

The Dilemma of Planning

Workshop Honoring the Legacy of Prof. Hubert Law Yone

March 25, 2020

Organized by the Laboratory for Contemporary Urban Design, Tel Aviv University
Hosted by the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion



09:00-9:30 | Welcome and Coffee

09:30-9:50 | Greetings

Yasha Grobman
Dean of Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion

Tali Hatuka
Dep. of Geography and Human Environment, Tel Aviv University

Yosef Jabareen
Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion

9:50-10:10 | **Keynote: Hubert Law Yone**
The Dilemma of Planning

10:15-10:45 | **Bish Sanyal**
Dep. of Urban Studies and Planning, MIT
Nirit and Michael Shaoul Fellow, IAS, TAU
Critical Optimism as a Way Out of Law-Yone's Dilemma

Open discussion

11:15-11:30 | Coffee Break

11:30-13:00 | **Session 1**
Reflections on the Dilemma of Planning

Moderator: **Deborah Shmueli**
Dep. of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Haifa

Rachel Kallus
Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion
The Agency of Professional Knowledge within and Beyond the Planning System

Ravit Hananel
Dep. of Public Policy, Tel Aviv University
Policy with no Vision

Tali Hatuka
Dep. of Geography and Human Environment, Tel Aviv University
What can planning Offer the World?

Open discussion

13:00-13:45 | Lunch

13:45-14:15 | **Diane Davis**
Graduate School of Design, Harvard University
Nirit and Michael Shaoul Fellow, IAS, TAU

Rethinking the Role of Property Rights in the Enactment of Citizenship: The Potential of Community Land Trusts to Remediate the Dilemmas of Planning

14:15-15:15 | **Session 2**
Reflections on the Dilemma of Planning

Moderator: **Yosef Jabareen**
Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion

Erez Tzfidia
Dep. of Public Policy and Administration, Sapir College
Displacers or Placemakers: Urban Planners in Gray Spaces

Nurit Alfasi
Dep. of Geography and Environmental Development, Ben-Gurion University
Can Democracy Solve the Dilemma of Planning?

Open discussion

15:15-15:30 | Coffee Break

15:15-16:15 | Closing Remarks

Oren Yiftachel
Dep. of Geography and Environmental Development, Ben-Gurion University

Location: Faculty Board Hall, room 240, 2nd Floor, Segoe Building, Technion.

Participation: The event is open to postgraduate students. Limited places are available, participation by invitation only.
[Sign to the event here](#) or contact Hadas Zur hadastsu@mail.tau.ac.il

The Dilemma of Planning

The article 'The Dilemma of Planning' opens with a short generic background wherein the birthpangs and surrounding political environments of the growth of planning are examined by using the methodology of discourse analysis. The danger of over-simplification in the choice of models among multiple discourses involving so many cultural variables is overcome by proposing a set of identity crises: (1) Loss of confidence in the basic foundational myths of planning; (2) Loss of epistemic coherence of planning; and (3) morality systems and the growth of planning as Law-Fare. Next, the role of Zionism in the Israeli Planning Discourse is discussed. The following chapter examines critical issues in contemporary planning concerning legality in and of planning; public vs private; The Commons alternative to state and market in urbanism. Marcuse's attempt to problematize this timely approach is found to falter at the need for professional discourse. Finally, in an attempt to come to terms with post-politics governmentality by Foucault's bio-politics of subjectification, morality is shown to have been closely aligned to British Colonial Mandatory 'Rights of the Commons' of British Law. The article closes by sounding the knell of warning concerning the possible conflict between Hardt and Negris Commonwealth and Ortega y Gasset's Mass-Man. Are we ready for a new magnanimous liberalism OR an abundance of states facing a new mediality of exceptions and noise where planning is radically redefined as paradox with parasites and racially-inspired states of exceptions constituting the new law-fare?

Hubert Law Yone



Born in MytKyina, Burma, 1934.
Undergraduate studies at Technical University of Rangoon, Burma.
B.Sc (Electronics) Stanford University, USA, 1957.
Senior Research Officer, Union of Burma Research Institute, 1957-1960.
B,Sc 1964, M.Sc 1966, Phd 1970, Architecture and Town Planning Technion, Israel.
Faculty member at Technion since 1966. Retired as Associate Professor, 2002. Courses initiated and taught: Architectural Design, Urban and Regional Planning, Ideology in Planning, Public participation in preparation of planning, Politics and Planning. Served as President of ISAGA International Society of Simulation and Gaming. Senior Advisory member of ADVA Voluntary Institution of Public finance, Active participation in several professional Urban and Regional Planning Teams including creating new Towns and Regions, Plans for unrecognized Arab villages. Head of Methodology Team for Israel 2000 National Plan.

Critical Optimism as a Way Out of Law-Yone's Dilemma

This paper begins by acknowledging the scholarly contribution of Professor Hubert Law-Yone to planning theory. In particular, it acknowledges his influence on progressive ideals going as far back as early stages of industrialization and the urbanization accompanying it. This forward-thinking branch of planning is essential for a critical approach which flourished in the 1960s and has remained relevant despite attacks first on communism and, more recently, on liberalism (remember: the jubilant announcement that history had ended; book: why liberalism failed). The ultimate aspiration of creating an egalitarian 'good society' through planning remains pertinent thanks to progressive scholars like Law-Yone, Friedmann, Marcuse (both father and son) and others. We should be grateful for their critical voices. However, we must also subject their criticism to Zadie Smith's test to determine whether such criticism gives hope or creates hopelessness. We must go beyond Antonio Gramsci's famous quote regarding pessimism of the spirit and optimism of the will. This paper argues that planners must be at once both critical and optimistic. It further claims this new planning sensibility can be cultivated in the following three ways: (1) by defining challenges in a manner which encourages problem-solving; (2) by designing planning interventions as social experiments with organizational constraints in mind and; (3) by sympathetically assessing planned outcomes by highlighting modest successes as well as the factors contributing to such success. The overarching theme encompassing this planning sensibility is a new appreciation of the role of the democratic state. Here, the purpose of the state is to articulate and satisfy 'public interest' and to use its organizational capabilities to steer both society and markets to that end. This is achieved via public consultation, contestation and negotiation throughout the planning process.

Bish Senyal



Professor Bish Senyal is Ford International Professor of Urban Development and Planning in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at MIT. He also heads the Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program at MIT. Professor Senyal served as the Head of the Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP) at MIT from 1994 to 2002 and as the Chair of the MIT Faculty from 2007 until 2009. Professor Senyal has published extensively on cities and city planning in developing countries, particularly on the question of how to integrate the majority of the urban population who are poor into the physical and economic fabric of the city. He has also written on procedural planning theory, and planning education. Professor Senyal's publications include 5 books, his most recent (2012) is *Planning Ideas that Matter* (MIT Press). Professor Senyal is the recipient of many awards, including the Gill-Chin Lim Award for humanistic approach to international development (2018); the Global Planning Educator's inaugural award for International Planning Education (2016); MacVicar Faculty Fellowship at MIT in 2011 for outstanding contributions to undergraduate education; and was awarded the Distinguished Alumnus Award 2011 from his alma mater, the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur. Professor Senyal has advised national and local governments in India, Bangladesh, Jordan, Zambia, Curacao, Argentina, Brazil, and Thailand. He has also advised leading development agencies, such as ILO, USAID, UNDP, UNHCR, as well as leading philanthropic institutions, including the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

For more on Professor Senyal's projects and work, please visit his website in DUSP at: <http://dusp.mit.edu/faculty/bish-senyal>

The Agency of Professional Knowledge Within and Beyond the Planning System

Searching for an alternative to planning depends on what we as planners want to achieve and how far we are willing to go. Regardless of identity crises, some fundamental questions are: What makes us planners? How do we use our knowledge? For whom and to what extent? If the desired outcome of planning is the greatest common good, the question is then about the agency of planning knowledge and how it is best used to maximize benefit to the community as a whole.

'Lawfare' and 'morality of the commons' frame the legal system as a weapon against immorality and injustice. They offer a means with which to turn against the state, its systems and officials, with the aim of promoting the common good. This opens the possibility for counter action from within the system, based on a deep and meticulous understanding of how the system operates, how it is used, and what it enables and allows. The option of lawfare within the planning system focuses on professional capacity and proficiency; only with complete and thorough understanding and familiarity of this intricate system can planning be used as a weapon against immorality and injustice.

To this suggestion, which gives priority to knowledge, I add the necessity to open up and share planning knowledge in order to confront the system and its operating mechanisms. In my contribution I explore the potential of breaking down the armor of autonomous professional knowledge with the goal of sharing it with others for the benefit of the common good. Can proliferation of professional knowledge help build a sense of ownership and urban citizenship to confront the current system? Could sharing professional knowledge with others become yet another channel towards moral and just planning? How does such an approach stand in opposition to current critique of participation and the use of local knowledge in planning.

Rachel Kallus is an architect and urban planner, holding professional degree from MIT and Ph.D. from the Technion. She is Professor Emerita at the Technion. Her scholarship concentrates on the socio-political production of the built environment and the formation of urban cultures. She examines ethno-nationally contested spaces in the interplay between policy measures (planning) and physical-spatial interventions (architecture) within cultural, political and intellectual environments.

Rachel Kallus



Policy with No Vision

In his paper 'The Dilemma of Planning', Law-Yone reviews changes in the role of planning in society. He argues that "planning was never very critical to start with. Over time, it became mostly concerned with formal practice, less with theory." He claims further that planning 'theories' deal less with 'what' and 'why' but rather with 'how'.

In this paper, I take Law-Yone's arguments one step further and argue that the process for creating planning policy has narrowed overtime, especially over the last two decades with the global spread of neo-liberalism.

In his seminal book of 1936, Harold D Laswell defines policy and process as: "who gets what, when, and how". In spatial and planning policies, it is also common to ask 'where?', giving importance to space and place. In this paper I argue that these questions no longer exist in making of planning policy. Over time, the way policy makers perceive the process of making planning policy has narrowed. Visions, values, and broader goals have been omitted from the process, narrowing focus on procedural questions such as 'how many?' and 'by whom?' referring mainly to the private sector, while ignoring all other dimensions of policy.

In this paper I present these changes through an analysis of Israel's major National Master Plans.

Ravit Hananel



Dr. Ravit Hananel is a faculty member and Head of the Urban Renewal Lab, in the Department of Public Policy, Tel Aviv University. She holds a Master's degree in political science from Tel-Aviv University, and a Ph.D. in urban and regional planning, from the Technion in Israel. She is an expert in land policy, land use (planning) policy and housing policy, especially for disadvantaged populations. She is engaged in spatial and urban studies, and focuses on the relationship between decision-making by public institutions and questions about distributive justice and social equality

What can Planning Offer the World?

Planning cultivates ideas that address the question of "what should be done" and fosters the related discourse of "how to" with the ultimate goal of developing mechanisms for implementation. Law-Yone's criticism is an attack on both. He views modern ideas and mechanisms as tools that reinforce hierarchical, sociopolitical systems of control. His most recent paper, however, goes beyond this critique and offers a new discursive dilemma: "do we foresee a conflict of interests between "rational", "objective" planning and a liberal democracy of the commons? Is there a chance for an evolution of new "politics" or are we facing a future of states of exception where planning becomes radically redefined? This dilemma calls for re-assessing the role of planning in a time when democracy is under attack, and when the goals of planning and its benefits to society are unclear.

In response to this dilemma, I suggest moving forward in the following directions: Creating a utopian-conceptual inflation with a focus on democracy and engagement. Develop ideas that emphasize sociodemographic diversity and develop new configurations of our institutions. An 'ideal society' can only be realized where a multitude of opinions and forms coexist. In that sense, the Commons is just one path in a broader lexicon of calls and reforms for creating the 'good place'.

Addressing time-space. This is a critical component in any call for reform, and was the Achilles heel of many 20th century utopian theories. Their visionaries neglected spatiotemporal context, creating static models that allowed for overriding and manipulative exploitation of essentially sound ideas. There is likewise a need to reflect and be sensitive to temporality in the case of the Commons.

Contextualizing reforms. We are living in the era of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Previous industrial revolutions had a marked influence on society, the economy and on creation of models for socio-spatial development. In the near future, important questions will be focused on the influence of artificial intelligence; digitization; employment; the climate crisis; and human existentialism. These questions are more than a critique of 'mechanisms'. They pointedly ask how society will adapt to new technologies, taking into account the ever-evolving variety of cultural, political, environmental and socio-structural dynamics; and further, how all of this will advance the principle of equality and equity.

Planning is a discipline that fosters socially agreed action, but does not promote enough activism to counter or question norms. Thus, , we must increasingly support activism in planning through dynamic mobility and through antagonism (i.e. challenging institutionalized approaches). Dynamic mobility and antagonism are both means to promote ideas and reforms in search of the 'good place'.

Tali Hatuka



Tali Hatuka (B.Arch, MSc., PhD), an architect and urban planner, is a Professor of Urban Planning and the head (and founder) of the Laboratory of Contemporary Urban Design, in the Department of Geography and the Human Environment at Tel Aviv University (lud.tau.ac.il). Her work is focused primarily on two fields: (1) urban society (i.e., public space, conflicts and dissent); and (2) city design (i.e., housing and industrial areas, and technology). Her current major projects are: 1. The City in the Digital Age, with a focus on planning, technology, industry and inequality; 2. The City in the New Industrial Age, with a focus on the influence of industry on spatial development ;and 3. Dissent, Public Spaces, and Immigration, focusing on immigration and protests in contemporary cities. Her recent book, *The Design of Protest* (University of Texas Press, 2018), is an analysis of spatial characteristics and manifestations of protests..

Rethinking the Role of Property Rights in the Enactment of Citizenship: The Potential of Community Land Trusts to Remediate the Dilemmas of Planning

This paper weaves a range of threads associated with the work of Hubert Law Yone into an argument about how to transcend the dilemmas of planning, by focusing greater attention on legal arrangements and cultural traditions that reinforce collective property rights. The paper has several main arguments. First, it suggests that it is possible for planners to transcend some of the most egregious inequality impacts associated with market logics in cities by fostering land-use arrangements built around experiments in urban collective ownership. While much of the work on collective property ownership has focused on rural areas, we argue that urban areas can also be fertile sites for such arrangements. Second, we show that recent collective ownership and management experiments, like community land trusts (CLTs), hold the potential to mitigate against displacement and dispossession in cities, even as they provide an opportunity to reinforce citizenship rights and new forms of horizontal solidarity. Such dynamics can offer residents a partial means to push back against market-driven land uses and state complicity in their design. A third and related claim is that legal traditions and urban politics are as important as colonial status in explaining the barriers and enablers to the adoption of community land trusts. Closer attention to the distribution of CLTs worldwide shows they are more prevalent in common law than in civil law systems, and that these patterns do not necessarily align with colonial status per se. All this suggests that we should be cautious about adopting the 'blunt analytic' that comes with framing planning and land use practices through the lens of colonialism and its constraints on progressive planning outcomes. Whether literally, as in the case of planning within veritable post-colonial and settler societies, or figuratively, as a shorthand for understanding planning as the extension of hegemonic power relations associated with state and market logics; a conceptual preoccupation with the colonial nature of planning can sideline appreciation of the ways that collective land use dynamics are enabled or constrained by both legal traditions and politically-negotiated alliances between local officials and mobilized activists.

Diane E. Davis



Diane E. Davis is the Charles Dyer Norton Professor of Regional Development and Urbanism and former Chair of the Department of Urban Planning and Design at Harvard's Graduate School of Design (GSD). Before moving to the GSD in 2011, Davis served as the head of the International Development Group in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at MIT, where she also was Associate Dean of the School of Architecture and Planning. She began her academic career teaching at the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research. Trained as a sociologist with an interest in political geography (BA in Geography, Northwestern University; Ph.D. in sociology, UCLA) Davis's research interests include the relations between urbanization and national development, urban governance, informality, and the growth and structure of cities, with a special emphasis on Latin America and on questions of political power, sovereignty, and urban violence. Books include *Cities and Sovereignty: Identity Conflicts in the Urban Realm* (Indiana University Press, 2011); *Discipline and Development: Middle Classes and Prosperity in East Asia and Latin America* (Cambridge University Press, 2004; named the ASA's 2005 Best Book in Political Sociology); *Irregular Armed Forces and their Role in Politics and State Formation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003); and *Urban Leviathan: Mexico City in the Twentieth Century* (Temple University Press 1994; Spanish translation 1999).

Displacers or Placemakers: Urban Planners in Gray Spaces

In September 2005, the "Planning Committee for Principle Issues" (which constitutes one of Israel's main planning institutions) met to discuss construction of 30 new farms in the Negev Desert. The program presented desirable positioning of agro-turism farms, as well as access to them and associated infrastructure, in an area that appeared empty. It wasn't. Farms had already been informally established years earlier "to preserve the nation's lands" from the proliferation of Bedouin-Palestinian communities; in essence, to serve geopolitical goals. The new program was in complete contrast to the existing regional and national plans that showed the area to be vacant. That is, the new plan was designed to legalize informal development. The head of the National Planning Administration focussed the discussion on the question: under what circumstances might planners legalize informal construction? None of the suggestions claimed that legalization is desirable when there is political support and when it serves geopolitical goals. Eventually, this was the only justification that successfully legalized the farms through planning.

I use this example as a doorway to the question: 'what should be done?' To answer this question, I focus, methodologically, on analyzing the 'grey space'; the space in which formal and informal planning co-exist. Gray space is a complex product of dynamics in which capital, identities, and politics are 'tight-knit'. In this framework, I attempt to understand the role that planners play, as a preparation for the question of 'what should be done?' Three alternatives are presented and discussed in the paper:

A. Planners at once as 'placemakers' and as 'displacers'; partners of politicians in realizing geopolitical and capitalist goals, inspired by Smadar Sharon (2006, 2017). This alternative upholds the idea that planners serve political interests, rather than being loyal to professional planning and sensitive to social needs.

B. Planners as placemakers in the process of building community through 'small changes', inspired by Nabeel Hamdi (2010, 2013). Contrary to the idea of planning as a science and theoretical framework, Hamdi proposes that planners should be "improvisers that have long-term, large-scale effectiveness of immediate, small-scale actions".

C. Planners as placemakers in insurgent planning, protest and activism, inspired by Yacobi (2007) and through interpretation of Law-Yone's law-fare and morality of the commons. Comaroff (2001) introduces the term 'lawfare' as a form of war consisting of use of the legal system against an (internal or external) enemy. Based on this term, Comaroff claims that 'modern' legal systems, mainly the ones focused on land, space and property rights, are actually an "effort to conquer and control indigenous peoples by the coercive use of legal means" (Comaroff 2001, 306). While lawfare is a strategy for disposition - translating indigenous space into a commodified good- my interpretation to Law-Yone's law-fare and morality of the commons is the ability to employ the legal and formal planning system to defend the rights of informals.

At this stage I cannot point to a preferred alternative.

Erez Tzfadia



Erez Tzfadia is Associate Professor of Public Policy and Administration at Sapir College, Israel, where he was the head of the department and an executive board member (2011-2015). Erez is an alumnus of Ben Gurion University (2002), held a Lady Davis Postdoctoral position at the Hebrew University (2003), and was an Israel Institute Visiting Scholar at the Bildner Center at Rutgers University (2015-6). He holds adjunct positions at Ben Gurion University and at the University of Maryland (2016-2018). His studies focus on spatial policy in Israel. He is the coauthor of *Rethinking Israeli Space* (Routledge, 2011); *Israel since 1980* (Cambridge, 2008), and the coeditor of *Abandoning State—Surveillancing State: Social Policy in Israel, 1985–2008* (Sapir and Resling, 2010). More details on his research are available at: <https://ws.sapir.ac.il/lecturers/lectpage.php?id=2481>. Erez is the chairperson of the board of directors of BIMKOM – Planners for Planning Rights - an Israeli non-profit, human rights organization (<http://bimkom.org/eng>).

Can Democracy Solve The Dilemma of Planning?

Law-Yones definition of The Dilemma of Planning provides a critical yet ambitious perspective. It is justifiable and reasonable to expect from planning a coherent view of society; to be just in the face of injustice; to tolerate identity crisis; to be generous toward minorities; to be both moral and lawful; and to be institutional and yet for and of the people. If not, what is its purpose? As long as the promise of a better society is embedded in the idea of planning, and as long as that promise is far from being fulfilled, this dilemma exists. Law-Yone claims "ALL planning is law-fare". He calls on planners to adopt the values of 'law-fare of the commons'; that is, to reject the so-called 'rational' and 'objective' values of the formal state and develop a new, 'neo-neo-liberal' set of values that neutralize the state and create new planning – and new politics.

Law-Yone's and others disappointment from the reality of planning is inevitable. This results from what I see as the mistaken role, and as a result structure, given to planning. The fault lies in defining planning as a profession and a mechanism with the ability to transform society. Planning is mistakenly expected to apply semi-scientific tools through a comprehensive understanding of space, society and the environment. Moreover, planning is expected to be constructed on values of justice, tolerance and equality. This expectation is not necessarily typical throughout the public sphere. These unrealistic expectations often lead to disappointment.

I suggest seeing planning as it should be, and as it has been throughout its history: as a political tool. Instead of expecting planners to lead the 'law-fare of the commons', why not use planning as a tool of the modern, liberal state? That is, basing planning on the principles of democratic administration; adopting planning laws in an open and democratic manner, through public debate; and ensuring that planning laws reflect society rather than correct it. Planning must be reformulated according to two lines of action: first, the separation of powers between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial authority; second, adherence to a set of abstract principles that are formulated by public delegates at the local and the national levels. These principles must be articulated in advance and presented publicly in an open and accessible manner, like all other rules and laws in democratic society. Such principles would put planning on an open, publicly scrutinized stage and ensure it functions according to publicly accepted values and principles. Like all law, planning policy would constantly evolve, in line with ever changing social values, technology, fashion and challenges. Once planning is a reflection of society – rather than its saviour – the dilemma of planning can be resolved.

Nurit Alfasi



Another critical component of democratizing planning is the transferring of decision-making power from the governmental sphere to a 'judicial' authority, whose role is to review, publicly discuss and decide on specific rules. Separating the powers of decision-making and rearranging them in line with the structure of the modern-democratic state is an important step toward solving the dilemma of planning and toward allowing planning to reflect the true will of society.

Nurit Alfasi is an associate professor in the Department of Geography and Environmental Development at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. Since 2011 she has been the head of the graduate planning program. Nurit is the deputy chair of the Israeli Association of Planners and a member of the board of directors of Sikkuy, The Association for the Advancement of Civil Equality, www.sikkuy.org.il. Nurit's research interests include planning theory, urban dynamics and complexity theory. Her thesis centers on the 'Self-Planned City', incorporating the notion of complexity and the principles of liberal democracy within the planning process. From this viewpoint, she is researching the relations between planning policies and urban processes, currently focusing on adaptive and anti-adaptive neighborhoods and on the Israeli planning crisis.

Decolonizing Planning?

Most planning theories are partial, as they turn a blind eye to the 'darker sides' of planning. As such, they leave planners without appropriate horizons, agendas, and tools to fulfill the field's *raison-de'tre* – emancipate society from spatial oppressions, and create credible alternatives for improving urban society.

On the other hand, Law-Yone's inspiring work over the years, and his recent essay 'Dilemmas of Planning', rightly identifies oppressive planning as part of a colonial and capitalist state *Lawfare* against ordinary people. The oppressive nature of planning exists alongside its more benign dimensions, but is often concealed or silenced. Under these settings, most urban regions have experienced a process of 'spatially inversed coloniality' and reached unprecedented levels of inequalities and dispossession. Israel/Palestine – one of the most planned spaces on earth – is a prime example.

It is hence high-time to re-theorise planning and resolve the dilemma posed by Law-Yone, by disrupting the false balance between objectivity and advocacy. I propose the SouthEastern 'Aleph epistemology', as a conceptual and professional platform to decolonise the process of spatial change. Such an exercise would move beyond the problematic call to serve 'the public interest' or the 'greater common good', which tends to favour the powerful.

Instead, planning in structurally unequal societies should work first and foremost with, and for, marginalized and dispossessed communities. Such a shift would move planning towards a sustainable normative horizon – the pursuit of just space and society. Planners should thus be educated to become experts in resisting oppressions and finding paths for spatial justice(s). This entails moving towards a 'pluriversal' understanding of space, de-privatising ('commoning') parts of the city, redistributing its resources and decision powers, and constructing equal 'metrozenship' as a foundation for our future metropolitan society.

Oren Yiftachel



Yiftachel teaches urban studies and political and legal geography at Ben-Gurion University, Beersheba. Yiftachel has taught at a range of universities in Australia, Israel, the US, India, South Africa and Italy. His research has focused on critical understandings of the relations between space, power and conflict. He has published over 100 articles and ten authored and edited books, including *Planning a Mixed Region in Israel* (1992), *Planning as Control: Policy and Resistance in Divided Societies* (Pergamon, 1995); *Israelis in Conflict* (Sussex, 2004), *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine* (Penn 2006); *Indigenous (in)Justice* (Harvard, 2012) and *Emptied Lands: Legal Geography of Bedouins in the Negev* (forthcoming Stanford, 2018). Yiftachel is an activist, who has worked with a range of human rights and civil society organizations, including the RCUV -- council for unrecognized Bedouin villages, "Adva" – Center for social equality, and as the chair of B'Tselem – monitoring human rights violations in the Palestinian Territories.

Discussants

Deborah F. Shmueli



Deborah F. Shmueli is a professor in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at the University of Haifa. She is a co-Principal Investigator of the Minerva Center for Law and Extreme Conditions and the Head of the National Knowledge and Research Center for Emergency Readiness, Israel. She is a planner specializing in environmental and public policy issues and has published widely in these areas. Strong foci are public and environmental conflict management, water policy, collaborative planning, and community and institutional capacity building, and she currently serves as a member of the Ministry of Interior's Haifa Metropolitan Area Permanent Geographic Boundary Committee. She is an editorial board member of *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *Socio-ecological Practice Research*, *Planning Theory and Practice*, the *Journal of the American Planning Association*, and *Ecology and Environment (Hebrew)*. She received her BS and MCP degrees from MIT (1980), and her DSc from the Technion Israel Institute of Technology (1992).

Yosef Jabareen



Yosef Jabareen is a planning theorist who focuses on the nexus and rift between urban planning theory and practices in two realms: urban justice and rights, as well as, sustainability and climate change. His recent book *The Risk City* presents a new theory regarding contemporary city plans around the world, and the evolving risk and uncertainties.