

# GLOBAL PLANNING EDUCATORS INTEREST GROUP (GPEIG) Newsletter

Spring 2003

## Contents:

- Message from the Co-Chair
- Global Planning Panels at the ACSP-AESOP Joint Congress, Belgium, 2003
- Member News
- GPEAN News
- 2006 World Congress
- Internationally Oriented Research Centers
- Field Studies
- Member Publications
- War and Teaching

Co-Chairs:  
Nihal Perera (2002-04)  
[nperera@bsu.edu](mailto:nperera@bsu.edu)

Teresa Vázquez (2003-05)  
[teresav@csupomona.edu](mailto:teresav@csupomona.edu)

## Message from the Co-Chair

Greetings!

I hope this newsletter finds all of you involved in exciting summer endeavors.

This is an exciting time for the GPEIG and its members. I believe that we have reached a critical juncture in regard to our mission and that our goals are changing. The Baltimore conference represented a crucial turning point in regard to the significance of "international" within the ACSP. It was full of meetings, paper sessions, and round tables that concentrated on international events, international planning related issues, global planning education, transnational collaborations, and discussions on GPEAN and the ACSP-AESOP joint congress. This is very different from even a few years ago when international issues were quite marginal at ACSP conferences. The Baltimore conference was, therefore, huge for the GPEIG; the significance was symbolized by our representation on the podium. I was very proud to be that representative of the Group.

This is not a sudden change of tide. Although the GPEIG does not have a long history, but a short active one, the work on international urbanism and planning by planning educators goes a long way back. Among others, John Friedman, Peter Marcuse, and Saskia Sassen have championed such work. The turning point is solid, and well supported by the ACSP leadership. President Wim Wieval's interest in providing an international dimension to our planning education is crucial in this regard. We should not forget that the past President, Bruce Stiffler began working hard in the area of international connections, and it was during his presidency that the first World Planning Schools Congress was organized. Today we have a global planning educators organization: GPEAN.

All of the above were brought to a height by a well-attended GPEIG meeting in Baltimore. Despite the time crunch we all felt, we had a great meeting. Most crucially, we now have official GPEIG bylaws. In addition to John Browder and Alnoor Ebrahim who drafted the bylaws, I would also like to thank our past Co-Chair Jo Looye who got it approved within the time frame. Teresa Vázquez and Keith Pezzoli were elected Co-Chair and Co-Chair Elect at that meeting. Moreover, the GPEIG continues to have an active presence on the presidential task force which draws heavily on the GPEIG membership.

On the one hand, this is certainly a time to think about our past and those who worked hard to bring the Group to this stage; on the other hand, we should find ways to shoulder the responsibilities that come with what we have worked hard to achieve. We need to step up our contribution and the focus needs to be shifted from organization to content. One way we keep in touch is through our listserv. To subscribe, visit <http://www-scf.usc.edu/~gsukumar/Globeplan.html>

See some of you in Leuven. Nihal Perera

## International Development Grants and Fellowships List

<http://www-scf.usc.edu/~gsukumar/Globeplan.html>

**GPEIG Meeting at Leuven: July 12 Saturday 7:30-9:00am at Victor Servranckx (de Nieuwe Valk)**



## Global Planning Panels and Roundtables at the

### Third ACSP-AESOP Joint Congress

Leuven, Belgium, July 8-12, 2003

## Member News

**John O Browder**, Virginia Polytechnic, continues into the second year of NSF-funded research project, "Patterns and Processes of Land Use Change in the Brazilian Amazon," the final phase of a 10-year longitudinal study of 240 farmers in Rondonia, Brazil, focusing on the determinants of their land use decision-making. The project has a comparative component involving co-PI, Robert Walker (Michigan State) and another 280 farmers in central Para State. The project considers the impacts of regional development plans and programs on small farmer land use decisions and deforestation.

**Alnoor Ebrahim**, Virginia Polytechnic, organized two workshops:

1. "Approaches to Natural Resource Management: Policies, Efforts, and Practices," in Ahmedabad, India, August 7-8, 2002. The workshop involved participants from state agencies and non-governmental organizations in four states, all of whom are key players in collaborative approaches in managing forest, irrigation, and watershed resources.
2. "Accountability and Moral Community," Roanoke, VA, September 26-28, 2002, hosted by the Center for Global Accountabilities. The colloquium brought together scholars from the US and UK to discuss issues of accountability in civil society organizations and multilateral institutions. Papers are being edited for publication.

**Lorlene Hoyt**, MIT, undertook a research project the purpose of which was to gain exposure to the innovative community building tools and Community-based information System (CBIS) currently being used

by National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA) in Delhi. Technical and strategy support was provided to further develop the CBIS to a point where it can begin to be used by citizens and government to improve water accessibility in low-income areas.

**Dave Johnson**, retired from U of Tennessee, is an advisor to the Global University System and is a delegate to the UNESCO conference on Intercultural education, Jyväskylä, Finland, June 15-18. Dave has co-authored an article on environmental education for a UNESCO book to be distributed at the conference. Visit: [www.jyu.fi/kti/unesco2003/conference.htm](http://www.jyu.fi/kti/unesco2003/conference.htm)

**Gill-Chin Lim**, Endowed Professor, Michigan State University, is teaching a course on "Decision Making in the Public and Private Sectors: Conflicts, Negotiation and Strategy." at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management, in summer 2003.

**Peter Marcuse**, Columbia University, taught an intensive two-week course in the planning program at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg in spring 2003. The topic was globalization and its impact on urban spatial development. The students were very interested: Jo'burg, like many other places, has a good bit of "global cities envy," and they discussed whether that made sense. He subsequently wrote up a limited comparison of the movement of groups since the ending of apartheid in Jo'burg with similar patterns in New York City for a conference on comparative trends in migration, and found unexpected similarities.

**Ayse Pamuk**, San Francisco State University, is Co-Principal Investigator on a 3-year NSF funded project: "Space, Culture, and Urban Policy: Integrating GIS into Social Science Research Methods Courses." She is developing instructional materials to teach spatial thinking and analysis in urban policy oriented methods courses using international data on housing and human settlements. She may be contacted at [pamuk@sfsu.edu](mailto:pamuk@sfsu.edu).

We do not have a Global Planning track at the ACSP-AESOP joint congress this year. Some members of the GPEIG have volunteered information about their sessions:

**Gill-Chin Lim** <[limg@pilot.msu.edu](mailto:limg@pilot.msu.edu)> will moderate a panel on **Globalization: Redefinition and Implications to Planning Education and Beyond**

**Ayse Pamuk** <[pamuk@sfsu.edu](mailto:pamuk@sfsu.edu)> Paper on "Geography of Immigrant Clusters in Global Cities: A Case Study of San Francisco, 2000"

**Nihal Perera** <[nperera@bsu.edu](mailto:nperera@bsu.edu)> **Roundtable on Emerging Trends in Asian Urbanization and Planning**, Participated by Tridib Banerjee, Elise Bright, Aseem Inam, Gill-Chin Lim, and Chris Silver

**Bish Sanyal** <[sanyal@mit.edu](mailto:sanyal@mit.edu)> Will chair a panel on **Comparative Planning Cultures**, based on an edited volume which will be published soon. Will chair a panel on **Internationalizing Planning Education**. It will draw on the work done by the members of the sub-committee on Curriculum Development for the National Commission on Internationalizing Planning Education. Will be the discussant for a panel on **the Urban Informality organized**

## Global Curriculum Taskforce

Tresa Vazquez

The members of the curriculum sub-committee of the Global Taskforce of the ACSP met in April 2002 to work on the conceptual base for a global planning curriculum. The participants in this meeting were Hemalata Dandekar (Arizona State University); Edward Jepson (University of Tennessee, Knoxville); Keith Pezzoli (University of California, San Diego); Siddhartha Sen (Morgan State University); Betsy Sweet (Instituto del Progreso Latino); Teresa Vázquez (CalPoly Pomona); and Niraj Verma (USC). The meeting was sponsored by ACSP and hosted by Professor Bish Sanyal at MIT. Ruth Yabes and Bish Sanyal facilitated the meeting. A first report of the recommendations resulting from this meeting was presented at the ACSP 2002 meeting in Baltimore. A second report will be presented at the 2003 AESOP-ACSP International Congress in Leuven.

## The World's Planning School Associations Are Building a Collective Agenda

Bruce Stiffel, ACSP Delegate to GPEAN

Readers of this letter will recall that in Shanghai in July 2001, leaders of ten planning school associations signed an agreement committing those associations to creating a Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN). This agreement was ratified by nine of the associations and GPEAN held its inaugural meeting in Volos, Greece in July 2002 in conjunction with the annual AESOP Congress. And, in May 2003, the Network met a second time in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, in conjunction with the bi-annual conference of ANPUR. From these two meetings and work during the intervening year, we have much to report.

We established four sub-committees and elected officers, have proposed a Charter, and agreed to By-laws for our coordinating Committee. We have a website, a Global Prize Papers book series project and are organizing a series of meetings bringing association personnel with similar responsibilities together. We coordinate with the Steering Committee for the second World Planning Schools Congress to be held in 2006.

GPEAN founding member associations are: Asian Planning Schools Association (APSA), Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS), Association of Canadian University Planning Programs (ACUPP), Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning [USA](ACSP), Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP), Association for the Development of Planning Education and Research (APERAU), Association of Latin-American Schools of Urbanism and Planning (ALEUP), Australian and New Zealand Association of Planning Schools (ANZAPS), and National Association of Urban and Regional Post-graduate and Research Programs [Brazil](ANPUR).



African planning schools had been represented in Shanghai by two scholars who were part of an effort among three schools to get an association started. This association was born as AAPS in December 2002 by agreement among thirteen schools from across sub-Saharan Africa and they have now added a fourteenth member.

They are working toward a first conference planned for Johannesburg in May 2004. Interested persons might contact AAPS through GPEAN delegate Vanessa WATSON at the University of Capetown ([watson@ebe.uct.ac.za](mailto:watson@ebe.uct.ac.za)). The (Indonesian) Association of Schools of Planning had participated

in the Shanghai meeting but subsequently did not ratify membership in GPEAN. In Volos, we agreed to twin aims of facilitating international cross-fertilization among planning educators and supporting and developing national and supra-national associations of planning schools. We began with a tentative structure, establishing sub-committees on Technology (chaired by WU Zhiqiang of APSA), Publications (chaired by Watson of AAPS), Finance (chaired by Stiffel of ACSP) and Structure (chaired by Tom Harper of ACUPP), and electing a chair (Stiffel of ACSP), co-chair (Basil Dimitrou of AESOP), and secretary (Angus Witherby of ANZAPS). A website was begun at Tongji University with Wu of APSA as webmaster: [www.gpean.org](http://www.gpean.org).



In the months following Volos, the sub-committees pursued their charges so that by the time we met in Belo Horizonte we were able to take concrete action in a number of areas.

The Technology Sub-committee developed explicit guidelines for website operation and in Belo we adopted a Memorandum of Agreement between GPEAN and Tongji University governing the operation of the GPEAN website. This MOA calls for, among other things, staged development of the website using non-proprietary software, effective access by persons using older computers and slow connection speeds, and offering of listserv capabilities to planning school associations and interest groups that do not have such capabilities elsewhere.

The Publications Sub-committee developed an agreement with the publishing house of Taylor and Francis in London under which at least two volumes will be published in English featuring prize papers selected by the nine planning school associations. Translations to other languages are being pursued as well. The intent is to make examples of fine planning scholarship from the different regions of the world available to others who may not otherwise have access to them, in the hope of encouraging expanded scholarly horizons. The editorial board of this book series has been named, with Stiffel (ACSP) and Watson (AAPS) as co-editors, and the first volume is scheduled for release in summer 2004. ACSP and AESOP have agreed to provide copies of the first volume to their Member schools.

The Finance Sub-committee sought funds to underwrite the Belo meetings and has prepared a strategy for seeking US\$500,000 from national and international agencies and foundations to support the second WPSC and the various ongoing GPEAN activities through 2006.

The Structure Sub-committee drafted a GPEAN Charter and By-laws for the GPEAN Coordinating Committee. A modification of this Charter was formally proposed by the Coordinating Committee in Belo and has been transmitted to the nine associations for ratification by the end of 2003. Under the By-laws, adopted in Belo, the Coordinating Committee has three standing sub-

## GPEAN Contd ...

committees: Communications, Finance and Publications, and four officers: Chair, Co-chair, Secretary and Treasurer. Elections to fill these four offices are underway with the expectation of results being announced at the Leuven meetings this summer.

Two meetings are planned for Leuven as a result of GPEAN initiative. Michael Hibbard of ACSP has organized a meeting of journal editors from planning journals worldwide, and Wim Wiewel of ACSP and Alesandro Balducci of AESOP will host a meeting of planning school association presidents. Similarly, it is hoped that other meetings at places and times yet to be determined will bring together association curriculum/accreditation officers, conference chairs, and secretaries/treasurers. The Coordinating Committee is also asking the various associations to schedule conference roundtables that will discuss the advisability and nature of international curricular recognition or curriculum development assistance. The hope is that these roundtables might help GPEAN discuss whether and how it might respond to international interests in degree program credentialing. The next meeting of the GPEAN Coordinating Committee will take place in Portland in October 2004 in conjunction with the ACSP Conference.

As I look back on the first World Congress and the birth of GPEAN, I believe we have crossed a threshold in the globalization of the planning schools movement. Planning scholarship and planning education have been weaker because of the relative isolation of the various national corps of planning educators. Cooperation across national boundaries has the potential to make us much stronger.

As a relatively small profession, it has been difficult for us to have rich debates about our scholarship—debates informed by a variety of perspectives and many active research projects. Communication across borders is increasing the size of the groups of investigators who are aware of each others work, resulting in more robust debates.

As a profession with widely disparate traditions and broad interdisciplinary connections, we have significant differences across national boundaries. International comparisons force us to re-evaluate our national decisions about structure and nature of our discipline and to understand better why we choose to do what we do, the way we do it.

As a profession entangled with national legal and institutional structures, our scholarship has often lacked variation in key variables. Communication across national boundaries has the potential to increase variation in our scholarship and to therefore reduce the level of assumption which we must use in our work.

Finally, given the extent of difficulty planning schools often have explaining their purposes and justifying their cost structures within their universities, the growth of international cooperation has allowed us to gain new ideas about how to effectively represent our accomplishments and our purposes to our own institutional leaders.

## 2006 World Congress Preparations

Jo Looye, ACSP Delegate to the WPSC'06 Steering Committee

At the same time the Coordinating Committee has been meeting to establish a constitution for the nine participating organizations in the GPEAN, the Steering Committee for the World Planning Schools Congress 2006 (WPSC'06) has been organizing itself for the second world congress. The group met for the first time at the 2002 AESOP meeting in Volos, to discuss principles of conference structure and organization, develop a call for proposals and criteria for site selection, and to elect steering committee leadership.

The formal call was distributed by e-mail and paper in fall 2002 and the committee has been "meeting" via e-mail since then to conduct its business. The next formal meeting will be held in Leuven, Belgium, during the joint ACSP-AESOP conference in July 2003.

### Committee members and leadership:

Louis Albrechts, Chair, AESOP, Association of European Schools of Planning

Johanna Looye, Co-chair, ACSP, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning [USA]

WU Zhiqiang, Co-chair, APSA, Asian Planning Schools Association  
Sergio Flores, ALEUP, Association of Latin-American Schools of Urbanism and Planning

Michael Gunder, ANZAPS, Australian and New Zealand Association of Planning Schools

Tom Harper, ACUPP, Association of Canadian University Planning Programs

Alain Motte, APERAU, Association for the Development of Planning Education and Research

Tumsifu Nnkya, AAPS, Association of African Planning Schools

Carlos Vainer, ANPUR, National Association of Urban and Regional Post-graduate and Research Programs [Brazil]

---

I don't believe these assertions will be new to GPEIG members; they lay behind much of the international scholarship that individual planning educators have undertaken for decades and the exchange programs that many of our universities have in place. But, the fact that our planning school associations are collectively building institutional devices for encouraging and increasing global cooperation is new and it has the potential to magnify the vigor and impact of international learning among planning educators.

These steps are not taken with ease. The various associations are as different in outlook and resources and the cultures they represent. Centuries of dependency leave us with no shortage of concerns about exportation of hegemonic views. But, the early experience of GPEAN cooperation suggests that these fears need not dominate our interactions. The spirit of GPEAN's development has been one of cooperation and sensitivity. We have moved slowly in recognition of the need to respect the different views, different decision cultures and different resources of the various associations. We have undertaken only that which is in harmony with the needs of ALL the associations. We have consciously adopted the principles of exchange, believing we each have things to learn from each other. These have been solid first steps.

## Enabling Comprehensive Regional Planning in the San Diego-Tijuana Global City-Region

On May 29, 2003, the Regional Workbench Consortium (RWBC) held its first EXPO at UC San Diego. Among the 188 participants, three members of our ACSP Global Planning Educators Interest Group (GPEIG) participated (Keith Pezzoli, Teresa Vasquez, and Clara Irazabal). The RWBC is a collaborative network of university and community-based partners. Our mission is to "Create innovative research-learning collaboratives, planning support systems, and integrated educational tools to enable sustainable city-region development"

<<http://regionalworkbench.org/mission.php>>. We promote multidisciplinary research and service learning aimed at understanding how problems of environment and development interrelate across local, regional and global scales. Taking a forward-looking perspective, the RWBC focuses on the Southern California-Northern Baja California transborder region - especially the San Diego-Tijuana city-region and coastal zone. The May 29 RWBC EXPO included an opening plenary, four 60-minute information and visualization technology DEMOS, lunch and a closing reception. UCSD's Urban Studies and Planning Program, Superfund Basic Research Program, and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) provided the bulk of funding. The International Community Foundation, and the San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation also contributed funds to make the event a success.



A broad spectrum of participants including academic (88 people), government (34 people), community-based/non-profit (29 people), and industrial/private sector representatives (37 people) attended the RWBC's May 29 roll out. This kind of broad-based participation is essential to the task of enabling integrated regional planning in fragmented cross-border metropolitan areas. But there are many obstacles.

A full report describing the May 29 roll out is on the RWBC's Web site at:

<http://regionalworkbench.org/expo/expo2003.php>

The intent is to make the RWBC's tools available to those engaged in crossborder and international regional planning. To learn more about what we are working on, please visit these pages on the RWBC Web site:

1. The RWBC Projects page

[http://regionalworkbench.org/databank/rwbc\\_search.php?page=viewall](http://regionalworkbench.org/databank/rwbc_search.php?page=viewall)

This page includes a link to our award winning "Colonia 10 de Mayo" documentary: a brief Web-based, interactive, bilingual multimedia narrative describing a community development project in Tijuana, Mexico.

2. Linking the RWBC to our nascent global network of planning schools (regional associations) around the world:

[http://www.regionalworkbench.org/html/wr\\_planning.htm](http://www.regionalworkbench.org/html/wr_planning.htm)

## Center for International Policy, Planning, and Development

Center for International Policy, Planning, and Development (CIPPAD) was established in October 2001 under aegis of the School of Policy, Planning, and Development (SPPD) at University of Southern California (USC). CIPPAD's goal is to broaden and deepen USC's contributions to social, economic, and political advancement of societies in developing and transitional countries by directing multilateral and bilateral resources to these countries and working collaboratively with government agencies, universities, for-profit and non-profit organizations throughout the world. The Center is directed by Koichi Mera, who worked as an economist and a regional development advisor at the World Bank, and has directed several projects for JICA and bilateral agencies.

CIPPAD has an extensive institutional record of projects relating to Indonesia. Between January 2000 and March 2002, the Center provided technical assistance to 22 local governments in Indonesia through the Capacity Building for Decentralization in Indonesia (CBDI) Project. This \$1.25 Million project was designed to assist the Government of Indonesia in implementing legislations for government decentralization by strengthening the capacity of local governments to undertake their enlarged responsibilities. The project was financially supported by the Partnership for Economic Growth (PEG) program of United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

CIPPAD currently undertakes two other projects related to Indonesia, namely *US- Indonesia Conflict Resolution Exchange (US-INDO CRX) Program* and *the Access Indonesia project*. The former project is sponsored by United States Department of State, and is designed to promote exchange between local government officials in

## Field Studies

**Patricia A. Wilson**, Professor of Planning at the University of Texas, initiated collaboration with the Manadovaya Institute of Participatory Development in Lucknow, U.P, India. In March 2003, she and some of her graduate students in international planning and participation attended Manadovaya's three-week training program in participatory village development for international students and development practitioners. The training emphasizes the role of values and women's empowerment, and involves fieldwork in some of the 150 villages where Manadovaya is active.

**Dave Johnson**, retired from U of Tennessee, was lead faculty for the International Honors Program on Cities and Globalization in Spring 2002. With 31 undergraduates from colleges across the country instruction was carried out for a full semester in India, South Africa and Brazil. Dave will continue to be associated with the IHP program on Cities in 2004. The program is affiliated with Boston University and is open to undergraduates with interests in international development, globalization and cities. For more information go to <http://world.std.com/~ihp/home.html>

### CapAsia III

CapAsia is a south Asia-based field study offered by Ball State University. Taking a more "subaltern" approach, as opposed to the dominant developmentalist view which assumes that the "Third World" is following "our" lead, we know what they should do to get where we are, and we can help them. The study is driven by the question why they build (develop urban environments) the way they build in south Asia and what can we learn from them? The students visit the marvels of Western imagination built in south Asia such as New Delhi and Chandigarh. Yet, they are kept aware of the fact that south Asia might be able to help us achieve our own goals. Many goals that the American society is striving to achieve such as sustainability and many traits that most contemporary societies are losing (e.g., community, integrated land-uses and activities, and self-reliance) may be operating --in their own way-- in south Asia, albeit within a continuously Westernizing and Americanizing environment. Along with learning about south Asia, the participants are expected to profoundly enhance their critical and creative thinking capability and, by reflection, learn about their own cultures, environments, and their larger global context.

Web: <http://web.bsu.edu/perera/capasia/>



## Center for International Policy (continued)

the United States and Indonesia on use of arbitration and reconciliation techniques for enhancing Indonesian local government agencies' capacity to mitigate conflicts. The latter project is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and its main purpose is to foster a fuller interdisciplinary understanding of Indonesia by using recent advances in Internet technology (e.g. Web-GIS, Multimedia).

In addition to these projects, the Center hosts periodic seminars and workshops on international development, and awards financial assistance for Ph.D. students at USC conducting their fieldwork outside the United States. CIPPAD also publishes online working papers and produces "World Development Maps". By using interactive web-GIS technologies, these maps show selected statistical data provided by international agencies (e.g. World Bank, World Health Organization, United Nations).

CIPPAD's website: <http://cippad.usc.edu>.

In spring 2003, 16 CapAsia III participants visited India, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Malaysia. They began their intellectual journey at the *City One*, a multi-disciplinary conference participated by leading scholars on the south Asian city. The undergraduates worked with the School of Planning and Architecture (SPA), Delhi, preparing a development plan for the southern Indian city of Pondicherry.

The graduates got involved in three of the National Institute of Urban Affairs' (NIUA) self-built-community upgrading projects in New Delhi. The main purpose was to expose the students to the innovative community building tools developed by the NIUA and to investigate the potential of its Community-Based information System (CBIS) for both the community and the city. They undertook a "building to learn" project in Sri Lanka and visited development projects and planning agencies in Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, and Sri Lanka.

The graduates learned about the mismatch between formal social structures and the daily practices of the people and between city plans and the spatial organization of self-built neighborhoods. Their project also resulted in a community receiving water to one community. More than learning to plan, however, the students learned about society and space in India and how to interact with people of another culture through planning. As much as they learned about south Asia, the students also learned about themselves and their own communities.

## Member Publications

### Alnoor Ebrahim

1. *NGOs and Organizational Change: Discourse, Reporting and Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
2. "Accountability in Practice: Mechanisms for NGOs" *World Development* 31, 5 (2003): 813-829

### Gill-Chin Lim.

1. *Strategy for A Global University: Model International Department Experiment (MIDE)*, 2nd Edition. (ed.), (International Studies and Programs, Michigan State University, 2003).
2. *Nutritional Problems in North Korea: Current Situation and Policy Alternatives* (eds. with N. S. Chang) (Oruem Publishing House, 2003).

### Nihal Perera

1. "Feminizing the City: Gender and Space in Colonial Colombo," chapter in *Trans-Status Subjects: Genders in the Globalization of South and Southeast Asia*, eds., Sonita Sarker and Esha Niyogi De: 67-87 (Duke University Press, Sage, 2002).
2. "Indigenising the Colonial City: Late 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Colombo and Its Landscape" *Urban Studies: Special Issue on Contested Landscapes, Asian Cities*, eds., Lily Kong and Lisa Law, 39, 9 (2002): 1703-21.

---

Concerned Architects and Planners, UCLA, "Ecological Effects of the Vietnam War" *AIP Journal* (September 1972): 297-307

Tariq Ali, 'Recolonizing Iraq', *New Left Review* 21 (May-June 2003)

Terry Eagleton, "History Gets the Last Laugh: Capitalists were triumphant when they saw off socialism. But will they live to regret it?" *The Guardian*, (Saturday May 18, 2002 (Comment))

Ian Roberts, "CAR WARS" *The Guardian* (Saturday January 18, 2003

Arundhati Roy, "Mesopotamia. Babylon. The Tigris and Euphrates," *The Guardian* (Wednesday April 2, 2003)

Edward Said, "Thoughts about America" (warns against the return to a shameful episode in the US's intellectual history) *Al-Ahram Weekly* (28 Feb. - 6 March 2002)

### Films on War:

**Apocalypse Now**, (Redux) Dir. Francis Ford Coppola, 1979 (Redux 2001). 3h 23m

**Dr Strangelove, Or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb** Dir. Stanley Kubrick, 1964. 1h 33m

**Three Kings**, Dir. David O'Russell, 1999. 1h 54m

**Black Hawk Down**, Dir. Ridley Scott, 2001. 2h 24m

**Wag the Dog**, Dir. Barry Levinson, 1997. 1h 37m  
(Source: PUKAR)

## Planning at the Time of War

Kanishka Goonewardena

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO | KANISHKA@GEOG.UTORONTO.CA

What's urban planning and theory got to do with the latest war on Iraq? More than one would have first thought, it seems. According to its proponents, the war is about human rights and democracy for Iraq—as well as peace and security for the US and its obedient allies—all of which are to be achieved by forcibly removing the evil dictator Saddam Hussein from power. Iraqis will be certainly better off without him, yes; and progressive planners advocating for democracy and human rights through whatever work they do may well be inclined to lend their principled support to the well-advertised humanitarian aims of this putatively pre-emptive strike.

Yet, the moral case for war rings hollow. For the historical record of US imperialism that now sports the feather of the 'international community' in its cap—and goes by the euphemisms of globalization and neoliberalism in our academic discourse—leaves no room for the official claims for war to be taken at face value. If we are to trust that human rights and democracy (however defined) have always been the global goals of the US, then it becomes impossible to make sense of its overt and covert support for all manner of brutal dictatorships over the years, especially in the Muslim world; not least in the case of Suharto's in Indonesia, which murdered many more of its own citizens than did Hussein's in Iraq, with ample backing from the CIA. Nor can we understand, if we are to believe that recent US administrations have represented the will of the 'international community', even in the limited expression of the UN, then why the US (and its loyal and momentarily disloyal allies) turned a blind eye to all those violations of UN Security Council resolutions by Israel, while acknowledging its formidable nuclear arsenal and weapons of mass destruction with a knowing wink. Not to mention former support for Hussein himself, which Mr. Rumsfeld knows well. The clear pattern that emerges from the history of US foreign policy veiled by human rights and democracy reveals not humanitarian values, but increasingly naked and arrogant self-interest. If there is any morality in it, it consists of the decisive rejection of Platonic Right is Might by Nietzschean Might is Right.

Washington's Faustian bid for world dominance now involves the globalization of a 'free market' that is anything but free—a global economy quite literally rigged in favour of the US über alles, by any means necessary, including the IMF, the World Bank and the Military Industrial Complex. The thirst for oil, no doubt, springs from the same master plan. The vital part played in it by urban planners and theorists who have long promoted neoliberal ideology and provided legitimacy to auto-dependent forms of urban sprawl, as thousands who had to *drive* to anti-war rallies in the US would have noted, has aligned planning with US imperialism. Against this unholy alliance, the progressives among us must heed the advice given to American activists by the leader of the Brazilian landless peasants' movement, João Pedro Stedile, upon being asked how they could be of help in the South: 'overthrow your neoliberal governments'! In the name of human rights and democracy, a *radical* regime change is needed indeed—in Washington.

Introduction to the INURA (INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF URBAN RESEARCH AND ACTION) Panel on Urban Theory/Berlin Revisited, 99<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL AAG CONFERENCE, New Orleans, 8 March 2003