

Urban Land: Rough Landing: Planning Theory meets C21 Urbanism

Oren Yiftachel

Ben-Gurion University of The Negev

yiftach@bgu.ac.il

Landing? Despite constantly invoking inclusive concepts such as democracy, social justice or right to the city, planning theory has remained largely silent on key factors shaping the vast majority of contemporary cities – particularly in the global South-East. These include, intra-alia, land regimes, mass immigration and refugeeness, urban citizenship, collective identities, violence, and the emergence of (neo) colonial relations in many of the world's large cities. These are not only central to the making and transformation of the urban, but strongly intertwined with spatial public policies, that is, planning.

The paper argues and demonstrates, that in order to be effective, planning theory must 'land' into the material and political reality prevalent in the majority of cities during the early C21. To do this, it will have to build on promising new beginnings already evident in the literature, and seriously deal with new types of urbanism surfacing in all corners of the world, typified by what Sophie Watson termed 'the stubborn realities' of the global South-East.

Land: A central -- and oft neglected-- theme in this endeavor is allocation of urban land, housing and property. These have become a pivotal infrastructure of contemporary social relations and the making of urban citizenship. Most planning and urban theorists have (erroneously) assumed the existence of an organized, registered and tightly regulated land system, which allocates liberal development rights according to market or governance principles. Yet, in a typical contemporary metropolis vast populations -- at times the majority -- reside on unregistered land as traditional customary owners, collective unofficial renters, invaders, trespassers or purchasers. The use of alternative land systems has spawned the classification of these

developments as 'illegal', 'slums' or 'informalities', forming into what Ananya Roy has conceptualized as 'subaltern urbanism'. At the same time, land and development rights have been allocated to powerful elites, often with the support of the planning apparatus, thereby creating a path of rapid accumulation through dispossession.

Beyond the reshaping of class relations, land policies are critical to urban collective identities, often reproduced through the making of the C21 metropolis. Urban segregation, militarization and territorial conflicts are rarely 'colour-blind' and tend to essentialize identities and boundaries. Urban space often links mobility, spatial power, prestige and stigma to particular identity groups and affiliations, most typically along ethnic, racial or religious lines. Yet, the walling and ghettoization of certain groups stand in contrast to the liberal openness assumed by most urban planners and scholars. The urban land system is critical in mediating the tensions between enclosures and openness, which largely shape the nature of urban regimes, between liberal democracies to creeping apartheid.

Gray spacing: This variegated legal geographies have created a structural process conceptualized by Oren Yiftachel as 'gray spacing', denoting the dynamic assemblages of bodies, groups, developments and transactions that are neither fully included in the urban polity and society, nor evicted or destroyed. 'Gray spacing' has become a technology through which planners and policy makers attempt to control the 'unwanted/irremovable and contain the wanted/untamable. Gray spacing has also highlighted the vital role of planning in managing urban time as a key factor in shaping social relations.

The paper presents a comparative analysis of land policies, urban planning and the 'gray spacing' of contemporary cities. It draws on research conducted in a range of cities of the South-East, with a focus on the main urban regions in Israel/Palestine – Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv and Beersheba. The paper illustrates the manner in which planning and land regimes combine to dispossess marginalized social and ethnic groups, through the manipulated, yet legalized, nationalist, security or 'market' mechanisms.

The comparative analysis shows that urban planning should be conceptualized as a central component of an emerging urban sovereignty, and is a key factor in making

and shaping of urban citizenship in the C21. Plans and policies typically create the foundation of what appears as emerging urban apartheid– framing a legal geography of 'separated and unequal'. On the other hand, planning also has the potential to resist the process, by fully including all populations in urban plans and development, or by mobilizing marginalized groups around the making of alternative counter, or insurgent, plans (Yiftachel, 2015).

Metrozenship? Under these circumstances, the concept of 'metrozenship', it is suggested, can provide a new spatial framework with which to comprehend and guide research and mobilization. Metrozenship implies, analytically, a lens through which the actual status of groups and individuals can be understood by planners; and normatively, a goal for full material and political status for all metropolitan residents as a foundation of a just and resilient urban society. Metrozenship can also put 'flesh on the bones' of the vague 'right to the city' slogan, fueling struggles for decolonizing urban spatial relations. But for this to happen, planning thought and theory will have to fully land in the rough terrain of C21 urbanism.