

In / In Knowledge Handbook of Planning Theory (edited by Michael Gordon, Ali Madanipour, Vanessa Watson . 2017. London, NY: Routledge .

22

INSURGENT PRACTICES AND DECOLONIZATION OF FUTURE(S)

Faranak Mirafshar

This chapter further elaborates the concept of insurgent planning (IP) and why it needs to be taken seriously in planning education, scholarship, and practice. Without strong conceptual elaboration, ideas can be easily dismissed as fanciful or become buzzwords that fail to engage deeply with transformative practices and actions. I therefore build this chapter on three sections. The first section describes the crises and social contradictions of the late 20th and early 21st centuries and the implications of the resulting political and ideological shifts for planning. This supposedly post-political era, which has exposed the liberal democratic promises of inclusion and equity, places citizens' insurgent practices high on the political and intellectual agendas. I discuss the political philosophies that drive liberal democratic and insurgent citizenship practices and argue that IP ontologically departs from liberal traditions of so-called inclusive planning that have held the inclusion of disadvantaged groups as an objective of professional intervention. The second section takes a closer look at the range of citizens' direct actions and conceptualizes them through the analytic devices I offer as invited and invented spaces of citizenship. I discuss the potential flexibility of these forms of action and dispel a binary misconception of invited versus invented spaces for citizens' direct action; instead, I focus on the theoretical construct of IP as practices that are transgressive, counter-hegemonic, and imaginative. In the third section, inspired by anticolonial scholars and activists of liberation, I discuss the urgency in decolonizing the future as a result of political contestation and imagination. I conclude the chapter by stressing the opportunities ahead as the crisis of capitalism leads to aggressive shutdowns of democratic spaces and citizens innovate strategies and practices to invent new spaces of action. IP is not a set of blueprints for action but a conceptual and normative construct to guide planning thought and action that promotes humane urbanism into the future.

Insurgent Planning: An Ontological Break with Liberal Inclusive Planning

The planning profession as institutionalized in the West has traditionally served to mediate state relations with citizens and the market. Conditions that have reconfigured the state's relationship with citizens and the market have placed the idea and the practice of insurgent citizenship high on the political agenda; those same conditions have also had important implications for planning thought and theorization.

276

The end of the Cold War, which removed the threat of the socialist bloc to the West, unleashed a domination of free market economy that has resulted in seismic 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 (McLaughlin 1969; Faludi 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 developmental 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 (Hillier 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 past its ‘sell-by date’” (Gunder 2010, 303, citing Habermas 1987, 196; Purcell 2009; Sager 2005). In this post-ideological neoliberal reign of the free market, professional planning practice has boomeranged to its original managerial role—one that believed in equilibrium. While the earlier genre of planning professionals believed in teaching such equilibrium through scientific system analysis, this 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 obscures, 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. Scholars document that inclusive planning through citizen participation has, indeed, often served as an alibi for elitist, private-sector-driven decisions, or as cheap compensation for state withdrawal from public and social services (Angotti 2008; DeFilippis 2001; Mayer 2003; Mirafshar 2003; Harwood 2007). At this historical juncture of neoliberalism, where formal politics of inclusion is an alibi for exclusion and normalization of neocolonial domination, the bankruptcy of liberal inclusive planning urges us to rethink the epistemological and ontological parameters of planning

277

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 covert planning (Heard 2002) reflected predominantly on grassroots practices in the global South, taking seriously the practices of subordinate groups in shaping the plans, 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 determining 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 space 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 (Holston 1998). Drawing on Holston's concept of insurgent citizenship (1998) and Young's "politics of difference" (1990), Sandercock (1998a, 1998b) articulated the notion of insurgent historiography and IP to reflect on dynamics of power and production of urban space in increasingly multicultural 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 recognizing 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 (Stello 2012; Merr 2005; Meth 2010; Sweet and Chakras 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 unsettling of welfare capitalism and joining the rest of the world in takeovers of urban space (Occupy movements). 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 reimagine 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 (1990). This 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 with how this "outsider" (the planner) needs to relieve 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, nor do 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 wherein 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 *invited* spaces of action, but also the insurrections that state and corporation seek to ostracize and criminalize—what I call *invented* spaces of action. IP makes an ontological intervention in understanding the relationship between planning and citizens; 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 unmuting 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: *invented* 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. *Invented* spaces I 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 that seek to make structural changes in power relations often move across invented and invented spaces of action. If they are to reach more than individualized needs (the goal of liberal inclusion), they often have to move across and between those spaces as called for by specifics of the struggle. Invented practices are fluid, moving across all spaces of participation and engaging both the formal and informal arenas of politics; they aim to combine the struggles for redistribution and recognition, echoing Nancy Fraser's (1997) theorizations. But institutions of power, such as the mainstream media, the state, and international donor organizations, configure these invented and invented spaces as binary, 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 activism and to contain them within a space of activism that can be more easily controlled. Svirsky (2010, 5), quoting Buchanan, points out that "from conformity it is but a short step to complicity" (Buchanan 2000, 75), because activism that "reads established paths of dissent is always in danger of being besieged 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, 5). "Activists that seek *only* to guarantee the workings of representative democracy," Svirsky writes, "are essentially *stare activists*; they dwell in safety and their impact and potential is expected to be absorbed without drawing the system into new structures of resonance" (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 defies confinement and performance of citizens' actions to liberal state and market norms, but also recognizes how citizens might use those 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 (invented spaces), but also invite them to dialogues 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 invented, leaders versus masses—so as to identify and subdue projects of grassroots autonomy. On the other hand, the insurgent student movement—precisely because it shifts attention from actors to practices—evaded this construction 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 suffocate existing modalities of law, state power, and capital accumulation.

Invited and invented spaces of citizenship practice should be thought of as spaces with "porous borders," borrowing from Steven Robins' (2014) reflection on the Toilet Wars waged by the poor in Cape Town townships over the last few years. In that struggle, citizens waged a range of actions and strategies, some criminalized by the state (e.g., the Ses'khona movement's throwing of poop at the Cape Town international airport terminal) and others tolerated by the state (e.g., the Social Justice Coalition [SJC] documenting lack of toilets and authorities' false promises). Whereas the sanitized terminology of formal politics such as "service delivery backlog" obscured their plight and the urgency of their demands, "poop protestors" used abrupt acts of insurgency to create spectacle and shock that moved the problem of defecation and lack of toilets to the center of political debate—indeed it became top of the agenda in an electoral campaign. But "politics of shit," or "poolitics" as McFarlane and Silver (2016) call it, as practiced by activist citizens was not limited to acts of sabotage or insurgency, such as throwing poop at the mayor's house or lining up by the hundreds to use toilets in plush suburbs and outside City Hall. They drew on a rich repertoire of grassroots action which also includes practices of organizations like the SJC that predominantly concern remuneration and auditing using the language and perspective of the state (McFarlane and Silver 2016).

We should note that a binary construction of these practices taking place through invited and invented spaces risks an embedded misconception of stability in each space. It disregards the flexibility and innovative nature of capitalism, which folds in whatever lies at its margin and seeks to incorporate whatever might be a threat. What is today an alternative, or radical, might become mainstream and de-politicized by containment and entrapment tomorrow, with its transformative force hollowed out—leaving activists holding "a toy telephone with no lines that reach anywhere," a metaphor used by my colleague Ken Salo for such stolen movements. Movements thus need to continually reinvent their spaces of action. Similarly, movements can appropriate a space that has been created by the establishment to contain the creative actions of dissent and use it to invoke new imaginations of inclusion. Neoliberal inclusion wants to contain the grassroots actions in invited spaces where their demands are controlled and appreciated, but insurgent practices seek to push these limits by occupying those and other spaces. These transgressions are necessary particularly because of capitalism's ability to occupy the alternative imaginations and spaces of being and action.

In fact, the power of insurgent practices lies in their agility and ability to transgress and destabilize hegemonic normality and open up new political terrains for the imagination of a different future. To use the Deleuze and Guattari (1980) concept of nonindexed politics that are agile, insurgent movements must constantly reinvent and innovate new spaces as the oppressive state appropriates whatever lies outside it. Clearly, citizens' successful political action requires agility. There can be no rigid joining of actors to actions. The point to reiterate here is that the theorizing objects of IP are practices, not the actors. The point is not to label a particular actor, or a particular organization or movement, but to take into account the range of actions that move toward a particular outcome—a more just and humane urbanism.

But skeptics raise important questions: How do we recognize insurgent practices that contribute to building a participative democracy and create the foundation on which to develop humane urbanism? Is every act of insurrection and interruption progressive in that it seeks a participative democracy, or could it be anti-democratic, reactionary, or even fascist? Moreover, do insurgent practices necessarily need to be in the form of insurrections, riots, and loud protests?

The answers are embedded in what we have so far discussed, but, to clarify, the response is negative on both counts. Not all insurgency is theorized here as the democratic insurgent practice of citizenship; not all invented spaces of activism, nor all forms of insurgency by poor and disadvantaged groups, are celebrated in this theoretical endeavor. Moreover, far from a unifying

form of action, invented spaces can take as many forms as their context calls for, be it loud and collective protest or quiet and under-the-radar politics of entrenchment.

What determines radical practices and their promise for a humane urbanism is a set of conceptual guideposts that I have discussed at length elsewhere: transgression (in time, place, and forms of action), counter-hegemony, and imagination (Mirdafab 2009). These practices *transgress* false dichotomies, by public actions spanning formal and informal arenas of politics and invited and invented spaces of citizenship practice. They also transgress national boundaries by building transnational solidarities of marginalized people and move beyond time bounds by seeking a historicized consciousness and promoting historical memory of present experiences (Salo 2015). IP practices are *counter-hegemonic* in that they destabilize normalized relations of dominance and insist on citizens' rights to dissent, rebel, and determine their own terms of engagement and participation. IP practices seize advantage from the contradictory nature of neoliberal capitalism, exposing the rift between inclusion and redistribution. They understand the world of such contradictions contrapuntally, looking not only at how systems of oppression are conceptualized and exerted, but also at how they are contested. IP practices are *imaginative*. They recover riskiness for a just society. Insurgent practices recognize the symbolic value of insurgent citizenship activities that offer hope from which to work toward alternatives. In short, IP consists of purposeful transgressive actions that aim to disrupt relationships with oppressors, and to destabilize the status quo through consciousness of the past and imagination of an alternative just future.

Understood against these principles, not all acts of insurgency or invented spaces of activism outside the normalized, routinized spaces of citizen participation have an anti-hegemonic agenda. Nor do all counter-hegemonic practices need to be through confrontation, insurrection, or collective protest. Let's take those on the far right of the political party spectrum, such as Tea Party insurgency in the United States or the poor people's protests against African migrants in South Africa.⁷ In the latter case, xenophobic attacks in 2015 reinforced the interest of the black entrepreneurs in Durban, who, subsequent to the attacks, used the riots to funnel funds their way and enrich themselves, increasing the gap between the haves and have-nots.⁸ It would be a grave mistake, therefore, to assume that any insurgency by the poor is an insurgent practice—which we theorize here as radical planning and ontologically shifting planning discourse beyond the limits of liberal-democratic inclusion. Paula Meth (2010), studying a vigilante group in Durban, offers another example that poignantly reminds us of the complexity and social thickness of the grassroots actions and warns against idealizing those as necessarily progressive. While in some regards they might promote a just cause, they might also adhere to violence, sexism, or racism. The vigilantes Meth studies are engaged in practices that are both liberating and oppressive, and we cannot flatten the complexities of grassroots movements and their practices; we have to see these practices in relation to their overarching dimensions. First, we need to remember that in theorizing the relationship between citizens and planning through an IP framework, the focus is on practices, not actors. Actors—e.g., vigilantes or social movement activists or organizations—might adopt practices that are progressive and transformative at one point, but they might be coopted or misused into taking part in practices that are oppressive at another point (or even at the same time). I therefore insist on terminologies that do not rigidly link spaces of action we conceptualize as invited and invented to a particular actor, movement, or organization—hence *insurgent planning*, not *planner*. Moreover, the form of action, whether it is a “quiet encroachment” under the radar or an act of insurrection and “loud takeovers,” does not determine the political potential of the action for broader social transformation. It is important to inquire into the historical and transnational consciousness as well as the organizational matrix and strategic arc within which insurgent practices are nested. If citizens' practices

contribute to the fulfillment of a broader strategy of capital and colonialism, they are merely episodes of reactionary tactics—regardless of their loudness or quietness.

To wrap up, whoever the actors (be it professional planners, activists, or regular citizens) and whatever the specific form of an action, particular practices can be identifiable as IP practices if they are guided by certain principles that I articulate as follows: transgression; destabilizing hegemonic order; and imaginative of an alternative and just future. In evaluating any set of citizen practices, we need to ask how they temporally and spatially historicize their struggles that might lead or draw on transnational solidarities; how they engage in counter- or anti-hegemonic practices; and how they evoke an alternative, just future—a key principle to which I now turn.

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 1986 [1967]) and liberating imagination. Liberation needs a new consciousness, one that is recovered from the colonial moral injury, the profound alienation that belated development of the colony could happen only “upon condition of rejecting itself” and wholesale importing of non-African scenarios and solutions (Davidson 1992, 199). 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 habitats.

I move slowly in the world, accustomed now to seek no longer for upheaval. I progress by crawling ... under the white eyes, the only real eyes. I am *fixed*. Having adjusted their microtones, they objectively cut away slices of my reality. I am laid bare. (Fanon 1995, 292)

African cities, for example, are dissected, critics remind us, under Western eyes as incomplete, crawling, and not causing upheaval because they have not yet become like the superior models they are expected to become; they are invisible to the colonial gaze (De Boeck and Pilsart 2004; Watson 2006, 2009; Simone 2004). In this normalized relation of power, inclusion means erasure of difference and incorporation of subordinate groups into the norms, 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 insist 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 imaginations. The elitist and consumerist planning ideals persist in our post/neocolonial, 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 intense 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 collages with the power to create interruptions, involving sense of direction, playfulness, and pleasure at the same time (Santos 1995, 499). 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, Europeans’ 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 ability 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 (Browne 2014). The emancipation of one without the others is not possible. It is from historicizing 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—a 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, what Santos (1995, 481) calls the virtual archaeology of the present. Archaeology of the present involves understanding the historical 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 (1969) observations of Parisian arcades. Benjamin observed how—through museums and heritage centers, exhibitions, arenas of spectacle, and festivals—sanitized collective memory is produced, an uncritical aesthetic sensibility nourished, and the future possibilities absorbed into a supposedly conflict-free arena that is eternally present.

Browne’s (2014) *Feminist, 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 overcome 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 performative 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 Mirafshah 2016). Others among new social movements might turn to science fiction for social justice movements and imagining a just world.⁸ Acts of insurgency that simply invoke such imagination can sometimes produce enduring gain 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 insurgency for 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;⁹ 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 emperor 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 human 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 cooption 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 transgression, counter-hegemony, and decolonized imagination discussed in this chapter, which promises to invent new spaces of action previously shut 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 crucial 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 discrete territory binary to rural or other forms of human habitat.) In other words, 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 transgress and destabilize present legemonies—hence the extended discussion in this essay on the importance of decolonizing 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 guideposts 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 Cornwall (2002, 50) to develop the notions of invited and uninvited spaces of citizenship.
- 2 In April 2014, I witnessed the unfortunate 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. Attackers looted or burned small businesses owned by African foreign nationals, accusing them of "stealing jobs from citizens"—discourses so similar to those we hear about immigrants in the United States.
- 3 Riding on the anti-immigrant discourse of "foreigners steal our jobs," the KwaZulu-Natal government announced investment of over R300 million to assist local small businesses in competing with their foreign counterparts (Hans 2015).
- 4 For example, see Inarasha and Brown (2015).
- 5 See Purcell (2015), drawing on Kanetere's work.

References

- Angotti, T. 2008. *New York for Sale: Community Planning Conflicts Global Real Estate*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ay, D., and F. Mirafidab. 2016. "Invented Spaces of Activism: Gezi Park and Performative Practices of Citizenship." In *The Handbook of International Development*, edited by Daniel Hammett and Jean Grugel, 555–74. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Beard, V. A. 2002. "Covert Planning for Social Transformation in Indonesia." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22 (1): 15–25.
- Benjamin, W. 1969. "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century." *Perspecta* 12: 165–172.
- Biko, S. 1978. *Black Consciousness in South Africa*. New York: Random House.
- Brown, J. 2015. "You Can't Choose Your Interlocutors." *Business Day Live* November 23. www.bdlive.co.za/opinion/2015/11/23/you-cant-choose-your-interlocutors (accessed May 14, 2017).
- Brown, V. 2014. *Feminism, Time, and Nonlinear History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buchanan, I. 2000. *Exclusion: A Metacommentary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cornwall, A. 2002. "Locating Citizen Participation." *IDS Bulletin* 33 (2): 49–58.
- Davidson, B. 1992. *The Black Man's Burden: Africa and the Cause of the Nation-State*. New York: Times Books.

- De Boeck, F., and M. E. Pilsart. 2004. *Kimbasa: Tales of the Invisible City*. Ghent: Ludion; Tervuren: Musée Royal de Afrique Centrale.
- Defilippi, J. 2001. "The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development." *Housing Policy Debate* 12 (4): 781–806.
- Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. 1980. *Mille plateaux (Capitalisme et schizophrène)*. Vol. II. Paris: Minuit.
- Faludi, A. 1973. "The Rationale of Planning Theory." In *Planning Theory*, 35–53. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Fanon, F. 1986. *Black Skin, White Mask*. London: Pluto Press.
- Fanon, F. 1995. "The Fact of Blackness." In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 291–4. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. 2017. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Post-socialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Friedmann, J. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, J. 2000. "The Good City, in Defense of Utopian Thinking." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24 (2): 460–72.
- Friedmann, J. 2002. *The Prosper of Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Friedmann, J. 2011. *Insurgences: Essays in Planning Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Fukuyama, F. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Gander, M. 2010. "Planning as the Ideology of (Neoliberal) Space." *Planning Theory* 9 (4): 298–314.
- Habermas, J. 1987. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Volume 1. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hans, B. 2015. "KZN Vows Aid for Local and Xenophobic Violence." *Business News April* 16. www.iol.co.za/business/news/kzn-vows-aid-for-local-and-xenophobic-violence-1845871#comments_start (accessed September 28, 2016).
- Harvey, D. 1999. "Frontiers of Insurgent Planning." *Planimorph* 1 (2): 269–86.
- Harvey, D. 2000. *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Harwood, S. A. 2007. "Geographies of Opportunity for Whom? Neighborhood Improvement Programs as Regulators of Neighborhood Activism." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26 (3): 261–71.
- Hilber, J., and P. Healey (eds.). 2008. *Foundations of the Planning Enterprise: Critical Essays in Planning Theory*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Holton, J. 1998. "Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship." In *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning Theory*, edited by L. Samercock, 37–56. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Inarasha, W., and A. M. Brown (eds.). 2015. *Otaria's Blood: Science Fiction Stories from Social Justice Movements*. Edinburgh: AK Press. www.themotivator.com/article/why-science-fiction-labulubus-tool-light-social-justice/ (accessed September 28, 2016).
- Irazabal, C. (ed.). 2014. *Translating Latin America: Land, Place, Cultures, and Powers (Plece)*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Kundera, M. 1999. *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Mayer, M. 2003. "The Onward Sweep of Social Capital: Causes and Consequences for Understanding Cities, Communities and Urban Movements." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 27 (1): 110–32.
- McFarlane, C., and J. Silver. 2016. "The Political City: 'Seeing Sanitation' and Making the Urban Political in Cape Town." *Antipode* Version of Record online: 27 July 2016 | DOI: 10.1111/anti.12264.
- McLoughlin, J. B. 1969. "The Guidance and Control of Change: Physical Planning as the Control of Complex Systems." In *Urban and Regional Planning: A Systems Approach*, 75–91. London: Faber and Faber.
- Meyer, A. 2005. "Bedouin, the Israeli State and Insurgent Planning: Globalization, Localization or Globalization?" *Cities* 22 (3): 201–15.
- Niech, P. 2010. "Unsettling Insurgency: Reflections on Women's Insurgent Practices in South Africa." *Planning Theory and Practice* 11 (2): 241–63.
- Mies, M., V. Beunholdt-Thomson, and C. Van Werloof. 1988. *Women: The Last Colony*. London: Zed Books.
- Mirafidab, F. 2003. "The Perils of Participatory Discourse: Housing Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22 (3): 226–39.
- Mirafidab, F. 2009. "Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South." *Planning Theory* 8 (1): 32–50.
- Mohanty, C. T. 1991. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, 51–80. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Priester, J. N. 2000. *Global Futures: Shaping Globalization*. London: Zed Books.

- Purcell, M. 2009. "Revising Neoliberalization: Communicative Planning or Counter-hegemonic Movements?" *Planning Theory* 8(2): 140-65.
- Purcell, M. 2015. "Equity at the Beginning, Ranciere and Democracy Today." In *City and Inequalities in a Global and Neoliberal World*, edited by F. Mirzaifab, D. Wilson, and K. Sato, 188-206. New York, London: Routledge.
- Robin, K. 1994. *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class*. New York: Free Press.
- Robin, S. 2014. "The 2011 Toilet Wars in South Africa: Justice and Transition between the Exceptional and the Everyday after Apartheid." *Development and Change* 45 (3): 479-501.
- Roy, A. 2009. "Why India Cannot Plan Its Cities: Informality, Insurgency and the Idiom of Urbanization." *Planning Theory* 8 (1): 76-87.
- Sager, T. 2005. "Communicative Planners as Naïve Mandarins of the Neo-liberal State?" *European Journal of Spatial Development*, December. ISSN 1650-9544. www.nordregio.se/EJSD/ (accessed September 28, 2016).
- Salo, K. 2015. "Local Practices and Trans-local Solidarities: Reflections on Anti-eviction Practices on the Cape Flats, South Africa and in South Side Chicago." In *Cities and Inequalities in a Global and Neoliberal World*, edited by F. Mirzaifab, D. Wilson, and K. Sato, 217-26. New York, London: Routledge.
- Sandercock, L. 1998a. *Towards Cosmopolitan Planning for Multicultural Cities*. London: John Wiley.
- Sandercock, L. 1998b. "Framing Insurgent Historiographies for Planning." In *Making the Inhabitable Habitable: A Multicultural Planning History*, edited by L. Sandercock, 1-35. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Santos, Bonaventura de Sousa. 1995. *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Postcolonial Transition*. London: Routledge.
- Simone, A. 2004. *For the City Yet to Come: Changing African Life in Four Cities*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Stello, B. 2012. "Insurgent Planning and Its Interlocutors: Studia Pedagogy as Unsanctioned Practice in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 33 (2): 228-40.
- Svirsky, M. 2010. "Introduction: Beyond the Royal Science of Politics." In *Exile Studies: Special Issue on Defiance and Political Action*, edited by M. Svirsky, 1-6.
- Sweet, E., and M. Chakras. 2010. "Identity, Culture, Land, and Language: Stories of Insurgent Planning in the Republic of Buryatia, Russia." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 30 (2): 198-209.
- Watson, V. 2006. "Deep Differences: Diversity Planning and Ethics." *Planning Theory* 5 (1): 31-50.
- Watson, V. 2009. "Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe's Central Urban Issues." *Urban Studies*, 46 (11): 2259-79.
- Watts, M. 1994. "Development II: The Privatization of Everything?" *Progress in Human Geography* 18 (3): 371-84.
- Young, I. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

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, 2000; Hillier, 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; Yiftachel, 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 Lacanian, Žižekian, and Laclauian concepts of fantasy, lack, and desire I theorize and propose the theoretical framework of "hegemonic planning," which, I argue, serves to approach fulfilling the fantasy of the state apparatuses, or precisely the politically hegemonic 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 home-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 promoting 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.