For nearly a quarter century, *Critical Planning Journal* (CPJ) has been a venue where UCLA urban planning students and allies ask some of the most pressing questions of the time. After the election of Donald Trump (Number 45), the hashtag #Resist quickly spread. In many ways, Number 45 typifies the perfect villain of ongoing neoliberal restructuring and global political shifts right. Naomi Klein (2017) explains how Number 45 fuses a new style of hyper-capitalism beyond product branding into multiple domains of life, including real estate, clothing, television shows, and so on, as sites of accumulation for trillions of worldwide surplus capital. Number 45 also stokes the fires of racism, taking advantage of middle class economic hardship, while insisting the solution lies in the Mexico border wall, the Muslim travel ban, and tax cuts for the rich. Yet, vilifying Number 45 is not enough.

In step with Klein, critical planners must not only reject these trends and their influence on urban planning, but also generate alternative worlds by questioning the shifting terrain of intervention and role of planners. How can radical planning *disrupt* the ongoing rise of right-wing nationalism and white supremacy? In what ways can critical planning *challenge* the reign of male power and violence? How can we *illuminate pathways* toward constructing a radically different world? While I ask these questions without answers, the following papers—submissions that preceded the election of Trump—provide a glimpse into nine forms of *Resistance to Extraction* from around the world, and serve as an invitation for future radical planning students, activists, and allies to chart the path forward. While Number 45 is tremendously
distracting at this historic conjuncture, the political, economic, and social restructuring is only a contemporary manifestation of accumulation. Critical planning has long served as a code word for anti-capitalist planning, which ought to be expanded to anti-racial capitalist planning.¹ As a student-founded and run journal, CPJ has always attempted to disrupt conventions in the field, planners’ own complicity with power, and reconceptualize radical urban praxis. In brief, the journal tracks the shifting terrains of oppression and tactics of resistance, reimagining, and rebuilding.

This special issue on Resistance to Extraction builds upon a rich history of past issues that took up similarly pressing, timely and timeless issues: the boundaries of disciplines, political economy, environmental justice, new regionalism, megaprojects, technology, privatization, spatial justice, urban restructuring, resilience, migration, military, Indigenous planning, and crisis urbanism. I invite you to look back and see what we can learn from the past while simultaneously taking on tomorrow’s pressing issues.

Volume 23 combines submissions on Resistance to Extraction with a variety of thoughtful reflections on the life, contributions, and activism of Jacqueline Leavitt and Edward W. Soja. Resistance to Extraction brings into focus how firms embedded in global capitalism continue to depend on colonial practices of forced movement in order to generate capital accumulation. Extraction takes many approaches to distinct objects: natural resources, goods, languages, bodies, profits, etc. The following essays illuminate various agents, practices, and objects of extraction, and their embeddedness within systems of urbanization. Resistance is essential at a time when the effects of climate change are being felt worldwide, and neoliberal capitalism reproduces forms of racial, gender, and class hierarchy. Place-based resistance shifts identities, challenges rental extraction, and recreates local economies.

The peer-review articles bring together case studies on Resistance to Extraction from around the world, including: Lebanon, Syria, Iran, Columbia, Chile, Brazil, India, South Korea, New Zealand, Canada, and South Wales. Zoë Roller (2017) destabilizes conventional planning epistemologies with a global survey of criminal planning, focusing on gangs and militias in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, cartels in Medellin, Columbia, mafias in Mumbai, India, and Isis and Hezbollah in the Middle East. The non-state entities with ‘illegitimate’ practices, while not romanticized by Roller, engage in activities under the umbrella of ‘planning:’ resource distribution, security

¹. On racial capitalism see Robin DG Kelley (2017a; 2017b).
services, and infrastructural development.

Two papers directly address the ways in which communities are responding to natural resource removal. Kelvin Mason and Paul Milbourne (2017) deploy a participatory postcolonial analysis to unsettle notions of environmental justice with narratives of everyday struggles to open cast coal mining in South Wales. Next, drawing connections between extraction and community displacement, environmental destruction, and criminalization of protest, Sebastián Smart (2017) quantifies the relationships between the growth of extractive industries under neoliberal economic policies in Chile and forms of social mobilization.

The next few papers think about how urban planning often disrupts communities. Babar Chohan (2017) unpacks how land seizures and cultural appropriation resulted during the construction of a mega transportation project in New Zealand. By questioning relations of power between the state and community groups as an analytic lens, Chohan reveals planning's complicity with economic growth at the expense of local communities. Then Yasir Hameed (2017) addresses the supposed modern and secular nature of smart cities, arguing how forms of otherization persist in housing discrimination and segregation that are reproduced through planning practices in Delhi, India, which neglect a more intersectional approach that fuses caste, race, religion, and identity.

The articles then shift to Indigenous people's resistance in Canada from cultural and environmental destruction. Analyzing how Athabasca tar sands have led to ongoing displacement of Indigenous communities and disruption of traditional economic activities in Alberta, Christopher Alton (2017) illustrates how planning serves as "the handmaid of industry and settler colonialism" (140). Following this, Alyssa Koehn (2017) questions the longterm implications of a recent conflict around an Aboriginal burial site in cəsnaʔəm or so-called Vancouver, unearthed during an urban development project, wherein tactics of protest by the First Nation tribe of the Musqueam people included a 100 day vigil to stop the project.

**Resistance to Extraction** closes with the vexing relations between space and politics. Exploring a gender-exclusive park in Tehran, Iran, Shahrzad Shirvani (2017) questions the ambivalent politics of freedom within a walled-in space, and its relation to ongoing repression, separation, veiling, and gender power. And Eunseon Park (2017) explains the strategies and implications of sit-in occupations in response to distinct neoliberal urban policies in South Korea,
and the ways in which they manifest new enclosures of urban commons.²

Beyond the peer-reviewed articles, we are excited to include a photo essay by Mia Bennet, a poem questioning Number 45’s notion of America’s greatness by Bryonn Bain, a documentary film on resisting an oil pipeline in Canada by Tomas Borsa, an interview with Leonie Sandercock by Maria Francesca Piazzoni, an overview of the UCLA Urban Planning PhD experience by Lisa Berglund, Emily Erickson, and Hugo Sarmiento, and a book review of Evicted by Luis Flores. Finally, I was pleased to be joined by Nina M. Flores and Sue Ruddick to pull together thirteen papers reflecting on the contributions of Jacqueline Leavitt and Edward W Soja to critical planning. The contributors include: Nina M. Flores, Peter Marcuse, Dustianne North, Amy Shimson-Santo, Sue Ruddick, Allen J. Scott, Mark Purcell, Mike Davis, Núria Benach and Abel Albet, David J. Thompson, Luca Delbello and Nabil Nazha, and Michael Dear.
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