INSURGENT PRACTICES AND DECOLONIZATION OF FUTURE(S)
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The end of the Cold War, which removed the threat of the socialist bloc to the West, unleashed a domination of free market economy in that has resulted in serious shifts of the political terrain and has also produced significant recalibrations in planning theorization and practice. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, some commentators claimed to see the end of ideological war between the capitalist and socialist blocs—and therefore “the end of history” ( Fukuyama 1992) and “the end of politics.” The subsequent hegemony of free market capitalism and global restructuring of the capitalist state in this era have dramatically reconfigured the relationship between the state and its citizens. When all political struggles and tensions are subsumed under the free will and reach of the capitalist market, everything is privatized—from nature to public services and public resources, and even the government and state ( Watts 1994)—and the capitalist state no longer defines its role in mediation between labor and capital through provision of basic needs and development, but primarily in protection of optimal market functioning for capital. These shifts in the broader political dynamics of state vis-à-vis citizens and market invite us to reflect on how the planning profession has redefined itself and its obligations with respect to the public good. In the 1950s and 60s, the capitalist state relied on developmental and welfare programs, and public planning saw its role as serving public good through a scientific managerial approach that claimed to find the best solution to problems that politicians defined. Planning as “problem solving, not problem framing” was the mantra of the time (McLoughlin 1969; Fabusi 1973). In the 1960s and 70s, with the rise of social movements demanding inclusion, the planning profession was also politicized. Planning’s professional role in addressing the public good was to frame social problems and secure the inclusion of the most vulnerable citizens in the state’s development and welfare programs. Advocacy planning and equity planning, originated by US planning practitioners and scholars, are outcomes of this era when state welfare programs were still in effect and progressive planners saw their role as helping vulnerable citizens win a fair share of these public goods (Hiller and Healey 2008). But with the increasingly diminishing responsibilities of the state vis-à-vis citizens since then, the intermediary role of planning professionals was redefined from a redistributive, political role to a facilitating role, which is managerial and de-politicized. Communicative planning and collaborative planning, for instance, which have dominated planning theorization, scholars argue, epitomize this post-political society in which all is de-politicized and “ideology is put as its ‘sell-by date.’” (Gundl 2010, 309, citing Habermas 1987, 196; Purcell 2009; Sager 2005). In this post-ideological neoliberal reign of the free market, professional planning practice has been arranged to its original managerial role—one that believed in equilibrium. While the earlier genre of planning professionals believed in reaching such equilibrium through scientific system analysis, the new genre—communicative and collaborative planning—believes that an equilibrium among competing interests can be reached through communication and ideal speech in other words, if we find the right pitch, the right keynote, we can all sing in harmony.

Moreover, decades of professional planning practice that advocates inclusion through participation have shown that its conception within liberal ideals obscure, and at best is unable to address, complex layers of conflict, oppressive power, and imposition. A liberal notion of inclusion might recognize difference and call for citizen participation, but this inclusion is in ways that do not challenge power but merely incorporate differences. Scholastic document that inclusive planning through citizen participation has, indeed, often served as an ally for elitist, private-sector-driven decisions, or as cheap compensation for state withdrawal from public and social services (Angotti 2008; DeFilippis 2001; Mayer 2003; Mirafzal 2003; Harwood 2007).

At this historical juncture of neoliberalism, where formal politics of inclusion is an ally for exclusion and normalization of neocolonial domination, the bankruptcy of liberal inclusive planning urges us to rethink the epistemological and ontological parameters of planning
theorization and practice. Planning theorization needs to make an ontological and epistemological break with the ideas, ideals, and political philosophies that guided it through much of the 20th century. IP, I argue, pursues such ontological and epistemological breaks in our contemporary conjuncture.

IP builds on an earlier radical tradition in planning theory that recognized the practices of citizens and local communities as forms of planning. This theoretical intervention, initiated by Friedmann in the 1980s, reflected on citizens’ struggles in the global South cities and was continued by Sandercock’s work in the 1990s reflecting on realities of North American cities. Barrio planning (Friedmann 1987) and cover planning (Beard 2002) reflected predominantly on grassroots practices in the global South, taking seriously the practices of subordinate groups in shaping the place, policies, and spaces. In the global South, where, among other historical conditions, the state has had less ability to cover up capitalist contradictions through its welfare programs, citizens hold fewer illusions about the state’s benevolence and have had to determine insurrectional urban interventions outside the state apparatus of inclusion. Radical planning in its epistemic shift paid attention to the fact that residents of squatter settlements, favelas, and townships make their own living spaces and livelihoods not because of, but often despite, the state’s institutions, planning regulations, and laws. From this perspective, the informal settlements that mark urban landscapes of most cities of the global South provide material, spatial evidence of citizens’ insurgencies and direct action to plan and address their livelihood (Fulton 1998). Drawing on Fulton’s concept of insurgent citizenship (1998) and Young’s “politics of difference” (1990), Sandercock (1998a, 1998b) articulated the notion of insurgent historicity and IP to reflect on dynamics of power and production of urban space in increasingly multi-cultural North American cities. In dealing with recognition of difference, Sandercock furthers the earlier epistemological shift in radical planning by moving away from profession-centered liberal North American traditions of inclusive planning, and re-orienting the practices of citizens and local communities as forms of planning—IP.

Today urban political insurgencies have gained traction in theorizing insurgent practices as forms of planning (Stella 2012; Meir 2005; Meht 2011; Sweet and Chakrar 2010; Harvey 1999; Friedmann 2002, 2011; Sandercock 1998b, Roy 2009). This in part reflects the unprecedented rise of citizens’ direct action in Western European and North American cities, which are now experiencing the neoliberal unwinding of welfare capitalism and joining the rest of the world in takeovers of urban space (Occupy movement). But the growing attention to citizens’ insurgent practices and the urge to think through them in respect to planning also reflects the crisis of legitimacy the profession faces in its inability to deliver on the promise of inclusion and service to public good through a framework of inclusive representation. Planning theory, along with planning education and practice, has had to deal with key questions of this century with respect to difference and justice, where citizens re-engineer and practice different kinds of democracies, ideals, and citizenship.

IP builds on the epistemological contribution of the radical planning approach to make a move that I argue is ontological—that is, it shifts the understanding of justice from a liberal Rawlsian notion of justice as fairness to a Youngian notion of justice based on recognition of difference and its politics. Rawlsian theory seeks justice in terms of individualized rights and fair treatment. Young’s notion highlights the limitation of liberal policies of inclusion that might satisfy beneficiaries’ rights as individuals yet, through stigma, oppress them as a group (1998). Thus philosophy insists on recognizing self-determined and group-based forms of oppression in reaching justice. Such an understanding of justice changes the terms of debate about inclusion from representation to self-determination—a shift that validates citizens’ direct action and has substantial implications for planning. In representative democracy, citizens as individuals delegate their rights to others—political representatives, bureaucrats, or technical experts. In contrast, in participatory democracy disadvantaged and marginalized citizens who recognize the inadequacy of formal rights turn to direct action to achieve justice. They do not hand the advocacy of their interests to others but instead directly take part in shaping decisions that affect their lives. Participatory democracy consequently promotes a form of citizenship that is multi-centered and has multiple agencies, including the citizens and their direct social actions.

As IP de-centers the role of representation and relies on direct action as a means of inclusion, a shift in the subject of its theorization is also noteworthy. In previous variations of inclusive planning, the subjects of theorization are professional planners and their professionalized practices. For example, in advocacy and equity planning, the planners’ role is to advocate for citizens, speak in the face of power, and get the best deal on behalf of the citizens. In communicative planning, the professional planner is responsible for bringing all parties to a consensus through ideal speech. In that theoretical framework, planning is conceptualized as a realm outside the community, and its agent is the professional planner. The core concern is how this “outsider” (the planner) needs to redefine his/her role and responsibility vis-à-vis the disadvantaged community. In IP, however, planning is no longer the prerogative of professionals or trained planners. Professional planners are but one of the actors that shape the contested field of action known as planning. In the conceptual architecture of IP, the core concern is therefore a set of practices independent of their actors: the theoretical object shifts from planner to planning. The discussion is not about insurgent planners as a category, but as we expect actors to adhere to a specific category of practice. Insurgent practices ontologically break with liberal inclusive planning because IP calls for a different kind of participation and inclusion. It does not aim for a bigger share of the pie but for a different kind of pie. It does not seek inclusion in liberal democracy through better representation (be it by experts or politicians); it seeks to create a humane urbanism where people’s rights are real and practiced. Moreover, while building on the earlier critical tradition of radical planning, IP expands the notion of planning practice to include not only select forms of action by citizens and their organizations sanctioned and tolerated by the dominant groups, what I call insured spaces of action, but also the interventions that state and corporations seek to ostracize and criminalize—what I call invented spaces of action. IP makes an ontological intervention in understanding the relationship between planning and citizenship I will expand on this in the following section.

To summarize, the ontology of IP departs from that of its predecessors, which were guided by the assumption that representative democracy works in the best interests of all with citizenship rights, including disadvantaged groups. To the contrary, IP is guided by the principles of participatory democracy—that is, understanding citizenship as a practice constructed from below through citizens’ direct action for the development of their self-determined political community. This difference does not, however, position insurgent and inclusive planning as binaries: they are ontologically different but have a dialectic relationship. Just as participatory and representative democracy dialectically influence each other, IP and inclusive planning can do the same, so unfeeling them conceptually is crucial while engaging in the complex terrain of planning today.

A Theoretical Elaboration: Invited and Invented Spaces of Action and Misconceptions about Them

Because concepts of invited and invented spaces of citizens’ action are critical to my approach in theorizing IP, I first offer a brief definition. Over a decade ago, reflecting on grassroots movements in black townships of post-apartheid South Africa, I conceptualized their actions...
In these terms, \textit{invited spaces} are defined by grassroots actions through community-based informal groups and their allied nongovernmental organizations that are legitimized by donors and government interventions and aim to cope with systems of hardship. \textit{Invited spaces} defined as collective actions by the poor that directly confront the authorities and challenge and destabilize the status quo. These two sorts of spaces, however, can stand in a mutually constituted, interacting relationship, not a binary one. They are not solidified, and they change character as dominating groups seek to appropriate them whenever a threat is posed. On-the-ground evidence also shows that grassroots practices seek to make political changes in power relations often move across invited and invited spaces of action. If they are to reach more than individualized need (the goal of liberal inclusion), they often have to move across and between these spaces as, called for by the specifics of the struggle. Insurgent practices are fluid, moving across all spaces of participation and engaging both the formal and informal arena of politics; they aim to contest the strategies for redistribution and recognition, echoing Nancy Fraser's (1997) theorization. But institutions of power, such as the ministerial bodies, the state, and international donor organizations, configure these invited and invited spaces and tend to criminalize the latter by designating only the former as the "proper" space for citizens' voices and participation.

The authorities tend to vilify and criminalize one set of actions and celebrate another because they try to steer citizens to a certain model of action and to contain them within a space of activism that can be more easily controlled. Svinski (2010), 

\begin{quote}
points out that "from conformity it is but a short step to complicity" (Buchanan 2000, 75), because activism that "treads established paths of dissent is always in danger of being beguiled and contained by the organism of the State." Radical activists therefore need to shift strategies and create new spaces through "practices of rupture and creation" (2010, 8). "Activism that seeks only to guarantee the workings of representative democracy," Svinski writes, "are essentially slave activism; they dwell in safety and their impact and potential is expected to be absorbed without drawing the system into new structures of resistance" (2010, 3). This kind of slave activism is what de-politicized planning theorization has celebrated and popularized as participatory planning, citizen participation, and grassroots involvement.

IP breaks away from this mode of thinking in radical ways. It defines confinement and confinement of citizens' actions to liberal state and market norms, but also recognizes how citizens might use these norms to induce a rupture and create something new. In the recent South African student movement against raising university tuition, for example, Julian Brown (2015) points out how the South African police would beat up students when claims were made through protests (invited spaces), but also invite them to dialogue between the administration and students' leaders (invited space). For the authorities, binary construction is an effective means of weakening progressive movements, but insurgent activists recognize the fallacy of binary constructions and use all available means and spaces to make their demands heard and addressed. In this instance, the invited space itself was politicized by activists when they failed to produce a "set of leaders" to negotiate with authorities. The politics of containment works through introducing a range of binaries—invited versus invited, leaders versus means—so as to identify and subdue projects of grassroots autonomy. On the other hand, the insurgent student movement—precisely because it shifted attention from actors to practice—accordingly constructed by creating an ambiguous liminal space within which authorities lose their points of reference (Irazabal 2014). For authorities the question was how to double down with the force of law to make these spaces, times, and bodies legally legible. For insurgent citizens, the question is how to sustain this illegible threshold long enough to frustrate and sustain existing modalities of law, state power, and capital accumulation.
\end{quote}
Imagination and the Urgency in Decolonizing the Future

The writings of African intellectuals teach us that liberation of the colonies could happen only through "decolonizing the mind" (Fanon 1966 [1967]) and liberating imagination. Liberation needs a new consciousness, one that is recovered from the colonial moral injury, the profound need that believed development of the colony could happen only in the condition of rejecting itself and wholesale importing of non-African scenarios and solutions (Davidson 1992, 1999). Anticolonial scholars and activists of liberation expose means of domination beyond direct use of brute force, and how tropes of inclusion can be used to subordinate groups. Domination can work through internalized values and voices of the dominant groups—a condition that colonizes our imagination and validates only the knowledge of the West and the forms of knowing and being under Western eyes, to borrow from Mohanty (1991). In planning, the colonial gaze, to evoke Fanon, is the only contemplation that matters in how we theorize planning and see the outcome of plans as human habitus.

Imagination is a kind of radical thinking about an alternative future that is not only an end but also a means of change. Imagination is the capacity to envision possibilities that are not眼前的 and to question the taken-for-granted assumptions that structure our societies. It is a form of critical thinking that challenges the status quo and opens up new possibilities for social change. Imagination is essential for the process of decolonizing the mind and envisioning a future that is free from colonial legacies.

Imagination and decolonizing the future go hand in hand. As Fanon (1966) argued, liberation requires not only the dismantling of the material structures of domination but also the dismantling of the mental structures that sustain them. Imagination is the mental structure that enables us to visualize a world that is free from domination and exploitation. It is through imagination that we can envision and plan for a future that is more just and equitable.

The role of imagination in planning and design is crucial. As architects and planners, we have the responsibility to imagine and design a future that is inclusive, equitable, and sustainable. This requires a shift in mindset, from one that is dominated by colonial and capitalist logics to one that is dominated by principles of justice, equality, and sustainability. Imagination is the key to this shift.

African cities, for example, are dissected, critics remind us, under Western eyes as incomplete, crawling, and not growing up because they have not yet become like the superior models they are expected to become; they are invisible to the colonial gaze (de Boer and Pels 2004; Watson 2006, 2009; Simonne 2004). In this normalized relation of power, inclusion means a state of difference and incorporation of subordinate groups into the normative, values, and ideals of the dominant group.

For planning in this era, decolonizing planning imagination is by questioning the very assumptions, norms, values, and ideals that shape every plan and policy—for example, that plans and policies must operate on economic growth, or that planning models developed and implemented in the West are models to be emulated. Echoing Steve Biko (1978), I assert the need for a new consciousness that liberates planning imagination. The elite and consumerist planning ideals persist in our postcolonial, neoliberal time, through suppression of any alternative conceptualization of cities and of planning. IP scholarship aims at decolonizing the planning imagination by taking a fresh look at subaltern cities to understand them by their own rules and values rather than by the planning prescriptions and fantasies of the global and local elite.

History and future are interwoven sites of struggle and contestation. Concerning power and history, the struggle is between forgetting and remembering, as Kundera (1999) calls it, and concerning the future, the struggle is in imagining. Future is the political terrain of the core
struggle this generation faces over opening and closing the realm of possibilities—that is, the struggle between expanding the realm of imagination and closing it down. The future is inevitable. It is open and it is plural (Pieterse 2000, 6). People need it like they need air, writes Pieterse (2000, xxi). But the future is also empty, meaning that what it constitutes depends on how it is imagined, susceptible to be reinvented and be “opened by a horizon of possibilities” (Santos 1995, 479). Because of its openness and its multiplicity/plurality, the future should be understood as an object of dispute; should be thought of as open-ended collage with the power to create interruptions, involving sense of direction, playfulness, and pleasure at the same time (Santos 1995, 459). But the open-endedness, plurality, and unpredictability of the future also makes it a political territory, a site of fierce contestation over its content. If we do not dare to imagine the unimaginable, then the future is less open and more predetermined as persistence and perpetuation of the present.

The concept of “colonization of future” is of key importance. In the first colonies land, natural resources, and slave labor were objects of wealth creation. In the 1980s, Mies and her colleagues (1988) provocatively wrote about Women: The Last Colony. That is, European’s global colonization had raped land that did not belong to them and which allowed their jump start in wealth creation, and now colonization had turned to women and their cheaply obtained labor for more wealth creation. In that new international order, women’s bodies and labor were subjects of colonial accumulation. Today, however, I argue that it is the imagination that must be invoked as the last colony—imagination as a political territory, a “territory” to be “occupied” to secure closure through totalitarian imaginations and through erasure of alternative imagined futures. The latest subject of “colonial occupation,” then, is the inability to imagine a different future, and the struggle for its emancipation is urgent.

The struggle between past, present, and future is inevitable, ongoing, and nonlinear (Brown 2014). The emancipation of one without the others is not possible. It is from historizing and understanding the past that we can understand the present struggles; it is by understanding our present struggles that we can imagine a future similar or different. But without an imagination of a future, we cannot change the present. We also need guidance to choose desirable future paths—necessity that makes imagination of futures an intrinsically political exercise (Friedmann 2000, 463).

Imagination of an alternative future requires a deep understanding of the present. Anxieties of the present involves understanding the basis at the roots of contemporary realities. This understanding of the present has been a site of contestation against the production of a sanitized past that washes off the conflicts, contradictions, and power struggles that have shaped it. Harvey (2000, 168) notes this entanglement of past, present, and future through Benjamin’s (1909) observations of Parisian arcades. Benjamin observed how through museums and heritage centers, exhibitions, arenas of spectacle, and souvenirs—a sanitized collective memory is produced, an aesthetic and critical sensibility nourished, and the future possibilities absorbed into a supposedly conflict-free arena that is eternally present.

Brown’s (2014) Feminism, Time, and Nonlinear History, in which she discusses polytemporal pasts and futures and relational temporalities, helps us better understand IP’s heralding of multiple futures. As opposed to Fukuyama’s argument for the end of history, which seeks to bring closure to the future, our citizens’ struggle is to overturn such closure and open the terrain of imagination to conceive of alternatives. The end of history as we know it is also the beginning of history as we want it. To open the realm of possibilities for an imagined ideal future, we need to seek practices, ideals, and ideas that allow us to overcome analytic and imaginative closures. Some might employ performance actions that evoke imagination of a different world—for example, the performative practices of Turkish youth in the 2013 Gezi Park struggles recreated the imagination of an urban commons even if momentarily and temporarily (see Ay and Miralbah 2016). Others among new social movements might turn to science fiction for social justice movements and imagining a just world. Acts of insurgency that simply invoke such imagination can sometimes produce enduring gains in this struggle for future. The communal spaces that Occupy movements create, whether in Gezi Park or Madrid or New York, help us imagine a different world and, for the participants, even provide a short experience of living in a different world. Both the imagination and the experience are key to winning the struggle. This performative aspect of IP superimposes future(s) on the present, entwining multiple times.

In short, politicization of imagination and the future as a terrain of struggle for justice is key if we are to plan for a world more just, and an urbanism more humane. The potential of insurgent in humane urbanism lies in the normality that it disrupts and the new common sense that it helps to create; in assuming equality and solidarity as normality interrupted by structures of domination, not the other way around; and in its aspiration to recover an idealist imagination of a different, more just future.

Conclusion: The Way Forward

Moving into the future, the editors of the volume before us ask, “What are the implications for this theoretical construct of planning—insurgent planning?” I wish to first stress the understanding of IP not as a set of blueprints for action but as a conceptual and normative construct to guide planning thought and action to promote humane urbanism into the future. I next stress that, because we live in times of crises of both capitalism and of the planning profession, IP will have important contributions to make. The bottom line is that the capitalist state, and the experts that seek to maintain the status quo through liberal democratic inclusion, are facing the limitations of its promise. Planning as we know it is faced with a crisis of legitimacy, and the spatial injustices it facilitates are glaring evidence of an “empire with no clothes.” We need a different kind of planning, and IP as a theoretical construct offers elements of that.

The notion of IP expands planning from the prerogative of a selected group of professionals to a contested field of action by a range of actors, which includes professionals but also other organized individuals and communities deeply involved in shaping our urban habitats and environments. This expanded notion of planning is more in tune with the reality of the 21st century, discussed earlier in the chapter, whereby the state’s welfare and development programs, of which planning professionals have traditionally been in charge, have increasingly diminished. Moreover, as the crisis of capitalism leads to aggressive shutdown of democratic spaces, citizens will innovate strategies and practices that invent new spaces of action and new means of shaping the spaces we inhabit. These innovative practices and invented spaces are not fixed; indeed, to survive threats of co-optation or incorporation by dominant powers, they need to constantly shift with agility. They might move to “under-the-radar politics,” or create ambiguous spaces of action through performative acts, or opt for politics of agitation and protest. The point is not the specific forms of action, but the range of innovative practices guided by principles of transnational, counter-hegemony, and decolonized imagination discussed in this chapter, which promises to invent new spaces of action precisely shot down by powerful interest groups that govern the cities and dominate human habitat. If we are to achieve a humane urbanism, professional planning must recognize these other critical actors and the important spaces of citizenship they innovate and invent, because their role and weight in bringing about change are even more important than in the previous century. Professional planning educators, practitioners, theorists, need to recognize the wide range of actors and actions undertaken to shape a city more humane. (A qualifier: I take city and urbanism as broad terms, by no means referring
to city as de facto territory buary to rural or other form of human habitat.) In other words, as in the global North in particular, as the illusion of inclusion through the formal and representative channels of inclusion wears off, citizens’ insurgent practices are taking center stage as means of shaping a new world, one that is more just and embodies a humane urbanism.

What IP needs to develop, however, is greater imagination of what we want. It is easier to mobilize action around negating the present. As important as that is, it does not replace the need for what we wish to replace the present reality by. A greater understanding of the elements constitutive of humane urbanism is what we must develop as we mobilize to transform and destabilize present hegemonies—hence the extended discussion in this essay on the importance of decentering the future and imagination of what that future entails. An important opportunity, and challenge, of progressive planning in this particular historic moment is to decolonize the imagined futures and dare to imagine a radically different world. In this age of “realism,” where ideals are looked down on and dreaming is stigmatized, the exercise of collective or individual imagination of a just world and what elements a humane urbanism embodies, are of prime radical value. For planning scholars, the frontier of anticolonial and anti-hegemonic struggle is indeed the fight to decolonize the planning imagination, in its theoretical construct as well as its pedagogy and practice. IP offers the theoretical guidance for such an endeavor as we move into the future we wish to construct.

Notes
1. I borrow the term “invited spaces of citizenship” from Cornwell (2002, 94) to develop the notions of invited and invited spaces of citizenship.
2. In April 2014, I witnessed the untimely outbreak of violence against poor black African migrants in Cape Town, South Africa. These attacks, which started in Durban and spread to other South African cities, took place by and large in townships, informal settlements, and areas poor people inhabit. There were eight deaths and hundreds of injuries, and thousands of people were displaced, seeking refuge at police stations, churches, and temporary accommodation set up by NGOs. Attacker’s rhetoric and burned small businesses owned by African foreign nationals, accusing them of “stealing jobs from citizens”—discourses not similar to those heard about immigrants in the United States.
3. Rallagh on the anti-immigrant discourse of “foreigners steal our jobs” the KwaZulu-Natal provincial government announced investment of over R300 million to avoid local small businesses in competing with their foreign counterparts (Hams 2015).
4. For example, see Intsila and Brown (2015).
5. See Pan (2015), drawings on Ramakant’s work.
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HEGEMONIC PLANNING AND MARGINALIZING PEOPLE

Yosef Jabareen

Introduction

Often viewed as a public undertaking aimed at creating a better society and better cities, planning has long been portrayed as a state responsibility that is visionary, utopian, progressive, and reformist in nature and that is intended to serve as a fair and legitimate process for producing preferable physical and social spaces (Bridge & Watson, 2002; Fuller, 2010). Indeed, in both theory and practice, it has typically been taken for granted “that planning is, could, or should be, A Good Thing” (Huxley, 2010: 136). Despite these claims, however, planning is often not what we were promised and can have catastrophic impact on different populations. Some scholars have used the metaphor of a “dark side” of planning to draw attention to the negative outcomes of the process (Flyvbjerg, 2002; Huxley, 2010; Jabareen 2017; Sandercock, 1998; Yifakhal, 1994).

This chapter interrogates the role of state planning in marginalizing and oppressing religious, racial, national, ethnic, and other kinds of social groups with the aim of exploring the existing theories and contributing to the theorization of the subject. Interestingly, the literature review reflects that although much has already been written on this issue, little theorization has thus far considered the role of planning as an instrument of marginalization and domination. To begin filling this gap, this chapter pursues a theory of planning that engages with broader society but that also sheds light on the state’s implementation of spatial planning on a practical level.

Drawing on Lecanau, Žižekian, and Lacanian concepts of fantasy, back, and desire I theorize and propose the theoretical framework of “hegemonic planning,” which, I argue, serves to approach fulfilling the fantasy of the state apparatus, or precisely the politically hegemonic groups, regarding their own ethnosymbolic or ideological hegemony. This fantasy is related to the “harmony” and “wholeness” of this hegemonic group, while excluding disadvantaged groups, the “others,” from this total fantasy, and perceiving them as alien to their house-state frameworks and as “others” who need to be addressed through marginalization, oppression, exclusion, and dispossession. In this chapter, I suggest that hegemonic planning plays a powerful role in producing and accomplishing state supremacy on the ground by fulfilling state fantasies through the use of common professional spatial planning practices and sophisticated, manipulative, and often veiled planning measures aimed at displacing and marginalizing people.