Electoral Politics by Itself Doesn't Work for the Left

By Frances Fox Piven

A good many liberals and progressives are shocked at George Bush’s victory. Republican gains in the Senate and House only make it worse. It is not that we were unaware of the Republican advantages. We knew that the Bush campaign’s constant talk of the war on terror stirred fear and excitement in many voters and that this worked to Bush’s advantage. So did the so-called morality issues of abortion and gay marriage, which evoked the peculiar American obsession with sex. And then there was the Republican propaganda machine, run by skilled and ruthless operatives whose messages were amplified by networks of evangelical churches and dutifully trumpeted by a sympathetic corporate media.

[Cont. on page 6]
Planners and Bush II: Where Do We Go From Here?

By Tom Angotti and Chester Hartman

Issue Editors

We know it’s not going to be easy for progressive politi-
ces in the next four years, but we know that even with a new administration there weren’t going to be
any good options. Congress is likely to deal with
the enormous budget deficits that were caused by
tax cuts and other forms of government spending by
taking an ax to social programs and making things even worse by
dealing out more tax cuts and bigger military bud-
get. Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid will be on
the chopping block. So will Section 8, public hous-
ing, public transit and the remaining shreds of block
grants. Cities and suburbs in the blue states will get
less from Washington, corporate welfare moochers and
europoliticians will get more.

For people and organizations working in communi-
ties whose basic survival has long been in question,
the apocalypse has never been as far away and fight-
ing collective depression has been a full-time job.
Progressive urban planners and community activists are
facing some difficult challenges, but most of the
people we work with can’t afford to drop out.

There are a few things we have to work with in the
coming years. First, as Frances Fox Piven continues
to remind us, progressives can’t accomplish any-
thing of great significance unless they hook up with
massive popular movements. Opposite are the
barbarous occupation of Iraq is bound to continue, and
urban planners, the experts on cities, have a special
role to play by drawing attention to the destruction of
cities, the phony participatory process enacted under
military rule and the thoroughly inadequate rebuild-
ing of cities that is made possible by the new
conditions. It’s time for planners to join with other
coalition organizers to challenge the bipartisan drift towards
the complete privitization of the social contract.

Progressive planners in the civil rights movement
began moving decades ago, and it’s time for a
new chapter. Also, the labor movement and many progressive organizations are looking for new
allies as they face increasing threats to their own
survival. The turmoil in the Democratic Party sug-
gests that it’s time for the old institutions of politics
dedicated to reform and social change to get seri-
ously back to work on their roots.
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Back to Basics for Progressive Planners

By Peter Marcuse

John Kerry lost the election because he ran a lousy campaign, both in tactics and substance.

Tactical Illusions

Kerry was given a winning hand and blew it. Bush was vulnerable on Iraq, Al Qaeda, his pretensions at being a military leader, his failures on health care, Social Security, the environment, unilateralism, tax cuts, budget deficits, partisanship in appointments, etc. Even given his middle-of-the-roadism, Kerry didn’t play the hand he held. No pictures of Bush with the pluto turkeys, no Mission Accomplished, no Karl Rove, no Halliburton, no coffins, no millionaires’ tax benefits, no “He lied to us, I believed him and I’m sorry!”

By not providing any real alternative on the important issues, Kerry left the door open for pseudo-issues like gay marriage.

What now? Tell it like it is, stop the national unity business, criticize ruthlessly. Bush has no mandate, just a slim majority.

Substantive Muddle

On substance there was very little to distinguish Kerry from Bush. It was just ‘I can do what he’s doing, but better’. Indeed, Kerry’s positions were often strikingly similar. He didn’t defend social programs, he didn’t criticize the war (he just said he’d do it better) or the attacks on civil liberties and didn’t come out for national health insurance. He had no urban program, he talked only about the middle-class and not working people or the poor. What got his supporters energized was not Kerry, but Anybody but Bush.

What now? Turn to a really progressive agenda: back to basics. Progressive taxes to provide public services, real campaign finance reform, single payer health insurance, anti-poverty programs, internationalism, labor rights, subsidized housing, strong environmental protection and national living minimum wages. Abolish the Electoral College. Admit we are a divided country, but get the lines of division right. And for God’s sake don’t draw the conclusion that the Democratic Party now has to woo the southern white Christian vote, as the party bonchos are now mumbling.

Moral Values

Kerry wrapped himself in religion as much as Bush did—or at least he tried to. But Bush really is more conservative than Kerry on values as he defined them, and Kerry never challenged his definition of values. The effort to win over Bush’s hard core supporters couldn’t succeed, and the effort to win over undecided but family-oriented voters didn’t succeed.

What now? Take the bull by the horns and defend sensible positions. Defend gay marriage and make fun of those who worry it will undermine the family. Defend abortion and make clear the value of a woman’s right to choose as overriding mystical positions on when life begins. Defend birth control as planned parenthood and plain common sense. If life is sacred, respect real existing lives—Iraqis, soldiers, civilians, prisoners. Defend the separation of church and state as protecting both. Criticize the bishops if they get into politics. Talk about social programs, helping the poor, reducing inequality and fair tax burdens as what real moral values are about. Talk about supporting international standards and courts of justice as the right thing to do, patriotism but not chauvinism, pride but not arrogance. Make it clear God should bless everyone, not just America.

And attack the Right’s moral values: The US pays the least foreign aid of any industrialized country, boasts of kill totals in Iraq, cuts welfare benefits, scraps on HIV/AIDS funding, leaves the homeless in the cold and denies due process to prisoners. What kind of morality is that?

Maybe the moral values tack will work and maybe it won’t. But it should be done anyway because it’s right.

What Can Planners Do?

The Bush administration’s antisocial orientation on land use, public health and the environment has been obvious, but there was an insidious derogation of planning by both candidates in the election campaign. Planning to win the Iraqi war was an accepted goal. This is the exact opposite of what ethical planning is about. By constantly criticizing Bush for ‘not having a plan to win the war’ Kerry only gave planning a bad name. When we espouse planning, it isn’t just planning for any purpose, but planning for a particular set of values and goals, and social justice should be a key ingredient. Signing up to repair the damage of war by planning to ‘rebuild’ Iraq for the United States occupation force is not consistent with planning ideals, which include democratic decision-making and popular participation. If there were a democratically elected and independent Iraqi government, planners might have a legitimate role to play.

For urban planners in the US, I see three possible ways to go.

- Move to the Center: Talk about preserving the family, endorse faith-based programs and espouse homeownership for all.
- Ignore the Election: The election didn’t change things much. In the long run it doesn’t make much difference, time is on our side, there are bright spots, so let’s keep doing what we’ve been doing. Use the programs we have and advocate for better ones without alienating anybody.
- Go Back to Basics: Push the underlying issues up front, be willing to be radical when the issue really calls for radical ideas and approaches. This is the approach I think PNers should take.

Back to Basics

We need to focus on basic issues such as polarization, exclusion, inequality, exploitation, global warming, the fortification of communities in the name of anti-terrorism, market worship, commodification of social goods and privatization. There are so many outrageous small policies being perpetuated that it’s easy to lose sight of the big picture, the systemic sources of most of them. Planners can expose the system even when they can’t change it. The idea that planners must seek to achieve consensus and satisfy all stakeholders should be given up once and for all; conflict is part of planners’ lives, and of the society in which they work.

We need to go on the offensive with our basic ideas and proposals. We have the moral values and those values demand social action. We know enough to push some basic ideas: public housing, welfare improvements, mass transit, progressive taxes; rent regulation; anti-speculation measures; land banking; affirmative action; civil rights for all, including immigrants; minimum wages at living levels; public works; ending the economy’s over-reliance on finance, insurance, and real estate (FIRe) industries and global activities; supporting whistle-blowing; and more.

We need to take seriously the connection between planning and power. Realize that it isn’t simply having better ideas, but better studies or better data that will achieve progress, but political power. And power that can be exercised in a number of ways, not just formal channels, hearings and arguments, but organization at the neighborhood level, real involvement of those affected and political sophistication at the ballot box; also constant pressure and, if needed, out-of-the-ordinary actions up to and including peaceful disruption. Professional planners are not themselves organizers, but they can be of substantial help to organizers and organizations, remembering always that they are helpers, not decision-makers.

---

Peter Marcuse, E.A.C.P. teaches urban planning at Columbia University in New York City. He is past president of the Los Angeles City Planning Commission, former chair of Community Board 9’s Housing Committee in Manhattan, and long active in Planners Network. He has written widely on housing, planning, professional ethics, globalization and policy issues.

---

REMINDER: Bulk discounts are available on The 2004 Progressive Planning Reader, with over 100 pages of the best from Planners Network Newsletter and Progressive Planning Magazine.
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Piven [cont. from page 1]

Still, many of us expected the Democrats to win, or at least we expected Kerry to win. We thought we could overcome Republican advantages by bringing new voters to the polls. The conventional wisdom has it that nonvoters are preponderantly low-income, minority and young, all groups that favor Democrats. But while that is broadly true, the pool of nonvoters is vast, and get-out-the-vote drives inevitably target only specific groups in the pool. So the Republicans could launch a voter drive too, and that they did, targeting suburban and rural areas and drawing on networks of fundamentalist churches to widen their reach. State constitutional amendment ballot measures against gay marriage also helped draw right-leaning voters to the polls. The turnout effort on both sides was remarkable, and in the end, it was probably a draw.

The underside of the voter turnout campaign was the Republican effort to bar likely-Democrats from actually voting by obstructing the registration of new voters, placing challengers at the polls, issuing false writings of the risks of voting or simply making sure the lines at polling places in Democratic districts were insufficiency long. And then there were the efforts by state and local Republicans to distort the vote count. Reports abound of voting registration forms discarded, provisional ballots not counted and suspicious tallies by electronic voting machines with secret codes and no capacity for a recount. We may never know what actually happened in the belly of these machines.

So what have we learned, and what to do now? The usual lessons are that we should try harder next time—or vote harder, as one wag said recently. As always, we should promote an agenda of democratic reforms that make vote suppression and outright stealing less likely. I am for those things, but we are unlikely to win them unless we first win some elections.

In any case, I think there is another lesson in the failure of our efforts in campaign 2004. The democratic and elitist victories in American history were not won with voter guides and get-out-the-vote campaigns. Nor were they won by Democratic Party initiatives. When we restrict ourselves to these conventional forms of electoral politics, we cannot match the Right’s money, propaganda, voter guides and get-out-the-vote drives.

Electoral politics by itself doesn’t work for the Left. Or rather it only works in the context of great upsurges of popular protest. This is the lesson of the mobilization of the American Revolution, of the abolitionist movement against the Civil War, of the labor movement of the 1930s and of the civil rights and poverty rights movements of the 1960s. The drama and disruption created by these movements gave them communicative power to match the propaganda of party operatives. The issues the movements raised also drew people to the polls in numbers far greater than voter drives can do. And because the movements were disruptive—impeding the functioning of major institutions—politicians were forced to respond.

So yes, we should work on our agenda of democratic reforms, including a national right to vote and a national voter registration system, implementing the National Voter Registration Act and making Election Day a holiday and election officials non-partisan. But we have to do more. Everything we know about the Bush regime indicates that they will be reckless and aggressive, in Iraq and perhaps Iran, as well as at home—with their tax and spending policies that threaten dire economic instability and with their social policy initiatives that are both cruel and shortsighted. The time when mass protest is possible will come. We should be ready and receptive, obdurate and bold. The high-tech voter registration campaign had a slogan, “Vote or Die.” They were on the right track, but maybe now the slogan should be broadened to be “Struggle or Die.”


Act Locally:
Strategies for Cities and Activists under Siege
By Marie Kennedy and Chris Tilly

With the national electoral victories of the Republicans in 2004, hopes for a progressive federal urban policy in the United States have suffered a tremendous setback. Our attention must shift back to state and local struggles—our arena of action for most of the last twenty-four years. We would suggest seven theses to guide such action going forward, touching on urban policy but also on broader progressive issues.

Economic Populism Can Win Majority Support As Peter Drucker pointed out in the last issue of Progressive Planning and others have pointed out elsewhere, large majorities support higher minimum wages, and majorities in Florida and Nevada voted big boosts in the state minimum wage at the same time they voted for Bush in November. It’s time to start taking the living wage movement to the state level and challenge state legislators to either pass a higher state floor or show whose side they’re really on. In Blue states, the agenda can be more ambitious. Labor lawyer Tom Geoghegan, in The Nation (November 29, 2004) suggests fighting for a series of state laws defining defenders (including guaranteed benefits and protections from firing) that will make everybody with a job live in a Blue state.

Do the Hard Work on “Values.” We should not overreact. Only 22 percent of voters chose “moral values” as the most important issue in the presidential election, whereas 34 percent chose terrorism and Iraq combined, and 25 percent chose the economy/jobs and taxes combined. But neither should we simply trumpet economic issues and hope that voters forget about controversies like gay marriage and abortion. For issues like “civil rights” is probably a more apt name than “moral values.” We would not call whites who defended segregation in the 1950s and 1960s “values” voters, though many claimed that was the basis for their transgression. There is no substitute for community-level and one-on-one work. Attitudes toward homosexuality have softened precisely because so many relatives, friends and neighbors (as well as celebrities) came out of the closet. We have to do the outreach to convince many more people that normal, good people include those who are gay and lesbian and those who have abortions.

A dose of economic populism is sorely needed to preserve public institutions.

Defend Public Goods and Services. Here a dose of economic populism is sorely needed to preserve public institutions. Market rationalization and downsizing are driving on-deep-seated disinterest of government, is driving the privatization of public utilities, notably water, public services, including education; and public social welfare programs, including the largest one of all, Social Security. We must expose the implications of these schemes: more profits for private corporations, reduced service and quality, less access for low-income clients and, in many cases, worse and fewer jobs. This may well be the largest threat to the standard of living of the majority in the next few years. Many public goods and services are recognized internationally as human rights. The challenge is to convince the people of the US to see this as a challenge. It is a lot harder to undo the damage of privatization than to prevent it in the first place.

Educate, Educate, Educate. The fact that over 70 percent of Bush voters believed that Saddam Hussein was involved in 9/11 drives home how misinformation and disinformation fuels conservative ideology in this country. This makes it all the more important to defend critical thinking.
against the growing emphasis on "standards" and vocational training in public K-12 and higher education. We also have to build educational components into as many public arenas and activities as possible.

Win Local Elections, Turn Out Voters. In Boston's elections of 2003 and 2004, communities of color turned out at higher rates than white communities for the first time ever, electing a progressive Latino citywide councilor (Felix Arroyo) and a progressive Cape Verdean sheriff (Andrea Cabral). The reason, as far as we can tell, is that nonpartisan 527 voter mobilization funds teamed up with dozens of standing grassroots community organizations to excite voters. In the national 2004 election, the religious flight played this game more successfully than the Left, but that doesn't mean it's the wrong game to play if progressives can use the kind of ongoing work we have described to expand their constituency, future elections will reflect that fact.

Align Personal Practice with Broader Goals. As planners, we must find ways to incorporate principles of diversity, egalitarian public interaction, environmental sustainability, etc., into our policies, programs and projects. As citizens, we must find ways in our busy lives to walk the walk, not just talk the talk.

Chris Tilly is professor of regional economic and social development at the University of Massachusetts-Lowell. Marie Kennedy is professor of community planning (retired) at the University of Massachusetts Boston and a member of the advisory committee of Planners Network.

Needs Are Not Just Urban
By Jonathan Lachance

In the next four years of Republican rule, we can be sure that the critical needs of cities—for example, new investment in human services, public transit and affordable housing—will remain unmet. But these needs are critical in every type of American settlement, not just in central cities and inner-ring suburbs. Multi-generational poverty, disinvestment in infrastructure, pollution and industrial job loss are no longer the exclusive domain of our old urban centers; they are just as real in suburbs and scattered industrial towns that are little more than a single factory, a collection of houses and a dot on a map. By locating political and social otherness in cities, and demonizing cities as enclaves of the "liberal elite," the Republicans have deepened the perception of cultural divisions between rural areas, small towns and cities while gutting the social safety net that serves middle-class and poor people of all geographies.

We must show that when politicians ignore "urban" issues they are ignoring America's social and economic problems writ large. This will require powerful rhetoric to counter the anti-urban inventive spin so readily by Republicans. Progressive planners, as a group and as individuals, need to link up with neighborhood and community activists to identify and share information on emerging social trends and policies. Once we can make it clear that "urban" problems are not unique to cities, then we will gather political momentum to address social equity issues and dissolve the notion of urban otherness.

Jonathan Lachance is a recent graduate of the University of Michigan, where he received his master's degree in urban planning. He lives in Brooklyn, NY.

U.S. Urban Policy After the 2004 Elections: The View From Abroad

Canada Scapegoats US Voters

By R. Alan Walks

"Morons Elect One of Their Own" was one of the more provocative headlines offered in the wake of the recent US election by commentators here in the Great White North. The phrase is in reference to the much criticized slip-of-the-tongue by Francoise Duceppe, ex-Prime Minister Jean Chretien's communications advisor, who called Bush a "moron" in 2002.

The reaction to Bush's victory on "the street" was a mixture of horror and sickness not unlike Marlon Brando's performance in Apocalypse Now. Polls showed that Kerry was preferred in Canada by almost 85 percent of the adult population. Even among the 35 percent of Canadians who see themselves as "right wing," including our religious right (which is proportionately smaller than its US counterpart), opinions of Bush are divided. (The "morons" headline came from a self-styled right-wing blogger). As in the rest of the world, it is the war in Iraq that has most Canadians concerned, followed by the proposed continental ballistic missile defense system and Bush's unilateralism. While such issues are important, they are not the most worrisome aspects of Bush's victory for Canada.

Bush's re-election clearly took many Canadians by surprise. A glance at the polarized electoral geography of the vote suggests why. The places where Canadians are most likely to become accustomed with US opinion and culture—the northern border regions and the largest cities—went to Kerry, whereas Bush took rural areas and outer suburbs, areas more distant from most Canadians.

It's interesting that US residents living in areas most vulnerable to a terrorist attack—the largest and densest cities—opted for Kerry's more internationalist foreign policy stance, while those far from the potential action voted for Bush's aggressive gunnlslinger approach. Who, after all, is going to blow up Cactus Gulch, Nevada? Might US settlement patterns, marked in part by low-density sprawl, political and social exclusion and an idealization of rural lifestyles, be responsible for producing an election result that effectively offers up central cities as sacrificial cows for some "clash of civilizations" in the distant future? To the extent that foreign policy played a role in US voter preferences, the results do not contradict such a hypothesis. Many urban Canadians were silently thankful they lived north of the border on November 3rd but worried—with images of the Madrid subway bombing still fresh in their memory—for their counterparts in urban America.

Yet Bush's victory spells trouble for Canada too. First, there are stark differences in policies, actions and values between the current Republican administration and mainstream Canada. Polls suggest that Canadians overwhelmingly believe the war in Iraq, the militarization of space and unilateralism to be wrong. Meanwhile, the majority in Canada supports same-sex marriage, the de-criminalization of small amounts of marijuana and the right to an abortion. Canadians are worried that Bush will push for Canada to go along with his plans for a Star Wars missile defense system and that he will continue to thumb his nose at the multilateral institutions that allow Canada some say in international affairs.

Bush's victory is also worrisome for the direction of Canadian social and economic policy. Already, Bush's sweeping income tax cuts are putting pressure on Canadian governments to compete by lowering their own tax rates. This can only happen if public expenditures are reduced, fuelling the privatization of public services such as health care, neoliberal urban development policies and cutbacks in welfare and education. And in such a tightly integrated continental economy, any rightward shift on behalf of the US lends urgency and legitimacy to those on the right in Canada, who argue for the shedding of progressive social policies and legislation.

The biggest problem facing Canada as a result of the recent US election, however, lies in 25
Canadians' smug reaction to it. Bush provides a foil for Canadian grievances, letting Canadians off the hook from having to deal seriously with their own government's complicity in the unjust US-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, structural inequalities within the global economic system and growing problems of social polarization and crumbling social infrastructure at home. As long as the Bush administration is worse than our own, as long as US cities are in poorer shape, Canadians too easily allow themselves to slacken in their efforts at improving their own cities, workplaces and schools.

Even worse is the cynical and self-interested revisionism that has appeared in some of the Canadian media post-election. The silver lining in the Bush victory, the story goes, is that at least he is less protectionist and thus more likely to get Canadian beef back on American shelves (despite the Canadian government's refusal to guarantee its safety through mandatory BSE testing like Japan does). And it's thought that Bush is less likely to close the Michigan border to Toronto's garbage, as Kerry had proposed (but why shouldn't Toronto be allowed to send 120 trucks of garbage every day to a private dump in Michigan?). Bush's re-election thus provides an excuse for Canadian short-term economic interests to trump the health of American workers and North America's environmental integrity.

The challenge for Canadians is to see beyond their distrust of Bush's swaggering moralism or their own short-term economic interests to the geo-political realities that shape the contours of US-Canada relations and uneven development under global capitalism. Instead of scapegoating and stereotyping US voters for impious choices, Canadians need to reach out to those in the US and elsewhere actively working to educate, halt the war and make progressive change in the name of social justice.

R. Alan Walks (awalks@utm.utoronto.ca) is an assistant professor of urban geography and planning at the University of Toronto.

Más Pasión
Por Jordi Borja (Barcelona, España)

En España la democracia no satisface todas las ilusiones acumuladas. Llegó el desencanto y un escritor popular, Vázquez Montalbán, escribió con ironía "contra Franco vivíamos mejor". Luego vino el franquismo blando y repugnante de Aznar. Insoportable. Hace unos meses tuvimos elecciones, el candidato opositor, Zapatero, no entusiasmaba a casi nadie. Pero los sectores más democráticos, más progresistas, deseaban ante todo "que no ganara Aznar". Y hubo un movimiento emocional causado por dos fenómenos consecutivos: el atentado del 11 de marzo en Madrid y la grosera mentira que precedieron a las elecciones. Mentira del gobierno sobre la autoria del atentado causado por la sumisión incondicional a la política belicista de Bush. Cambio por la reacción pasional contra esta sumisión y la mentira cabrera posterior.

Bush aparentemente también se ha beneficiado de una reacción emocional, de signo contrario. El miedo y la ignorancia provocados ambos por la manipulación gubernamental y los monopolios televisivos. Frente a ello la racionalidad moderada, los matices confusionales, la frágil distancia del candidato opositor, han fracasado. La izquierda debe recuperar radicalidad emocional, más importante que la ideológica. La política sola moviliza nuevos votantes si transmite pasión, pues el corazón tiene razones que la razón no siempre sabe expresar.

More Passion
By Jordi Borja (Barcelona, Spain), Translated by Tom Angotti

The arrival of democracy in Spain didn't realize all our accumulated dreams. Disenchantment set in, and Vázquez Montalbán, a popular writer, wrote with irony that "against Franco we were better off." Then came the soft and repugnant Francisco of (the conservative Prime Minister) Aznar. That was unbearable. Months ago we had elections and Zapatero, the opposition candidate, excited almost no one. But the democratic, progressive sectors above all wanted to see Aznar lose. And there was an emotional movement caused by two consecutive phenomena that preceded the election: the terrorist attack on March 11 in Madrid and the government's gross lie about the source of the attack, behind which was unconditional support of the aggressive policies of Bush. There was a passionate reaction against this support and the cowardly lie.

Apparently Bush also benefited from an emotional reaction in the opposite direction. Fear and ignorance were provoked both by government manipulation and the TV monopolies. As a result, moderation and reason, with shades of confusion, and the frigid distance of the opposition candidate, failed. The Left needs to recover its emotional radicalism more than ideology. Politics only mobilizes new voters if it generates passion since the heart has reasons that reason doesn't always know how to express.

Jordi Borja is author of La Ciudad Conquistada (Alianza Editorial, 2003) and Local & Global, with Manuel Castells (Earlsborn, 1996).
Bush y América Latina

Por Alejandro Rofman
Buenos Aires, Argentina

No se puede visualizar el impacto del prolongado período de crisis y sobre todo de inestabilidad en la época de la presidencia de EEUU, en donde las decisiones cuestionadas y el desacuerdo con los países latinoamericanos ha sido mayor. Sin embargo, este desacuerdo no ha impedido que se mantengan relaciones comerciales importantes, fundamentalmente en el campo del petróleo.

Las negociaciones comerciales y de inversión con los países latinoamericanos han sido un importante eje en la política exterior de EEUU. El acercamiento con países como Brasil, México y Argentina ha sido fundamental en el desarrollo de la economía de estos países. Sin embargo, también ha habido tensiones y conflictos, como el caso del conflicto comercial con México en materia de ganado bovino.

La situación actual de la economía de América Latina es una situación compleja, con desafíos importantes a superarse. La crisis económica y financiera internacional ha afectado a muchos países de la región, lo que ha llevado a una situación de incertidumbre económica.

Estos factores han sido exacerbados por la situación política y social en muchos países de la región. La corrupción, la ineficiencia y la falta de transparencia en el gobierno han sido constantes en muchos casos, lo que ha llevado a una disminución en la confianza de los ciudadanos en los sistemas políticos y económicos.

En conclusión, la relación de EEUU con América Latina es un tema de gran importancia en el contexto actual de la economía y la política internacional. Es necesario continuar trabajando para fortalecer las relaciones y encontrar soluciones a los desafíos que enfrentan los países de la región, en particular en el campo económico y financiero.

---

**5. La Estrategia de la Guerra Preventiva**

En todas las decisivas votaciones realizadas en las Naciones Unidas durante los debates en torno a la guerra en Irak, antes de haber sido encarrada en forma aislada por la coalición norteamericana-británica los países latinoamericanos, en particular Argentina, claramente mostraron su desacuerdo con la iniciativa de esas dos naciones aliadas. En sus declaraciones formuladas en el seno de las Naciones Unidas los países más representativos del continente votaron en contra de la Guerra Preventiva, de la adopción de decisiones bélicas sin coordinación expresa del organismo mundial de preservación de la paz, y reafirmaron su respaldo a los dictámenes de los inspectores de las Naciones Unidas de la inexistencia de armas nucleares y químicas en Irak, México, Argentina, como naciones líderes del continente, claramente se manifestaron en contra de la Guerra, en favor de los Derechos Humanos que pudieran ser violados. La Guerra en Irak, en su totalidad, y por la búsqueda de cambios concertados para la paz mundial. Esta posición, que no ha perdido su vigencia en el gobierno estadounidense y que no ha perdido su vigencia en el gobierno de EEUU, ha sido claramente defendida por los países latinoamericanos, en particular Argentina, y por la ONU por la cuestión de los Derechos Humanos en la isla.

Además, en conjunto con Chile, que está gobernada por una coalición de socialistas y democráticos, se está gestando la constitución de la Unión Sudamericana, que será el primer intento formal de una organización de países del sur del continente dispuesto a proponer un nuevo programa de desarrollo político, social y económico para la Región. Este programa ofrece oportunidades para el manejo conjunto de los recursos y el gas, la presencia unificada en las discusiones sobre política mundial, el comercio coordinado al hilo y la minería y el uso eficiente de los recursos y la ciencia y la tecnología como herramientas para el desarrollo.

La propuesta de creación del Area de Libre Comercio de los Estados Unidos (ALCA) entre los dos países del sur, Argentina y Chile, está siendo evaluada con mucho cuidado por las autoridades de ambos países. Sin embargo, el proceso de negociación es complicado y requiere de un mayor esfuerzo para encontrar una solución satisfactoria para ambas partes.

La creación de una zona de libre comercio entre los dos países del sur, Argentina y Chile, presenta numerosos desafíos, pero también ofrece importantes oportunidades para el desarrollo económico y social de los países involucrados. La creación de esta zona de libre comercio permitiría el libre flujo de bienes y servicios entre los dos países, lo que podría facilitar el comercio y la inversión, y mejorar la competitividad de las economías de ambos países.

Por lo tanto, es importante que se continúe trabajando en la creación de una zona de libre comercio entre Argentina y Chile, con el objetivo de promover el desarrollo económico y social de ambos países y de la región en general. La creación de esta zona de libre comercio podría tener un impacto positivo en la economía de los países involucrados, así como en la economía de la región en general.

---

**6. Protección a la Producción Interna de los EEUU**

Este tratado es una manera de proteger a los productores nacionales de productos agrícolas de la competencia de los productores extranjeros. El tratado establece reglas que obligan a los países a proteger a sus productores de la competencia de los productores extranjeros, lo que ayuda a mantener los precios de los productos agrícolas en los países de la región, lo que a su vez favorece el desarrollo de las economías de estos países.
Mexico, es, entonces, fundamental para defender los principios generales que siempre animaron a sus pueblos y para avanzar hacia un continente con justicia social, plena soberanía y voluntad de transformación de las estructuras económico-sociales existentes, que generan desempleo masivo, hambre elevado y pobreza generalizada (casi el 50% de su población se encuentra hoy en día, en esa situación altamente crítica).

Alejandro Rojas es Profesor honorario titular del Departamento de Economía, Universidad de Buenos Aires y Universidad Nacional de Rosario, y Investigador Principal del Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas en el Centro de Estudios Urbanos y Regionales/ CONICET, Buenos Aires (Argentina)

English Summary by Tom Angotti

To understand the impact of the re-election of George W. Bush on Latin America it is first important to understand the recent changes that have occurred there. In Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela and Uruguay new governments were elected that are critical of the dominant economic and social order imposed by the Washington consensus and the neoliberal model of capital accumulation. Similar forces have arisen in Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador and Nicaragua, and may soon come to govern in Mexico. These new projects oppose the use of the armed forces within their countries, see hunger and poverty as more important than terrorism, and oppose the embargo of Cuba.

There are five basic areas of discord between these new political forces and the United States:

1. The Role of the Armed Forces. After 9/11, there has been an attempt to reestablish the doctrine that the armed forces need to play an aggressive role to maintain domestic order as it did in the long history of dictatorships. Return to this doctrine has been rejected by the major countries of Latin America, with the exception of Colombia.

2. American Free Trade Area. Bush the Father proposed a Free Trade agreement for all of the Americas, but this has been resisted as long as it means that the U.S. would have free access to Latin American markets so it could undercut local industries.

3. Intervention in the Affair of Other Nations. The interventionist role of the Bush administration in Haiti, Venezuela and Cuba suggests that during the second term basic principles of sovereignty will continue to be violated.

4. U.S. Protectionism. The U.S. subsidizes its internal production and refuses to lift protective trade barriers that would allow produce from Latin America to enter its market.

5. The Strategy of Preventive War. The most important nations of Latin America did not support the strategy of preventive war or the war in Iraq, and support the doctrine of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other nations.

Bush won the election but many of us didn’t expect it, especially after the lies about the Iraq war and the lack of a political program based on anything but “moral issues” and national security. It always surprises me to see how bad ideas survive in the human mind, how people easily forget or do not want to recognize deceits and bad actions. We also have that problem in Italy.

I am afraid that the election of Bush means that Americans will be more convinced that they alone can decide about war and peace, sexual and social activities and environmental issues. And in the rest of the world, unfortunately, and anti-American feelings are developing as people resent the nation that is absorbed with itself. It’s important to understand the social base of those who voted for Bush, how Bush’s winning ideas emerged and how to work towards a new ideal of democratic society—an evolving society based on the dialectic and acknowledgement of others as equals, both locally and globally.

Behind the search for wealth and the myth of the self-made man in America there is a mix of pragmatism and idealism, enriched by a rigid division of the world into good and bad. The idealism is steeped in self-righteousness and a sense of moral superiority. Domestically it leads to charity instead of social welfare and externally it leads to wars and embargoes. The pragmatism results in problems looked at simplistically, and often in a self-referential way, as if they were all military objectives. As advocates of the good against evil, and in the name of a moral superiority that leads them to export their model, Americans awarded the leader who better represented this vocation.

Bush conveyed a sense of community laden with the religiosity of a warrior. It is a sense of community that guarantees individual freedoms by defending them from public actions. If “the public is for us a problem,” for Americans from Thomas Jefferson to George W. Bush it is almost absent and is instead the enemy of the individual. I believe that a challenge for you Americans is to rethink your sense of community, and consequently democracy. Many political issues are related to this idea of community that is based on the defense of the individual, a concept that, when translated into practice, seems to be always an enemy to fight, whether it’s Muslim terrorists, homosexual weddings, abortion, the government or even your wealthier neighbors.

Community-Based Planning and Pragmatism

Many of us admire and are interested in your tradition of community planning. We believe in your struggles from the 1960s, and share the notion that achieving a democratic society starts by reducing the gap between rich and poor and empowering neglected communities. We know about the battles against an unequal system that respects only privileged interests and the efforts to find more effective bottom-up planning methods and sensitize more planners. But I am concerned that the same sense of community that prevails at the national level is also being repeated at the local level in the form of “community-based planning.” Behind the communitarian policies are a sense that everyone must defend her own turf from the enemy.

At the root of the problem is the pragmatic tradition that always has the individual, local experience as its point of departure and leads to immediate action rather than thought. It is important to search for a new community paradigm. In the US, the conferences I participated in and the books I read were often tales about planning experiences related to the fight against gentrification and displacement. But they were not framed as a result of deep theoretical examination or in the context of a political and ideological worldview. Americans are more practitioners, so you have an advantage over us Europeans, who are more theoretical. But maybe now it is easier for people to see how political ideology can lead to tragedy, and how a lack of theoretical understanding is politically irresponsible. American democracy needs to be rethought in a way that opens up a new sense of community and the public.

In the US, and in the rest of the world as well, we should look toward the concept of public—as something to be constructed in the process of
educating ourselves for a broader social responsibility—developed by John Dewey. The public should be seen as guarantor of an inclusive concept of community that recognizes others. Community can be an interactive and collective process that continuously reconstitutes itself through participation in the development of cities, combining individual and collective action in a democratic process. A new paradigm is needed that shapes informed and responsible citizens who have a sense of belonging to the same world and human race. Community-based planning can bring civil society closer to local institutions and persuade people to put their confidence in public administration and assure the public that they will be listened to. Planners should improve the local socializing and democratic processes by helping people to develop a sense of responsibility to the global.

For example, the planning process to rebuild the World Trade Center was a lost opportunity for democratic learning. New York City undertook a participatory process that failed to reinforce local democracy and the plan follows a short-term, unsustainable model of the global city. If the attack against the Twin Towers was an attack against humanity, then the rebuilding project should have been opened to the whole world. This would have sent a signal to the rest of the world that the attack was a dangerous event that required a search for a new and different world. Instead, the signal was that the US had to react on its own and show that it could stand tall. This could have been an example of global democracy giving voice to other parts of the world, including those who look upon New York as a symbol of imperialism. It could have helped convince people that political globalization can balance economic globalization and help develop global solidarity, cooperation and mutual respect for diversity.

Progressives in the US can learn to redefine the sense of active militancy and democracy sustained by political ideology, educating people with a vision of the public good against an irreverent privatized notion of rights. We, the rest of the world, should perhaps force you to confront ideas and initiatives and to share decisions and responsibility, and we should get to the heart of your actions and your policies. Just as some of you do with the rest of the world, not by embarrassing ideas but by comparing and educating ourselves in a different way.

Caterina Timpianos is an urban planner at the LabPEAT (Laboratory for Ecological and Environmental Planning and Design of the Territory), University of Catania (Italy).

Up, Down, Inside, Outside: (New) Directions for Progressive Planning in the US

By Josh Lerner

In this hostile political climate, progressive planners in the US can learn a lot over the next four years by looking in (new) directions up, down, inside and outside. We can look up to Canada and down to Latin America, and both inside and outside the structures of government. By looking at the experiences of our geographic neighbors we can learn different ways of working for progressive social change. I use “new” with a caveat, since although these directions are not necessarily standard practice, neither are they entirely transformed from existing approaches.

Participatory Budgeting in Toronto

Originally developed in Brazil, participatory budgeting is a democratic process for deciding resource allocations. Participatory budgeting is best known for its use with municipal government budgets, but the process is increasingly being applied in other institutions, such as regional government bodies, schools and public housing companies. One example of a new application is the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC), which has been allocating $9 million (in Canadian dollars) of its capital budget per year through a participatory budgeting process.

Starting in 2001, the 164,000 public housing tenants of the TCHC have been deciding how the Corporation’s discretionary funding is allocated for building improvement projects. Through a series of facilitated meetings over the course of several months, tenants decide on local (building), regional (building cluster) and citywide spending priorities. TCHC staff persuades technical support and guidance as tenants identify, learn about and vote on the main community housing issues and priorities.

Ultimately, elected tenant representatives and staff integrate the different community spending priorities into a single participatory budget, using equity criteria that focus funding on buildings with the greatest needs. The participatory budget is then approved by the TCHC’s Board of Directors and implemented over the course of the following year. Tenant delegates disseminate information about the approved budget and oversee the implementation of approved projects through a monitoring committee.

What are the results? The first participatory budget cycle provided funding for 237 new local infrastructure projects such as playgrounds, building heating and accessibility ramps. Tenants and staff also gained a greater appreciation of the needs of different public housing communities in Toronto, partly through bus tours to different buildings. Although most tenants started with a “me or me” approach focused on their own problems, after a few admitted difficulties the tenants began to appreciate the interests of other participants. Realizing that other tenants had graver needs, many participants voluntarily gave up their funds to support more disadvantaged communities. One participant explained this as a natural result of such an intense deliberative process: “Once everybody gave a little bit, we all came together as a community.”

Autonomous “Caracols” in Chiapas, Mexico

Continuing a long tradition of indigenous resistance, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) in 2003 established a new system of autonomous municipal and regional governance, called caracol (snail). Assailed by the military and neglected by the state government, the Zapatistas have attempted to build their own governments from the bottom up. The resulting caracols are independent government bodies that function as an alternative to the Mexican state and a space for more participatory planning and governance.

Each caracol consists of roughly seven rural municipalities radiating out from a central administrative and community core (the center of the snail). Residents in each community elect their own community council and two members of the council’s 14-member Junta de Buen Gobierno (Board of Good Government). The community councils are responsible for maintaining lines of communication with and between village residents and the Board. The Board is responsible for responding to community problems, safeguarding against corruption, resolving legal disputes and...
communicating with international Zapatista supporters. As the Zapatistas explain, however, neither the community councils nor the caracol Board make decisions independently. Rather, both operate according to the principle that “the people command and the government obeys.”

The Zapatista caracol function both alongside and in opposition to Mexican state government. While the state government is largely inaccessible to the remote Chiapas villages, the caracol maintain community offices in each municipality and in the caracol center. The Mexican government has not provided funding for these government services, but Board members claim that they can maintain the caracol through volunteer community labor and foreign donations. The Zapatistas have also established their own legal code, and caracol residents can now seek justice from either Zapatista or Mexican laws.

What have the caracol accomplished? Village residents have used them to build free health clinics and autonomous community schools. Through the caracols, many municipalities have established cooperative agricultural and handicrafts programs. According to the Zapatistas, these new systems are more responsive to the needs and cultures of the region’s predominately indigenous population, in contrast to the neglect and ineffectiveness of the Mexican state.

Looking Inside and Outside of Government Planning

Unfortunately, neither widespread participatory budgeting nor autonomous revolutionary governments appear to be looming on US horizons. So what can we learn from the experiences of our neighbors to the north and south? Amongst other things, perhaps the experiences of our neighbors can illuminate ways of opening up new spaces for progressive planning both inside and outside of existing power structures.

In Toronto, progressives have found a niche for participatory budgeting despite a lukewarm municipal government. While lobbying the city, participatory budgeting advocates have also sought out more receptive and strategic institutions to democratize. By promoting participatory budgeting in public housing, schools and unions, advocates are working to establish a more organic base for participatory planning in the demographic communities that need participatory action the most. In the US, we might also benefit from focusing out and focusing more on the riches of the existing government, where change is most possible and our efforts most productive.

In Chiapas, Zapatistas are learning to work around the unresponsive Mexican government and build their own alternative governance systems in order to better meet the basic needs of indigenous communities. By working outside of the state power structure, the Zapatista caracols have been able to establish communal agricultural systems and design their own school curriculum (which now includes humanism and systems of production as core subjects). The caracol claim that they would have been unable to achieve these changes by working through traditional state channels of lobbying and advocacy, and the past actions of the Mexican government seem to support this claim.

All of this is not to suggest that we ignore the current government and move to autonomous rural collectives (although there are certainly worse options), but rather that we seek out new ways to delve deeper inside and farther outside the problematic government with which we are stuck. Looking up, we can see progressive programs that are already feasible in a society similar to the US. Looking down, we can see how, when confronted with extremely unjust regimes, people have created their own spaces for participatory democratic governance. So what are progressives in community development and planning to do when faced with the Bush regime? Let’s start by looking for inspiration in new places.

Josh Lerner (Josh.Lerner@utoronto.ca) is a Planner’s Network Steering Committee member currently traveling and researching in Latin America. Information about the TCJH is extracted from his masters thesis. Information about Zapatista caracols is based on field research.
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Where Do We Go from Here?

By Gus Newport

Following the recent presidential election, many concerned and free-thinking Americans began to wonder, "Where do we go from here?" We soon recovered and recognized that G.W. was inheriting a mess which he himself created. As we wondered how he might get out of this, our initial thoughts were, of course, in reference to the Iraq war. Thinking Americans have long recognized that a war abroad launches a war on us at home. How many remember the dialogue referring to the “peace dividend” at the end of the Cold War and immediately prior to the Gulf war? With time to recover, we recognized that the domestic scene is just as absurd.

Let’s examine the backdrop. In the area of affordable housing, G.W.'s administration cut Section 8 vouchers to a disastrous low level. It has since become apparent that HUD strategists (if there is such a group) have put all of their eggs in homeownership programs; they forget, however, about the state of the economy and employment, which places homeownership out of reach for the poor, the working class and, in many cases, even the middle class. For example, in recent years the rapid rise in home prices throughout California has forced many local governments to look for new tools to make homeownership affordable. Over the past twenty years, single-family homes in California have been appreciating at an average rate of over 9 percent per year; between 1995 and 2002 they appreciated over 15 percent per year. Over the same twenty years, the median family income in California has risen only an average of 6 percent per year. And the gap between what the average family can afford and what it costs to buy a home just keeps growing.

As reported by the California media during the week of November 15, one out of every four California was thinking of leaving the state for more affordable areas.

We have learned that poverty is the grandaddy of crime and revolution. Beyond housing, what is the thinking regarding strengthening inner-city and poor rural areas so that they might function with dignity and with an entrepreneurial environment that would assure vitality, growth and spirituality, rather than the crime we know is bred by dysfunctional communities? What is the response and approach of the Bush administration? It needs to be clear that the policy of this administration is to totally dismantle what remains of the New Deal. With his so-called mandate, G.W. has given the green light to more tax cuts and the privatization of Social Security This, despite, as economist Paul Krugman describes it in a November 22 Reuters interview, a “chorus of economic thinkers who caution against such measures.” Krugman compares Bush policy to the determinants of the Argentine debt crisis of the 1990s, which ended in Argentina defaulting on an estimated $100 billion in debt. “One little-appreciated thing,” Krugman states, “is that Social Security privatization was an important source of the expansion of that debt. When asked if we look like Argentina, Krugman replied, ‘A whole lot more than anyone is quite willing to admit at this point. We’ve become a banana republic.’” He also raised concerns that Bush’s electoral victory over Kerry “would only reinforce the administration’s unwil-

ingness to listen to dissenting opinions.”

American urban policy unfortunately will, doubtless, continue to be based on the administration continues to prioritize rebuilding Iraq while underfunding HUD. And it appears likely that Bush will attempt once again to revive the ‘faith-based initiative’ despite difficulties faced in launching it four years ago. We all know it is ☞

The policy of this administration is to totally dismantle what remains of the New Deal.
Don’t Be Absent from the Tax Debate

By Sheila Crowley

Well, the people have spoken and given George W. Bush a second term in the White House. Housing advocates should prepare for more of the same, only worse. What lessons can we draw from our experience with federal housing policy during the first Bush administration? The words are souring, but the works do not match up.

For all the talk about increasing homeownership, what has the Bush administration actually done? The President said there would be 5.5 million new minority homeowners by the end of the decade, but he has made limited proposals that would move him closer to realizing that goal.

The American Dream Down Payment Program, first introduced in 2001, was finally enacted in 2003 with an authorized level of $200 million a year. But appropriations for the first year were only $87 million and down to $50 million in the appropriations bill just passed for the current fiscal year. At an average grant of $5,000, that’s only 10,000 new homeowners a year. The Zero Down Payment program was rolled out in early 2004 and was not taken up by Congress. It was only envisioned to serve 150,000 families a year any way. Much has been made of support for a Home Ownership Tax Credit, but despite bills in both the House and the Senate with a lot of bipartisan co-sponsors, both bills are stalled. At the President’s initiative, the Congress passed no fewer than four tax bills in the first Bush term, but none contained this tax provision. Given that President Bush has spent no political currency on the Home Ownership Tax Credit, the depth of his support for this idea is questionable.

In 2001, the Bush administration declared the goal of ending “chronic” homelessness in ten years, but it has proposed precious few new resources to that end. The 2004 Samaritan Initiative, which would direct additional $70 million to supportive housing and services, has not passed. But that’s the least of the problems. The Wholesale attack on the HUD public housing program by the Bush administration that started in 2003 and accelerated in 2004 renders the rhetoric on ending homelessness empty. If Congress had agreed to the 5.5 million new minority homeowners by the end of the decade, HUD in 2004 with a $1.6 billion cut in voucher spending, voucher administrators would have been left with the flexibility to choose to serve fewer extremely low-income families, charge higher rents to already poor households or worse. What HUD wanted Congress to do and what HUD has done is that they undertook in part programmatically what they said in the most severe conditions in which more people would become homeless. The exploitation of the language of ending homelessness and the shameless promotion of this fiction by the Interagency Council on the Homeless is hypocrisy that takes your breath away.

Taxes

The most serious threat to federal housing programs is the same threat that all non-security domestic discretionary spending faces—tax cuts. George W. Bush has convinced Congress to enact tax cuts that have turned the $508 billion federal surplus we had as the end of 2001 into a $413 billion deficit by the time the FY2004 books are closed. President Bush has made clear that he expects Congress to make all the tax cuts permanent, which will cost another $1 trillion. The tax cuts are intended to constrain federal spending. Sooner rather than later the deficit level will become unsustainable and spending will have to be slashed.

It is, of course, domestic discretionary programs like housing, education, environmental protection, transportation, child care and nutrition that will be targeted first for cuts. Indeed, the Flexible Voucher program in the FY2005 budget was simply a spending cut dressed up as a program reform. But even if all of HUD was wiped out tomorrow it would barely dent the deficit. It is in the entitlement programs like Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, rather, where the big money is to be found.

President Bush also wants to make the tax code simpler, including closing loopholes and eliminating some deductions and credits. The National Association of Home Builders has already extracted a promise from the President that the mortgage interest tax deduction will not be affected. The charitable contributions deduction also is off the table. There is no such protection for the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC). Given the close call on the LIHTC in 2003, when the
dividend exclusion was almost passed, we should not expect the President to care much about what happens to the LTHTC this year.

The President also has stated that tax reform will be revenue neutral, meaning he does not want to raise or lower overall taxes in the process. But there is no promise that the tax burden will not be shifted from one group of taxpayers to another. If simplification means a flat tax or a consumption tax, as many have suggested, the federal tax system will become more regressive, placing a disproportionate burden on people who have low incomes.

The fact that the majority party gained seats in both the House and the Senate would seem to give President Bush more support for his proposals in the Congress, but members of Congress still have to pay attention to their constituents. Congress protected the housing voucher program this year precisely because they heard from their constituents about the impact the cuts would have on the communities they represent. Already, the public is indicating that they want deficit reduction more than they want tax cuts.

Federal tax policy is where the major action will be in the next two years. Those who want to protect and increase the federal commitment to safe, decent and affordable housing for all Americans cannot be absent from the tax debate.

Sheila Crowley is president and CEO of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, member of the Board of Directors of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, the National Housing Trust, the Alliance for Healthy Homes and others, adjunct faculty at School of Social Work of Virginia Commonwealth University, BSW, MSW, PhD. in social work and social policy.

Reprinted from Shelterforce, with permission.

What Planners Must Do

By Norm Krumholz

All planners should do everything they can, including lobbying, writing op-eds, organizing, etc., to protect and support the essential elements of affordable housing. These essential elements include: the Community Development Block Grant program, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, the Community Reinvestment Act, Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers and the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit.

Beyond this, planners—in their roles as practitioners, academics and citizens—should continue to study, write about and re-affirm the following outrageous facts that are the result of conservative government and their policies:

• the gap between rich and poor is greater today than it has been at any time since the Census Bureau started collecting data on the subject;
• the high number of poor people and poor children in our nation should be a deep source of shame;
• our skyrocketing national debt has transformed us from the world's leading creditor nation to the world's leading debtor nation and our banks and real estate are increasingly in hock to foreigners;
• our schools, cities, environment, roads, bridges, housing and health care are in decay; and
• a reckless and arrogant foreign policy has reduced international confidence in the US.

Norm Krumholz is professor of urban planning at Cleveland State University and past president of the American Planning Association.
Expanding Affordable Housing Through Inclusionary Zoning

By Angela Glover Blackwell and Kalima Rose

The most strategic way to make affordable housing widely available is to advance policies that increase the quantity and accessibility of affordable housing close to opportunity. Yet such policies have been sorely missing at the national level, and the Bush administration’s almost continuous proposals to further cut federal resources for housing do not bode well for resolving the housing crises faced by American families. While state and local coalitions, legislative bodies and public agencies have been building their strategies and power over the last few decades to take on housing affordability, access and integration issues, these are now the places where there is potential to expand housing opportunities.

So much life depends on where you live. The schools children attend are usually neighborhood-based. Health is related to having access to good neighborhood air quality, stores with nourishing foods and neighborhood parks, walkways and safe streets that allow for exercise. The availability of jobs and public transportation, too, is determined by where people live. Yet too many people are priced out of neighborhoods where goods and services exist that can support healthy, productive lives for individuals and their families.

Multiple factors contribute to the paucity of affordable housing throughout regions. In most places, wages have not kept up with rising housing costs. Tight housing markets, a diminishing number of neighborhoods with affordable rents or homes for sale, and continuing housing segregation result in fewer housing options for those who need it, especially low-income people of color. Declining commitments by the federal government have meant that as housing costs escalate, low-income residents are pushed further and further into neighborhoods where housing may cost less but where opportunities are scarce.

The National Low Income Housing Coalition reports data from the Census Bureau’s 2001 American Housing Survey stating that there are 37 million households (an estimated 94 million people) in the United States experiencing severe or moderate problems with housing cost and quality. The problem of housing affordability not only remains great, the Coalition notes, it is growing:

- 26 percent of households spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing, a benchmark for unaffordable housing used by government and the finance industry.
- 11 percent of households report severe housing cost burdens, spending over one-half of their income on housing; and
- an estimated 75 million people live in unaffordable housing, 30 million of them in households with severe housing cost burdens.

Research documents the negative effects of living in high-poverty neighborhoods that lack the economic and civic infrastructure essential to a healthy community. In poor neighborhoods people are often isolated from good jobs, high-quality education, adequate health services and protection from criminal activities. Persistently high unemployment in these poor communities can become self-reproducing. When neighbors have no jobs or bad jobs, social networks are less helpful in connecting individuals to employment. Moving to a neighborhood that can offer more avenues to success is often very difficult.

Opportunity-rich neighborhoods often have exclusionary housing policies—such as zoning laws that do not permit rental units, require only large single-family homes or allow only homes built on large lots—that make it difficult to impossible for lower-income people simply to move to areas that would provide better access to good schools and jobs. Reversing the trends that result in racially isolated and economically segregated housing patterns, and moving toward diverse, mixed-income communities is the doorway to greater opportunity and inclusion and healthier communities.

Policy Changes to Make Housing Affordable

In the six years since PolicyLink began, advancing the fair distribution of affordable housing has become a central focus of our work. Over one-half of the residents of the twenty-two frequently visited policy states on the online PolicyLink Equitable Development Toolkit focus on increasing the supply of affordable housing in economically integrated neighborhoods, and these are tools aimed at local and state-level advocacy efforts.

Perhaps one of the most promising tools for advancing affordable housing in this current political climate that focuses so intensely on opportunity market initiatives is inclusionary zoning (IZ). Inclusionary zoning is a key starting place because it promotes mixed-income housing in new and rehabilitated residential developments, thereby leveraging market activity for other social outcomes. These new mixed-income developments can cumulatively help create greater access to opportunity for lower-income people, since, over the course of many years, such policies begin to reverse trends of income-segregated housing and promote greater distribution of affordable housing, and with it greater access to opportunity.

Inclusionary zoning acts as an antidote to exclusionary housing by requiring developers to make a percentage of housing units in new residential developments available to low-income and moderate-income households. As a result, developers receive non-monetary compensation in the form of density bonuses, zoning variances and/or expedited permits that reduce construction costs. For almost thirty years, cities and jurisdictions throughout the United States have used IZ principles to make affordable housing possible. Inclusionary zoning can contribute to a housing climate that is attractive to new residents and supportive of existing residents by:

- creating mixed-income communities;
- producing affordable housing that attracts a diverse labor force;
- connecting residents in high-poverty neighborhoods to opportunities; and
- designing consistent regulatory guidelines for developing affordable housing.

Applying Inclusionary Zoning Strategies to Increase Affordable Housing

In California, the second most expensive housing market in the country, a family needs to earn over $110,000—more than 175 percent of the state median income—to purchase a home at the prevailing median cost. Jurisdiction after jurisdiction has responded by implementing an IZ policy, making the state home to more IZ programs than anywhere else in the country. One hundred and seven California jurisdictions now use IZ to produce affordable housing. About one-third of the state's known inclusionary programs reported production numbers accounting for 10 percent or more of the total IZ-eligible units in their area, according to the California Housing Element Law, which requires jurisdictions to plan for housing growth, and itsdensity housing law, which requires jurisdictions to grant additional density in exchange for affordability, which has helped catalyze the use of the tool forward.

Jurisdictions have used IZ to foster mixed-income neighborhoods.

The nation’s oldest IZ program, in Montgomery County, Maryland, is a case study in how the practice can be altered and revised as a community’s development and growth patterns change. Montgomery County’s ordinance includes a requirement that all housing developments of thirty-five units or more make at least 12.5 percent of the units affordable to low-income households. Established in 1974, it originally applied to developments of fifty or more units. Sixty percent of the units produced serve families earning 65 percent or less of the area median income; 40 percent are packaged with other affordability housing resources to serve families earning below 30 percent of the area median income. Since and July, Montgomery County has produced 1,121 units of affordable housing, both ownership and rental. The Montgomery County program is now the focus of national scrutiny about how long units should remain affordable, as ownership units revert to market-rate property in twenty years, and the affordability terms of thousands of units have expired, resulting in a loss of affordable units.

Across the country, jurisdictions have used IZ to foster mixed-income neighborhoods that are more racially and economically diverse than nearby areas that lack this policy. Communities surrounding Washington, DC, for example, are quickly developing mixed-income jurisdictions with IZ programs that have collectively produced over 15,000 units of affordable housing.

Campaigned for Inclusionary Zoning

In 2002, housing organizations in Washington, DC, formed a coalition, The Campaign for Mandatory Inclusionary Zoning (www.dcit.org), to extend...
In New York City, groups have also united—under the banner of the Campaign for Inclusionary Zoning (www.izny.org)—to urge adoption of inclusionary zoning. These groups see IZ as a policy that can expand Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s redevelopment plans to address the city’s severe housing crisis. The mayor’s plans include proposed rezoning actions, targeted financial incentives and public investments in infrastructure, transportation and parks, as well as sports, convention and cultural venues that could add as many as 80,000 new units of housing over the next two decades. Were IZ applied to the two dozen neighborhoods slated for rezoning, it could have enormous implications for the city’s housing markets.

Recent production of new housing has not kept up with population growth and demand. A family earning the New York City median household income of $38,293 can afford a rent of $597 per month. The typical rent for a two-bedroom apartment in the city, however, ranges from $1,600 to $1,800, and in Manhattan from $3,000 to $5,200. The proposed zoning changes will alter the type and density of developments (residential, commercial and/or manufacturing) allowed in each neighborhood. The campaign aims to make sure that as zoning changes are approved, a policy is in place to assure that a portion of any new housing is affordable.

Community Engagement and More Connected Partnerships

By Anne Pasmanick

If you want to know about the impact of the newly re-elected Bush administration on housing and community development, keep your eye on the nearest low-income neighborhood. Whether it is a collection of city blocks, a reservation or a farming community, neighborhoods are where public policies and corporate practices unfold, affecting the quality of schools, health care, housing conditions and development. This neighborhood lens motivates the National Neighborhood Coalition to reinvigorate community development in challenging times.

In low-income neighborhoods, scarce resources and stalled delivery systems create a sense of hopelessness among neighborhood residents. The administration’s virtual freeze on domestic public policy development—other than crafting new barriers between low-income people and the resources they need—engenders the same reaction from the leadership of community-based organizations.

Along with federal policies, low-income neighborhoods are challenged by philanthropic and other non-profit sector trends. Foundations are consolidating grantmaking to fewer nonprofits and focusing on quantifiable results such as affordable housing production and investment in community infrastructure. The depth and scope of neighborhood change that is needed in our nation’s neighborhoods, however, cannot be achieved through policy development and units of production alone. Community engagement, by neighborhood groups and residents, is the essential component of a neighborhood revitalization strategy over the long haul. This is what local organizations at their best help to motivate, inform and support. Making the case for change on Capitol Hill is what national organizations at their best make possible.

The National Neighborhood Coalition—which has promoted public policy that benefits low-income people and neighborhoods for twenty-five years—is committed to bringing these sometimes disconnected power sources—neighborhood organizations and national organizations—into more connected partnerships. This is our source of hopefulness for the future.

Anne Pasmanick (anne@neighborhoodcoalition.org) is executive director of the National Neighborhood Coalition in Washington, DC.
Justice By Design?
The Planners Network 2005 Conference
Twin Cities, June 2-5

Registration
Whole Conference Registration
Register for the whole conference from the opening plenary on Thursday June 2 to the business meetings on Sunday June 5. Cost includes breakfasts, lunches, and receptions/snacks each day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Registration</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>After April 30</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$  ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (not student)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$  ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Day Registration on Friday or Saturday
Register for one day only, either Friday (tours and a plenary) or Saturday (sessions). Cost includes breakfast, lunch, and reception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Registration</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>After April 30</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$  ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (not student)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$  ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Become a Member and Receive Progressive Planning Magazine, the PW E-Newsletter, and a $10 Discount on Registration
Join Planners Network / renew your membership: $25 for students; $35 for incomes of $25,000-$50,000; $50 income over $50,000; and $100 for sustaining members. Note: special Canadian membership rates are available if you join separately via the web site. We can only accept US Dollars. $  ____

Planners Network Members Only
Check here if you would like to receive the $10 member discount on registration $  ____

Subtotal on this page $  ____

"Two Keynotes" Registration
Registration to attend the plenary lectures by Mike Pyatok (Thursday at 6pm) and/or Anne Spinn (Friday at 6pm). This does not include any other conference events. Registration deadline is May 16.

Free but Advance Registration Required (I am registering for this alone; if you are registering for the entire conference you do not need to register for this).

* Cancellations after April 30 will only receive a partial refund.

For more information see www.designcenter.umn.edu

Accommodation
Dorms
The dorms feature river views from many rooms, well equipped computers/internet facilities, laundries, air conditioning, and daily towel service. Reservations close May 9, 2005, and require payment in full. Refunds for cancellations after May 9 will occur only if we can reallocate the room.

Riverbend Commons: 220 Delaware St. SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, Information Desk: 612-625-8786. Close to the Weisman Art Museum, Riverbend is a new building and features "two-person, two-room suites" (two single rooms, each with kitchenettes, share a bathroom). Five to seven minute walk to the main conference venue at Rapson Hall. See http://www.housing.umn.edu/student/halls/riverbend/index.shtml.
Price per person: $44. Parking per car: $8 per car per day.

| Thursday June 2 | One night at $44 | $  ____ |
| Friday June 3  | Two nights at $88 | $  ____ |
| Saturday June 4 | Three nights at $132 | $  ____ |

I know this is a single room and I would like the other person sharing the bathroom to be
I will need parking for ____ cars at $8 per car = $  ____

Middlebrook Hall: 412 2nd Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455-0424, Information Desk: 612-625-0536. Across the Mississippi River on the West Bank of Campus near the arts precinct. "Two-person suites" sleep four in two rooms each with two beds; bath is shared by the two rooms. Twelve to fifteen minute walk to the main conference venue at Rapson Hall. See http://www.housing.umn.edu/student/halls/rooms/middlebrook.
Price per person: $30. Parking per car: $8 per car per day.

| Thursday June 2 | One night at $30 | $  ____ |
| Friday June 3  | Two nights at $60 | $  ____ |
| Saturday June 4 | Three nights at $90 | $  ____ |

I am sharing with the following people (up to three, put a * beside the one in your room):

Match me to a roommate:______
I will need parking for ____ cars at $8 per car = $  ____

Hotel
Located quite far from the Metromet but very close to the main conference venue at Rapson Hall, the Radisson provides a full-service hotel option. Bookings can be made directly with the hotel. Mention the Planners Network Conference when you call (612) 379-8888 or (800) 333-3333 for a reservation. Price per room: $104 plus 13% sales tax.

Your Information
Name: ________________________ Affiliation (for name tag): ________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________________
City: __________________________ State/Province: ______ Zip/Postal Code: ______ Country: __________________________ Member: yes/no

Payment (check one)
____ Paypal: Go to www.plannersnetwork.org and note "conference" in the "payment for box and then
send this form via mail or fax (see below). It's really simple! You'll get a gold star for using it.
____ Check enclosed (payable to Planners Network)
Credit card information: Visa: ___ Mastercard: ___
Card number: __________________________ Expiration date: __________
Signature: __________________________
Phone (for queries): __________________________
Mail to: Planners Network, 1 Rapson Hall, 89 Church St SE, Minneapolis MN 55455. Fax to: (612) 626-0600

Total Payment (both sides of page) $  ____

Progressive Planning Reader 2004

Progressive Planning Magazine

Order Form

___ Copies of Reader @ $12 each postage paid (up to 4 copies)* $___
___ Copies of Reader @ $8 each postage paid (5 or more copies)* $___
___ Subscribe to Progressive Planning Magazine @ $25/year for individuals and $50/year for organizations and libraries* $___
___ Join Planners Network / renew your membership and receive Progressive Planning Magazine for free $25 for students, $35 for incomes of $25,000-$50,000, $50 for incomes over $50,000, and $100 for sustaining members* $___

* All figures in US dollars, for Canadian rates see the web site

Order Total: $___

Your Information

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
City: __________________ State/Province: ____ Zip/Postal Code: ___
Country: __________________ Email (for queries): __________________
Current member: __________________ Renewing member: ______

Payment: Check enclosed (payable to Planners Network): $___
Or credit card information: Visa: ____ Mastercard: ____ Amex: ____
Card number: ____________________________ Expiration date: __/___
Name on card: ____________________________ Signature: __________________
Phone (for queries): ______________________

Mail to: Planners Network, 1 Rapson Hall, 89 Church St SE, Minneapolis MN 55455
Fax order to: (612) 826-6060

Or you can also order using PayPal at www.plannersnetwork.org - It's really simple!
Update from PNL-A

On October 2, Planners Network Los Angeles held its first event at an art gallery in Pasadena that happened to be featuring "Gardenlab," an exhibit that was appropriately themed for a planning event. About thirty people attended, including community members, students from various universities, faculty and non-profit and public organization representatives. Information tables displayed literature from PNL as well as from local organizations.

Three speakers gave presentations about projects and programs they are involved in locally. James Rojas, founder and director of Latino Urban Forum (LUF), discussed and showed slides depicting creation of space and community among Latino community members. He explained the structure and purpose of LUF in fostering dialogue about issues and connecting Latino communities to planning and other resources. Kei Nagao, director of Southern Californians for Youth, a network of seven youth organizing groups in LA, explained one model of youth organizing and then screened a short documentary by youth about their experiences organizing and shaping policy. Melanie Winter, founder and director of The River Project, gave a presentation about the history of planning around the Los Angeles River. She provided a synopsis of the different approaches, uses and stakeholders, focusing on advocacy for the surrounding residential community's vision of the area as sustainable and recreational. Joshua Lerner from PN was the final speaker. He talked about Planners Network—its structure, function and purpose—and the value of getting involved in a local chapter. A networking reception with live acoustic music followed. So far, feedback has been quite positive.

For more information about PNL-A, contact Katherine Petersen at kepters@usc.edu.

PN Member Updates

On November 19th at the Center for Architecture in New York City there was a forum, "Community + Planners = Change," featuring PNL's Tom Angotti, Chester Harman, Peter Marcuse, Frances Fox Piven, Rion Shelfman and Walter Thabit. The event was taped and will be transcribed for a future issue of Progressive Planning magazine.
RESOURCES

PUBLICATIONS


“Green Infrastructure: Smart Conservation for the 21st Century” by Ipswich Watch Clearinghouse, 2002, calls for states and communities to make green infrastructure an integral part of regional, local and state plans and policies. The report introduces green infrastructure as a strategic approach to land conservation that is critical to the success of great growth initiatives. To order a copy, contact Allison Smiley, 202.532.7000, or email allison@ipswatch.org.


“Land Reform, Chicago Style,” Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2004. A paper describing two civic initiatives in the ‘70s and 80s that catalyzed the paradigm shift toward the preserva-

tion of existing housing and communities, arguing that lowering abandonment and demolition rates is at least as important an indicator of well-being as new home building, especially in "hollowed-out" core areas of central cities. Paper available at http://www.cnt.org/publications/land-reform/chicago-style.pdf.

EVENTS

February 26-27, 2005, Gendering Urban Space in the Middle East, South Asia and Africa, Cairo. This workshop is co-organized by the Institute for Gender and Women’s Studies at the American University in Cairo (www.susec.ugt.edu.eg) and the Shehr Network (www.shehr.org). This workshop seeks to bring together work that critically examines ways in which gendered subjects negotiate their life-worlds in Middle Eastern, African and South Asian urban landscapes.

April 8-9, 2005, Youth Activism Conference, Toronto, Canada. This conference is sponsored by the Hunger Change Organization Collective. For more information on the conference, contact: mekel@toronto.on.ca.

June 20-24, 2005, 4th IMLC. Conference on Tenure Urbanism & the European Town Square, Venice, Italy. Co-organized with the University of Notre Dame School of Architecture. For more information, see www.lislab.cities.org.


ONLINE RESOURCES

Corporation for Supportive Housing’s Toolkit for Ending Long Term Homelessness is now available at www.chh.org/toolkit. This valuable resource profiles supportive housing projects across the US that are housing those who have been homeless for the longest term. Project profiles are accompanied by an extensive resource list, valuable industry-shaping definitions, and interactive photo tours. www.fed-uphoney.org. The Fed Up Honeye invite you to check out their website to find out more about their project. "Makes Me Mad: Stereotypes of Young Urban Women of Color," which looks at the relationship between the lack of resources in the community and representations of young women of color. Download the report online.

JOIN PLANNERS NETWORK

For three decades, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning, social and environmental justice. PN’s 1,000 members receive the Progressive Planning Network magazine, communicate on-line with PN-Net and the E-Newsletter, and take part in the annual conference. PN also gives progressive ideas a voice in the mainstream planning profession by organizing sessions at annual conferences of the American Planning Association, the Canadian Institute of Planners, and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

The PN Conference has been held annually almost every summer since 1984. These gatherings include speakers and workshops with exchanges involving local communities. PN conferences engage in discussions that help inform political strategies of the local, national, and international levels. Several conferences have been held in Philadelphia, MA, Rochester, NY, Toronto, Ontario, Lowell, MA, Ford St. Louis, IL, Brooklyn, NY, and Phoenix, CA.

Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others!

All members must pay annual dues. The minimum dues for Planners Network members are as follows:

$25 Students and income under $25,000
$35 Subscription to Progressive Planning only
$50 Income between $25,000 and $50,000
$100 Income over $50,000: organizations and libraries
$100 Sustaining Members — if you earn over $50,000, why don’t you consider helping at this level?

Canadian members: See column at right.

PN MEMBERS IN CANADA

Membership fees by Canadian members may be paid in Canadian funds:

$30 for students, unemployed, and those with incomes under $30,000
$40 for those with incomes between $30,000 and $60,000
$60 for those with incomes over $60,000
$120 for sustaining members

Make cheques or money orders payable to “Planners Network” and send w/membership form to: Amey Siciliano Dept of Geography, Room 5047 100 St. George St., University of Toronto, M5S 3G

If interested in joining the PN Toronto listserve, include your email address with payment or send a message to Amey Siciliano at asciliano@graffiti.net.

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 270 DeKalb Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11215. Please specify the issue and provide your email address or a phone number for orders. Multiple back issues are $8 each.

Each issue of the former Planners Network newsletters are for sale at $2 per copy. Contact the PN office at pn@planners.org 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. See ordering and content information at http://www.plannersnetwork.org/html/pn-pn-reader/index.html.

PLANNERS NETWORK ON LINE

The PN WEB SITE is at: www.plannersnetwork.org

The PN LISTSERVER: AT (www.plannersnetwork.org

The PN LISTSERVER

PN maintains an on-line mailing list for members to post and respond to queries, list job postings, conference announcements, etc. To join, send an email message to mailman@listserv.jpr-edu with “subscribe pn-net” (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>Size</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Send file via email to <a href="mailto:pnmail@umn.edu">pnmail@umn.edu</a>, or mail camera-ready copy, by January 1, April 1, July 1 and October 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half page</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 page</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8 page</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Issue Editors

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 35 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.