Building Bridges

By Eve Baron, Issue Editor

Typically we think of walls and bridges, the theme of this year's Planners Network Conference (New York, June 24-27), as physical structures. Participants in several of the workshop sessions reminded us that some bridges and walls can also be metaphysical and invisible, defining our landscapes all the same in ways calculated to symbolize containment, disempowerment and separation. The main issue in how walls and bridges are created and collectively perceived is the distribution of power. Two entities, if they have equal power, can agree upon the meaning and purpose of a wall or a bridge. [Cont. on page 2]
In every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations.

From the Great Law of the Iroquois Confederacy

The SEVENTH GENERATION

A case in point is Belfast, Northern Ireland, where the wall works because it enables a mutually agreed upon goal of reducing violent confrontations between Catholics and Protestants (see this issue’s article by Rogalski and Vance, page 51). The Wall in Israel, on the other hand, is a visceral, inescapable reminder of who wields power in the region, and of who has the resources to use the tools of planning to dominate and oppress. The Israeli Wall almost certainly will be the beginning of a story, the resolution and conclusion of that story is not predictable and depends on actions taken by all of us. Sometimes walls galvanize interests and spur social movements—the Berlin Wall is a prime example of this—and the Israeli Wall is generating opposition locally and around the world. The exciting keynote speech by Palestinian lawyer Diana Buttu brought into focus the extent to which construction of the Israeli Wall is part of a larger planning and political strategy.

In the United States, the placing of indigeneous peoples on reservations following American European interpretations of treaty rights walled them off from ancestrral homelands and communities of relatives. Reservation walls were porous only when it suited the claims Americans made on indigenous lands, as in the illegal sale of allotment parcels after the passage of the Dawes Act in 1887, or the claim of state and local governments to the reserve land generated on indigenous land by the sale of goods and services to non-Indians. The walls have not been so permeable for indigenous people—the movement of ideas, information and practices has been almost exclusively uni-directional. Western notions of planning have shaped most of the development taking place on indigenous land in the recent past.

The lead article in this issue by Ted Jojola reports on the creation of a new bridge between mainstream planning and indigenous practices. The American Planning Association (APA) recently adopted Indigenous Planning as its 18th Division. Although a network of planners working in indigenous communities has existed in one form or another for quite some time, its institutionalization as an APA division acknowledges indigenous planning as a distinct field with its own history, core principles, methods and practices. It is only by virtue of a decade of effort by its leaders that indigenous planning was able to break into the APA. These leaders are committed to building bridges between each other and to the broader planning profession.

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

Progressive Planning seeks articles that describe and analyze progressive physical, social, economic and environmental planning in urban and rural areas. Articles may be up to 2000 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 any substantial rewriting or changes will be checked with the author. A photograph or illustration may be included. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. Send to the Editor at langotti@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 4, April 1, July 1 and October 1.

Upcoming Topics (articles welcome):

Olympic Cities
U.S. Urban Policy After the 2004 Elections
Global Warming and Energy
Design, Arts and Culture
Race and Planning
Indigenous Planning
Sharing Indigenous Planning: APA’s Newest Division

by Ted Jojola

The new Indigenous Planning Division in the American Planning Association (APA) is meant to identify and link planning practitioners that work among tribal nations and indigenous communities. This bridge is needed to provide a forum for sharing and showcasing the planning efforts of indigenous practitioners, especially those that advocate for the use of cultural values in their approaches to community development.

Although U.S. federally-recognized American Indian tribes, Native Alaskans and Native Hawaiians are among the most visible indigenous communities, they are not the only ones. The history of Westernization is replete with examples of traditional land-based communities overtaken and subsumed by outside forces. In spite of the unyielding social and political forces that have attempted to limit their inherent powers of self-government, indigenous communities have survived. They have managed—in various ways—to maintain their own cultural identities through the development of formal and informal collective practices.

APA Indigenous Planning Division Mission Statement

To develop a professional organization that advocates for a community development approach based on an indigenous planning paradigm. The practice of indigenous planning is predicated on adhering to land-tenure traditions and upholding the unique cultural worldviews of indigenous communities.

Since the passage of the 1975 Indian Self-Determination Act, tribes have assumed their rightful role of contracting their own education, health, social and economic development services. Now, with the emergence of Indian casino gaming and the impacts of the encroachment of urbanization onto tribal lands, planning issues have become even more complex and varied.

Given this emerging context, there is a need to educate planners through the exchange of ideas and approaches to indigenous community development. Solutions that address the complex interplay of public policy and indigenous sovereignty in these communities need to be presented and shared. This task means informing the profession about the complex set of issues, laws and regulations that apply to indigenous communities.

Origins

In 1961, a mostly young, idealistic group of native scholars and activists gathered at the American Indian Chicago Conference. Its purpose was to involve Indian leaders in updating the 1928 Meriam Report on the conditions and federal policies toward American Indians. Unbeknownst to anyone, this conference was to usher forth the era of Indian self-determination, sparking a movement that presumed that ideas originated from a people’s direct experience. A year later, a Declaration of Purpose was presented to President John F. Kennedy in a formal White House ceremony. And, because indigenous people were nurtured in a tradition of collective action, tribal community development had to be based on ideals that could only come from a successful history of shared experiences. This is known as an indigenous “worldview.” It has united native peoples, and also distinguished them from non-Indians who did not share the same history.

Over the course of several years, the outcomes of meetings of native scholars and activists eventually led to the formulation of a theory of action that came to be called “Indigenous Planning.” It was also a call for a radical reexamination of contemporary planning practice through long-term learning, the empowerment of community voice and the advocacy of culture and tradition. In 1995, the movement formulated its five basic principles. These were:

1. People thrive in community;
2. Ordinary people have all the answers;
3. People have a basic right to determine their own future;
4. Oppression continues to be a force that deviates people; and
5. The people are beautiful, already.


The most recent initiative was the Indigenous Planning Network (IPN). The organization had been seeded at the annual conference of the 1995 American Planning Association in Chicago where planners who worked in native communities embarked on reestablishing a professional organization modeled after the defunct United Indian Planners Association (UIPA). Influenced by the 1994 United Nations pronouncement on the International Decade of the World’s Indigenous People, the Geographic Land Information Systems (GLIS) Department of the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin took the lead role in convening this “indigenous” initiative.

The Concept of Indigenous Planning

While it seems as though the Indigenous Planning paradigm is a new concept, its principles are actually a reformulation of planning practices that have been used by “traditional” communities for millennia. Before traditional authority had been wrested away or usurped by Euro-western agencies, tribal societies planned their communities. And unlike the Western approach that bases planning primarily upon land use, the indigenous planning approach was formulated on practices associated with land tenure.

Land tenure is defined by long and sustained patterns of ownership—ownership sustained over successive generations. Land became the embodiment of collective groups who wanted to sustain the productivity of the land for those who would inherit it. It became a birthright and stewardship was the primary vehicle for maintaining it. As collective societies explored their territories they would interact with other groups. When they experienced new ideas, they adapted them. Contrary to the notion of invention, change was a process of transformation. Transformation was controlled by the need to assure the community that new ideas were mindful of the past, cognizant of present, suitable to the future and upheld land tenure.

It is land use, on the other hand, that is at the core of traditional Western planning practice. Land use gives form and shape to communities based on upholding the privileges associated with private property rights. When a property owner maintains the value of the land, then it is resold. There is little incentive to hold land as property longer than necessary, especially if it becomes unproductive.

Notions associated with land-tenure are the driving force for development in indigenous communities. Birthright and inheritance, as well as a strong sense of stewardship are principle considerations in any planning effort. Private property rights, if they even exist, are subordinate to such collective values—it’s clear how Indigenous and Western concepts of planning can come into conflict.

One such arena of conflict is Indian gaming. For a few lucky tribes, Indian gaming has become a panacea that has not only resulted in breaking the cycle of dependency on treaty reparations, but has given a renewed ability for tribal governments to make decisions for themselves. At the same time, it has forced tribal governments to adapt new models of management and to embark on tribal strategic planning as a way to mitigate the impacts of outside commercial development.

This is just one of the challenges that the Indigenous Planning Division of the APA has been formed to meet.

Ted Jojola (jojola@ausm.edu) is Regents’ professor and director of the Community & Regional Planning Program at the University of New Mexico. He welcomes visitors to the new APA-IP website.
Pioneers of Advocacy Planning:
Five Recognized at 2004 Conference

By Tom Angotti

The 2004 Planners Network Conference recognized the important role played by five people who for four decades have made outstanding contributions to progressive planning. They began their careers as advocate planners in the spirit of Paul Davidoff, who first made that term popular. Linda Davidoff, who passed away December 31, 2003, played a central role in theory and practice of advocacy planning. Chester Hartman, Peter Marcuse, Ron Shiffman and Walter Thabit continue to make significant contributions to planning for economic, racial and environmental justice.

Linda’s 1997 article in Panorama, the student-produced journal at the University of Pennsylvania Department of City Planning, Urban Development and Public Policy (where she received her master’s degree in planning) provides clues to her philosophy. “The dialogue about public life and urban communities in the United States today is in a primitive state,” Americans express indifference and hostility to their institutions of governance; affluent Americans are fleeing urban communities to live in insulated, walled and gated private communities... At this depressing time in the life of the public dialogue in America, we need to focus on how to find ways to place our lever and find our fulcrum so we can move a lever, snog, self-satisfied society to give a little—exposing the fault lines but also exposing pathways that lead to a richer community life.”

One of Linda’s great qualities was a perennial optimism when staring in the face of great odds. She worked hard to get progressive people elected and was Ruth Messinger’s first campaign manager in her unsuccessful 1997 campaign for mayor of New York. Linda also managed Elizabeth Holtzman’s losing 1986 bid for Senate.

One important victory of Linda’s was negotiating an alternative plan to Donald Trump’s proposed development on the West Side of Manhattan. As director of the Parks Council, Linda played a leading role in winning a twenty-two-acre waterfront park, reducing by half in the amount of building space allowed Trump, some affordable housing, and removal and re-routing of an elevated highway. While she frankly acknowledged her work among elite civic groups, she never lost her commitment to principles of equity. The conclusion to her Panorama article says a lot about Linda.

The planning profession has both the mark of greatness—the Chicago Plan, Brooklyn City, the good side of Robert Moses, Jane Jacobs—and the mark of Cain—the bad side of Robert Moses, the decline of great cities, and the erosion of civic spirit. The profession constantly risks being classed as a corps of minor civil servants who labor in obscurity while developers and the elected officials who depend on the developers’ campaign contributions make all the important decisions. Faced with these challenges, planners must find a place from which they can exert the power for good that the public imagination and the valuable skills and insights of our profession make possible, keeping always a sense of humor and irony about the unlikely combinations which sometimes bring their plans to fruition.

[Excerpted from the Winter 2004 issue of Progressive Planning Magazine]

Pioneers of Advocacy Planning:
Chester Hartman

Chester Hartman started Planners Network in 1975 as a mimeographed newsletter to some 300 people, and he chaired the organization until 1996. He is now an ex-officio member of the PN Steering Committee and heads PN’s Advisory Board. Chester was founding president/executive director of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC) in Washington DC and recently became PRRAC’s Director of Research.

Chester’s many contributions to progressive planning are evident in his book, Between Eminence and Notoriety: Four Decades of Radical Urban Planning (Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, 2002), which includes his most important writings. He has worked tirelessly with grassroots activists and progressive planners to bring about meaningful social change. His advocacy cost him reapportionment after a drawn-out fight with Harvard University. Yet his essays and books on displacement, housing and planning education continue to inspire and inform students, academics, practitioners and political activists.

Chester has consistently fought poverty and racism and for progressive politics within the planning profession.

In the foreword to Between Eminence and Notoriety, Jane Jacobs writes:

Throughout the mad spree of vandalism, deceptions and waste known as urban renewal and slum clearance, Chester Hartman’s was a voice of sanity, caution and compassion. There were many other such voices, raising and falling in response to the orchestration of events in this plan or that. Chester’s voice was unusual in three respects. First, after getting into the fray early on, he then stayed with it unremittingly. Even after urban renewal and slum clearance petered out, he continued dealing with the social wreckage the programs left in their wake and with problems of providing housing for the poor and the disregarded that remained unsolved— as he continues doing to this day. Second, at a time when very few “credentialed” voices were to be heard in protest... Chester was among the few who added that clout to opinions he voiced. And third, he was optimistic enough to suppose that schools of planning could reform themselves; his efforts to help institute advocacy planning in service to communities helped give teeth to the idea of public participation in planning, now widely accepted in theory but still hard in practice for many professionals and politicians to chew on and swallow.

Chester is a former board member/secretary of the National Low Income Housing Coalition. He has served as a fellow of the Transnational Institute in Amsterdam and of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington. He holds a Ph.D. in City and Regional Planning from Harvard and served on the faculty there as well as at Yale, the University of North Carolina, Cornell, the University of California-Berkeley and Columbia University. He is currently adjunct professor of sociology at George Washington University in Washington DC.
While most people who know him recognize his imposing intellectual achievements, many do not know of Peter’s extensive professional experience in local planning. He chaired the Housing Committee of a Community Board in New York City and also served as president of the Los Angeles City Planning Commission. He has also been active in local planning affairs in Connecticut, where he lives.

Peter recently edited The Changing Spatial Order in Cities (Sage, 1997) with Ronald van Kempen.

Pioneers of Advocacy Planning:
Peter Marcuse

Peter is perhaps the person most recognized throughout the world as a leading proponent of progressive planning in the United States. His contributions to both the theory and practice of planning are recognized broadly; he was recently named a fellow of the American Institute of Certified Planners.

Peter has been a prolific writer on a wide range of topics including globalization, housing, redlining, racial segregation, divided cities, gentrification, New York City planning history, legal and social aspects of property rights, privatization and professional ethics. But Peter doesn’t just write to get published. He covers many issues of importance to practitioners and activists. We can always count on Peter to be an active voice in national debates on housing policy, rent control and professional ethics, where he has consistently stood on the side of social justice. He drafted a statement adopted by the local Planners Network chapter charging the New York City Planning Department with violations of professional ethics for their failure to protect community gardens. He also helped develop a platform supporting community-based planning in the city. Peter has written timely articles for Progressive Planning Magazine and many other popular publications, in addition to the impressive list of contributions to scholarly journals. One of the early members of the Planners Network, he has helped steer planning in a direction that promotes equity and social justice.

Peter is about to retire from Columbia University, where he has been a professor of urban planning in the Graduate School of Architecture Planning and Preservation for over three decades. He also taught in both West and East Germany, Australia, the Union of South Africa, Canada, Austria and Brazil.

friends in neighborhoods throughout the city, and his fellow commissioners, depended on Ron to raise all the difficult questions about equity and participation in planning that were often left off the official agenda.

Throughout his career, Ron has emphasized inclusion, transparency, democracy, sustainability and social, economic and environmental justice. He has consistently introduced new ideas in housing and environmental quality to local planners and community activists, using leading examples from other parts of the world. With Susan Molloy he wrote Comprehensive and Integrative Planning for Community Development, available at http://www.picced.org/NewDesign/complan.htm.

Ron is now an advocate for community planning and equity in the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan. He is chair of the board of the New York Industrial Retention Network, co-chair of the Civic Alliance's Committee on Social, Economic and Environmental Justice, and has been working with the Municipal Art Society (MAS) and Imagine New York, a "visioning process" to engage a broad set of people in the memorial and rebuilding process. He is co-chair of New York 2050, a broad initiative to envision the future of New York City. He recently became a fellow of the American Institute of Certified Planners.

Pioneers of Advocacy Planning:
Ron Shiffman

For the last four decades neighborhood activists in New York City’s five boroughs have called on Ron for advice and technical support. Ron was present at the creation of the Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development (PICCED), one of the first and longest lasting university-based centers providing planning assistance to low-income neighborhoods. Ron directed PICCED for most of its history and recently retired from that position. He is a full-time professor in Pratt Institute’s graduate planning program.

Ron became active in community development while a student of architecture and planning, and worked with communities torn apart by poverty, displacement and urban renewal. He was involved in the earliest community-based efforts in housing and economic development that led to the formation of the Bedford Stuyvesant Community Development Corporation, the first CDC in the country.

He served on the New York City Planning Commission for six years from 1988-1996. His planner responsible for the Cooper Square Alternative Plan, the first community plan in the city. Walter is known nationally as a founder and long-time chair of Planners for Equal Opportunity, the national organization of planners and activists that preceded Planners Network.

Walter has a wealth of practical experience in housing, renewal, community planning, city planning and anti-poverty projects. He also worked on plans in Morningside Heights, East Midtown and Park Slope in New York City, and in Philadelphia, Newark, Poughkeepsie, Hoboken and other US cities. He taught at New School University, Hunter College and Long Island University.

After the riots of the mid-1960s, Walter began working with the community of East New York to assist in developing a plan for low- and moderate-income housing. Through this process, he began to experience and understand the forces that had caused the initial decline of East New York and those factors that worked against its successful revitalization.

In his book, How East New York Became a Ghetto, Thabiti describes how the area shifted from a working-class immigrant neighborhood to a largely black and Puerto Rican one, and how the deterioration of this area was caused by a series of racially-biased policies.

In the review of Thabiti’s book that appeared in the Spring, 2004 issue of Progressive Planning Magazine, Lewis Luba says:

How East New York Became a Ghetto is a powerful indictment of society’s failure to deal with its inadequacies, and Thabiti unashamedly takes the side of the poor and minorities victimized by the pervasive and virulent racism that he calls American apartheid. There is no false ‘objectivity’ here, the façade behind which many establishment planners conveniently cop-out.

One of Walter’s lesser-known but important works, “The Folly of Civil Defense Planning,” appeared in the Journal of the American Institute of Planners at a time when professional planners were tripping over themselves to do civil defense plans that falsely promised to save cities from a nuclear holocaust.

Rolodex Update:
Planners Network has a new membership address. See masthead on page 3 for complete contact information.
Columbia University's Manhattanville Expansion: Potential Harms and Solutions

By Mindy Thompson Fullerlove, Lourdes Hernandez-Cordero and Robert E. Fullerlove

New York City’s Columbia University is in desperate need of space to house new programs, employees and students. The University has proposed the “Manhattanville Project” in which they will build new facilities in West Harlem between 125th and 133rd Street from Broadway to the Hudson River. Currently, structures will be replaced by exciting, tall, modern facilities that respect the current street grid and enhance the connection between Harlem and its riverfront. This project holds great promise for the future of the University.

We propose that such a project might also benefit others who live and work in Northern Manhattan, but the achievement of this broader goal depends upon the negotiation of a plan quite different from the one now on the table. First, we will examine the harms that are implied by the current plan and then we will propose a solution that holds promise for all of Northern Manhattan.

Harms

Research by Alexander Leighton, A. F. C. Wallace, Rodrick Wallace and Deborah Wallace has established that upheaval from natural or man-made causes has the potential to rupture social bonds, confuse cultural practice and transmission and undermine health practices. Any of these factors can contribute to the risk of disease. Destruction of neighborhoods, such as that proposed by Columbia University, is one such process that leads to upheaval. With funds from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, our team sought to track the consequences of urban renewal as promulgated by the Housing Act of 1949. This program gave cities money to clear large tracts of "blighted" land for new uses designed to attract rich people back to the city. With the exception of a small number of projects in little-used downtown areas, urban renewal projects caused enormous disruption to area residents. Five findings are relevant to Columbia’s West Harlem project:

1) “You have to break a few eggs to make an omelet,” or the Humpty Dumpy Scenario.

Urban renewal was billed as “progress.” There was little acknowledgement that the benefits of urban renewal accrued to real estate developers and other big businesspeople, while the harms accrued to the poor people who were displaced. Planners told those

...continuing about urban renewal, ‘You have to break a few eggs to make an omelet.’ Not surprisingly, the mitigation of harms fell far short of the actual costs.

2) All that jazz

Widespread clearance—whether it affects a forest or a city neighborhood—destroys an ecosystem.

No one was compensated for the contents of the neighborhood: the clubs, street life, socialization and markets that left the neighborhoods examined in the study undertaken by our Community Research Group (CRG), jazz clubs were important assets, and for some, able to relocate. Consequently, people lost not only the space of the clubs, but also the sounds of jazz that walked through the neighborhoods. In that epoch, jazz nearly died in the US, but was fortunately saved by Asian and European aficionados. This is but one example of the massive, uncompensated losses that accompanied urban renewal. Loss on such a scale triggers further loss. In many communities, urban renewal initiated an accelerated downward spiral of loss that has not been stopped. Ironically enough, the present-day incarnation of the Cotton Club is erected on a plot of land slated for clearance in the first stage of this expansion project.

3) Burns, baby, burns.

One of the unintended consequences of urban renewal was its contribution to the civil disorders that swept American cities between 1964 and 1968. This was linked to several factors: the massive destruction, without replacement, of low-income housing, the construction of more and more people of color into fewer and fewer housing units due to fierce enforcement of residential segregation; and the alienation that people experienced from seeing their neighborhoods destroyed by an uncaring central government. Simply put, alienating territory alienates people. Schools and universities were often built on urban renewal sites. The proposal to demolish the School of Medicine on 204 acres in the Central Ward of Newark, NJ was one of the triggers for the Newark riot of 1967.

4) You paint your house, you fix your house...”

Poor African Americans migrated to cities in search of opportunity. They worked very hard, often for pennies a day, in order to make it in America. When they could, they bought homes, they built churches, they organized businesses and they created a way of life that was part of the urban renewal.

The sorrow that follows the loss of such a complex entity as a neighborhood is best described in the words of the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins as “a child, world-sorrowing, and world-lamenting, and in their hearts for the rest of their lives. A new home is a new home. It does not replace the one that went before. One man interviewed by CRG, and quoted above, said, “I got my house to where I liked it and then the government came and took it away.”

5) You can’t go home again.

Urban renewal projects destroyed the existing urban terrain, and the land was taken for “new” uses. This meant that the community that used to live in the area was excluded from its future. The exclusive use of land for new groups of people was profoundly humiliating for those who had lived there. One woman told us, “I don’t know if the old people ever got over the shame.”

A New Lens on the West Harlem Project

Viewing the West Harlem project in light of these findings, CRG finds several problems:

• The University’s public materials for the project celebrate progress, but downplay harms. Because the discourse downplays the enormous costs, the mitigation will surely be inadequate.

• The impact of insufficient mitigation will be a deeper impoverishment of already poor people. This has many corollaries, among them a deeper alienation within the city. What of the big businesspeople who can increase.

• Finally, the project takes land from aghetto community for the nearly exclusive use of the University community. This contributes to the segregation of New York City—a city of one of the most segregated cities in the nation.

Mining the Potential for Good

Despite all this, the West Harlem project has the potential to do great good. The communities of Northern Manhattan are suffering. A recent newspaper story pointed out that nearly half of all black men are unemployed, and most of the unemployment are undereducated. The shortage of low-income housing has created a class of homelessness. The list of unsolved problems is long. A great university, acting as a good neighbor and community partner, could make enormous contributions to finding solutions and creating a better day for area residents.

We are convinced that unmitigated disruption and exclusionary use of the land are serious problems that require a new plan. We consulted with Michael Cantal-Dupart, chair of the Department of Urbanism and the Environment at the National Conservatory of Arts and Trades in Paris, France.

For the past eight years, Cantal has provided advice to our group on issues of urban design. After visiting the site and reviewing the University’s documents, Cantal proposed that the issue was the creation of a university neighborhood, rather than a university campus. The contrast he was making is this: The campus is a territory of exclusion, while the neighborhood is a territory of inclusion. A university neighborhood includes many kinds of institutions and people, some connected directly to the university, but others just living there because the neighborhood is part of the city. The great advantages of the university neighborhood, in Cantal’s view, are the possibility of preparing students for the future by preparing themselves to lead the new global economy, and the sharing of assets between the university and its neighbors, which lays the groundwork for a stronger, more vital city, also enlivening the university.

What would a university neighborhood look like? The key is that the area marked for the University’s expansion would not be given over to the exclusive use of the University. In addition to stores serving the wider community, the area should continue to be a part of the Harlem neighborhood, offering housing, schools and other facilities to people of the wider area. The development undertaken by the University should do much more to include Harlem, sharing the area on a 50/50 basis. This is radically different from the plan as it exists now. Instead of a ghetto and people currently located on the site would be moved away so that the University could use the site exclusively.

Manhattan is rapidly becoming the exclusive province of rich white people. It is possible that people of color will be pushed out of ghetto neighborhoods by rising prices and changed pattern of ownership. Columbia University, as one of the world’s great universities, need not participate in further exclusion and expulsion. Rather, the University might provide leadership in the creation of a cosmopolitan model of the university neighborhood, one that would lead to peaceful collaboration. The riots that helped to propel the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry are a grim reminder that exclusion leads to rage. This is a historic lesson worth learning.

The authors are at the Community Research Group of Columbia University and New York State Psychiatric Institute.
Book Review: 
*Root Shock: How Tearing Up City Neighborhoods Hurts America, and What We Can Do about It* 
By Mindy Thompson Fullilove

**Review By Cynthia Golembski**

Urban renewal was first implemented by the US government as part of the 1949 Housing Act, and arguably continues to influence urban planning to this day. The impact of this policy on minorities and the urban poor has been enormous. According to Mindy Fullilove’s new book titled *Root Shock*, 1,600 African American neighborhoods were demolished nationwide. More specific-
From Disinvestment (Abandonment) to Reinvestment (Gentrification):
Homefront’s Abandonment Analysis Thirty Years Later

By Ann Meyerson and Tony Schuman

In March 1974, 200 housing and community activists attended a conference in New York City to discuss the systematic destruction of low-rent housing caused by government urban renewal programs and expanding private institutions. An organization called Homefront, Citywide Action Group against Neighborhood Destruction and for Low-Rent Housing emerged from this conference to continue the fight to preserve neighborhoods and expand the existing stock of low-and moderate-rent housing, especially in working-class neighborhoods with large numbers of black, Latino and other oppressed minority residents. In 1977, Homefront produced a 140-page report, Housing Abandonment in New York City.

Many of Homefront’s assessments were on target and, when looked at in light of changing conditions, can help chart new strategies for progressive housing activists today.

An Explicit Anti-Capitalist Analysis

Unlike other housing organizations at the time, Homefront was explicitly anti-capitalist and socialist in its ideology. Its purpose was to:

...help provide analysis, coordination and a socialist political perspective for various tenant and community struggles. Homefront feels that the real enemy is not the small landlord or even the developers. The underlying cause of all forms of community destruction is the economic system controlled by giant corporations and banks—capitalism. This system has only one purpose—to maximize profits based on private ownership of property. Homefront maintains that the housing problem as such cannot be solved in isolation. It can only be solved within a socialistic society, i.e., a society where decent housing, along with full and meaningful employment, adequate healthcare and all other human needs are considered the top priority.

Building socialism in the U.S. is a long and arduous process. As part of this process, Homefront recognizes the importance of developing and supporting short-range programs which address people’s immediate needs while demonstrating their connection to the capitalist system which created them. Our focus, however, is on confronting those forces most clearly attacking the system of private ownership and financing of housing for profit.

Following the 1974 conference, Homefront set out to study the phenomenon of landlord abandonment of sound working-class rental housing. They estimated 150,000 units had been abandoned in New York City and entire neighborhoods were destroyed. People wanted to know why this was happening and what could be done about it. The two-year study outlined the key causes of abandonment, government and community responses to it and strategies for combating it. Homefront also published a pamphlet in 1975 with articles on hospital and commercial expansion, government-sponsored projects (highways, sports arenas, etc.) and the racist tipping point theory of why neighborhoods change demographically.

The Causes of Abandonment

In clarifying the role of bank finance in the profitability of residential real estate, and the impact of redlining by banks in particular, Homefront made a useful contribution to the public understanding of the causes behind the wave of housing abandonment that struck New York in the mid-to-late-1970s. People could understand the role of individual landlords in abandonment, but it wasn’t that clear why abandonment was taking place on such a large scale, wiping out whole sections of the city.

The abandonment report argued that rent control and the age of the building stock were not the cause of landlord abandonment, as the prevailing conventional wisdom held. Many relatively new buildings in good condition were being milked and abandoned by their owners, who stopped paying their real estate taxes and walked away. Furthermore, many heavily rent-controlled neighborhoods were not being abandoned. And there was widespread housing abandonment in other cities without any history of rent control.

The process, the report concluded, was a systemic one involving disinvestment and capital flight on the part of financial institutions on which landlords depended to realize their return on investment. The report showed that landlords generally do not make most of their profit from cash flow based on rental income. Rather, they make most of their profit by refinancing their mortgages, allowing them to take their built-up equity out of their properties. Banks demand that they would no longer lend in certain neighborhoods (which were redlined) and instead moved their investments out-of-state and into non-rental and non-real estate sectors. Landlords then did the logical thing: They cut back on maintenance of their properties to gain the maximum profit as quickly as possible and then walked away, leaving the city of New York to own and operate the buildings.

Banks, mortgage and insurance companies redlined neighborhoods as much as they would the declining-class populations followed jobs and housing investment to the suburbs. In the throes of a fiscal crisis, New York City adopted a de facto racist policy of ‘planned shrinkage’ that cut back services in these neighborhoods. At the same time the national government under President Richard Nixon declared an end to the War on Poverty and federal aid to cities.

Thirty years later, we can see the Homefront report as prescient. It cited ‘one aspect of the uneven development of capitalism, bound to be followed in the long run by neighborhood redelocation for profit.’ Many of the neighborhoods in the city today that are experiencing intense gentrification are those that were once plagued by landlord abandonment.

On the strategy front, the report criticized the self-help efforts to cooperatively own and operate abandoned housing that were widely advocated at the time. ‘Self-help strategies put all the responsibility on individuals who are the victims of abandonment rather than on the capitalist system and government which causes it.’ In practical terms, the main problem with self-help is that it is usually too costly for people with modest incomes.

Instead, Homefront saw the expanding stock of abandoned and therefore city-owned housing as a critical opportunity to achieve the goal of ‘public-owned, tenant-controlled housing,’ where the government would adequately rehouse and maintain this housing. This flew in the face of the city’s policy, still operative today, of turning those abandoned buildings over to private developers, even the worst slumlords, on the premise that only the private sector should provide housing. Homefront said, instead, that ‘our aim is to promote programs that move toward public ownership of low-rent housing and attack the system of private financing, production and ownership.’

At that time, Homefront and the left in general were heavily influenced by the successful national liberation movements around the world, the growth of the socialist left in Europe and détente with the Soviet Union. This led to strong views about the limitations of capitalism and the possibilities of socialist development.

There can be no real tenant control of housing under capitalism. Publicly-owned housing with tenant control can’t solve the problems that arise from a capitalist system...Genuine solutions to housing decline are not possible under capitalism. This strategy, therefore, is aimed at strengthening the movement for socialism. It exposes the rule of capitalism and the role of government. It puts responsibility for abandonment where it belongs, and increases the ability of people to struggle.

Response to the Report at the Time

The report was generally well-received. As one neighborhood activist commented, ‘When it comes to housing, we’re all socialists.’ But when it came time to discuss next steps, many local leaders demurred. ‘We don’t have time for this kind of citywide action,’ they explained. ‘We’re too busy trying to deal with these thirty families in an abandoned building.’

Some academic commentators were less receptive, and Homefront was accused of being a bunch of remote academics pushing a ‘statist’ line. It is certainly true that Homefront called for public resources and responsibility for addressing housing needs (public ownership with tenant control). We debated internally whether to advocate for an expansion of public housing or some other form of tenant control. But it was never an organization of mostly academics. It was an amalgam of activists and professionals, and the report was a good example of activist scholarship. Its members, including many who worked on the abandonment report, took part in campaigns to stop the auction of city-owned properties and the cutbacks in city services in low-income communities.

The city continued to auction properties back to developers, and many of these programs aimed at converting renters into homeowners but without the necessary financial and technical resources to help them succeed in this new role. So Homefront played a leadership role...
role in a citywide "Stop the Auctions" campaign featuring demonstrations at Police headquarters, site of the public auctions. Two Homefront veterans (Tom Gogan and Dave Robinson) organized the In Rem Tenants Coalition to unite tenants in city-owned buildings.

were focused on neighborhood organizing gradually became community development corporations, providing substantial amounts of new housing but losing the sense of a citywide movement around broader housing issues. The very language of the housing movement changed. Its goal now became "affordable" housing, not "subsidized" housing. This shift was accompanied by a shift in focus from rental housing for low-income households to homeownership opportunities for moderate-income working families. The term "affordable" glossed over the necessity of substantial subsidies to bring the purchase price of housing into range for even two-income working families. Nowhere is this shift more pronounced than in the Hope VI program that encourages the demolition of rental public housing units and their replacement by mixed-income homeowner row houses. In New York City, one of the major new housing production programs was a public-private partnership that put one-, two-, and three-family homes on public-ownership vacant land where low-cost rental housing had been abandoned and demolished.

In the last decade, the city has also lost a significant number of modestly-priced housing units in limited equity co-ops. Expiring restrictions on rent and resale prices offered one-time bonanzas for co-op owners who could capture the limited equity value of their limited equity apartments. These units have been taken out of the dwindling affordable housing stock. For renters in private units, the gutting of rent regulations under pressure from the real estate industry has jacked up rents throughout the city. In the suburbs, exclusionary land use and zoning practices continue to limit opportunities for new low-cost housing. With all of these changes, homelessness has become a regular part of the housing scene since the 1980s. Overall, one thing that hasn't changed is the fact that the concentration of the urban poor in central cities (and some inner-ring suburbs) and the intersection of poverty and race that make urban ghettos a continuing challenge to the cause of social justice.

The Homefront Report in Hindsight

Ceritably the brightest outcome of the housing movement in the 1970s and 1980s was the emergence of experienced and committed local development organizations. Although some of these expanded too quickly and crashed and burned under the weight of their inexperience and, occasionally, the egos of some leaders, others became critical outposts in holding the line against gentrification or in maintaining viable pockets of neighborhood life in the midst of devastated neighborhoods. Following the Homefront session at the conference, housing consultant (and charter member of PN) Emily Achtenberg offered the following reflection on Homefront's analysis:

In one sense, we can argue that Homefront's critique of the in rem tenant co-op programs for failing to achieve public ownership was correct, insofar as some of these buildings (with limited restrictions) now have opportunities to cash in on gentrifying markets, and others face significant risks of disinvestment or tax foreclosure as tenants incomes erode. But the majority still seem to be working as affordable, non-speculative housing, and in that sense Homefront failed to give credit to the massive transfer from private to public social ownership—broadly defined—that was accomplished by these programs, on a scale unprecedented (before or since) in any US city.

On the Williamsburg tour [a PN conference session], we visited an in rem co-op that was impressively well-maintained, democratically run, affordable and closely linked to the local non-profit support organization. We learned about neighborhood-wide networks of in rem coops working to extend tax relief in exchange for continuing use restrictions. These social ownership forms are by no means perfect, but do seem like a step in the right direction. Today, activists and planners should be working to save and improve them. With hindsight, perhaps Homefront should have been less rigid in its prescription and more open to the notion of "radical reforms" that further the concept of social housing while exposing the limitations of what can be accomplished under current conditions.

This is a fair critique. The Williamsburg building, and larger-scale efforts like the Cooper Square Mutual Housing Association on the Lower East Side, which manages hundreds of apartments, are important examples of social ownership in the non-profit sector. We would certainly have to abandon any "stale" notions that socially-owned housing must be government-owned. In almost all cases, however, these projects would not be accessible to low-income tenants if the land hadn't been publicly owned and conveyed to the non-profit sponsors at little or no cost. The Cooper Square buildings are owned by a land trust that requires that the housing be used for low-income tenants in perpetuity. It is more important that the land and housing be under the control of tenants and owners who can't sell them for a profit than it is for them to be in the hands of government. This is the way to make sure the housing remains affordable.

Since Homefront, Ann Meyerson directed NYU's Metropolitan Studies Program where she teaches courses on housing and urban development. She is currently the curator of exhibitions at the Brooklyn Historical Society, having shifted from teaching urban studies to interpreting urban history. Shortly after working on the Homefront report, Tony Schuman began teaching at the New Jersey School of Architecture (NJIT), where he currently directs the graduate program. A founding member of PN, Tony's teaching and writing are focused on housing and urban development from a design and policy perspective. Others who participated in producing the Homefront report were: Tom Angotti, Debbie Bell, Almubat David, Tom Gogan, Dan Gutman, Eileen Murray, Mirni Rosenberg and Phil Wittenberg. We are sorry to say that the Homefront report was produced before the digital days and copies of the report are only available in some local libraries.

SEND YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS TO OUR "NEW" EMAIL ADDRESS!

The PN e-letter has member updates, jobs, conferences and other announcements. Often PNs in the same city ask us how they can get in touch with other PNs, and the best we can do is send them names and addresses. Email is also the best way to let us know when your membership/subscription has to be renewed. If you don't want to receive the e-letter, we can keep you off that list, but please send us your email address so we can contact you when we need to.

Send to our new email address: pnmall@umn.edu and in the subject line put "subscribe to e-newsletter."
Traffic Against the People: New York City’s Transportation Planners Move Cars at All Costs

By Aaron Naparstek

On Monday February 9, 2004, at 3:30 PM, Juan Estrada and Victor Flores, fifth-graders at PS. 124 in Brooklyn, New York, were crushed to death by a gravel-filled landscaping truck while walking home from school. The boys were crossing 3rd Avenue at 9th Street, a busy but familiar intersection, less than a block from their homes. They were killed in the crosswalk while the pedestrian signal indicated they had the right-of-way.

These “accidents.” But it’s hard to write this one off so easily. A simple traffic-calming device called a leading pedestrian interval, or LPI, almost certainly could have prevented this tragedy. An LPI lights up the pedestrian signal about three seconds before vehicular traffic gets the green. This gives pedestrians a head start into the intersection and forces turning vehicles to be less aggressive as they drive through the crosswalk. LPIS could easily have prevented the type of right-turn collision that killed Juan and Victor. The purpose of an LPI is that a few less vehicles may be able to move through the intersection at each cycle of the light.

Nearly three years ago, Brooklyn’s first LPI was installed—as part of an initiative called the Downtown Brooklyn Traffic-Calming Project—about a mile away from the intersection where Juan and Victor were killed. The LPI, according to Community Board 6 District Manager Craig Hammerman and many others, is a “smashing success.” So why don’t we have an LPI at 3rd and 9th, and what does it take to get the city’s Department of Transportation (DOT) to install one?

DOT’s public affairs office refused to make any of their “highly qualified engineers” available to answer these questions. But one former DOT planner, under condition of anonymity, explained to me how it works: there are no formal requirements for installing LPIS in New York City. The decision is made based on “engineering judgment.” He said that when traffic engineers analyze an intersection like 3rd and 9th, “they are primarily looking to see that an LPI won’t degrade the vehicular ‘level of service.’ DOT’s attitude is, ‘We’ll just do one more safety study and see if it would be worth the expense of the flow of traffic.’”

To the traffic engineers who run DOT, “it’s all about big maps and traffic counts.” Their “engineering judgment” is not likely to take into account the two schools, major subway station, big grocery store, churches, small businesses and working-class Mexican immigrant neighborhood within a few blocks’ walking distance of 3rd and 9th. All the traffic engineers know is that 3rd Avenue and 9th Street are truck routes. Nineteenth Street exists in this world “for the purpose of pumping morning rush hour traffic through to the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel.” The avenue is a great place to put vehicles when the nearby Brooklyn-Queens Expressway gets full. “It’s just the way the system works,” the former DOT planner continued. “Guys in Lexuses stuck in traffic jams are simply more important than Mexicans crossing the street.”

DOT says it is disingenuous for anyone to claim that its traffic engineers could have done anything to prevent Juan and Victor’s deaths. Spokesmen say budget constraints have made it impossible to put together the extensive traffic geometric and engineering review and substantial capital that would be required to make 3rd and 9th safer.

But that’s simply not true. DOT’s failure to implement traffic-calming measures at 3rd and 9th has little to do with funding or geometric gobbledegook. The recommendation to install an LPI at this particular intersection had been sitting on a shelf in the DOT Brooklyn Borough Commissioner’s office since at least November 2001. That’s when Aon, an internationally respected engineering firm, issued its first draft of the Downtown Brooklyn Traffic-Calming Plan. It doesn’t take two years to install an LPI. This particular traffic-calming device is so inexpensive and easy to set up, DOT doesn’t even bother to put a dollar figure next to it in their budget estimates. All the traffic engineers have to do is make a slight adjustment in the timing of an intersection’s signals. Not only that, if the LPI causes problems, the traffic engineers can simply change the signal back to the way it was. No concrete gets poured. No work crews dig up the street.

The Department of Traffic, Its Engineers and Planners

The real reason there is no LPI at the intersection where Juan and Victor died is because the traffic engineers who control and run New York City’s DOT fundamentally disagree with the entire concept of traffic-calming. Just as the US Department of Defense is still determinedly hostile to the idea of the Department of War, the New York City Department of Transportation was once known as the Department of Traffic. Though the name has changed with the times when New York City’s all-powerful public works czar Robert Moses flattened vibrant neighborhoods and decimated mass transit to make the city “fit for 20th century motorists,” DOT still reflects his car-first values. Traffic is what DOT continues to make. It’s their product. It’s what they are all about.

The way that DOT operates is scandalous. But the scandal is not so much about incompetence or corruption. The DOT is controlled and run by an insular and widely disregarded group of professionals called traffic engineers. The more effectively the traffic engineers do what they perceive to be their job, the more choked and immobilized New York City’s streets become.

The real crime at DOT isn’t so much that the Agency is doing a bad job, but that it’s doing the wrong job. Former DOT Traffic Commissioner and Chief Engineer Sam Schwartz is a traffic engineer. Schwartz started his career behind the wheel of a New York City taxi and, perhaps because of that, tends to have a more holistic view of transportation than your typical engineer. “Traffic engineers have failed,” Schwartz says. “If you compare the accomplishments of our profession over the last fifty years to the medical profession, our performance is equivalent to millions of people still dying of polio, influenza and other minor bacterial diseases that have been cured.”

While London, Paris and municipalities all across Northern Europe are, with great success, developing ways to make their dense central districts less convenient, accessible and free to automobiles, New York City traffic engineers are still focused on figuring out how to shuffle more vehicles through the urban grid. The traffic engineers’ typical solution for congestion is to add a lane or build a new road, which in Schwartz’s words is like “telling an obese person that the way to get healthy is to buy a bigger pair of pants and a longer belt.”

While they know it or not, DOT’s traffic engineers are deeply implicated in this city’s motorism; they believe in the primacy of the automobile. One former DOT employee says that DOT’s prime directive is “to move the most traffic possible; They always try to simply move street’s capacity and increase the flow of traffic.”

Although most New Yorkers do not own automobiles, the majority of the city’s public space—the streets—has been annexed for the primary use of motor vehicles. Considering that few things are as valuable in the city as public space, this gross misuse of the single biggest government entitlement program we have. And as the Agency that controls and maintains the city’s streets, DOT runs this program.
The Congestion Pricing Option

In February 2003, London's mayor Ken Livingstone began charging motorists a £5 ($7.50) toll every time they drove through an eight-square-mile section of Central London. The tolling is automated, so motorists don't have to slow down or stop at toll booths to pay, and the enforcement is carried out by traffic cameras. Violators are mailed a £120 ($180) fine. The initiative is projected to raise £200 million a year, all of which will be used to improve London's mass transit, pedestrian and cycling facilities.

"We've Been Fighting for the Land since Time Immemorial."

Indigenous Land Struggles in Michoacán, Mexico

By Chris Tilly and Marie Kennedy

The Mexican state of Michoacán, located in the center of the country, is known outside Mexico—if it is known at all—for being the world capital of avocado production and the Mexican state that sends the most migrants to the United States. Few would associate it with indigenous rights movements like those that have convulsed the southern Mexico state of Chiapas, where the Zapatista movement exploded in 1994 and has continued to mobilize.

But indigenous people are actively demanding and defending their rights across Michoacán—above all, rights to control land, water and natural resources. True, only 3.5 percent of the state’s population speaks an indigenous language (compared to 7.2 percent for Mexico as a whole). Many of Michoacán’s Indians, however, are concentrationed in predominantly indigenous communities, especially Purépecha Indian towns in the center of the state. The Purépechas are the remnants of the once-mighty Tarascan federation, which successfully repelled Aztec marauders from the east, but eventually succumbed to the Spanish. Today, Michoacán’s indigenous localities confront modern versions of the Spanish invaders—land-hungry developers, settlers from other regions and politicians willing to sell out on longstanding commitments to the tribes.

Blue Lake, Green Mountains, Long Struggle

The most dramatic current struggle is unfolding in the lakefront Purépecha town of Zirahuen. Silver-blue Lake Zirahuen, unlike nearby Lakes Patzcuaro and Cutzévo, remains free from contamination (the lake's name means “mirror of the gods” in Purépecha). In a bid to keep it that way, last October the Purépecha community declared themselves an autonomous community. This tactic, pioneered by the Zapatistas, asserts the community’s independence from official government structures and its right to manage its own resources. As a woman selling homemade cheese in the town square commented, "The lake is the only thing we have."

The threat of contamination is imminent. Developers have proposed a massive resort development, including 2,000 cabanas, a golf course and docks for motorboats and jet skis. The governor stated: "If it damages the environment, it will not be approved," but after 400 years of broken promises, the Purépechas are not inclined to take this commitment at face value.

The Indians of Zirahuen, like many across Mexico, have an important political asset. They are officially recognized as an indigenous settlement by the Mexican government. This means that by law they hold the land communally, and land can only be sold with the approval of the community—in the case of Zirahuen, via a community-wide assembly. The hitch is that although Zirahuen’s Purépechas hold a land title going back to 1735, that legal claim has not kept the local caciques—political bosses—from stealing, selling or giving away chunks of the land over the years. Today, 37,000 acres in Zirahuen and surrounding areas is in contention. This situation is not uncommon; experts estimate that half the land in Mexico lacks a definitive title, and there are conflicting claims on over one million acres in Michoacán alone.

Zirahuen’s other powerful asset is a long history of community self-government through the assembly, its executive committee and the...
committee leader, the commissioner of communal property—a soft-spoken farmer named Marcos Paz Calvílo. Mexico's law of uses and costs allows recognized Indian communities to govern themselves in traditional fashion. Again, however, the indigenous self-government and the 'official' government of the county-sized municipio may end up making conflicting claims of authority—and that is precisely what's happening in Zirahuén.

The Zirahuén struggle didn't begin with the current resort scheme. Jesús Mendoza Patricio, a grizzled Purépecha elder, remembers joining the fight in 1955 when federal land reform review boundaries. Efecto Capita Villegas said it started even earlier: "Of my eighty years, in seventy-five of them I have participated actively and consciously for the struggle in Zirahuén.

As of mid-2004, plans to operate as an autonomous community were still vague. 'We have agencies to perform all the functions of government,' Marcos declared, but admitted, 'We would need to have more to play this.' The goal is clear, however: 'We want development projects based on natural resources, tourism, forest resources—but ones that will benefit local people.' To its credit, the Purépecha community of Zirahuén has already implemented a series of projects with its own sweat. They have reforested 2,300 acres of land with millions of trees, put in place twenty thousand cubic meters of filtering dikes to cleanse water flowing into the lake and built a technical junior high that is their pride and joy: 'It has electricity, water, bathrooms, a functioning kitchen,' Marcos beamed.

When asked how people in the United States could best support the Purépechas of Zirahuén, Marcos replied, 'We don't ask for economic support, but moral support. Send messages to the Governor asking him to support us, not to steal from the community of Zirahuén.' (See box at end of article, next page.)

Zirahuén Commissioner Marcos Paz in his family's restaurant

Zirahuén Commissioner Marcos Paz, interviewed as he sliced fresh habanero pepper into fish soup at a hole-in-the-wall restaurant owned by his extended family, said, 'The indigenous community has been fighting for its land since time immemorial.' He dated the current mobilization, however, back thirty-five years, when the community organized to reassert demands for recognition of its title to the land. In 1979, Zirahuén indigenous activists along with others across Michoacán formed the Union de Comuneros Emiliano Zapata (UCEZ) to coordinate and garner support for such fights. We've had demonstrations, sit-ins; we've occupied government offices across the state, Marcos said: 'We've been imprisoned—Jesus was in jail thirty years ago; I was in last year. We've had to be very determined not to sell out, not to betray the community there have been a lot of offers from rich people, of money for the land. But no, we're sticking to this fight!'

Although the most visible leaders are men, Marcos pointed to women's involvement as well. 'When someone got imprisoned, women would organize to take over the city hall, the courthouse. Men and women working together is the only way to succeed.'

As of mid-2004, plans to operate as an autonomous community were still vague. 'We have agencies to perform all the functions of government,' Marcos declared, but admitted, 'We need to have more to play this.' The goal is clear, however: 'We want development projects based on natural resources, tourism, forest resources—but ones that will benefit local people.' To its credit, the Purépecha community of Zirahuén has already implemented a series of projects with its own sweat. They have reforested 2,300 acres of land with millions of trees, put in place twenty thousand cubic meters of filtering dikes to cleanse water flowing into the lake and built a technical junior high that is their pride and joy: 'It has electricity, water, bathrooms, a functioning kitchen,' Marcos beamed.

When asked how people in the United States could best support the Purépechas of Zirahuén, Marcos replied, 'We don't ask for economic support, but moral support. Send messages to the Governor asking him to support us, not to steal from the community of Zirahuén.' (See box at end of article, next page.)

Indigenous Land Struggles from the Highlands to the Coast

Although Zirahuén has the highest profile, indigenous communities across the state wrestle with similar issues. Ocumicho, on the plateau northwest of Zirahuén known as the Meseta Purépecha, is known locally as 'Mexico's cradle of devils.' An ancient iconography has been found on its territory. The Purépechas have also been involved in a long-running struggle against Ocumicho's modern-day land developers. The community's right to the land was recognized by the Spanish as early as 1540, but over the centuries settlers from nearby Tangancicuaro encroached on the land. At the time of the Mexican Revolution in 1917, Ocumicho's indigenous people asked for a judicial ruling on the land boundaries. Eighty-two years later they are still waiting. In 1932, in the context of national land reform, President Lázaro Cárdenas del Río reaffirmed the Ocumicho community's original 160,000 acres, but the settlers persisted, and in 1965 President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz reversed earlier rulings and granted the land to the settlers. The Ocumichanos refused to leave, but in 1981 armed settlers accompanied by police and military forces ousted them and burned their houses to the ground.

Working with the UCEZ and other organizations, the Ocumicho comuneros attempted unsuccessfully to retake the land in 1985. In 1999 they tried again, and while they planted the land for three months, they were then driven off and seventy-five of them were jailed. In 2002 they initiated an encampment at the entrance to the property, winning a temporary court ruling in favor of the community. The property and cultural sites are a. The community is organized to assert its right to the land, which it has continuously struggled to reassert since the 1970s.

Although Zirahuén and Ocumicho are well-known, there are many other indigenous communities in Michoacán that are struggling against land dispossession. For example, the Purépechas of Zirahuén and Ocumicho have seen land claims disputed and settled in favor of the settlers. In Zirahuén, the community has been fighting for its land since the 1970s, and has since formed the Union de Comuneros Emiliano Zapata (UCEZ) to coordinate and garner support for such fights. The community has engaged in various strategies, including demonstrations, sit-ins, and occupying government offices. Despite these efforts, the community has faced opposition from the state and its representatives.

The indigenous communities of Zirahuén and Ocumicho have faced numerous challenges, including land dispossession, displacement, and cultural erasure. The community's struggle for recognition and self-determination continues, and ongoing support is needed to help them in their fight for justice and equity.
Activist Planning and the Neoliberal City: 
*The Case of Planning Action* 

By Deborah Cowen

A lot has been written about urban neoliberalism but much less about activist responses. Planning Action is a group of activists that has been organizing to combat neoliberal policies in Toronto. By sharing our stories, failures, challenges, and even our moments (or months) of confused disillusionment, we hope to advance the broader struggle against neoliberal planning.

For the past few decades, neoliberalism in Canada has entailed the dismantling of the Keynesian welfare state, the rise of workfare, privatization of public goods and services, the shift away from rights-based entitlements towards user-fees and other individualizing and ‘active’ forms of citizenship, “flexible” work practices, and a faith in the power of private enterprise to cure all that ails us.

In the realm of urban planning, neoliberalism has entailed an increasing reliance on private consultants and appointed boards to identify and define problems and prescribe solutions. Corporate interests and private professionals are replacing citizen consultations and public planners in laying out the future for cities and citizens. These changes are all taking place as cities themselves are becoming more and more important in local, national, and global politics and economics. In a ‘glocalizing’ world of increasing competition among cities, across and within national boundaries, we are told that attracting cultural and economic capital and the people who hold it must become priority number one. Urban planning is thus assigned the role of enabling the physical transformation of the city in order to accommodate this social and economic transformation. Neoliberal discourse often uses the language of participatory and democratic planning practice, but many social justice activists see these as instrumental moves towards token consultations, which have the effect of draining the capacities of already hard-pressed communities.

The Restructuring of Toronto Politics

We can trace some practices that are consistent with neoliberal assumptions and interests as far back as the immediate post-World War II years. But it was with the more recent municipal amalgamation that a whole host of new policies and practices were put into effect which expedited the process of neo-liberalizing Toronto.

In January of 1998, the conservative provincial government implemented a contested amalgamation of the municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto. The amalgamation collapsed a two-tier system of local government into one mega-city and entailed a series of massive policy restructuring. The new government instituted workfare, privatized public asset and services, and downsized the civil service. Amalgamations were supposed to provide cost savings through the elimination of duplication, but more importantly provided an occasion for the Province to reorganize both provincial and municipal responsibilities. In fact, the amalgamation of Toronto created a fiscal crisis for the city, which then became a raison d'être for the privatization and marketization of city services. Since the amalgamation of the Province phased out capital subsidies to public transit and downloaded the operating costs of social assistance and housing, altogether leaving the City with added net costs of around $500 million a year.

For citizens and residents of the city this meant the elimination of a whole tier of local government and of half of the local elected officials, making access to an already unresponsive and bureaucratic system even more difficult. There has been a huge decline in the number of community planning meetings and public consultations, an erosion in the number of consultants working on contract, and a rise in the number and influence of lobbyists at city hall.

The city has also institutionalized competitive city politics with economic development plans and reports such as the 2000 report, “Toronto Competes: An Assessment of Toronto’s Global Competitiveness.” Individual private citizens, who are generally white, male and well connected, are increasingly defining visions for large chunks of the city, based on their own inspiration, innovation, “creativity” and style.

While the neoliberalization of planning in Toronto is producing a range of significant shifts in both process and effects, overall the most resounding change has been the dismantling of opportunities for participation in decision-making, what a number of us call the “de-democratization” of planning.

Planning Actions

Planning Action is an activist organization formed in Toronto in the summer of 2001 in response to these neoliberal trends. Some of the organizers met while planning the 2000 Planners Network conference in Toronto. We formed Planning Action with the intention of being a more explicitly activist organization engaged with local issues. We were also influenced by the past work of groups like the feminist planners of ‘Women Plan Toronto’ and the labor and community coalition ‘Metro Network for Social Justice.’

It was increasingly clear to us that planning was becoming a professional and corporate exercise, precisely at a time when the growing polarization, ecocentrization and feminization of poverty and space was coming to define the social landscape of Toronto. First and foremost, there was a sense among organizers that planning was catering to an increasingly selective group of people, and that this was quickly unraveling the work of a number of activist communities whose struggles for social justice were of vital regional or local importance in city politics prior to amalgamation. We wanted Planning Action to provide a voice for radically democratic planning practice, to challenge the professions who were complicit with the neoliberalization of urban planning, and to re-politicize what was becoming a highly professionalized and inaccessible discourse.

During the group’s early formation, we held public meetings at community centers for several months in order to involve a broad range of people and ideas. Numbers and interest levels fluctuated from loud and lively meetings of 50 people to quiet meetings of eight or ten. This series of gatherings helped us form a social and facilitated workshop to outline priorities for the group and a mission statement:

We are a group of urban planners, architects and activists who work with diverse communities of Toronto struggling against economic, cultural, and ecological injustices. We are a group of people to imagine, transform, and enjoy the city.

The mission statement and the action priorities have been important for Planning Action as we grow and membership charges. They help maintain our critical political vision, inform the radically democratic way we operate, and guide the coalitions we join and projects we take on. Since 2001, the group has been involved in a range of activities, primarily critical planning projects like our critiques of the Official Plan and Waterfront plan, as well as a range of popular education projects such as public forums and workshops, and articles written for the alternative media.

Recent Actions by Planning Action

- Testimony on the Draft Official Plan of Toronto: Given to the Planning and Transportation Committee in September 2002. Planning Action argued that the Plan views the city from the narrow perspective of property owners, developers, and multinational corporations.

Planning Action’s Mandate

*Popular Education and Outreach:*
- Challenge the professionals involved in the planning practice to define their role in a more critical and responsible way.
- Build relationships with social justice and environmental organizations, academic institutions and with diverse communities of the city.
- Engage popular education methods to reciprocally increase awareness, understanding and involvement among city residents in planning processes.

*Critical Projects:*
- Critically assess specific land use developments and provide appropriate planning advice to people actively resisting these developments.
- Develop alternative plans, statements and research projects that critically examine and publicly address current plans and planning processes that have the potential to widen social and economic disparity.
- Articulate a definitive stance on policies and practices, of various levels of government and governing bodies that have an impact on the social, environmental and economic well-being of city residents.

*Community Involvement:*
- Provide planning, design and advocacy services to individuals and communities chronically marginalized from traditional planning and legal systems.
- Support participatory planning that creates alternatives to municipal, competitive and corporate-driven planning practices.

- Testimony on Making Waves: Principles for Building Toronto’s Waterfront: Given to the Planning and Transportation Committee in December 2002. The testimony focused on the lack of affordable housing in the City’s waterfront plan.
- Public Services for Sale?: A public forum organized in March 2003 by Planning Action and the Toronto Chapter of Council of Canadians, addressed the implications of
The plan was crafted by and for people who own land, and people who develop land in the city.

Our critique of the city’s new Official Plan in the fall of 2002 made connections between the neoliberal transformations of Toronto and the democratization of urban planning. It is also a good example of the kind of response Planning Action has mounted to the shifts described above. As our first collective project, it played an important role in defining the politics of the group.

The New Official Plan

After a lengthy process of collective reading and intense debate of the plan, a working group formed to do more of the same. Instead of focusing on detailed policies in the plan, our critique emphasized what we thought was the more fundamental problem of the perspectives it operationalized, and the process behind its construction. While we did comment on problems with definitions of housing affordability, and other specific proposals, our overwhelming emphasis was on the structure of the plan. The plan was of a radically new kind; a slim document with lots of pictures of city spaces, with no sign of the cumbersome old zoning and density regulations of yesteryear. Planning would be simpler, quicker and sexier, anchored not so much in uses but in forms. While no doubt, the old systems were heavily bureaucratic, paternalistic, and needed to be changed, we argued that the kind of changes that were proposed would undermine the power of citizens to challenge development and developers. What sort of planning argument can be made against the vague measure of ‘aesthetic’s by citizens that cannot be toppled by the aesthetic analysis of an internationally known architect? What level of government does ‘good form’ provide for citizens in place of the old system of density bonuses through which concessions were won for daycare spaces, parks, and other essential public goods?

The plan was built around three “lenses.” It quickly became clear to us that the lenses identified different kinds of development that would serve the interests of three different groups. The first lens would designate areas for intensive regeneration. With little concern for existing uses and users, it would create open zones for large-scale redevelopment, called ‘employment zones.’

The second lens was geared towards the intensification of wider roads and designated areas foragen- trification. Without investment in public housing, the intensification of the avenues would displace existing businesses and apartments. In the third lens, the neighborhoods, change would be prevented, catering to the NIMBYism of homeowners.

Action testified following a glowing presenta- tion by none other than Jane Jacobs herself. In our view, when homeless activists stormed into city council chambers, it was perhaps the only moment where any kind of democratic or par- ticipatory process was evident in the entire Official Plan process. City Hall offered a measly low of six public consultation ‘open houses,’ or one for every 500,000 residents, while hand- picked experts had been brought in to the process early on in working groups, focus groups, and visioning sessions. We insisted that a plan for the city must be articulated by the diverse communities of Toronto who are already struggling against economic, cultural, and ecological injustice.

In addition to our testimony, we also prepared articles for alternative media, newspapers, and professional journals. A short film about the Official Plan for popular education purposes was planned but never completed. Our response to the Official Plan had some impact in the media and with a few city councilors, but over all it is impossible to measure these kinds of effects.

Most importantly, we are actively engaged in building a community and a counterpublic.

Purchase your copy of the 2004 Progressive Planning Reader

106 pages of articles from past issues of Progressive Planning Magazine and Planners Network Newsletter on topics including:

Politics and Planning • Urban Design • Race, Gender, and Diversity • Globalization and International Issues • Planning Education • Regional Planning • Transportation and Information • Sustainability, Environment and Health

$12 per issue postage paid
Orders of 10 issues or more, $8 per issue
Send order and payment to:
Planners Network
1 Rapson Hall
89 Church Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455-1019
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How Planners Can Change Public Policy Through Social Action

By Ayse Yonder

Three longtime activist planners, during one of the main plenary sessions at the Planners Network 2004 Conference, talked about breaking down barriers to developing bridges at local, national, and international levels. Jackie Leavitt, professor of urban planning at the University of California, Los Angeles; the Community Scholars program and works with community/labor coalitions. Sheila Patel is director of SPARC, the Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centers, based in Mumbai (Bombay) India. Jan Peterson is active in the National Congress of Neighborhood Women (NCNW), Grassroots Organizations Operating Together in Sisterhood (GROOTS) and the Haarlow Commission.

"How can progressive planners respond to the task of making social change? How can we move from the margins to the mainstream in the planning profession and create wider coalitions?" With these questions Jackie Leavitt launched a wide-ranging discussion that urged both individuals and organizations like Planners Network to go further than they have. In the discussion, a few key principles emerged for helping progressive planners break down the walls between community groups, practitioners and academics:

- Shed the cloak of providing expertise from on high and learn new roles from grassroots groups;
- Appreciate the power of grassroots, community and labor groups;
- Reach across borders—national and international, between planners and grassroots groups—to ensure that resources are more equitably divided, that grassroots voices are at the table when decisions are being made and that research supports social action; and
- Inclusive processes that originate from communities to the point that they can include broader groups and more interests.

Community and Labor in Los Angeles

Jackie Leavitt drew on the history of the public housing bill in the 1930s, recalling Catherines Bauer's role in the struggle for organizing, coming to the main conference hall to support it, joint forces where people are already in motion. Leavitt also referred to the example of today's burgeoning labor movement in Los Angeles and its inclusion of workers in low-wage occupa-
tions. "Plain and simple, labor's desire have won union representation, health benefits and increased respect for laboring in low-wage jobs. Los Angeles' landscape of social action also includes worker centers, such as those for day labors and garment workers that fight against wage discrimination and exploitation. The centers serve mainly immigrants and a coalition of five centers is leading the campaign for new policies that recognize that the benefits of new policies must be linked to workers of different social groups (for example, the work of coalition building to expand the benefits of new policies to women workers)."

Community Scholar, a joint project of the UCLA Department of Urban Planning and the Center for Labor Research and Education, is one example of a bridge between community and academia that expands on the concept of action planning. This was the first program of its kind in the University of California system. It turns university resources outward by engaging local and community activities—Community Scholars—in collaborative projects with graduate and undergraduate stu-
dents. Drawing from a paper written with Karla Heffernan, Leavitt described the program, which was launched in 1991.

Community Scholars are chosen from among activists in community and labor organizations and work alongside urban planning graduates and undergraduates for two terms of applied research. Over its lifetime about 120 Scholars and 300 gradu-
ate and undergraduate students have been involved in the program. Scholars are drawn from the ranks of staff, leaders and/or executive board members of labor/community-based organizations, including community development corporations, service delivery groups, faith-based groups, union locals, the County Federation of Labor and worker centers.

The program has multiple objectives: 1) advancing networking among activists by defining boundary lines among unions and community organizations, community development and economic development corporations; 2) breaking down the academy's insular-
ity and connecting to the world beyond the ivory towers; 3) turning university resources outward through an applied research project, encouraging graduate and undergraduate students to collaborate with Scholars and by bringing the groups sponsoring the Scholars; 4) exposing planning students to labor research and broadening the content of more traditional classes in community development and community-based planning classes; and 5) laying a founda-
tion for future partnerships. The first Scholars' proj-
et set a precedent for this: "Accidental Tourist" critiqued the city of Los Angeles' tourism promotion strategy, which worked to make LA a "cheap" destination that would bring economic benefits to working-class communities and communities of color.

Local Knowledge and International Expertise: Mumbai and Kenya

Sheila Patel talked about planners who do not listen to the experiences of grassroots people or pay attention to the creative ways in which people resolve their issues. This often leads to conflicts with communities, institutions arrive with prede-
termined solutions and planners with approaches that begin from the top down. Patel stressed the importance of community dialogues and peer learning that crosses national boundaries.

Patel gave as a positive example the assistance given by SPARC to shum dwellers trying along the railway tracks in Mumbai. The strategy there was adapted to conditions in Kenya, where Patel saw a parallel situa-
tion. Patel suggested that the Pamoja Trust and the National Shum Dwellers Federation (NSDF) in Kenya talk to their railways and bring the communities and gov-
ernment to the same table, which is now happening in India. In February 2004, the government started demolishing houses by the railways in Nairobi. The Pamoja and Mungano Trust asked the railways to consider a new way of dealing with the process of clearing the land. They explored working cooperatively with the poor to solve the problem: providing alternative housing for the poor and clearing only those areas around the railway tracks. Two months later, a team of seven Kenyans came to Mumbai to meet with communi-
ties, SPARC, the railways and government officials who worked with the Mumbai process, and they began to explore how Kenya would undertake a sim-
ilar partnership in Nairobi.

Patel also described the coalition-building of SPARC and the Shack Dwellers International (SDI), a net-
work of community federations of the urban poor who work with and learn from each other. The inter-
national network of poor peoples' federations in Asia and Africa sus-
tains peer foundations. SPARC and SDI have worked with other federations to negotiate with global insti-
tutions such as the World Bank and with local private

In conclusion, Patel emphasized that some-
thing has to change to open up real partnerships, that planners should not come into communities with preconceived ideas of how to organize democratically.

From Local to International Organizing

Jan Peterson talked about how her community development work in her neighborhood of Williamsburg-Bowery (New York City) led her to par-
ticipate in the formation of a national organization, the National Congress of Neighborhood Women (NCNW), and then to new international organiza-
tions. Starting in 1985, grassroots organizations and groups who were meeting at a series of United Nations conferences saw the need to form a global net-
work, GROOTS was the first group to form when people from NCNW realized that grassroots women's organizations throughout the world were doing similar work around community develop-
ment, housing and infrastructure projects, and that the work needed to learn from the south. In 1995, at the fourth World Women's Conference in Beijing, the Haarlow Commission was formed with a mis-

sion to forge partnerships with grassroots organizations and bridges to other partners such as the media, foundations, international organizations and academia. Peterson called for a new way of partnering between grassroots communities and planners that went beyond participation to real democratic prac-
tices. She noted that planners need to fill their roles and learn how to best serve community pri-
orities. Planners should provide expertise but also share practices, and really listen and learn. She emphasized the need for planners to construct networks both inside their own organizations and externally so they are not acting as isolated profes-
sionals at the mercy of management. She stressed that planners can have leverage if they build their own areas of influence by coalescing with international audiences.

In an increasingly global world, US planners should learn from other countries. There are many examples of good planning and effective partnerships, particu-
larly between grassroots communities and local authorities. Peterson gave examples of Haarlow Commission member-gov't work in the areas of the AIDS pandemic, natural disasters and post-conf-
flict situations. These are powerful examples that start with the immediate and basic needs of people and move to their "strategic" needs—as opposed to outside experts' recommendations—a transformation in people's roles, whether in disaster-
stricken areas of India and Turkey or conflict areas in Bosnia, or with regard to the spread of AIDS across national borders in Africa. [Cont. on next page]
Hearing Children’s Voices

By Ray Lorenzo and Roger Hart

This year’s annual Planners Network Conference featured a workshop devoted to incorporating a set of voices rarely heard in the participatory planning process—those of children. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (adopted in 1989) set a rigorous agenda for ways in which, across an extremely wide range of issues, children’s voices should be heard. Issues addressed by the Convention include housing, community health, child care, child labor and poverty, schools and juvenile justice. The Convention was the centerpiece for a conversation among the workshop participants.

The workshop asked how and why children’s voices are not heard when it comes to making decisions about the local environment. This issue was featured in the Convention’s supporting documentation and especially in a follow-up publication, Cities for Children: Children’s Rights, Poverty and Urban Management (Shelbirn Bartlett [and others], UNICEF [New York] and Earthscan [London], 1999).

Participatory in nature, the workshop allowed attendees an opportunity to brainstorm reasons why children and youth should be involved in urban design, planning and development processes. Ideas were organized loosely into four themes: citizenship and rights (i.e., children are citizens now and have basic civil rights); capacity-building, empowerment and learning (i.e., participation encourages a sense of the future and of efficacy and empowerment); different perspectives (i.e., children have a unique perspective and it makes for better development to hear this perspective); and activities/priorities for youth and children (i.e., it produces better designed services for youth).

The discussion that followed was rich and animated. The overall sense was that those in the group who had had experiences of participation with children and youth were highly motivated and held this “approach” as fundamental to progressive, participatory planning and design.

Yonder [cont. from preceding page]

Peterson suggested that Planners Network provided such a framework and could become a training ground for the next generation of activist planners.

For additional information on each of these projects, see: UCLA Community Scholars:

http://www.sprsr.ucla.edu/; SPARC: www.sparcindia.org;
The Huaion Commission: www.huaion.org

Ray Lorenzo works with the ARCoG in Milan, Italy. Roger Hart is professor of environmental psychology, Center for Human Environments, Graduate Center of City University of New York. For more information, contact Ray Lorenzo at raylorenzo@it.

Yonder is Chair of the Graduate Center for Planning & The Environment at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, NY.

Walls Becoming Bridges/Bridges Becoming Walls

By Anneliese Vance and Joanna Rogalski

At first glance, the concepts of walls and bridges seem to be antagonistic opposites. One is considered negative, the other positive. One signifies oppression while the other represents freedom.

But it’s not that simple. If you look more closely at the concepts of walls and bridges, what’s revealed are many complex and interrelated dynamics. This is what came out of our workshop at the Planners Network 2004 Conference “Walls or Bridges?”

After discussing several concrete cases, we realized that walls and bridges are only two possible results of the perceived differences between people and places. In other words, walls and bridges differ according to the social context and the meanings that people give to them. Alternative interpretations allow us to transform walls into bridges and bridges into walls, and to transcend the idea of walls and bridges as necessarily antagonistic.

Walls Come First

Walls represent differences between people and places, barriers that divide. They lead us to look at what’s on the other side of the wall as “the other.” Walls are more obvious than bridges because they reflect differences between people, whether physical or metaphorical. They are a lot easier to recognize than bridges, but bridges are also there because of differences. They wouldn’t be bridges if there wasn’t anything what’s on both sides of the bridge were the same.

When people perceive differences between groups, they can decide to either separate them or bring them together. They can either create barriers to human interaction or create new connections. As they move towards building a wall or a bridge, they also construct the ideas that go along with the infrastructure.

As planners and activists interested in social and physical changes, we want to learn how walls can become bridges and bridges can become walls. The cases we discussed in our workshop help shed some light on these processes.

Walls Becoming Bridges

In Belfast. Maggie Cowell studied the Peace Lines in Belfast, Northern Ireland. These ‘lines drawn in the sand’ are intended to divide Catholics and Protestants living in the city. Several walls have been erected at the request of people living on both sides of the Peace Lines as a means to minimize inter-group violence. It could be argued that these walls serve a secondary role as bridges between the two warring communities. The imposed separation is by mutual agreement, and can serve as a temporary bridge between Catholics and Protestants, Nationalists and Unionists. The physical wall is the representation of social negotiations whose immediate motivation is peaceful co-existence and safety for people living on both sides.

At a time and place where no actual bridges seem likely, the creation of walls can result in the building of surrogate bridges—agreements by residents on both sides to curb violence. In this context, good fences do indeed help make good neighbors.

Cross-Border Education. Anneliese Vance and Ute Lehrer looked at how the international border between the United States and Canada affected cross-border commuting by post-secondary students and educators. Although the international border superficially makes a distinction between Americans and Canadians, various colleges and universities located along the border have lessened this distinction by offering tailored education opportunities that accommodate student needs. Indeed, several colleges and universities in western New York offer specially marketed programs designed specifically to meet the needs and desires of Canadian students. And over the past decade Canadian colleges and universities have marketed their subsidies (that is, low cost) tuition as an incentive for US students to study in Canada.

Political Walls in the West Bank. Fida’ Abdel Latif wrote about the now-famous network of Israeli-built walls in the West Bank—the same network discussed in the keynote address by Diana Buttu at the 2004 Planners Network Conference. Ms. Buttu’s informative speech is itself a kind of bridge that is emerging that spreads the knowledge and awareness of human rights infringements created by the wall. This bridge of awareness is reaching the international community through organizations such as Stop the Wall ©
Bridges Becoming Walls

Community Art Projects. Joanna Rogalski and Ute Leher explored how public art projects, like the recent "Cow Parades" in North American cities, could be used to alter the definitions of public space and community. Although these projects intend to show how diversity is celebrated, in a sense bridging difference, they also become a means for censoring and redefining what amount of difference is tolerated in public space. De facto walls are created in the name of celebrating diversity and building community.

Fire Escapes. Shannon Doyle explored another type of bridge—fire escapes. Fire escapes serve as bridges to safety, connecting a building's upper floors to the ground level. But, they also serve as secondary staircases, and what many term the "poor man's balconies," bridging public spaces at the street level with the private space of apartments. The dual nature of fire escapes creates a transitional space and leads to more questions—are fire escapes public or private spaces? The more fire escapes are used as public spaces, the more likely they become to be regulated and private in nature. On their own, fire escapes represent physical bridges. However, through this unconventional usage, the public and private nature must be negotiated; fire escapes have the potential to become walls between indoor (private) and outdoor (public) existence.

The Struggle to Define Walls and Bridges

Despite our initial concerns over how to knit our topics into a coherent workshop, we managed to find common threads, but it was the process of finding those threads that was the most useful aspect of the Planners Network Conference. In fact, our struggles for a common voice served as a convenient metaphor for what the theme of the conference implied for us—moving beyond the conventional definitions of walls and bridges, and then attempting to transcend them through the hard work of discussion. A long process of negotiation and listening taught us not so much how to define a wall or a bridge (sometimes a structure is concurrently both), but how to recognize the underlying social, economic and political issues which physical walls and bridges often mask through artificial dichotomies.

Our workshop participants could have chosen to focus on the differences we found, throw up our hands and agree to disagree. But we were struck by how often this artificial dichotomy is used as the bridge in times of conflict, and at times is a means of keeping the peace. A static physical structure is often a misguided solution for addressing dynamic social processes. Our workshop group, over the span of many coffee shop meetings and one intense Saturday afternoon, learned that the hard work of tolerance, negotiation and openness to discussion cannot be avoided if walls and bridges are to be effective means of navigating social, economic and political complexities.

The difficulty when discussing walls and bridges is the conceptual dichotomy the two words create. Transcending this dichotomy, i.e., realizing that the concepts are not antagonistic, is key to the process of transforming walls into bridges.

Ameliese Vance and Joanna Rogalski are students at the State University of New York (SUNY) at Buffalo. This article arose from intense pre-conference discussions and meetings among the participants of their workshop at the Planners Network Conference. They wish to thank Ute Leher (Brock University), Maggie Cowell (SUNY/Buffalo), Shannon Doyle (Brock University) and Fida Abdel Latif (SUNY/Buffalo) for their thoughtful contributions and a great journey.

Conference Highlight:
Community Workshops

The organizers of the annual Planners Network Conference believe that exposure to local practice makes for a good exchange of information among progressive planners. For this reason, we try to arrange for conference participants to meet with local groups engaged in grassroots planning efforts, and New York City certainly has its share. The following is as a sampling of this year's community workshops.

Williamsburg-Greenpoint, Brooklyn

Williamsburg-Greenpoint is an ethnically diverse, traditionally working-class community in northeastern Brooklyn that is currently experiencing rapid redevelopment, gentrification and displacement pressure. Residents and local non-profits fear that a sweeping rezoning initiative proposed by the city will lead to further real estate speculation, change neighborhood context and result in even more displacement.

The workshop in this neighborhood was conducted by residents and a representative of a local housing development corporation. The group included a few North Americans and primarily people from other countries, including Italy and Germany. The group met at Jennings Hall for breakfast and a viewing of a film made about the neighborhood.

Tour leaders pointed out buildings in the neighborhood where development pressures were likely to result in their conversion. They explained that their group was seeking to preserve the structures because of their historical value and because they were rent-stabilized. Tour participants learned about the history of the neighborhood (including the fact that one person taking the tour had been born at a hospital visited on the tour). Community struggles related to local schools and other sites were explained. Participants learned about the community struggles to overcome violence in local schools and parole office of the community. The overall impression was that the tour succeeded in weaving the history of the community with the struggle to maintain and produce affordable housing for local residents.

East Harlem, Manhattan

The group met with representatives and partners of the Tenants Association at James Weldon Johnson (JWJ) Houses, a 1,300-unit public housing development in East Harlem. The Association, "working as an unpaid CDC," as the residents put it, has been active in helping residents gain control over and improve their environment, and in building broader coalitions with other public housing residents citywide and nationally. Ethel Velz, a resident and the head of the Association, is also a co-founder and executive director of NYC Public Housing Residents Alliance. Ethel Velz, Harold Thompson and other residents of JWJ Houses talked about their development, organizing efforts, including tenant patrols, and current threats and challenges facing public housing residents in general, i.e., the loss of thousands of affordable public housing units despite the rising demand; the implications of increasing unemployment on the ability to afford housing; bureaucracy that ignores residents' demands and needs; the blaming of residents for dilapidated building conditions caused by cheap and wasteful construction practices and, finally, the implications of the mandatory community service requirement.

Sylvana Boggia from the Legal Aid Society discussed the efforts to stop evictions and waive the mandatory community service requirement. She agreed that these were just pieces of the government's implicit policy to evict residents and dis- mantle public housing. Nicole Branca from TRADES (Trade Unions and Residents for Apprenticeship Development and Economic Success) explained how this coalition of progressive unions, public housing residents and community groups have organized to strengthen Section 8 hiring to provide employment and employability of residents.

In the afternoon, other resident leaders from different boroughs and the NYC Public Housing Residents Alliance joined the discussion. Vernell Robinson from Brooklyn told her own story of how she became a resident leader and discussed the inadequacy of the current Resident Advisory Council to NYC Housing Authority (NYCHA) in
bringing the residents' voices to the table. It was noted that NYCHA districts do not coincide with any political boundaries, making it difficult to petition local politicians. Ruby Johnson talked about their negotiations with contractors to hire the youth, and the media's role in reinforcing the negative image of public housing while there is crime all over the city. fauna are less than equines from the Bronx discussed issues related to trying to work with the local police precinct after losing their own security service.

The meeting ended with suggestions from participants about whether the mandatory work requirement could be used to organize residents around tenant associations, and about forging broader coalitions with other groups, e.g., other tenant groups in subsidized housing and community-based organizations around planning issues. A plea was also made by resident leaders for a think-tank meeting with planners to discuss the future of public housing.

Cooper Square, Manhattan

The workshop commenced with a condensed forty-five-year history of the struggle for low-cost housing in the Lower East Side of Manhattan by: Frances Goldin, community leader; Walter Thubbt, who prepared the Cooper Square Alternate Plan; Val Orselli, director of the Cooper Square Mutual Housing Association; and Steve Herrick, director of the Cooper Square Committee. They explained how residents and business owners organized against an urban renewal plan directed by Robert Moses, fought for their own plan that would not displace low-income people and ended up producing an amazing number of housing units that will remain affordable to low-income people in perpetuity. The hot, muggy weather did not impede the tour—participants visited several units of mutual housing, and lunched at a Housing Works supportive housing project for people with HIV/AIDS. The tour concluded at First Houses, the historic site of the nation's first public housing project, still one of the best.

South Bronx

The South Bronx workshop began with a presentation and neighborhood tour from Lourdes Zappata-Perez, assistant vice president of industrial and business development for SoBRO, a major economic development organization in Morrisania and Port Morris. Lourdes provided a rundown of SoBRO's work with the 138th Street corridor, industrial and business development, and relatively recent forays into housing development.

After a walk down Brook Avenue, participants traveled to the offices of Mothers on the Move (MOM), a community organizing group in Hunts Point. Co-directors James Mumm and Wanda Salaman and the rest of the MOM staff gave updates on their environmental justice, housing, and education campaign. The planners in the group had a particular interest in a major transportation initiative that MOM is working on in coalition with other South Bronx groups to close the little-used Sheridan Expressway. The initiative calls for opening the land up for affordable housing and open space and creating new off-ramps from the Bruckner Expressway directly to the Hunts Point Market and the newly-relocated Fulton Fish Market, as a way to reroute heavy commercial truck traffic away from neighborhood streets. The last stop on the tour was The Point, an innovative CDC with a focus on arts and environmental justice. Their location, a renovated warehouse, is home to a theater, a restaurant, a web design company, a desert maker and the Point's educational programs. Director Paul Lipson and Associate Director Maria Torres provided a rundown on the history of the organization, as well as a sound education on the environmental, food planning and traffic problems of the neighborhood.

Images from the 2004 Planners Network Conference:
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At right: Conference brochure designed by Patricia Gallo

Below: Photos from the conference sessions and neighborhood tours. All photos by Ann Forsyth.

**Articles welcome for upcoming theme issues:**

- Olympic Cities
- U.S. Urban Policy After the 2004 Elections
- Global Warming and Energy
- Design, Arts and Culture
- Race and Planning
- Indigenous Planning

See page 3 for submission details.
TO ALL PLANNERS NETWORK MEMBERS:

Proposed Revisions to PN By-Laws

PN’s by-laws were adopted by the Steering Committee when PN was incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1997. The Steering Committee recently reviewed the by-laws and proposes the changes marked below. The changes basically bring the by-laws into line with the way PN has functioned, eliminates an unrealistic quorum requirement, and explicitly allows for some business to be conducted via the internet. Although not required by the by-laws we ask members to approve the new by-laws by checking the box on the Steering Committee ballot.

BYLAWS OF PLANNERS NETWORK, INC.
PROPOSED REVISIONS, 2004

ADDITIONS ARE UNDERLINED. DELETIONS ARE STRIKED OUT.

* ARTICLE I. MEMBERS

Section 1. Membership. Membership shall be open to all persons interested in the purposes of the Planners Network. All Members must make an annual financial or other contribution to the Planners Network.

Section 2. Meetings. The annual meeting of the Members (the “Annual Meeting”) for the transaction of all business as may come before the Members shall be held each year at the place (which may be either within or outside the State of New York). time and date, as may be fixed by the Steering Committee, or, if not so fixed, as may be determined by the Chairperson of the Steering Committee. Special meetings shall be held whenever called by resolution of no less than three Steering Committee members, the Chairperson(s), or by written demand of no less than 5% of the Members to the Chairperson(s). Annual meetings will normally be conducted at the time of the annual conference but are not required if there is no conference and no business requiring action by the membership.

Section 3. Notice of Meetings. Written notice of the place, date and hour of any meeting shall be given to each member entitled to vote at such meeting by mailing notice of the meeting by first class mail, postage prepaid, or by personal delivery, distributed via the Planners Network email list(s) and announced on the Planners Network web site and magazine not less than ten nor more than fifty days before the date of the meeting. Notice of any special meetings shall indicate the purpose for which they are called and the person or persons calling the meeting.

Section 4. Quorum. Adjournments of Meetings. All meetings of the Members, a majority of the Members, present in person or by proxy, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. In the absence of a quorum, a majority of the 25 Members present in person or by proxy may adjourn the meeting, and fix a new meeting date and time, or decide to conduct a postal/email/web vote.

Section 5. Organization. The Chairperson(s) of the Corporation shall preside at all meetings of the Members or, in the absence of the Chairperson(s) an acting Chairperson shall be chosen by the Members present. The Staffperson shall act as secretary at all meetings of the members, but in the absence of the Staffperson, the presiding officer may appoint any person to act as secretary of the meeting.

Section 6. Voting. At any meeting of the Members, each Member present, in person or by proxy, shall be entitled to one vote. Upon demand of any Member, any vote for the Steering Committee or upon any question before the meeting shall be by ballot.

Section 7. Action by the Members. Except as otherwise provided by statute or by these by-laws, any action authorized by a majority of the votes cast at a meeting of Members shall be an act of the Members.

Section 8. Special Action Requiring Vote of Members. The following corporate actions may not be taken without approval of the members:

(a) a majority of the votes cast at a Meeting of the members, or via ballot distributed via the magazine, email lists, and web site with at least 30 days allowed for a response, is required for (1) any amendment of or change to the Certificate of Incorporation, or (2) a petition for judicial dissolution;

(b) two-thirds of the votes cast at a meeting of the Members is required for (1) disposing of all, or substantially all, of the assets of the Corporation, (2) approval of a plan of mergers, (3) authorization of a plan of non-judicial dissolution, or (4) revocation of a voluntary dissolution proceeding.

provided, however, that the affirmative votes cast in favor of any such action shall be at least equal to the minimum number of votes necessary to constitute a quorum. Blank votes or abstentions shall not be counted in the number of votes cast.

ARTICLE II. STEERING COMMITTEE

Section 1. Powers and Numbers. The properties, affairs and activities of Planners Network shall be managed and controlled and its powers exercised by the Steering Committee. The number of members constituting the entire Steering Committee after the first annual meeting of the Members shall be no less than three (3) and no more than 14.

Section 2. Election and Term of Office. The initial Steering Committee members shall be the persons elected at the organizational meeting. Their term shall expire at the first annual meeting of the Members (the “Annual Meeting”). Prior to the Annual Meeting, the Steering Committee shall elect its members to hold office for a term of one year. Any member elected to hold office for the term of one year is, unless re-elected by a vote of the majority of the members present at the Annual Meeting, automatically removed from office at the end of the term of office. Any vacancy on the Steering Committee shall be filled by the Board of Directors in the manner prescribed in the by-laws. At the Annual Meeting, each member of the Steering Committee shall be elected to hold office for the term of one year. Any member elected to hold office for two years for the term of two years. Any member elected to hold office for the term of two years shall be eligible for re-election at the next Annual Meeting of Members.

Section 3. Newly Created Steering Committee Positions. Newly created positions and vacancies among the Steering Committee for any reason may be filled by vote of a majority of the Steering Committee members then in office, regardless of their number, and the members so elected shall serve until the next annual meeting of the Members.

Section 4. Resignations. Any member may resign from the Steering Committee at any time. Such resignations shall be made in writing, and shall take effect at the time specified therein, and if no time be specified, at the time of receipt by Planners Network or its Chairperson(s).

Section 5. Removal. Any Steering Committee member may be removed at any time with cause by a majority of the Steering Committee at any meeting, provided that at least one week’s notice of the proposed action shall have been given to the entire Steering Committee. Any Steering Committee member can be removed at any time with cause by a majority vote of the Members.

Section 6. Meetings. Meetings of the Steering Committee may be held at any place as the Steering Committee may from time to time fix, or as shall be specified in the notice or waivers of notice thereof.

Section 7. Quorum and Voting. Unless a greater proportion is required by law, a majority of the entire Steering Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business or of any specified item of business. Except as otherwise provided by statute or by these by-laws, the vote of a majority of the Steering Committee members present at the time of the vote, if a quorum is present at such time, shall be an act of the Steering Committee. If at any meeting of the Steering Committee there shall be less than a quorum present, the members present may adjourn the meeting until a quorum is obtained. Any one or more members of the Steering Committee may participate by telephone or other similar communications equipment by means of which all persons participating in the meeting can hear each other at the same time. Participation by such means shall constitute presence in person at a meeting.

Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Steering Committee may be taken without a meeting if two-thirds of the members of the Steering Committee consent in writing to the action, or if a resolution authorizing the action. The resolution and the written consent thereto by the members of the Steering Committee shall be
filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee.

Section 8. Notice of Meetings. Notice of the time and place of each regular or special meeting of the Steering Committee, together with a written agenda stating all matters upon which action is proposed to be taken and to the extent possible, copies of all documents on which action is pro-
posed to be taken, shall be mailed to each Steering Committee member, postage pre-
paid, addressed to him or her at his or her residence or usual place of business, or sent via email, at least seven days before the day on which the meeting is to be held;
provided, however, that notice of special meetings to discuss matters requiring prompt action may be sent to him or her at such address by fax, telegram, electronic mail or given personally or by telephone, no less than forty-eight hours before the time at which such meeting is to be held, unless the meeting must be held within forty-eight hours.

ARTICLE III. OFFICERS, AGENTS, AND EMPLOYEES

Section 1. Number, Election and Term of Office of Chairperson and Staffperson.

The officers of Planners Network shall be a Chairperson and/or Co-Chairperson and a Staffperson. The Chairperson(s) shall be elect-
ed at the annual meeting of the Steering Committee held immediately following the annual meeting of the Members. In the event of the death, resignation, or removal for cause of the Chairperson(s) or if the Chairperson(s) are unable or unwilling to serve until the next annual meeting, the Steering Committee shall elect an interim Chairperson(s) to serve until the next annual meeting.

Section 2. Employees and Other Agents.

The Steering Committee may appoint from time to time such employees and other agents as it shall deem necessary, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of the Steering Committee, and shall have such authority and perform such duties, and shall receive such reasonable compensation, as a majority of the Steering Committee may from time to time determine.

Section 3. Removal. Any officer, employee or agent of the Planners Network may be removed by the directors of the entire Steering Committee.

Section 4. Chairperson(s), Powers and Duties. The Chairperson(s) shall preside at all meetings of the Members and of the Steering Committee. The Chairperson(s) shall have gen-
eral supervision of the affairs of the Planners Network, and shall keep the Steering Committee fully informed about the activities of the Planners Network. He or she has the power to sign and execute any contract or agreement to which the Planners Network is a party, provided that the power to sign and execute any contract or agreement shall be vested in the Steering Committee unless otherwise stated in this仪文.

The Chairperson(s) shall perform all duties usually incident to the office of the Chairperson, and shall perform such other duties as from time to time may be assigned by the Steering Committee.

Section 5. Staffperson: Powers and Duties. The Staffperson shall be appointed from time to time by the Steering Committee. The Staffperson shall keep the minutes of the annual meeting and all meetings of the Steering Committee, maintain the Membership roll and tabulate election results. S/he shall be responsible for the serving of notice. S/he shall keep or cause to be kept full and accurate accounts of receipts and disbursements, and shall deposit or cause to be deposited all monies and other valuable documents of Planners Network in such banks or depositories as the Steering Committee shall designate at the Annual Meeting and whenever else required by the Steering Committee, s/he shall render a statement of Planners Network’s accounts.

Section 6. Compensation. Any officer, employee or agent of Planners Network is authorized to receive a reasonable salary or other reasonable compensation for services rendered when authorized by a majority of the Steering Committee, and only when so authorized.

ARTICLE IV. AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended or repealed by a majority vote of a majority of the entire Steering Committee at any meeting of the Steering Committee, or by the Members of the Planners Network at the Annual Meeting or a special meeting, providing notice of the pro-
posed alteration has been included in the notice of meeting.

Candidate Statements

2004 Steering Committee Election

Tom Angotti, Brooklyn, New York: As long as the wealthiest country in the world breeds communities that live in poverty while its exclusive enclaves of conspicuous consumption continue to grow, there will be space for progressive planning. Planners Network is helping to fill that space. I was one of the original members of Planners Network in 1975, have been on the Steering Committee since 1996, and with Ann Forsyth started Progressive Planning Magazine as a successor to the PN Newsletter. In the next two years I would like to focus on developing the Magazine and its staff and work with others to expand PN’s voice as an advocate for progressive politics in the professions and the broader progressive community.

Alex Schaffer: I am a planning student at Hunter College/CUNY with a background in housing policy, community organizing and immigrant rights. I helped organize the 2004 conference, and I am looking forward to working on future conferences. My main interests with PN are mobilizing young planners, expanding PN throughout the country, especially the West and Mexico, and raising our profile within the planning profession, APA and ACSP.

Amy Siciliano: My involvement with the Planners Network began in 2002, providing editorial assistance to Progressive Planning Magazine. Since then my work with PN has involved establishing a local chapter of Planners Network in Montreal, organizing local PN events and assisting with the production of a ‘Disorientation’ guide for students. This fall I will serve as student representative to PN.

Norma Rantisi: I have been a member of Planners Network for almost five years. For four years, I have been a member of the Progressive Planning Magazine Editorial Board (formerly the PN Newsletter). In the past year, I have served as an interim member of the Steering Committee and Editor for the new PN Enewletter. As a new professor at Concordia University in Montreal, I have found Planners Network to be an invaluable resource for identifying critical (and many times, controversial) planning issues in both local and global contexts, and for exploring progressive alternatives for addressing such issues. I elected to the Steering Committee, I would like to continue to support and to expand the PN network through the Enewletter and the new website.

Richard Milgrom: I am an architect, planner, urban designer and activist. I have been a member of Planners Network since 1996 and a member of the steering committee since 2001 and I am currently co-chair. My work in both the professional and academic realms has focused on issues of sustainability, housing and participatory processes in planning and design. I have worked in Canada, the UK and the US. As a member of PN, I have acted as guest editor for several issues of Progressive Planning, contributed numerous articles and was one of the organ-
izers of the 2000 conference in Toronto. Having recently moved to Minneapolis, where I am an associate director of the Metropolitan Design Center, I am now working to bring the 2005 PN conference to the Twin Cities.

Ken Reardon: I am an Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell University where I engage in research, teaching, and outreach activities related to neighborhood planning, community development, and community/university development partnerships. Prior to returning to Cornell, I was on the planning faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign where I helped launch the East St. Louis Action Research Project. Prior to pursuing graduate degrees in planning at Hunter and Cornell, I worked as a community organizer for the New Jersey Federation of Senior Citizens, the Connecticut Citizens Action Group, and NYP Sims’ Citizens Alliance. I have shaped my empowerment approach to planning based upon the ideas and examples of Patrick Geddes, Paul Davidoff, Don Sullivan, and Rob Mier.

Josh Lerner: As an interim steering committee member since July 2003, I’ve initiated and coordinated the university/local organizing campaign and website redesign. I hope to continue supporting local organizing, developing new lines of communication between members, and building a more democratic and active Planners Network.
Planners Network
2004 Steering Committee Election

Voting Instructions and Ballot

According to the by-laws of Planners Network, the responsibilities of the Steering Committee are as follows:

• The property, affairs and activities of Planners Network shall be managed and controlled and its powers exercised by the Steering Committee. The number of members constituting the entire Steering Committee after the first annual meeting of the Members shall be no less than three (3) and no more than 14.

• Steering Committee members may be elected to any number of consecutive terms. Steering Committee members shall be elected at the Annual Meeting of Members by a plurality of the votes cast or by mail or email ballot distributed to all Members via the magazine and web site/email list and due at least 30 days after mailing or emailing.

Planners Network
2004 Steering Committee Election
and By-Law Change Referendum

Official Ballot

Please make your selection from the following list of candidates. Please vote for at least three candidates. (Statements from each candidate on following page.)

[ ] Tom Angotti
[ ] Josh Lerner
[ ] Richard Milgrom
[ ] Norma Rantisi
[ ] Ken Reardon
[ ] Alex Schafman
[ ] Amy Siciliano

[ ] Approve By-Law Changes

Please return your ballot form no later than October 1 to:

1 Rapson Hall
89 Church Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0109

---

Planners Network Steering Committee
Statement on the Israeli Wall

We believe that urban and rural land should be planned in a way that fosters interactions and connections between people and the elimination of social, economic and ethnic barriers. We oppose planning that leads to the displacement of communities, the destruction of homes and the erection of barriers.

The Israeli Wall is planned to encircle the Occupied Territories of the West Bank and create a series of isolated enclaves of Palestinian Arabs. Most of the Wall is being built illegally within the Occupied Territories, enabling the Israeli government and businesses to take control over Palestinian homes, water and farmland. The Wall separates many Palestinians from their families, schools, hospitals and workplaces. By dividing Palestinian communities, it prevents the creation of a contiguous, viable Palestinian state.

The Wall is the latest tactic to realize the Israeli government’s long-range plan to displace Palestinian people and gain control over the resources of the Occupied Territories. Israel has also built an extensive network of ‘bypass roads’—freeways that only Israelis can use to drive through the Occupied Territories and to Israeli settlements, which are exclusive ethnic enclaves. The bypass roads and hundreds of internal military checkpoints restrict Palestinians from moving within the Occupied Territories. These tactics are resulting in a segregated arrangement of gated Israeli settlements and isolated Palestinian ghettos, comparable to the Bantustans of South African apartheid. The plan is largely financed through the $3 billion annual military aid of the United States government, making it the largest government-financed urban renewal project since the 1960s.

Planners Network supports efforts to stop the construction of the Israeli Wall, stop the demolition of homes and end the occupation of the Palestinian Territories. We endorse all efforts that bring together Israelis and Palestinians to promote peace and security with equality. We oppose the use of our tax dollars to fund the Wall and Israel’s vast ‘urban renewal’ program.

—The Planners Network Steering Committee

Below is a list of Israeli, Palestinian and international organizations that are currently working to end construction of the Wall and house demolitions:

• PENGON, the Palestinian Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations Network: www.pengon.org;
• Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions: www.icahd.org;
• The Rebuilding Alliance: www.rebuildingalliance.org
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PN News
Post-Conference Note from Tom Angotti & Ayse Yonder
Thanks very much for joining us in New York City for the 2004 Planners Network Conference. We heard from a lot of you that you loved the workshops in local communities, the keynote, plenary and workshop sessions on Saturday. We also know that we planned too many things, which explains why most people who came only went to one or two sessions, reducing attendance at individual sessions. There’s always so much going on in the city that it’s hard to keep anyone in one place for very long!

We have a partial list of names of those who attended, with most email addresses, and we’re trying to send it out but having technical problems. We estimate that some 300-400 people took part, but since some participants didn’t register we don’t have an exact accounting. If there’s someone in particular you want to get in touch with let us know.

Stay tuned for more information about next year’s conference in Minneapolis, June 2-5, 2005. All the information will be posted at www.plannersnetwork.org.

Again, we’d like to thank everyone who took part and the many volunteers who made PN 2004 possible.

Tom Angotti and Ayse Yonder
Conference Co-chairs
tagotti@hunter.cuny.edu
ayonder@pratt.edu

2005 PN Conference
The 2005 Conference will be June 2-5 at the University of Minnesota on the banks of the Mississippi.

Bookmark: http://www.designcenter.umn.edu/ref erence_crr/planNetConf.html and come back for more details later in the year. Information will also be provided in future issues of the Newsletter and the Magazine.

The 2004 Progressive Planning Reader
The brand new, bigger and better 2004 Progressive Planning Reader is out! It has selected articles from the new magazine as well as the best from the old newsletter. This is a great resource for classroom use, workshops and seminars. Copies are $12 each; bulk discounts available. To order a copy, send a check payable to Planners Network, or contact card information to Planners Network, 379 DeKalb Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11205 or call in your order to 718-636-3116. (A full table of contents is on the facing page.)

From PN’er Josh Lerner: Plannersnetwork.org
Website Redesigned
Over the past few months we have been working behind the scenes to make plannersnetwork.org a site that can better serve the Planners Network community as it continues to grow. The redesigned site that you see now is still in the initial “beta” stage, and we’ll be making more changes and improvements over the upcoming months. In the meantime, we wanted to share the new site with you and ask for your input.

In general, we tried to make the site more participatory, easier to navigate and more useful as a forum for sharing resources and information. Some of the new features include:

• Search functionality
• Navigation and menu bar more straightforward
• New content about the magazine and chapters
• New design and layout
• Online databases of news, events, publications, organizations, jobs and fellowships/grants

Important Note: Anyone can now submit content to these databases using online forms. Please find easy-to-follow instructions on the site if you would like to submit anything. Submissions will then be posted on the site after being reviewed and approved by a site administrator.

We are working on developing an online membership directory in the coming months. However, your privacy will be respected, if you so desire. Once it is fully operational, you will be
asked if you would like your profile and contact information made public when you register online. You will also be asked if you would like to receive the E-newsletter.

Please give a look through the site and tell us what you think, at webmaster@plannersnetwork.org.

Your feedback is much appreciated.

PN Endorses National Housing Trust Fund Legislation

PN is one of 5,000 organizations to endorse the National Housing Trust Fund Campaign in the US, which is organized by the National Low-Income Housing Coalition and has now reached the US House of Representatives. At present, three members of the House of Representatives, co-sponsors of legislation to create a National Housing Trust Fund, have filed a discharge petition in an attempt to move the bill, H.R. 1102, to the floor of the House for debate and an up-or-down vote. For more information on the campaign, contact the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, www.nlhcc.org, Tel.: 202.662.1530, x.229; Fax: 202.593.1973.

Call for PN University Representatives

Planners Network is inviting students and faculty to become PN university representatives. We are currently developing a list of student and faculty PN representatives at planning schools to facilitate local and national networking. This list will be posted on the PN website so that students and anyone else interested in progressive planning can connect with a local PN member in their area. Representatives will be responsible for encouraging students and faculty to join, participate in PN, respond to local inquiries about PN and hold an informational session about PN each fall.

If you are interested in becoming a Planners Network representative, or would like more information, send an email to Josh Lerner or Amy Siciliano at students@plannersnetwork.org

PN Member Updates

Update from PNer Ann Markussen
University of Minnesota: I am liberating myself for one semester each year for the next five years to focus on research and outreach. June to December each year, you can reach me via (amarkussen@hwh.umn.edu) or in Cromwell, Minnesota, 218.644.3615. I am working on two fronts—regional economic issues (minimum wage, job loss, etc.) and the contribution of artists to regional and neighborhood development.

PNer Jac Smit
(PN member since St. Louis APA 1965 & President of the Urban Agriculture Network [TUAN] Inc.): What’s up? The 21st Century City Welcomes Back Agriculture. See www.cityfarmer.org and www.ROAIE.org. I am working on: the preface to a planning book; second edition of an urban agriculture book; conferences and E-conferences; three boards; CFS Coalition; a County project with University of Maryland; and a regional project with George Mason University. Running ten-milers and half-marathons when the great-grand children permit [four generations of genius]. Contact information: 4701 Connecticut Ave. NW #304, Washington D.C. 10008-5617. Email: Jac.Smit007@yahoo.com. Tel.: 202.537.9333.

Update from PNer Theresa Williamson
I completed my Ph.D. in City & Regional Planning at the University of Pennsylvania in May with the dissertation titled Catalytic Communities: The Birth of a Dot Org about the first three year development of this new virtual organization. In it, I introduce the concept of Protagonist Action Research (PAR). I hope to publish it as a book. Following that I have returned to directing Catalytic Communities, the non-profit I founded in 2000, full-time, out of Boulder, CO. Catalytic Communities is a primarily web-based non-profit that develops a global, multi-language database with in-depth descriptions of community-initiated solutions to local problems around the word.

PNer Chester Hartman
organized a Summer Institute, “50 Years v Board of Education: The Ongoing Role of Racism in a ‘Colorblind’ Society,” at George Washington University, where he is an adjunct professor of sociology.

PNer Guillaume Neault
(co-founder of PN-Concordia) will also be leaving Montreal at the end of the month to begin his Masters in planning program at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. Guillaume will remain an editorial assistant for the PN E-newsletter while he is in Kingston.

PNer Amy Siciliano
(co-founder of PN-Concordia) has moved from Montreal to Toronto to begin her Ph.D. program in geography at the University of Toronto. Starting in September, Amy will take over as the Canadian contact who will manage the PN membership dues in Canada. She will also be taking on many of the responsibilities for coordinating the PN student network while Josh Lerner is away.

Resources

“Community Development in Dynamic Neighborhoods: Synchronizing Services & Strategies with Immigrant Communities” by Catherine Fernandez is a 2004 Working Paper from the Harvard University’s Joint Center for Housing Studies, downloadable at www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/communitydevelopment/w03-6 Fernandez.pdf.


“Financial Services for People of Modest Means: Lessons from Low-Income Credit Unions” by Marva Williams (72 pp., March 2004), is available (no price given) from The Woodstock Institute, 407 S. Dearborn Ave., Chicago, IL 60605, 312.427.8070, woodstock@woodstockinst.org, www.woodstockinst.org.

“First Nations/Métis/Inuit Mobility Study” (2004) is a study conducted by the Institute for Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg, in collaboration with the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, the Manitoba Métis Federation, with funding assistance from Western Economic Diversification Canada. To download a copy of the report: http://uwinipeg.ca/publications_new/research.html

“Welfare Reform and Immigrants” (May 2004) is a report by Audrey Singer for a copy of the report, visit www.brookings.edu.

“Making the Case for Mixed-Income and Mixed-Use Communities” is a report by

Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership Inc. that proposes solutions to the escalating costs of housing and transportation in the Atlanta region. To download the report of its executive summary, visit: www.andpi.org/mici.

“Helping People Get Jobs: Case Studies and Other Resources” (third edition), 210 pages, is a book published by The Enterprise Foundation, $15. For more information, visit: www.enterprisefoundation.org/resources/publications.

“Student Mobility and Housing” The Metropolitan Housing Coalition (Louisville, KY) has just published an issue paper examining the effect of housing needs on student movement (mobility) in the Jefferson City public schools. Available at: www.metropolitanhousing.org.


“Welfare, the Working Poor and Labor” edited by Louise Simmons, 2004, M.E. Sharpe Publishers; edited volume exploring the nexus of low-wage work, welfare policy and labor; contributors include Frances Fox Piven, James Jennings, Heather Boushey, Robert Cherry, Max Sawicky, Nik Theodore, Chirag Mehta, Louise Simmons and more.

“Why Building ‘Smart’ Is Hard” (2004) is an article by Seth Brown, published in Newtopia Magazine. For a copy of the complete article, visit: newtopiamagazine.net.

Events

September 16-18, 2004: Conference on Race/Ethnicity and Place will be held in Washington D.C. Binghamton University, Howard University, and the Association of American Geographers invite paper and poster presentations. Details about the conference are available online at: www.aag.org/meetings/place.html.
October 29-24, 2004. 3rd International Caribbean Conference: Relations between Africa, Asia, Brazil and the Caribbean. Abstracts and papers can be sent either by e-mail to ocabrera@fch.ufg.br or to the following address: Centro de Estudos do Caribe no Brasil Faculdade de Ciências Humanas e Filosofia Universidade Federal de Goias Campus II Samambaia 74000-970 Goiânia - GO - Brazil, Tel: 55-62-521-1457, Fax: 55-62-521-1013. For more information, visit www.fch.ufg.br/CaribeBrasil or email ocabrera@fch.ufg.br.

October 21-23, 2004. Building Blocks for Inclusive Communities sponsored by Fund for an OPEN Society, will be held in Cherry Hill, NJ. For information, contact Laura Siena at the Fund, 315 Walnut St., #1708, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215.546.0151. For more information, visit www.opensoc.org.

October 31, November 3, 2004. Sustainability and Urban Growth in Developing Countries will be held in Ascona, Switzerland. For more information visit: www.psl.ethz.ch:16080/lft/dims/us/index.htm.

Online Resources

The Forum on Sustainability and the Economy, sponsored by the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies of the School of Urban Studies and Planning, Portland State University's College of Urban and Public Affairs, has just completed a series "Designing with the Environment: A Portland Way." This is an effort of the Portland Environmental Partnership Program. On their website (www.upa.pdx.edu/DMS/about/events.html) you can access free streaming videos of all the presentations. "From the Region to the Site:" Designing the Pearl and South Waterfront; "Green Industries for a Green Region," and "Examining the Role of the University." You can also access videos of earlier forums, including "Whatever Happened to Equity Planning?" and "Will Nanotech Re-Seed the Silicon Forest?" in their archive (www.upa.pdx.edu/DMS/about/forumarchive.html).

Fellowships

The China Research Network is pleased to announce the selection of fifteen graduate students and two faculty members to receive small grants for their research projects. Grants range generally between $3000 and $5000, and they are open to scholars in any discipline. A full list of winners is available on: www.albany.edu/mumford/chnet. Select small grant program, and look for the list of awards. The next deadline for applications will be September 1, 2004.

Address Change

The PN membership office has moved to Minneapolis. Please use the following contact information for membership-related correspondence:
1 Rapsion Hall
89 Church Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0109
Ph: 612-624-3596 Fx: 612-626-0600
Email: pnmail@umn.edu

JOIN PLANNERS NETWORK

PN MEMBERS IN CANADA

Membership fees by Canadian members may be paid in Canadian funds:
$35 for students, unemployed, and those with incomes <$40,000
$55 for those with incomes between $40,000 and $80,000
$75 for those with incomes over $80,000
$150 for sustaining members

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

If interested in joining the PN Toronto listserve, include your email address with payment or send a message to Barbara Rahder at rahder@yorku.ca.

PURCHASING A SINGLE ISSUE

Progressive Planning is a benefit of membership. 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 379 DeKalb Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11205. Please specify the issue and provide your email address or a phone number for queries. Multiple back issues are $10 each.

Back issues of the newsletters are for sale at $2 per copy. Contact the PN office at pnmail@umn.edu to check for availability and for pricing of bulk orders.

Copies of the PN Reader are also available. The single issue price for the Reader is $12 but there are discounts available for bulk orders. To order, visit the PN website: www.plannersnetwork.org/dl/download/reader.html

PLANNERS NETWORK ON LINE

The PN WEB SITE is: www.plannersnetwork.org

The PN LISTSERV: pln

PMaintains 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 pln@pln.org with "subscribe pln" (without the quotes) in the body of the message (not the subject line). You'll be sent instructions on how to use the list.

Progressive Planning Advertising Rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</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>

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

I'm a renewing member. Keep the faith!

Just send me a subscription to Progressive Planning.

My contribution is: [ ] Make checks payable to PLANNERS NETWORK.
[ ] My credit card is Viva [ ] Amex [ ] Card No.
[ ] My billing address is different from above.

Name
Organization
City
State
Zip
[ ] Check enclosed for [ ] Bill to
[ ] My credit card is Viva [ ] Amex [ ] Card No.
[ ] My billing address is different from above.

Mail This Form To: Planners Network
1 Rapsion Hall
89 Church Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0109

INTERNATIONAL MEMBERS: Please send U.S. funds. We are unable to accept payment in other currencies. Thanks.
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.