Chapter 9 takes up the residents’ subsequent struggle to gain redress from the White Sox and the city for their economic and physical losses. As the authors emphasize: ‘The idea of rebuilding the South Armour neighborhood initially fired the enthusiasm of the residents and provided immediate tasks and a revitalized organizational vision for the SASNC’ (p. 261). When in 1996 the lawsuit SASNC filed seven years earlier was dismissed and their proposal for an empowerment zone grant was denied, the SASNC and Wentworth activists who were involved in these efforts decided that they could not go forward with the development plans. However, Feldman and Stall point to some modest gains that had been won, most notably the cultivation of new leadership and some significant improvements to Wentworth Gardens, including landscaping and the addition of picnic tables and playground equipment.

Chapter 10’s subtitle ‘a bureaucratic quagmire’, sums up the challenges residents faced when they decided to apply for HUD’s resident management program. Despite the many organizational skills that the Wentworth residents ‘brought to the job of resident mangers, the lack of resources and changing requirements served to “undermine and compromise the activists” efforts’ (p. 303).

In the final chapter, the authors emphasize the persistence of the activists’ resistance as well as consider the consequences for the empowerment efforts ‘when resistance is not enough’ (p. 347). They conclude that: ‘The 40-year history of Wentworth women residents’ activism flies in the face of conceptualizations of public housing residents as pathological or apathetic victims of despair and of their homes as places of chaos and misery’ (p. 351). The story that Feldman and Stall tell also reveals the inadequacy of public housing policy and the contradictory approaches that typically fail to take into consideration the needs and perspectives of low-income residents. All urban policymakers should heed the many lessons embedded in this richly detailed study. The significance of *The Dignity of Resistance* lies not only in the richness of detail the authors provide, but also in the way the authors weave description, biographical narratives of the activists, and theoretical analysis throughout the chapters. Given the interdisciplinary approach, the book should be of interest to urban studies scholars, social geographers, sociologists, women’s studies faculty and social policy analysts, as well as anyone advocating for the right of low-income residents to a decent quality of life.

Nancy A. Naples, University of Connecticut


This book is a rich and challenging first initiative by GPEAN — the Global Planning Education Association Network — to stimulate dialogue about a wide variety of planning-related theories and practices in several parts of the world. In the editors’ words: ‘The *Dialogues* book series seeks to offer a sampling of best urban planning scholarship from each of the world’s planning scholarship communities to scholars in the other communities’ (p. xiii). The articles were submitted to the editors after a prior selection process within each of the GPEAN planning associations.

Reviewing such a book in a few words is not an easy task, first because it is a collection of articles based on many different planning theories and approaches, and secondly because in the introduction the editors have already provided a thorough comparative review of the authors’ contributions. In it, they organize the articles under four different themes: planning and economy; environment and conservation; the nature of the planning process and decision-making; and two articles that discuss theoretical contributions to planning. The editors’ classification certainly provides anyone reading the book with a good guide, and it would therefore be pointless for me to repeat the
same arrangement here. My intention in this review is twofold. On the one hand I wish to discuss the essence of the theory that explicitly or implicitly underpins the articles, so as to identify the challenges and improve the chances of actually establishing dialogues. On the other hand, and complementing the above, I hope to distinguish among the various approaches according to their different social backgrounds. My first comment is that urban and regional planning in many of the developing countries has not yet been fully institutionalized. The process of institutionalization has been hindered by strong opposition from private economic interests to state regulation of their activities, including planning. In such a situation, the political economy approach seems appropriate to identify the unevenness of space production in urban/metropolitan contexts, as in the analysis of the Metropolitan Region of Buenos Aires, Argentina (chapter 4). The article from Brazil on ecological–economic zoning in the Amazon also emphasizes the way in which economic and political interests pervade planning proposals (chapter 7). Socio-economic inequalities are likewise a matter of concern in South African cities, despite the centrality of ethnic and race issues (chapters 9 and 11). The absence and/or weakness of state regulatory planning instruments are also emphasized in the article that discusses urban regeneration and conservation in China (chapter 6).

Difference — encompassing ethnic, racial and cultural diversities — and environmental issues, rather than socio-spatial inequalities, are seen as new challenges by those authors who discuss situations where urban/local planning is already consolidated, both in practice and institutionally. Despite their focus, I would suggest that it is inappropriate to label such urban analyses as essentially post-structuralist, because they very comprehensively incorporate a political dimension, even though difference is the central issue in the theory and practice of planning in these contexts. The meaning of difference here relates to a more comprehensive and structural (rather than fragmented) understanding of society. The chapters in question — 8, 10 and 11 — all offer useful discussions on recent changes at the world level and the challenges they pose to theory and practice in urban/local planning. In the context of ethnic and racial diversity in a Hawaiian community, the analysis in chapter 8 reveals the difficulties in designing and facilitating the planning process, suggesting that planners should ‘extend their thinking into other epistemological worlds’ (p. 180). In chapter 11, the author argues for the need to evaluate the assumptions of normative theories, especially communicative planning theory, and to consider ‘the extent to which they provide useful direction’ (p. 273) in the context of South African cities. The analysis in chapter 10, while advocating a ‘neopragmatic approach to collaborative planning’ (p. 247), also recognizes the need to rethink planning theory in a context (Banff National Park, Canada) where there are conflicts among stakeholders around environmental issues. The approach suggested is a more flexible planning process where ‘definitions of crucial concepts should emerge through dialogue and information sharing’ (p. 249).

Empirical case-study analyses inform the discussion of new planning challenges in chapters 2, 3 and 5. In chapter 2, the author uses the case of Canada to discuss the thorny question of mixed use in urban planning theory and practice. The author’s conclusions are that mixed-use initiatives are making little progress in Canada. The article is a valuable contribution to the book’s proposed dialogues, insofar as mixed use is now a subject of debate in urban planning and practice throughout the world. Another worldwide issue — the role of public–private partnerships in providing specialized infrastructure — is explored in the case study of Olympic stadiums in Sydney, Australia (chapter 3). Since the Barcelona Games in 1992, when Catalan consultants started to propose this kind of model in urban planning in several parts of the world, public–private partnerships have become a matter of concern insofar as they essentially subordinate planning to market forces. In spite of its specific nature, the case study in chapter 5 about conservation and biodiversity in farmed landscapes in Britain makes an important contribution to methodology — the ‘whole landscape’ approach — that can be tried out in other contexts.
Lastly, chapters 12 and 13 provide welcome additions to urban analysis and planning: the former proposes the incorporation of storytelling in planning processes, while the latter explores ‘dilemmas in critical planning theory’. Both will fuel dialogues among planners.

The theoretical discussions that explicitly or implicitly underpin the analysis in every chapter enable the reader to apprehend a more concrete view of the potential of planning as a means to achieve socio-spatial justice. There are, of course, other ways to read and interpret this book. That is another challenge I now pose to its readers. Whatever approach one takes to the book, however, it is certainly an important volume for anybody interested in a comparative analysis of planning theory, methodology and practice.

Geraldo Magela Costa, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil


The editors of this volume have brought together a diverse collection of essays and case studies, which stem from a series of papers presented and discussed at a roundtable conference on the ‘social sustainability of technological networks’, held in New York City in 2001. These essays provide an important cross-disciplinary view of critical infrastructure networks with a focus on the socio-political interactions. In an area typically dominated by engineering-based analysis, this volume provides a good, although somewhat scattered, overview of the economic, social, political and environmental risks associated with an increasing dependence on interlinked infrastructure systems.

In the introduction, Coutard, Hanley and Zimmerman outline the four major thematic areas in which the contributed essays analyze the sustainability of urban networks. These include networks in spatial and urban systems; risks and crises in networked systems; development of the internet; and networks and sustainable access to water. A fifth and final section, which constitutes a single essay, focuses on the challenges associated with the deregulation of large technical networks in the United States.

Part I (chapters 1–3) sets the tone for this volume. Although large technical networks continue to play an important role for increasing the efficiency of day-to-day operations in the global economy, particularly within urban systems, many of the more subtle (and some which are not) social and environmental implications of these networks have been ignored. The contributing authors examine the numerous regulatory, political and spatial contestations surrounding the growth of these networks in urban systems, including issues of privacy and exclusion. For example, Graham and Guy (chapter 2) provide an interesting look at the social-spatial reconstruction of San Francisco. Specifically, the authors examine the friction between pro-growth and growth-controlled ideologies during the ‘dot-com invasion’. As internet entrepreneurs began making portions of downtown San Francisco their center of operations, the social and cultural impacts of this ‘invasion’ were wide ranging. For instance, the authors provide an interesting discussion of a ‘cultural and class purge’ in the city, noting that ‘Seventy thousand white collar and high-tech jobs were being created in San Francisco every year in the late 1990s’ (pp. 39–40). Not surprisingly, because affluent dot-com employees sought homes in the city, both a massive spike in housing prices and an overall shortage of housing ensued. This process ultimately led to the expulsion of poorer people from San Francisco because they simply could not afford to remain residents. This was mirrored in the commercial real estate sector, with the growth of ‘internet ready’ real estate and the emergence of live-work developments throughout the city. Ultimately, Graham and Guy make the important link between simple disputes