The Ground Zero Architectural Competition: Designing without a Plan

By Peter Marcuse

Nine proposals by teams of internationally-renowned architects were unveiled by the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) in December, 2002. They made the front pages of every New York newspaper and have been subject to extensive comment ever since. Both praise for imaginative ideas and criticism for overblown gigantism have been heaped on the designs, but some major points are missing from the discussion.

Whatever the merits of the nine proposals, the basic problem is that the program they were given by the LMDC, developed without adequate public input, was the wrong program at the wrong time. The LMDC has set out a planning process that is hasty, undemocratic and evades the critical planning and policy questions.

How the Nine Proposals Happened

The LMDC is a subsidiary of the Empire State Development Corporation. It was created by New York Governor George Pataki to oversee development at the World Trade Center site, Ground Zero. It has been the chosen vehicle for significant federal and state funds to be spent below Houston Street, its jurisdictional northern boundary. It also has powers of eminent domain and can [Cont. on page 10]
The SEVENTH GENERATION

"In our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations."
From the Great Law of the Iroquois Confederacy

PN Magazine at One

By the Editors:
Tom Angotti, Eve Baron, Ann Forsyth, Kara Hefferman, Norma Rantisi

This time last year, we produced the first issue of Planners Network Magazine. Instead of unworkable champagne parties or baking a birthday cake, we'll like you to join us in taking a look at what we've done and where we want to go in the future. We think we're off to a good start, but we see a lot of room for improvement. Please read this and send us your comments and suggestions.

How It Happened

The creation of PN Magazine was a major step in a process that had been evolving for more than five years.

The bi-monthly PN Newsletter had been getting larger and was filled with more and more articles. It was getting harder to sustain six issues a year as essentially a craft operation by a small group of volunteers. In mid-2001, Tom Angotti proposed a shift from a bi-monthly to quarterly schedule and an expansion form 20 to 48 pages. Ann Forsyth agreed to act as co-editor. While Tom was on leave during the first part of 2002, and then agreed to stay on. Eve Baron, Kara Hefferman, and Norma Rantisi continued as editors, working on issue and article development, Resources, Updates and PN News. Francisco Martí helped redesign PN and our new printer, Photo Comp Press, gave us much better quality.

Going back a bit further, since 1975 the Newsletter was put together by Chester Hartman and, during the years he was in Washington, DC, Prentice Bowser. The bulk of each issue was short news items, comments by members, and other postings. It was a lot like a bulletin board. Bob Beinert created a short article in each issue.

In 1993 Peter Marcuse hosted a meeting in Rhode Island to talk about where PN was going. Chester had announced his intention of passing on the direction of PN and the newsletter. This led to the 1994 PN Conference in DC and the election of a new steering committee. Ann Forsyth and Ken Reardon, the new PN Co-Chairs, asked Tom Angotti if he would take over the newsletter. Tom had just started teaching at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, where PNer Ron Shiffman offered to give institutional support.

Jill Harnberg worked with Tom in the first year. Then Winton Piccific, a Pratt planning student with experience in community journalism, took responsibility for managing PN's membership list and compiling the newsletter. In 1995 to 1997, Winton was extremely dedicated and developed more analytical articles and debates. John McCrory, another Pratt student, took over but focused more on production, improving the look of the newsletter, while Tom did more of the editing. In 1998, Eve Baron joined the staff. John left Pratt in 1999, Tom took over production, and in 2000 the Editorial Board was formed.

How it Works

The editorial group works surprisingly well, given that we are a dispersed group of practitioners and academics, and we're all volunteers. We are in New York, Chicago, Minneapolis and Montreal—and three of the five of us moved to new jobs in new cities during the first year of the Magazine. Donovan Finn, a planning graduate student at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign, receives a modest sum for doing the layout. Printing and distribution is done in New York.

In the first year, there were glitches in the operation. When the PN Editorial office moved uptown to Hunter College along with Tom, PN's Membership office stayed at Pratt. This division happened just as the Magazine was taking shape, and some pro [cont. on page 17]

ERRATA:
In the Fall 2002 issue (No. 153), on page 2 Richard Stolz was incorrectly identified as John Stolz, and the photo is Beijing, not Shanghai.

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS
Planners Network asks articles that describe and analyze progressive physical, social, economic and environmental planning in urban and rural areas. Articles may be up to 2,000 words. They should be addressed to PN's broad audience of professionals, activists, students and academics and be straightforward and jargon-free. Following a journalistic style, the first paragraph should summarize the main ideas in the article. A few suggested readings may be mentioned in the text, but do not submit footnotes or a bibliography. The editors may make minor style changes, but they reserve the right to change major content. Changes will be checked with the author. No photographs or illustrations may be included. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. Send to the Editor at儒家学究@hunter.cuny.edu or Planners Network, c/o Hunter College Dept of Urban Planning, 695 Park Ave., New York, NY 10021. Fax: 212-772-5593. Deadlines are January 1, April 1, July 1 and October 1.

UPCOMING SPECIAL ISSUES (Articles welcome):
The Last Conservative Shift
Maxism, Socialism and Progressive Urban Planning
Planning, Food Production and Consumption
Imagine New York: Bringing Diverse Visions into View

By Penelope Duda and Eva Hanhardt

The tragic events of September 11, 2001 profoundly affected us all. Within days property owners, politicians, the press and some planning and architecture professionals began to propose how the city and region should quickly rebuild, some even calling for a "redevelopment czar." Yet, to many others it was clear that if the New York region was to successfully recover, the decision-making process would have to be democratic and inclusive and respond to the affected community’s needs, ideas and visions. The time had come for New York City and the region to make land use and resource decision-making processes and policies reflect the values that we as a society say we espouse—respect for human life and a commitment to participatory democracy, equity, quality of life and environmental quality for everyone.

In community-based planning, the affected community is usually defined as those living or working in a given area. But where is the "community" affected by the World Trade Center (WTC) tragedy? The events reverberated through all aspects of the region’s life. Nearly 3,000 people perished, but they were from many states and from over eighty different countries. Over 156,000 jobs were lost—both in Lower Manhattan and throughout the region. Residents were displaced from their homes. Small businesses were at risk of bankruptcy. Transportation systems were destroyed. Air quality and noise were and continue to be concerns. Affordable housing that was to be paid for through the lease of the World Trade Center must now find new sources of financing. Travel and tourism dropped off, causing declines in hotel and restaurant patronage and museum and performance attendance. City budget allocations and other financial support to meet pre-9/11 needs decreased. Now, strict security measures restrict access to buildings and places. Profiling restricts individual freedoms. People feels more anxious and less secure. Given the enormity of the physical, economic and emotional toll of 9/11, it was evident that, in this instance, the "community" included not only those living, working or owning property in Lower Manhattan, but also those who lost loved ones and jobs and everyone directly and indirectly affected by the tragedy.

The challenge was to develop a planning process that would enable it possible for the dispersed and diverse voices to be heard. With the help of Gianni Longo and the staff of ACP Visioning and Planning, who had done other large-scale public visioning projects, Imagine New York was designed.

Creating Imagine New York

Imagine NY was conceived by the Municipal Art Society (MAS) in collaboration with a broad-based group of partners that included victims’ family members, Lower Manhattan residents and representatives from over fifty community groups, government agencies, businesses, universities and religious institutions.

In a period of seven weeks, from March 14 to the end of April 2002, over 4,000 residents of the New York metropolitan region came together to share their thoughts and ideas about the memorializing of the World Trade Center tragedy, the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan and the future of communities throughout the region. Participants in Imagine NY became part of an historic experiment in participatory democracy. People of all walks of life met face-to-face, motivated by the desire to express their thoughts and by the opportunity to affect in profound and constructive ways the future of the region. Participants helped articulate diverse visions that, while addressing issues related to the site and Lower Manhattan, also addressed issues of community, social equity, education, culture and personal healing. These ideas were translated into vision statements that would serve as guiding principles for the rebuilding of the site as well as future plans and policies for the region.

Principles and Methods

Imagine NY has two objectives: 1) to gather ideas and visions from the broadest public; and 2) to ensure that those voices and ideas are heard by policymakers who in the months and years ahead will need to make decisions that are critical to the future of the region. The methodology of Imagine NY was based on a set of clearly stated principles that included:

- Encouraging participation, regardless of a participant’s age, educational background and language;
- Recording all ideas submitted by participants and displaying those ideas on the project website;
- Opening dialogue to all ideas, without limiting ideas to the geographic boundaries of Lower Manhattan and the WTC site; and
- Developing multiple visions to better reflect the rich diversity of the region.

Grounded on those principles, the workshops were designed to allow for maximum flexibility: The process could be held virtually anywhere and would allow for different types of activities and program lengths. Organizations from throughout the tri-state region were invited to host Imagine NY workshops. There were 124 different venues and 230 separate workshops. Workshops were held in local libraries, places of worship, schools, universities, museums and community centers. Some workshops were private sessions among friends, family members of victims or the membership of an organization. Others were open, public events that anyone could attend. Workshops were held in Cantonese, Spanish and American Sign Language, and many sites held art activities in which children took part.

The workshops were designed to allow the broadest spectrum of participants to contribute ideas in a safe and comfortable environment using words, drawings and images. Workshops were led by trained facilitators—nearly two hundred were trained to run the workshops. Some facilitators were employed by organizations, but others were volunteers. At each venue there could be multiple workshops and one of the three basic types of activities: visioning workshops, charrettes and unstructured activities.

- The visioning workshop consisted of a multiple brainstorming exercise. First, participants were asked to consider the past and present, and were asked to share their responses to two questions: As a result of 9/11, what have we lost? and How have we changed? They were then asked to think of the future and share their ideas in response to the question, How can we move forward from 9/11? In some venues, participants went beyond brainstorming and wrote vision statements and strategies to address recurring ideas in their session. In some venues, the first two questions sparked a long debate about American foreign policy. In others, participants focused intensely on the needs of their community, such as jobs and housing. Other groups were very focused on the WTC site and ways to memorialize victims.

- The planning and design charrettes were facilitated by trained architects and planners and focused on physical design and planning solutions for the WTC site and Lower Manhattan. Participants rendered plans and designs for memorials, improved pedestrian circulation, waterfront access and mixed-use development.

- In the unstructured activities, participants could draw, paint or sculpt on special, pre-cut paper, which were then placed on a grid wall for display. Participants created images of...
their vision for memorials, emotional reactions to the attacks and their aftermath, and political and emotional messages to policymakers.

- Finally, written and visual submissions were accepted through the Imagine NY website, which people from throughout the world visited to present their ideas.

For some workshops, people conducted their own outreach and publicity. Others depended on Mayor Bloomberg's outreach effort that involved extensive media coverage, posters and flyers. A public service announcement was run on several television stations and on the "jumbotron" screen in Times Square.

The workshops and over 700 web and mail-in entries generated a total of 19,000 ideas. The vision statements that resulted were based on those ideas and were written and finalized by participants in the last Imagine NY activity, the Summit, held June 1, 2002.

In preparation for the Summit, all ideas, drawings and artifacts were entered in the Imagine NY database. (They can be seen and sorted in the "Idea Gallery" of the Imagine NY website.) The ideas were reviewed and categorized under the organized goals of the Imagine NY Steering Committee. The Steering Committee also developed preliminary drafts of the forty-nine vision statements, one for each category.

At the Summit over 300 participants worked in small groups to refine, change and finalize the draft vision statements after a careful reading of the ideas suggested by Imagine NY participants for each category. The commitment was to keep the vision statements in the public's own words.

The vision statements that resulted from this process are eloquent and reflect a true determination to rebuild, recover and renew the New York region. They range in focus from the emotional to the political, from the specific to the region. The visions are organized into five broad categories: people, place, social equity, public involvement and planning and policy. Each category includes a number of vision statements.

- People. Visions about remembrance, honor and recovery—as individuals and community—focusing on spiritual and social rather than physical rebuilding. The vision statements focus on: building memorials, both on the WTC site and beyond; building community and solidarity; honoring the victims of the attacks; and focusing on personal recovery and priorities.

- Place. Visions that deal with the on-site memorialization of the 9/11 tragedy, and the revitalization and physical redevelopment of the WTC site, Lower Manhattan and the region's diverse communities.

- Social Equity. Visions that address the far-reaching impacts of 9/11 and recognize the importance of a commitment to resolving pre-9/11 problems region-wide. The vision statements focus on increasing employment opportunities, making affordable housing a priority and improving the NYC school system.

- Public Involvement in Planning. Visions that underscore the value of public participation and inclusiveness in planning and decision-making. The vision statements focus on establishing an ongoing, democratic decision-making process for Lower Manhattan, continuing the dialogue about 9/11 and the future of the city, and including the public in long-term holistic planning.

- Policy. Visions that call upon local, state and federal government to do its part to ensure a secure and sustainable future. The vision statements refer to improving public safety, engaging in comprehensive and regional planning, deregulating businesses and educating the public about 9/11 and its causes and impacts.

Who Was Involved?

The statistics on the Imagine NY participants are based on an exit survey at the workshops and a questionnaire on the Imagine NY website. The racial makeup of participants was very close to the regional averages, with slightly more Caucasian and fewer African American participants, and a higher percentage who identified themselves as Asian, Native American and Other.

The income of Imagine NY participants closely mirrored that of the region's population. The percentage of participants earning under $15,000 a year was exactly the same as for the region's population overall. Slightly more participants had household incomes of $90,750,000 and slightly fewer had household incomes of $75,150,000.

There was balanced participation by age, with nearly 30 percent of participants under the age of 30 (including 13 percent under 18), nearly 30 percent in the 30-44 category and 30 percent in the 45-65 category. Imagine NY participants tended to have a higher educational attainment level than the population of the region. Thirty-five percent of participants achieved some level of postgraduate study, compared to 13 percent of the region's residents. Twenty-four percent of the participants had a high school diploma or less, compared to 49 percent of the region's population.

What's Next?

Imagine NY's forty-nine vision statements were released June 10, 2002 in a summary report that was presented to the press and to a panel of decision-makers—both those appointed to redeploy the World Trade Center site and elected officials. The summary report and all 19,000 of the individual ideas are also on the Imagine NY website. The website continues to allow both written and visual submissions. It also identifies other organizations advocating for various visions, e.g. affordable housing, job development, memorials, etc., and encourages Imagine NY participants to work with them. An exhibit including many of the ideas and images was held at the Urban Center in New York City from July to October, 2002.

Imagine NY sponsors and participants have used the forty-nine vision statements as the basis for public testimony and lobbying by individuals and organizations. They have presented the results and visions to the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LDMC), the New York City Council and on radio, television and in newspapers. Getting the attention of the right people continues to be difficult when it comes to "proactive" rather than "reactive" public involvement.

In January, Imagine NY brought together over 500 people to discuss the designs commissioned by the LDMC. Imagine NY, NY1 News and Gotham Gazette posted the designs online and asked visitors to comment. Over 5,500 people responded. The results can be found at www.imagineinenewyork.org. It is clear that the public wants to be more involved and better informed about decision-making in Lower Manhattan. Participants called for a transparent, long-term process for rebuilding under a single governmental body. The next steps will involve vigilance by Imagine NY participants to make sure there is an inclusive process for public participation.

Penelope Doda is a planning consultant and Eva Hambardzumian is Co-Director of the Planning Center of the Municipal Art Society in New York City.
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ESBUILDER, founded in 1994, is an independent bi-annual publication committed to social justice as an underlying principle of the built environment.

ESBUILDER focuses on architecture that serves humanity. The editors consider architecture and building an integral part of real life culture, everyone's culture—whether yours cool, rich, scary stuff, or on the slide. Through its multidisciplinary approach, it poses a challenge to the built environment to consider alternatives and options that will lead to a more sustainable and humane society.

ESBUILDER is about people challenging the current thinking, not simply in words, but in actions that challenge free or design and build, retail or build, and for whom and with whom or not.

And unlike the conventional architectural media, ESBUILDER is written in an accessible and engaging language, easily understood by professionals, academics, and lay persons alike.

Sample Issue $3.50 New Year $28 Two Years $40

ESBUILDER 2405 Madison Ave Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505 Phone/Fax: 505-837-4549
Post-9/11 Planning: New York City and Beyond

By Tom Angotti

How should Lower Manhattan be rebuilt? Fill the gap in the New York City skyline? Or, leave it open? Create a memorial? Save the financial district? How can the city be safer and more secure from terrorist attacks?

These are the questions shaping the debates in New York City, and the rest of the country, about post-9/11 planning. The answers coming from government and business circles promote real estate development over solutions that focus on the needs of people and neighborhoods.

The official post-9/11 response at national and local levels has had three components: military, technological and urban design. Historically each of these has failed to thwart terrorism, and each may instead encourage it.

Military. United States foreign policy was reshaped to explicitly endorse unilateral ‘preemptive’ military strikes anywhere in the world the US deems appropriate. Domestic policy is to further strengthen the ability of local and federal law enforcement to detain and deport people without due process. Both responses legitimize the use of terror by the US and allied states and in the end reproduce the global diuum for US imperialism.

Technology. There is greater use of surveillance cameras, listening devices and web surveillance, as the US government invades public and private spaces. This denigrates the public character of public places (real and virtual) and strengthens the private, anti-urban character of US society. In particular, it degrades public places used by poor people.

Urban design. Physical determinism has again raised its ugly head. Planners and architects are knocking each other over to show how they can make ‘safe cities’ and ‘defensible spaces.’ They are advancing the myth that by rearranging things like buildings and roads, cities will be safe. They ignore the gaping economic and racial inequalities and the national culture of fear and violence, which are the real threats to public safety.

Post-9/11 Inequalities

The basic question in New York City is whether the $21 billion in federal and state aid will be used to build the 9/11 memorial, or to rebuild the financial district. The planners are talking about the most important element—the people who live and work in New York City. The planning process is geared almost entirely toward developing things, i.e. real estate, buildings, infrastructure and capital. Commodities that can be exchanged, land that can be bought and sold—are these the fetishes of post-9/11 planning. In the meantime, there are more restrictions on people, these immigrants.

In December Mayor Michael Bloomberg released his plan for Lower Manhattan, and the state-created Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) unveiled a set of nine alternative designs by leading architects. Stake is how the sixteen acre World Trade Center site will be redeveloped, how and where the $21 billion in federal and state aid will be spent and how this will affect Lower Manhattan and the rest of the region.

But the planning going on is mostly physical planning, and the planners aren’t talking about the most important element—the people who live and work in New York City. The planning process is geared almost entirely toward developing things, i.e. real estate, buildings, infrastructure and capital. Commodities that can be exchanged, land that can be bought and sold—are these the fetishes of post-9/11 planning. In the meantime, there are more restrictions on people, especially immigrants.

So far, the state-dominated LMDC has had all the power to make decisions about how to rebuild Lower Manhattan. Its Board of Directors (led by White males in a city where whites are a minority) monopolizes all decision-making authority. The LMDC’s preference for meeting the needs of the financial and real estate sectors led it to produce six alternative proposals for the development of the World Trade Center site last year. These met with an overwhelming thumbs-down reaction from the public because the alternatives were all about building offices. The LMDC then commissioned teams of big name architects and asked them to spread the office space around a bit and throw in a little housing and some service offices. Their designs, released in December 2002, have again met with groans from the public, but the LMDC is determined to decide on a plan regardless of public reaction. After all, they will reason, who can question the world’s most famous architects? Mayor Michael Bloomberg recently presented a more general and balanced plan for Lower Manhattan. But it, too, comes from the pinnacle of power, and no one there is supporting a participatory planning process that goes beyond the elite set of downtown insiders.

Finally, the victims of the most glaring inequalities are getting no public attention and no relief funds. Untold numbers of immigrants who lost loved ones and their jobs on 9/11 are fearful of stepping forward to ask for assistance in the post-9/11 climate of anti-immigrant hysteria. Even documented immigrants are reluctant to step forward for fear of being apprehended as terrorist suspects. And only a short hop from Ground Zero is Chinatown and the Lower East Side, working-class neighborhoods whose economies were devastated by 9/11 but whose representatives have not been invited to sit in the back rooms where decisions are made. Asian Americans for Equality has initiated its own Rebuild Chinatown initiative as a means of making its voice heard. But so far the winning combination is a Wall Street address and signature architecture, not participatory planning.

The ultimate sign of neglect for the human losses due to 9/11 is the outrageous continuing denial by the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that there are any significant long-term public health effects of the WTC disaster. Motivated more by an interest in avoiding litigation than an interest in the public welfare, the Bush Administration’s EPA has failed to adequately monitor environmental impacts. It also has refused local demands to automatically test and clean inside all buildings, including those in Brooklyn and Queens, where ground zero smoke drifted for weeks after 9/11. A local group, 9/11 Environmental Action, with the support of elected officials, continues to press the EPA to acknowledge what many local residents and rescuers know firsthand—they are still walking around with chronic respiratory problems.

“No one up there is supporting a participatory planning process that goes beyond the elite set of downtown insiders.”

Tom Angotti is Professor of Urban Affairs & Planning at Hunter College, City University of New York.
The Imaginative and the Gigantic

All of the proposals in the competition are imaginative and interesting from a design standpoint. All respect the program in design and in rhetoric emphasize the symbolic importance of the site. All pay attention to ‘green’ (environmentally-friendly) construction and many have gardens. All reserve space for a memorial, with one (Libeskind) suggesting a specific placement seventy feet below ground where the enclosure for the Foundation of the Twin Towers had been. All at least provide service to integration with the street grid of Lower Manhattan, and allow view corridors from outside the site. The suggestions for cultural centers, museums and ground-level gardens are imaginative.

So far so good. But all showcase big towers, four of them the highest in the world (heights range from 1,111 feet (Richard Meier) to 1,600 feet (Peterson Littenberg)) to 1,776 feet (Libeskind) to 2,100 feet (the Think group). Leaving aside the question of whether tall buildings symbolize that we have not been defeated, or that we have learned nothing from the attack, there is a general consensus that there is no demand for this much office space in the foreseeable future. Today there are seventeen million square feet of vacant office space in Lower Manhattan. According to Robert Yaro, president of the Regional Plan Association, “It will probably take a decade to fill the space that is currently vacant.” From a planning point of view, it is highly questionable whether an investment to induce such demand in Lower Manhattan is desirable (as opposed to, for instance, Midtown West, or to the other major subcenters elsewhere in Manhattan and in the other boroughs that are under consideration for development). Such concentration further runs counter to the idea of increased residential uses in the area, and would certainly raise rents or sales prices for housing. It is likely to run counter to the idea of mixed-income occupancy or the kind of creativity associated with start-up organizations.

Public uses are spoken of in many proposals, but come off badly. United Architects creates a ‘public space’ 800 feet in the air, and SOM proposes a “sky garden” on the fifty-second story. The Think team has a park ten stories above ground-level. Peterson Littenberg has gardens at the tenth floor. Viewing platforms would of necessity be tightly controlled for security purposes. Herbert Muschamp, architecture critic of The New York Times, speaks of one plan with “security precautions at a level not seen since the golden age of castle keeps.” Informal public uses, easy communication and diversity would be discouraged.

Costs and, indeed, uses of the massive structures are not considered in the proposals. These are not serious proposals for a client. They are not responses either to public or private demand for specific space for specific uses. They have nothing to do with economies of construction or land use. As a director of the LMDC said, on condition of anonymity [sic] to the New York Times, “Fundamentally it’s a sideshow, because none of these things will be built.”

The designs also do not fit into any wider plan for Lower Manhattan. David Kellicott, coordinator of the Labor Community Advocacy Network, told the New York Times that they “tuned their back on Chinatown.” At best, the designs view the site only in terms of its immediate neighborhood (except for the transit hub, which in turn is designed with no reference to costs, regional priorities or the impacts of changed transportation plans). Economic development, jobs and social justice in the distribution of benefits and costs should be key considerations. They play no role in this program.

The Wrong Program at the Wrong Time

The seven architectural firms cannot really be faulted for what they have done. They did what they were asked to do, and by and large it did well. The fault lies in the program and in the process.

The program is wrong. It asks for too much office space, too little housing, a transit hub that is not in the best location for New York City airport connections and whose dimensions and purpose are not yet clear. It leaves open the issue of mixed-income occupancy or the kind of creativity associated with start-up organizations.
provision for mixed housing, takes into account no market research, pays no attention to costs or available budgets, and is not based on any developed vision for how Lower Manhattan as a whole should develop.

The program is premature. Planning should precede, not follow, a design competition. Design alternatives are important once the overall plan is established and used, determined, not before. Both the city and the LMDC are involved in a planning process (possibly coordinated), and so apparently is the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, but they are far from complete.

The program is misleading. It suggests that the LMDC can produce what one or more of these designs suggest. It cannot. It does not control the land, cannot do the building, cannot make the decisions or the policies, and will not be the client for what eventually is done. Debate should not center around whether a tower should be 1,111 or 2,100 feet high. To act as if this architectural competition and its results will determine what is in fact built diverts attention from what decisions really need to be made, in what order and by whom.

The Process

The process of developing the program was wrong. Its justification, at best, was that the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey owned the land, and this is what they wanted. But clearly the Port Authority will not be the only decisive voice. The city, the state, and the public have all substantial leverage to affect what happens, and the Port Authority itself is a creature of other entities that can effectively control what happens. There is a need for a fully transparent planning process involving all of the entities that have an interest in the site or are impacted by its development.

The process is misleading. By making a show of public participation—by setting up models for public viewing, holding hearings, claiming to listen to civic groups and advisory committee proposals and concerns—the LMDC holds itself up as open and democratic. But the sole power of decision making lies in its sixteen-member board, dominated by those with pre-existing connections to the real estate industry and the financial community. There may be participation in the sense of an opportunity for the public to express itself, but they will not participate in making decisions.

The process is undemocratic. No public discussion, let alone democratic decision-making, went into the formulation of the program. The years of the people of New York City have fought for and established a planning and decision-making process that is at least on paper highly democratic. It includes a Uniform Land Use Review Procedure that involves local communities, the City Planning Commission, City Council, and the Mayor. It has mandated public hearings and votes, public disclosure and environmental impact review procedures. These established processes are being ignored. The Mayor’s plan may (or may not) signal the beginning of a turn in the direction of using these planning mechanisms. The architectural competition should be independent of them, not the other way around.

Lastly, the timing is all wrong. Decisions that will affect the future of New York City for years into the future are being rushed, without adequate information, discussion, planning, analysis and thought. The LMDC wants to go from the design competition to decision-making and a plan within less than two months. As New Yorkers know, you can’t get a license to open a sidewalk hot dog stand that quickly. Other planning processes, more broad-based than that of the LMDC, are under way and not yet complete, including the work of the Civic Alliance and the Imagine New York project of the Municipal Art Society (see the article by Penelope Dada and Edwina Huntorth in this issue). The Department of City Planning is reported to have studied underway, the results of which should also be useful. Granted that prompt action can itself have a positive effect, nonetheless a well thought-through timetable with a clear sense of feasible priorities is needed. It does not yet exist.

How To Refocus on Planning

While the imaginative and provocative character of the proposals should be recognized, the focus needs to be on the real decisions that are being made and who is making them—on where the power really lies. That means that attention must be paid to the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, the Governor, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the private real estate developers. The sole power of decision-making lies in the sixteen-member board, dominated by those with pre-existing connections to the real estate industry and the financial community. There may be participation in the sense of an opportunity for the public to express itself, but they will not participate in making decisions.

• What private activities and what public programs (in addition to global and financial) best serve the economic development interests of the major players in New York, in terms of jobs, wages and opportunity?
• What can be done to meet critical housing needs, including those of very low-, low- and moderate-income New Yorkers?
• What measures will best protect environmental quality in the city, both in Lower Manhattan and elsewhere?
• What are the city’s regional transportation needs and where is infrastructure investment most needed?
• How can communities, here and elsewhere, be strengthened?
• How does the allocation of public resources here fit with other citywide needs, e.g., for schools, libraries, cultural activities and healthcare?
• And, of course, how can the built environment contribute to meeting these concerns?

The planning process must be more transparent, open and democratic. The city must, with its formal structure of participatory planning, regain and keep the initiative in planning and decision-making. Following the McKim, Mead & White proposal may not be acceptable as the beginning of such a process, but should be seen as only a beginning, both in substance and process. A good start might be a series of public hearings by the City Planning Commission, whose absence from the discussions thus far is remarkable, and by the City Council, which has hesitated to assert its role.

For more information on this topic, visit: www.renewny.org or www.renewmanhattan.info, to view the Architectural designs; www.nyc.gov, to read the analysis of the Labor Community Advocacy Network; and www.golubancig.com/rebuilding_nyc/web_resources.shtml, to see other proposals related to rebuilding Lower Manhattan.

Peter Marcuse is professor of city and regional planning at Columbia University in New York City.

THEME ISSUE on MARXISM, SOCIALISM AND PROGRESSIVE PLANNING

Thirty years ago when Planners Network started, many progressive planners proposed or discussed socialist alternatives to capitalist urban development and planning. Central planning in the Soviet Union, China, and the emerging socialist nations of Africa and Asia was a reality, although there were differing judgments about the merits of these regimes. Many progressive planners went to Cuba and were inspired by the possibilities of revolutionary power. In the U.S., the civil rights, anti-war and new social movements were significant political forces and generated interest in socialism and Marxism. It was not unusual then to contemplate the progressive possibilities of planning without private property, even in North America. Marxist analysis was more commonly used to look at urban class and racial divisions. Though often the main theoricians were European, and North Americans has always had a strong pragmatically bent, Marxist categories were often used in urban analysis.

The Soviet Union is no longer and the map movements have dispersed. With the Reagan Revolution, the entire political spectrum shifted to the right and most Democrats and Republicans run from even the "liberal" label. TINA ("There Is No Alternative") is for many the only alternative. The failed socialist alternatives are criticized for being utopian. Progressive planners take part in the debates about New Urbanism, Smart Growth, Equity Planning, Environmental Justice and other major issues. But there's virtual silence when it comes to the themes of socialism and Marxism.

Is Marxism relevant today as a theoretical or practical reference for progressive planners? What does dialectical and historical materialism have to offer in explaining urban phenomena and charting the course for progressive planning that deals with issues such as displacement, environmental justice, tenants, and housing equity and participatory democracy? Does socialism have any meaning today for progressive planning? What can we learn from the history of socialist cities? In charting alternatives to capitalist urban development, is there a place for socialist alternatives, and if so, what is it?

We invite articles of up to 2,000 words that follow the Planners Network accessible, non-academic style guidelines. Content should be jargon-free and address PN’s diverse audience of activists, professionals and academics, which includes many not familiar with Marxist terminology or socialist history.

Deadline: July 1, 2003.

Send inquiries and articles to Tom Angotti. tangotti@hunter.cuny.edu
From Pruitt-Igoe to the World Trade Center: Planning and the ex/implosion of (post)modernity

By Clara Irazabal

Implode: to burst inward; to collapse inward as if from external pressure.
Explode: to bring into disrepute or discredit (explode a theory); to burst violently as a result of pressure from within.

Praktikum Bookman Dictionary and Thesaurus

Where else is the demise of hegemonic modern illusions as evident as in the physical collapse of the Pruitt-Igoe public housing complex (1972, in St. Louis) and the World Trade Center (2001, in New York City)? Looking at these two cases, we can reflect on the meaning of modernity in the production, destruction, and reproduction of the built environment. We can use the events of 9/11 as a backdrop for analyzing the planning field, considering the status quo and new perspectives for planning.

According to Charles Jencks, modern architecture died in St. Louis, Missouri, on July 15, 1972 at 3:32 p.m., when the Pruitt-Igoe public housing project was dynamited. Now, three decades later, it is important to recall that the 3,000-unit project epitomized modern planning and architecture. Its design followed the planning principles of Le Corbusier and the International Congress of Modern Architects, and was hailed as an example of the New Enlightenment.

Contrary to the designer's expectations, Pruitt-Igoe suffered 17 years of vandalism by some of its residents, and millions of dollars were spent in failed attempts to maintain it as habitable.

At the time of the project's inception, several trends in Western culture made up the dominant cultural ethos of modernity. It included the inevitability of progress in human history and the indefinite improvement of the quality of life through advancements in scientific and technological knowledge. Pruitt-Igoe symbolized these ideals and myths of modernity. Today, the environmental determinism that inspired its architecture is discounted and perceived as utterly naive. At that time, however, the notion was widely accepted. It was grounded in prestigious philosophical doctrines such as rationalism and pragmatism.

Have today's architects and planners learned the lessons from Pruitt-Igoe? We may too rapidly answer yes, because no Western planner or architect would dare think of building something similar nowadays. At least not on American or Western European soil. But it is less than scary to view Third World cities, particularly in Asia, being filled with Western-planned neo-Pruitt-Igoes.

WTC: The Failure, Revision or Reenactment of the Model?

The architect of both Pruitt-Igoe (PI) and the World Trade Center (WTC) was the same person: Minoru Yamasaki. The WTC was being built when PI was demolished, after stringent critiques of modern architecture and urbanism had been widely published and acknowledged. In her classic book The Death and Life of Great American Cities (1961), Jane Jacobs praised the streets of Greenwich Village, as noticeable just a few blocks from the WTC, as precious spaces capable of nurturing a sense of place, community, and diversity. Yamasaki's towers, on the other hand, were the most evident representation of Le Corbusier's isolated towers in a park. Its modernist architecture also condemned because of its unmediated relationship to real estate speculation, just as it became the symbol of Western capitalism.

The terrorist attack on the WTC materialized the chaotic and arbitrary postmodern fragmentation that constitutes the world's current condition: the ambiguity between the real and the virtual; the end of the ideals of social and material progress; the exacerbation of contradictions between high technology and religious or imperial fanaticism, and between concentrated wealth and vast lands of misery.

Can Planning Change After 9/11?

Some may argue that the collapse of PI cannot be compared to the collapse of the WTC. The collapse of PI was a natural disaster, and the collapse of the WTC was not planned by the society that used the building. It may then be argued that the rationale for the collapse of PI was to correct something that had been done badly, i.e., to do some good; whereas the collapse of the WTC was to destroy something that had been done well, i.e., to do some harm. There are valuable partial truths in these assertions. But I dispute what would otherwise be a narrow, non-philosophic, and ethnocentric view of the events.

In our new world, we experience unprecedented interconnectedness. We know, painfully, that WTC victims had real faces, names, lives, and dreams that were brutally and unjustifiably destroyed. Yet, so did innocent victims of the war in Afghanistan, or so will potential innocent victims of war in Iraq. We live in an interconnected world, and if we as planners and architects have a particularly well-developed and progressive sensibility when it comes to planning, then we should act upon that understanding in our academic and professional lives. This might entail a radical, unprecedented openness to the other. We planners like to think of ourselves as ever more efficient at planning for inclusive communities and promoting participatory planning. But do these commendable practices truly advance the concept and practice of an interconnected world? Has the commonly acclaimed "think globally, act locally" maxin trapped us in parochialism instead of liberating us for novel, more inclusive understandings of the new world?

I propose to change this credo to "think globa- lly, act globally." This would have specific planning and design implications. For instance, if we were to transform the myth of independence of the nation state, how would our approach to the design of memorials change? The Vietnam memorial in Washington D.C. would have not been conceived without respectful acknowledgment of the Vietnamese victims. Wouldn't we be perpetuating that lack of understanding if we built a WTC memorial without including the Afghan victims of the war (not to mention the victims that may emerge from the alleged "war on terrorism" in Iraq and other countries)? For some it may be extremely hard to think in these terms within the current nationalistic and war-prone mindset that the U.S. is so prone to be embedded in. However, it is precisely this mindset and its engendered politics (based on the modern myths of independence, sovereignty, and military hegemony) which ought to be challenged and transformed if we truly want to succeed against terrorism.

What kind of future can we planners envision based on this notion of an interconnected world? And what kind of actions should we take?

Our actions should be guided by an uncompromising, human-centered ethics that function the same on American soil as abroad. In planning education, it entails giving more emphasis to teaching ethics, and teaching both domestic planning with an international scope and international planning per se. This may imply amending the links between research, pedagogy, and advocacy, too often purposely de-linked because of the fear of compromising the rigor of scholarship. It entails giving more emphasis to planning, not only for the local other but also for the global other. That may sometimes imply creating a link between local and global equity, too often purposely kept separate by the fears of compromising the power of local activism. For both planning educators and practitioners, re-embracing a human-centered ethics in an interconnected world may mean analyzing the status quo in action, and becoming outspoken activists to uphold the values of our field.

In 1990, Manuel Castells delivered a keynote speech to the ACSP (Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning) meeting, titled: "The World Has Changed. Can Planning Change?" In his address, he identified connections between macro-social changes and the field of planning. He argued that the world's changes challenged the rigidity of planning. What 9/11 brought to the fore was the unavoidable, painstaking realization that the world had indeed changed. Today, what is needed for the field of planning is the brave removal of old theorectical and practical debris, and a rebuilding from ground zero—philosophically speaking. According to Castells,

"A new world is always a land of opportunity. But only if the actors [...] understand the trans formation and value the utility of [...] Planning can, indeed must, have a new historical departure [...] and only if, the field as such and ourselves as its subjects, are able to engage in a refoundation of the intellectual foundations of our activity, according to the new epics we are entering."

Decentering Planning

Since 1990 no significant changes have occurred in the planning profession. This is in part due to
Get On the PN Roster 2003

In 1998 PN published its last PN Roster. We plan to develop a new roster in 2003. We are exploring options for some kind of password protected version on the web but there will possibly be a print version. For those of you who remember the old rosters, they were terrific networking resources. We will use the PN address list as the basis for the roster but it is much better to have more information about each member, particularly a brief bio. Remember, PN is a network and it is only as strong as its members.

To make sure you have the best possible information, please fill in the following:

Name: 
Organization: 
Address: 
City: 
State: 
Country: 
Phone: 
Fax: 
Email: 
URL: 
Brief statement describing your work, interests, and activities in 50 words or less.

Send it to: pn@pratt.edu (preferred) OR Fax to 718-636-3709
OR mail to Planners Network, 379 Dekalb Ave., Brooklyn, NY 11205

7th Generation (Cont. from page 2)

ple missed issues (including members of the Steering Committee). Hopefully these problems have now been rectified.

What's in PN Magazine

The themes for this first year of the magazine were Youth and Planning, New Urbanism, the Planners Network Conference/Planning Education, and Just and Sustainable Transportation.

As we said in the last issue of the PN Newsletter, "We strive to remain a forum that gives voice to ideas and topics that would not otherwise get attention in mainstream circles...[and] encourage dialogue in new areas and new ways of looking at the traditional topics of planning... We hope to give voice to a range of views, particularly those that are not welcome by mainstream publications because of their focus on issues of economic and social justice." PN is the only consistent outlet for the diverse voices of progressive planning today. We have done special issues on women and planning, queer and planning, youth and planning. Our editors and contributors reflect this diversity, though clearly there are many more voices to be heard. Many of our contributors are usually too many, are academics. But we publish only those who can write in an accessible style for a broad audience and are tuned in to the world of planning practice; we go out of our way to encourage minority activists, young people, and students to write for us, and try to support them as best we can.

While the magazine is based in the U.S., we regularly carry articles from or about other locations. In 2002, we published 56 articles; 65 percent from or about the US, 18 percent from Canada, 11 percent from Latin America, and 10 percent dealt with other countries.

PN Magazine includes regular columns: The Seventh Generation (for editorial opinion), member Updates, PN News, the Spanish-language column from Latin America, and Resources (Events, Publications, and Web Sites). These reflect the role of the publication as a means for networking. With the web site and list serve, the magazine is a major means for keeping the network together.

Where Are We Going?

One of the main questions the magazine faces is survival. The majority of the funds we need to continue publishing come from membership dues. PN benefits from the generous support of the Fannie Mae Foundation but most of those funds have gone to finance the annual conferences. If the magazine is to grow and develop we will need to have paid staff. Each issue takes days and weeks of time from the volunteer editors. We can start selling subscriptions to the magazine and expand circulation. We can seek grants. And we can welcome more volunteers (but increasingly we need a staff person to coordinate them). "We can do all these things, if you can do some of them, or if you can help us raise money to hire someone. Our current volunteers are stretched to the limits. Get in touch if you can help.

Another question is, with a successful magazine, what will happen to Planners Network, the organization? Throughout our nearly three decades-long history there has been a continuing tension between two models for PN. One is the network model. The function of the network has been to foster connections among progressive planners, through the newsletter and magazine and the PN conferences. The other model is that of an advocacy organization that engages in progressive planning, particularly in the American Planning Association and Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. We've had events at conferences by these organizations. Also, some PN members have wanted us to do more as advocates within the broader progressive movements.

The networking and advocacy models are by no means contradictory. Both functions are valuable and should be further developed. But the advocacy function is relatively weak. PN's voice on the critical issues facing planning is not consistently present in the profession. It isn't clear what PN as an organization advocates when it comes to issues like smart growth, Bush's promotion of faith-based organizations, HOPE VI, and so forth. The newsletter and magazine present views of our members and contributors, and sometimes there are debates. But what does PN advocate and what does it contribute publicly? Planners always talk about setting goals and objectives. What are ours? Will we challenge the mainstream professional organizations to deal forcefully with the current ultra-conservative drift, or just talk to each other? Will we proactively join the campaigns against war and racism, and strengthen our ties to the movements for economic, environmental, racial, and gender justice?
We would like to see PN’s organization improve, from the Steering Committee to local chapters, so it can be an effective advocate for progressive planning. Perhaps we can learn something from the model of the Editorial Board—a task-orientated group that needs to produce materials each quarter.

The Editorial Board is divided on where we think the balance should be between networking and advocacy. After nearly three decades this may be the time to become a center for organizing. But it may also be that PN’s traditional role of networking and support for planners fulfills an important need and that individuals can use that base to do work through other groups.

Whatever is decided, PN needs to have a paid staff person because the student interns we have operated with so far is a must if we’re to expand our advocacy role. But it’s also critical to sustain our two main current initiatives—IPPM and conferences. From time to time someone has a burst of energy to do a project, and we have managed to launch national conferences most years for the last decade, injecting more vigor into PN each time. But the conferences are more and more difficult to sustain. They depend on someone volunteering to organize a conference, almost single-handedly, raising most of the money and providing all of the labor.

We hope that over the next year we can provide a forum for discussing these issues about the direction of Planners Network. We welcome articles and updates that reflect on the relevance and activities of PN. We also welcome comments on the Magazine itself—but remember we are volunteers!

---

**Homeland Security:**

**Busting Immigrants and Unions at the Airports?**

By Jacqueline Leavitt

Since 9/11 security has been a public obsession, and the federalization of security has been the policy of choice. The Bush administration has used the federalization of airport security as a way of weakening union protections and undermining the rights of immigrants.

The $38 billion package creating the Department of Homeland Security aimed at twin targets, escalating linguistic parallels to the Twin Towers: preventing similar attacks and protecting similar targets. These measures include what might be loosely considered a jobs and wage benefits package, expanding the role of the INS (Immigration and Naturalization Service), Coast Guard, FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) and Customs Service. Also included are funds for equipment, training and the communications infrastructure for two million police, fire and emergency medical personnel across the country.

These measures, taken in the name of security and the war on terrorism, create difficulties for vulnerable members of society, particularly immigrants, and for unions organizing in the service industries. The federalization policies embedded in homeland security have been called union busting, an issue that may become clearer as an estimated 170,000 workers in twenty-two existing government agencies are reorganized. Indeed, federalization may prove to be the precursor to increased privatization. In the Los Angeles Times of November 15, 2002, Edward Chen wrote that George Bush’s intention was “to allow the private sector to compete for nearly half of the nation’s 1.8 million federal civilian jobs.” Citing the White House Office of Management and Budget, Chen stated that “as many as 850,000 workers covering a wide range of white- and blue-collar jobs could be affected.”

In the language of the military, the impact on organized labor is considered to be “collateral damage.” This gives rise to questions about the nature of security and on whom the “war on terrorism” is being waged. Local 1877 of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) in Los Angeles has suffered “collateral damage.” SEIU’s organizing heightens our understanding of security as integral to the fight for human rights and social justice. The experience of SEIU shows how national security policies threaten the rights of immigrants and how federalization can displace immigrants, resulting in what we might call “job gentrification.”

**Multiple Meanings of Terror and Security**

No one comprehensive definition of terror exists. Jim Rodgers and Tim Kullman in *Facing Terror: The Government’s Response to Contemporary Extremists in America* draw attention to Irwin Cotler’s assertion that terrorism is an “assault on human rights and human dignity” and that counterterrorism should be treated as human rights policy. Different discourses exist within the human rights literature. I will draw from those who espouse universalism—that is, the view emphasizing everyone’s rights, including the rights of physical protection, political liberty and social justice. This view is relevant when considering that collateral damage can be suffered by those who fight for economic and social justice.

We see the contrast to the post-World War II Cold War era, when economic growth could tolerate, as Michael Katz phrases it in *The Price of Citizenship: Redefining the American Welfare State*, a “degree of social justice.” Universal liberal rights did not stand up when the choice was protecting private capital. Taking this stance, the Nixon administration broadened the meanings attached to national security and targeted activism on the domestic front.

As economic liberalism and the accompanying tolerance for social justice waned, the US labor movement was in flux. Union membership plummeted between 1953 and 1997 from about 35 percent of the labor force to below 15 percent. Between 1975 and the early 1990s, more than four million union members were lost. During this period, organized labor was detached in the drive to expand social benefits. The result, as Katz concludes, was to divide the working co-
class and lay the groundwork for nonconserva-
tive policy on issues such as public assistance. The balance shifted in national politics as the idea of a welfare state was cemented in favor of the more private and less accountable acts within the labor market. When generations of workers benefited from steady work and a sense of secu-
ritv, the compact between workers and bosses benefited employers in the long run. For the highly skilled and professional workforce who were part of that compact, life may have changed most dramatically and tragically fallen apart since 9/11.

For the other set of workers—the largely immi-
grant workforce in a growing services industry left out of organized labor—their security was as vulnerable in the days before 9/11 as it is after.

New Maturity, Continuing Organized After 9/11

In the 1980s and 1990s, organized labor experi-
cenced internal dissent and flourishing mergers. Nevertheless, a new maturity arose that predated the election in 1995 of John Sweeney and the new leadership of the AFL-CIO (American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations). SEIU, the largest union in North America today, has emerged as a leader fighting broad struggles that include human rights and security. Prior to 9/11, SEIU succeeded in organizing airport screeners in Los Angeles and San Francisco. The result of the drive was that in a three-year period, wages for screeners in both cities rose from $6 to $9.50 per hour in Los Angeles and $10 per hour in San Francisco. Improved health benefits and vacation pay were also won.

Innovative unions like SEIU operate in a politi-
cized public space where the contentious issues are not only wages and benefits, but also the rights of citizenship. In its war on terrorism, the Bush administration bore down on the nation's 28,000 privately employed airport screeners in 425 airports across the country. In LA, union organizers responded by dealing with issues of immigrant rights, citizenship requirements and federalization policies. They set up relief centers for displaced workers, filed lawsuits against the contractor, lobbied for changes in policies and consumer protection laws, and organized joint campaigns throughout the country to defend screeners.

The Respect at LAX Campaign Before 9/11

In 1998 Respect at LAX was formed, rapidly becoming one of the largest joint organizing campaigns in the country, bringing together SEIU Local 1877 and HERE (Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees) Local 814. The two unions joined with religious leaders and community-based organizations in an effort to secure living wages and union protection for thousands of low-wage airport workers.

The three-year organizing fight centered on Argebruggh Security, whose 1,200 workers included baggage handlers, skycap, and the 400 screeners working for Aviation Safeguards. The Respect at LAX campaign resulted in a vote of 285 in favor of representation by SEIU, and fifty against. Baggage screeners were not includ-
ed in the contract bargaining process until later that year. SEIU's success at Argebruggh was fol-
lowed by the organization of another 425 workers at Globe Aviation services, who joined Local 1877 through a card check process whereby the employer agrees to voluntarily recognize the union upon proof that a majority of workers support it.

Los Angeles Living Wage Ordinance

The history of Respect at LAX is entwined with the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE) and its successful fight for a living wage ordinance in LA. The initial passage of the living wage ordinance had not included airport workers. In November 1998, after a series of public meetings that included civil disobedience and direct action at LAX and in City Council chambers, the Los Angeles City Council included airport leases in the living wage requirement. Subsequently, the Airport Commission adopted this requirement which "kicks in" when leases and contracts come up for renewal. In the case of the Delta Airlines terminal, the living wage requirement comes up for renewal in the short-term, as the lease runs until 2025. In June 2000, the living wage requirement was used to stop Northwest Airlines, Hawaiian Airlines, and Air Canada from laying off 200 Argebruggh work-
ers.

The airlines announced plans to cancel their contracts four days before the new Service Provider Worker Retention Ordinance (SCWRO) went into effect. SCWRO required the retention of workers when employers change contracts. Switching to another contractor would have resulted in the firing of 200 workers who were scheduled to become union members. In addition to weekly demonstrations, which included an attempted takeover of the November 8, 2002. elections at LAX, the campaign pressured the LA City Council which, in turn, voted to delay the renewal of the operating agreement with Northwest and threatened to cancel the air-
line's permit to fly out of LAX.

Prior to 9/11, Local 1877 organized 200 securi-
ty screeners at LAX who worked for Huntleigh USA. The Local's plan to organize an additional 400 screeners working for Aviation Safeguards came to a halt because of 9/11. After 9/11, the Local had to put more resources into servicing workers most directly affected by job layoffs, reacting quickly by providing relief centers that opened on October 8 and continued until the new year. According to Javier Gonzalez, the Local's political coordi-
nator of SEIU Local 1877, many who lost their jobs were able to find another in the security industry fairly quickly. We [SEIU 1877] gained members in the short-run because of the immediate demand for security entrances, but we are getting ready to lose 800 baggage screeners who will be federalized.

Federalization Policies and Job Gentrification After 9/11

The task of federalizing the airports fell on the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), which deployed about 50,000 federal personal, including passenger and baggage screeners and law enforcement officers, to all airports by November 2002. This placed the enforcement of federalization, that is, the requirement—that at least 40 percent of the 1,200 current screeners are not US citizens, ruling them out as candidates for the federal workforce.

SEIU joined the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) in the challenging Section 111—The citizenship requirement—of the newly enacted Aviation and Security Transportation Act (ASTA). The judge ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, barring enforcement of the ASTA pending the outcome of the lawsuit. The result was that the citizenship requirement set to go into effect on November 19, 2002 did not take effect in Southern California airports. In his opinion, Judge M. Takasugi stated that at this stage of the case, the court cannot conclude that this categori-
cal exclusion of all non-citizens from employ-
ment as screeners is the least restrictive means to further the interest of the government (i.e., improving aviation security as a compelling governmental interest).

The Department of Transportation (DOT), the defendant in the suit, has downplayed the sig-
nificance of the citizenship requirement by p
stating that this requirement is only one among many. Unsatisfied with limiting themselves to federalization, the administration waged a rear-guard action labeled Operation Tarmac, raids were made against allegedly illegal workers at airports. Operation Tarmac targeted janitors, caterers, baggage handlers and maintenance workers whose social security numbers did not match those on file with the Social Security Administration (SSA). This is part of the administration's overall strategy towards immigration. In the first half of 2002, the SSA sent letters to more than 800,000 businesses, covering about 7 million employees, requesting that employers identify those cases where a worker's name or social security numbers did not match the SSA's file.

Social security cards are a requirement for work in seeking airport jobs that require security clearances. On August 22, 2002, dozens of workers with access to airplanes at LAX and other Southland airports were arrested as part of a nationwide crackdown on airport security. Officers from several agencies, including the INS, SSA, and the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), charged approximately forty-seven workers at LAX (thirty-three of whom were later arrested) for misusing social security numbers. Most of the charges stemmed from past use of inconsistent work permits or social security numbers that did not reflect the worker's present legal status. Some detainees faced the threat of receiving a felony conviction, opted for voluntary deportation. None of the detainees in Southern California were found to have links with any terrorist organization.

Union Benefits

Unionization can improve wages. According to research by SEIU in 2002, the income of union workers in Los Angeles is 20 percent higher than that of non-union workers. Unions also play an important role in improving working conditions as well as providing training and career opportunities, all of which is important to a workforce that is characterized by low wages, limited benefits, poor training and a high turnover rate. In the 1990s, only 4 percent of the working poor in Los Angeles were covered by collective bargaining agreements, compared to 22 percent of other workers.

Unionization can also protect workers when terrorism and security policies infringe on human rights, including the right to organize. In an interview with Richard Just, as reported in the online version of The American Prospect, Jonah Shafro, deputy director of the building service division of SEIU, argues that "We can figure out how to legislate wages... without a union. Anybody that works knows that those who speak up face retribution and that's where the strength of a union contract makes a difference... Workers have to have the unfettered and guaranteed ability to speak up without fear."

Before 9/11, real gains had been made for many low-wage workers at LAX. Respect at LAX won concessions that broadened the use of the living wage ordinance. The emphasis on terrorism and the linkage to security has led to the speedup of organizing and fed the national anti-immigrant hysteria. Screeners were designated as sacrificial lambs in order to assure the fear of terrorism. SEIU had to put resources into temporary measures, such as setting up relief centers and joining lawsuits to protect against discrimination. Ongoing raids such as Operation Tarmac have required immediate response and resources. At the same time, there has been necessity to wage campaigns, such as organizing security officers. One of the organizers of SEIU said, "The government gave the appearance that it was working towards keeping airports safe but it gastro- nized a workforce that was largely comprised of immigrants and people of color. The tragic events of 9/11 put a spotlight on security, but in the end it caused working people to feel less secure as many lost their livelihood."

Hydrogen fuel cell cars use hydrogen to produce electricity to move a vehicle. What's wrong with that? Plenty. Every time you convert energy from one form to another, you lose a little energy in the process. With oil (as gasoline), there's much conversion—it just gets refined and then goes right into the engine, via your gas tank. The route of energy in an HFC machine is a bit more complex. First, you have to find the hydrogen.

Big shock here: there are no vast, unapped pools of hydrogen just waiting to be pumped out of the ground. Not even little meenie ones. Nor even in the Arctic National Wildfire Refuge. The hydrogen has to be extracted from other more complex substance, such as natural gas or water. And that takes energy. Energy you could have been using to power your car in the first place. Not to mention that natural gas production is busy falling off a cliff here in North America. I won't go into that right now. Let's just say that you need to get far away from depending on natural gas for anything as you possibly can. You'll thank me later for this bit of sage advice and probably sooner than you think."

OK, so now you've got your hydrogen. It took some doing, and more than a little oil, but you filled the hydrogen tank in your car with the gas that made Lakerhans famous. Now the energy in that hydrogen has to be converted yet again, this time into electricity to spin the motors that drive the car—and again, with a loss of energy in the transition, because nothing comes without a price. The Second Law of Thermodynamics? Something like that.

Why all the bother for a little energy? Energy in America is big business. Very Big Business. From the electricity and gas in our homes to the fuel in our many, many cars, we use far more people than any other country on earth. Is that really what "power to the people!" was all about? Man, was I misinformed. We almost all have cars and trucks and SUNS and motorcycles and lawn mowers and snow blowers and well you get the idea. We use energy like it's going out of style. And the funny thing is, it is.

From the impending peak of global oil production to the high depletion rate of natural gas wells in North America, we're headed-pedals-to-the-metal into The Last Energy Crunch. But you knew that, didn't you? Then again, you also knew that you might have to buy a new car in the next few years. So what are you going to do? Well, here's a tip: Don't be the first one on your block to roll into that driveway with an HFC-powered car. Trust me.

If you really have to have a car—on that in a moment—your energy options boil down to these: gasoline, diesel, hybrid, electric and HFC. Right now, only HFC lacks the real world infrastructure to supporting it. That might change, but neither you nor I want to be the one betting on it.

So what do you want your next car to be? Whatever it is, it needs to be the most energy efficient machine you can buy that fits your needs. Yes, if you own an 8,000 acre cattle ranch in Montana, you probably do need a big truck. Such is your life. But if you don't—well then, maybe you need to downsize your expectations somewhat in what in view of the coming energy crisis. If you live in the vast suburban mountains and you need to do, you're going to have to ask yourself one hard question: what is the least I can get with it?"
How small a vehicle can I use? How low can I go? Time for a little transportation limbo!

Let’s assume (i.e. lie to ourselves) that you have done everything else you could to reduce your energy footprint on planet earth. You moved close to work, bought a bicycle and have a house full of hamstringing lights. You recycle, you compost and you have a whale saved in your freezer. You exchange Christmas cards with Julia Butterfly Hill. You are truly one with the earth. But you still need a new car. Below is your current list of personal transport energy choices.

Small Displacement Gas

Too bad Mercedes can’t be bothered with importing their ‘SMART’ mini car to the US. Failing that, the smallest new car is probably the Suzuki Swift. Great economy with an economy of technology—just what you’re looking for, right? If you want something completely different, however, you might want to check out the used rebuilt microma at www.tinymotorsworks.com. Still, whatever you do, look for the very smallest dis- placement gas engine available that still meets your needs. That’s today’s best bet, even though we Americans are on quite the power binge with our personal vehicles.

Diesel

Funny thing about diesels: to make up for their lower power-to-weight ratio, most manufacturers make them big. There was a short spurt of small displacement diesel cars back in the 1970s, but they’re all quite forgotten for the ultimate in small displacement diesels, there’s Royal Enfield’s Taurus diesel motorcycle—six horsepower (trying to push) 250 pounds of motorcycle. Jack Paar said it best, I lied you not. The big plus for diesels is this: they’ll run on vegetable oil, and run quite well, apparently something to think about when petroleum runs out.

Hybrids

All, the motorized comfort food of the auto industry, sort of four-wheeled chicken pot pie. Want to feel positively green? Buy one of these twi- engined techno overkills. Now you’ve got twice the maintenance with half the cargo capacity. My Vespa is rated to carry more weight than the Honda Jazz. It gets good gas mileage, but ask the dealer how much it’s going to cost to replace that massive battery pack. And if I were you, I’d ask before I bought the thing. And while you’re at it, ask what happens to the old batteries when you buy new ones (And do he mention cost?) Just because you aren’t spending the money on gas doesn’t mean you aren’t spending the money on energy. Ask questions.

Electric

Please don’t think of electric cars as ‘pollution free’. They aren’t. Even if you ignore, for a time, the battery discard issue, mentioned above all then really do is transfer where the pollution is exhausted into the atmosphere. In the case of the electric vehicle, it goes from out the tailpipe at the back of the car to out the smokestack at the back of the power plant. Not much difference, really. Then there’s that issue of the discarded batteries. Still, if you buy an electric vehicle and can charge it up off the grid with a solar panel, or a wind turbine, now you’re talking almost pollution-free—or at least as close as we’re likely to get for quite some time. (And yes, I know; I’ve con- veniently ignored the issue of pollution from tire rubber, that from the brake linings and those ozone-producing electric motors—not to men- tion the pollution associated with the car’s manu- facture in the first place.) Geez. All of which brings us right back to the federal government’s latest Golden Boy of the Open Road: The HFC-powered electric vehicle. Whew.

Hydrogen Fuel Cells

OK, assuming, for the moment, that these things become a common reality on American roads, with the refueling stations and repair shops neces- sary to keep them on the road, what’s really wrong with them? From an energy cost point of view, maybe plenty. It takes more energy to make the hydrogen (and put it in your tank) than the energy inherent in that tank full of hydrogen, there’s no reason to do it. Sure, government sub- sidies to the hydrogen industry could maintain an artificially low price for quite some time, just as it does with ethanol and gasohol, but eventually the pipe must be paid. Especially in a world where conventional non-renewable energy resources will be dwindling. (And that will be our world in just a few years, in case you’ve forgotten.) Then there’s that pesky battery replacement thing again, since these beasts do require batteries to store energy to some degree—just as you car does now. It’s tough to recycle any vehicle, but what about an HFC? Here’s hoping anything really dangerous in this new technology can simply be recycled. Repeatedly and safely.

The biggest issue with HFC is where the H (the hydrogen) comes from. If it’s going to be pro- duced from natural gas, we’re fast running out of natural gas. Natural gas wells in the United States are depleting at a rate of about 50 percent per well per year. That means we have to drill half as many wells as we have this year just to keep pro- duction steady next year. Want more gas? You’ll help cut our energy by helping heat fuel cells (e.g. all air- planes). That’s still a lot of water—a ton of billion gallons per person per day in the US. Can we really commit that precious resource to such a frivolous use? I’d like to think not, but I’ve been wrong before. Americans will give up their hard-earned before they give up their cars.

So where’s all that hydrogen going to come from? How can we use this natural gas we don’t have? Or how will we replace the vital water resources it takes, if it takes them? And what sort of new and as yet unseen environmental pollution might arise from this new technology being used on such a large scale? Stay tuned—I’m sure we’ll find out when it’s all too late.

Is it all too confounding? Too many bad choices for an environmentally conscious person like your- self? Here, let me make it easy for you—make your next car a bicycle.

There, that was easy enough—and the best choice to boot. You’re welcome.

Chip Hoyes is a planning technician with the County Planning department in Pinellas County, Florida and a fulltime bicycle commuter. This piece was reprinted from www.newcolunist.com.
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Planning as a Tool of Political Control:

Israel's Matrix of Control

By Jeff Halper

In Israel’s thirty-six-year occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and Gaza, planning has been perfected as a tool of political control. Nowhere in the world is planning used with such sophistication to such a single-minded purpose because Israel desires having an “occupation” at all—at the insistence of which it is merely reclaiming the historic land of Israel as the exclusive possession of the Jewish people—it seeks to make its control over the Territories permanent. Maintaining control through outright military actions, though effectively employed, is not a preferred means, since it is brutal, too visual, and generates both internal and foreign opposition. Instead, Israel prefers to use administrative means—and here is where planning comes to the fore. Dressed in neutral professional jargon, its rationale graphically presented in maps, planning is an ideal guise for concealing political ends.

The complex web of bureaucratic constraints on the Palestinian population, combined with massive Israeli construction, enmeshes the Palestinians in what I call a “Matrix of Control.” The Matrix hides the very fact of occupation behind a façade of “proper administration” and “neutral” construction, thus shunting public protest or any push for real change. It creates massive Israeli “facts on the ground” that render the occupation permanent. And it is intended to induce such despair among Palestinians about ever achieving a viable state of their own that they will submit to an Israeli-controlled mini-state.

Creating Facts on the Ground

Consider the following facts:

Since 1967, Israel has expropriated for settlements, highways, “bypass roads,” military installations, nature reserves and infrastructure some 24 percent of the West Bank, 89 percent of Arab East Jerusalem and 25 percent of Gaza.

More than 200 settlements have been constructed in the Occupied Territories, and 400,000 Israelis moved across the 1967 boundaries (200,000 in the West Bank; 200,000 in East Jerusalem; 6,000 in Gaza).

During the Oslo “peace process” Israel constructed a system of twenty-nine “bypass roads,” funded entirely by the United States (at a cost of $5 billion). Together with the settlement blocs and military checkpoints, these highways bypass Palestinian communities, creating massive barriers to Palestinian movement while linking the settlements with Israel, thus confining to more than 200 tiny and impoverished islands.

Construction of seven (of a planned twelve) industrial parks on the “east” between the Occupied Territories and Israel give new life to isolated settlements while robbing Palestinian cities—with which they are in direct competition for workers and markets—of their own economic vitality. The industrial parks exploit cheap Palestinian labor while denying that same labor access to Israel. They also allow Israel’s most polluting and least profitable industries to continue dumping their industrial wastes into the West Bank and Gaza.

Israel’s Matrix of Control extends underground as well, using settlement sites to maintain control over the main aquifers of the Occupied Territories and other vital natural resources.

Even seemingly innocuous holy places such as Rachel’s Tomb in Bethlehem, the Cave of the Patriarchs in Hebron, sites in and around Jerusalem and Joseph’s Tomb in Nablus serve as pretenses for maintaining an Israeli “security presence,” and hence military control reinforced by settlements.

Bureaucracy, Planning and Law in the Service of Political Control

Planning procedures, deriving from a discriminatory legal system and embedded in a Kafkaesque bureaucracy, comprise a subtle but highly effective form of political control that entangle Palestinians in a tight web of restrictions and trigger sanctions whenever Palestinians try to expand their life space. For example:

Israel has taken two British Mandatory planning documents—the Jerusalem Regional Planning Scheme R5 (1942) and the Samaria Regional Planning Scheme RS15 (1945)—and used them to effectively freeze Palestinian development in Jerusalem and the West Bank as it was in the 1940s. RS15, for example, zones the entire West Bank as “agricultural land.” Since this severely limits the construction of houses on such land, Israel can effectively deny Palestinians building permits, and demolish their houses if they build “illegally.” But another little-noticed provision of British planning law gave the District Commission (now Israel’s “Civil Administration”) the “power over to grant a relaxation of any restriction imposed by this scheme.” This has been exploited to permit the construction of hundreds of thousands of housing units for Jews in the settlements of the West Bank and Jerusalem.

Military orders issued by the commanders of the West Bank and Gaza (some 2,000 in number since 1967) have replaced local civil law with policies and procedures designed to strengthen Israeli political control. Thus, Order 59 (1967) grants the Israeli Custodian of Abandoned Properties the authority to declare unutilized, unregistered land as state land, enabling Israel to “legally” claim as state land 22 percent of the West Bank, making it easy to expropriate land from Palestinian owners. Order 270 (1968) designates 250,000 acres of the West Bank as closed “combat zones” which can then be handed over to settlers. Order 291 (1968) stopped the Jordanian process of systematic land regularization, thus preventing Palestinians from registering their lands at all. Order 393 (1970) grants any military commander in Judea and Samaria the authority to prohibit Palestinian construction if he believes it necessary for the security of the Israeli army or to “ensure a public order.”

Order 977 (1982) allows the Israeli army and its agencies (such as the Civil Administration) to proceed with excavation and construction without a permit, providing yet another legal basis for the construction of settlements. Hundreds of other orders prohibit Palestinian building around army bases and installations, around settlements and whole settlement areas and within 200 meters of main roads. Orders effectively curb the development of Arab communities and alienate tens of thousands of acres of land.

Because Palestinians will outnumber Jews in the area between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean by the end of the decade, Israel considers the “demographic bomb” the greatest threat to its hegemony. To counter the trend, Israel actively pursues policies of displacement; exiles and deportation of Palestinians; revocation of residency rights; impoverishment of the population through economic “closeres”; expropriation of land and demolition of houses (10,000 since 1967). In general, Israel makes life so unbearable that they will “voluntarily” emigrate.

Administrative restrictions intrude into every corner of Palestinian life, enveloping the average person in a web of constraints and controls. Severe restrictions on the planting of crops and their sale hits an already impoverished population hard, especially when combined with Israel’s practice of uprooting hundreds of thousands of olive and fruit trees since 1967, either to clear land for settlement activity or for “security” purposes.

Even seemingly innocuous practices such as licensing and inspection of Palestinian businesses are exploited as a way to harass businesses and stunt the local economy.
Barak’s “Generous Offer”

But what about Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak’s “generous offer” of 95 percent of the territories, presumably made at the Tab’a talks in January 2001? Taken at face value, it seems to be “generous” indeed (who, after all, gets 100 percent in negotiations)? At a distinct disadvantage are those who say it was not a good deal, that it would leave the Matrix of Control intact and that it would not lead to a viable Palestinian state. These positions seem to contradict common sense. It is much easier to pin the blame on the Palestinians and justify Israel’s policies of repression.

First off, let’s state the truth: there never was a “generous offer.” In an interview with the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz (September 6, 2002), Barak explained it was plain to me that there was no chance of reaching an agreement at Tab’a. Therefore, I said there would be no negotiations and there would be no delegation and there would be no official discussions and no documentation. Nor would Americans be present in the room. The only thing that took place at Tab’a were non-binding contacts between senior Israelis and senior Palestinians. The 95 percent figure comes from Bill Clinton’s proposal, to which both sides responded favorably but with “reservations.” According to Barak, Israel’s “reservations” filled twenty pages.

But even if there was such an offer, we must be careful not to equate territory with sovereignty. Israel can retain its Matrix of Control by establishing a Palestinian canton. Even if the Palestinians “receive” 85 to 90 percent of the West Bank and Gaza, they still would not have the prerequisites of national self-determination: coherent territory, economic viability and genuine sovereignty. Retaining just 10 to 15 percent of the West Bank would enable Israel to:

- Create a Palestinian entity truncated into at least four cantons—the northern, central and southern parts of the West Bank and Gaza—which would render a Palestinian state non-viable and easily controlled by Israel.
- Consolidate its strategic settlement blocs around the city of Ariel and in the Greater Jerusalem area, blocs that comprise 150,000 Israeli settlers—or 80 percent of the West Bank settlers. In doing so it would create territorial continuity for Israeli settlements while dividing the West Bank into isolated Palestinian islands; remove Jerusalem from the Palestinian sphere; thus cutting out the economic heart of any Palestinian state; and leave Israel in control of the West Bank’s water resources.
- Retain control over highways and Palestinian movement. Over the past decades, and especially during the Oslo “peace process,” Israel has been constructing a system of major highways and “by-pass roads” to link its settlements, creating barriers between Palestinian areas and incorporating the West Bank into Israeli proper. Even if physical control over the highways is relinquished, strategic parts will remain under Israeli control. There are other restrictions as well. The “safe passages” from Gaza to the West Bank, crucial to the viability of a Palestinian state, will continue to be controlled by Israel, and Israeli insist on retaining rights of “emergency deployment” to both the highway system and to the Jordan Valley, severely compromising Palestinian sovereignty. Indeed, the highways would retain the status of Israeli “security roads,” meaning that Palestinian development along them would remain limited.

The settlement blocs and highway grid play key roles in the process of incorporating the West Bank and East Jerusalem into Israeli proper. Again, seemingly innocuous planning lies at the center of this supremely political program. As early as the late 1970s, Ariel Sharon, then head of the Ministerial Committee on Settlements, presented a Master Plan of Incorporation that called for contiguous Israeli urban growth straddling both sides of the “Green Line.”

The massive Trans-Israel Highway project, now nearing completion, provides a new “central spine” for Israel along the West Bank. Hundreds of thousands of Israelis will be resettled in the many towns and cities planned along the length of the highway, especially along the Green Line, in an area of Galilee heavily populated by Arabs. New and expanded Israeli cities, towns and settlements on both sides of the Green Line form a new “metropolitan core-region” in which metropolitan Tel Aviv meets metropolitan Jerusalem, which in turn stretches across most of the central West Bank. The Trans-Israel Highway, integrated with the highways and settlement blocs of the West Bank, reconfigures the entire country and moves the entire population center of the country eastward.

The Political Role of Israeli Planners

The schemes for imprisoning Palestinians in impoverished islands while leaving Israel in control of the entire country—the essence of Barak’s “generous offer”— devoted with strategies to “transfer” them out of the country altogether, the threat of the Sharon government’s policies, looked at in a historical perspective, they form part of a century-long program of displacement—nibul in Hebrew—in which the Jews reclaim the country as their exclusive possession.

In this process planning has always played a key role. It started with the placement of Jewish settlements before 1948 to determine Israel’s future borders. Land use policies following the 1948 war were intended to alienate Palestinian refugees from their lands. Current policies allow settlement expansion, displace Palestinians from their land, and result in house demolitions and the incorporation of the Occupied Territories into Israeli proper. As both a means to control a subordinate population and as an “invisible” way of conquering land, planning has few equivalents.

Indeed, the active involvement of professional planners, most of whom identify politically with the peace movement, raises thorny questions about subordinating professional activities to political and financial considerations. Even more troubling, it may indicate that planners are either not aware of the political uses of their work, or simply do not want to know. In a situation where repression and displacement are largely carried out by administrative means that involve planning and law, these issues are those that deserve wide debate. At the very least, Israeli planners should be confronted with the implications of their professional work at international conferences or in university settings.

Jeff Halper is the coordinator of the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (www.icahd.org). He can be reached at c 0 b d r i s e n g . n e t . i l .
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Fighting “Rural Removal” in Alcântara, Brazil

By Marie Kennedy and Chris Tilly

As Brazil’s new president, Luís Inácio Lula da Silva of the Workers’ Party, takes office, one of the major challenges he faces is democratizing the planning process. Current top-down planning processes in use across most of Brazil mimic the worst of the US urban renewal program of the 1960s and 1970s, which was so effective at razing poor communities that activists gave it the nickname “urban removal.” While most international attention has focused on cities such as Rio and São Paulo—with their teeming favelas (shanties)—it is at least as important for Latin America’s largest nation to confront the “rural removal” that is driving farmers to the favelas in the first place. Among hundreds of community struggles in the Brazilian countryside, the efforts of the community of Alcântara to keep its land from turning into a US military base may be best exemplify the intersecting currents that drive rural conflict.

Few in the United States have heard of Alcântara, a town on Brazil’s northern Atlantic coast. And why should they? Two hundred years ago, Alcântara was the wealthiest city in northern Brazil, but its riches collapsed when slavery ended. Today, descendents of African slaves and indigenous peoples make a living by fishing and farming amidst the ruins of the old colonial city. Alcântara, at the edge of Amazonia and just south of the equator, looks like a tropical paradise, from the lush green vegetation to the flamingo-like scarlet judicial birds flying overhead.

But there is trouble in paradise, and as is so often the case in Latin America, the United States is involved. Back in 1982, the dictatorship then holding power in Brazil seized over one-half the land area of Alcântara to set up a satellite launching base. According to one activist, the base displaced 2000 fishing and farming families to unsustainable “agro-villages,” breaking up communities “without regard to culture or the structure of their lives.” Communities that were economically linked—for example, milk-producing, rice-growing and fishing communities that exchanged products—are now scattered and hungry. Unable to make a living, many of the displaced subsequently moved to the favelas of Alcântara and neighboring São Luis. The base also threatens fish stocks and wetlands. The parallels between this act and government facilitated displacement in the United States (and elsewhere)—fragmenting vital communities, driving the poor to worse and worse locations, contributing to environmental devastation—are striking.

As it turns out, the Brazilian military has proven unable to get its space program off the ground, and it is now announcing the base to the United States. Alcântara’s equatorial location makes it far easier to get payloads into orbit, and US companies are poised to snap up much of the base’s business. But the US military, which controls US space operations, is insisting that in addition to the launch technology the site needs are those of “pressing national interest,” it is difficult to apply this justification to the privatization of the base by leasing it to the United States. They hope that activists in the United States will join them in opposing the base ideal.

The Significance of Alcântara

Alcântara has a political importance in Brazil—beyond the several thousand people directly affected by the base—because it resonates with three decisive issues facing the country: the first is access to productive land. With deindustrialization and factory farming wiping out people’s livelihoods, more and more families are eking out a marginal existence in urban favelas. The government has failed to enforce laws requiring landowners to put their land to productive use and obey labor regulations. But the Landless Workers Movement (Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais sem Terra, MST) has led two million Brazilians to claim unused rural land, under those laws, building thriving agricultural communities and reversing “rural removal.” The MST has played a leading role in linking up land struggles across the country—people occupying unused rural land, communities like Alcântara that have been displaced by ill-conceived public works projects and urban homelessness movements.

Alcântara also marks an important front in the war against corporate-dominated free trade—in this case, bartering Brazil’s land and resources to US aerospace businesses. The Brazilian coalition battling free trade has publicly linked Alcântara to the ALCA—the Portuguese/Spanish initials for the Free Trade Area of the Americas are FTAA—pointing that the phonetic coincidence points to a deeper connection. MST organizer Jonas Borges da Silva declared in a meeting at Alcântara that if the FTAA goes into effect, “Brazil will become the quintal (backyard) of the United States,” adding, “The fight against —
Poverty of Planning:
Tent City, City Hall and Toronto’s New Official Plan

By Adrian Blackwell and Kanishka Goonewardena, for Planning Action

On September 24, 2002 the Toronto media reported two events under two separate headline lines. The smaller headline was about the unveiling of the new official plan of the city of Toronto. This began with news of presentations by Mayor Long and the director of the Planning Department as to how they were going to make Toronto the greatest and most beautiful city. It was followed by public testimony, almost all from well-groomed supporters of the plan, including the usual suspects like developers and taxpayers, as well as world famous experts like Jane Jacobs.

While that show was dogging on in City Hall, security guards hired by Home Depot, under the “supervision” of the police, were on a rampage—kicking people out of Tent City, the post-industri- al man-made island on Toronto's waterfront that has been home for far more than a very large concentration of homeless people. The site was legally taken over by Home Depot, who then confiscated the improvised homes and modest possessions of the homeless people. That sorry spectacle made the headline bigger, which appeared even more infuriating stories that blamed the victims.

City Hall and Tent City

But why two headlines when both news items were really part of the same story? No one in the mainstream media bothered to note how the people evicted from Tent City stormed into City Hall that afternoon. They were looking for the real perpetrators of their evictions—those politicians and planners who are shameless in their enthusiasm for a plan catering so generously to the interests of developers, taxpayers and multinational corporations, at the expense of those who don’t own town and can’t afford properties in the city. Most Torontonians did not need to be rocket scientists to see the link between what happened in Tent City and City Hall on that day.

The very logic of urban development endorsed by the plan—the kind of city planning that is just a code name for the selling of the city to the highest bidder—created Tent City in the first place. It also forced its (former) residents into a bizarre confrontation with ecstatic fans of the plan inside City Hall. According to one eyewitness, “All of a sudden a bunch of people who looked like they weren’t supposed to be there seemed to take over the Council Chambers.” These were not the folks you often see rubbing shoulders with the power brokers of City Hall. Rather, they were the representatives of a large population that just didn’t appear anywhere in the hyperbolic “vision” of the plan.

City planning and urban design, which are meant to create spaces for a better life for everyone, have been hijacked from the people who need that space. Over 100 years ago, Friedrich Engels quite correctly called planning in capitalist cities “hypocritical,” explaining in his famous study of Manchester how “town planning” was really about “hiding from the eyes of wealthy ladies and gentlemen with strong stomachs and weak nerves the misery and squalor which are part and parcel of their own riches and luxury.”

Not much has changed since Engels’ time. The former Tent City and its vast, underutilized surroundings are imagined today by developers and planners alike as the ideal location for social housing and other public amenities, but as a gigantic bourgeois playground and high-tech entertainment complex generously sprinkled with high-end condos—a bright, glossy place where dot.coms and related yuppies of all countries can unite!

Who is this Plan Talking to?

What does the plan say? Whose Toronto are we talking about?

The plan takes up the task of guiding the development of Toronto over the next thirty years with a great vision for the city—one that claims to improve transit, create a more compact urban form, encourage economic growth and modernize the city. The language and the pictures of the plan are most seductive and make want you to believe. But when you look through the glossy pictures and read between the lines, you begin to see what’s really going on.

How to Support the People of Alcântara

People in the United States and around the world can bolster Alcântara’s efforts to win back land rights and prevent the satellite base from being expanded and turned over to the United States.

You can help by:

- Sending messages requesting Brazilian Deputy (the equivalent of a Congressional representa-
tive) Zenaldo Coutinho reject the agreement with the United States. (Walidz Pires, the other Deputy for the Alcântara area, has vocally denounced the deal.) Deputado Zenaldo Coutinho can be contact-
ed in the following ways: email: dep.zenaldocoutinho@camara.gov.br; fax: 011-55-61-318-2266; mail-
ing address, Camara dos Deputados, Anexo 3, 70000 Brasília, DF, Brasil.

- Contributing financially to the Landless Workers’ Movement (MST), which is rallying the resistance to the proposed transfer of the base to the United States. Send tax-deductible contributions (marked “for MST”) to Grassroots International, 179 Boylston Street, Jamaica Plain, MA 02130; or Global Exchange, 2017 Mission Street #303, San Francisco, CA 94110.

- Keeping up-to-date on Alcântara and other Brazilian land struggles by joining the Friends of the MST email list or visiting their website, http://www.mstbrazil.org.

lot, and the same ten million (99 percent of those voting) voted against turning over the base to the United States.

Finally, Alcântara symbolizes the struggles of black and brown Brazilians—who make up almost half the country—for equal rights and respect. Despite the myth of racial democracy, Afro-Brazilians and indigenous people lag behind whites in every economic and social indicator. At a national level, Afro-descendant activists are pushing for affirmative action. They won a limited victory in 1988, when the government agreed to special provisions for quilombos, historical communities of escaped and freed slaves. Like Brazil’s land reform laws, these rules have largely remained a dead letter. So the Movimento—among and across the country, communities with African roots are racing to win the rights they have been promised.

The people of Alcântara and other groups like them across Brazil are fighting for democratic planning and true community development, and they could use some support from us.

Marie Kennedy is associate dean of the College of Public and Community Service at the University of Massachusetts-Boston and a member of the PN Advisory Committee. Chris Tibbs is a professor of regional economic and social development at the University of Massachusetts-Lowell. Their visit to northeast Brazil was arranged by Grassroots International, a nonprofit that provides aid and support to movements working for eco-

The plan raises a number of counter assumptions. It assumes that planners will be reasonable, developers will be benevolent, architects will be brilliant and citizens will be quiet. City planning is presented as a conflict-free process in which everyone, by the grace of the ‘free market’, is a winner.

But as Tenth City folk and many others who closely now tell you, planning is no win-win game. In the social struggles over space in the city, there are, surprisingly, losers. They are the people altogether missing from the plan. That’s why their abrupt appearance in City Hall on September 24 was both odd and apt. To deflect attention away from what the plan can’t see (or, rather, what it does not want you to see), it speaks in animated tones about what it chooses to see and how it sees it. It urges everyone else to see the city the same way. So it looks down upon the city through what it calls the three lenses.

The Vision of the Three Lenses

If we adopt the visionary language of the plan for a moment, what do we see through its first lens? We see downtown spaces and former industrial areas—large areas cleared for intensive development, the removal of existing planning controls (such as zoning). There is hardly a thought given to existing uses or users; in other words, it will be open season for developers to move in, build and make the best bang for their buck.

The second lens zooms in on the “Avenues.” Large suburban east-west roads like Eglington, Lawrence and Finch are strategically primed for gentrification, but without offering “Not In My Backyard” (NIMBY) taxpayers. With no investment in social housing (about which the plan is mute), the intensification of development on these streets can only displace existing residents. Businesspeople who operate small-scale or start-up companies and renters unable to afford the new luxuries promised in these hot spots will have to pack up and leave.

In the third lens we see what the plan quaintly calls “Neighborhoods,” which account for 75 percent of the land area of the city. Here change is foretold. This obviously caters to NIMBYism, which official planners hold in the same high regard with which they consider the economic wisdom of laissez-faire development. In the context of a city otherwise ruled by developers, this “neighborhood” designation (distinct from the already dense “apartment neighborhoods” where further densification is encouraged!) promises to send property values skywards.

In fact, the plan’s language of lenses is deeply misleading. The lenses do not represent different ways of seeing, or distinct perspectives. They simply refer to three levels (densities) of development—high, medium and negligible. These designations serve the interests of people who own property and people who develop land. The derogation of Toronto’s downtown zones, now called “employment areas,” caters to powerful players in the global economy, creating “flexible enterprise zones” with publicly subsidized streets, services and spaces.

When you really look at it, then, the function of the three lenses becomes obvious—to partition the city into three distinct zones, one for each of the three dominant interest groups served by the plan: developers, taxpayers and global capitalists. It has nothing to say to anyone else. What the language of lenses obscures is therefore clear: the questionable reasons and mechanisms for favoring the interests of these powerful groups.

What Will Be the Effects of the Plan?

While the plan represents a victory for the ruling classes of Toronto and the world, some of the background documents prepared for the plan reveal traces of a struggle, even within City Hall. Toronto at the Crossroads, for example, includes a crystal clear map of the concentrations of “socially vulnerable areas” in the city. It illustrates the growing economic polarization and pockets of poverty that form a ring running through the outer suburbs and around the inner city. Any reasonable official plan aiming to build a sustainable and equitable urban life would have started with these real problems for existing residents. As it is, however, the reality that Toronto’s high-density modernist housing is that people are both concentrated and isolated from one another at the same time.

Real separation and isolation are symbolically overcome in the image of the beautiful city. The objective of urban design here is to mask beneath the spectacle of derelict urban space the potentially explosive realities of the new amalgamated city of developers, taxpayers and global capital.

The relocation of poor populations to badly maintained suburban spaces and the constant move towards the gentrification of downtown neighborhoods is just the current manifestation of a long history of evictions and slum clearance in Toronto. In the 1970s with the movement to stop the Spadina Expressway and save historic downtown neighborhoods in the early days, lip service was paid to the construction of affordable housing, the protection of downtown industries and the maintenance of diverse populations, but by the early 1980s these explicit goals had all but disappeared. What has remained is a constant since 1970 in the project of recuperating Toronto’s “livable downtown” for the middle and affluent classes. The result of this planning legacy—which the new official plan continues—has been the increasing concentration of poverty in dense suburban neighborhoods.

The alienation of the physical and symbolic violence constantly inflicted on individuals forced to live in these suburban spaces. These have a number of real effects.

• The physical distance between social classes protects affluent people from the violent power and frustration that economic exploitation creates.

• The physical separation prevents middle- and upper-class Toronto from ever experiencing poverty firsthand, allowing them to indulge in a fantasy of equality, while breeding stereotypes about people they don’t have to interact with everyday.

• Separation organizes the city so that affluent people have much better access to not only luxury goods, but also to essential services like healthy food, a clean environment, healthcare, public transportation, parks, public spaces and jobs.

• Isolation strengthens the communities that could otherwise create unified resistance to this alienating condition. One of the lasting legacies of Toronto’s high-density modernist housing is that people are both concentrated and isolated from one another at the same time.

What Toronto really has going for it is neither the “free market” nor its global city status, but its diverse community of committed people who are unwilling to put up with the violence of city planning—no matter how rational it seems to the “common sense” of corporate greed, professional planners and academic consultants. It has not gone unnoticed to these activists how the removal and dilution of various planning controls in the new plan (tax zoning, streamlined approval processes, restricted uses of public construction, behind-the-scenes maneuvering, etc.) amounts to an erosion of democracy in the planning process and a submission of urban life to the merciless logic of the ‘free market.’

In recent years direct actions led by the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP) and others have applied pressure on downtown neighborhoods, rudely waking Toronto’s elite from their gentrified dreams. Required as a complement to the fight against gentrification, however, are effective strategies and tactics of resistance emanating from Toronto’s suburban spaces that are designed to overcome the very real isolation found in the peripheral areas of the city. A model for this kind of strategy is the Los Angeles Bus Riders Union, which was founded by dispersed riders spread throughout the Los Angeles area.

Adrian Blackwell and Kantibha Goenkaardena teach architecture, urban design and planning at the University of Toronto and are members of Planning Action Toronto, a group of architects, planners and activists in Toronto.

Communities of Resistance

The new official plan packs a lot of power: the financial power of business elites, the ideological power of mainstream planning intellectuals and professionals, the coercive power of the police. But the political-economic-bureaucratic logic of the plan also has its Achilles heel—the people it disreglasses.
ACSP Conference Report:
Planners Network Session on
Four Decades of Radical Urban Planning

By Ann Forsyth and Norma Rantis

Although it contained a strong undercurrent of nostalgia for the 1960s, the panel also raised a number of potential directions for the future.

What is radical planning and what does it mean to be a radical planner? Between Emittance and Notoriety: Four Decades of Radical Urban Planning (CUPR Press, 2002) by FN founder Chester Hartman serves as the starting point for a roundtable discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Association of College Schools of Planning in Baltimore, Maryland, in November 2002. As moderator Barbara Rahder noted at the beginning of the session, a strength of Hartman’s book is its form. The introduction is a story about his life and refers to Hartman’s own experiences and writings. While framed by the book, the discussion in which panelists and audience members in the PN-sponsored session took part was wide-ranging, about the trajectory of progressive and radical planning in the decades since the 1960s.

Chester Hartman

Marie Kennedy focused on the shift from advocacy planning to transformative community development. The advocacy planning movement of the 1960s and 1970s, of which Chester was a leader, was characterized by community struggles focused on equity and the redistribution of existing resources. At the time that advocacy planners were under attack for having taken part in decisions that resulted in neighborhoods being uprooted, it was a time when planners worked for those who could pay for their services, governmental or private, and in essence were advocating the interests of those groups. Marie Kennedy identified four significant contributions made by advocacy planning: 1) challenging the notion of planning as a neutral science or apolitical; 2) institutionalizing community participation in planning in the public sphere; 3) introducing to planning education hands-on field projects in collaboration with underserved groups; and 4) a human legacy. Many of today’s progressive planners had their ideas and careers forged in the advocacy planning movement. However, advocacy planning failed to effectively frame technical assistance in relationships to people’s movements in such a way as to establish mutual benefits or to challenge people’s existing goals. Advocacy planners often had a confused notion of what popular participation in and control over planning decisions meant, so that planning practice remained representational rather than participatory.

Transformative planning, on the other hand, is based on the understanding that significant redistribution of resources follows redistribution of power. It assumes knowledge is power, and utilizes methods from participatory research and popular education to put in control those who are most affected by the problems addressed in the planning process. In this way, transformative planning elevates community development to at least an equal footing with tangible products. This approach does not imply that everyone should be made a professional planner or a consumer of the particular set of skills developed through professional education and practice. It does imply, however, that planning should integrate the overarching values of communities in the decision-making process and develop tools that frame real alternatives, including organizing, political and educational strategies and traditional planning outcomes. Despite its limitations, the advocacy planning movement—and the approach employed by Chester in his own practice and in the education of planners—is a critical basis on which to establish such an agenda.

Luis Aponte-Paredes contributed to the roundtable discussion by focusing on the missing voices in Chester’s book. He suggested that when one speaks about advocacy for the poor, one is speaking about a generic group of people and that such a classification does not capture the varied, sometimes competing, interests or struggles that are at stake. He emphasized the need to compare Chester’s narrative of radical planning history with other histories that have been written, such as those of Latinos, Asians or Blacks. Each of these groups has had its own projects. Luis acknowledged that such research, in turn, would demand an assessment of the relative advantages and disadvantages of ethno-centric development.

The roundtable ended with questions from the audience. An overarching question that dominated the discussion concerned the methods and strategies that could be employed to teach or engage in transformative planning, particularly in the present context of a conservative political landscape. Most of the speakers suggested that the grassroots level was an increasingly important site for activism, since there is now less support from the political establishment above, and since the courts are no longer a course for redress. This involvement would have to be fundamentally educational. It could include identifying the broader political, economic and social trends and revealing the racist or sexist assumptions underlying them; alerting people to media bias and how to challenge it; and learning about the history of social movements in the 1960s to establish what could be gleaned from those experiences for present day challenges. Several people identified the need for educators to forge close ties with local communities; they suggested sending students out into the field and also bringing activists and community leaders into the classroom. Overall, it was seen as vital to accommodate different perspectives and narratives. As Chester Hartman suggested, “who” is doing the telling is important, and there are many perspectives to learn from.

Norma Rantis and Ann Forsyth are members of the PN Magazine editorial group.
From PN Co-Chair Ayse Yonder

At the ACS conference in November 2002, Planners Network organized a reception and a well-attended session titled "Four decades of radical urban planning" that focused on PNer Chester Hartman's new book, *Between Emprise and Notoriosis: Four Decades of Radical Urban Planning* (Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, 2002; ask for discount for PN members). The speakers included Tom Angotti, Marie Kennedy, Luis Aponte-Pare, Barbara Rahder, and Chester Hartman. (see article on page 36)

Instead of a conference in 2003, the Steering Committee decided to promote events organized by students and faculty at campuses throughout North America as part of a Campus Drive. The new initiative will be coordinated by Richard Milgrom (SUNY/Buffalo) and Chester Hartman (Poverty & Race Research Action Center). Students and faculty on campuses across the United States and Canada will be invited to form a local committee to plan an event or series on participatory community planning. Events may include meetings, conferences, charrettes, field trips or other forms of open dialogue with community groups outside the university. PN will provide each school committee with: 1) a packet of PN brochures, the PN reader, and back issues of the newsletter and magazine, 2) speakers and panelists on request, and 3) up to $1,000 to organize the proposed events. Each campus committee will submit a short one-page proposal to the Steering Committee stating their objectives, proposed activity, membership goals, and the award amount requested. Please contact the Steering Committee at cgroniumdesign@buffalo.edu if you have questions or want to participate in this initiative.

The PN New York Chapter's Forum series, co-sponsored by Pratt Institute, will start with two sessions on immigration issues in February 2003: "New York City's Changing Immigrant Landscapes" and "NYC Electoral Redistricting and Immigrant Political Empowerment," organized by Lynn McCormick and Arturo Sanchez. On March 14, "Rebuilding Lessons from Europe" will be a follow-up to last year's conference on post-9/11 rebuilding efforts. Planners and community activists who participated in a study tour to Europe will be part of an event organized by Pratt Institute Community and Environment Development (PCECD) and will share their observations. The last session on April 11 will critically discuss the implications of Olympics on New York City. All meetings will be held at Pratt Manhattan on 144 W 41st Street. (See Box on page 38)

Upcoming Conferences in Europe From PN Co-Chair Barbara Rahder

In the summer of 2003 there are at least two conferences in Europe in which PN members will be actively involved, and certainly more are welcome to become involved.

The International Network for Urban Research and Action (INURA) will be hosting a conference in Berlin from June 22-28, 2003. As the name suggests, INURA conferences typically attract a mix of academic researchers and urban activists from around the world, including Switzerland, Italy, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, Canada, France, the United States, Mexico, Brazil and Australia. Several PN members are active in INURA and will be taking part in the Berlin conference. While the conference programme hasn't been announced yet, previous themes have included "Solidarity," "Social and Cultural Rights," "Rights & Rights," "Florence (2001); "Urban Contrasts," "Brussels (2000); "Regeneration and Renewal," "Glasgow & Durham, UK (1999); "Diverse City," "New York City Policy: What is it and what it can become: Innovation: Great new practices from New York City and all over the world:

How To Do It: Implement community plans and projects

Feb. 20 Developing & implementing 197-a plans: Jocelyne Chait, Planning Consultant
Feb. 27 Developing affordable housing in changing neighborhoods: Brad Lander, Fifth Avenue Committee
March 13 Safe streets and traffic calming: Lisa Schreitman, Hunter College
March 20 Historic districts and community preservation: Vicki Weiner, Municipal Arts Society
March 27 Planning and zoning for mixed use: Eva Hanhardt, Municipal Art Society
April 3 Planning for green buildings and sustainable communities
April 10 From waste transfer stations to comprehensive waste management: Tim Logan, NYC Environmental Justice Alliance
April 24 Brownfields development: Matty Stanilis, Environmental Consultant
May 1 Inclusionary zoning: Laura Wolf-Rowers, Pratt Institute

All sessions are Thursday evenings 5:10-7:00 pm at Hunter College, 68th & Lexington, NYC

Registration and information: William Beauford 212-772-6351 or email: wbeauford@hunter.cuny.edu

Nominal cost; certificates and course credit available
Events

April 4-5. Critical Tools, the third biennial Network for Theory, History, and Criticism of Architecture colloquium, will be held at the Institute for Policy Research, Washington, DC. For more information, visit http://www.ipr.org/ncta.html.


July 5-3. The Annual Journal Of Urban Spaces History, Culture And Design/ Anuario De Espacios Urbanos Historia, Cultura Y Diseño is seeking submissions for its 10th Anniversary Edition. Some of the topics suitable for publication include: urban form, territory and architecture; social movements and political participation; demography; social and cultural identities (including questions of class, ethnicity, and gender). Deadline: February 28. For more information contact: rias@esercxazo.unic.un.mx (email); (01 521) 5518 0568 (phone).

The Building & Social Housing Foundation is seeking applicants for its World Habitat Awards, which granted annually to human settlement projects that provide practical and innovative solutions to current housing needs and problems—both developed and developing countries—and which are capable of replication. Deadline: June 1. For more information, visit www.architecturalfoundation.org/books/awards/bshf.html or http://www.worldhabitation.org.

Publications


Community Organizing: A Populist Base for Social Equity and Smart Growth, from the Funder's Network for Smart Growth & Livable Communities, seeks to provide greater insight into the premise and power of low-income community organizing, and what it means for low-income groups to take on regional equity. Available at www.fundnetnetwork.org/info/rntocat/2778/inforum_recat_show.htm?doc_id=140996.


Development Report Card for States, from the Corporation for Enterprise Development, ranks states according to three indexes—performance, business vitality and community capacity—and finds that states that have invested in the building blocks of long-term economic growth are doing better, despite economic hard times, than their peers. Available at http://reciced.org/


The Employment Experience of Public Housing Residents: Findings from the Jobs-Plus Baseline Survey, from Mathematica Demonstration Research Corporation, dispels some widespread myths about public housing residents, i.e. that they are harder to employ than other low-income working age populations. Available at www.mdrc.org/1557868_jpemployment/jpemployment_overview.htm.

False Hope: A Critical Assessment of the HOPE VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program, prepared by the National Housing Law Project together with the Poverty & Race Research Action Center, Sherwood Research Associates, and Everywhere and Now Public Housing Residents Organizing Nationally Together. The report argues that the HOPE IV program launched almost ten years ago to address the most troubled portion of the public housing stock, has been the source of new problems as serious as those it was created to address. Available at www.shbhp.org/false_hope.htm.

Identifying the Real Costs and Benefits of Sports Facilities, from the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, addresses the inadequate information available to policymakers about the real costs and benefits of sports facilities by establishing a baseline of that includes a broad understanding of existing literature on sports facilities and economic development, and an awareness of the full range of costs and benefits of these projects. Available at www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/pub-detail/bhs/571.


Modest Progress: The Narrowing Spatial Mismatch Between Blacks and Jobs in the 1990s, from the Brookings Institution, analyzes US Census Bureau data and concludes that blacks' physical isolation from jobs improved slightly in the 1990s, though it remains significant. The survey also observes that the residential movement of black households within metropolitan areas drove most of the decline of segregation. The survey also observes that the residential movement of black households within metropolitan areas drove most of the decline of segregation. Available at www.brookings.edu/perspectives/2001/08/15_urbanpolicy/spatialmismatch.may.htm.

Race, Equity and Smart Growth: Why People of Color Must Speak for Themselves, from the Environmental Justice Resource Center, argues that while some people of color communities and grass-roots organizations are taking action on their own to address a range of incomes that affect them, a national equity and smart growth strategy is needed among African Americans and other people of color environmental justice organizations and networks, educational institutions, churches, civil rights groups, professional associations, legal groups, community development corporations, business associations, banks, and health care providers. Available at www.eje.ca.us/acsequestimizationgrowth.htm.

Rebuilding Community: A Toolkit For Historic Preservation And Neighborhood Revitalization, from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, discusses how to use historic preservation to address the affordable housing shortage resulting from success stories across the country; it describes effective public policies, innovative financing programs, model partnerships and powerful marketing and design programs that have been used successfully in communities to stimulate housing revitalization. Available at www.nationaltrust.org/press/2002/213_toolkit.html.

School Finance and Sprawl: How Pennsylvania's System of School Finance Drives Sprawl and Undermines Pennsylvania's Older Communities, from 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania, focuses on land use issues overlooked in the ongoing debate about property taxes, arguing that Pennsylvania's outdated property tax system and education funding systems threaten the viability of Pennsylvania's older communities and drive sprawl. Available at www.10000friends.org/Web_Pages/News/SchoolFinanceAndSprawl111802.pdf.

Seizing City Assets: Ten Steps to Urban Land Reform, from the Brookings Institution, examines the significant problems and opportunities associated with abandoned land and vacant space in many of the nation's cities. Available at www.brookings.edu/perspectives/2001/10/01_urbanpolicy/seizingcityassetsac.pdf.

Cont. on page 46
UPDATES

Bringing America Home

Planners Network contributed $100 to the National Coalition for the Homeless and its campaign in support of  The Bringing America Home Act. This bill, introduced by Congresswoman Julia Carson (D-IN) and Congressman John Conyers (D-MI), develops a comprehensive housing agenda that addresses the majority of the homeless experience facilities, new home ownership, and maintains a commitment to tenants by improving public housing and more choices for those living in assisted housing. The bill includes a resolution supporting the idea that housing is a basic human right, an expansion of resources for affordable housing and homelessness programs, and greater police and work supports, health care and services, and civil rights protection for people experiencing homelessness.

PN Bio/Obituary: JEFFREY B. HOCHMAN

Jeffrey Hochman B. Hochman, a Roosevelt Island, New York City resident, passed away on Monday, October 21, 2002. He is survived by his wife, Dr. Jacqueline Pope; stepchildren, Neneka Pope, Donna Pope Tomlinson, Rhonda Pope Stephens and Lauren Pope Forbes; father, Sam Hochman; sister, Lori Hrica and her husband John Hrica; niece and nephew, Jennifer Hrica and Matthew Hrica respectively and numerous friends and family. The cause of death was leukaemia. As a result, Jeffrey Hochman served his family and friends and are now experiencing loss.

Jeffrey Hochman loved urban life completely, especially New York City and Roosevelt Island in particular. He completely embraced the idea of “city citizen”. As a result, Jeffrey Hochman was a Masters degree in Urban Planning from New York University in 1990. For his PhD at the City University of New York. He helped establish Planners Network. He was employed full-time as a Project Manager at the Department of Design and Construction, and employed as an adjunct professor at LaGuardia Community College. Jeffrey Hochman was an active participant in the Roosevelt Island Residents’ Association’s Community Council and the Rivercross Committee for Concerned Shareholders, attending meetings and providing invaluable research data and other information to both organizations. It was in 2002 that he battled his illness on his own terms, always doggedly pushing forward, while continuing to both the city and the community that he loved. Teaching was his passion. Thus his friends and family have established a scholarship in his name to be awarded to students most in need of tuition assistance. The family humbly requests that you join their efforts and contribute to the fund.

Donations can be sent to:
LaGuardia Education Fund, Inc.,
31-10 Thomson Avenue
Room E-13
Long Island City, New York 11101

Kindly note the following on the memo line of your check: Jeffrey Hochman Scholarship Fund.

New Appointments

Joe Greng (Ph.D., Cornell University) has recently assumed the position of Assistant Professor in the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Michigan. Joe researches the relationships between transportation policy and city development patterns. He is currently studying how suburbanization influences population and land-use changes. Inequality was also a focus on recent changes in national transportation policy. Other research interests include methods of spatial analysis, urban policies, and new forms of social movements emerging in the field of transportation. He teaches classes in transportation policy, GIS, and urban theory.

Kara Heffernan recently relocated from New York City to Chicago, after completing a 2-year contract with the Ford Foundation, where she worked in its Community & Resource Development Unit. She just started a project at the Center for Neighborhood Technology, an organization grounded in principles of sustainable development that works to support and implement new tools and methods that create livable urban communities.

Eric Mann (Director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles) is the author of the newly-released book, Dispatches from Durham: Firsthand Commentaries on the World Conference Against Racism and Post-September 11th National Security State. With a foreword by Robin D.G. Kelley (author of Freedom Dreams), 216 pp., 2002. The book is published by Frontlines Press and the cost is $14.95, with a 20% discount for 10 or more. Eric has been a civil rights, anti-Vietnam war, Labor, and environmental organizer for 35 years with the Congress of Racial Equality; the Students for a Democratic Society; the United Auto Workers, and the L.A. Bus Riders Union. Eric also worked on book or to order a copy, visit the website: www.frontlinespress.com or call (212) 887-2800.


PN Member Updates

An update from PNer and President-Elect of AICP, Daniel Lauber: The members of APA…
December 5 suggesting that the United States "wouldn't have had all these problems over all these years" if Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), the presidential nominee of the breakaway Dixiecrat Party and a strong racial segregationist, had been elected president in 1948.

"The ACP Board of Commissioners can no longer remain silent when one of our nation's leaders espouses policies of racial segregation," said ACP President Sam Casella of Tallahassee, Florida. "Sen. Lott's comments legitimize the racial bigotry that has led to the racially discriminatory exclusionary zoning and housing policies that make it so difficult for professional planners to conduct the inclusionary planning they are pledged to implement."

Under the ACP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, forum and regional planners are duty-bound not to engage in planning practices that exclude minorities from many communities. Racial discrimination underlies most of our nation's downtown problems that planners are working to solve, the ACP Commission said. "We have a principled obligation to demand that someone holding such beliefs not lead the Senate," Casella said. He added that two of ACP’s primary responsibilities are to support the ethics of its members who must often contend with similar bigotry in their capacity as planners in communities where residents supporting racial segregation attempt to subvert fair land use, environmental, and infrastructure decisions.

"Just which 'problems' does Senator Lott mean," asked ACP President-Elect Daniel Lauber of River Forest, Illinois. "Is he referring to the development of racially integrated communities? Is he talking about the many suburbs that have been built to exclude whites to live away from African-Americans? Does he believe that the color of people's skin should exclude them from holding professional jobs like planners, doctors, or lawyers — jobs from which African-Americans were actually barred by law under segregation? Does he think that African-Americans should not have full access to living the American Dream?"

WELCOME
NEW PLANNERS NETWORK MEMBERS
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ners want to fulfill their obligations under the AICP Code of Professional Responsibility. When elected officials like Sen. Lott make statements that support racial segregation, it makes it difficult, if not impossible, for us to perform our jobs ethically and to practice sound planning."

"The tragedy with racism is that it never really goes away," noted AICP Commissioner Mark Winograd of Venice, California. "It simply becomes more emboldened whenever we are more tolerant of it, whenever we stop challenging it. When the spotlight is on it, it retreats back into its ugly hole -- much the way Sen. Lott is now backtracking," Winograd added.

Located in Washington, D.C., AICP is the professional Institute of the American Planning Association (APA). According to the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, members of AICP are ethically obligated to facilitate tolerant, inclusive communities, and to guard against exclusionary zoning and other discriminatory practices. The AICP ethics code states that AICP members must:

"Strive to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons, and must urge the alteration of policies, institutions and decisions which oppose such needs; and"

"Strive to increase the opportunities for women and members of recognized minorities to become professional planners."

For further comments, contact:

• Sam Cassella, AICP President: 850-219-0029 (Tallahassee, Florida)
• Daniel Lauber, AICP President-Elect: 708-360-5200 (River Forest, Illinois)
• Mark Winograd, AICP Commissioner: 310-915-5001 (Venice, California)

PN Resources [cont. from page 41]

Smart Growth: The Future of the American Metropolis, published by the London School of Economics, reviews the current state of smart-growth and metropolitan thinking in the US. It outlines the demographic, market, and development trends affecting metropolitan areas; describes how current government policies facilitate the excessive decentralization of people and jobs; and how smart-growth reforms are being enacted; and identifies the major challenges the smart-growth cause needs to address in order to succeed in shaping sustainable metropolitan communities. Available at: www.brookings.edu/urban/publications/2002/1014katz_zilke2.htm.

Subsidizing the Low Road: Economic Development in Baltimore, from Good Jobs First, details how Baltimore's past and present economic development practices have failed to create family-wage jobs. The report also points out that while past efforts often involved federal and state funds, the city is now making increased use of Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILOTs) and Tax Increment Financing (TIF), both of which threaten to reduce future local property tax revenues for education, infrastructure and other public services. Available at: www.goodjobsfirst.org/pdf/balt.pdf.


Tango 73: A Bus Rider's Diary, a documentary from New Day Films, tells the stories of three women who depend on AC Transit's Number 73 bus to get about their daily lives along the east shore of the San Francisco Bay. The film is available for use by professors, community groups and libraries at: www.newday.com.

The US Department of Transportation's Bureau of Transportation Statistics created this site to provide one-stop shopping for access to over 100 transportation-related databases. Information can be searched by mode, subject or agency. A brief description of each database is available and many databases can be downloaded directly. Available at: www.transtats.bts.gov.

For over 25 years, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning and social justice. PN members in 30 states of the U.S. and 10 other countries receive its bimonthly publication, 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 American College of Building Appraisers.

The PN Conference has been held annually each spring since 1994. These gatherings combine speakers and workshops with exchanges involving local communities, PN conferences engage in discussions that help inform political strategies at the local, national, and international levels. Recent conferences have been held in Washington DC, East St. Louis, IL, Brooklyn NY, Pomona CA, Lowell MA, Toronto, Canada, and Rochester, NY.

Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others! All members must pay annual dues. The minimum dues for PN Network members are as follows:

$25 Students and income under $25,000
$35 Income between $25,000 and $50,000
$50 Income over $50,000, organizations and libraries
$100 Sponsoring Members - if you earn over $50,000, won't you consider helping at this level?

PN MEMBERS IN CANADA
Membership fees by Canadadian members may be paid in Canadian funds:
$40 for students, unemployed, and those with incomes $40,000
$50 for those with incomes between $40,000 and $60,000
$75 for those with incomes over $60,000
$150 for sustaining members

Make cheques in Canadian funds payable to "Planners Network" and send membership form to: Barbara Rahder, Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3

PN CONFERENCES
If interested in joining the PN Toronto lattice, include your e-mail address at payment or send a message to Barbara Rahder at rahder@yorku.ca.

PURCHASING A SINGLE ISSUE
Planners Network Magazine is available by single issue. If non-members wish to purchase a single issue of the magazine, please mail a check for $10 or credit card information to Planners Network at 278 DeKalb Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11205. Please specify the issue and provide your email address or a phone number for queries.

Back issues of the newsletters are also available. The single issue price for the Reader is $6 but there are discounts available for bulk orders.


PLANNERS NETWORK ON LINE
The PN WEB site is at: www.plannersnetwork.org

The PN LISTSERV:
PN maintains an on-line mailing list for members to post and respond to queries, list job postings, conference announcements, etc. To join, send an email message to join-planner@list.pratt.edu with "subscribe please without the quotes" in the body of the message (not the subject line). You'll be sent instructions on how to use the list.

Canadian members:
See column at right.

Dues are deductible to the extent permitted by law.

Canadian members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half page</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 page</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8 page</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PN ADVERTISING RATES:

Yes! I want to join progressive planners and work towards fundamental change.

I am a renewing member -- Keep the faith!

My contribution is $________. Make checks payable to PLANNERS NETWORK.

My credit card is Visa MC Amex Card No. Exp. date __________

Billing address:

Name ____________________________
Organization ______________________
Address __________________________
City _____________________________ Zip ________
Telephone _________________________ Fax __________
Email ____________________________

Mail this Form to:
Planners Network
379 Dekalb Ave.
Brooklyn, NY 11205

INTERNATIONAL MEMBERS: Please send U.S. funds as we are unable to accept payment in another currency. Thanks.

Mail this Form to:
Planners Network
379 Dekalb Ave.
Brooklyn, NY 11205

INTERNATIONAL MEMBERS: Please send U.S. funds as we are unable to accept payment in another currency. Thanks.

INTERNATIONAL MEMBERS: Please send U.S. funds as we are unable to accept payment in another currency. Thanks.
In This Issue

World Trade Center Design Proposals

Homeland Security

Rural Removal in Brazil

ACSP Panel Recap

Your Last Issue?

Please check the date on your mailing label. If the date is more than one year ago this will be your last issue unless we receive your annual dues RIGHT AWAY! See page 47 for minimum dues amounts.

And while you're at it send us an UPDATE on what you're doing. MOVING?
Please send us your new address.