaces is often part of a cultural emphasis on interdependency as a personal and political goal, while sleeping alone and other emphases on physically bounded private domestic space help cultivate a greater emphasis on individualism.

The 2:1 occupancy standard is so much a part of the dominant ideology of arrival, that a politically active friend berated me for my insistence on a more lenient occupancy standard with: “I want others to have what I want for my own family.” He didn’t consider that having one’s own bedroom is not only a personal choice, but a sociocultural one. Since restrictive covenants were deemed illegal in 1948, some municipalities continue to find creative new ways to reconstitute some facsimile of their dis-
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THE INVASION OF AZTLÁN AND STRUGGLES FOR LAND

By Teresa Córdova

The traditional New Mexican lives with the memory of invasion.

In New Mexico developers are quickly turning fertile land into resorts for the rich, displacing locals from their land-based economy and then telling them they should be grateful for jobs cleaning toilets. They say they stand in the way of progress, that we are backward for wanting to hold on to something long gone. But our memory is always being refreshed with new examples of invasion.

Now we are viewed impacts how people view the space that we occupy. A 1996 Chicago Tribune column by Mike Royko on Pat Buchanan's views about Mexico, outraged the Latino population. Royko rants that Mexico is not发动机 about wanting to "improve itself." If Mexico were serious, "it would invite us to invade and seize the entire country and turn it into the world's greatest golf resort. There is no reason for Mexico to be such a mess except that it is run by Mexicans, who have clearly established that they don't know what the heck they are doing. ... We should grab [Mexico], privatize the whole country, and turn a neat profit by giving Chávez the franchise." If we are viewed as "not knowing what the heck we are doing," then it is easier to justify taking our land. The view that defines us as inferior also defines our space as "there for the taking." Redefining taxation and land use law has been one of the most effective means of land grabbing. Dislocating locally-based economies increases the likelihood that someone will sell their land, even when they would rather not.

What is in people's minds when they think it is okay to move somebody over and take their space? I recall the words of a transplanted "easterner" who has a strategic position in Albuquerque City Hall. In response to a question on the cultural implications of infill development, he responded, "This is how we do it in the east coast and people in New Mexico are just going to have to get used to it." Another example is the newly arrived West Side resident of Albuquerque who says, "build the damn road through the Petroglyphs" — a sacred site — so he can get downtown as quickly as possible.

These newcomers refuse to understand what it is like for the traditional New Mexican who lives with the memory of invasion and the reminders of its continued existence. Even many who have lived here more than twenty years display a visible discomfort when the traditional New Mexican raises the issue of how a particular development plan might affect native communities. Our insistence that there may be a problem here is often met with impatience or downright scorn.

Teresa Córdova is Associate Professor of Community and Regional Planning at the University of New Mexico.

New Policy

The only source of funds for PN

PN produces a bimonthly publication and organizes conferences on a $10,000 annual budget, significant support from Prat Institute, and a lot of volunteer sweat. We cannot sustain these activities without increasing financial contributions. In the past, our policy was ambiguous, and Updates to membership letters or notes to the editor were considered contributions. The Steering Committee decided that we could no longer afford to do this.

7TH GENERATION

continued from first page

THE SEVENTH GENERATION

Clearing House, Mel King suggests some lessons for building an effective multiracial coalition. Luis Aponte-Parks looks back at the experience of the New Great Society to illuminate a question that we still haven't resolved: how can planners who don't share the life circumstances or culture of the group they are working with be effective in supporting not only short-term planning goals, but social movements attempting to force substantial changes? Teresa Córdova shows how the landgrab from indigenous people in the Southwest nurtured racist notions that continue to justify displacement and racial exclusion. Karen Unemoto tackles the problem of working across cultural differences by briefly discussing a case study where attempts at participatory planning unwittingly challenged deeply held meaning in a traditional Hawaiian community.

American Community, cautions us that we cannot formulate a new anti-racist practice of urban planning without a careful study of the intertwined history of urban planning and African-American. Ellen Pader questions the motives behind government-imposed standards, arguing that thinly disguised racism and cultural and class oppression, rather than concern for social and physical health, more often underlie the setting of standards. Drawing from the history of the Third World Jobs Clearing House, Mel King suggests some lessons for building an effective multiracial coalition. Luis Aponte-Parks looks back at the experience of the New Great Society to illuminate a question that we still haven't resolved: how can planners who don't share the life circumstances or culture of the group they are working with be effective in supporting not only short-term planning goals, but social movements attempting to force substantial changes? Teresa Córdova shows how the landgrab from indigenous people in the Southwest nurtured racist notions that continue to justify displacement and racial exclusion. Karen Unemoto tackles the problem of working across cultural differences by briefly discussing a case study where attempts at participatory planning unwittingly challenged deeply held meaning in a traditional Hawaiian community.

New Policy

The only source of funds for PN

PN produces a bimonthly publication and organizes conferences on a $10,000 annual budget, significant support from Prat Institute, and a lot of volunteer sweat. We cannot sustain these activities without increasing financial contributions. In the past, our policy was ambiguous, and Updates to membership letters or notes to the editor were considered contributions. The Steering Committee decided that we could no longer afford to do this.

By Teresa Córdova

Resisting the Invasion

So not only do they invade the territory, but then they attempt to define what our reaction should be to that invasion. We are supposed to "behave" and quietly allow their unjust behavior so they will not call us heathens that God did not mean to bless with the gift of land. Many seek the approval of the invaders and collude in the loss of their own people's land and culture. But there are far more who remain deeply committed to the survival of themselves, their resources, and their culture.

New Mexicans (and others like them throughout the world) have a long history of resistance. Communities throughout the state are employing a number of strategies in their struggle to maintain the land and their cultural identities. Community-driven economic development strategies build on local resources; legal strategies abound over jurisdictional use and ownership of land; land grant communities have organized as a network; urban and rural CDCs have formed; associations have grown stronger and more motivated; grassroots organizations are aggressively challenging corporate welfare; state government agencies are being made accountable, and so on.

We must remember the history of resistance in New Mexico along with the history of invasion. PN

Teresa Córdova is Associate Professor of Community and Regional Planning at the University of New Mexico.

New Policy

Contributions now a must for PN members

At its recent annual meeting, the Steering Committee was forced to confront PN's New York's dire financial condition. Too many people receive this publication who rarely or never contributed to PN, or contribute at a very minimal level. Member contributions are

the only source of funds for PN.

PN produces a bimonthly publication and organizes conferences on a $10,000 annual budget, significant support from Prat Institute, and a lot of volunteer sweat. We cannot sustain these activities without increasing financial contributions. In the past, our policy was ambiguous, and Updates to membership letters or notes to the editor were considered contributions. The Steering Committee decided that we could no longer afford to do this.

If your mailing label has a date of April 1999 or earlier, you will be dropped from the membership list unless we receive a contribution from you soon. Members will get a reminder card before being dropped. If you have any question about your status, contact Steve Johnson at the PN office: stevej@pratt.edu.

PN is the only source of organization consistently advocating for progressive planning. Without your support, it cannot be sustained!
THE INVASION OF AZTLÁN AND STRUGGLES FOR LAND

By Teresa Córdova

The traditional New Mexican lives with the memory of invasion.

In New Mexico developers are quickly turning fertile land into resorts for the rich, displacing locals from their land-based economy and then telling them they should be grateful for jobs cleaning toilets. They say we stand in the way of progress, that we are backward for wanting to hold on to things long gone. But our memory is always being refreshed with new examples of invasion.

How are we viewed impacts how people view the space that we occupy. A 1996 Chicago Tribune column by Mike Royko on Pat Buchanan's views about Mexico, outraged the Latino population. Royko rants that Mexico is not about wanting to "improve itself." If Mexico were serious, "it would invite us to invade and seize the entire country and turn it into the world's greatest golf resort. There is no reason for Mexico to be such a mess except that it is run by Mexicans, who have clearly established that they don't know what the heck they are doing. ... We should grab [Mexico], privatize the whole country, and turn a neat profit by giving Chavez, Benito the franchise." If we are viewed as "not knowing what the heck we are doing," then it is easier to justify taking our land. The view that defines us as inferior also defines our space as "there for the taking." Redefining taxation and land use law has been one of the most effective means of land grabbing. Locally-based economies increases the likelihood that someone will sell their land, even when they would rather not. What is in people's minds when they think it is okay to move somebody over and take their space? I recall the words of a transplanted "easterner" who has a strategic position in Albuquerque City Hall. In response to a question on the cultural implications of infill development, he responded, "This is how we do it on the east coast and people in New Mexico are just going to have to get used to it." Another example is the newly arrived West Side resident of Albuquerque who says, "build the damn road through the Petroglyphs" — a sacred site — so can get downtown as quickly as possible.

These newcomers refuse to understand what it is like for the traditional New Mexican who lives with the memory of invasion and the reminders of its continued existence. Even many who have lived here more than twenty years display a visible discomfort when the traditional New Mexican raises the issue of how a particular development plan might affect native communities. Our insistence that there may be a problem here is often met with impatience or downright scorn.

Resisting the Invasion

So not only do they invade the territory, but then they attempt to define what our reaction should be to that invasion. We are supposed to "behave" and quietly allow their unjust behavior so they will not call us heathens that God did not mean to bless with the gift of land. Many seek the approval of the invaders and collude in the loss of their own people's land and culture. But there are far more who remain deeply committed to the survival of their selves, their resources, and their culture. New Mexicans (and others like them throughout the world) have a long history of resistance. Communities throughout the state are employing a number of strategies to maintain their land and their cultural identities. Community-driven economic development strategies build on local resources; legal struggles abound over jurisdictional use and ownership of land; land grant communities have organized as a network; urban and rural CDCs have formed; associations have grown stronger and more militant; grassroots organizations are aggressively challenging corporate welfare; state government agencies are being made accountable, and so on.

We must remember the history of resistance in New Mexico along with the history of invasion.

PN Teresa Córdova is Associate Professor of Community and Regional Planning at the University of New Mexico.

New Policy

CONTRIBUTIONS NOW A MUST FOR PN MEMBERS

At its recent annual meeting, the Steering Committee was forced to confront New Mexico's dire financial condition. Too many people receive this publication who rarely or never contributed to PN, or contribute at a very minimal level. Member contributions are the only source of funds for PN. PN produces a bi-monthly publication and organizes conferences on a $10,000 annual budget, significant support from Pratt Institute, and a lot of volunteer sweat. We cannot sustain these activities without increasing financial contributions. In the past, our policy was ambiguous, and Updates to our brochure or notes to the editor were considered contributions. The Steering Committee decided that we could no longer afford to do this.

If your mailing label has a date of April 1999 or earlier, you will be dropped from the membership list unless we receive a contribution from you soon. Members will get a reminder card before being dropped. If you have any question about your status, contact Steve Johnson at the PN office or sjohnson@pratt.edu.

PN is the only self-supporting organization consistently advocating for progressive planning. Without your support, it cannot be sustained!
VISIONS OF HOPE FOR PEOPLE OF COLOR

A Framework for Communication and Collective Action

By Mel King

The political climate of this nation is exemplified by the politics of scarcity, which pits groups of people against one another, persuading our communities to buy into the notion that our well-being can be gained only at the expense of other people. The same rhetoric that blames immigrants, people without resources, people without housing, and people receiving welfare for the country's ills begins at the national level and permeates local politics. Manifestoes like the Republican Contract with America buttressed by theories exemplified by the innate intelligence paradigm, the basis of the "Bell Curve," have created the climate that allows the advocacy of positions that deny access to resources of the society to some members of our human family. These policies have encouraged measures such as Proposition 187 in California, the various anti-bilingual initiatives in many parts of the country, and fueled the violence within and among communities of color. (Several thinkers have argued that the tensions between communities of color are a result of mimicking white racism, where our people emulate their oppressors' actions.)

The politics of scarcity can only be countered by the politics of hope. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "I have the audacity to believe that people everywhere can have three meals a day for their bodies, education and culture for their lives, dignity, equality and freedom for their spirit. I believe that what self-centered men have torn down other-centered people can build up. We should be outraged at the misallocation of resources at the expense of the most vulnerable members of our society. At the same time, we have to believe that Divisions among communities of color ... nurture feelings of helplessness this country — the richest country in the world — has the resources and the technological capacity to meet the basic needs, provide a viable economic development program that will create full employment, and a decent standard of living for all our people.

Practicing the politics of hope is a struggle for the mind of our communities and on some level it becomes a struggle for the heart. We have to think about acquiring power not for its own sake but for creating change. Most people view power as a fixed resource. On the other hand, if we think about power as a construct in which every individual and every social unit has the opportunity to play a significant role in the community, then we can begin to think about power differently — where the power of one is increased along with the contribution to the increase of the power of others. Martin Luther King, Jr. was very aware of the significance of power. He strived to get people to understand the disadvantages of placing the car (programs) before the horse (power). Once we believe and know that we can work together, that others have destroyed and create a reallocation of resources to meet human needs, I believe that we can come together to work for what we believe in. The benefits, be they economic development, better housing, or affordable health care, will follow automatically.

Divisions in Communities of Color

Divisions among communities of color will not yield power to create systemic change. Instead, these divisions nurture feelings of helplessness. We tend to move away from addressing the perpetrators of oppression and continue to struggle among ourselves, which in turn creates more feelings of powerlessness. The struggle of Asians, Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans to come together as a unified community of color centers around communication. In Boston, the Third World Jobs Clearinghouse was an example of the benefits that can result when different communities of color work together to create a common agenda that serves all communities of color and moves away from the politics of scarcity. The Clearinghouse was the result of a long and relentless struggle waged by construction workers in Boston against the construction industry in an effort to persuade the industry to provide apprenticeships and jobs in the construction trades for people of color. When the city of Boston and the construction industry used the sector of block grant support to induce competition among the different communities, these communities came together to create the Clearinghouse on the principle of providing two votes for each constituency. The number of people in that constituency did not become the issue and through mutual trust an arrangement that would benefit the African-American, Latino, Asian, and Native American communities was established. The communities did not have to use a majority rule approach and people who were a numerical majority had trust that they would not lose out and that the relationship would benefit all groups involved.

Chuck Turner, one of the architects of the Third World Jobs Clearinghouse, says that the organization was "built up in a way that there was a sense of safety" among the different communities. Members felt that they could discuss the hard issues and there was no attempt to gloss over or ignore real differences between the groups. The honesty allowed the dialogue to continue and people could identify barriers and obstacles to working together.

Complementary Holism

Complementary Holism is a theoretical approach that can be used to enhance positive communication among different communities of color. This approach provides a framework for the disparate concerns of diverse social groups, without making concessions about the relative hierarchy of importance of each group's concerns. This model allows for different movements to come together and work for systemic change. A practical demonstration of Complementary Holism was the development of the Rainbow Coalition, which allowed progressive groups and different communities of color to come together to shape the political agenda of the nation.

There are several elements which are integral to the success of positive and constructive communication among people of color. First, trust is the cornerstone of any positive communication. During the development of the Third World Jobs Clearinghouse, for example, African-Americans had to trust that their numerical superiority would not be undermined by sharing power with other groups. Second, the problem has to be framed while overcoming the different perceptions that groups have about each other. Finally, a plan for action has to be developed in which all the groups understand the positive benefits of collective action. PN

This article is excerpted from an article that appeared in the magazine Colors.

Mel King is MIT Professor Emeritus and has been a leader in Boston's African-American community—and all of Boston—for four decades.
Where there are no limits to growth visions of plenty abound; where visions of plenty abound growth is unlimited; mind set is critical the 8 straight up sets limits, lazy = 0 on its side is infinite. See.

The political climate of this nation is exemplified by the political of scarcity, which pits groups of people against one another, persuading our communities to buy into the notion that our well-being can be gained only at the expense of other people. The same rhetoric that blames immigrants, people without resources, people without housing, and people receiving welfare for the country's ills begins at the national level and permeates local politics. Manifestos like the Republican Contract with America buttressed by theories exemplified by the innate intelligence paradigm, the basis of the "Bell Curve," have created the climate that allows the advocacy of positions that deny access to resources of the society to some members of our human family. These policies have encouraged measures such as Proposition 187 in California, the various anti-bilingual initiatives in many parts of the country, and fueled the violence within and among communities of color. (Several thinkers have argued that the tensions between communities of color are a result of mimicking white racism, where our people emulate their oppressor's actions.)

The politics of scarcity can only be countered by the politics of hope. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "I have the audacity to believe that peoples everywhere can have three meals a day for their bodies, education and culture for their lives, dignity, equality and freedom for their spirit. I believe that what self-centered men have torn down other-centered people can build up." We should be outraged at the misallocation of resources at the expense of the most vulnerable members of our society. At the same time, we have to believe that divisions among communities of color need not destroy and create a reallocation of resources to meet human needs. I believe that we can come together to work for what we believe in. The benefits, they economic development, better housing, or affordable health care, will follow automatically.

The politics of scarcity can only be countered by the politics of hope. The struggle of Asian, Hispanic, Latino, and Native Americans to come together as a unified community of color centers around communication. In Boston, the Third World Jobs Clearinghouse was an example of the benefits that can result when different communities of color work together to create a common agenda that serves all communities of color and moves away from the politics of scarcity. The Clearinghouse was the result of a long and relentless struggle waged by construction workers in Boston against the construction industry in an effort to persuade the industry to provide apprenticeships and jobs in the construction trades for people of color. When the city of Boston and the construction industry used the system of black grants to support middle-income among the different communities, these communities came together to create the Clearinghouse on the principle of providing two votes for each constituency. The number of people in that constituency did not become the issue and through mutual trust an arrangement that would benefit the African-American, Latino, Asian, and Native American communities was established. The communities did not have to use a majority rule approach and people who were a numerical majority had trust that they would not lose out and that the relationship would benefit all groups involved.

This article is excerpted from an article that appeared in the magazine Colors. Mel King is MIT Professor Emeritus and has been a leader in Boston's African American community—and all of Boston—for four decades.
THE EAST HARLEM
REAL GREAT SOCIETY

A Puerto Rican Chapter in the Fight for Self-Determination

by Luis Aponte-Parés

This is a story of an important "advocacy-planning" experience during the late sixties in New York City. Its importance is twofold: to add a missing chapter in the history of "progressive planning," and to gain a critical understanding of ethnic-centered planning as it was articulated during the early period of the "advocacy" planning paradigm. Among the many missing voices of this period are those of Puerto Ricans and Latinos.

When Puerto Ricans were moving to New York City in great numbers during the early postwar period, there were momentous transformations taking place in the city. The emerging post-industrial city had no need for housing structures built for industrial workers of earlier periods. Puerto Ricans lived in neighborhoods where a large number of these buildings were deemed to be surplus. Poor communities generally lacked the institutional infrastructure or framework to devise strategies to stop displacement. By the sixties Puerto Rican neighborhoods like East Harlem and the Lower East Side were the target of massive spatial restructuring and the state's role was articulated through urban renewal.

Advocacy Planning and other Responses

The architecture and planning professions responded to the restructuring through "advocacy" architecture and planning. Paul Davidoff was a principal proponent of advocacy planning, which openly invited political and social values to be examined and debated within the profession. This position was a clear rejection of planning practices which made the planner a "technician." Davidoff argued that appropriate planning action could not be prescribed from a position of value neutrality. Thus planners had to go beyond explaining the values underlying their prescriptions: "He should affirm them. He should be an advocate for what he deems proper," argued Davidoff. In contrast, Frances Fox Piven cautioned that advocacy planning implied that "the urban poor can influence decisions once they are given the technical help of a planner — or better still, once they actually learn the technical skills of planning." Piven also argued that involving local groups in "elaborate planning procedures is to guide them into a narrowly circumscribed form of political action, and precisely that form for which they are least equipped."

Advocacy planners were "coaching ghetto leaders off the streets," where they could make trouble. In New York City there were many advocacy groups. There were "technical" advocacy centers linked to universities, like the Pratt Center and Columbia's East Harlem Studio, and "ethnically-centered" ones like the Architect's Renewal Committee of Harlem, and the Real Great Society Urban Planning Studio.

The Great Real Society is Born

The Great Real Society (ROS) was founded in the Lower East Side of Manhattan in 1964 by former gang leaders who teamed up to "fight poverty with politics." The Chicano branch (ROS/juventudes) was organized in 1967, also by former gang leaders who along with young professionals wanted to be "at the center of the struggle for total environmental control."

In 1968 the School of Architecture at Columbia brought together a group of students, a studio professor and ROS/Uptown. Under the leadership of Willie Vázquez, the studio engaged in a year-long study of projects in East Harlem. But, the results of the Columbia Studio were mixed. Envisioned as a joint effort, an "experiment" to bring together the technical knowledge of architecture and planning students at Columbia, the know-how and community knowledge of ROS, it was nevertheless a difficult and uneasy partnership.

At this time, Harry Quintana came onto the scene. He felt that the "Columbia kids would not stay long enough for any of the projects to come through, thus leaving the community hanging." His view that only those with a vested interest in APONTE-PARÉS page 21

MULTICULTURAL PLANNING

Lessons from Papakolea

by Karen Umemoto

There is a lot of talk about multiculturalism in planning. Planning programs and agencies often stress the need for planning staff to be able to work in "diverse communities." Sometimes this simply means placing planners of certain ethnic backgrounds in communities whose residents share the same ethnic heritage. While this may be effective in some cases, it doesn't necessarily bring about positive working relations between communities and planners. Nor do all planning agencies have the number of planners to "cover" all the ethnic groups that may live in a city.

It is more useful to discuss what it means to effectively work in diverse communities, since planners frequently work in communities whose ethnic backgrounds are different from their own. Here I'd like to highlight two challenges in working across cultural paradigms. I refer to these challenges as "ethnoloquial," that is, challenges that involve different ways of knowing. Leorie Sandercock eloquently discusses this problem in her book, Towards Cosmopolis, and advocates for multicultural literacy. But what does such literacy entail? There are two challenges: 1) addressing culture, history and collective memory and 2) understanding the multiple meanings of language. I draw examples from a community-led planning process in the Hawaiian Homeland community of Papakolea where students and faculty in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Hawaii helped to facilitate a visioning process along with community residents.

Culture, History and Collective Memory

When a planner enters a community, she or he enters into a cultural setting in a particular historic moment. Culture, history and collective memory shape the way it was important for us to learn about the history of Papakolea and its living memories and to hear the stories of the residents.

In multicultural cities, planners often work in communities where the ethnic or racial background of residents is different from their own. The stronger the racial or ethnic identification within a geographic community, the more likely that the racial or ethnic background of a planner may be a factor in initial interactions. This may influence how a planner is viewed and how people make judgments about a planner's motives or intentions.

Actions and gestures are also interpreted from a lens colored by history. For communities that have faced oppressive or discriminatory treatment, the memory of past experiences with outside institutions is often saddled with ambivalence towards whom they identify with the dominating group. In the U.S., this tension is most often found, at least initially, when white planners enter non-white communities. With contemporary urban conflicts, these tensions also exist between racial or ethnic minorities as well.

Part of the living history in Papakolea was the memory of university staff examining Native Hawaiians as objects of research projects that were never seen by residents to produce anything of benefit to them. They felt they were "studied to death." "Collaborations" were often weighted in favor of outside "partners." Social researchers often focused on the "problems" in the community with little attention to its beauty and richness. Many residents felt labeled as a "problem population," leading to further marginalization. When students and faculty from the university initially entered the community in fall 1997 to embark on a visioning project — where people envision and plan for the future of their community — we encountered the memory of this past and the feelings of resentment towards those affiliated with the university.

see UMEMOTO page 16
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A Puerto Rican Chapter in the Fight for Self-Determination

by Luis Aponte-Parés

This is a story of an important "advocacy planning" experience during the late sixties in New York City. Its importance is twofold: to add a missing chapter in the history of "progressive planning," and to gain a critical understanding of ethnic-centered planning as it was articulated during the early period of the "advocacy planning" paradigm. Among the many missing voices of this period are those of Puerto Ricans and Latinos.

When Puerto Ricans were moving to New York City in great numbers during the early postwar period, there were momentous transformations taking place in the city. The emerging post-industrial city had no need for housing structures built for industrial workers of earlier periods. Puerto Ricans lived in neighborhoods where a large number of these buildings were deemed to be surplus. Poor communities generally lacked the institutional infrastructure or framework to devise strategies to stop displacement. By the sixties Puerto Rican neighborhoods like East Harlem and the Lower East Side were the target of massive spatial restructuring and the state's role was articulated through urban renewal.

Advocacy Planning and other Responses

The architecture and planning professions responded to the restructuring through "advocacy" architecture and planning.

Paul Davidoff was a principal proponent of advocacy planning, which openly invited political and social values to be examined and debated within the profession. This position was a clear rejection of planning prescriptions which made the planner a "technician." Davidoff argued that appropriate planning action could not be prescribed from a position of value neutrality. Thus planners had to go beyond explaining the values underlying their prescriptions: "He should affirm them. He should be an advocate for what he deems proper," argued Davidoff.

In contrast, Frances Fox Piven cautioned that advocacy planning implied "that the urban poor can influence decisions once they are given the technical help of a planner — or better still, once they actually learn the technical skills of planning." Piven also argued that involving local groups in "elaborate planning procedures is to guide them into a narrowly circumscribed form of political action, and precisely that form for which they are least equipped.

Advocacy planners were "coaxing ghetto leaders off the streets," where they could make trouble.

In New York City there were many advocacy groups. There were "technical" advocacy centers linked to universities, like the Pratt Center and Columbia's East Harlem Studio, and "ethnic-centered" ones like the Architect's Renewal Committee of Harlem, and the Real Great Society Urban Planning Studio.

The Real Great Society was born

The Real Great Society (ROG) was founded in the Lower East Side of Manhattan in 1964 by former gang leaders who teamed up to "fight poverty and racism." The Harlem branch (ROG/Manhattan) was organized in 1967, also by former gang leaders who along with young professionals wanted to be "at the center of the struggle for total environmental control."

In 1968 the School of Architecture at Columbia brought together a group of students, a studio professor and ROG/Uptown. Under the leadership of Willie Vázquez, the studio engaged in a year-long study of projects in East Harlem. But, the results of the Columbia Studio were mixed. Envisioned as a joint effort, an "experiment" to bring together the technical knowledge of architecture and planning students at Columbia, and the know-how and community knowledge of ROG, it was nevertheless a difficult and uneasy partnership.

At this time, Harry Quintana came onto the scene. He felt that the "Columbia kids would not stay long enough for any of the projects to come through, thus leaving the community hanging." His view that only those with a vested interest see APONTE-PARÉS page 21

MULTICULTURAL PLANNING

Lessons from Papakolea

by Karen Umemoto

There is a lot of talk about multiculturalism in planning. Planning programs and agencies often stress the need for planning staff to be able to work in "diverse communities." Sometimes this simply means placing planners of certain ethnic backgrounds in communities whose residents share the same ethnic heritage. While this may be effective in some cases, it doesn't address the good working relations between communities and planners. Nor do all planning agencies have the number of planners to "cover" all the ethnic groups that may live in a city.

It is more useful to discuss what it means to effectively work in diverse communities, since planners frequently work in communities whose ethnic backgrounds are different from their own. Here I'd like to highlight two challenges in working across cultural paradigms. I refer to these challenges as "epistemological," that is, challenges that involve different ways of knowing. Leonie Sandercock eloquently discusses this problem in her book, Towards Cosmopolis, and advocates for multicultural (literacy). But what does such literacy entail? There are two challenges: 1) addressing culture, history and collective memory and 2) understanding the multiple meanings of language. I draw examples from a community-led planning process in the Hawaiian Homeland community of Papakolea where students and

actions and events are interpreted and how meaning is made. One's mental map and historical lens is shaped by unique personal experiences as well as factors associated with group membership such as age, ethnicity, race, gender, length of residence, membership in social networks and roles played in a neighborhood.

Planners are confronted with the challenge of interacting and facilitating interaction among individuals who may see the world from distinctly cultural paradigms — worldviews embedded in the history of a community and in their individual and collective memories.

In multicultural cities, planners often work in communities where the ethnic or racial background of residents is different from their own. The stronger the racial or ethnic identification within a geographic community, the more likely that the racial or ethnic background of a planner may be a factor in initial interactions. This may influence how a planner is viewed and how people make judgments about a planner's motives or intentions.

Actions and gestures are also interpreted from a lens colored by history. For communities that have faced oppressive or discriminatory treatment, the memory of past experiences with outside institutions is often saddled with ambivalence towards those whom they identify with the dominating group. In the U.S., this tension is most often found, at least initially, when white planners enter non-white communities. With contemporary urban conflicts, these tensions also exist between racial or ethnic minorities as well.

Part of the living history in Papakolea was the memory of university staff examining Native Hawaiian objects of research projects that were never seen by residents to produce anything of benefit to them. They felt they were "studied to death."

"Collaborations" were often weighed in favor of outside "partners." Social researchers often focused on the "problems" in the community with little attention to its beauty and richness. Many residents felt labeled as a "problem population," leading to further marginalization.

When students and faculty from the university initially entered the community in fall 1997 to embark on a visioning project — where people envision and plan for the future of their community — we encountered the memory of this past and the feelings of resentment towards those affiliated with the university.
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It was important for us, especially before diving into the project, to learn about the history of Papakoea and its living memories and to hear the stories of the residents. It helped us identify issues that needed to be clarified, like the purpose and process of visioning and the nature of the partnership between the university and community. It was important to assure residents that the planning process was community-led and ownership of the project rested in the community association. And it was important for residents to receive the product of the visioning project, which took the form of a booklet containing a summary of the process and results of the visioning activities. Not only was it important to understand the past as conveyed from the standpoint of residents, but it was also important that those with whom we worked understood that the university team valued that history and their world-view. While it would be naive to think that one could know the world from someone else’s shoes, it is not unrealistic to create the foundation for social learning that emphasizes multiple epistemologies (ways of knowing) in planning.

Understanding the Multiple Meanings of Language

Language carries with it the power to discourage or encourage, to repress or release, legitimize or degrade. How planners phrase what they say, how they choose their words, how they convey their message can affect the extent to which people participate in or withdraw from a planning process. Epistemology, as a lens for interpretation, mediates how messages are relayed and how they are received. Not only do problems of interpretation arise in translating between different languages, but meaning can also be distorted or misread among speakers of the same language.

Words in the English language can acquire meaning unique to a particular group. The use of some words in the planning process can occasionally trigger an unintended reaction based on differences in the meaning that they evoke. In the case of ethnic communities where both history and culture may lend unique meaning to words, planners are confront-ed with the task of clarifying the meaning of words or symbols to insure that participants and potential participants in the planning process share the same understanding.

In the visioning process in the community of Papakoea, the problem of multiple meanings was one of the first challenges we encountered. Among many of the elders, the term “visioning” had an almost sacred meaning. We learned after some confusion that “visioning” is a term that many of the kupuna, or elder generation, use to refer to a highly personal and private practice. It usually takes place while in a dream state and is also a form of communication with deceased ancestors or jinamakau. The term kihikihi refers to a dream or vision and ho'okule refers to seeing, knowing and understanding. It is sometimes practiced in search of an answer to a question or dilemma. It is done under special circumstances and for situations of import that warrant such sacred practices. When it was announced that university students would facilitate a “visioning project” in Papakoea, a number of the kupuna called the president of the Papakoea Community Association to voice their objection. What business would university students have conducting visioning in Papakoea? It was only after the different meanings of “visioning” were clarified that the kupuna gave their consent and university partners were educated about this use of the term.

What should have been considered ( hindsight is always much more clear) was to change the name of the project to something other than “visioning” so as to avoid the unnecessary altering of the traditional meaning of the word. In other cases, there might be reasons to continue to use a word in order to clarify its meaning. “Collaboration” may be one such word. Collaboration can be interpreted in several ways. It can have a very positive connotation of working together in mutual support on equal terms towards common goals. But it can also connote working in partnership with an enemy force to sabotage another. Given the pervasive use of collaboration in the world of community building and non-profit organizations, it may create more sense to use the word and clarify its meaning in the particular situation so that people develop a shared understanding over time.

While it is impossible to know where language discrepancies may lie, knowing that discrepancies exist help us navigate the minefields of discourse. It is possible to develop a sensitivity about epistemological multiplicity. A sensitivity alerts us to potential language or interpretive dissonance. It helps us know what to listen for. It helps us pay attention to inaccuracy and commutation that can be found in narrative, in tone or in silence. And it helps us to understand the potential sources and nature of conflicts that result from epistemological differences.

Karen Umemoto is Assistant Professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Working for a Decent Living: Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Community

Planning for a Decent Living: Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Community, is a three and a half day conference that will explore the connections and interactions between community and work in the domestic and global context. It is a critical time for work and workers in the United States. Most workers are putting in longer hours, at lower wages, in less stable jobs. Inequalities by race and education are widening, and gender inequality persists as well. New work requirements and time limits push welfare recipients into dead-end jobs. Anti-immigrant policies intensify the second-class status of undocumented workers, and of all immigrants. At the same time, the U.S. labor movement is newly revitalized, and community-based campaigns such as those for living wage ordinances have scored many successes.

Recognizing that community and labor initiatives/organizing can be more effective if they collaborate, the conference seeks to identify barriers to collaboration, highlight successful models, and explore strategies for the future. We will look beyond the U.S. to understand globalization and learn from successful models from abroad. Plenaries, workshops, meetings with local community and labor organizations are designed to engage participants actively in moving forward a progressive agenda.

Marie Kennedy
College of Public and Community Service, University of Massachusetts-Boston; PN Steering Committee (617) 287-3202 <marie.kennedy@umb.edu>

Chris Tilly
Department of Regional Economic and Social Development, University of Massachusetts-Lowell (617) 983-3202 <chris_tilly@uml.edu>

Sponsors: Massachusetts AFL-CIO • Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Urban Studies and Planning • Peabody Fund • Tufts University, Department of Urban and Environmental Planning • University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning • University of Massachusetts at Boston, College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Regional Economic and Social Development

Endorsers: Chinese Progressive Association/Workers’ Center (Boston) • City Limits Magazine • Coalition for a Better Acre (Lowell) • Dollars and Sense Magazine • Greater Roxbury Workers’ Association (Boston) • Harvard University Trade Union Program • Hispanic Office of Planning and Evaluation (Boston) • Immigrant Workers Resource Center • Institute for Asian American Studies • Massachusetts ACORN • Massachusetts Jobs with Justice • Mauricio Gast—Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy • Merrimack Valley Project • Merrimack Valley Urban Resource Institute • Shelterforce Magazine • United for a Fair Economy • University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Labor Relations and Research Center • University of Massachusetts at Boston, Labor Resource Center • University of Massachusetts at Lowell, Labor Extension Program • William Monroe Trotter Institute • Women’s Institute for Housing and Economic Development

Full details on the 1999 Conference are on the web at: www.plannersnetwork.org/pn99.htm>
 UMEMOTO (continued from page 15)

It was important for us, especially before diving into the project, to learn about the history of Papakolea and its living memories and to hear the stories of the residents. It helped us identify issues that needed to be clarified, like the purpose and process of visioning and the nature of the partnership between the university and the community. It was important to assure residents that the planning process was community led and ownership of the project rested in the community association. And it was important for residents to receive the product of the visioning project, which took the form of a booklet containing a summary of the process and results of the visioning activities. Not only was it important to understand the past as conveyed from the standpoint of residents, but it was also important that those with whom we worked understood that the university team valued that history and their worldview. While it would be naïve to think that one could know the world from someone else’s shoes, it is not unrealistic to create the foundation for social learning that emphasizes multiple epistemologies (ways of knowing) in planning.

Understanding the Multiple Meanings of Language

Language carries with it the power to disseminate or encourage, to repress or release, legitimate or degrade. How planners phrase what they say, how they choose their words, how they convey their message can affect the extent to which people participate in or withdraw from a planning process. Epistemology, as a lens for interpretation, mediates how messages are relayed and how they are received. Not only do problems of interpretation arise in translating between different languages, but meaning can also be distorted or misread among speakers of the same language.

Words in the English language can acquire meaning unique to a particular group. The use of some words in the planning process can occasionally trigger an unintended reaction based on differences in the meaning they evoke. In the case of ethnic communities where both history and culture may lend unique meaning to words, planners are confronted with the task of clarifying the meaning of words or symbols to ensure that participants and potential participants in the planning process share the same understanding.

In the visioning process in the community of Papakolea, the problem of multiple meanings was one of the first challenges we encountered. Among many of the elders, the term “visioning” had an almost sacred meaning. We learned after some confusion that “visioning” is a term that many of the kupuna, or elder generation, use to refer to a highly personal and private practice. It usually takes place while in a dream state and is also a form of communication with deceased ancestors or iʻaumaika. The term hikilo refers to a dream or vision and hoʻolei refers to seeing, knowing and understanding. It is sometimes practiced in search of an answer to a question or dilemma. It is done under special circumstances and for situations of import that warrant such sacred practices. When it was announced that university students would facilitate a “visioning project” in Papakolea, a number of the kupuna called the president of the Papakolea Community Association to voice their objection. What business would university students have conducting visioning in Papakolea? It was only after the different meanings of “visioning” were clarified that the kupuna gave their consent and university partners were educated about this use of the term.

What should have been considered (hindsight is always much more clear) was to change the name of the project to something other than “visioning” so as to avoid the unnecessary altering of the traditional meaning of the word. In other cases, there might be reasons to continue to use a word in order to clarify its meaning. “Collaboration” may be one such word. Collaboration can be interpreted in several ways. It can have a very positive connotation of working together in mutual support on equal terms towards common goals. But it can also connote working in partnership with an enemy force to sabotage another. Given the pervasive use of collaboration in the world of community building and non-profit organizations, it may make more sense to use the word and clarify its meaning in the particular situation so that people develop a shared understanding over time.

While it is impossible to know where language discrepancies may lie, knowing that discrepancies exist help us navigate the minefields of discourse. It is possible to develop a sensitivity about epistemological multiplicity. A sensitivity alerts us to potential language or interpretive dissonance. It helps us know what to listen for. It helps us pay attention to innumerable and connotative that can be found in narrative, in tone or in silence. And it helps us to understand the potential sources and nature of conflicts that result from epistemological differences. PN

Karen Emeroto is Assistant Professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Hawaii at Manoa.
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Working for a Decent Living: Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Community, is a three and a half day conference that will explore the connections and intersections between community and work in the domestic and global context. It is a critical time for work and workers in the United States. Most workers are putting in longer hours, at lower wages, in less stable jobs. Inequalities by race and education are widening, and gender inequality persists as well. New, harsh work requirements and time limits push welfare recipients into dead-end jobs. Anti-immigrant policies intensify the second-class status of undocumented workers, and of all immigrants. At the same time, the U.S. labor movement is newly revitalized, and community-based campaigns such as those for living wage ordinances have scored many successes.

Recognizing that community and labor initiatives/organizing can be more effective if they collaborate, the conference seeks to identify barriers to collaboration, highlight successful models, and explore strategies for the future. We will look beyond the U.S. to understand globalization and learn from successful models from abroad. Plenaries, workshops, meetings with local community and labor organizations are designed to engage participants actively in moving forward a progressive agenda.
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Department of Regional Economic and Social Development, University of Massachusetts-Lowell (617) 993-2302 <chris.tilly@uml.edu>

SPONSORS: Massachusetts AFL-CIO • Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Urban Studies and Planning • Pequot Fund • Tufts University, Department of Urban and Environmental Planning • University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning • University of Massachusetts at Boston, College of Public and Community Service • University of Massachusetts at Lowell, College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Regional Economic and Social Development

ENDORSERS: Chinese Progressive Association/Workers’ Center (Boston) • City Limits Magazine • Coalition for a Better Acre (Lowell) • Dollars and Sense Magazine • Greater Roxbury Workers’ Association (Boston) • Harvard University Trade Union Program • Hispanic Office of Planning and Evaluation (Boston) • Immigrant Workers Resource Center • Institute for Asian American Studies • Massachusetts ACORN • Massachusetts Jobs with Justice • Mauricio Gast—Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy • Merrimack Valley Project • Merrimack Valley Urban Resource Institute • Shelterforce Magazine • United for a Fair Economy • University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Labor Relations and Research Center • University of Massachusetts at Boston, Labor Resource Center • University of Massachusetts at Lowell, Labor Extension Program • William Monroe Trotter Institute • Women’s Institute for Housing and Economic Development

Full details on the 1999 Conference are on the web at: <www.plannersnetwork.org/pn99.htm>
THURSDAY, JUNE 17

AFTERNOON
2:00-6:00 pm
Registration

3:00 pm
Community tours: Boston (by United for a Fair Economy), Lowell (by Coalition for a Better Acre), Lawrence (by Merrimack Valley Project)

EVENING

6:00 pm
Light dinner

7:00 pm
Varied activities, possibly orientation for facilitators, poetry or prose readings, community theater workshop

FRIDAY, JUNE 18

MORNING

8:00 am
Continental breakfast

9:00-10:00 am
Welcome and orientation to the conference

10:15-11:45 am
Workshop session 1: Successful strategies • Education and job training • Affordable housing as issue for workers and unions • Job creation in environmental industries • Living/salable wage • Occupational safety/health and community environmental protection • Part-time and contingent work • Planners in unions • Plant closing/retention (especially community services such as hospitals) • Unions as investors/lenders • Unions developing housing

11:45 am - 1:15 pm
Lunch

1:15-2:45 pm
United for a Fair Economy workshops

3:00-4:30 pm
Workshop session 2: Building new connections • Anti-racist organizing • Bringing people of color and women into the building trades and union leadership • Community groups organizing unions • Community support for union organizing • Confronting globalization • How unions learn from community organizing, and vice versa • Immigrant rights in workplace and community • Linking job demands to development • Reindustrialization • Supports and services needed for work (child care, transportation, etc.) • Sweatshops at home and abroad • Transportation planning as link between community and workplace • "Union cities" • Unions and worker ownership • Welfare and workplace organizing • Anti-racist organizing

5:00 pm
Tribute to Bennett Harrison

5:45 pm
Dinner

EVENING

6:45-8:45 pm
Plenary 1: Challenges and prospects for labor-community alliances

• Bill Fletcher — Education director, US AFL-CIO

• Gilda Haas — Director, Strategic Action for a Just Economy and Director, Community Scholars Program, UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Welfare

(Brief keynote speeches followed by open discussion)

SATURDAY, JUNE 19

MORNING

7:30 am
Continental breakfast

9:00-11:00 am
Plenary 2: Working through conflicts and challenges Case Study: Community Access to Building Trades Unions

11:15 am - 12:45 pm
Workshop Session 3: Working through conflicts and challenges • Jobs vs. the environment • Construction jobs vs. sustainable, community-controlled development • Overcoming anti-immigrant sentiments • Race and gender as barriers to union access • Welfare-to-work funding • Unionization of community-based agencies • Working with businesses while defending worker rights

12:45-2:00 pm
Lunch, including Tribute to Planners for Equal Opportunity (on their 35th anniversary)

AFTERNOON

6:00-7:00 pm
Dinner

EVENING

7:00-8:00 pm
Plenary 5: Lessons from Brazil’s labor-community alliance (with a speaker from Brazil)

8:00 until ?
Dance party

SUNDAY, JUNE 20

MORNING

7:30 am
Continental breakfast

9:00-11:00 am
Workshop session 5: Open sessions on barriers and strategies

11:15 am - 1:00 pm
Planners Network Business Meeting, with box lunch

AFTERNOON

Lowell National Historical Park canal boat tours; historical tour of Nashua, New Hampshire
THURSDAY, JUNE 17

AFTERNOON

2:00-6:00 pm
Registration

3:00 pm
Community tours: Boston (by United for a Fair Economy), Lowell (by Coalition for a Better Acre), Lawrence (by Merrimack Valley Project)

EVENING

6:00 pm
Light dinner

7:00 pm
Varied activities, possibly orientation for facilitators, poetry or prose readings, community theater workshop

FRIDAY, JUNE 18

MORNING

8:00 am
Continental breakfast

9:00-10:00 am
Welcome and orientation to the conference

10:15-11:45 am
Workshop session 1: Successful strategies • Education and job training • Affordable housing as issue for workers and unions • Job creation in environmental industries • Living/salable wage • Occupational safety/health and community environmental protection • Part-time and contingent work • Planners in unions • Plant closures/retention (especially community services such as hospitals) • Unions as investors/leners • Unions developing housing

11:45 am - 1:15 pm
Lunch

AFTERNOON

1:15-2:45 pm
United for a Fair Economy workshops

3:00-4:30 pm
Workshop session 2: Building new connections • Anti-racist organizing • Bringing people of color and women into the building trades and union leadership • Community groups organizing unions • Community support for union organizing • Confronting globalization • How unions learn from community organizing, and vice versa • Immigrant rights in workplace and community • Linking job demands to development • Reindustrialization • Supports and services needed for work (child care, transportation, etc.) • Sweatshops at home and abroad • Transportation planning as link between community and workplace • "Union cities" • Unions and worker ownership • Welfare and workplace organizing • Anti-racist organizing

5:00 pm
Tribute to Bennett Harrison

5:45 pm
Dinner

EVENING

6:45-8:45 pm
Plenary 1: Challenges and prospects for labor-community alliances

• Bill Fletcher — Education director, US AFL-CIO

• Gilda Haas — Director, Strategic Action for a Just Economy and Director, Community Scholars Program, UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Welfare

(Brief keynote speeches followed by open discussion)

9:00 pm
Agiarte — community-based youth hip-hop from Lynn, Massachusetts with a political message and audience participation

SATURDAY, JUNE 19

MORNING

7:30 am
Continental breakfast

9:00-11:00 am
Plenary 2: Working through conflicts and challenges

Case Study: Community Access to Building Trades Unions

11:15 am - 12:45 pm
Workshop Session 3: Working through conflicts and challenges • Jobs vs. the environment • Construction jobs vs. sustainable, community-controlled development • Overcoming anti-immigrant sentiments • Race and gender as barriers to union access • Welfare-to-work funding • Unionization of community-based agencies • Working with businesses while defending worker rights

12:45-2:00 pm
Lunch, including Tribute to Planners for Equal Opportunity (on their 35th anniversary)

AFTERNOON

2:15-3:45 pm
Workshop Session 4: Strategies for the future • Building class consciousness and working class culture • Coalitions: labor-community, labor-interfaith, labor-environmental • Community income statements, community currencies • Confronting racism and sexism in workplaces and communities • Electoral strategies, including third parties • Full employment • International solidarity • Regional strategies from the bottom up • Roles for planners in labor/community coalitions • Setting comprehensive standards for development • Unions refusing to do work that is destructive to communities

4:00-6:00 pm
Plenary 4: Strategies for the future

• Kathy Casavant, Secretary-Treasurer of Mass. AFL-CIO

• Lydia Lowe, Chinese Progressive Association, Boston

• Teresa Cordova, Planners Network Steering Committee and Associate Professor of Community and Regional Planning, University of New Mexico

6:00-7:00 pm
Dinner

7:00-8:00 pm
Plenary 5: Lessons from Brazil's labor-community alliance (with a speaker from Brazil)

8:00 until ?
Dance party

SUNDAY, JUNE 20

MORNING

7:30 am
Continental breakfast

9:00-11:00 am
Workshop session 5: Open sessions on barriers and strategies

11:15 am - 1:00 pm
Planners Network Business Meeting, with box lunch

AFTERNOON

Lowell National Historical Park canal boat tours; historical tour of Nashua, New Hampshire
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Conference Registration

PN 1999 — Working for a Decent Living: Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Community
June 17-20, 1999 • University of Massachusetts at Lowell

NAME ________________________________
AFFILIATION ____________________________
ADDRESS ________________________________
_______________________________________
_______________________________________
CITY ____________________ ZIP __________
STATE ___________ COUNTRY ____________
DAYTIME PHONE ( ___ ) FAX ( ___ )
EMAIL ________________________________

Registration fees (meals included)

( ) High income $100 per person before April 15
( ) $110 per person after April 15
( ) Middle income $80 per person before April 15
( ) $90 per person after April 15
( ) Low income $40 per person before April 15
( ) $50 per person after April 15
( ) 1 day registration $40 per day

TOTAL REGISTRATION FEE: $______

Housing Fees and Reservations

SINGLE ROOMS ($33.00 per person, per night)

| person(s) for | nights | Arrival date: | | Departure date: |
|--------------|--------|--------------|-----------------|

DOUBLE ROOMS ($23 per person, per night, bunked beds)

| person(s) for | nights | Arrival date: | | Departure date: |
|--------------|--------|--------------|-----------------|

LINENS ($10 per set, duration of stay includes sheets, towels, blankets)

| linen sets: | @ $10 each | |
|-------------|-------------|

MICRO-FRIDGE ($10 for duration of stay)
Yes, I want a Micro-Fridge for $10:

TOTAL HOUSING FEES: $______

Planners Network membership (special conference rate $15)

TOTAL PAYMENT ENCLODED: $______

APONTE-PARES < continued from page 14

should be in charge of development drove
Harry Quintana and the staff of
RGS/Upton to establish the RGS Urban Planning Studio, replacing the Colombia
studio. The new studio’s
founders believed that as long
as the technical resources neces-

sary for physical develop-
ment were controlled by
forces outside the community,
the development itself would
not be completely for the community.

A New Approach to Advocacy

Two visions guided the founding of
the RGS studio: a critical view of
the architecture and planning professions, and
the goal of community self-determination
through ethnic-centered development. The
advocacy this studio espoused differed
from both Davidoff’s and Piven’s.
Quintana and others in the RGS studio
saw how Colombia’s advocacy planning
studio had failed. Their principal argu-
ment, while echoing Piven’s, was
that even "los Managua liberadores" would
ever cross the line and attempt to disrupt
the system, particularly since the RGS
studio saw itself as part of "oppositional
movements." Between 1968 and 1970 the
RGS studio instigated protests by joining
others in the community in civil disorder;
by burning trash on the streets and
blocking traffic on the 125th street entrance
to the Traverbridge Bridge.

Furthermore, many in the RGS studio
argued that the "problem" dwelt with
"white professionals" and that self-deter-
mation through ethnic-centered develop-
ment was good. Although the two views
were not necessarily incompatible, the
RGS studio partially based its rhetoric on

the long tradition of Puerto Rican radical
politics in the U.S.

Puerto Rican youth whose political aware-
ness was being shaped by the cultural
forces that had shaped the nation during
the sixties. With calls for "community
empowerment," "advocacy planning,"
"citizen participation," "black/Boricua
Pride," etc., the RGS studio espoused the
language of those who called for a com-
munity’s right to development by those
who "looked like them." The RGS studio
emerged in a transition period in the
development of Puerto Rican institutions.
It combined several of the characteristics
of groups organized during those years: it
was founded by grassroots community
youth; it was a professionally staffed
organization; it was structured around an
advocacy model; and it valued in ethnic-
specific Puerto Rican-ness.

A Lesson in Turf Politics

When the RGS studio emerged, eth-
nic-and-turf-centered community develop-
ment was deemed by many progressives
as an appropriate means to "empower" the
dis-empowered. The people in power also
supported community development through
territorial or "turf" control by one or
another group, assuming that those
groups would compete against each other
and undermine the other’s legitimate
demands. The history of disputes between
Puerto Ricans and African Americans in
Northern Manhattan, or Jews and Puerto
Ricans in the Lower East Side or in
Brooklyn, shows how turf-centered and
ethnic-centered development schemes
divided these communities.

And yet, the legitimate calls from each community to "control" their develop-
ment should not have necessarily meant
that alliances across groups could not be
made. In today’s more com-
plex multi-racial and multi-
ethnic neighborhoods — the
"Borderlands" where new
immigrants replace and dis-
place "traditional" minorities
— new challenges have
ever emerged. For example, Harlem, the
traditional "Homeland" for African Americans
in New York City, is increasingly being
"Latinized." People from the Dominican
Republic, Mexicans, and other Latinos are
moving in. Some African Americans
resent the loss of institutions and images
that had helped define Harlem for close to
a century. Others support the legitimacy
of new immigrants in reviving the nearly
defunct shopping districts of these neigh-
borhoods, and thus projecting new images
that "look like them."

Outstanding Questions

Many questions remain. How does a
planner deal with these conflicting
demands? In a city like New York where
people of color have become the majority,
what role, if any, should ethnicity and
race play in planning and community
development? What role do whites,
the new minority, play? What if the planning
and community development professions
do not change and whites retain control
of the major institutions? PN

This article is excerpted from "Lessons from
El Barrio — The East Harlem Real Great
Society Urban Planning Studio: A Puerto
Rican Chapter in the Fight for Self
Determination," New Political Science Volume

Luis Aponte-Pares teaches at the School of
Community Affairs, University of
Massachusetts in Boston.
Conference Registration

PN 1999 — Working for a Decent Living: Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Community
June 17-20, 1999 • University of Massachusetts at Lowell

NAME ____________________________

AFFILIATION ________________________________

ADDRESS _______________________________________

CITY ______________________ STATE ______ ZIP __________

COUNTRY __________________________

DAYTIME PHONE (__) _______________________

FAX (__) __________________________

EMAIL ______________________________________

Registration fees (meals included)

( ) High income
     ($850,000)
     $100 per person before April 15
     $110 per person after April 15

( ) Middle income
     $50 per person before April 15
     $60 per person after April 15

( ) Low income
     $40 per person before April 15
     $50 per person after April 15

( ) 1 day registration $40 per day

TOTAL REGISTRATION FEE: $________

Housing Fees and Reservations

SINGLE ROOMS ($33.00 per person, per night)
     person(s) for ______ nights = $________
     Arrival date: / / 
     Departure date: / / 

DOUBLE ROOMS ($23 per person, per night, bunked beds)
     person(s) for ______ nights = $________
     Arrival date: / / 
     Departure date: / / 

LINENS ($10 per set, duration of stay includes sheets, towels, blankets)
     Linen sets: ______ @ $10 each = $________

MICRO-FRIDGE ($10 for duration of stay)
     Yes, I want a Micro-Fridge for $10: $________

TOTAL HOUSING FEES: $________

Planners Network membership
(special conference rate $15)
     $________

TOTAL PAYMENT ENCLOSED: $________

APONTE-PÁRES — continued from page 14

should be in charge of development drove
Harvey Quintana and the staff of
RGS/Upman to establish the RGS Urban Planning Studio, replacing the Columbia
studio. The new studio’s
founders believed that as long as
the technical resources neces-
sary for physical develop-
ment were controlled by
forces outside the community,
the development itself would
not be completely for the community.

A New Approach to Advocacy

Two visions guided the founding of
the RGS studio: a critical view of
the architecture and planning professions, and
the goal of community self-determination
through ethnic-centered development. The
advocacy this studio espoused differed from
both Davidoff’s and Piven’s. Quintana and others in the RGS studio
saw how Columbia’s advocacy planning
campaign had failed. Their principal argu-
ment, while echoing Piven’s, was that
even “los Managua liberales” would never
cross the line and attempt to disrupt
the system, particularly since the
RGS studio saw itself as part of “oppositional
movements.” Between 1968 and 1970 the
RGS studio instigated protests by joining
others in the community in civil disobedi-
ence; by burning trash on the streets and
blocking traffic on the 125th street
entrance to the Triborough Bridge. Furthermore, people in the RGS studio
argued that the “problem” dwelt with
“white professionals” and that self-deter-
mination through ethnic-centered develop-
ment was good. Although the two views
were not necessarily incompatible, the
RGS studio partially in its rhetoric on
the long tradition of Puerto Rican radical
politics in the U.S. Quintana and others in
the RGS studio recognized that only
through a massive grass roots response by
the community residents to the nefarious
policies being implemented through urban
renewal, would the power brokers, both in
the neighborhood as well as the “white
establishment,” make adjustments and
stop the displacement.

RGS and its studio were organized by

The Real Great Society Urban Planning Studio
partially based its rhetoric on the long tradition of
Puerto Rican radical politics in the U.S.

Puerto Rican youth whose political aware-
ness was being shaped by the cultural
forces that had shaken the nation during
the sixties. With calls for “community
empowerment,” “advocacy planning,”
“citizen participation,” “black/Boricua
Pride,” etc., the RGS studio espoused
the language of those who called for a
community’s right to development by those
who “looked like them.” The RGS studio
emerged in a transition period in the
development of Puerto Rican institutions.
It combined several of the characteristics
of groups organized during those years: it
was founded by grassroots community
youth; it was a professionally staffed
organization; it was structured around an
advocacy model; and it valued in ethnic-
specific Puerto Rican-ness.

A Lesson in Turf Politics

When the RGS studio emerged, eth-
ic-and-turf-centered community develop-
ment was deemed by many progressives
as an appropriate means to “empower” the
disempowered. The people in power also
supported community development through
territorial or “turf” control by one
or another group, assuming that those
groups would compete against each other
and undermine the other’s legitimate
demands. The history of disputes between
Puerto Ricans and African Americans in
Northern Manhattan, or Jews and Puerto
Ricans in the Lower East Side or in
Brooklyn, shows how turf-centered and
ethnic-centered development schemes
divided these communities.

And yet, the legitimate calls from each
community to “control” their develop-
ment should not have necessarily meant
that alliances across groups could not be
made. In today’s more com-
plex multi-racial and multi-
ethnic neighborhoods — the
“borderlands” where new
immigrants replace and dis-
place “traditional” minorities —
new challenges have
ever emerged. For example, Harlem, the tradi-
tional “Homeland” for African Americans
in New York City, is increasingly being
“Latinized.” People from the Dominican
Republic, Mexicans, and other Latinos are
moving in. Some African Americans
resent the loss of institutions and images
that had helped define Harlem for close
to a century. Others support the legitimacy
of new immigrants in reviving the nearly
defunct shoptopping districts of these neigh-
borhoods, and thus projecting new images
that “look like them.”

Outstanding Questions

Many questions remain. How does a
planner deal with these conflicting
demands? In a city like New York where
people of color have become the majority,
what role, if any, should ethnicity and
race play in planning and community
development? What role do “whites,” the
new minority, play? What if the planning
and community development professions
do not change and whites retain control
of the major institutions? PN

This article is excerpted from “Lessons from
El Barrio — The East Harlem Real Great
Society Urban Planning Studio: A Puerto
Rican Chapter in the Fight for Self
Determination,” New Political Science Vol-

Luís Aponte-Páres teaches at the School of
Community Affairs, University of
Massachusetts in Boston.

EVENTS
April 15-17, 1999. National Community Land Trust Conference in St. Paul, Minnesota. Workshops, panel discussions, speakers, presentations, tours, and conversations with land officers and technical assistance providers. Contact: Julie Kuhl at (651) 746-8060.

April 24-26, 1999. American Planning Association Conference. [For more information, see cpa-aplanning.org or planning.org.]

May 2-5, 1999. President’s Council for Sustainable Development has announced its 1999 National Meeting for a Sustainable America to be held in Detroit, MI and events held at hotels across the country if you or your organization would like to become part of this event. [Contact APA (800) 428-5596]

May 13-16, 1999. The Hague Appeal for Peace, Peace Palace, the Netherlands. [For more information see pacemos.nl or contact E.U. at (31-70) 363-4621] and [For more information see pacemos.nl or contact E.U. at (31-70) 363-4621]

May 17-20, 1999. Planetary Network Conference at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell. [For more information see planetarynetwork.org or contact E.U. at (31-70) 363-4621]

June 6-9, 1999. Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP) Conference "The City and its Regions" will take place in Montreal, Canada. The focus will be on rapid urban growth, globalization of markets, private-public partnerships in municipal programming structures. Info: CIP 16 Albert St., Suite 801, Ottawa, Canada, K1N 9R4. [http://www.cip.ca or (613) 523-6200]


August 16-30, 1999. Women, Community & Development in Urban Planning Institute, Beijing, China. Focus on hands-on, interactive opportunity to explore some of the crucial issues facing women in India. Visit grassroots organizations, women's groups, activists, and villages in both rural and urban settings. Info: contact Susan at (303) 497-1994.


September 10-20, 1999. International Society of City and Regional Planning Symposium in thighs, Germany. [For more information see isc-ncra.org or (613) 730-79 79 cloverpotstreet@]

Websites
Looking for news, analysis, education and relevant online forms of content at www.greenpeace.org in the United States.
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Looking to fill an open position with someone you can count on? PN is your friend to the right person. Send your job announcement to the national office or email: jobs@pn.org. Please limit listings to 50 words!

ARIZONA
The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is looking for an Assistant Director, Responsible for developing the multi-modal transportation planning, philosophy and project of the ADOT. Significant planning coordination with Maricopa County,should be able to get the job done. Send resume to: ADOT, Human Resources, 206, 157th Ave., Mesa, AZ 85214. Questions contact Lisa Vittek at (602) 255-8889.

CALIFORNIA
California Coalition for Rural Housing seeks an Affordable Housing Advocate. Requires a Bachelors degree in community development, planning or a related field, 5 years experience, familiarity with government agencies, programs, issues and regulations related to agriculture, rural, agricultural, 2009. Send cover letter and resume to: ADOT, Human Resources, 206, 157th Ave., Mesa, AZ 85214. Questions contact Lisa Vittek at (602) 255-8889.

COLORADO

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
The Women's Foreign Policy Group, a national non-profit women's organization, seeks an Assistant to the Executive Director. This full-time position requires scheduling and travel management, arranging and participating in office functions, and Board, committee, and member relations. Candidate should have a B.A., relevant international experience, office experience, oral and written communication skills, computer and research skills are essential. Send resume, cover letter, and three references to Women's Foreign Policy Group, 887 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 708, Washington DC 20006. Fax: (202) 480-2429.

The HHHRE Research Department has openings for full-time Researchers. Researchers must have research experience and familiarity with basic financial concepts or analysis. Salary depends on experience starting salary $22,000 and includes benefits and package college and exchange. Send to: Research, HHHRE Research Department, 1215 26th St. NW, Washington, DC 20036-7389. Fax: (202) 333-5501.

ILLINOIS
Illinois Community Micro-Enterprise Fund seeks Executive Director. Duties include administrative responsibility, program development, evaluation, and development initiatives. Send cover letter and resume to: Illinois Community Micro-Enterprise Fund, 520 West Wabash Ave., Chicago, IL 60606. Fax: (312) 642-4682.

JOBS
Looking to fill an open position with someone you can count on? PN is your friend to the right person. Send your job announcement to the national office or email: jobs@pn.org. Please limit listings to 50 words!

ILLINOIS
Western Illinois University seeks a Field Community Development Program Coordinator in Rural Community Development to provide field support to farmers, including technical assistance, demonstration, and information dissemination. Send cover letter and resume to FCS Search Committee, 1802 N. 19th St., Peoria, IL 61601. Fax: (309) 674-7299.

IOWA
Community Housing Opportunities Corporation, a nonprofit affordable housing organization, is seeking a financial manager for a Project Manager II position. Duties include new construction and rehabilitation of single and multi-family housing, 2 years experience in development, new project identification, analysis, housing needs assessment, planning, overseeing construction. Send resume and cover letter to Clifford D. Whitfield, Community Housing Opportunities Corporation, 3220 College Ave., Des Moines, IA 50316. Fax: (515) 284-1344.

MASSACHUSETTS
The Institute for Community/Economic Development (ICED) is seeking a field manager. Responsibilities include preparing for a new development, facilitating community organizing, coordinating community-based organizations, and leadership and community development. Requires 5 years experience working with community-based organizations and relevant professional preparation in organization, planning, and community education. Send resume to: AIDS, CTD, 200 Main St., Northampton, MA 01060. Fax: (413) 584-2900.

The Affordable Housing Field Network is looking for a Project Manager for a national project developing a proposal for affordable housing and economic development projects. Requires excellent communication, management, writing and organizational skills. Some travel required. Send resume, writing sample and salary history to: Marilyn Kitchell, Director Development, Goodwill Industries of Boston, c/o AHN, PO Box 1746, Newton, MA 02158. (617) 993-3792.

NEW YORK
Asian Americans for Equality (AAFE) seeks a Community Development Director. Position involves aggressive leadership, seeking a Project Manager to increase community development opportunities. Requires 3 years of experience in real estate finance and development or a B.S. or B.A. in financing, urban planning, urban development, or related areas. Send resume, cover letter and references to: AAFE, 154 Broadway, New York, NY 10013. (646) 262-2600.

The New Housing Company seeks a Housing Development Manager. Responsibilities include managing and training staff to identify and develop new housing opportunities. AHC also seeks a Housing Manager (Community maintenance and repairs activities and with management company for both positions). Experience a plus but not required. Send resume and cover letter tit: Senior Housing Manager to: NTAR, 3rd Ave., 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10001. (212) 299-0319.

The Department of Urban Planning and Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is seeking to fill a ten-year faculty position, Assistant Professor of Environmental Policy. Responsibilities include developing and teaching graduate courses in environmental policy. For more information contact: Prof. Lawrence Susskind, School of Public Policy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave., Room 7-185, Cambridge, MA 02139. Fax: (617) 258-2030.

NEW YORK
Asian Americans for Equality (AAFE) seeks a Community Director for technical assistance program. Position involves aggressive leadership, seeking a Project Manager to increase community development opportunities. Requires 3 years of experience in real estate finance and development. Send resume, writing sample and salary history to: Marilyn Kitchell, Director Development, Goodwill Industries of Boston, c/o AHN, PO Box 1746, Newton, MA 02158. (607) 993-3792.

NEW YORK
Asian Americans for Equality (AAFE) seeks a Community Director for technical assistance program. Position involves aggressive leadership, seeking a Project Manager to increase community development opportunities. Requires 3 years of experience in real estate finance and development. Send resume, writing sample and salary history to: Marilyn Kitchell, Director Development, Goodwill Industries of Boston, c/o AHN, PO Box 1746, Newton, MA 02158. (607) 993-3792.

New Housing Company seeks a Housing Development Manager. Responsibilities include managing and training staff to identify and develop new housing opportunities. AHC also seeks a Housing Manager (Community maintenance and repairs activities and with management company for both positions). Experience a plus but not required. Send resume and cover letter tit: Senior Housing Manager to: NTAR, 3rd Ave., 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10001. (212) 299-0319.

The Department of Urban Planning and Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is seeking to fill a ten-year faculty position, Assistant Professor of Environmental Policy. Responsibilities include developing and teaching graduate courses in environmental policy. For more information contact: Prof. Lawrence Susskind, School of Public Policy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave., Room 7-185, Cambridge, MA 02139. Fax: (617) 258-2030.

The New Housing Company seeks a Housing Development Manager. Responsibilities include managing and training staff to identify and develop new housing opportunities. AHC also seeks a Housing Manager (Community maintenance and repairs activities and with management company for both positions). Experience a plus but not required. Send resume and cover letter tit: Senior Housing Manager to: NTAR, 3rd Ave., 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10001. (212) 299-0319.
Bennett Harrison 1942-1999

Bennett Harrison, planner, economist, and activist, died in January at the age of 56. He was best known for his twelve books on community development, labor, and corporate restructuring. Best known of all is The Deindustrialization of America (with Barry Bluestone), which provided a desperately needed analysis of plant closings and put the word “deindustrialization” in common parlance — an immensely irritating but important book,” grumbled the orthodox economist who reviewed it for The New York Times. Harrison and Bluestone were also among the first to warn of growing income inequality (in a series of articles and The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructuring and the Polarization of America (1988). Harrison’s work on corporate downsizing, outsourcing, and networking (Lean and Mean: The Changing Landscape of Corporate Power in the Age of Flexibility, 1994) and on the role of community-based organizations in employment and training (Workforce Development Networks: Community-Based Organizations and Regional Alliances, with Marcus Weiss, 1998) extended his lucid analysis to new areas. His research consciously bridged issues of race and class, labor and community.

When Ben read something that interested him, he would circle it with comments exuberantly scribbled with a ticked red marker — remarks like “Terrific!!!” “Fabulous!!!” “Or sometimes, “Why?!” For those of us privileged to know him, the scrabbles told as much about the man as his books. They conveyed Ben’s infectious enthusiasm, which he brought to every activity from playing the saxophone to conducting research. Fueled by his zeal for social justice, Ben spoke to audiences of labor and community activists as often as he appeared in academic seminars. He didn’t just write about policy and organizing, but joined in struggles to stop plant closings, improve wages for the lowest-paid, and develop inner-city communities.

Ben’s handwritten notes also expressed his vast generosity. When asked to comment on a work-in-progress, his response was invariably quick and copious. He shared his insights with generations of students at planning and policy programs at MIT, Carnegie Mellon University, and the New School for Social Research, always paying special attention to nontraditional students who came from a background of community or labor practice. Ben taught with a style that was energetic, entertaining, and effective.

Ben’s enthusiasm and generosity made him an incomparable network-builder. As radical geographer Susan Christopherson observed in an appreciation she circulated after his death, “One of Ben’s greatest contributions was building a community of people interested in studying and working to change American economic policy.” He gave us the impression that we were engaged together in a larger endeavor to make our economy more just.” That enduring legacy may be Bennett Harrison’s most important legacy.

—Chris Tilly

Future Issues of Planners Network


Arturo Sanchez will guest edit a future issue on Technology, and Richard Pliskin will guest edit a future issue on The Growth Machine.

Please submit articles, notes, updates, and resources typed and double-spaced. Feature articles of 500 to 1,500 words are always welcome. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. All electronic submissions should be sent as ASCII text. Send your submissions, resources, or job listings to the editors at <pnn@pratt.edu> or the address given at left. All updates should be directed to Steve Johnson, <johnso@pratt.edu>.

For more than twenty years, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning and social justice. PNN’s 1,000 members receive this bimonthly magazine, network online with PNN-NE, and take part in the annual conference. PNN also promotes progressive ideas in the mainstream planning profession by organizing sessions at annual conferences of the American Planning Association and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

The PNN Conference has been held annually each spring since 1994. These gatherings combine formal workshops and exchanges involving local communities. PNN conferences engage in lively discussions that help inform political strategies at the local, national, and inter-national levels. The 1999 conference will be held June 17-20 in Lowell, MA. Recent conferences have been held in East St. Louis, IL, Brooklyn, NY, and Pomona, CA.

Whether you can or cannot attend this year, or on the internet, PNN is a part of a network that shares progressive ideas and experiences. Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others!

All members must make an annual financial contribution. The Steering Committee recommends the following amounts as minimums:

$15 for those with incomes under $25,000, students and unemployed
$25 for those earning between $25,000 and $50,000
$45 for those earning over $50,000
$50 for organizations and libraries
$100, sustaining members, if you earn over $50,000, won’t you consider helping at this level?

Your contribution to Planners Network is tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.
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Bennett Harrison
1942-1999

Bennett Harrison, planner, economist, and activist, died in January at the age of 56. He was best known for his twelve books on community development, labor, and corporate restructuring. Best known of all is The Deindustrialization of America (with Barry Bluestone, 1982), which provided a desperately needed analysis of plant closings and put the word "deindustrialization" in common parlance — "an immensely irritating but important book," grandated the orthodox economist who reviewed it for The New York Times. Harrison and Bluestone were also among the first to warn of growing income inequality (in a series of articles and The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructuring and the Polarizing of America (1988)). Harrison's work on corporate downsizing, outsourcing, and networking (Lean and Mean: The Changing Landscape of Corporate Power in the Age of Flexibility, 1994) and on the role of community-based organizations in employment and training (Workforce Development Networks: Community-Based Organisations and Regional Alliances, with Marcus Weiss, 1998) extended his lucid analysis to new areas. His research consciously bridged issues of race and class, labor and community. When Ben read something that interested him, he would cover it with comments exuberantly scrawled with a thick-tipped red marker — remarks like "Terrific!!!," "Fahulous!!!," or sometimes, "Why???" For those of us privileged to know him, the scribbles told as much about the man as his books. They conveyed Ben's infectious enthusiasm, which he brought to every activity from playing the saxophone to conducting research. Fuelled by his zeal for social justice, Ben spoke to audiences of labor and community activists as often as he did to academic seminars. He didn't just write about policy and organizing, but joined in struggles to stop plant closings, improve wages for the lowest-paid, and develop inner city communities.

Ben's handwritten notes also expressed his vast generosity. When asked to comment on a work-in-progress, his response was invariably quick and copious. He shared his insights with generations of students at planning and policy programs at MIT, Carnegie Mellon University, and the New School for Social Research, always paying special attention to nontraditional students who came from a background of community or labor practice. Ben taught with a style that was energetic, entertaining, and effective.

Ben's enthusiasm and generosity made him an incomparable network-builder. As radical geographer Susan Christopherson observed in an appreciation she circulated after his death, "One of Ben's greatest contributions was building a community of people interested in studying and working to change American economic policy.... He gave us the impression that we were engaged together in a larger endeavor to make our economy more just." That enduring legacy may be Bennett Harrison's most important legacy.

—Chris Tilly

FOR MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning and social justice. PN's 1,000 members receive this bi-monthly magazine, network online with PN NET, and take part in the annual conference. PN also gives progressive ideas a voice in the mainstream planning profession by organizing sessions at annual conferences of the American Planning Association and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

The PN Conference has been held annually each spring since 1994. These gatherings combine workshops with exchanges involving local communities, PN conferences engage in dialogues that help inform political strategies at the local, national, and inter-national levels. The 1999 conference will be held June 17-20 in Lowell, MA. Recent conferences have been held in East St. Louis, IL, Brooklyn, NY, and Pomona, CA. Whether face-to-face or using the Internet, PN members are part of a network that shares progressive ideas and experiences. Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others! All members must make an annual financial contribution. The steering committee recommends the following amounts as minimums:

$15 for those with incomes under $25,000, students and unemployed
$25 for those earning between $25,000 and $50,000
$45 for those earning over $50,000
$50 for organizations and libraries
$100 for sustaining members — if you earn over $50,000, won't you consider helping at this level?

Your contribution to Planners Network is tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.

THE PLANNERS NETWORK

The Planners Network is an association of professionals, activists, academics, and students involved in physical, social, economic, and environmental planning in urban and rural areas, who promote fundamental change in our political and economic systems.

We believe that planning should be a tool for allocating resources and developing the environment to eliminate the great inequalities of wealth and power in our society, rather than to maintain and justify the status quo. This includes opposition to racial, economic and environmental injustice, and discrimination by gender and sexual orientation. We believe that planning should be used to assure adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care, jobs, safe working conditions, and a healthful environment. We advocate public responsibility for meeting these needs, because the private market has proven incapable of doing so.

Mail This Form To: Planners Network 379 DeKalb Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11205

☐ Yes! I want to join progressive planners to work for fundamental change.

Enclosed is my check payable to Planners Network for $ ________

☐ I'm a renewing member - keep the faith!

Name ____________________________

Organization ____________________

Street __________________________

City ____________________ State __ Zip Code ______

Email ___________________________

Telephone ( ) Fax ( )

Notes: Your contribution is tax-deductible.

INTERNATIONAL MEMBERS: please send a check in U.S. funds as we are unable to accept payment by credit cards or in other currencies at this time.

Thanks!
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MOVING?

Please make sure to let PN know if your address changes.
It saves us money and helps ensure you don’t miss an issue!

TIME TO RENEW?

Your current membership expires as of the date on your mailing label. If that date is April 1999 or earlier, we need to hear from you before May 1st or you won’t receive PN anymore! See the inside back page for contribution suggestions, and page 7 for our new membership policy — contributions are now required. Thanks for your continued support!