

2009 Miraftab, F. "Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South." *Planning Theory* 8(1):32-50. The final, definitive version is available at <http://online.sagepub.com/>

Insurgent Planning:

Situating Radical Planning in the Global South

Faranak Miraftab

faranak@uiuc.edu

111 Temple Buel Hall,

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, IL 61820

Telf. 217/ 265 8238 (work); 217/ 377 9736 (cell)

Fax: 217/ 244-1717

Abstract

This paper revisits the notion of radical planning from the standpoint of the global south. Emerging struggles for citizenship in the global south, seasoned by the complexities of state-citizen relations within colonial and post-colonial regimes, offer an historicized view indispensable to counter-hegemonic planning practices. The paper articulates the notion of insurgent planning as radical planning practices that respond to neoliberal specifics of dominance through inclusion — i.e., inclusive governance. It characterizes the guiding principles for insurgent planning practices as counter-hegemonic, transgressive and imaginative. The paper contributes to two current conversations within planning scholarship: on the implication of grassroots insurgent citizenship for planning, and on (de)colonization of planning theory.

Insurgent Planning:

Situating Radical Planning in the Global South

Faranak Miraftab faranak@uiuc.edu

This paper revisits the notion of radical planning, which in the last two decades has placed major emphasis on inclusion and participation. The paper articulates the notion of insurgent planning as those radical planning practices that respond to neoliberal specifics of dominance through inclusion. It highlights the hegemonic drive of neoliberal capitalism to stabilize state-citizen relations by implicating civil society in governance, and it stresses the importance to radical planning of the contested terrains of inclusion and dominance. Emerging struggles for citizenship in the global south, seasoned by the complexities of state-citizen relations within colonial and post-colonial regimes, offer an historicized view indispensable to counter-hegemonic planning practices. As post-welfare societies shrink the sphere of public responsibility, strengthening inequality and alienating the marginalized populations in the metropole, the insights to be gained from the standpoint of the global south have increasing relevance for radical planning in the era of global neoliberalism.

The paper contributes to two current conversations within planning scholarship. One discussion, addressing the implication of grassroots insurgent citizenship for planning, builds on the concept of insurgent citizenship first articulated by Holston (1995, 2008), and incorporated into planning discourse by Sandercock (1998a, 1998b), Friedmann (2002), and Miraftab (2006, with Wills 2005). The other conversation concerns the colonization of planning theory that tends

to universalize the experience of the metropole (see Yiftachel 2006; Watson 2006, 2002; Simone 2004).

Each of the four sections of the paper centers on a key question for understanding the notion of insurgency and insurgent planning: **Section one**, Rethinking Participation, interrogates the role of citizen participation in neoliberal governance. **Section two**, South Africa's Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, examines how the insurgent citizenship practices move across both invited and invented spaces of action. **Section three**, Inclusion and Citizenship, closely examines the relation between neoliberal inclusion and insurgent citizenship. **Section four**, Implications for Radical Planning, teases out the concrete implications of grassroots insurgency for radical planning practice and pedagogy in the neoliberal era. **The final section** of the paper, Seeing from the South, identifies important insights drawn from the anti-colonial struggles of the south. This section stresses the importance of liberation for radical planning and lays out guiding principles for it. Insurgent planning practices are characterized as counter-hegemonic, transgressive and imaginative. They are counter-hegemonic in that they destabilize the normalized order of things; they transgress time and place by locating historical memory and transnational consciousness at the heart of their practices. They are imaginative in promoting the concept of a different world as being, Walter Rodney says, both possible and necessary.

1. Rethinking Participation

*How does citizen participation articulate
with neoliberal governance?*

Critical to a discussion of citizen participation in the neoliberal era is the recognition of how neoliberalism, as a strongly ideological project, relies on legitimation and citizens' perception of inclusion to achieve hegemonic power. As attested by the global trends in state decentralization, a structure of inclusive governance is critical to neoliberal governance. Whenever possible, hegemonic power is pursued through citizens' consent and perceptions of inclusion. Though reserving violence as an option, the neoliberal technology of rule does not rely primarily on coercion and military force, as did the expansionist mercantile capitalism of the colonial era (Rose 1999). Neoliberalism should be understood as not simply a bundle of economic policies that extract surplus capital, but as a network of policies, ideologies, values and rationalities that work together to achieve capital's hegemonic power (Brown 2003). For example, the water privatization policies that have spread around the world rest not just on the argument for economic efficiency, but also on a range of value-based discourses to justify the commodification of a basic need — water. A new definition of civic responsibility propounds fee-paying citizens, as the virtuous contrast to “free-riders.” Freedom of choice, meaning citizens' choice among for-profit providers of basic services, is another value discourse used to legitimize the global spread of water privatization.

In examining the international development agencies' shift toward defining good governance in terms of citizen participation and local government development, a Gramscian reading is enlightening. Understanding hegemony as normalized relations, and counter-hegemonic effort as practices and forces that destabilize such relations illuminates the contested fields of power in neoliberal inclusive governance. Cox (2001) argues that to stabilize state

relations with grassroots and informal townships, international development agencies such as the World Bank have since the 1980s employed a hegemonic move from above that adopted development of local states, community participation and participatory development as their institutional mandate. The evidence of this institutional move is the increasing number of state partnerships with CBOs and NGOs over the last two decades (Miraftab, Beard and Silver 2008). A large body of literature has documented how such routinization of community participation depoliticizes communities' struggles and extends state control within the society. Drawing grassroots movements into NGOs maintains the status quo by stabilizing state-society relations.

Although in low-density democracies neoliberal governance legitimizes its dominance, by creating sanctioned spaces of participation, the process also creates a disjunction that insurgent movements are able to take advantage of. Symbolic inclusion does not necessarily entail material re-distribution. Counter-hegemonic movements may use such contradictory conditions to destabilize the neoliberal hegemonic order.

Cox (2001) likens hegemony to a pillow, which can shift to fit. But dominant power can make itself comfortable on the pillow of hegemony only if there is no firm social and political challenge to hegemony. Consider for example, the processes of state decentralization. This global trend embodies the state's hegemonic strategy to contain grassroots struggles through local formal channels for citizen participation and claims. Such a hegemonic move, however, creates contradictions that can stimulate grassroots movements building deep democracies from below. Through persistent counter-hegemonic practices, these movements expose and upset the normalized relations of dominance. (In Gramscian terms, they launch a war of positions).

Examples from Bolivia, Brazil and South Africa are among those that come to mind. Kohl and Farthing (2008), for example, document how in Bolivia the law mandated local

participation in decisions through local governments, to stabilize the state's relations with indigenous communities. Inadvertently, however, as Khol and Farthing document, that process strengthened indigenous rights movements. The result was a shift in the power balance that gave rise to the Eva Morales movement and the election of the country's first indigenous president.

Just as the sites producing power are multiple and shifting, so are the sites for counter-hegemonic movements. Analysis of squatter movements in the global south reveals how informal settlements as embodiment of citizens' insurgency also serve to stabilize the system. By virtue of their illegality, squatter settlements that provide affordable shelter for the majority poor are the state's opportunity for political manipulation in exchange for much needed services. Yet at the same time they breed counter-hegemonic and insurgent movements, mobilizing beyond the state's control and claiming their right to the city.

In his most recent book Holston (2008) conceptualizes Brazil's informal settlements as arenas of insurgent citizenship that both produce stability in state-citizen relations and destabilize them. Squatters' insurgent practices in Brazil use a universal citizenship and a rights-based discourse to destabilize the old formations of differentiated citizenship. Differentiated citizenship, Holston explains, offers equal rights to equal people and, correspondingly, unequal rights to unequal people— e.g., only the literate have the right to vote. Insurgent citizenship, on the other hand, uses Brazil's recently mandated universal citizenship — whereby all people have equal rights — to disrupt the normalized relations produced through differentiated citizenship. In informal settlements, which are the material expressions of poor citizens' insurgency, organized residents enacting their universal citizenship mobilize to claim their entitlement to the city and to urban livelihood. Holston emphasizes the entanglement of differentiated and

insurgent citizenship. Just as the state and civil society are never clear-cut categories, neither are the relationships between the squatters and the state, or the citizenship debates that justify them.

The following section, on South Africa's Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, grounds the discussion of how grassroots movements use the hegemonic system's political openings to make counter-hegemonic moves, and vice versa. Insurgent movements do not constrain themselves to the spaces for citizen participation sanctioned by the authorities (invited spaces); they invent new spaces or re-appropriate old ones where they can invoke their citizenship rights to further their counter-hegemonic interests. Fluidity characterizes insurgent citizenship practices: through the entanglement of inclusion and resistance they move across the invited and the invented spaces of citizenship.

2. South Africa's Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign

What are insurgent citizenship practices, and how do they move across invited and invented spaces of action?

The contradictory nature of globalized neoliberal capitalism is perhaps best exemplified by the experience of post-apartheid South Africa, where political liberation and economic liberalization occurred simultaneously in 1996. As South Africa's new constitution of 1996 extended political citizenship to all South Africans, the macro-economic policies of Growth Employment and Redistribution (GEAR), adopted the same year, stripped citizens of their substantive citizenship rights. The newly constituted South African citizens became also the fee-paying customers of public and private providers of basic services. This process, more blatant in neoliberal, post-apartheid South Africa than in many other states, demonstrates how citizens can be excluded materially even though included symbolically in governance and decision making.

Today, more than a decade after South Africa's new Constitution, the South African poor still endure forced removals from their homes, albeit for different reasons than under apartheid. In Cape Town, the earlier wave of evictions in the late 1990s was invoked for inability to pay for basic services and/or the failure to pay rent by public housing residents or arrears in mortgages to private banks.¹ The more recent wave of forced removals, which has received both greater media attention and collective resistance, has served the eradication/relocations of informal settlements along highway N2 connecting the international airport to the city — a plan that is important in relation to the city image and the 2010 soccer World Cup to be held in Cape Town.

The Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign or Western Cape AEC, a movement officially founded in early 2001, serves as an umbrella body for a number of community organizations, crisis committees, and resident groups that emerge in Cape Town's poor townships to resist such evictions and service cut-offs and demand their rights to shelter and basic services. As one Campaign activist put it, they defend their right to the city, to water and roofs over their heads because these are necessities, not privileges. Their struggle is against "privatization of these basic rights, which leads to dehumanization of the poor and of those who cannot afford them" (Robert Wilcox, interview 2002). The Campaign is an agglomeration of discontented residents, civic organizers, retrenched workers, union activists and shop stewards and ex-members of the ruling tri-partite coalition (ANC, Communist Party and Cosatu). It does not align itself with any political party and defends its independence from either of the parties, ANC or DA, that currently struggle for power in the Western Cape and Cape Town (for more on AEC practices, see Oldfield and Stokke 2006).

The AEC groups also insist on their autonomy from NGOs, which they declare often control social movements through the power of their funds and legitimation. NGOs use their

power of funding, according to a WCAEC press release, “to speak for and essentially take over popular struggles in South Africa.” The Campaign seeks to insist on “democratic horizontally organized networking forums and the right to speak for themselves” (WCAEC 2007:1). AEC has coalesced with several other grassroots movements, most closely in recent years with the KwaZulu Natal shack dwellers’ movement Abahlali BaseMjondolo.

While some of the AEC strategies, such as rent boycotts and mass protest demonstrations, echo those used in the anti-apartheid struggle, others have emerged from the post-apartheid context and the newly gained universal citizenship. Movement members sit in boardrooms and use both the court and judicial systems and formal politics to pursue the citizenship rights granted by the new 1996 Constitution. But they combine that use of formal, legal strategies with informal survival livelihood practices and with oppositional practices. Their strategies range from informal negotiations with the agents of forced eviction to ignore or postpone its implementation, to capacity building and creating their own data about the plight of evicted or threatened families, to operating weekly soup kitchens to feed children, to defiant collective actions such as reconnection of disconnected services by so-called “struggle plumbers and electricians” and relocation of evicted families back into their housing units, to mass mobilizations and protests, sit-ins, and land invasions — as well as the use of courts and legal claims. They use their constitutional rights and a rights-based discourse to achieve their just claim to shelter and livelihood, but have no illusions about limiting their struggle to the court procedures of claim making or to the sanctioned governmental and nongovernmental channels. They use formal spaces when they are advantageous, and defy them when they prove unjust and limiting. When formal channels fail, they innovate alternative channels to assert their citizenship rights and achieve a just city.

A more recent example of Western Cape AEC's struggle against evictions in Delft and Joe Slovo to reveals the range of formal and informal legal and extra-legal practices they mobilize to wage their struggle for the rights to the city and to shelter.² The N2 Gateway Project is a joint endeavor by the national Department of Housing, the provincial government and the city of Cape Town to build some 25000 units, and has been described by Housing Minister Lindiwe Sisulu as "the biggest housing project ever undertaken by any Government" (Chance 2008:2). It is a project prioritized by the City of Cape Town and other spheres in light of the 2010 World Cup and its high visibility linking Cape Town International Airport with the City.

To make way for the N2 project, some 6000 shack dwellers must be relocated from Joe Slovo to temporary houses being constructed in Delft, an area 40 km outside of Cape Town. But the shack dwellers living along and close to the highway do not want to be relocated to Delft, and have fiercely resisted relocation, knowing that they will not be able to afford and move back to their neighborhood once the project is completed. In the meantime the swelling numbers of backyard dwellers in over-crowded houses in Delft, some of whom had been on the housing waiting list for 30 years, took advantage of the almost completed temporary houses constructed in Delft for relocation of the Jo Slovo families. On December 19, 2007 Delft families in need of housing moved into these vacant units and claimed them as theirs, spray painting their names on the exterior walls. Hence continuing the N2 project then involved authorities' eviction of about 1600 people from occupied units in Delft, and the forced removal of about 6000 Joe Slovo shack dwellers to Delft—a process that at best can be described as "a bureaucratic madness" (Manjuvu 2008:1).

In this process the Campaign has acted to bring together the struggles of both the Delft and the Joe Slovo poor communities against the forced removal processes. They waged a legal

and extra-legal struggle against the process of forced removals imposed on the poor from Pretoria. With the help of the Campaign's Legal Coordinating Committee (LCC)³, concerned residents in both communities filed a court case against the evictions. They claimed their constitutional rights to shelter and basic services (articles 26 and 27 of the 1996 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa), thus making a claim to substantive citizenship and to the city.

The Campaign's use of formal legal procedures, however, was innovative, in that they turned the bureaucratic legal procedure into a spectacle (field notes, Ken Salo 2008). Instead of going one by one to the court to register their claims for housing, the 1600 Delft residents threatened by eviction and their supporters massed in front of the courthouse. Unable to handle such a large crowd inside the building, the court's clerical staff brought out tables and chairs to the street and conducted the bureaucratic procedure of filing and stamping the paper work for the long line of plaintiffs on the street. Singing anti-apartheid protest songs on the steps of the courthouse, they made their presence and demand visible and strong. In other words, as they took their housing struggle to the court, they also brought the courts and its inherent limitations out to the street.

Following almost two months of daily demonstrations and public protest, on February 5, 2008 Cape High Court ruled in favor of the evictions and granted an order to the provincial government and Thubelisha homes (the subcontracted developer) to evict backyarders in Delft. The eviction of 1,600 Delft residents was pursued on February 19, 2007 with the help of police, private security and dog units that went door to door with brutality that wounded more than twenty people including a three-year-old child, gaining much media attention. The evicted residents were then left on the pavement, and their belongings — furniture, bedding, clothes — packed onto trucks by the eviction team and taken to the local police precinct (Chance 2008).

In the days immediately after the evictions, half of these evicted families relocated to temporary tents offered by the DA politicians (the current ruling party in Cape Town). The other half, affiliates of AEC, protecting their autonomy from political party manipulation, refused the tents and stayed on the pavement across from the N2 temporary houses on the Symphony Road. Three months since their eviction, the Symphony Road pavement dwellers have not moved. They have set up shacks on the sidewalk and displayed their solidarity and community building. They have set up a community crèche; they run a 'pavement camp' for children on school holiday, including soccer and netball clinics; they collect children for discussions on life and life-skills; and they have organized a Symphony Way Fashion Show, with the help of a newly created Delft-Symphony Children's Committee (Delft-Symphony Anti-Eviction Campaign 2008:1).

Elsewhere (Miraftab 2006), reflecting on my earlier ethnographic work on the Campaign practices in Cape Town during the 2001-2006 period, I conceptualize their actions in terms of *invented* and *invited* spaces of citizenship. “Invited”⁴ spaces are defined as those grassroots actions and their allied non-governmental organizations that are legitimized by donors and government interventions and aim to cope with systems of hardship. “Invented” spaces are defined as those collective actions by the poor that directly confront the authorities and challenge the status quo. The two sorts of spaces stand in a mutually constituted, interacting relationship, not a binary one. They are not mutually exclusive, nor is either necessarily affiliated with a fixed set of individuals or groups or with a particular kind of civil society.

Insurgent citizenship practices, as observed in the case of the AEC, are fluid, moving across invited and invented spaces of participation. Their activities engage both the formal and informal arenas of politics, and aim to combine the struggles for redistribution and for

recognition (echoing Nancy Fraser's theorizations 1997). While some AEC actions such as "struggle plumbers" reconnecting services and resistance to evictions directly pursue redistribution, other AEC practices aim for recognition of poor residents' plight, their histories, their struggles and their plea for justice. In the example of their recent struggle recounted above, the insurgent grassroots use, but do not view as sufficient, the legal path to make their citizenship claim to shelter and basic services. They also literally and metaphorically bring to the public eye the inadequacy of the judicial system, by bringing its bureaucratic system to the street. By staying on the pavements they display their continued plight and hence the contradictory and limited nature of their formal citizenship in the post-apartheid era. Most importantly, their sidewalk presence provokes a collective memory of apartheid's ugly legacy and its brutal forced removals. Doing so expresses and produces an historical consciousness of their oppression.

The institutions of hegemonic power — the media, the state, and the international development agencies, however, frame the complex, diverse, and fluid range of grassroots citizenship practices as a binary relation (World Bank 1998). They celebrate grassroots and their collective actions selectively, applauding those that help the poor cope with inequality, while criminalizing the others. Planning practices that celebrate inclusive planning through citizens' participation, yet remain uncritical of the complexities of inclusion and resistance in the contemporary neoliberal era are complicit in the binary misconception of civil society and public action. Section four discusses this challenge to planning. First, however, in section three, I offer an overview of the notion of inclusion that was exemplified in detail above, placed in its historicized context.

3. Inclusion and Citizenship

*What is the relation between neoliberal inclusion
and insurgent citizenship?*

Holston and Appadurai (1999) argue that citizenship should be understood as a drama that varies with its conditions. British indirect rule in its colonies through native collaborators is perhaps an early example of domination through inclusion. During the colonial era, selective inclusion of the natives and tribal chiefs is well known to have been a colonial approach to stabilize relations of dominance in the colonies. However, as Mamdani (1996) explains, in the British white settler colonies such inclusion did not necessarily mean citizenship. To the bifurcated state, only the white settlers were citizens; natives were mere subjects. Under French colonialism, however, the drama of citizenship differed from British colonialism in that French colonized subjects could become citizens if they showed the ability to “civilize” to the status of a Frenchman [*sic.*] (Fanon 1986).

For the authoritarian post-“independence” state, a connoisseur of state-centered modernist planning, development projects shaped the drama of modern citizenship. To stabilize their rule among the newly declared citizens, post-colonial states tried to construct modern citizenship through a combination of development, coercion and corruption. This model of citizenship, however, reveals internal contradictions between form and substance: an entitlement to political and social rights does not necessarily guarantee substantive rights to livelihood. Feminist scholarship has made an important contribution to understanding the fallacy of the liberal drama of citizenship, demonstrating that despite its formalistic assumption that citizens constitute a single, all-rights-bearing entity with equal rights and obligations, the entitlements and obligations in actuality are unequal being differentiated according to gender, race, and ethnicity (Lister 1997; Gouws 2005).

Thus the contemporary neoliberal era's universal formal citizenship has brought selective material inclusion. People may gain more access to state institutions through local governments and the possibility of participation, as well as social and political inclusion in institutions of the state, but that does not necessarily mean their substantive inclusion. As people's political rights expand, their access to livelihood resources may simultaneously erode. The disjunction can be seen in the examples of political liberation in post-socialist Eastern Europe and post-apartheid South Africa, where socioeconomic inequalities have intensified as citizens' political and civil rights have expanded.

It is this disjunction between formal and substantive inclusion that motivates the contemporary practices of insurgent citizenship (Sandercock 1998b). In this neoliberal moment tangible citizenship does not arrive through the state's legislative institutions. It rather grows under the skin of the city, that is as an invisible city, through the insurgent practices of marginalized communities — be it disenfranchised immigrants; ethnicized, racialized and gendered minorities of the industrialized world; or the squatter citizens of the global south.

I argue that in this neoliberal moment the hypocrisy of modern citizenship can be most clearly observed in the global south. In the liberal democracies of the global North, citizens experience the pretense of neoliberal capitalism through the shrinking of the public sphere and some infringement on civil liberties. In the global South, however, for example in Brazil and South Africa, new found universal citizenship rights are starkly contradicted by the material inroads on citizens' lives made by neoliberal capitalism. Their political citizenship and abstract formal rights have expanded, yet simultaneously their economic exploitation and the abdication of public responsibility for basic services continue, and their livelihood erodes. In societies that have emerged from a colonized legacy, "citizens have gained rights they cannot eat!"

4. Implication for Radical Planning

*What does insurgency mean for the practice
and pedagogy of radical planning?*

Legitimation is central to hegemonic relations of power. So far we have discussed how neoliberalism seeks legitimation through governance that promotes political inclusion, but avoids translating it into redistributive equity. Rather, neoliberalism's structures of inclusion and participation contain citizens' collective action into sanctioned spaces of invited citizenship — e.g., formal, decentralized state channels or a legitimated NGO sector that functions to replace social movements. This strategy is often complemented by a bifurcated conceptualization of civil society as authentic versus a criminalized ultra-left.

In such a context, radical planning practices should be insurgent. To promote social transformation, insurgent planning has to disrupt the attempts of neoliberal governance to stabilize oppressive relationships through inclusion. Insurgent planning, then, constitutes radical planning practices that challenge the inequitable specifics of neoliberal governance operating through inclusion. Insurgent planning should read through the bluff of neoliberal governance's promise of inclusive citizenship, just as anti-colonial/ anti-apartheid struggles "saw through the bluff of a "modern" civilization in South Africa" (Ahluwalia and Zegeye 2001:463).

Overcoming the bifurcated construction of civil society, planners should not confine their practices to only the sanctioned spaces of participation — be it through NGOs and NGO-ized community groups, or through formal structures of local officials. Insurgent planning recognizes, supports and promotes not only the coping mechanisms of the grassroots exercised in invited spaces of citizenship, but also the oppositional practices of the grassroots as they innovate their own terms of engagement.

Skeptics may ask if insurgent planning is not a contradiction in terms. In pursuing the notion, I note that the discussion of insurgent planning is framed in terms of its relevance for “planning,” not for “the planner.” It refers to a set of practices, not to a specific type of actor (insurgent planner). The focus is on a value-based definition of practices we can recognize as insurgent.

Insurgent planning is not an exclusive subjectivity, just as planning practices in general are not confined to professionally trained planners. Indeed, planning is a contested field of interacting activities by multiple actors. That recognition rests on decades of radical planning scholarship debunking the myth of planning as a prerogative of professionals who act in isolation from other spheres of action (Sandercock 1998a, 1998b; Leavitt 2004; Fainstein 2000). In the 1960s, advocacy planning arose in opposition to an elitist definition of rational planning as activities undertaken by all-knowing actors best able to decide on their clients’ interests (Davidoff 1965). From that first step there ensued, in the 1980s and 1990s, strides through equity planning, participatory planning, and communicative planning (Krumolz 1994, Forester 1989; Innes 2004; Healey 1999). Nevertheless, those critical perspectives remained within the bounds of the conventional wisdom that conceptualized planners as professionals who stand outside the society, though reaching out to citizens for inclusion, perhaps through redistribution but at least communication.

A more recent movement in radical planning scholarship has taken steps to open the category of planning to beyond its professionalized borders. The movement responds not only to the prominence of civil society organizations in developing communities, cities and regions, but also to a new generation of planners who are not necessarily employed in traditional public or private consulting organizations (see contributions to Douglass and Friedmann, 1998). This

planning scholarship demonstrates how *de facto* community and urban developments take place through everyday practices of squatter citizens, determined poor women, illegal immigrants and other disfranchised and marginalized communities (Irazabel 2008; Friedmann 1988; Beard 2003; Sandercock 1998b; Miraftab 2005). Through their development of houses and infrastructure such actors also build deep democracies (Appadurai 2001).

That material reality is widely observable in the global south: more than two-thirds of Third World cities are developed through the spontaneous, unplanned activities that Holston (2008) conceptualizes as insurgent urbanization. Eighty-five percent of Third World urban residents “occupy property illegally” (Winter King 2003: 471, cited in Davis 2004:6). Moreover, in the labor market activities of many Third World economies, formal employment channels have only a minor role. Worldwide, the informal economy has grown as a percentage of non-agricultural employment, by the 1990s reaching 43.4 percent in North Africa, 74.8 percent in Sub-Saharan Africa, 56.9 percent in Latin America and 63 percent in Asia (Beneria 2003: table 4.2, p. 111). These figures make clear that only a limited share of the spatial and economical development in Third World cities occurs through formal structures and professional planning.

In the contemporary global context, then, planning academics’ much discussed anxiety about creating a clear definition and professional border for planning practice seems out of place. The majority of marginalized people take into their own hands the challenges of housing, neighborhood and urban development, establishing shelter and earning livelihoods outside formal decision structures and “professionalized planning.” The protagonists of urban development have thus shifted from planning agencies to community-based informal processes; from professional planners and formal planning to grassroots activists and strategies. But this reality, more sharply demonstrated through the deep informality of Third World cities and their

uneven development processes, should not be assumed as unique. In the global North, for example in the heartland of the United States, where my other research project takes me, much of the rural towns' development takes place by immigrant newcomers and through local commissions and committees that are not staffed or overseen by professional planning practitioners (Miraftab and Wills 2008). It is retired teachers, businessmen and women and elected officials that constitute the committees that make the development planning decisions of these small towns. These realities expand the definition of planning.

Insurgent planning builds on an expanded definition of radical planning in the ways just described. But insurgent planning has traveled an important further path by revealing how inclusive planning, with its emphasis on citizen participation and civil society partnership, has often become the accomplice of neoliberal governance. Insurgent planning reveals how the interests of global capitalism and the corporate economy misappropriate collective action to depoliticize progressive planning and transform its actors to “radicals you can take home to mother.”

That revelation pushes radical planning scholarship to historicize the understanding of inclusion and participation. Given that the central task of radical planning is the “mediation of theory and practice in social transformation,” according to its original definition by Freidmann (1987: 391), what insurgent planning does is to rework radical planning to reflect the selective definition and celebration of civil society and citizen participation and the challenges it poses to socially transformative planning practices in the specific context of neoliberal global capitalism. In “planning in the time of empire,” Roy (2006) problematizes the particularities of this mediation and its doubleness for planning practices “in the belly of the beast,” that is in the US, when empire's global hegemony involves selective material inclusions through renewal,

reconstruction and redevelopment. Insurgent planning practices shaped by and responding to the historical struggle between selective inclusion and dominance seek to re-appropriate spaces of collective action for liberation.

The practices of insurgent planning acknowledge what the hegemonic drive of neoliberal capitalism tries to obscure: the potent oppositional and transformative practices that citizens and marginalized populations invent outside global capitalism's definition of inclusion. Insurgent planning practices strip 'democracy' and 'inclusion' of their formalistic elements, recognizing the importance to counter-hegemonic movements of choosing their own ways of constituting their collectivities and their participation (Gills 2001: 5).

To emphasize those values is not, however, to naively celebrate any and all disrupting and oppositional actions, but rather to be guided by an historicized understanding. Critical planning must rely on contextualizing planning — i.e. recognizing the power struggle within which it is practiced. To contextualize insurgent planning and informal politics is to recognize a broad arena that cannot be conflated into a single category. For example, informal politics have sometimes been coopted or corrupted into criminal elements, whether by the state or by despotic elites, and in that form have served the interest of the status quo though clearly outside formal institutions. Hence, grassroots mobilizations and initiatives outside the formal arena of politics ("community activism") should be carefully characterized according to their historical origins, their political and cultural roots, and their agendas. The insurgent movement and oppositional practices described in this paper, as historicized reveal their political and cultural roots to be in political formations that resisted the inequalities produced by colonialism, apartheid — and now, neoliberalism.

The importance of historical consciousness is reflected in the much-cited rhetorical question posed by Marx: “Are bees architects?” (cited in Mitchell 202:45). For Marx, historical consciousness and the ability to imagine one’s creation distinguish architects from bees. For this discussion of insurgent planning, the distinction is drawn not in terms of who acts, but of the actions themselves. A range of actors may participate in insurgent planning practices: community activists, mothers, professional planners, school teachers, city councilors, the unemployed, retired residents, Whoever the actors, what they do is identifiable as insurgent planning if it is purposeful actions that aim to disrupt domineering relationships of oppressors to the oppressed, and to destabilize such a status quo through consciousness of the past and imagination of an alternative future. In conclusion, the following section elaborates on the guiding principles of insurgent planning practices.

5. *Seeing from the South: Principles for Insurgent Practices*

What insights are gained by seeing radical planning through the anti-colonial struggle of the south?

What are the principles of insurgent planning practices?

Earlier in this paper I historicize the notion of citizenship and how both the colonial struggle for dominance and the anti-colonial resistance have often been mediated through inclusion. To elaborate here on principles of insurgent planning, I return to the insights gained from the global south and its anti-colonial struggles.

The writings of African intellectuals teach us that liberation of the colonies could happen only through “decolonizing the mind”: upsetting the internalized inferiority of the colonized and the superiority of the colonizer (Fanon 1986 [1967]). The black consciousness movement teaches us that “the only way to bring about a defeat of black feelings of inferiority was to look

anew at the black person to discover what it was that lent him/her so easily to denigrate himself/herself” (Ahluwalia and Zegeye 2001: 460). Liberation needs a new consciousness, one that is recovered from the colonial moral injury, the profound alienation that believed development of the colony could happen only “upon condition of rejecting itself” and wholesale importing of non-African scenarios and solutions (Davidson 1992:199).

For planning in this era a similar process means decolonizing planners’ imagination by questioning the assumption that every plan and policy must insist on modernization. This mental decolonization requires recognizing how the ideal of the Western city has been deployed historically in the colonial era, and is now deployed in the neoliberal era to advance a certain paradigm of development and capital accumulation. A collective of developers, planners, architects and politicians and a powerful industry of marketing and image-making have promoted the Western city as an object of desire (Perera 1999). As Edward Said (1994) revealed the material power of orientalist imagery in literary text and art to further colonial domination, so insurgent planning scholarship exposes the role of Western urban imaginary in enforcing exclusionary cities and citizenship. In that regard, planning that one might view as analogous to Orientalism honors the Western ideals and imaginations of the city and urban development as its norm, and represents cities of the South that have not fit into that Western model as failures. Often they have been constructed as the “elsewhere,” which is systematically demonized or made “invisible.” The work by urban scholars like Simone (2004), Mbembe (2004), Mbembe and Nuttall (2004), De Boeck and Pilssart (2004) and Mobogunje (1990), for example, critique how African cities are presented as cases of extreme chaos, lawlessness, complete incomprehensibility, irrelevance; as cases of failed urbanization — in short, as something that was supposed to be something else.

The persistence of Western planning ideals in our post/ neocolonial, neoliberal times suppresses the subaltern conceptualization of cities and of planning. Insurgent planning scholarship aims at decolonizing the planning imagination by taking a fresh look at subaltern cities to understand them by their own rules of the game and values rather than by the planning prescriptions and fantasies of the West. An “upside-down” look at the world of development allows that perhaps the deep informality of third world cities is not their failure, but as Simone (2004) suggests, a triumphant sign of their success in resisting the Western models of planning and urban development. I assert the need for a new consciousness that liberates planning imaginations, echoing Steve Biko, the father of the black consciousness movement in South Africa, who insisted that the liberation of the colonies could happen only through a new consciousness looking at the colonial subject (1978).

If colonialism and colonial power seek to suppress memory, anti-colonial struggles teach us to locate politicized historical memory at the very heart of liberating practices (Werbner 1998). Historicizing the notion of inclusion from the vantage point of the ex-colonies allows us to see how the participation of the oppressed in their own conditions of oppression functions to normalize those oppressive relations, in the post-colony as it had in the colony. That helps us to understand the political career of citizen participation, how the inferiority and superiority of oppressed and oppressor may well continue in an “inclusive” planning process.

Such historicized consciousness is a constitutive principle of insurgent planning. While neoliberal capitalism promotes a collective social amnesia, an important task of counter-hegemonic, insurgent planning is to stimulate historical collective memories and historicize the problems arising from the actions and inactions of authorities— what Sandercock calls insurgent historiographies (1998a). For example, AEC’s showcasing of sidewalk dwellers purposefully

provokes the memory of apartheid's forced removals. Exposing the historical parallels between current evictions and apartheid removals helps the AEC fight against South Africa's neoliberal policies of displacing less affluent urban citizens for the sake of gentrification projects.

Similarly, insurgent planning scholarship values the oral histories of marginalized people as both a significant knowledge form and an emancipatory methodology. Insurgent planning scholarship and practice locates memory at its center.

In *Prospect of Cities* (2002: 83-84), Freidmann lists the normative principles of insurgent planning that concerns marginalized and oppressed groups: offer critical analysis and understanding of the structural forces that marginalize and oppress people; understand that a problem must be attacked simultaneously at multiple scales; aim for both material and political rights; and engage state and state-like formations. This list concurs with aspects of the guiding principles of insurgent planning practices as discussed in this paper and synthesized below: transgression, counter hegemony and imagination.

Insurgent planning is transgressive in time, place, and action. It transgresses false dichotomies, by public actions spanning formal / informal arenas of politics and invited / invented spaces of citizenship practice. It transgresses national boundaries by building transnational solidarities of marginalized people. It transgresses time bounds by seeking a historicized consciousness and promoting historical memory of present experiences. Being transgressive, insurgent planning is not Eurocentric in its theorization. It rather recognizes how the global core and the peripheries north and south might exist within each other.

Insurgent planning is counter-hegemonic. It destabilizes normalized relations of dominance and insists on citizens' right to dissent, to rebel and to determine their own terms of engagement and participation. Insurgent planning seizes advantage from the contradictory

nature of neoliberal capitalism, exposing the rift between inclusion and redistribution. It understands 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.

Insurgent planning is imaginative. It recovers idealism for a just society— the imagination that the neoliberal illusion of TINA, There Is No Alternative, has suppressed. Insurgent planning recognizes the symbolic value of insurgent citizenship activities that offer hope from which to work towards alternatives.

Above all, insurgent planning holds stubbornly to its ideal of justice.

References:

- Ahluwalia, Pal and Zegeye, Abebe. 2001. "Frantz Fanon and Steve Biko: Towards Liberation." *Social Identities* 7(3):455-469.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 2001. "Deep Democracy: Urban Governability and the Horizon of Politics." *Environment and Urbanization* 13 (2): 23-43.
- Beard, Victoria. 2003. "Learning Radical Planning: the Power of Collective Action." *Planning Theory* 2(1): 13-35.

- Beneria, Lourdes. 2003. *Gender, Development and Globalization: Economics as if People Mattered*. New York: Routledge.
- Biko, Steve. 1978. *Black Consciousness in South Africa*. New York: Random House.
- Brown, Wendy. 2003. Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy. *Theory & Event* 7(1).
- Chance, Kerry, 2008. "Housing and Evictions at the N2 Gateway Project in Delft. A Report for Abahlali baseMjondolo accessed on May 8, 2008 at <http://www.abahlali.org/>
- Cornwall, Andrea. 2002. Locating Citizen Participation. *IDS Bulletin* 33(2): 49-58.
- Cox, Robert. 2001. "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: an Essay in Method," in Barry Gills (ed.) *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*. NY: Palgrave. Pp. 35-47.
- Davidson, Basil. 1992. *The Black Man's Burden: Africa and the Curse of the Nation-State*. New York: Times Books.
- Davis, Mike. 2004. Planet of Slums. *New Left Review* 26, March-April.
- De Boeck, Filip and Marie-Françoise Pilssart. 2004. *Kinshasa: Tales of the Invisible City*. Ghent: Ludion; Tervuren: Musée Royal de Afrique Centrale.
- Delft-Symphony Anti-Eviction Campaign_2008. Solidarity: Delft-Symphony Pavement Dwellers Building a New World - One Child at a Time
<http://www.abahlali.org/node/3467> submitted April 14, 2008 accessed May 21, 2008.
- Douglas, Mike and John Friedmann (eds.). 1998. *Cities and Citizens*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fainstein, Susan. 2000. New Directions in Planning Theory. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35 (4): 451-478 .
- Fanon, Franz, 1986. *Black Skin, White Mask*. London: Pluto Press.
- Forester, John. 1989. *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections of the Post-Socialist Conditions*.
New York: Routledge.
- Friedmann, John. 2002. *The Prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis/ London: University of Minnesota
Press.
- Friedmann, John. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton,
NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Freidmann, John. 1988. *Life Space and Economic Space: Essays in Third World Planning*.
New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Gills, Barry. 2001. "Introduction: Globalization and the Politics of Resistance" in Barry Gills
(ed.), *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*. NY: Palgrave.
- Gouws, Amanda. 2005. *(Un)Thinking Citizenship: Feminist Debates In Contemporary South
Africa*. Burlington, VA: Ashgate.
- Holston, James. 2008. *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in
Brazil*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Holston, James. 1995. Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship. *Planning Theory* 13: 35-52.
- Holston, James and Arjun Appadurai. 1999. "Cities and Citizenship" in James Holston and
Arjun Appadurai (eds.), *Cities and Citizenship*. Durham and London: Duke University
Press.
- Healey, Patsy. 1999. Institutional Analysis, Communicative Planning and Shaping Places.
Journal of Planning Education and Research 19, 111-21.
- Innes, Judith. 2004. Consensus Building: Clarification for the Critics. *Planning Theory* 3(1), 5-
20.

- Irazabal, Clara. 2008. *Ordinary Place/ Extraordinary Events: Democracy Citizenship, and Public Space in Latin America*. New York: Routledge.
- Kohl, Ben and Linda Farthing. 2008. "New Spaces, New Contests: Appropriating Decentralization for Political Change in Bolivia," in Victoria Beard, Faranak Miraftab and Chris Silver (eds.), *Planning and Decentralization: Contested Spaces for Public Action in the Global South*. New York: Routledge.
- Krumholz, N. 1994. Dilemmas in Equity Planning: A Personal Memoir. *Planning Theory*. 10(11), 45-56.
- Leavitt, Jaqui. 1994. Planning in the Age of Rebellion: Guidelines to Activist Research and Applied Planning. *Planning Theory* 10(11): 111-29.
- Lister, Ruth. 1997. Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis. *Feminist Review* Fall, no 57: 28-48.
- Manjavu, Mandisi, 2008. "Joe Slovo's Housng Struggle." March 11. <http://www.zcommunications.org/blog/view/1457> , accessed May 21, 2008.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizens and Subjects: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mbembe, Achille and Sarah Nuttall. 2004. Writing the World from an African Metropolis. *Public Culture* 16(3):347-372.
- Mbembe, Achille. 2004. Aesthetics of Superfluity. *Public Culture* 16(3):373-406.
- Mitchell, Timothy, 2002. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Miraftab, Faranak and Eileen Diaz McConell. 2008. "Multiculturalizing Rural Towns: Insights for Inclusive Planning." Unpublished paper under review by *International Planning Studies*.
- Miraftab, Faranak. 2006. "Feminist Praxis, Citizenship and Informal Politics: Reflections on South Africa's Anti-Eviction Campaign." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* vol. 8(2): 194-218.
- Miraftab, Faranak. 2005. "Informalizing the Means of Reproduction: The Case of Waste Collection Services in Cape Town, South Africa" in Beneria, Lourdes and Neema Kudva. (eds.) *Rethinking Informalization: Precarious Jobs, Poverty and Social Protection*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University e-Publishing Program.
- Miraftab, Faranak and Shana Wills. 2005. "Insurgency and Spaces of Active Citizenship: The Story of Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign in South Africa." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25(2): 200-217.
- Miraftab, Faranak, Chris Silver and Victoria A. Beard. 2008. "Situating Contested Notions of Decentralized Planning in the Global South" in Victoria Beard, Faranak Miraftab and Chris Silver (eds.), *Planning and Decentralization: Contested Spaces for Public Action in the Global South*. New York: Routledge.
- Mobogunje, Akin. 1990. "Urban Planning and the Post-Colonial State in Africa: a Research Overview." *African Studies Review* 33(2):121-203.
- Oldfield, Sophie and Stokke, Kristen. 2006. "Building Unity in Diversity: Social Movement Activism in the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign," in Habib, A., Valodia, I., & Ballard, R., *Globalisation, Marginalisation and New Social Movements*. Durban: University of KwaZulu Natal Press, pp. 25-49.

- Perera, Nihal. 1999. *Decolonizing Ceylon: Colonialism, Nationalism and the Politics of Space in Sri Lanka*. Oxford University Press.
- Rose, Nicolas. 1999. *Power of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roy, Ananya. 2006. "Praxis in the Time of Empire." *Planning Theory* 5(1): 7-29.
- Said, Edward. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: First Vantage Books.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1998a. "Framing Insurgent Historiographies for Planning" in Leonie Sandercock (ed.) *Making the Invisible Visible: a Multicultural Planning History*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/New York: University of California Press.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1998b. *Towards Cosmopolis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Simone, AbdouMaliq. 2004. *For the City Yet to Come: Changing African Life in Four Cities*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- UN-Habitat. 2003. *The Challenge of the Slums: Global Report on Human Settlements*. London.
- World Bank. 2008. *Social Capital: the Missing Link? Washington DC.: The World Bank*.
- Watson, Vanessa. 2006. "Deep Difference: Diversity Planning and Ethics." *Planning Theory* 5(1): 31-50.
- Watson, Vanessa. 2002. "The Usefulness of Normative Planning Theories in the Context of Sub-Saharan Africa." *Planning Theory* 1(1): 27-52.
- WCAEC 2007. "African movements continue their fights against NGO authoritarianism." <http://www.wombles.org.uk/article2007121403.php> (accessed January 2008).
- Werbner, Richard 1998. "Beyond Oblivion: Confronting Memory Crisis," in Richard Werbner (ed.), *Memory and the Postcolony: African Anthropology and the Critique of Power*. London and New York Zed books, Pp. 1-17.

Winter, King. 2003. Illegal Settlements and the Impact of Titling Programmes. *Harvard Law Review* vol 44(2): 471.

Yiftachel, Oren. 2006. Re-engaging Planning Theory? Towards 'South-Eastern' Perspectives. *Planning Theory* 5(3): 211-222.

Endnotes:

¹ One calculation in 2001 carried out by the Municipal Services Project and the Human Science Research Council (HSRC) marked nearly 2 million people evicted since 1994 (see McDonald 2002: 22).

² My knowledge of AEC practices relies on earlier ethnographic field work conducted in Cape Town during the 2001-2006 period (2001, 2003, 2004 and 2006). The more recent struggle of 2007-2008 around the N2 project draws on information gathered from the WCAEC web site and more specifically from the reports by Chance 2008; WCAE 2007; Manjuvu 2008; Delft Symphony Anti-Eviction Campaign 2008; and field notes by Ken Salo kensalo@uiuc.edu as the events unfolded December 2007 to February 2008.

³ In 2001, the Campaign formed a Legal Coordinating Committee (LCC) who undertook legal training to be able to represent families facing eviction or service disconnection in magistrate's court. This, the Campaign declares, is to use the courts to maximize citizens' benefit, be it by overturning and delaying eviction and disconnection orders, by frustrating those processes, or simply by documenting citizens' struggle through the formal system (Oldfield and Stokke 2006).

⁴ I borrow the term "invited spaces of citizenship" from Andrea Cornwall (2002:50) to develop the notions of invited and invented spaces of citizenship.