

Document Version

Final published version

Licence

Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa)

Citation (APA)

Rocco, R., & Silvestre, G. (2024). Introduction: how do you employ an insurgent planner? In R. Rocco, & G. Silvestre (Eds.), *Insurgent Planning Practice* (pp. 1-15). Edinburgh University Press.

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

In case the licence states "Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa)", this publication was made available Green Open Access via the TU Delft Institutional Repository pursuant to Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa, the Taverne amendment). This provision does not affect copyright ownership.
Unless copyright is transferred by contract or statute, it remains with the copyright holder.

Sharing and reuse

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: HOW DO YOU EMPLOY AN INSURGENT PLANNER?

Roberto Rocco and Gabriel Silvestre

This book investigates insurgent planning practices, and their potential for alternative forms of civic engagement and democracy-building. It features planners “pushing the envelope” and challenging technocratic planning, “respond[ing] to neoliberal specifics of dominance through inclusion” (Miraftab 2009: 32), by incorporating notions of participation, inclusion, trans-sectionality and the right to the city into their daily practices.

Its 11 chapters, written by contributors from diverse socio-political realities, delve into these daily practices to answer these questions. What does insurgent planning look like in practice? How are radical planners coping with traditional, technocratic planning as practised in most places around the world? And what do they do to advance an agenda of democratization and the right to the city, counteracting neoliberal forms of governance?

This book relies on conversations with planners acting in several cities around the world and aims to serve as a catalogue of insurgent experiences that challenge the status quo of contemporary market-based, exclusionary city-making. It also incorporates cross-cutting issues of gender, race and class, among others, to try and explore how insurgent planning around the world challenges neoliberal governance and technocratic planners by bringing diversity into planning.

In doing so, its intention is to cultivate a broader discourse surrounding insurgency as an alternative path for fostering positive change. At the core of insurgent planning lies the critical task of bridging theory and practice in the pursuit of societal change, as articulated by Friedmann (1987: 391). Correspondingly, insurgent planning, practised by actors including professionals and citizens, challenges the confines of technocratic planning practices, empowering citizens to reclaim their rights to the city and assert their fundamental “right to have rights”, as expressed by James Holston (2009). We see insurgent planning practices as those pushing the boundaries of planning towards the reformulation of established orders of spatial production,

actively facilitating, articulating or redefining the ways by which individuals and communities shape their own identities and their urban environments.

An early – humorous – title of this book was *How Do We Employ an Insurgent Planner?*, inspired by a question posed by an exasperated Australian panellist at a congress of the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP). The panellist implied that the ideas connected to insurgent planning being presented at the congress were too grand and disconnected from the day-to-day realities of spatial planning around the world. Guided by this enquiry, we invited Faranak Miraftab to re-articulate in the foreword to this volume the distinction she has repeatedly made between planners and planning, to stress that there is a more constructive theoretic intervention around actions as opposed to actors; and we asked contributors to delve into the complexity and messiness of planners' day-to-day endeavours, engaging in dialogues with those hailing from diverse cities across the world.

This quest is anchored in ideas about insurgent citizenship formulated by, among others, Holston (2009: 246): "Insurgent citizenships confront the entrenched [order] with alternative formulations of citizenship; in other words, that their conflicts are clashes of citizenship and not merely idiosyncratic or instrumental protest and violence." Put another way, insurgent citizenships seek to reformulate established orders and to literally "conquer" the space of the city, subverting relationships of exclusion and oppression through political action. In this sense, we see insurgent planning as an emerging tool that acknowledges the need to promote inclusion and participation and to reconstitute a notion of publicness through action that addresses competing claims over spaces and resources. For this reason, we are careful utilizing the word "citizenship", used here to express belonging to the realm of public inclusionary argumentation (Sen 2009), rather than a sign of national belonging.

Active civic participation and stakeholder engagement have opened up endless possibilities in terms of city-making in the last few decades. But have they been successful? Miraftab (2009) points out the persistent tendency of neoliberal governance to co-opt, tame and finally neutralize social movements. Our tentative hypothesis is that, despite the promises of participation, most planning practice around the world remains technocratic and exclusionary. There have certainly been revolutionary, ground-breaking experiences, but they remain mostly one-off and isolated.

More specifically, "citizen engagement" as an activity underlining procedural justice in planning encompasses a large variety of engagement and participation methods, in practice mostly related to the lower steps of Sherry Arnstein's famous "ladder of participation" (Arnstein 1969).

The vast majority of democratic theory, and deliberative democratic theory in particular, either implicitly or explicitly assumes

the need for widespread citizen participation. It requires that all citizens possess the opportunity to participate and also that they take up this opportunity. But empirical evidence gathered over the past half-century strongly suggests that many citizens do not have a meaningful opportunity to participate in the ways that many democratic theorists require, and do not participate in anything like the numbers that they believe is necessary.

(Parvin 2018: 31)

Reasons for low levels of citizen engagement in policy-making abound and are as much related to governance styles and other political, cultural and economic factors as they are to public officials' unwillingness or lack of capacity to engage citizens (Parvin 2018). Engaging in policy-making requires time and effort.

Here we wish to pay attention to the broader superstructures that inhibit participation. Neoliberalism seems to be antithetical to true popular participation, as it obviously emphasizes free markets, privatization and limited government intervention, which often results in a prioritization of profit-driven development over community needs. This approach tends to marginalize and exclude already disadvantaged groups, reinforcing existing power structures and making it challenging for ordinary citizens to meaningfully participate in decision-making processes.

Others may feel unable to participate because of their lack of knowledge or simply because they do not feel authorized to speak up or are unable to do so, such as children, the elderly and the disabled. Citizens may believe that their input will not make a difference or that policy-makers have already made up their minds. If people feel that their voices will not be heard or that their input will not lead to meaningful change, they are less likely to engage in the process.

This detrimental process is further exacerbated by rising inequalities and labour precariousness, preventing citizens from engaging in the manner envisaged by well-meaning planners. This begs the question: how to escape this logic and the neoliberal governance of cities it engenders?

This is compounded by a growing lack of trust in institutions and politicians, which undermines citizen engagement (Perry 2021). If people perceive corruption, dishonesty or a lack of accountability, they may become disillusioned and choose not to participate in policy-making – and there is little reason to believe they should not be.

This process of democratic erosion is underlined by the crisis in public rationality that has pervaded democracies everywhere (Freedom House 2019). This crisis in public rationality refers to the breakdown of meaningful communication in the public realm and the distortion of public discourse,

which undermines the foundations of democratic decision-making. This crisis can be seen in the growing prevalence of fake news, propaganda and disinformation and the manipulation of public opinion through social media and other digital platforms. This crisis poses a fundamental threat to democracy, as it undermines the ability of citizens to engage in meaningful deliberation, compromise and collective decision-making.

Following Amartya Sen (2009), in order to advance the idea that public reasoning and public justification can deliver policy that is both better informed about the pleas, needs and wishes of citizens and more just, because it includes the voices of the vulnerable and silent, we must identify and give attention to innovative ways citizens participate in city-making, in order to enable more meaningful and fruitful forms of engagement. This means shifting our attention to the practices by those who, moved by necessity or ideal, are prompted to challenge the status quo and propose alternatives anchored in those practices. Hence, in this book, we direct our focus towards “insurgent planning practice” as a revitalized, dynamic and potentially less structured manifestation of citizen practices of city-making that approaches citizenship and the right to the city from an insurgent standpoint.

The (re)generation of a public realm through insurgent planning practices speaks to the concept of publicness, of public imagination and of collective practical undertakings to face the direct challenges of our time (inequalities, exclusion, climate change, unchecked urbanization and the discredit of democracy, among others). Without a democratic public realm and the recognition of the value of alternative insurgent practices, it seems impossible to (re)constitute a real public sphere. These ideas are, we think, at the root of insurgent planning practices that aim to reconstitute the public sphere, subverting established orders of exclusion and/or oppression and reinforcing democracy and inclusion through the exercise of the “right to the city” (Harvey 2008). In short, this book explores the insurgent practices of planning and the experiences of planners in a field usually hostile to radical ideas and resistant to them.

EARLIER CRITICAL DEBATES: ADVOCACY, EQUITY AND COMMUNICATIVE PLANNING

Attempts to make planning more democratic and oriented to social justice have long been a concern in theory and practice. Although providing a comprehensive review of this rich literature is outside the scope of this book, it is helpful to situate how insurgent planning was informed by previous discussions in critical planning theories. Here we focus on two particular debates articulated by US- and UK-based scholars who sought to overcome the clout

of rationality, technicality and neutrality associated with planning practice and make it plural in response to social imperatives.

The first body of literature is that of advocacy planning, articulated by practitioner, scholar and activist Paul Davidoff. Clearly informed by the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s in the United States, Davidoff argues in his seminal article (1965: 331) that planning practice also plays a part in “the need to rectify racial and other social injustices.” According to him, “[a]ppropriate planning action cannot be prescribed from a position of value neutrality, for prescriptions are based on desired objectives” (331, emphasis in original). He argues that planning would be more democratic if planners were open about their values and ideologies while working on behalf of related client groups, especially under-represented ones. The planning process should then be plural, with different plans presented by planners working as advocates of different groups. Ultimately, this would strengthen “urban democracy” by presenting alternative choices to the public. The planning actors discussed include those not only in the public sector but also within civil society. Although such a proposed “battle of ideas” has been questioned in practice (Allmendinger 2017), advocacy planning opened and stimulated debates about the politics of the planning profession and critical reflection regarding the ability to work “in the public interest” (Checkoway 1994; Clavel 1994).

Also articulated within the same context and period – and inspired by advocacy planning – equity planning was more attentive to how public planning officials could pursue social justice goals for disenfranchised communities rather than with the planning process. As Metzger (1996: 113) notes, it was “a framework in which urban planners working within government use their research, analytical, and organising skills to influence opinion, mobilise underrepresented constituencies, and advance and perhaps implement policies and programs that redistribute public and private resources to the poor and working class”. This body of work was mostly empirical and informed by public practice, drawing on the experiences of progressive planning departments in US cities during the 1970s and early 1980s (Clavel 1986, 2013; Krumholz & Clavel 1994), especially Cleveland, where Norman Krumholz led the planning commission and who would later chair the American Planning Association (Krumholz & Forester 1990). Equity planning reinforced the plea for the planning profession to play an active role in meeting social justice, as it documented cases when planners influenced the redirection of resources to assist poorer neighbourhoods with low-cost housing and improvements to public transport and to public spaces. Strongly reflecting wider debates of its time, attention to equity planning diminished over the 1980s, as such governments gave way to the “urban entrepreneurialism” of the Ronald Reagan era (Harvey 1989).

The second body of literature is represented by communicative planning, an umbrella term that includes the work of planning theorists John Forester and Judith Innes in the United States and Patsy Healey (who applied the idea of collaborative planning) in the United Kingdom. Broadly, their concern is with the planning process and in facilitating spaces for different participants to contribute with their knowledge and to foster ways in which decisions of mutual agreement can be reached. Developed in the 1980s and 1990s, it drew on critiques elaborated in the previous two decades in relation to planning as a “positivist” and “rational” practice (as argued in advocacy planning), as well as its role in reinforcing unequal class structures, elaborated by urban Marxist scholars such as David Harvey and Manuel Castells. Communicative planning focuses on the role of the planner as “mediator and broker” (Healey 1997: 309) of diverse knowledge, so as to inform decisions, and in creating forums or arenas that are inclusive and democratic (Healey 1996). A key focus is on enabling argumentation and deliberation, with an expressed influence of German philosopher Jürgen Habermas’s work on communicative rationality. For the proponents of communicative planning, this constituted a new “turn” or “paradigm” for planning theory and practice (Healey 1996; Innes 1995), which in fact influenced vigorous debates in the 1990s and 2000s, including important critiques.

Criticisms directed towards communicative planning were commonly based on how inclusive the design of such arenas was in order to account for representative groups and to account for power differentials between different participants (Huxley & Yiftachel 2000), as well as on the potential for such spaces to depoliticize debate because of the drive for consensual agreement (Purcell 2009). Planners themselves should not be abstracted “from their positioning in a nexus of power, knowledge, and rationality in which their professional forms of knowing, reasoning, and valuing are validated, and thus ... underestimate the challenges of asserting alternative forms” (McGuirk 2001: 196). In seeking to displace conflict and foster consensus, communicative planning – despite its ideal of enabling diversity and transparency – can also legitimize neoliberal policies that enhance social polarization. The charge of promoting a kind of participation that can lead to domination would be a key feature in the later theorization of insurgent planning.

INSURGENT CITIZENSHIP AND RADICAL PLANNING

Insurgent planning entered the planning lexicon influenced by the work of anthropologist James Holston (1989, 2007), based on his analyses of the experience of modernist planning in Brasília and the struggle of residents of informal settlements in São Paulo. This work analysed the tensions, frictions

and conflicts of two oppositional processes (Holston 1995). On the one hand, there are the state-directed agendas of modernization and nation-building, which include the expansion of universal rights to participate and benefit from a democratic society (as in the context of post-dictatorship Brazil) as well as top-down projects to modernize cities with effects aimed at disciplining inhabitants and their living experiences (epitomised by the planning and architecture of the city of Brasília). On the other hand, Holston's work examined the "struggles over what it means to be a member of the modern state" (Holston 1998: 47) by marginalized groups within unequal societies that must resort to grassroots practices to enable their survival. The expression of this citizenship was entwined with the built environment – what he calls *insurgent urbanism* – that, in the case of São Paulo, was represented by the self-built settlements in the peripheries of the city and the continuous mobilizations of their residents and support groups to demand their rights to be met, especially access to the services and welfare promised by the state. Insurgent citizenship emerged out of the distinction between formal and substantive citizenship to be found "at the intersection of these processes of expansion and erosion" (Holston 1998: 48). Holston was interested in studying non-state sources that aimed to legitimize citizenship rights, meanings and practices, particularly by organized grassroots mobilizations and everyday practices.

Holston's initial theorization of insurgent citizenship was first published as a paper in 1995 but was republished by the feminist planning scholar Leonie Sandercock three years later in the edited volume *Making the Invisible Visible*. She applies the concept of insurgency to strengthen her line of work, arguing for a plural and diverse planning history that more often than not was made invisible by the "official story" of planning theory, "synonymous with the history of the profession and its great men, great ideas, and great achievements" (Sandercock (1998a: 27). The book focuses on "alternative traditions of planning", whose central characters were activists and practitioners who, among others, included women and people of colour, gays and lesbians, and indigenous people. Their stories were "histories of insurgent planning practices, stories of marginalised and oppressed groups excluded from or in resistance to state-directed, modernist planning" (21). Similar to Holston, insurgency was conceptualized as oppositional to top-down state-directed modernist planning and signified "the rise of civil society in the form of organised social movements which confront modernist planning with its anti-democratic, race and gender-blind, and culturally homogenising practices" (Sandercock 1998b: 4).

At this stage, it is worth noting that both Sandercock and planning theorist John Friedmann employed the notion of "insurgent planning" interchangeably with "radical planning". Earlier, Friedmann (1987) had presented

a typology of intellectual planning traditions alongside a continuum that ranged from societal guidance to social transformation, the latter comprising the realm of “radical planning”. This was characterized by actions aimed to bring about structural change within society “based on people’s self-organised actions, [standing] in necessary opposition to the established powers and, more particularly, the state” (Friedmann 1987: 407). As Victoria Beard (2003) recognized, this was a turning point, as it acknowledged a wider range of planners beyond those professionally trained or in authoritative positions to situated radical planners as “rooted in civil society rather than the state” (Friedmann 2003: 9). Nevertheless, key assumptions in the theorization of radical planning – also present in Sandercock’s insurgent planning histories – were that opposition to state practices could be openly expressed as well as formal institutions being held accountable. For Beard (2003), such assumptions were problematic, as they did not account for other contexts, especially in the Global South; her own work examined the activities of community leaders within the repressive context of Suharto’s regime in Indonesia. She writes (30–1):

Importantly, all of these authors discuss radical planning and/or radical action with the assumption that democratic institutions are in place. As a result, they assume a level of civil and human rights and procedural processes associated with the presence of a liberal–democratic state, or, at the very least, that institutions are held accountable to these societal expectations.

The concept of insurgent planning was then rearticulated by Faranak Miraftab in 2009, this time delivered through a timely and potent critique of neoliberal state practices. Building on her earlier work (Miraftab 2004; Miraftab & Wills 2005), it offered an analytical framework and a set of concepts that equipped critical scholars to interrogate the turbulent 2010s in both the Global North and South.

MIRAFTAB’S INSURGENT PLANNING

In “Insurgent planning: situating radical planning in the Global South”, Miraftab (2009) updates debates about radical planning and insurgent citizenship, moving the discussion from a historical critical reading of modernist state projects to a timely critique of the neoliberal state practices disseminated during the 1990s and 2000s. More specifically, insurgent planning is articulated in relation to the concept of “governance” – a process of governing with and through networks including the state, the private sector and civil society

(Rhodes 2007) – portrayed as a neoliberal practice of dominance through the illusion of inclusion. Focusing on both the formal spaces of institutional participation and the self-organized oppositional practices of claim-making, it provided a conceptual framework to examine the dual process of expanding formal citizenship and the worsening of socio-economic inequality and material redistribution under neoliberalized regimes.

Governance became a ubiquitous keyword in the restructuring of states' institutional frameworks and delivery mechanisms under the processes of neoliberalization in most of the world, as well as within contexts of transition from authoritarian regimes to democratic ones (Cornwall 2002; Doornbos 2001; Miraftab 2003). Championed by international organizations, state donors and NGOs alike, "governance" – as well as terms such as "community" or "citizen participation" – offered the promise of policy delivery being more efficient with the input of all concerned parties – called stakeholders – as well as more transparent. However, the gap between what participation suggested and how actual practices of business as usual continued led to strong scepticism as to what it could actually achieve, especially in addressing social justice (Cooke & Kothari 2001). Miraftab bridged debates in planning and development studies regarding the limitations of community participation to argue that – particularly within contexts of reinvigorated democracy, as in post-apartheid South Africa – institutional participation tended to demobilize the struggle of social movements and served to extend state control within the society. Employing the Gramscian notion of "hegemony", Miraftab (2009) states that the promise of participation stabilizes state–society relations and hence reinforces the dominance of elite groups. Nevertheless, this dominance is not always complete, and groups realize the contradiction between their expanded participation and increasing precarity. This creates what Miraftab (2009) calls a "disjunction", which can serve to reactivate original claims and stimulate the historical collective memory of struggles for social justice. Counter-hegemonic moves may then follow, which can strategically use the political openings of formal participation as well as insurgent practices.

In order to mobilize support and reposition their agendas, social movements have to be inventive, creating spaces of engagement outside formal structures as well as employing new practices to denounce injustice and put pressure on policy actors. In order to comprehend the fluidity with which groups operate across spaces, Miraftab (2004) offers the concepts of "invited" and "invented" spaces of citizenship. The formulation developed Andrea Cornwall's (2002) earlier analysis of governance mechanisms and the power-laden formal spaces that are created and in which communities are "invited" to participate. An opposing tactic to resist domination is thus to articulate "invented" spaces, defined as "those collective actions by the poor that directly confront the authorities and challenge the status quo" (Miraftab

2009: 39). Insurgent planning is thus defined as “radical planning practices that challenge the inequitable specifics of neoliberal governance operating through inclusion” (41). Miraftab illustrates her conceptual framework within the context of post-apartheid South Africa and the case of the Western Cape anti-eviction campaign in Cape Town (Miraftab & Wills 2005). Despite the universal rights to housing and services guaranteed in the 1996 South African constitution, evictions and forced removals intensified in the mid-2000s in preparation for the staging of the 2010 football World Cup. Squatter support groups resorted to legal practices to file their cases and advance them in boardrooms, as well as employing insurgent practices such as protests in public spaces that made visible the injustice of state policies and the memory of the apartheid era.

Miraftab’s (2009) paper offers a more contemporary and critical view of state–society engagement, particularly in relation to urban and development policies, and how insurgent practices are combined to advance agendas for social justice. It struck a chord with experiences of depoliticized institutional participation and insurgent actions under neoliberalism in the Global South, as well as in the Global North, and inspired a new set of analyses in the following decade.

THE EVOLVING INSURGENT PLANNING LITERATURE

The reinvigorated analytical lens of insurgent planning has since been applied to contexts as diverse as Kenya (Butcher & Frediani 2014), Finland (Berglund & Peipinen 2017), the Dominican Republic (Sletto 2013), Nepal (Shrestha & Aranya 2015), Turkey (Ay & Miraftab 2016), Brazil (Freitas 2019; Friendly 2022), the United States (Cahen, Schneider & Saegert 2019), Venezuela (Velasquez Atehortua 2014), Germany (Hilbrandt 2017), Indonesia (Putri 2020), South Africa (Meth 2010) and Spain (García-Lamarca 2017). Within this body of literature, three particular approaches have been productive in pointing to new directions.

The framework of invited/invented spaces has been particularly fruitful in analyses of grassroots groups navigating spaces and conciliating practices of contestation and negotiation. Overcoming a monolithic depiction of “community”, Butcher & Frediani (2014) and Shrestha & Aranya (2015) examined the complex politics of collective mobilization by informal settlement dwellers to resist eviction and/or advance material gains, in Nairobi and Kathmandu respectively. Just as the notion of “state” requires nuance to account for its contested and contradictory actions, poorer communities are also heterogeneous and complex, with the relevant implications for their

insurgent practices. Therefore, an examination of the creation of invented spaces should not be exempt from considering internal power structures, how the most vulnerable are included or how what counts as “democratic” is understood. This is powerfully illustrated by Meth (2010) in her analysis of women’s insurgencies in Durban. Critical to the celebratory contours informing the insurgent planning literature, Meth exposes how the same groups may engage with transformative practices to resist eviction from informal settlements while also supporting repressive insurgency acts, such as vigilantism to address crime and violence in their neighbourhoods. The scenario “unsettles” the morality and consideration about rights present in the insurgent planning literature, with implications over the kinds of insurgent practices selected for study. Insurgency is, after all, “shot through with ambiguities which cross simple dichotomies” (Meth 2010: 258–9).

Equally, an attention to the politics of invited spaces should not assume *a priori* its co-optation or depoliticizing dynamics. Institutional participation, even when formulated within a neoliberal governance context, can still enable spaces for groups to coalesce and resist dominant planning approaches. Drawing on the proposed visions for the redevelopment of a disused airport in Berlin, Hilbrandt (2017) argues that shared frustration with institutional participation enabled opposition groups to come together and articulate an alternative vision for turning the site into an urban park. Even though the invited spaces of civic participation were carefully managed to avoid dissent, it still presented opportunities for groups to coalesce. On the other hand, institutional practices vested with progressive agendas and inclusive participation may not be enough to avert exclusionary practices. Freitas (2019) examines how the institutionalization of the Right to the City into the planning framework of Brazilian cities such as Fortaleza introduced instruments of land value capture and social participation that helped to legitimize urban interventions that continued to displace poorer communities. Taking a longer view of housing struggles in Chicago and New York, Cahen, Schneider and Saegert (2019) call for attention to be given to the temporal and shifting dynamics of participation and insurgencies, which can turn insurgent achievements into losses over time just as well as institutional participation may be leveraged for progressive gains. As the authors suggest, “Scholarship that remains focused on one point-in-time risks missing the long co-evolution of political contexts and popular struggle, which are mutually constitutive, if on unequal footing” (1429–30).

Finally, the insurgent planning literature has also been helpful in comprehending the “decade of urban protests” that marked the 2010s, spanning the Arab Spring, Occupy, the Indignados movement in Spain and many other citizen mobilizations against the dominant political and economic order that took over streets and squares across the world (for an overview, see Hou &

Knierbein 2017 and Swyngedouw 2018). The occupation of public spaces often offered the opportunity to prefigure a different urban future animated by the ephemeral solidarity and strength found in urban struggles. Ay and Miraftab (2016) examine the Gezi Park protests in Istanbul that took place in May 2013, when citizens occupied a centrally located park designated for demolition and redeveloped as a shopping centre, only to be met with violent repression by the police. Their analysis focuses on the performative acts of protesters (standing still, quietly, in protest, giving improvised piano recitals and dining collectively over an improvised table stretching along rail tracks) and their effect of galvanizing support as thousands joined, many as a way to express their wider protest against the national government. Elsewhere, García-Lamarca (2017) analyses the insurgent practices of the citizen-led Platform for People Affected by Mortgages (PAH) in Catalunya in the aftermath of the mobilizations of 15 May 2011, when thousands of people occupied squares in cities across Spain to protest against the national government's austerity policies. The housing movement supported the struggle of thousands of mortgage borrowers facing foreclosure, with practices such as collectively blocking evictions and occupying the empty flats owned by the banks. The organization of weekly assemblies (invented spaces) where those affected by foreclosure sought guidance about their rights, possible strategies and solidarity is put forward as enabling a collective political subjectivity and holding emancipatory potential. PAH is one of the most visible and enduring housing movements in Spain, and it has played an important role in shaping public discussions over housing and the unjust practices of banks assisted by the state.

The body of work focusing on insurgent practices is still evolving and increasing, animated not least by the successive rounds of disenfranchisement, austerity and precariousness that have affected many cities around the globe in the last decade. This book contributes to this expansive work by positing greater attention to the “purposeful actions that aim to disrupt domineering relationships of oppressors to the oppressed, and to destabilise such a status quo through consciousness of the past and imagination of an alternative future” (Miraftab 2009: 44) through a global selection of case studies.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

Inspired by the work of Faranak Miraftab, this book focuses on the practices connected to insurgency in planning, rather than on the conceptualization of insurgent planning only. It explores these practices and experiences in environments usually hostile to radical ideas. Although planning has often

worked to serve the interests of the most affluent and powerful, there are certainly those who challenge those interests, pushing the boundaries of the profession, leading the way into new forms of planning and designing cities. As we shall see, there are many ways to define insurgency, and as many ways to perform it in different areas of planning. This book is divided into three sections. These sections address different areas in which an insurgent attitude manifests itself: *Political and Citizenship Practices*; *Academic Action*; and *Planning Practice*.

In the *Political and Citizenship Practices* section, four contributors explore how grassroots and social movements perform insurgency in their daily struggles. These practices reveal how non-expert citizen planners are able to influence the outcomes of public policy through organized action. In the *Academic Action* section, three contributors critically describe the way in which academics are being influenced by ideas of insurgency, and how they try to incorporate it in research. In the *Professional Planning Practice* section, four contributors explore insurgency from within the profession. Although this may sound contradictory, and antithetical to insurgency itself, these contributors illustrate a growing unease with technocratic planning within the profession and showcase practices that challenge established paradigms in planning.

REFERENCES

- Allmendinger, P. 2017. *Planning Theory*, 3rd edn. London: Red Globe Press.
- Arnstein, S. 1969. "A ladder of citizen participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216–24.
- Ay, D. & F. Miraftab 2016. "Invented spaces of activism: Gezi Park and performative practices of citizenship." In J. Grugel & D. Hammett (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of International Development*, 555–74. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beard, V. 2003. "Learning radical planning: the power of collective action." *Planning Theory* 2(1): 13–35.
- Berglund, E. & V. Peipinen 2017. "Spaces of insurgent citizenship: activism and acceptability in Helsinki." *Finnish Journal of Urban Studies* 55(3): 64–70.
- Butcher, S. & A. Frediani 2014. "Insurgent citizenship practices: the case of Muungano wa Wanavijiji in Nairobi, Kenya." *City* 18(2): 119–33.
- Cahen, C., J. Schneider & S. Saegert 2019. "Victories from insurgency: re-negotiating housing, community control, and citizenship at the margins." *Antipode* 51(5): 1416–35.
- Checkoway, B. 1994. "Paul Davidoff and advocacy planning in retrospect." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60(2): 139–43.
- Clavel, P. 1986. *The Progressive City: Planning and Participation, 1969–1984*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Clavel, P. 1994. "The evolution of advocacy planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60(2): 146–9.
- Clavel, P. 2013. *Activists in City Hall: The Progressive Response to the Reagan Era in Boston and Chicago*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Cooke, B. & U. Kothari (eds) 2001. *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Cornwall, A. 2002. "Locating citizen participation". *IDS Bulletin* 33(2): 49–58.
- Davidoff, P. 1965. "Advocacy and pluralism in planning". *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31(4): 331–8.
- Doornbos, M. 2001. "'Good governance': the rise and decline of a policy metaphor?". *Journal of Development Studies* 37(6): 93–108.
- Freitas, C. 2019. "Insurgent planning? Insights from two decades of the Right to the City in Fortaleza, Brazil". *City* 23(3): 285–305.
- Freedom House 2019. "Freedom in the world 2018: democracy in crisis". Washington, DC: Freedom House.
- Friedmann, J. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, J. 2003. "Why do planning theory?". *Planning Theory* 2(1): 7–10.
- Friendly, A. 2022. "Insurgent planning in pandemic times: the case of Rio de Janeiro". *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 46(1): 115–25.
- García-Lamarca, M. 2017. "From occupying plazas to recuperating housing: insurgent practices in Spain". *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 41(1): 37–53.
- Harvey, D. 1989. "From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism". *Geografiska Annaler: Series B* 71(1): 3–17.
- Harvey, D. 2008. "The right to the city". *New Left Review* 53: 23–40.
- Healey, P. 1996. "The communicative turn in planning theory and its implications for spatial strategy formation". *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 23(2): 217–34.
- Healey, P. 1997. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hilbrandt, H. 2017. "Insurgent participation: consensus and contestation in planning the redevelopment of Berlin–Tempelhof airport". *Urban Geography* 38(4): 537–56.
- Holston, J. 1989. *The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holston, J. 1995. "Spaces of insurgent citizenship". *Planning Theory* 13: 35–52.
- Holston, J. 1998. "Spaces of insurgent citizenship". In L. Sandercock (ed.), *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, 37–56. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Holston, J. 2007. *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Holston, J. 2009. "Insurgent citizenship in an era of global urban peripheries". *City & Society* 21(2): 245–67.
- Hou, J. & S. Knierbein 2017. *City Unsilenced: Urban Resistance and Public Space in the Age of Shrinking Democracy*. New York: Routledge.
- Huxley, M. & O. Yiftachel 2000. "New paradigm or old myopia? Unsettling the communicative turn in planning theory". *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 19(4): 333–42.
- Innes, J. 1995. "Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice". *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14: 183–9.
- Krumholz, N. & P. Clavel 1994. *Reinventing Cities: Equity Planners Tell Their Stories*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Krumholz, N. & J. Forester 1990. *Making Equity Planning Work: Leadership in the Public Sector*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McGuirk, P. 2001. "Situating communicative planning theory: context, power, and knowledge". *Environment and Planning A* 33(2): 195–217.
- Meth, P. 2010. "Unsettling insurgency: reflections on women's insurgent practices in South Africa". *Planning Theory & Practice* 11(2): 241–63.
- Metzger, J. 1996. "The theory and practice of equity planning: an annotated bibliography". *Journal of Planning Literature* 11(1): 112–26.

- MirafTAB, F. 2003. "The perils of participatory discourse: housing policy in post-apartheid South Africa". *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22(3): 226–39.
- MirafTAB, F. 2004. "Invited and invented spaces of participation: neoliberal citizenship and feminists' expanded notion of politics". *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies* 1(1): art. 3.
- MirafTAB, F. 2009. "Insurgent planning: situating radical planning in the Global South". *Planning Theory* 8(1): 32–50.
- MirafTAB, F. & S. 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): 200–17.
- Parvin, P. 2018. "Democracy without participation: a new politics for a disengaged era". *Res Publica* 24: 31–52.
- Perry, J. 2021. "Trust in public institutions: trends and implications for economic security", Policy Brief 108. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations.
- Purcell, M. 2009. "Resisting neo-liberalisation: communicative planning or counter-hegemonic movements?". *Planning Theory* 8(2): 140–65.
- Putri, P. 2020. "Insurgent planner: transgressing the technocratic state of postcolonial Jakarta". *Urban Studies* 57(9): 1845–65.
- Rhodes, R. 2007. "Understanding governance: ten years on". *Organization Studies* 28(8): 1243–64.
- Sandercock, L. 1998a. "Introduction: framing insurgent historiographies for planning". In L. Sandercock (ed.), *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, 1–33. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sandercock, L. 1998b. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Sen, A. 2009. *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shrestha, P. & R. Aranya 2015. "Claiming invited and invented spaces: contingencies for insurgent planning practices". *International Planning Studies* 20(4): 424–43.
- Sletto, B. 2013. "Insurgent planning and its interlocutors: studio pedagogy as unsanctioned practice in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic". *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 33(2): 228–40.
- Swyngedouw, E. 2018. *Promises of the Political: Insurgent Cities in a Post-Political Environment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Velasquez Atehortua, J. 2014. "Barrio women's invited and invented spaces against urban elitisation in Chacao, Venezuela". *Antipode* 46(3): 835–56.

