

SEEKING SPATIAL JUSTICE

Edward W. Soja

Globalization and Community Series



University of Minnesota Press
Minneapolis
London

Globalization and Community Series
Susan Clarke and Gary Gaile, Series Editors
Dennis R. Judd, Founding Editor

Copyright 2010 by Edward W. Soja

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Published by the University of Minnesota Press
111 Third Avenue South, Suite 290
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2520
<http://www.upress.umn.edu>

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Soja, Edward W.

Seeking spatial justice / Edward W. Soja.

p. cm. — (Globalization and community series 16)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8166-6667-6 (hc : alk. paper) —

ISBN 978-0-8166-6668-3 (pb : alk. paper)

1. Social justice. 2. Justice, Administration of. 3. Space perception.

4. Geographical perception. I. Title.

HM671.S675 2010

304.2'3—dc22

2009049955

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

The University of Minnesota is an equal-opportunity educator and employer.

20 19 18 17

10 9 8 7 6 5 4

Contents

Prologue vii

Introduction 1

1. Why Spatial? Why Justice? Why L.A.? Why Now?	13
2. On the Production of Unjust Geographies	31
3. Building a Spatial Theory of Justice	67
4. Seeking Spatial Justice in Los Angeles	111
5. Translating Theory into Practice: Urban Planning at UCLA	157
6. Seeking Spatial Justice after 9/11: Continuities and Conclusions	179

Acknowledgments 201

Notes and References 203

Index 249

and scholar activism, producing relevant public geographies, locating the boundaries of the geographies of justice, working with and researching social movements, and mapping the future of radical/critical geographies.

The second initiative is exemplified by a working paper by the geographer Heidi Nast, "Statement of Procedure in Developing a Certificate Program in International Spatial Justice and GIS," part of a series sponsored by the People's Geography Project based at Syracuse University and directed by Don Mitchell, author of *Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space* (2003) and journal articles on the geography of injustice and scales of justice. While these activities relate closely to the concept of spatial justice as defined here, the seemingly determined avoidance of the specific term by many radical geographers, especially those influenced by the writings of David Harvey, is significant, as I will explain further in chapter 3.

Clearly, the concept of spatial justice has entered the contemporary agenda in a variety of areas. At the same time, a cluster of associated and overlapping concepts and discourses has also emerged. Some, like the ideas about the right to the city, add significantly to the evolving definition of spatial justice, while others, such as the "just city" discourse, tend to draw attention away from the core arguments about the innovative possibilities that arise from applying an assertive and explicit spatial perspective. I will continue to address at least some of these alternatives to the specific notion of spatial justice in chapter 3. I turn next to the many different ways unjust geographies are produced and reproduced.

On the Production of Unjust Geographies

AS BOTH OUTCOME AND PROCESS, seeking spatial justice can be studied at multiple scales and in many different social contexts. Stretching the concept to its maximum scope, we can speak of unjust geographies involving the human body, as in debates about abortion, obesity, stem cell research, the transplantation of body parts, sexual practices, or the external manipulation of individual behavior. At the other extreme, the physical geography of the planet is filled with spatially defined environmental injustices, some of which are now being aggravated by the uneven geographical impact of socially produced climate change and global warming. These two extremes, the corporeal body and the physical planet, usefully define the outer limits of the concept of spatial (in)justice and the struggles over geography but will not be discussed any further here.

Instead, we look next at how consequential geographies are produced in the spaces in between these outer limits, ranging in scale from what Michel Foucault once called the "little tactics of the habitat" to the regional, national, and global expressions of geographically uneven development. Focusing in on specific examples of where and how (in)justice takes place helps to ground the search for spatial justice in socially produced contexts rather than letting it float in idealized abstractions and too easily deflected calls for universal human rights or radical revolution.

Of particular importance here is the urban context and condition. Given that the majority of the world's population now lives in cities, contextualizing spatial (in)justice becomes to a significant degree a matter of locating it in the specific conditions of urban life and in the collective struggles to achieve more equitable access of all residents to the social resources and advantages that the city provides. As noted in the introduction, however, the specifically urban condition and the justice/injustice associated with it are not confined to or by a particular territorial scale. Urban life is nested within many different geographical contexts above and below the administrative space of the city itself.

This gives to the search for spatial justice a regional, national, and global dimension as well as a localized and more immediate and intimate expression. This *multiscalar view of the city* is not a familiar one but is key to understanding the scope and interpretive power of a critical spatial perspective and pivotal in the development of a spatial theory of justice and injustice. In this chapter, I explore the conceptual and empirical scope of the spatiality of (in)justice by selecting pertinent examples of the diverse ways unjust geographies are produced, reproduced, and responded to at three different but overlapping arenas of social action, roughly definable as exogenous or top-down, endogenous or bottom-up, and mesogeographical or regional, conceived as the in-between spaces where the macro and the micro, the global and the local, converge. The intent is not to present extensive details on the specific topics mentioned but to use them to illustrate the multifaceted nature of the struggles over geography and to exemplify the range of contexts that can be explored from a spatial justice perspective.

Exogenous Geographies and the Political Organization of Space

Viewed from above, every place on earth is blanketed with thick layers of macrospatial organization arising not just from administrative convenience but also from the imposition of political power, cultural domination, and social control over individuals, groups, and the places they inhabit. These exogenously generated geographies range in scale from the global divisions of power associated with what we have called First, Second, and Third Worlds, to the internal governmental structures that have evolved within sovereign nation-states, to the dense web of state-created

political and administrative districts and boundaries that impinge on practically every daily activity wherever one is located. At every scale, these superimposed or exogenous geographies of power define and contextualize particular geographies of (in)justice.

The Banlieues of Paris

Building on his conceptual discussion of spatial justice in "Justice and the Spatial Imagination," Mustafa Dikec has focused his empirical and interpretive work on the spatial injustices implicitly embedded in the immigrant-impacted *banlieues* surrounding Paris. These dense inner suburbs have been the sites of major urban uprisings, the most explosive of which took place in autumn 2005. In his book he calls these sites of contextualized immigrant struggles and urban insurgency the "badlands of the republic" (2007a). These real and imagined badlands provide a revealing first look at the many material and symbolic framings—the taking place—of what Dikec has called the spatiality of injustice and the injustice of spatiality.

The term *banlieue* is temptingly translatable in a literal sense as "banned place" but actually derives from the ancient notion of the bann. Surviving today almost entirely in church-announced banns of matrimony, banns in medieval times were pronouncements often placed at the entrance to the city telling newcomers what proper "civilized" or "urbane" life was about. Banns were boundary markers of urban civilization and ranged in subject matter from how to dispose of refuse to what were an urban dweller's political rights. In more recent times, however, the *banlieues* came to refer to the inner suburbs that ringed the outer edge of the city, often where city walls were formerly located. To some degree, they continue to mark the edge of specifically urban culture.

The *banlieues* surrounding Paris have had a particularly interesting geo-history. For the most part, they formed a densely settled and largely high-rise ring of inner suburbs after World War II, when the majority of the Parisian working class moved out of the central city. Observers have argued that this was largely part of a process of fragmenting working-class political control in the central city and making central Paris more amenable to the local middle classes and to global tourism. This "cleansing" or "decanting" of the working class from the Parisian urban core was in many ways as dramatic a spatial transformation as that induced

by the nineteenth-century strategic boulevards designed by Baron Haussmann, overtly for efficiency of movement but with the additional effect of creating improved spatial systems of social control, especially over the poor populations of the city.

Postwar economic development and further efforts at urban spatial restructuring led to major changes in the *banlieues*. As the prospering French domestic population moved farther out to expanding middle-class suburbs, they were replaced in the worst left-behind high-rise housing by immigrants and ex-colonial citizens, creating a volatile geography of increasing economic exclusion, public neglect, and cultural and political polarization. As these changes were taking place, the increasingly unjust urban geography of Paris exploded with unrest. The riots and demonstrations of May 1968 began in Nanterre, one of the rapidly changing inner suburbs located near the imposing new business node of La Defense.

These deteriorating conditions were aggravated by French urban policies both before and after 1968. While superficially filled with what seemed to be democratic ideals and principles, including lip service to Lefebvre's notion of *le droit à la ville*, the right to the city, they were actually constrained by persistent republican values that refused to recognize differences in the socioeconomic and spatial configuration of the city, seeing everyone as equal under French law, *le droit*. In an exaggerated sense, there were no minorities and majorities, immigrants and native born, rich and poor. Promoting the right to the city in French urban policy became little more than a matter of police- and state-maintained security, what in the United States would be called "law and order."

From this deeply rooted cultural and ideological perspective, it was improper to discriminate negatively or positively based on race, class, or location in space. As a result, the problems of geographically concentrated poverty, unemployment, and social exclusion were made virtually invisible or at least very difficult to address directly in public policy, thereby contributing to the increasingly volatile conditions. The eventual irruption of violence in 2005 and continuing unrest in Paris and other large French cities, expressing what Dikec describes as insurgent citizenship and unarticulated justice movements, brought to the surface these underlying problems of spatial injustice.

Such episodes of explosive urban unrest are often moments when the deprivation and injustices that are buried under normalized or taken-for-granted geographies burst to the surface and into the public eye, exposing deep structures of privilege based on race, class, gender, and other forms of social discrimination and oppression. A long list of such revelatory moments can be identified for Paris alone, from the revolutionary storming of the Bastille in 1789 and the uprisings of 1848 to the Paris Commune in 1871, to the paradigmatic events of May 1968, to the immigrant insurgency of 2005.

The list can be extended to include many other cities as well. Particular attention will be given in later chapters, for example, to what are now being called the Justice Riots of 1992 in Los Angeles. This peak moment of urban unrest in U.S. history was one of the earliest examples of violent protests against the negative socio-spatial effects of neoliberal globalization and the New Economy of flexible capitalism. It was followed by a period of intensified surveillance and an accelerated retreat by those who could afford to move into more defensible spaces such as gated communities and high-security buildings. At the same time, however, it also stimulated grassroots coalition building and the translation into practice of specifically spatial theories of justice and injustice.

The problems associated with the tightly bounded immigrant populations in the *banlieues*—and the analogous badlands of all cities—vividly illustrate the relevant spatiality of urban injustice (as outcome) and the active infusion of injustices (as process) into the geography of the city by corporate interests and the local and national states. Seeking spatial justice was not explicitly referred to in mobilizing the Paris uprisings or organizing grassroots efforts in 2005, nor was there a conscious struggle over *le droit à la ville* as occurred in 1968. Although achieving spatial justice was not the primary motivating force, interpreting what happened through a critical spatial perspective and its wide-ranging geographical imagination adds significant insight and understanding to conventional commentaries. The specific case also opens up a wider exploration of other empirical expressions of the multiscalar search for spatial justice.

Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies

"None of us is completely free from the struggle over geography," writes the Palestinian cultural critic Edward Said, a struggle that he describes as

not just about expressions of military power but also about ideas, about our images and imaginings. Said's writings on culture and imperialism, the politics of dispossession, and the profound imprint of colonial and postcolonial geographies supply one of the richest sources for conceptualizing how spatial injustice is socially produced through the intrusive process of organizing specifically political geographies.

Among the leading cultural critics and postcolonial thinkers of the twentieth century, Said stands out for his exceptionally creative and insightful applications of a critical spatial perspective, weaving into his historical, anticolonial, and autobiographical narratives a brilliantly conceived and incisive geography. In exposing the "imaginative geographies" associated with Eurocentric orientalism, Said brings into focus the powerful spatial strategies of territorial dispossession, military occupation, cultural domination, economic exploitation, and reactive popular resistance that have permeated East-West relations and defined the colonial condition everywhere in the world. As he writes, "Imperialism and the culture associated with it affirm both the primacy of geography and an ideology about control of territory."

Said develops his concept of imaginative geographies drawing on Michel Foucault, who played a major role in the formation of Said's (and many other scholars') critical spatial imagination. Foucault's probing inquiries into the microgeographies of power and social control, both as a mode of dominating and governing political subjects and as a pathway for enabling and encouraging political resistance and action, inspired Said's personal, political, and explicitly spatial approach to analyzing the starkly ambivalent relations between the colonizer and the colonized. As Said argues, it is impossible to conceive of colonialism and imperialism without significant attention to the material forms and imaginative processes associated with the acquisition, subordination, and intrusive political organization of space. This holds true just as forcefully for the social production of (in)justice.

For Said, colonizing power and the imaginative geographies of Eurocentric orientalism, the cultural construction of the colonized "other" as subordinate and inferior beings, are expressed poetically and politically in defined and regulated spaces. These colonizing spaces of social control include the classroom, courthouse, prison, railway station, marketplace, hospital, boulevard, place of worship, even the private

household and home, practically every place used in everyday life. The spaces of social control extend on to a larger scale as well in geopolitical arrangements, the drawing of administrative boundaries, and the politics that arise over the location of public buildings and the allocation of land. The resulting real and imagined geographies, the material, symbolic, and hierarchically organized spaces of colonial occupation along with the processes that produce them, contextualize enclosure, exclusion, domination, disciplinary control.

Said's contributions expand on and explain how the political organization of space, through its material manifestations as well as representational imagery, produces oppressive and unjust geographies. Following Foucault and giving hope to the postcolonial condition, Said also recognizes that these unjust geographies of political power can also be enabling, creating the foundations for resistance and potential emancipation. It is important to remember this double-sidedness, how the spatiality of (in)justice can be both intensely oppressive and potentially liberating, as we move on to other examples.

Gerrymandering

A much more innocent but easier to grasp example of how the political organization of space produces and reproduces spatial (in)justice has to do with the drawing of boundaries defining electoral districts in a representative democracy. Electoral districts are socially constructed and easily manipulated spaces whose effects can range from fair and just to the highly discriminatory and unjust. The ideal solution to drawing fair and democratic boundaries would be a set of roughly equal-sized, compact, and contiguous districts that reflect the overall distribution and demographic makeup of the population and assure that every individual vote counts much the same as any other, the familiar one person-one vote principle. But when there is electoral competition, as there is likely to be in every democratic election, hierarchical differences in political power enter the picture to create distortions and deviations from the ideal condition, some of which will be expressed in purposeful manipulations of the political organization of space.

Perhaps the best-known example of such undemocratic distortions in the political organization of space is gerrymandering, illustrated in the well-known map of a congressional district signed into law by Elbridge

Gerry, governor of Massachusetts from 1810 to 1812. Designed to favor the Republican Party versus the Federalists, the district as depicted in a newspaper cartoon resembled a wriggling salamander-like (hence Gerry-mander) monster with a dragon's head and extended arms and legs. A series of Supreme Court decisions in 1842, 1962, and 1985 ruled that such spatial strategies of drawing electoral district boundaries were unconstitutional and unfair (unjust in our terms) when they favored one individual or one political party over another. This did not stop such maneuvering; it just became more sophisticated and deceptive, especially with the creation of computer programs capable of designing district geographies to maximize any purposeful (spatial) advantage.

Three microtechnologies of empowerment, to use a heavy Foucauldian phrase, have been identified—and used—in drawing spatially unjust congressional constituency boundaries. The excess vote, or “packing,” strategy concentrates the voting power of oppositional parties (or certain racial groups) in just a few districts. A wasted vote, or “cracking,” strategy dilutes the vote of the opposition by distributing it across all constituencies. Stacking the vote is still another form of gerrymandering, creating bizarrely shaped districts to favor one party or group over the other. All are unconstitutional and democratically unfair, but actual examples are constantly under examination in the courts, and perhaps will always continue to be, for the ideal solution may be impossible to reach. There will always be some degree of unfairness and injustice embedded in electoral geographies, and these injustices are usually intensified the more culturally and politically heterogeneous the voting population.

As is often the case in the political organization of space, there is a complicated double-sidedness to electoral geographies. Boundaries can be redrawn to serve both positive and negative purposes, giving greater or lesser representation to certain population groups on a kind of sliding scale of inequality. Sometimes positive and negative objectives are combined in a tenuous balance, making it even more difficult to decide whether the results are spatially just. Take, for example, the recent efforts of the state of Texas to allow the state legislature to redraw and gerrymander districts as often as they would like to favor one political party over another, as long as they maintain the equitable voting rights of racial and ethnic minorities. Although seemingly unconstitutional and undemocratic, the practice was upheld for the most part by the

conservative U.S. Supreme Court majority in June 2006 based primarily on the absence of increased racial and ethnic bias.

South African Apartheid

Standing at another extreme in the process of creating unjust geographies is apartheid, the system of spatial or territorial control associated with the formerly racist regime of the Republic of South Africa and now a symbolic reference to all forms of cultural domination and oppression arising from spatial strategies of segregation and boundary making. The story of apartheid revolves paradigmatically around struggles over geography. Through legislation, ideological rationalization, and violent political action, the political organization of space in South Africa was reshaped starting in 1948 into a hierarchy of territorially segregated and tightly bounded areas that persisted up to the remarkably peaceful breakdown of the system of domination in the mid-1990s.

Apartheid as it was expressed at the national level involved the creation of separate administrative regions for the dominant white elite, mostly in the best-developed areas, and the assignment of the majority African population to peripheral reservations, or “homelands,” which functioned economically as enclosed labor reserves. A finer grain of spatial discrimination at the local scale within white-controlled cities partitioned urban space down to the street level, displacing and spatially dispossessing long-established African, Coloured (mixed race), and Asian residents when deemed necessary for achieving racial-spatial purity. Ideologically rationalized as separate but equal, the South African “badlands,” to use Dikec’s term for the Parisian *banlieues*, rigidly confined daily life and urban, regional, and national politics in multiscale strait-jackets of spatial control.

The lasting effects of the apartheid system are vividly expressed in contemporary urban landscapes of the independent and African-led Republic of South Africa. In Johannesburg today, residential spaces in the wealthy and formerly entirely white suburbs, now sprinkled with a black elite, are still fortified with high walls and guarded entranceways running continuously block after block, street after street, like a massive agglomeration of residential citadels signaling obsessive protection against a perceived threat of invasion. At the opposite end of the economic spectrum, Soweto, a name derived from the exclusionary South West Township designed to contain the African population, lives on as a

displaced city-within-the city, marginalized yet central, suburban in some senses yet densely urbanized in others, creatively surviving in its poverty and isolation, both inside and outside Johannesburg. There is nothing quite like this polarized cityscape of fortified urban extremes in any other city I know, although nearly every major world city today has its growing citadel-ghetto metro-polarities.

This socially produced geography of institutionalized racial segregation that was apartheid pushed to an extraordinary level spatial strategies and processes that were commonly used in colonial situations as a means of population control and assuring disproportionate economic advantage for the colonizers versus the colonized. This was not only a matter of divide and rule in an abstract and theoretical sense, it was a sophisticated strategy specifically designed to produce beneficial geographies for the hegemonic few while creating spatial structures of disadvantage for the rest. Even the voracious demands of capitalism adjusted to this colonial geography, and powerful though they may have been, they were probably not the primary force shaping the spatiality of social life in South Africa and most other colonies as well.

The imposition of these powerful colonial geographies, rationalized through ideological variants of orientalism that dehumanized the colonial "other," was an integral part of what critical scholars called the development of "underdevelopment." Seen from a critical spatial perspective, underdevelopment processes actively involve the creation of discriminatory urban and regional built environments and a restrictive political organization of space that fix in place a persistent geography of dependent development, cultural domination, and efficient economic exploitation. This has been at the heart of the relations between the First World and the Third World, the core and the periphery, since the beginnings of colonialism. Even after independence, these concretely embedded and imaginatively maintained unjust geographies of underdevelopment and colonial control linger on as stubborn continuities, almost impossible to erase entirely, virtually defining what has come to be called the postcolonial condition.

Occupying Palestine

Colonial and postcolonial geographies of control and domination continue to be produced today, perhaps nowhere as vividly and deliberately

as in Israeli-occupied Palestine. Reflecting the volatile and violent current events in the wider region, the Arab-Israeli borderlands have become an unusually fertile and ideologically charged contemporary milieu for creative research on oppressive geographies and the production of spatial injustice. One of the best of these contemporary researchers is Eyal Weizman, an architect, designer, and critical spatial analyst. In *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation* (2007) and other writings, he shows how the Israeli military has literally and figuratively penetrated into the built environment, bulldozing "overground tunnels" into the existing walls and through the living rooms of Palestinian homes and settlements while at the same time building new walls and barricades to keep people apart, what Yiftachel and Yacobi (2005) call "creeping apartheid."

Demonstrating that this battle over space and territory is not just about soldiers and guns but also about ideas and imagery, Weizman has filmed Israeli military officers at their leisure discussing the latest philosophical writings of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, as well as other specialists in urban and spatial theory, including Edward Said, to enhance their ultrasophisticated and technologically advanced strategies of social and spatial control in territories that are nominally Palestinian. Disturbingly obvious here is the realization that spatial theories and spatial strategies can be used both to reinforce oppression and control as well as to stimulate resistance and enhance the search for spatial justice.

Observing these spatial tactics and strategies makes one realize that the occupied territories would essentially remain under the control of the Israeli military even with the creation of an independent Palestinian state. Almost invisible microgeographies of power, surveillance, and control, as well as the intentionally overt construction of barrier walls and guarded settlements, infuse the spaces in and around the state of Israel with an array of multilayered injustices more subtle and sophisticated in their colonizing effect and spatially organized system of control than ever achieved by apartheid. One lesson is clear: once spatial injustice is inscribed into the built environment, it is difficult to erase.

These borderlands strategies and their spatially unjust effects echo around the world wherever boundaries separate contrasting and/or combative cultures and nation-states. An especially cruel and violent example has emerged in recent years along the fluid boundary between the United

States and Mexico, where drug cartels have carved out "plazas" of territorial control and superhighway-like corridors in and under the twinned border cities to channel the flow of drugs. Here the insidious geography is maintained through the murder of thousands of individuals connected either to public authorities or to the cartels themselves.

As with all these inflections of what Michel Foucault described as the intersection of space, knowledge, and power, it is important to remember that the inscription of oppressive geographies can also create potential spaces of resistance and enablement, as occurred in the unexpectedly nonviolent struggles against South African apartheid. And it is equally important to recognize that opening up these spaces of hope hinges on the development of a critical spatial consciousness as a motivating and mobilizing political force. Without such spatial awareness, the creation and maintenance of unfair geographies are likely to remain invisible and unchallenged.

Security-Obsessed Urbanism

The findings of such spatially informed scholars as Said, Dikec, and Weizman can be extended into many other contemporary debates, especially with regard to the geographies of political control and the relations of power embedded in the political organization of the restructured modern metropolis. Particularly noteworthy is the rampant expansion of what Mike Davis in *City of Quartz* (1990) described as security-obsessed urbanism, a defensive fortressing of urban life and urban space built on a psychogeography (he calls it an ecology) of fear and aimed at protecting residents and property against real or imagined threats of invasion.

The rich have always lived behind protective walls of various kinds, physical as well as institutional and psychological. However, over the past thirty years and in many ways linked to the uneven effects of globalization and economic restructuring, fortressing the urban and suburban built environments has spread almost everywhere. Not only are residences becoming increasingly gated, guarded, and wrapped in advanced security, surveillance, and alarm systems, so too are many other activities, land uses, and everyday objects in the urban environment, from shopping malls and libraries to razor-wire protected refuse bins and spiked park benches designed to stave off incursions of the homeless and hungry.

Microtechnologies of social and spatial control infest everyday life and pile up to produce a tightly meshed and prisonlike geography punctuated by protective enclosures and overseen by ubiquitous watchful eyes.

The best known of these defensive enclosures is the gated community, a fortified housing compound often protected by armed guards and various visible and invisible indications that trespassers will be shot. These security-obsessed islands can be found in many cities around the world but have become especially numerous in the United States. Some of the earliest gated communities were established on the Palos Verdes peninsula south of Los Angeles, where today whole municipalities exist comprised entirely of these insulated enclosures. Are these gated communities spatially unjust? Or are they extreme expressions of democratic individualism and freedom of choice? Perhaps the main problems arise from answering yes to both questions.

The gated and guarded community, however, is only the tip of a much larger iceberg of change in the political geography of the city, at least in the United States. Driven both by fear and voluntary preference, growing numbers of people, predominantly from the upper quintile of the income ladder (called by some the fortunate fifth), are in many ways withdrawing from urban public life and civil society to live in insular "privatopias," as the political scientist Evan Mackenzie called them in his 1994 book. This trend has created a growing number of privatized residential governments embedded in and often disconnected from the larger public realm. This centrifugal movement away from the city and urban responsibilities is very different from the back-to-the-city movement and the so-called gentrification process in its lack of commitment to urban living.

What we are seeing in all these pervasive and privatizing reconfigurations of urban life is another form of spatial colonization, less overtly dominated by the state but not entirely different from the blunt institutional expressions of territorial power associated with apartheid or the more technologically advanced spatial tactics of the Israeli military in controlling occupied Palestine. Fear of potential invasion and violence by what the more powerful perceive as threatening "others" drives all these processes of spatial control. This almost endemic and security-obsessed sense of fear has been reaching a fever pitch over the past thirty years of profound urban restructuring, hastening the fortressing of urban space and the drenching of the city with surveillance cameras.

The globalization of capital, labor, and culture, along with the formation of a New Economy and the accompanying explosion of transnational and intranational migration flows, has resulted in the concentration of the richest and the poorest populations of the world in around five hundred megacity regions of more than one million inhabitants. Although it is again impossible to prove conclusively, it is probably safe to say that those city regions with the largest concentrations of the urban poor, especially when they differ in culture and ethnicity from domestic populations, are where security-obsessed urbanism and its associated carceral geography are most advanced. In this sense, the more localized "City of Quartz" described by Mike Davis looking at Los Angeles has exploded globally into his more recent depiction of a "planet of slums" (2007). This deepening chasm between the rich and poor populations of the world is perhaps the most emphatic life-threatening expression of spatial injustice at a global scale.

Public Space and Private Property

Hidden behind the florid materiality of gated communities and privatopias is a more intricate web of spatial injustice deeply rooted in the naturalized sanctification of property rights and privileges. Every square inch of space in every market-based economy has been commodified and commercialized into parcels of valued land that are owned by individuals, corporations (usually considered as individuals under the law), or by the state (considered to be representative of the public at large). Direct social or collective ownership of land or common spaces has almost disappeared as the three-sided ownership model (individual/family, corporate, and state/institutional) has been accepted virtually without question, even when it leads to and sustains the production and reproduction of profound injustices.

This property blanket is the underlayer of a thick sedimentation of bounded spaces that powerfully shape our everyday life. Above (and below) each of us is a stratification of almost innumerable and virtually invisible spatial authorities. Decades ago, it was noted that looking out from the top of the Empire State Building in New York City one could see, if boundaries were visible, more than 1,500 governments. If we could see further into the thick layers of spatial regulation that enmesh us, the numbers would zoom even higher, boggling our geographical

imaginings. Every movement we make crosses some boundary whether we are aware of it or not. Understanding how unfair geographies are formed requires some attention to this underlying blanket of property rights.

The property ownership model upon which American and other capitalist societies have been built originated thousands of years ago in the ancient city-states, was filtered through feudalism, and constituted anew in the aftermath of the American and French revolutions as integral to emerging notions of liberal democracy aimed at combating the influential effects of more radical socialist thought. What became legitimized if not sanctified in this later process was the inalienable right to own property as the central principle in defining the capitalist nation-state, its system of laws, and its revised definition of citizenship. Human rights in general and such specific claims as the right to the city become subordinated to the primacy of rights to property. As a result, a finely grained netting of recorded but usually invisible boundaries was thrown over the earth's surface, creating a perpetual tension between private and public ownership and between private and public space that is played out in everyday life all over the world.

For some the essential starting point in the search for spatial justice is the vigilant defense of public space against the forces of commodification, privatization, and state interference. It is widely contended that public space has been rapidly eroding in contemporary cities, as neo-liberal policies of deregulation remove the microspatial structures that maintained our "civil liberties" in place, literally and figuratively. Waves of privatization have been flowing into formerly public arenas of all kinds, compromising freedoms of speech, association, and political expression. Although seeking spatial justice should not be confined only to struggles over public space, such struggles are vital and can be extended in many different directions in the search for justice and the right to the city.

For example, we can see public space as a localized urban expression of the notion of common property or, as it was once called, the commons. These democratic spaces of collective responsibility extend to involve many geographical scales, starting with the microspatial mesh of property ownership itself. All the publicly maintained streets of the city as well as crossroads, plazas, piazzas, and squares are part of the

commons, and so too are the mass transit networks and the buses and trains (if not the automobiles) that move across the city. Think not just of the Bus Riders Union case but also of Rosa Parks demanding her democratic spatial rights to sit anywhere on a public bus. Are sidewalks also part of the commons? Are beaches and parks? Are forests and wilderness areas?

Actually, all these are zones of contention between public and private property rights and focal points for social action aimed at assuring residents' rights to the city, in the sense of collective access to the common pool of public resources the city provides. Extending these arguments to the scale of the metropolitan or city region is relatively straightforward, creating the foundation for what some now call community-based regionalism, regionwide coalition building for local community development and environmental justice. The mobilizing idea of the commons can be extended still further to larger regional, national, and global scales, building on the strategies defined in struggles over the regional right to the city and associated demands for access to public goods and services no matter where they may be available. Raising the scale to national and global levels makes it possible to expand the notion of the collective commons to include all natural and cultural resources that are shared by all the world's inhabitants, from clean air and water to sites of natural beauty, ecological significance, and cultural heritage. It does not take much to see how local struggles for spatial justice and the right to the city can be connected to global movements for planetary sustainability and universal human rights. The scales of spatial justice are not separate and distinct; they interact and interweave in complex patterns.

My purpose making these cross-scalar connections is not to attack property rights and private property ownership in themselves, or to call for a revolutionary transformation into collective ownership as the only solution to the problems involved, but to use a critical spatial perspective to open up a fresh look at the subject of public versus private space and to explore the possibilities for developing new strategies to achieve greater socio-spatial justice. The aim is to heighten awareness of the powerful grip on our lives that comes from the political organization of space as it is imposed from above as a form of social control and maintained by the local state, the legal system, and the land market.

Endogenous Geographies of Spatial Discrimination

The whereness or taking place of spatial justice is not only shaped from above by the exogenous drawing of territorial boundaries and the impositions of hierarchical power. It is also configured from below through what can be broadly called endogenous processes of locational decision making and the aggregate distributional effects that arise from them. In this sense, spatial justice and injustice are seen as the outcome of countless decisions made about emplacement, where things are put in space.

Distributional Inequalities and Discriminatory Geographies

Distributional inequality is the most basic and obvious expression of spatial injustice, at least when emphasizing geographical outcomes rather than the processes that produce them. Take, for instance, the distribution of doctors, hospitals, clinics, and other health services. In every urban region, some effort is made to distribute health facilities in ways that will provide equal access to the entire population, but when seen from a spatial perspective, such equal access is virtually impossible to achieve. Some distributional inequality is inevitable, in part because of the differential effects of relative location and distance friction on consumers and in part due to the locational decisions made by individuals producing the services. Budget requirements, institutional inefficiency, personal greed, racial bigotry, differential wealth and social power, and a host of other factors add to this basic distributional inequality, creating locationally biased and hence discriminatory geographies of accessibility to health services and perhaps more seriously to public health itself.

Similar distributional inequalities arise with regard to all basic needs of urban life, ranging from such vital public services as education, mass transit, police and crime prevention, to more privatized provisioning of adequate food, housing, and employment. The end result is an often self-perpetuating interweaving of spatial injustices that, at least after passing a certain level of tolerance, can be seen as a fundamental violation of urban-based civil rights and legal or constitutional guarantees of equality and justice. This is what came to the surface in the Bus Riders Union case and underlies nearly all struggles for spatial justice.

Distributional inequalities are the more visible outcome of deeper processes of spatial discrimination set in place by a multitude of individual decisions made by many different, often competing actors. Urban

geographies have been shaped by such decisions from the very beginnings of the industrial capitalist city, mostly to the advantage of the rich and powerful. As Engels noted for Manchester and the Chicago School codified in its models of urban ecology, industrial capitalist cities tend to develop concentrically around a dominant center with radial wedges of wealth and poverty that work to produce and maintain geographies that proffer greater advantage and higher status to the wealthier versus the poorer residents. While never as rigid as racial apartheid or as restrictive as ethnic enclaves and ghettos, which have also always characterized the industrial capitalist city, the social geography of class has been and continues to be spatially unjust and open to democratic challenge in nearly every city in the world, whether fully capitalist or not.

Challenges can occur, however, only when such discriminatory geographies are recognized as being socially constructed (rather than naturally given) and therefore open to being changed through concerted social action. It is no surprise that such critical spatial awareness has not been widespread. Rather than being seen as modifiable injustices or violations of civil rights, distributional inequalities have most often been buried under claims that they are the normal, expected, and unavoidable consequences of urban living. For some observers, they may even be viewed as ultimately contributing to the greater public good as products of individualized freedoms of choice, as noted for the multiplication of gated communities. This has ingrained in the industrial capitalist city and, one might add, in many socialist cities as well, deep and unquestioned *structures of privilege and spatial advantage* based on differential wealth and power.

David Harvey in *Social Justice and the City* (1973) was one of the first to uncover and expose to fuller examination this hidden urban geography of injustice and discrimination. More will be said about Harvey in the next chapter, but for the present discussion I refer mainly to his "liberal formulations," where he delves deeply into the everyday operations and processes of locational decision making that work to create and sustain unjust urban geographies. Focusing on the normal functioning of labor, housing, and real estate markets as well as the locational decisions of planners, banks, developers, and retailers, Harvey argues that the net effects of these normalized activities tend to lead consistently to the redistribution of real income in favor of the rich. In other words, the

industrial capitalist city itself functions day to day as a machine for the manufacturing and maintenance of distributional inequalities and what Harvey terms territorial injustice. Even when intervention into this discriminatory geography occurs, the wealthiest tend to win out in the competition for locational advantage, another vivid example of what Said described as the inescapable struggle over geography. Harvey's early liberal formulations remain today among the most important and insightful contributions to understanding the inherent qualities of what can be called the *urbanization of injustice*.

Spatial Discrimination and the Law

Many additional discriminatory biases, from patriarchy and heterosexism to cultural nationalism and racism, accentuate spatial injustices and provide ample opportunities to raise legal and/or constitutional challenges and claims of civil rights violations. Indeed, almost every effort to achieve spatial justice seeks some form of legal or legislative judgment. Yet such claims of spatial discrimination, speaking primarily of the United States, are rarely brought to court. Why this is true has many explanations, the most pertinent to emphasize here being the absence of a cogent understanding of the spatiality of (in)justice both in the wider public and in the U.S. legal system itself. Without the insights of a critical spatial perspective, the maldistribution of vital public services and all other available resources of urban life tends to be considered as naively given and normalized outcomes, possibly inconvenient for some but unintentional in their causes and consequences. To submit them to legal scrutiny and democratic process is often perceived as opening up a Pandora's box of chaotic consequences and indeterminate claims.

The U.S. legal system also has built-in defenses against claims of spatial injustice. Avoiding the particularities of place, it defines the provisioning of justice at a strictly "universalized" national scale, available in theory to all inhabitants equally. It aims to supply justice to everyone equitably, at least in principle, and attempts to respond to demands for justice on egalitarian terms as well, but for the most part the law ignores the unfairness of the processes creating unjust outcomes in the first place. In particular, justice is almost entirely blind to the concept of unfair geographies and specifically spatial injustice. I say

almost, because occasionally such explicitly spatial claims of injustice break through to open up new possibilities for remedying the problems involved.

One such breakthrough took place in 1975 in *Southern Burlington County NAACP v. Mount Laurel Township*, the so-called Mount Laurel decision. Mt. Laurel is a municipality located about ten miles from Camden, New Jersey, one of the poorest cities in the country. Mt. Laurel itself was settled early by freed slaves and has had a long and rich African American heritage. In the original court case, the township authority was challenged over what came to be called exclusionary zoning after regulations were introduced that made the production of affordable housing highly restricted. The plaintiffs directly challenged "home rule," or the rights of local government units to decide on how to regulate land use within their territory, a legally sanctioned responsibility similar to states' rights in the U.S. Constitution. Against all odds, the New Jersey Supreme Court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. In 1983 the court reinforced its decision that affordable housing needed to be constructed (Mt. Laurel II), triggering the creation of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act in 1985 and the subsequent spread of similar court cases to other municipalities in and outside New Jersey.

Called "communistic" by a seated governor, the Mt. Laurel decision played an important role in civil rights struggles over housing throughout the country, embedding the distinction between exclusionary and inclusionary zoning into the legal system and adding the provision of fair and affordable housing to the responsibilities of local government. As was the case with the Bus Riders Union decision in 1996, the implications of this precedent were potentially far reaching. The Mt. Laurel decision could have led, for example, to legal recognition that location in space is a source of discrimination in itself. This would be based not only on race/ethnicity but on meeting fundamental human needs, with everyone having the right of fair access to affordable housing and health services as well as to other location-related advantages arising from state actions, including all public investment and subsidy. It could have also created a legal principle of territorial or spatial responsibility in which all municipal governments recognize the negative spillover effects of local decision making on at least the immediately surrounding areas. Pushed to its limits, this precedent of spatial responsibility could have formed

the basis for coordinated intrametropolitan regional welfare planning in the absence of other governmental structures.

The Mt. Laurel decision stimulated optimistic activism among housing advocates and planners and became linked directly into the broader civil rights movement, but it would never reach its full potential. Some efforts were made to test and extend legal principles of locational discrimination and territorial responsibility, but nearly all were unsuccessful. Resistance to these extensions, based on constitutional and other arguments, became increasingly powerful, especially from a more openly conservative federal government and judiciary. As would be the case for the civil rights movement as a whole, local tactics along with state and federal court decisions during the Reagan era constrained the impact of the more radical efforts, echoing what happened to struggles for greater racial justice after the desegregation of schools induced by the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954. It seemed that the harder the breakthrough precedents were pushed, the stronger the reactionary resistance.

During the period of increasingly restrained school desegregation, the location of elementary and high schools and the attendance areas of students in the United States were experiencing one of the largest-scale spatial reorganizations of public services ever attempted anywhere in the world. School district consolidation used tools that were forerunners of present-day geographical information systems (GIS) and ideas taken from central place theory and other formulations of professional geographers. The capacity was there, it would seem, to have planned and promoted the desegregation of schools in a fair and democratic manner, but the will and awareness were not.

It is tempting to argue that the primacy of the struggles against institutionalized racism in the civil rights movement as opposed to a broader attack on discriminatory geographies deflected any possibilities for a spatial justice movement to emerge as a complementary and supportive force. In any case, eventually the civil rights movement in all its manifestations, from inclusionary zoning and school desegregation to affirmative action and antipoverty programs, was institutionally and constitutionally blunted in its continuing impact. With the Bush administration's penetration of the Supreme Court and its constraints on the judicial system as a whole, many of its major achievements have been reversed.

Particularly influential in the derailment of the civil rights movement and the reduced national impact of such legal victories as the Bus Riders Union consent decree was the series of legal decisions that either protected the courts from hearing any complaints from private individuals or groups about any form of discrimination or, alternatively, required that plaintiffs prove that discrimination was intentional, an almost impossible task. The use of the legal system in the struggles for racial and spatial justice and the right to the city has not been entirely closed off, however, and will continue to be of major importance, especially as legal scholars increasingly adopt a critical spatial perspective.

Race, Space, and Environmental Justice

As the civil rights movement waned and the opportunities for legal recourse with regard to racial and spatial discrimination were shrinking, one new opening occurred that played an important role in the long-term search for spatial justice. It too was blunted in its impact by similar institutional and constitutional resistance, but it nevertheless raised widespread public consciousness about spatial discrimination, unjust geographies, territorial responsibility, and democratic rights to the city. I refer here to the environmental justice movement (EJM).

Reflecting the ongoing struggles for civil rights, the EJM began as an attack on what was called environmental racism, the tendency for poor and minority populations, especially African Americans, to suffer disproportionately from air and water pollution and the siting of hazardous or toxic facilities. To some extent, racial issues, at least at first, obscured the spatial issues, as they did in the civil rights movement, but the search for environmental justice did as much to raise consciousness about the spatiality of (in)justice as any other development in the last decades of the twentieth century. Its lasting effects include opening up the concept of civil rights to a broader spatial scope, especially by adding locational bias to more conventional notions of racial, class, and gender discrimination and encouraging new forms of progressive coalition building among all those who suffer from the geography of unequal spatial advantage.

Given that practically everything that happens in cities can contribute to hazardous environmental conditions, the EJM has over the years been connecting more closely with movements for spatial justice

and democratic rights to the city. As with the Bus Riders Union, this convergence has created opportunities for mutual learning and shared strategies but has also led to some confusion and divergent interests, largely due to different underlying philosophies and theoretical frameworks. The alternatively radical and romantic environmentalism that often drives the EJM markedly contrasts with the critical spatial perspective that is behind the struggle to create more just geographies.

Rather than an explicitly spatial perspective, many forms of passionate environmentalism tend to emphasize physical or natural causality, leading to such overly idealized notions as the sanctity of Mother Earth and to activism that focuses on narrowly defined targets and highly localized and unique cases of discriminatory environmental impacts. David Harvey (1996) used the term "militant localism" to describe this narrowed focus of the EJM and its fragmenting effect on larger class and labor struggles. That the Bus Riders Union assertively maintained the connections between environmental and transit justice and wider struggles over race, class, and gender discrimination was among its most important achievements.

To be clear, this is not meant to say that environmental justice advocates or the issues they address are not spatial: everything on earth is spatial whether recognized as such or not. Nor does it suggest that the EJM has not contributed significantly to the struggles for spatial justice and democratic rights to a just city. Similar to struggles over public space, the search for specifically environmental justice has been and must continue to be a vital part of the larger justice struggle. Environmental and spatial justice, however, should not be too easily conflated. Environmental justice may be best considered and conceptualized as a subfield of spatial justice focusing on geographical discrimination with regard to negative environmental impacts, ranging from the location of a toxic waste facility to the uneven regional and national impact of global warming and climate change.

As such, the EJM can benefit significantly from a greater awareness of the interactive and multiscale geographies of place-based discrimination that shape environmental justice and provide opportunities for intervention in between the global and the local. For example, although global warming and climate change have now been conclusively linked to human agency, it is useful to see that such human agency works

through the production and reproduction of unfair geographies and global structures of spatial advantage and disadvantage. This calls for political responses at multiple and interacting scales.

Similarly, regarding environmental limits to growth, it can be argued that enough is produced today to feed, clothe, shelter, and entertain the entire world population without significant environmental degradation. What prevents this (and induces potentially unstoppable and disastrous climate change) is the globally unjust geography of production and consumption, with an overconcentration in some favored places and spaces and serious scarcity in others. The persistent extremes of polarized geographical development create not so much a challenge to do something about the environment per se but rather a political challenge to struggle for redistributive spatial justice at multiple scales, focusing less on outcomes than on the processes producing them.

Rephrasing Martin Luther King, spatial injustice anywhere, at any geographical scale, is a threat to justice everywhere. Even more cogently and specifically, this suggests that large-scale phenomena such as climate change have a global geography of effects but also affect individual nation-states, subnational regions, intrametropolitan areas, and local communities and neighborhoods in highly differentiated ways. The same can be said moving across scales in the other direction, linking a localized event such as the breaking of the dams and levees along the Mississippi River by Hurricane Katrina to a critique of national economic and science policy and to how global climate change has increased if not the incidence at least the ferocity of extreme weather phenomena all over the world. Everything is connected to everything else, as the environmentalists say, but not just in a flat horizontal ecosystem or biosphere. These connections also extend vertically through a socially produced layering of bounded geographical scales extending from the planet to the body.

Segregation and Spatial Justice

Whether imposed from above or generated by spatial decision making from below, segregation or the confinement of specific populations to specific areas seems clearly to be connected to the production of spatial injustice. Unjust segregation has been discussed in several different ways thus far, from the imposed structures of apartheid to the local creation of racially segregated schools, and there can be no doubt that segregation

forms an integral part of the spatiality of injustice and the injustice of spatiality. But here again, as with all forms of locational discrimination, the issue is complicated by the interplay of endogenous and exogenous influences and by the complex relations between *geographies of choice* and *geographies of privilege*.

Not all examples of residential segregation are entirely unjust. To some degree, residential segregation can be voluntary and beneficial, with people of similar background choosing to live together for many different purposes, from creating identity and community to eating preferred food and obtaining other forms of nourishment and cultural sustenance to helping new arrivals to find jobs and housing. Segregation becomes a problem, however, when it is rigidly imposed from above as a form of subjugation and control, as with apartheid and racial ghetto formation; or when it emerges less intentionally from below as an oppressive by-product of unregulated "freedoms" of choice operating within persistent spatial structures of advantage.

It may be useful here to distinguish between two extreme forms of segregation, the discriminatory and disadvantaged ghetto versus the enclave created for largely positive reasons. I say extreme forms because there are some positive advantages to ghetto formation, such as serving to create a shared consciousness of oppression that can generate concerted resistance; and there are negative effects that can occur in the most culturally adaptive enclave. Segregation, like so much about the spatiality of (in)justice, is in itself not automatically evil and bad, nor are attempts to promote greater cultural or economic integration always positive and beneficial to the people involved.

Segregation, like the erosion of public space, seems initially to be a fundamental feature of the production and urbanization of (in)justice, and hence a principal target in justice struggles, and at different times and places this is certainly the case. The point being made here, however, is that these surface expressions of injustice are more complex than they initially appear. Rather than being inherently characterized as good or bad, they need to be seen contextually as arising from underlying spatial structures and structurings of locational advantage and disadvantage. It is the task of theoretically informed spatial practice to bring these structures of privilege, whether based on race, class, gender, ethnicity, sexual preference, disability, or any other form of hierarchical control

through the production and reproduction of unfair geographies and global structures of spatial advantage and disadvantage. This calls for political responses at multiple and interacting scales.

Similarly, regarding environmental limits to growth, it can be argued that enough is produced today to feed, clothe, shelter, and entertain the entire world population without significant environmental degradation. What prevents this (and induces potentially unstoppable and disastrous climate change) is the globally unjust geography of production and consumption, with an overconcentration in some favored places and spaces and serious scarcity in others. The persistent extremes of polarized geographical development create not so much a challenge to do something about the environment per se but rather a political challenge to struggle for redistributive spatial justice at multiple scales, focusing less on outcomes than on the processes producing them.

Rephrasing Martin Luther King, spatial injustice anywhere, at any geographical scale, is a threat to justice everywhere. Even more cogently and specifically, this suggests that large-scale phenomena such as climate change have a global geography of effects but also affect individual nation-states, subnational regions, intrametropolitan areas, and local communities and neighborhoods in highly differentiated ways. The same can be said moving across scales in the other direction, linking a localized event such as the breaking of the dams and levees along the Mississippi River by Hurricane Katrina to a critique of national economic and science policy and to how global climate change has increased if not the incidence at least the ferocity of extreme weather phenomena all over the world. Everything is connected to everything else, as the environmentalists say, but not just in a flat horizontal ecosystem or biosphere. These connections also extend vertically through a socially produced layering of bounded geographical scales extending from the planet to the body.

Segregation and Spatial Justice

Whether imposed from above or generated by spatial decision making from below, segregation or the confinement of specific populations to specific areas seems clearly to be connected to the production of spatial injustice. Unjust segregation has been discussed in several different ways thus far, from the imposed structures of apartheid to the local creation of racially segregated schools, and there can be no doubt that segregation

forms an integral part of the spatiality of injustice and the injustice of spatiality. But here again, as with all forms of locational discrimination, the issue is complicated by the interplay of endogenous and exogenous influences and by the complex relations between *geographies of choice* and *geographies of privilege*.

Not all examples of residential segregation are entirely unjust. To some degree, residential segregation can be voluntary and beneficial, with people of similar background choosing to live together for many different purposes, from creating identity and community to eating preferred food and obtaining other forms of nourishment and cultural sustenance to helping new arrivals to find jobs and housing. Segregation becomes a problem, however, when it is rigidly imposed from above as a form of subjugation and control, as with apartheid and racial ghetto formation; or when it emerges less intentionally from below as an oppressive by-product of unregulated "freedoms" of choice operating within persistent spatial structures of advantage.

It may be useful here to distinguish between two extreme forms of segregation, the discriminatory and disadvantaged ghetto versus the enclave created for largely positive reasons. I say extreme forms because there are some positive advantages to ghetto formation, such as serving to create a shared consciousness of oppression that can generate concerted resistance; and there are negative effects that can occur in the most culturally adaptive enclave. Segregation, like so much about the spatiality of (in)justice, is in itself not automatically evil and bad, nor are attempts to promote greater cultural or economic integration always positive and beneficial to the people involved.

Segregation, like the erosion of public space, seems initially to be a fundamental feature of the production and urbanization of (in)justice, and hence a principal target in justice struggles, and at different times and places this is certainly the case. The point being made here, however, is that these surface expressions of injustice are more complex than they initially appear. Rather than being inherently characterized as good or bad, they need to be seen contextually as arising from underlying spatial structures and structurings of locational advantage and disadvantage. It is the task of theoretically informed spatial practice to bring these structures of privilege, whether based on race, class, gender, ethnicity, sexual preference, disability, or any other form of hierarchical control

and domination, more clearly and cogently to the surface, to greater public awareness.

Mesogeographies of Uneven Development

In between the global and the local are many regional scales: metropolitan, subnational, national, supranational. At each of these scales, much like what has been described for the internal geography of the city, geographically uneven development inscribes significant spatial or territorial inequalities. When these intrametropolitan, intranational, and international inequalities are maintained over time, as with the longstanding division between First and Third Worlds, or the lasting income differentials between north and south in Italy, England, and the United States, they become another context or arena for seeking spatial justice.

In addition to illustrating these multiscalar dimensions of seeking spatial justice, critical regional thinking has become a focal point for a more general theorization of geographically uneven development, a primary force behind the production and reproduction of unjust geographies. These theories have been central to the development of an applied field of welfare-oriented regional planning aimed specifically at reducing regional inequalities and achieving what can be called regional justice and regional democracy. Exploring these regional worlds of (in)justice opens up new avenues for strategic spatial thinking and action.

Uneven Development at the Global Scale

Perhaps the most obvious example of the search for macrospatial justice involves what is popularly known as the global North–South problem, the gaping differences in societal development and quality of life between rich and poor countries. Such terms as North–South, First–Second–Third Worlds, the international division of labor, core and periphery, developed-industrialized versus developing-industrializing countries express the unfairness, inequality, and injustice of global geographies, although I hasten to add that these great divisions are typically seen through historical and sociological rather than spatial lenses.

This organized system of global inequality did not always exist. Some degree of geographically uneven development has always been present in the human occupation of the earth, but it was only in the second half of

the nineteenth century, in an age of imperialism and global colonization, that more deeply ingrained structures of privilege and spatial advantage consolidated their hold over the entire world population. A global core-periphery structure emerged at that time and persisted without many changes until the late twentieth century, when a significant but selective reconfiguration of the old world order began to occur.

After 1989 and the end of the cold war, the so-called Second World of socialist and communist countries led by the Soviet Union disintegrated. Beginning decades earlier, a growing number of newly industrialized countries (NICs) in the old Third World, led first by the so-called Asian Tigers and most recently by China and India, developed rapidly to join the advanced industrialized countries, while at the same time much of the rest of the world sank into deeper relative poverty. While there was a significant shuffling about in the old international division of labor, geographically uneven development proceeded apace in these decades of neoliberal globalization. Although it is difficult to prove, the global distribution of wealth and power today is almost surely more polarized (and unjust) than ever before, with growing numbers of the superrich concentrated in a few favored spaces and places while a billion or more people live, often strikingly adjacent, in increasingly compacted slums.

We can speak here of the *globalization of injustice and the injustice of globalization* in much the same way that we discuss the urbanization of injustice and the injustice of urbanization. Both arise primarily from geographically uneven development and the formation of lasting structures of privilege favoring the inhabitants of some areas and disfavoring others. An argument can also be made that, like the normal workings of the industrial capitalist city, the normal functioning of the global market economy in terms of international trade and flows of capital, information, and people tends, without significant intervention, to lead to the continuing redistribution of wealth from the poor countries to the rich, from the periphery to the core. Recognizing the cross-scalar connections between globalization and urbanization and acting to change their interdependent spatial injustices are a vital product of a critical regional or mesogeographical perspective.

Further comparisons can be made between the urbanization and globalization of (in)justice. Building on the findings of underdevelopment and dependency theory, it can be said that the unjust global geography is

the product of two interdependent but fundamentally different processes of capitalist development. One operates primarily to favor the rich and powerful, while the other, more truncated and haphazard and with fewer resources, mainly serves the poor. A similar separate-and-unequal argument was made at a different scale in the Bus Riders Union case, in efforts to combat racial segregation in the schools of the U.S. South, and for all forms of apartheid, which in Afrikaans means "separate development."

Emphasizing the point is necessary, for it is too easily forgotten by the world's major decision makers. Meeting the basic needs of the poor countries is almost always relatively neglected, whether through market mechanisms or governmental policies, in comparison to filling the much greater but less urgent consumption needs of the richest and most powerful, whether speaking of nations or neighborhoods. This produces fundamentally unjust geographies across many scales and demands significant remedial action.

Continuing the global-urban comparison, the Third World, even with its recent changes in composition, can be seen as a kind of global ghetto arising from a combination of immobility, individual choice, and imposed spatial discrimination and external control. The Third World, or the global periphery, in this sense is similar to a redlined zone in a city, an area of purposeful disinvestment and superexploitation. Like urban redlining, global redlining is not necessarily the product of greedy capitalists conspiring to drain out wealth from a certain area by drawing a red no-go line around it. Redlined zones emerge primarily from the normal, everyday operations of the market and the competitive search for maximum profits. Although it may shift about over time, there will always be some area of a city that is virtually redlined, where local savings and residential income are drained away to other areas and to external interests, based largely on the perception that the affected area is dangerous, unsettled, or simply an unattractive place to do business. Investments that directly benefit the local population tend to be reduced in comparison to investments that facilitate the transfer of physical and human capital out of the area for the benefit of others. To the degree that there will always be redlined areas in a market-dominated urban economy, one might also say that without significant and persistent intervention there will always be a Third World or its equivalent in the capitalist global division of labor.

There are important differences, however, between the global and urban scales. One major example involves structures of government, which are much weaker at the global level in comparison to the power of the national and local states. It has become rather easy to blame the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and even the United Nations for the persistence of global inequalities and widening income gaps, but they for the most part follow the insistent logic of the market rather than intentionally leading the way into poverty. The sources of geographically uneven development are much deeper than the superficial operations of global institutions, although they are certainly not blameless.

Deepening inequalities and worsening injustices at all geographical scales have stimulated a growing global justice movement mobilized, at least in part, around notions of environmental and spatial justice. The main targets tend to be highly generalized: neoliberal globalization, environmental degradation and global warming, nuclear proliferation, threats to world peace and universal human rights, and the perceived evils of capitalism itself. Nearly every effort to deal with these issues, however, faces regional specificities and the fundamental problems associated with the double-sidedness and related complexities of geographically uneven development and spatial injustice, especially the mixing together of the geographies of privilege and the geographies of choice.

One important manifestation of this search for global spatial justice is the World Charter for the Right to the City, created in 2005 after a series of meetings of the World Social Forum. Drawing on the key writings of Henri Lefebvre on *le droit à la ville* and long-standing struggles for universal human rights, the charter is indicative of the synergies emerging from the synthesis of ideas operating at different geographical scales. Grounding the global justice movement in the right to the city creates more tangible and achievable targets than simply organizing against neoliberal capitalism, globalization, or global warming, especially as all three are primarily generated from and made concrete in the major city regions of the contemporary world.

Some might argue that focusing on the right to the city excludes large portions of the world population who do not live in large cities. From a regional or mesogeographical perspective, however, the urbanization process and the spread of urban-based industrial capitalism have

been an integral part of the globalization of capital, labor, and culture. Just as one can say that every square inch of the earth's surface has to some degree felt the effects of globalization, very thinly in some areas but much thicker and deeper in others, so too can it be claimed that urbanization and everything that accompanies it have also spread, unevenly to be sure, everywhere on earth. As the whole world becomes urbanized and globalized to some degree, the urbanization of injustice and the globalization of injustice reinforce one another to create what are probably the greatest spatial inequalities of wealth and power the world has ever seen. Seeking spatial justice and the regionalized right to the city become more urgently needed than ever before.

Supranational Regionalism and the European Union

Another aspect of the new global geography that has been forming over the past forty years has been an expansion in supranational regionalism, inspired in large part by the emergence of the European Union as the first quasi-confederation—or coalition—of advanced industrial countries and now in the midst of a significant expansion absorbing most of the countries of Eastern Europe. If one adds to this the national and regional transformations evolving in China, Russia, and other parts of the former Second World, it might seem as if the contemporary world is moving in two very different directions, toward socialism and capitalism simultaneously. It may be more accurate (and strategically optimistic), however, to say that these seemingly divergent movements and the greater ideological complexity they create are generating new possibilities for creative admixtures or hybridities of capitalism and socialism, rather than maintaining them in their conventional dichotomous opposition.

In many ways, and especially with regard to the treatment of spatial injustice and the advocacy of regional democracy, the European Union is already somewhat of a creative hybrid of socialism and capitalism. Often described as the Europe of the Regions, the EU has played a particularly innovative role in seeking spatial justice through the promotion of progressive forms of regional and spatial planning. From the beginnings of the EU, the Regional Fund has invested in reducing regional inequalities and related forms of social and economic exclusion within and between the member states. One of its success stories, at least up to the present crisis, has been the transformation of Ireland from an

epitomizing example of the underdeveloped European periphery to the Celtic Tiger, one of the two or three richest European countries.

Although it has not yet had many tangible effects, there is another, more recent policy development in the EU that signifies a new approach to seeking spatial justice at the interurban and regional scale. I refer to the European Spatial Development Perspective, now an integral part of EU policy in all its member countries (Faludi and Waterhout 2002). The name itself is significant, at the very least as an expression of the importance of a critical spatial perspective. Thirty years ago, putting the words spatial + development + perspective together would have been nearly inconceivable and for most incomprehensible. Today, spatial development planning and policy, aimed at reducing spatial inequalities as well as fostering sustainable development of the social and natural environments at many different scales, have become central to the objectives of the EU.

The European Union has also led the way to the formation of a growing number of regional trading blocs, each aimed at achieving greater market size and power in the competition for global resources. Among the most prominent are the North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA), MERCOSUR (common market for virtually all of Latin America), and APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation). These and other special purpose groupings of states such as OPEC, OECD, and BRIC (the recently created informal alliance between Brazil, Russia, India, and China), along with an even larger number of giant global corporations, have partitioned the world in a thick layer of multinational or transnational organizations. Once relatively empty of examples, this supranational but subglobal organizational scale is now becoming rapidly filled. Most of the trading blocs remain highly specialized, relatively incohesive, and purely economically motivated, but if the EU model continues to have an effect, they have the potential to play a larger role in the future of the global justice movement and in reducing international inequalities.

Regional Inequality within Nations

Intranational regionalisms and struggles over what might be called regional justice have been exploding in the past twenty years. Examples include the disintegration into subnational regions of Yugoslavia, the

Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia; innovative forms of regional devolution in Spain (Catalonia and the Basque Country), the United Kingdom (Scotland, Wales, the Greater London Authority), and Canada (Quebec); and secessionist movements of varying intensity and success in Eritrea, southern Sudan, northern Italy, Flemish Belgium, Sri Lanka, Tibet, Kashmir, Aceh, Kurdistan, Chechnya, and Chiapas. For some, these subnational movements added to the rise of supranational regionalisms have signaled a weakening of the once unchallenged sovereignty of the nation-state. For others, however, the nation-state is seen as engaged in a significant restructuring and "rescaling" of its territorial powers (Brenner 2005), reaching upward in scale to remain the primary player in the global economy while at the same time extending its scalar power downward through controlled decentralization.

However one interprets the changing role of the nation-state, intranational regional development inequalities remain a political problem as a form of persistent spatial injustice. Efforts to achieve greater regional justice are expressed in many different ways. In some cases, cultural separatism leads to movements for secession; in other situations with "nations within nations" such as Catalonia in Spain and Quebec in Canada the struggle is primarily over degree of actual and symbolic autonomy. In every case, the established national order and the homogeneity of nationalist feeling and identity come under challenge.

Cultural separatism and struggles for regional justice are often closely associated with the pattern of geographical uneven economic development. The politics of regionalism that arises from this coincidence of spatial differences tends to move in opposing directions. The richest regions often feel they are bearing a disproportionate or unfair share of the burden in dealing with poorer regions, while the poorest regions demand even greater attention to their severe problems of poverty and unemployment. This polarized politics of uneven regional development can occur even when there are no pronounced cultural and linguistic differences between the regions. Again, there is no escape from unjust geographies. They are the battlefield for struggles over spatial justice at every scale from the global to the local.

Unfortunately, just as regional inequality and injustice at the intrametropolitan, intranational, and global scales have been reaching unprecedented levels, state restructuring and national policies around the

world, especially when strongly influenced by neoliberal ideology, have led to a weakening of welfare systems and significant reductions in central government funding for social and antipoverty programs. As a result, welfare-oriented urban and regional planning has declined, and more entrepreneurial approaches have taken over the planning process, creating vicious competition between cities and regions for global economic advantage. In this worsening context, promoting democratic regionalism and the recovery of welfare-oriented regional planning and governance becomes a major goal in the struggles seeking spatial justice.

Toward a Geographical Theory of Uneven Development

Understanding the dynamics behind geographically uneven development, why one area and its people develop faster than another, may be one of the greatest challenges facing contemporary scholarship. Yet, specifically geographical notions of uneven development have rarely been addressed directly, reflecting again what has been described earlier as the long-standing bias against giving geography a significant causal force in explaining social relations and societal development. The best available attempt to formulate a comprehensive theory of uneven development from a critical spatial perspective can be found within the field of regional development theory. The relevant literature is highly repetitive and not widely recognized or accepted by most contemporary development scholars, but a series of fundamental principles can be distilled from it that can add to our understanding of the production and reproduction of spatial (in)justice.

The starting point is the recognition that development, however it is defined, never takes place uniformly over space. All social processes have geographically uneven effects. This may sound obvious, but it was largely overlooked in the liberal social sciences and especially neoclassical economics until the 1950s, when the work of such prominent scholars as François Perroux and Gunnar Myrdal brought the discussion of economic development off the head of a pin, as some described it, and into a spatial world of cities and regions. They also took this first principle further, arguing that uneven development arises for the most part from geographical concentration, from dynamic and expansive urban agglomerations that persistently build on their own initial advantages. Spatial agglomeration or polarization, the emergence of developmental

poles of growth, was therefore seen to be the primary driving force behind geographically uneven development.

Few advances were made in understanding the dynamics of spatially polarized development until relatively recently, when economic agglomeration theory was revived by a new breed of spatially aware economists and geographers. In one of the most pathbreaking extensions of the spatial turn, it is now becoming recognized that urbanization and the economic force that arises from spatially organized urban and regional habitats are the primary generators of all aspects of societal development. One of the earliest explorations of this stimulating effect of urban agglomeration was Jane Jacobs's *The Economy of Cities* (1969), ridiculed and misunderstood in its time but now the inspiration for major new ideas about urban spatial causality. For more on Jacobs's contributions to the new economic geography, see the notes and references for chapter 1.

While not advancing very far in understanding the inner workings of these development poles and how their economic forces are created and maintained, the early regional thinkers did take an important next step. In a very broad sense, they recognized that there were both positive and negative forces emanating from urban agglomerations, a double-sidedness that is related to the simultaneous production of justice and injustice, as discussed earlier. Myrdal (1957) called these two forces and their effects *spread* and *backwash*, while Albert Hirschmann (1958) termed them *polarization* and *trickle down*. In many ways, this was the first recognition of what was later described in underdevelopment and dependency theory as two distinct development processes operating at a global scale, one favoring the advanced industrialization of the core countries and the other leading to the "development of underdevelopment" in the peripheral Third World.

Myrdal added the notion of circular and cumulative causation to the theorization of geographically uneven development, an idea he first applied in his analysis of the cycle of poverty in Black America. Once an initial advantage or disadvantage was established, he argued, it would tend to build on itself, leading implicitly to growing inequalities between rich and poor regions and countries. Other theories emerged showing that urban industrialized regions had inherent advantages over rural agricultural regions, leading to ever widening differential growth patterns, building up political pressures between core and periphery that would

have potentially explosive results if left unchecked. This was not unlike Harvey's analysis of the redistribution of real income in an urban system. These arguments made it appear that regional development planning and policy making were essential not just for efficient economic growth but also for reducing the problems associated with burgeoning economic inequalities or, in other words, seeking regional equity and justice.

What planners needed to do was clear. They needed to find ways to enhance the positive spread effects while reducing the negative backwash through efforts at "concentrated deconcentration," locating propulsive growth poles in relatively backward areas. How to accomplish this, however, was for the most part beyond their reach. The challenge of discovering how to redirect the powerful forces of geographically uneven development to achieve greater economic equality and spatial justice advanced little beyond these initial but rather superficial conceptual breakthroughs. Regional development theorists at the time did not help the planners very much, simply repeating the old arguments with an occasional change in terminology.

Part of the deterioration of the debates on geographically uneven development arose from a significant break and reorientation in the evolution of regional development theory beginning in the early 1970s, linked mainly to the rising force of neoliberal globalization and economic restructuring. Over the last three decades of the twentieth century, progressive forms of regionalism aimed at reducing spatial inequalities almost disappeared. As mentioned earlier, they were replaced by a neoliberal or, perhaps more accurately, neoconservative regionalism that was essentially entrepreneurial and dominated by intensified pressures to compete for a place in the global economy rather than dealing directly with issues of poverty and uneven development.

City marketing and regional image making took over the reins of planning and policy making, leading to a vicious territorial competitiveness to attract investment and the attention of global tourism, now the world's largest industry. Reducing regional inequalities was sacrificed to a rampant consumerism and the assumed need to reorganize urban and regional space to meet global market demands. With cruel irony, during a period when income inequalities and social polarization were reaching unprecedented levels, regional welfare planning almost disappeared.

Fortunately, however, there have been signs of a revival in association with what some are now calling a New Regionalism.

Spatial Justice and the New Regionalism

In part influenced by the spatial turn that has been spreading spatial thinking, and hence growing attention to urban and regional issues, a New Regionalism has been slowly emerging since the mid-1990s, with some promise of restoring the progressive ambitions of the welfare regionalism of the past and reconnecting with the justice movements operating in between the global and the local scales. The New Regionalism has sparked several innovative developments in the search for spatial justice. There is today an active and increasingly spatially conscious global justice movement aimed not only at environmental justice at a global scale but more specifically at democratic rights to the city. The European Union, especially through its Spatial Development Perspective, is reasserting the importance of multiscalar spatial planning to reduce spatial inequalities and social and economic exclusion. New developments in agglomeration theory and urban and regional economics are stimulating a radical rethinking of our notions of geographically uneven development and provoking renewed attention to regional approaches to planning, governance, and policy making at many different scales.

Of particular interest here are the new regional approaches developing at the metropolitan scale and in conjunction with the growing importance of megacity regions in the global cultural and political economy. Coalitions of local activists have begun to adopt regional approaches, connecting the local and the global, the micro and the macro, local knowledge and global strategy. The right to the city idea, for example, is being regionalized in such terms as regional rights to the city or the right to the city-region; new ideas are emerging about regional democracy and democratic regionalism at the metropolitan scale (Orfield 1997); and perhaps most surprising has been the emergence of community-based regionalism, connecting community development activists with progressive regional planners in ways never dreamed of before (Pastor, Benner, and Matsuoka 2009). How these regional approaches have developed in Los Angeles is discussed in chapters 4 through 6.

Building a Spatial Theory of Justice

FROM THIS BROAD CONTEXTUAL LOOK at the production and reproduction of spatial (in)justice, we move next to the task of theorizing spatial justice and reviewing the various ways scholars have approached this theory-building process. Building a spatial theory of justice follows six steps:

- Theorizing theory itself
- Building a new ontology of space
- Theorizing justice
- Examining the historical debates on spatial justice
- Focusing on David Harvey and the urbanization of injustice
- Developing and extending Henri Lefebvre's ideas about the right to the city

Theoretical Foundations

Theory building is one of at least five modes or levels of knowledge formation. Theory itself forms a bridge between the more abstract realms of ontology and epistemology, which respectively make statements about the essence of human being-in-the-world and develop ways to assure that our knowledge of the world is reliable; and the increasingly concrete modes of empirical analysis and practical application or praxis, the transformation of knowledge into action, theory into practice.