

UC Berkeley

Berkeley Planning Journal

Title

Foreword

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2z2342wh>

Journal

Berkeley Planning Journal, 29(1)

Author

Chapple, Karen

Publication Date

2017

DOI

10.5070/BP329138431

Copyright Information

Copyright 2017 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

FOREWORD

Karen Chapple

In an era of globalization, it is perhaps not surprising that displacement has become normalized. The Call for Papers for this volume of the *Berkeley Planning Journal* referenced the United Nations estimate of 65 million refugees globally, a staggering total that does not even include the internal displacement totals of the most affluent countries in the world. Many heroic efforts have emerged to assist refugees from nation-states, as well as victims of the affordable housing crises of advanced capitalism. Yet, there seems to be little movement towards addressing the root causes of displacement, or even taking preventive action to stabilize communities.

Our tiny world of urban planners should take this failure to heart. Since the mid-twentieth century, the biggest shock to planning practice has been the traumatic impact of urban renewal, which displaced hundreds of thousands of residents, the vast majority communities of color, for new development and highways. In the wake of resident revolts and new social movements, planning entered a new era of reflective or critical practice that increasingly acknowledged the multiplicity of views and complexity of institutions (Forester 1989; Innes and Booher 2010; Sandercock 2004). Still, planners continue to support infrastructure and real estate developments that displace residents either directly or indirectly, by accelerating processes of neighborhood change. We continue to plan for the jobs and residents to come, rather than for existing communities—particularly those with disadvantaged residents.

Abetting practicing planners is a world of scholarship that has fallen short in theorizing about and even describing displacement. Critical geographers and sociologists have crafted rich narratives about gentrification processes around the world, but offer almost nothing other than speculation about the displacement that is occurring (see, for instance, Lees, Shin, and

López-Morales 2016; Smith 1996). Economists and planners have struggled to operationalize displacement and neighborhood context, have examined only a small selection of potential causes, and have modeled neighborhood change only over short timeframes that cannot possibly capture the entirety of change (for more detail, see Zuk et al. 2018). Existing methodologies and data fail to track much of the displacement that is occurring, and the more rigorous and thoughtful definitions (Grier & Grier, 1978; Marcuse, 1986) remain largely ignored.

Given this vacuum, a *Berkeley Planning Journal* volume dedicated to displacement is a welcome addition. These articles deploy a variety of methodologies, conceptual frameworks, and definitions to deepen our understanding of displacement. Expanding on our US-centric definitions and narratives of displacement are Bhattachajee's examination of the gendered governance of mobility and Shelby's grounded, annotated storytelling about eviction pressures in Bangkok. Back to California, the authors deconstruct the housing crisis and its proposed solutions, from the racist epistemologies underlying both NIMBY and YIMBY arguments (McElroy and Szeto), to the failure of a social movement confronted by politics (Lin, Lindheim and Smith), to the glib readiness to blame labor costs for the inability to build enough housing at modest cost (Littlehale).

Taken together, these articles help build the case for new frameworks to understand displacement. Yet, they also point to ongoing challenges: the need to combine different ways of knowing, to couple deconstruction with vision, and to tell compelling stories in order to affect change. The next generation of scholarship will need to build such bridges if it is to reach our reflective practitioners.

REFERENCES

- Forester, John. 1989. *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Grier, G.W. and E. S. Grier. 1978. *Memo Report: Urban Displacement: a Reconnaissance. Prepared for the Office of the Secretary U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*.
- Innes, Judith E., and David E. Booher. 2010. *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. Routledge.
- Lees, Loretta, Hyun Bang Shin, and Ernesto López-Morales. 2016. *Planetary Gentrification*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Marcuse, P. 1986. "Abandonment, Gentrification, and Displacement: The Linkages in New York City." In *Gentrification of the City*, edited by Smith, N. and Williams, P. London, 153–77. Routledge.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 2004. "Towards a Planning Imagination for the 21st Century." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70 (2):133–41.
- Smith, Neil. 1996. *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Zuk, Miriam, Ariel Bierbaum, Karen Chapple, Karolina Gorska and Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris. 2018. "Gentrification, Displacement, and the Role of Public Investment." *Journal of Planning Literature* 33 (1): 31-44.