false profits: an analysis of planning's cult of growth and the demands of justice

04.15.22

Kayla Taylor

Master's Project

University of North Carolina at Chapel

Hill

Author's Note:

Due to the dearth of approaches to degrowth, this publication scratches the surface of future alternatives possible; it is my hope to illustrate the nuances and entanglements of theory, praxis, and pedagogy of the degrowth movement. All opinions reflected in this publication are my own.

This publication is open access.

The open access nature of this publication means that you can:

- read and store this document free of charge
- distribute it for personal use free of charge
- print sections of the work for personal use
- read or perform parts of the work in a context where no financial transactions take place.

Acknowledgments

This piece is only made possible through the varied and vigorous support from my community. Special thanks are given to my research advisor, Dr. Meenu Tewari.

Vested Interests and Politics of the Work:

Personal Adage: To plan, is to care

I understand that planners are not clinicians and do not have the capacity to provide medical help or give medical advice; planners, however, play key roles in the engineering of environments (both built and social) and therefore have the capacity to reduce harm and impart care through their work. The project is, therefore, an investigation of radical- therapeuticinterventionist approaches to planning and the epistemological analyses of the functions of care. Carework takes on many forms and planners have the capacity to function as care-workers. The labor of care-work is devalued within our current capitalistic paradigm because the nature of this work is regenerative and nonextractive. Some planners attempt to remedy the ills of capitalism through the policing and regulation of built environments. These attempts are futile as the biospheric integrity of our planet degrades at warp speed. There will be nothing left to repair.

Why I care:

- Materially, Capitalists and the supporters of capitalism (in the sense of rebuilding and reinforcing ideals) are the most valued people in society and therefore have a monopoly on power and influence
- Capitalism is exploitative in nature and wealth is generated through theft
- Unbridled growth cannot be sustained within our planetary boundaries
- The needs of most will be abandoned once resources are decimated and expansive and brutish violence will ensue.
- Functionally rational people are dedicated to selfpreservation
- The odds of survival are stacked against me.
- System breakdowns will be caused by the inability to cope with mass resource deprivation, and we will be left to fend for ourselves and defend what we have.
- Abandonment is violence because it is a refusal of care.

WE SHOULD CARE AND WORK FOR THE SAKE OF GOOD BECAUSE LIFE(& WELLNESS-THE PRODUCT OF LIVING A GOOD LIFE)MATTERS.

Abstract:

Degrowth planning and radical approaches have been minimally investigated within the planning department and teeter on the fringes of planning pedagogy. Planning methods have essentialized growth-approaches that yield opportunity and economic vitality. Planners have the power to spatially transform development and should have a role in the downscaling of society at all levels. Public planning is a major governmental institution that organizes and manages spatial development and prioritizes market needs and the facilitation of capital accumulation. The growth model is not sustainable model because of the planetary boundaries we exist under. The growth model functions under the assumption that all growth is beneficial and that there are unlimited reserves of resources for people to extract from. Unregulated free-market Capitalism and city/urban planning are at odds because planning should be used as a tool to mitigate uncertainty. Un-regulation begets uncertainty and crisis. Degrowth is a model that subverts the marketfetishistic/Capitalistic nature of planning and the functioning of society. It can be used as a preemptive measure to reduce the effects of the current global economic, environmental, and social crises of extraction and exploitation. Degrowth's aim is to retract the bounds economic systems at all levels.

Foundational Concepts and Key Words:

anti-utilitarianism, steady-state, bio-economics, smart growth, utility networks, care-based economies, austerity, gentrification, welfare, political imaginaries, vacancies, retraction, decay, rightsizing, justice

Table of Contents I. Introduction

II. Exploring the Collective Rights to the City and its Incompatibility with the Growth Machine

- a. Right to the City as an Organizing Principle for Radical Change
- b. The Formulation of Degrowth as a theory
- c. What is Smart Growth?
- d. American Planning Association's Smart Growth Declaration
- e. Planning for Capital Cities
- f. Collective Rights to the City and Commons Management

III. Applied Degrowth as Praxis: Cultivating a Global Culture of Care, Autonomy, Self-Determination, and Freedom

- a. REITs and the Specter of Speculative Growth
- b. Oakland and Philadelphia's Struggle for Housing and Self-Determination
- c. Contextualizing the "Right-Sizing" of Detroit as Degrowth
- d. Quicken Loans Funds Detroit
- e. Dystopian Detroit: The Detroit Future City Report
- f. Contextualizing Community Benefits within the framework of Wellbeing

IV. Shortfall of Urban Agriculture as a "Green Strategy" in the Rustbelt and Beyond

- a. Urban Agriculture in Detroit
- b. Urban Agriculture in Rio's Favelas

V. Conclusion

I. Introduction:

Cities are incubators that materialize culture and contribute to the engineering of political imaginaries. A given city's culture of growth is spatialized, enclosed, and departmentalized into "enclaves of regulated consumption". This regulation of consumption is compelled and enforced by the state (rule of law and monopoly of legitimacy/authority) resulting in exclusion, displacement, and inequality. City planners are compelled to regulate and enforce patterns of growth on behalf of the state. This imperative has resulted in practices of repression and coercion spurned by the wealthy who have a personal stake in the accumulation and hoarding of resources. The global ecological collapse will be caused by the degradation of the environment fueled by overconsumption. Economic, social, and political collapse will follow thereafter. The prospect of global mass extinction propelled by overconsumption and resource deprivation is neither hyperbolic nor glib. Spatial analyses of cities will provide contextual insights of the geopolitics of growth and retraction.

Cities such as Detroit, Philadelphia, Oakland, and Rio De Janeiro share socio-political commonalities such as deindustrialization, spatial mismatch, the criminalization of informal settlements/homelessness/vagrancy, racial segregation, unjust residential policies, and violent state repression. These shared experiences illustrate the expansiveness and depth of inequality created/compounded by capitalism.

The mechanisms of degrowth drive the multiscale reorganization of society. Degrowth compels places to redetermine patterns of the consumption, production, and distribution of resources and capital. Urban decline is catalyzed by social, political, and economic issues simultaneously. These factors are equally deterministic in the shrinking of cities and are tantamount in this project's research on how city planners implement degrowth interventions to manage city commons and promote the wellbeing of all.

Methods of Inquiry

The project explores the following questions:

- What alterative practices can be employed by planners to exert economic constraint to reduce production and consumption, while ensuring an equitable provisioning of commodities to promote the well-being?
- How should innovation and progression be considered within this new paradigm?
- How can urbanization be compatible with degrowth?
- How can cities become places of experimentation that challenge and transcend the growth imperative?
- What is the role of architecture and urban planning in this process of experimentation?
- How can the public contribute degrowth measures and what are democratic interventions of degrowth?
- What is the role of urban governance in the implementation of degrowth interventions?

To study these questions, I employ a qualitative analysis to contextualize and clarify salient concepts within the degrowth political framework to contribute to the development of degrowth theories and practices. This project conducts a literature review to deductively analyze the utility of the varied applications of degrowth theory to formulate interventions and to scrutinize their implications. These questions investigate the nature/benefits/impacts of degrowth interventions, what specific interventions are generated/compelled by unique environments/spaces, and how to materially realize the degrowth's claims of justice.

II.Exploring the Collective Rights to the City and its Incompatibility with the Growth Machine

a. Right to the City as an Organizing Principle for Radical Change

Henri Lefebvre's conceptualized people's right to the city wherein people possess the right to participate and appropriate the city; the public should be at the center of decision-making process regarding the creation and management of the city. And because the public holds this collective right, people have the right to use and occupy all spaces of the city without restriction. Lefebvre problematizes the spatial powers of the city as existing beyond location and possession. These aspects of space inform the "theatre" public life and inform people's sense of belonging. Belonging to the city is determined through participation rather than ownership and wealth. Lefebvre's argues a political imperative for citizens to formulate a "revolutionary conception of citizenship." He demands citizenship to be expressed beyond legality, but rather action. Radical citizenship can neither be bestowed or revoked from institutions of the "bourgeois nation-state". Even though people have a right and claim to the city, people must struggle, create, and reinvent social spaces of mutuality. This process is democratic citizenship and radically participatory city-building.

Radical participatory interventions are constrained by growth-first imperatives, market-oriented urban economic policy and by neoliberal urban governance. This type of governance reveres corporate and property-development interests in order to

maintain control over local land-use regimes. Planners are colonels of local land-use regimes and serve elite interests. Contemporary interventions in "opening up" the city have increased as financial crises have emerged, "While many places have provisionally experimented with instruments of community reinvestment, local land trusts and profit-sharing mechanisms in relation to such newly created arenas of urbanism, the predominant global trend is for growth machine interests—often linked to speculative, predatory investments in global financial markets—to reap the major financial rewards derived from them."(Brenner 2017).

21st century initiatives commonly involve the reconstruction of the "urban commons" through site-based public design interventions. This frequently results in the reinforcement of the ruling class's control over, "over the production and appropriation of urban space" (Brenner 2017). This reinforcement of control reinvents the wheel of and counteracts efforts of radical change. It is imperative for interventions to be divorced from top-down planning, market-oriented governance, social and spatial exclusion, and displacement. The redesign of space and the "opening" of the city catalyzes an influx of amenities, wealth, and speculation. These "benefits" are exclusively held and controlled by economic elites, and the commons are unduly influenced by the peripheral gentry. When wages continue to stagnate, unemployment continues to grow, the pandemic continues to persist, and the housing supply diminishes, interventions such as redesigning space and adding amenities are insufficient.

Therefore, smart growth interventions reinforce the capturing the commons by the elites.

b. The Formulation of Degrowth as a theory

The creation of the term degrowth is attributed to the French intellectual Andre Gorz. In 1972 he posited, "Is the earth's balance, for which no growth-or even degrowth-of material production is a necessary condition, compatible with the survival of the capitalist system?" (D'Alisa et. al 2014). The introduction of term impacted the French leftist lexicon of the 1970s and was cemented with the creation of the 'The Limits to Growth' report published in NEF Cahiers. (D'Alisa et. al 2014). Gorz's, Ecology and Freedom explicitly advocates degrowth as a means of praxis,

"The point is not to refrain from consuming more and more, but to consume less and less - there is no other way of conserving the available reserves for future generations . . . [equality without growth] is nothing but the continuation of capitalism by other means - an extension of middle-class values, lifestyles, and social patterns . . . Today a lack of realism no longer consists in advocating greater well- being through degrowth and the subversion of the prevailing way of life. Lack of realism consists in imagining that economic growth can still bring about increased human welfare, and indeed that it is still physically possible.(Gorz, 1980[1977]: 13)

Gorz was intellectually inspired by the political economist, Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen. Roegen's, "Entropy Law and the Economic Process" is the monumental thesis of ecological economics and bio-economics. Both terms are interdisciplinary in

nature and revolve around the economic governance challenges informed by ecological pressures, the transience of life, and the ephemerality of well-being. The theoretical development of degrowth was compelled by the oil crises of the 1980s and 1990s, generated through neoliberalism and deregulation.

c. What is Smart Growth?

Smart growth is synonymous with intentional coordination between places to ensure logical growth and development that ensures symbiotic and comprehensive regional infrastructure. Smart growth attempts to reimagine and implement alternative development patterns and clustered development to promote land conservation and landscape preservation. The beginnings of smart growth emerged in Massachusetts during the 1970s. The era was termed a "quiet revolution" that compelled growth management measures in places experiencing economic and population booms such as New England, Florida, and California. Robert Yaro is considered a pioneer of smart growth implementation when he signed on as chief planner at the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Management in 1976, "His office established some of the nation's first and largest state land conservation programs" (Flint 2011). Some of these programs included the Massachusetts Landscape Inventory - the nation's first statewide assessment of important scenic and historic landscapes and the North River Commission, a seven-town land-use regulatory commission, appointed to oversee the regulation of the North River. By the '80s, the Nantucket Islands Land Bank became the nation's first large-scale land conservation program to be funded by a real estate transfer tax engineered by the Nantucket planning director, William Klein (Flint 2011). By 1985 Massachusetts', governor, Mike Dukakis' restructured his "development cabinet" and established state agency networks that involved agency heads and state planners to manage redevelopment and to involve "second-tier" industrial cities such as North Adams and Lowell in

the municipal planning priorities and regional impacts. Long-term planning in New England was now steered by commissions funded by state-wide property tax add-ons and compelled coordination between cities and municipalities.

Massachusetts was heralded as a pioneer of smart growth and growth management. The state was a purveyor of interspatial coordination and extensive oversight over development. This does not inevitably compel equitable development, spatial justice, and promote collective rights to the city. Oversight is necessary, but the steering of development is solely controlled by the rich and the politically savvy.

d. American Planning Association's Smart Growth Declaration(2012):

Declaration: "The American Planning Association supports the development of mixed use, mixed income livable communities where people choose to live, work, and play because they are attractive and economical options rather than forced decisions. The American Planning Association identifies Smart Growth as that which supports choice and opportunity by promoting efficient and sustainable land development, incorporates redevelopment patterns that optimize prior infrastructure investments, and consumes less land that is otherwise available for agriculture, open space, natural systems, and rural lifestyles. Supporting the right of Americans to choose where and how they live, work, and play enables economic freedom for all Americans. The declarations below support that goal." (American Planning Association 2012).

The APA advocates for the support of Americans rights to choose where and how to live through the development of mixed use and mixed income "livable" communities. The declaration does not extrapolate how to ensure livability, nor does it advocate justice-oriented interventions (economic, spatial, social, legal, etc.) The utility of declarations is to assert principles and hopes for the future. This declaration illustrates the APA's dedication to maintaining the status quo and its reverence to the growth-machine. Sustainable development is paradoxical and an unviable intervention to resource deprivation. This 'alternative' fails to generate livable places because this type of development is not regenerative and is thus not sustainable. The paradox of degrowth planning is the manufactured destruction of development.

Degrowth planning interventions are materialized through the generation of circular economies of care.

The degrowth imaginary advocates for the reclamation and creation of the commons. "Caring in common" is operationalized by the formation of new ways of living and producing, i.e., cooperatives, universal basic income, reduction of the 8-5, Monday-Friday work week, paid parental leave, no limitations to sick/vacation/ or general leaves from work, worker's unions, tenant unions, salary caps, etc. (D'Alisia et. al 2014). A sustainable, equitable, circular economy is likely to secure abundance, wellbeing, and flourishment.

e. Planning for Capital Cities

"The nature of planning in capitalist democracies like the United States is mercurial and contradictory. No city is entirely planned, but none is devoid of planning. Our political discourse valorizes the free market in a way that makes planning seem unnecessary, yet the United States has consistently regulated its urban spaces in important and powerful ways. Americans often think of planners as either bureaucratic cogs or totalitarian tyrants, but planners tend to see themselves as promoters of fairness and protectors of the common good." from *Capital City* by Samuel Stein

The initial planning impulses were catalyzed by three interconnected movements: progressive reformism, City Beautiful, and City Practical. "Progressive reformers" attempted to redesign the city to ensure the social reproduction of a rapidly growing industrial labor force and to extinguish urban revolts of the Industrial Age. Some cities adopted "municipal socialism," where public monopolies took control of infrastructure development and maintenance, while other developed settlement houses to fill the gaps of need preempted by low wages and labor exploitation. Social services simultaneously imposed norms of Protestantism (especially in terms of work ethic, charity, and purity). Progressive reformism, foundationally cemented Protestant norms within US cities through imposing codes to promote health and safety standards. The New York City tenement laws of 1867, 1879 and 1901, for example, ensured that new residential buildings would have fire escapes, air shafts, windows, and toilets. On the one hand, safer housing protocols

were codified and mandated by the state, but also drove up property values. This relegated the poorest city dwellers to the least safe and least maintained housing of the city.

Consequently, housing development was monopolized by the economic elite.

The City Beautiful movement was foundational. a real estate program that sought to attract investment by implementing ambitious standards of urban design and aesthetics. Architect Daniel Burnham is often associated with the pioneering of this planning movement, "City Beautiful projects were often built on centrally located land inhabited by poor people, immigrants, and African Americans, who were treated as wholly incompatible with and undeserving of urban beauty." (Stein 2019). Central Park was once a large Black settlement, Seneca Village. Central Park is a cornerstone of NYC's City Beautiful project yet displaced the working poor that built and sustained the city. The beautification of the city was fervently demanded by the city's economic elites although the rich were unwilling to pay nor relinquish their holdings on privately held property and land. Planning commissions were created to alleviate this tension by baking in "public input" (overwhelmingly political & economic elites) into formal planning mechanisms, " . . . these largely unelected commissions were often populated by real estate elites, who tried to ensure that city planning decisions would stimulate profits." (Stein 2019). Development projects were steamrolled by the real-estate elites and subsidized by the public.

The City Practical movement was a response to the chaotic and un-planned forms of cities influenced by planning commissions. This movement attempted to, "formalize and expand the scope of planning in the United States" to rationalize and regulate growth and urban development. The Department of Commerce established and mandated the Standard State Zoning Enabling Act (SSZEA) and the Standard City Planning Enabling Act (SCPEA) under the tutelage of Herbert Hoover (1920-1928). Capitalists decried the unconstitutionality of property controls imbued by municipal governments through land-use codes. Zoning implementation and enforcement, however, varied based on the political influence/power of elites of a given place. Planning serves the large-scale project of capitalism and thus manufactures Capital Cities.

Planning attempts to rationalize capitalist development by cajoling public support for growth projects. Development is framed to serve the best interests of the public (especially the working class) to secure consent. Planners exacts authority through the policing space and provisioning of the commons of the city. Cities exists and persist due their role as "coordinators of economic production" to streamline the large-scale economic exchange, "Agglomeration is the basic glue that holds the city together as a complex congeries of human activities, and that underlies—via the endemic common pool resources and social conflicts of urban areas—a highly distinctive form of urban politics." (Brenner 2014). Intense land-use regulation augments the networks of exchange involving all components of institutional, economic, and political arrangements of the city.

Distinct types of capitalists require different demands of the state. Industrial landholders demand environmentally lax zoning codes that do not restrict the location of their operations in the city; real estate capitalists require the opposite- strenuous zoning to mitigate environmental hazards to protect property values. Industrial capitalists may demand affordable housing for their workforce, "to stave off demands for wages", realcapitalists would reject the constraint of profit maximization. Capitalists' privately held land is functionally useless without planning, yet Capitalists tend to reject planning as a machination of government overreach. This is dilemma is what Stein defines as the property contradiction. The property contradiction engenders the capitalist-democracy contradiction, where neo-liberal governments attempt to resolve the property contradiction through capitalist-democratic interventions. State actors must balance the ideals of transparency to maintain public legitimacy and maintain, " . . . that capital retains ultimate control over the processes' parameters. The people must have their say, but their options must be limited. If the system is entirely open, people might demand the full socialization of land, the abolition of private property, and all the rest. If the system is completely closed, however, they might revolt against an unjust and unaccountable government." (Stein 2017). Planners are tasked with steering public processes that are, "open but rigged" (Stein 2017). The capitalist-democracy contradiction generates interventions such as "participatory planning" where the public comments, community boards are engaged, and private citizens simply make recommendations. (2017). Planners and the

public are inhibited form making sweeping changes because the field of planning operates within a paradigm that ingratiates the public and empowers the propertied elites.

f. Collective Rights to the City and Commons Management

The Western conceptualizations of rights, social-contracting, and governance are informed by Enlightenment thinking. The individual sequestration of property grants individual rights that afford legitimate political participation and representation in liberal democracy. Liberal democracy ingratiates capital acquisition, and thus sustains capitalism. Monopoly capitalism tends to economically stagnate capital production. The tension is defined as a metabolic rift, a political ecology term informed by Marx's concept of metabolism. Marx conceptualized metabolism as a term that signals the interdependent processes of nature, likening this theory to the functions of biological system,

"Humans live from nature, i.e.: nature is our body, and we must maintain a continuing dialogue with it if we are not to die . . . nature is linked to itself . . . humans are part of nature." From Capital , Volume 3 written by Karl Marx and Frederic Engels (1844).

The metabolic rift is a consequence of capitalist property relations that inhibit a given society's means to metabolize the exchanges of nature and human life. A metabolic rift analysis undergirds the call for degrowth- augmenting the magnitude of ecological preservation and repair to sustain humanity.

Interdependency is relational and necessitates collective empowerment. Collective rights to the city and the expansion and management of the commons are imperative to degrowth planning. Current legitimate institutions and arrangements engineer benefits for capitalists in a variety of ways. Financial

innovations were conceived during the nexus of deregulation, the 1980s. The securitization and packaging of local mortgages for sale to investors world-wide, setting up of new financial institutions to facilitate a secondary mortgage market, and collateralized debt obligations have prompted surplus savings pools of the economic elite.

III. Applied Degrowth as Praxis: Cultivating a Global Culture of Care, Autonomy, Self-Determination, and Freedom a. REITs and the Specter of Speculative Growth

Planning interventions will inevitably impact land and property values within the environment of the private land market, "many nonprofits, unions, and community-based organizations . . . secure gains . . . through political programs that align with factions of real estate capital. . . " (Stein 2017). Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITS) are utilized in mass as a legally codified mechanism of speculative growth. REITS are considered, "unincorporated trusts" or "unincorporated associations" that functionally disperse stockholder ownership of open real estate. Corporations are managing real estate portfolios involving commercial and residential properties, and mortgages. Deregulation following the 1999 Steagall Act, has further concentrated economic power, and has steered absenteedevelopment within communities. Peripheral development is driven by the self- interest and informed by the American ethos of prosperity linked with private property ownership. REITS disperse real-estate stockholder ownership to swaths of economic elites. REITS also concentrate economic power (capital leverage) and severs the publics' claim to ownership. Ordinary people are relegated to the spaces that the elites engineer. The policing of space fractures and disempowers peoples claims to the commons and exacerbates inequality/exploitation. This is at odds with representative liberal democracy and highlights the duplicitous nature of modern western political economy theory.

b. Oakland and Philadelphia's Struggle for Housing and Self-Determination

Oakland and Philadelphia are sites of displacement and state-sanctioned violence all compelled by the growth machine. The cities also provide examples of how real-estate speculators and actors of the state, work in tandem to protect capital, at the sake of black families and black lives. Oakland's Moms 4 Housing Collective and Philadelphia's MOVE organization mark the persistence of the U.S's growth imperative and its inability/insufficiency in cultivating livable communities. These localities juxtaposed against Detroit's landscapes (economic, political, social, built) generate insights of racist, discordant, and inequitable placemaking. These strategic projects of governance engender manufactured crises.

In January 2020, Oakland's Moms 4 Housing squatted in a home owned by real-estate speculators on the west-end. This direct action was violented squashed by the Oakland Police Department. The women occupied the house for nearly 3 months to protest the displacement of working-class (particularly Black) families caused by developers. The activists condemned Oakland's persistent claims that speculative development generates "livable" cities when the number empty housing units outnumber the number of houseless people. This action illustrated the violence of displacement for the sake of profit, " . . . at the incalculable cost wrought through the distress and trauma caused by intergenerational expropriation from the already propertyless." (Roane 2020). The city is complicit and summarily

responsible for the material harms dealt to the public for the sake of profit and generate expansive urban crises.

This violence is outright terroristic in the case of MOVE and the Philadelphia Police Department. MOVE emerged in Philadelphia's Powelton Village in 1972, the political organization comprised of people seeking refuge from poverty and wage exploitation(Roane 2020). The founder and leader John Africa developed a doctrine rejecting growth and the profit-driven destruction of Black people and their communities specifically. The principles of the organization outlined the violence of capital accumulation through the exploitation of people that generates insecurity, deprivation, and death. Violence shared between market and state functions persists on a continuum.

MOVE's presence in west Philadelphia antagonized the local homeowner's associations seeking to preserve property value. (2020). This subsequently affected the area's major landholders represented by the West Philadelphia Corporation (WPC) (2020). The WPC was comprised of Drexel University, the University of Pennsylvania, and other privately held corporations. (2020). The WPC sought to transform Philadelphia's Black Bottom, a majority Black working-class enclave to attract white middle-class spectators. This part of the city was redlined and racially zoned to relegate Black people to the area. The persistence of racist labor exploitation, predatory lending, policing, and the general segregation of the commons created and intensified Black poverty. Speculators and spectators exact their will through the leverage of capital to displace, exclude, and exploit Black people permitted and supported by the state. MOVE members intentionally

redesigned their rowhouse to reflect the "natural world." (2020). The house was stripped to its bare bones and reflected an asceticism generated from the refutation of unfettered growth and excess. MOVE valued the reimagination of space as an articulation of political ideals of freedom, justice, and autonomy. This was met with threats of eviction, condemnation, charges of child endangerment (and subsequently the displacement of children from their guardians), and arrest.

Armed raids of were conducted and children were stolen from their houses with warrants citing the malnutrition of the children living on the property. The charges of malnutrition were started by a public health physician's diagnosis of iron deficiency. The public actor was responsible for informing the police about their findings of "malnutrition". This empowers the police to exert their monopoly of violence on families-particular poor and black ones. There are obvious interventions that could impart a level of care and regard for people's wellbeing's such as a no-cost, effective, and readily available healthcare system, livable wages, universal basic income, etc.

The police enacted their use of force to displace and disrupt the threat to the profit-driven regime. The Philadelphia Police Department with military-grade weaponry attacked MOVE. Their residence was bombed from a helicopter, the explosion's fire razed over two city blocks on Osage Avenue. This was in service to the execution of arrest warrants noting violations of parole, child endangerment, contempt of court, the illegal possession of firearms, and terrorism. May Wilson Goode and Police Commissioner Gregore J. Sambor classified MOVE as a

terrorist organization, this subsequently classified the row house as a terrorist cell, and thus justified this extreme statesponsored violence. Approximately 500 police officers along with city manager Leo Brooks were deployed, utilities were shut off, and MOVE members were commanded to evacuate the building or they would be forcibly removed.

The conflict escalated when gunfire was exchanged between the house and the police with 10,000 rounds of ammunition shot by the police. The police commissioner then ordered the dropping of the bomb onto the roof of the house. 11 people died in the house. Six adults and five children named: John Africa, Rhonda Africa, Theresa Africa, Frank Africa, Conrad Africa, Tree Africa, Delisha Africa, Netta Africa, Little Phil Africa, Tomaso Africa, and Raymond Africa. All were victims of state-sanctioned terrorism and died at the hands of the police on May 13, 1985. Their lives should be memorialized with dignity and with reverence.

Rest in power and eternal peace John, Rhonda, Theresa, Frank, Conrad, Tree, Delish, Netta, Little Phil, Tomaso, and Raymond.

The mayor subsequently appointed an investigation commission (mostly lawyers) called the *Philadelphia Special Investigation Commission*. The commission issued a report a little less than year after the bombing denouncing the actions of state. Mayor Goode, on behalf of the city, made a formal apology to the public. No criminal charges were brought against any governmental actor in this case. Ramona Africa, the only surviving adult was charged and convicted of rioting and conspiracy (these charges were not outlined in the arrest warrants) and was condemned to

seven years imprisonment. Romana Africa filed civil suits against the city (Africa v. City of Philadelphia) in 1994 citing violations of the 4th amendment's protection from undue search and seizure. The police and city officials had individual qualified immunity, a legal principle granting the police discretionary to perform the functions of the state by granting immunity from civil suits charged by the public. The city as an administrative entity was ordered to pay Ramona Africa and her co-plaintiffs \$1.5 million in 1996. Further litigation was charged on behalf of residents nearly a decade later. Residents sought damages for the displacement they faced after their community was bombed. \$12.83 million was awarded to the plaintiffs. In late 2020, city council approved a resolution to formally apologize for the MOVE bombing and established a day of remembrance on May 13, the anniversary of the bombing. The remains of victims Tree and Delisha- aged 14 and 12 respectively, were held by the state. Their remains were exchanged between the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archeology and Anthropology, Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the city's Medical Examiner's Office. The victims' identities weren't known until the city's health commissioner was forced to resign after it was revealed that he ordered the disposal of the bones without individually identifying them and contacting the family. Some of the remains were salvaged from a box labeled "MOVE" in the city's Medical Examiner's office and repatriated to the family.

c. Contextualizing the "Right-Sizing" of Detroit as Degrowth

Detroit, Michigan was the hallmark of the America's industrial-age and was a beacon for innovation, growth, and progress. The city is now synonymous with decline, bankruptcy, and corruption in the post-recession age.

The "rustbelt"- geographic region of the Northeast and Midwest comprised of places once industrious and dominated by manufacturing, is a symbol of industrial declined. Harvey Molotch's *The city as a growth machine: Toward a political economy of place* (1976) argues that localized elites forge coalitions to influence policy to entice development to augment capital gains. David Harvey developed this theory and marked the domination of neoliberal economic policies in the 1980s anchored by Ronald Reagan. The era catalyzed a transformation of urban governance. Managerialism and entrepreneurialism were the key occupations of the state.

Imperatives for growth intensified as inter-city competition for capital was reinvigorated through urban renewal programs sponsored by public-private partnerships and where municipalities take on the bulk of risk. (Harvey, 1989, 2011). Growth-machine politics and urban entrepreneurialism persist because the private sector continues to influence government. Municipal governments also continue to retract efforts to "manage collective consumption and instead focus on courting the private sector and cultivating economic enterprises across the urban landscape." (MacLeod and Jones, 2011: 2444)

All places within the rustbelt have been compelled to shrink (degrow) in the wake of industrial decline. Places now face

challenges surrounding the inefficiencies of sprawl and insufficient infrastructure. Companies such as Quicken Loans are attempting to solve the problem through "philanthropy". Growthoriented planning and programming is misplaced, and the social/economic/political landscapes of places can employ alternatives. Land-use is a place where planners can intervene.

d. Quicken Loans Funds Detroit

Quicken Loans is owned by CEO Dan Gilbert. He has dedicated \$500 million to Detroit neighborhoods over the last 10 years (\$350 million from Gilbert Family Fund and \$150 million from the Rocket Community Fund). The Gilbert family has exacted political influence through donations, "The Gilbert Family Fund will eliminate the property tax debt owned from roughly 20,000 homeowners in the city". The organization has claimed that this measure will "preserve" \$400 million worth of wealth and home equity. The \$500 million donation is to be used to support the Detroit Tax Relief Fund and Neighbor-to-Neighbor program administered through the Wayne Metro Community Action Agency (non-profit) which will be responsible for the remaining debt owed by qualified residents. The Neighbor-to-Neighbor programmatic goals include reducing the number of homes entering foreclosure auction. The funds will be used to mitigate issues of employment and financial emergencies so that homeowners don't default on their mortgages. Approximately 80,000 residential properties were abandoned in 2012. Policymakers attempted to intervene decades earlier. The Urban Homesteading Act (1999) gave authorities the ability to seize tax foreclosed properties and auction them to residents. These solutions were developed by right-wing thinktanks that overemphasized increasing homeownership and did little to combat predatory and speculative practices from investors. From 2002-2008, fewer than 11,000 properties were acquired and re-sold through this process. The city had owned a "surplus" of approximately 140,000 homes.

The city declared a state of emergency and authorized the emergency manager in charge of Detroit's finances in March of 2013. Detroit declared bankruptcy on July 18, 2013. It inevitably disrupted economic and political strongholds and forced many elites to abandon growth-oriented policies.

The most notorious negotiations directed by the manager involved state and city employees. The city proposed cuts to salaries and pensions to cut expenditures. All workers throughout the city were incensed by the proposal of slashing hard-fought benefits. The proposal of cutting pay for the people who built and grew the city, should not overlooked. Neoliberal austerity measures always misappropriate and are funded by the hard-earned labor of the working class. Financial crises that engender austerity measures, are overwhelmingly caused by the misappropriation of funds, the deregulation of growth, and the stagnation of wages. Austerity necessitates the direct rule by finance capital over cities and drastic cutbacks in services, wages, pensions, and the privatize industry to ensure payment. Banks compel cities to function under debt tutelage and retract operations to function at the bare minimum. This top-down, noniterative approach is undemocratic and unduly impacts workers. A capturing of the state occurs once austerity measures are employed. Dan Gilbert and capitalists like him, exploited the political environment catalyzed by austerity and economic environment caused by deindustrialization/recession to exact their influence and control the city on their terms.

State Representative Jim Tedder of Clarkston (District 43) even proclaimed the ineffectiveness of the Gilbert-funded

austerity interventions, "Under the free market, which I certainly am an advocate of these projects do not make sense for developers to pursue the blight still stands. . . . sites would remain vacant and useless unless we creatively cultivate redevelopment. With this legislation, we will generate tax revenue from sites that are not producing any now while providing new places to work and live across Michigan." (2017). Quicken Loans ranked the 17th largest spender on lobbying in Michigan for the first seven months of 2017. In 2016, bills to bring new tax incentives stalled in the Michigan House and by June 8, 2017, the House voted to adopt House Bills 111-115. These bills grant special tax-capturing ability to large-scale "transformational" brownfield projects that win approval from local authorities. Republican representative Jim Tedder of Clarkston (District 43) shepherded House Bill 111-115 through his House Tax Policy Committee. His policy interests revolved around the brownfields of Waterford Township. A quick review of Waterford Township's demographics include (2018):

Table 1: Waterford Township's Demographics

Waterford Township's Demographics

1.72% live below poverty level

100% civilian employment

46.81% of households make between \$50k to \$100k annually (median household income is \$65,990

Median value of owner-occupied units is \$96,700

Dan Gilbert's *Bedrock* is the city's most dominant landlord and has current development projects valued at \$2 billion. The Quicken Loans Community Fund and Buildings, Safety Engineering and Environmental Department announced their public-private partnership in 2019. The partnership redefined the development permitting process by speeding up determinations and simplifying application requirements. It created a "Quick Start Permitting Guide," for applicants, a web-hosted application portal, provided mobile devices for in-field inspections, redesign the department's building, and the condensation of forms from 85 to 35 pages. There is value in making applications efficient, but the level of scrutiny and inspection is diminished when applications are fast-tracked. Shortcutting is baked into this new process where sub-standard projects are permitted.

Developer benefits are clearly pronounced with in the case of Gilbert and the house bills he lobbied for have, " . . . legally enshrined this transfer of wealth from poor to rich." The codification of development entitlements has peripheral benefits to the public. All redevelopment on "blighted" land is eligible for public subsidies, and developers are allowed to capture sales and income taxes from their commercial projects. These policies give credence to refutable trickle-down economics. There is billions of dollars' worth of capital in the city, yet per capita spending for food assistance was \$21 in 2016. Hundreds of guards hired through Gilbert corporations are deployed throughout Detroit around the clock. A 500-hundred camera canopy looms over the city-center. Capitalists will always be compelled to protect their capital rather than funding social programs that promote welfare.

The house bills require assessments conducted by independent (private) contractors to assess benefits and economic impacts. The "benefits" are assessed by independent (private) third parties outlined in the bill and is considered a "built-in protection" for taxpayers. There is no mention of a schema or outline for how developments will be assessed. Remarkably, community assessment tools are not mentioned or proposed for any of the bills. Community needs assessments and post-development assessments will generate iterative and informed development that not only benefits the public but ensures that investments and capital are not wasted on non-viable projects. The growth-fetishistic impulses of the elite are reflected in the bills they sponsor and create. There is a guise of democratic idealism, yet

free-market ideals are inhibiting the democratic processes and tools of capital management and production. Developing for the sake of profit is not sustainable, ill-informed, and is short-sighted. Profit-driven cities that do not have democratic safeguards are in danger of crisis and chaos in all forms, ". . . cities have been transformed into assemblages of economic goods through the systematic privatization of health, safety, transport, education, housing services and facilities, and public space." (Harvey 2001; Sager 2011).

The city is not a commodity, yet policymakers and enforcers of the law operate under this assumption. They support commodification processes that transform the commons to support private entrepreneurialism. Commodities are then marketed to generate welfare rather than public goods and services. The state is a key sponsor of private entrepreneurialism. It encourages and manages free-market enterprise and legitimizes the retraction of its role in social matters and services (Schneider 2019). This financialization is undemocratic and unjust and the poor are compelled to create solutions to their welfare problems or are left destitute. The poor have no place or stake in the democratic process and thus cannot participate in legitimate placemaking. Houses are wealth caches that the elites can capture and leverage invariably in free-market capitalism, as inequality endures. These house bills permit the city to secure residential and commercial strongholds and generate revenue at the detriment of homeowners who defaulted on their mortgages. These extensive landholdings are sold at a fraction and investors jump at the opportunity to purchase- even though a lot of properties are not

viable for development and use. Growth-oriented cities focus on improvements involving "place-marketing," "city branding," "boosterism" and "public-private partnerships." These priorities reflect the city's compulsion to sell services (especially to visitors) and spearhead capital initiatives. Boosterism is idealist, but not utopian. (Hackworth 2015). The ideals of boosterism emphasize the marketing of space to generate wealth and lifestyles rather than wellbeing and welfare. (Hackworth Naturally, it informs political imaginaries surrounding development and what it means for a place to materialize progress. Many of the transformed buildings have been converted into "high-end retail and residential space and offices for white-collar firms." (Conklin 2018). The Hudson site what redeveloped specifically for the Quicken Loans headquarters. Gilbert converted the state's tallest skyscraper into an expensive, luxury retail and residential space. He is considered a "superhero" that saved Detroit from ruin. (Conklin 2018). He currently owns 95 buildings and has invested billions in the local real estate market. Downtown revitalization relies on neighborhood deprivation to support capital acquisition. Gilbert has received around \$250 million in public subsidies from development projects. (Conklin 2018).

e. Dystopian Detroit: The Detroit Future City Report

The Detroit Future City (DFC) is a report sponsored by the Detroit Works Project, a coalition of prominent members from Detroit's public, private and philanthropic sectors. They cultivated capital from corporations, foundations, and donors such as the Ford Motor Co., the Kresge Foundation, and the Hudson Webber Foundation (Lacy, 2013). The Detroit Works Project (DWP) website claims that the plan was informed by "robust" and "grounded" community engagement where the group held hundreds of public meetings, participated in 30,000 conversations, and received more than 70,000 surveyed responses and comments from participants' (Detroit Future City, 2012). These figures have been scrutinized and opponents claimed that officials sought to "evict" and "shrink" the city. Public-facing actors included Mayor Bing (2011) and his 12 appointees- most of the decisionmaking body was not elected nor can be held accountable to city residents. Their transparency is not compelled by democratic processes and their decision-making processes are discretionary. The appointees are mostly informed by the consultant they contract, a consultant describes the value and stakes the poor have in Detroit,

"... [low-income residents are] cultural designers ... [they possess] untapped skills and ingenuity ... that can be harnessed via entrepreneurial ventures that take advantage of new crowd-funding networks" (Griffin, 2012).

The poor are undoubtedly place-makers, but the consultant over-emphasizes the exploitation of labor rather than the cultivation of imagination and inspiration. People are valuable and worth investing in, despite their ability to generate

profit. The DFC cut services in the city's poorest neighborhoods to pay off creditors or free up resources for more "viable" areas. In short, the most impoverished would bear the costs of the crisis and shoulder the burden of revitalization. The report outlined a city-wide regeneration/redevelopment model to, "recognize and adapt to an unpredictable future' and thereby 'uplift the people, businesses, and places of Detroit by improving quality of life and businesses in the city' and its implementation would mark," . . . the first time in decades that Detroit has considered its future not only from a standpoint of land use or economic growth but in the context of city systems, neighborhood vision, and the need for greater civic capacity to address the systemic change necessary for Detroit's success. (p. 5). The plan is comprised of five elements: "economic growth," "land-use," "city systems," "neighborhoods," and "land and building assets." (Hackworth 2015). It emphasizes the diversification of Detroit's economy and identified food processing, medical technology, education, and creative industries as sectors to grow and advocates targeted education and training programs. This is a retreat from austerity urbanism, but piecemeal patronage by the state should be scrutinized, the investment in human capital should be unconditional and unequivocal.

Austerity urbanism compels cities to placate investors to avoid bankruptcy. (Schindler 2014). Austerity Implements targets informed by markets and the potential to generate maximum profits, "'Through preferential zoning, targeted infrastructure investments, attraction of new capital into the city, and

innovative approaches to address under-utilization of land, the strategy aims to increase the value of and investments in the city's highest-potential jobs-producing land' (Schindler 2014). "Preferential zoning" in land-use mechanisms is utilized as the city's strategy to generate economic growth. Seven districts are identified and target specific interventions and are interconnected by a network of transportation corridors. The plan calls for investment in blue infrastructure and green infrastructure as quality-of-life improvement measures.

Neighborhoods within the seven districts are further classified in terms of vacancy and the level of intervention required. The highest levels of vacancies would be, "allowed to return to a maintained version of its natural state" or no development interventions will be employed. (Schindler 2019). It advocates for the intensification of density in areas that are already relatively high density and elucidates an "official urban imaginary of demolition for development" that intensifies disparity and normalizes the politics of foreclosure and forced acquisition. (Schindler 2019). Political attitudes are colored by metaphoric language. Terms such as "infestation," "disease," and "cancer" pathologize precarity. This metaphoric language fails to capture the nuances of people relegated to precarious conditions and fails to diagnose the causes of precarity. Holistic, deliberative, and therapeutic interventions cannot be employed. Feelings of indifference, neglect, and animosity are materialized and reinforced through this language. This exacerbates the plight of people who are economically/socially/political ostracized and condemned.

f. Contextualizing Community Benefits within the framework of Wellbeing

Planning for wellbeing requires infrastructure interventions that promote equitable access to goods, services, and resources that promote wellbeing as well as generating adaptive solutions informed comprehensively through public engagement, to mitigate and infrastructural harm. Detroit's Fitzgerald neighborhood was empowered to select contractors and vendors interested in redeveloping their community. New parks, upgraded streets and public transportation, program sponsorship for educational, civic, and economic public-facing services were all enabled through public-private partnerships, "linking new or upgraded infrastructure to well-programmed public space, [is} an increasingly popular approach in many parts of the country, can likewise expand access to wellbeing. (Smyth 2021).

Detroit's Community Benefits Ordinances are tailored plans and projects that require open-access, evidence-based and dynamic frameworks. Community Benefits Ordinances (CBOs) community benefits agreements between citizens and developers seeking public support for projects through the provisioning of benefits such as ", affordable housing, job creation, environmental impacts regulation, and the generation of community amenities such as parks, daycares, and community centers. Detroit voted to pass its first CBO (Community Benefits Ordinances) in 2016. The initial ordinances drafted by citizens were rejected by the mayor's office and city council for being, "hostile to potential development" (Berglund 2020). The CBO was based on projects totaling \$75 million or more and that had received over \$1

million in tax abatements or city-held land (Berglund 2020). The CBO negotiations were arranged by the city's Planning and Development Department and involved developers and a nine-member Neighborhood Advisory Council (comprised of residents). The city's Civil Rights, Inclusion, and Opportunity Office (CIOO) are responsible for enforcing the benefits agreed upon. Surveys collated by the CIOO determined and organized the community benefits as follows:

Table 2: Neighbor Advisory Council Benefit Analysis

Key Benefit Type	Benefits	Number of Benefits
Parks and public space improvements	 Park landscaping New parks Streetscape improvements Community gathering places Dog parks Sports facilities 	24
Jobs and workforce development	 Priority hiring for Detroiters Funding for city employment programs Vocational scholarships Sponsorship for hiring fairs Youth career mentorship 	19
Construction management	 Protective fencing Pest control Security Work hours Board up vacant structures Construction signage 	19
Public engagement	 Consultation for future projects Development updates Alignment with existing neighborhood plans Community events 	14
Parking and Public Transportation	 Permitting systems Additional parking Bikeshares Collaboration with MDOT Pedestrian/cycling infrastructure Traffic control plans 	13
Affordable Housing	 20% affordable to 80% AMI More liberal affordability than city ordinance 	12

IV. Shortfall of Urban Agriculture as a "Green Strategy" in the Rustbelt and Beyond

a. Urban Agriculture in Detroit

Urban agriculture is a "green strategy" that improves the material conditions of the public. The development of urban agricultural infrastructure is commons-building that improves access to food. Shrinking cities uniquely experience increased rates of food inequity and industrial pollution. Making urban agriculture legal land use in Detroit is a strategic response to the compulsions of decline where land-use controls can manage and utilize the green vacancies of the city. The Detroit City Planning Commission (CPC) amended the zoning code with the adoption of the Urban Agriculture Ordinance (UAO) in 2012, permitting urban agriculture operations within city limits (Paddeau 2017). The ordinance was created and adopted during smart declines' heyday. Smart decline is informed by the tenets of degrowth where it is defined as planning for less people, fewer buildings, and few land-uses in the wake of spatial retraction compelled by deindustrialization. Smart decline compels the redevelopment of uses for vacant land and abandoned buildings.

Detroit has a robust network of urban agricultural programs such as Farm-A-Lot, Gardening Angels, and the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network and that were compelled to organize following the adoption of the UAO. Over 500,000 of city-dwellers are required to travel twice as far to shop in a food store rather than a fringe retailer (corner stores, gas stations,

and liquor stores) and nearly 20 square miles (approximately 105,000 lots) were vacant in 2012. (Detroit Works 2012). Community-based networks coalesced in the wake of DFC where organizers contested the growth-machine politics of smart decline. Opponents had fears of displacement with the kind of redevelopment philanthropic firms proposed. The network collectively built gardens, provided training and resources, and helped gardeners market their products. (Paddeu 2017). Efforts sponsored by the network are informed food-justice ideals and emphasize the investment in education, and the sharing of resources to empower people to garden, grow, and earn through their labor.

The Urban Agriculture Ordinance (UAO) and the Detroit Future City report (DPC) were engineered at in the same political space and time. The UAO was first conceived to, "...help secure existing illegal agricultural operations and [to] avoid potential destruction of gardens and farms" by allowing new agricultural uses and by setting standards for agriculture within the city limits. (Paddeu 2017). There were no operational limits to size, nor any regulatory distinctions between commercial and noncommercial operations. (2017). Urban gardens were limited to oneacre and urban farms were anything greater than an acre. Urban farming is permitted in all zones, but the city exacts contextual discretionary determinations of size. The ordinance's core tenet is as follows: "... [urban agriculture] will permit people to produce their own healthy food and also to sell the food they produce, which provides economic opportunity, thereby improving

health and general welfare." (2017). Initial concerns of programmatic implementation:

- (1) The original ordinance did not outline the processes necessary to utilize vacant greenspace to garden/farm.
- (2) The ordinance made no mention of city-sponsored funding to subsidize costs associated with starting a farm.
- (3) The program is functioning under the assumption that people have the time and do not have any incentives for this kind of development yet fervently offers tax incentives to real estate developers.
- (4) The level of farming necessary to fill gaps of access to food is too high for this to be the only programmatic intervention.
- (5) No mention if animal husbandry is permitted, and if there are limits to how many animals a garden or farm can have.

Most community gardens are sustained by growers who "squat" on unclaimed vacant land and enforcement is lax due to land management deficiencies spurred by mass abandonment, pre-existing squatting, and complications with determining ownership. Some people are waitlisted for several years before they can purchase a vacant lot and the city has offered to sell some lots between \$200-\$300 (2017). To reiterate, there are no built-in mechanisms for the city to help citizens acquire land.

The UAO falls short in recognizing and planning around the complexities of decline as residents experience marginal improvements from urban agriculture. "Greening" strategies engender fears of displacement through gentrification and the task of "beautifying" the city seems daunting. Time-poverty

further marginalize the working-class poor and their lack of leisure is at odds with the work required to sustain and operate a garden/farm. The claims that gardens/farms can be potentially lucrative, places undue risk on the working-class. It is imperative that the city fiscally incentivize the working-class and entice the time-poor with lofty hopes for community revitalization.

b. Urban Agriculture in Rio's Favelas

A municipal-level urban agroecology degrowth project was developed in the Manguinhos favela of Rio de Janeiro where multistakeholder participation and governance stabilized the contested, informal territory. It is comprised of government housing projects, abandoned factories readapted as housing for squatters, and low-rise favela housing (Rekow 2016). The favela is made up of clustered informal and formal settlements on both public and privately held land . The name "Manguinhos' is a derivative of the Portuguese term for mangrove- referencing the favela's ecological form (Rekow 2016) The ecosystem is now comprised of open sewers, highways, and transmission lines (2016). Numerous environmental risks afflict its residents- the acuity of risk is exponential for children, who are 500 times more likely to develop cancer and neurological disorders because of exposure to elevated levels of lead that contaminate the area (De Cássia 2009). Many children are noted to be undernourished according to age-weight-height ratios. The impacts of malnourishment on children's development are extremely varied. Malnourishment affects children irreparably and comprehensivelythe denial of food is traumatic and requires intensive, lifelong therapeutic measures. Agroecology could be an intervention. Agroecology is an approach to agriculture that focuses on cultivating sustainable, productive, equitable, and stable food (and/or forestry) systems that inform mass social justice movements of the Global South. Neoliberal appropriation of agroecological praxis has informed The Manguinhos (Rekow 2016). Agroecology can provide a framework to implement foundational

interventions that are environmentally focused to increase social equity in health and income without narrowly focusing on growth and economic development.

Since 2008, Rio's pacification (poverty eviction project) campaign (UPP) employs military interventions to control favela territory and to advance urbanization to prepare for FIFA's World Cup and the 2016 Olympics. Nearly 60,000 were evicted because of Rio's pacification programs. This is a process of accumulation by dispossession, whereby favelas are abandoned and devalued by the state, then strategically seized by corporations, and occupied by the military (Harvey 2004). The military has a more pronounced presence in state-exacted violence and control compared to the U.S. where police forces are employed. MOVE's eviction and armed struggle against the Philadelphia police department are comparable to what favela residents face, in light of eviction. As the U.S. police forces continue to militarize and as housing insecurity increases, Americans should expect more extreme acts of violence by the state in service of growth. In 2012, Rio's special operations forces stormed the favela with 1300 troops and occupied Manguinhos. The drug trafficking gang- Comando Vermelho (CV) which had a stronghold since the 1980s, was ousted through this occupation. There was approximately one officer for every 66 residents to oversee the "pacification" of the favelas. Their presence was assumed to quell crime and street violence.

The city bulldozed large swaths of homes to make way for a garden project. The total project costs were approximately \$250,000 USD. The project was sponsored by the Municipal Department for the Environment's Hortas Cariocas (HC) program,

Light (a public-private electric utility company, the Mayor's Office, and the Manguinhos Resident's Association- this illustrates a multi-stakeholder participation and governance structure. With a legacy of displacement and state-sanctioned violence, consequential projects generated from Rio's UPP projects are hard to understand as justice-oriented degrowth interventions. Understanding the benefits of Manguinhos' agroecological projects are complicated to analyze.

The conditions of Manguinhos ecological landscape have improved due to the state-sponsored cleaning of contaminated topsoil, clearing of drainage systems, and the clearing of trash and stagnant water. These measures should have been funded and sponsored by the state regardless. The creation of a garden has compelled the state to manage pollution for sake of crops for the sake of human wellness. Eight water tanks were installed on site and connected to the city's water supply to provide for manual irrigation of the beds. Many residents did not have access to potable water prior to the garden project.

It can be argued that these state-sponsored agroecology projects are not altruistic in nature even though they improve welfare generally. The National Organic Production and Agroecology Plan (PLANAPO), implemented in 2013, PLANAPO invested \$4 billion into the agroecology sector, mostly through establishing credit lines. (Rekow 2016). In 2013-2014, \$3 billion in credit lines for agroecology yielded the Sicredi Credit Union \$20 billion in assets, up 24 % from 2012, "The largest failure of Brazil's micro-credit system in general is that it is unable to reach the poor and informal sectors that

need it most because of restrictive lending policies." (Cravalho 2012).

The dual, contradictory forms of UPP governance within favelas like Manguinhos is detrimental to the wellbeing of residents. The armed presence of the military, coupled with gangs deepens contentions of territory and control. Neither arm is committed to the sustainability of circular economies. The state floundered the capital necessary to generate community owned and managed farms to serve private interests.

V. Conclusion

Growth-oriented imaginaries shape material and conceptual perceptions of place. Shrinking cities such as Detroit are "spatially stigmatized" due to perceptions of deprivation, decay, and blight. The stigmatization of place precipitates the conditions of peripheral citizenship and marginalization in all its forms. Radical interventions to combat growth imperatives requires people to abandon the visions of "clean-slate" imaginaries. The nature of justice is burdened by the past. Justice is involved with rectifying wrongs and is thus an iterative, dynamic, and referential process.

Conceptually and functionally, place is the site of continuous local struggle- an iterative process that identifies boundaries, space, and time. The maneuvering of power dynamics within places construct power-geometries where, " . . . capitalism (rather than being placeless) engages in the making and remaking of place to suit its own ends. Power geometries are also about differential mobility - to say people live among the ruins, or that ruins are threatened places, acknowledges unbecoming as a visible, material outcome when the disappearance of industry and capital leaves people stranded in decaying cities and towns, but also where redevelopment moves people on, and excludes them from the production of place." (Massey 2004). Place is pluralistically defined, "Unbecoming ruins make for vital ruminations upon the nature of place and politics because threatened places, as polyvalent sites of encounter, stand for extinguished rights over place-making." (Fraser 2018). Political imaginaries possess discursive power and work to create sense/meaning out of power dynamics within space. Derelict/

"placeless" sites attract future oriented imaginaries that serve,

"... to destabilize established politics of place to claim
social and cultural territory for capital. (Fraser 2018). The
process of unbecoming is a strategy that positions elites to
usurp influence of the dynamics of power. Perceptions of Detroit
and cities like it are distilled by the concepts of ruin and
renewal. Mainstream narratives reduce the city to a spectacle of
turmoil and disempower radical praxis.

Bibliography

- Alexander, S., & Gleeso, B. (2019). Degrowth in the suburbs: A radical urban imaginary. Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Alexander, S., Bramall, R., Garcia, E., Gras, A., Kirby, P., Montero, I., Martinez-Iglesias, M., et al. (2017). Transitioning to a Post-Carbon Society: Degrowth, Austerity, and Wellbeing. (E. Garcia, M. Martinez-Iglesias, & P. Kirby, Eds.) International Political Economy (1st ed., p. 488). London: Springer Nature.
- Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2014). The 'Urban Age' in Question. International journal of urban and regional research, 38(3), 731-755.
- Bruckner, M. (2021). Learning degrowth from women's food knowledge and care in Kenya. In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 45-59). New York: Routledge.
- Butler, C. (2012). Henri Lefebvre: Spatial politics, everyday life and the right to the city. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Cattaneo, C. (2019). How can squatting contribute to degrowth? In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Collins, M. (2010). Conflict and Contact: The 'Humane' City, Agonistic Politics, and the Phenomenological Body. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 28(5), 913-930. https://doi.org/10.1068/d13209
- Cravalho, G. (2012). Policies of Microcredit in Brazil: An Analysis from the Case of Community Development Banks (CDBs). Journal du Mass. Retrieved June 1, 2021, from http://www.journaldumauss.net/?Policies-of-Microcredit-in-Brazil
- D'Alisa, Giacomo., Demaria, Federico., & Kallis, Giorgos. (2014). Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era (1st ed., p. 220). New York: Routledge.
- Demaria, F., Kallis, G., & Bakker, K. (2019). Geographies of degrowth: Nowtopias, resurgences and the decolonization of imaginaries and places. Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space, 2(3), 431-450.
- Edwards, F., & Espelt, R. (2021). Technology for degrowth: Implementing digital platforms for community supported agriculture. In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 128–141). New York: Routledge.
- Edwards, F., Pedro, S., & Rocha, S. (2021). Institutionalising degrowth: Exploring multilevel food governance. In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 121-157). New York: Routledge.

- Ferreira, A., & von Schönfeld, K. C. (2020). Interlacing Planning and Degrowth Scholarship: A Manifesto for an Interdisciplinary Alliance. DisP The Planning Review, 56(1), 53-64. https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/02513625.2020.1756633
- Ferreri, M. (2019). Refurbishment vs demolition? social housing campaigning for degrowth. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth:

 Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Flint, A. (2015). Le Corbusier and the Biology of Beauty in Design. CityLab. Retrieved from https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-03-17/le-corbusier-and-the-biology-of-beauty-in-design
- Fodor, E. V. (2010). Better, not Bigger: How to take control of urban growth and improve your community. New Society Publishers.
- Foglesong, R. (2014). Planning the Capitalist City: The Colonial Era to the 1920s. Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1515/9781400854509
- Fraser, E. (2018). Unbecoming place: urban imaginaries in transition in Detroit. Cultural Geographies, 25(3), 441-458.
- Hagbert, P. (2019). Rethinking home as a node for transition. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Hall, J. (2007). The Boomer Burden: Dealing with Your Parents' Lifetime Accumulation of Stuff. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Harvey, D. (2012). Rebel Cities: from the right to the city to the urban revolution. London: Verso.
- Homs, P., Flores-Pons, G., & Martin Mayor, A. (2021). Sustaining caring livelihoods: Agroecological cooperativism in Catalonia. In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 100-113). New York: Routledge.
- Jones, P., & Ulman, M. (2021). Replacing growth with belonging economies: A neopesant response. In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 19-33). New York: Routledge.
- Lambert, D. (2021). Recycling old ideals? A utopian reading of "circular" food imaginaries. In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 159-173). New York: Routledge.
- Latief, J. (2019, February 15). Michelle Mlati's Afrofuturist Approach to Spatial Planning. ArchDaily. Retrieved January 15, 2022, from

- https://www.archdaily.com/911518/michelle-mlatis-afrofuturist-approach-to-spatial-planning
- Massey, D. (2004). Geographies of Responsibility. Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography, 86(1), 5-18. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3554456
- Montgomery, C. (2013). Happy City: Transforming Our Lives Through Urban Design. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- OECD (2020), OECD Regions and Cities at a Glance 2020, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/959d5ba0-en.
- Paddeu, F. (2017). Legalising urban agriculture in Detroit: a contested way of planning for decline. Town Planning Review, 88(1), 109-129.
- Pungas, L. (2021). Caring dachas:Food self-provisioning in Eastern Europe through the lens of care. In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 59-75). New York: Routledge.
- Purdy, M., & Walden, R. (2021). Le Corbusier and the Theological Program. The Open Hand.
- Kallis, G. (2015, February). The Degrowth Alternative. Great Transition Initiative. Retrieved December 13, 2021, from https://greattransition.org/publication/the-degrowth-alternative
- Kinkaid, E. (2020). Re-encountering Lefebvre: Toward a critical phenomenology of social space. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 38(1), 167–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775819854765
- Kunkel, B. (2014). Utopia or Bust: A Guide to the Present Crisis. London: Verso.
- Massey, D. (1995). Thinking Radical Democracy Spatially. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 13(3), 283-288. https://doi.org/10.1068/d130283
- Mayeroff, M. (1971). On Caring: World Perspectives. New York City: Harper & Row.
- McGuirk, J. (2014). Radical Cities: Across Latin America in Search of a New Architecture. London: Verso.
- Molotch, H. (2010). Canal to Hell. Contemporary sociology, 39(6), 657-659.
- Mumford, E. (2018). Crisis of Utopia: Rejections and Revisions of Modern Planning. Designing the Modern City: Urbanism Since 1850 (pp. 288-316). New Haven: Yale University Press. Retrieved March 16, 2022, from https://www-aaeportal-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/?id=-18605
- Murphy, M. P. (2013). Translating Degrowth into Contemporary Policy Challenges: A Symbiotic Social Transformation Strategy. Irish Journal of Sociology, 21(2), 76-89.

- Nelson, A. (2019). Nonmonetary eco-collaborative living for degrowth. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Nelson, A. (2019). Housing for growth narratives. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Olsen, E., Orefice, M., & Pietrangeli, G. (2019). From the "right to the city" to the "right to metabolism." In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities . New York City: Routledge.
- Radu, I., Parent, E., Snowboy, G., Wapachee, B., & Beaulieu, G. (2021).

 Degrowth, decolonisation and food sovereignty in the Cree Nation of Chisasibi.

 In A. Nelson & F. Edwards (Eds.), Food for Degrowth: Perspectives and

 Practices, Routledge Environmental Humanities (pp. 173-186). New York:

 Routledge.
- Ramos, S. J. (2022). The Body Politic: Planning History, Design, and Public Health. Journal of Planning History, 21(1), 3-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/15385132211021995
- Raworth, K. (2017). Doughnut Economics. Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Rekow, L. (2017). Urban agriculture in the Manguinhos favela of Rio de Janeiro: laying the groundwork for a greener future. In W. Leal Filho, D.-M. Pociovalisteanu, & A. Q. Al-Amin (Eds.), Sustainable Economic Development, World Sustainability Series (pp. 155-185). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Roane, J. T. (2020, January). Mothers 4 Housing and the Legacy of Black Anti-Growth Politics. Black Perspectives. Retrieved from the African American History Society https://www.aaihs.org/mothers-4-housing-and-the-legacy-of-black-anti-growth-politics/
- Schneider, F. (2019). Housing for degrowth narratives. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Schindler, S. (2016). Detroit after bankruptcy: A case of degrowth machine politics. Urban Studies, 53(4), 818-836.
- Soper, K. (2020). Post-Growth Living: For an Alternative Hedonism. London: Verso.
- Stefansdottir, H., & Xue, J. (2019). The quality of small dwellings in a neighbourhood context. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.

- Trainer, T. (2019). The Simpler Way: housing, living, and settlements. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Upton, D. (2008). Another City: Urban Life and Urban Spaces in the New American Republic (Illustrated., p. 395). New Haven: Yale University Press. https://www.aaeportal.com/?id=-21800
- Vishwanath, C. (2019). Degrowth: a perspective from Bengaluru, South India. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Widmer, H., & Schneider, F. (2019). Neighbourhoods as the basic module of the global commons. In A. Nelson & F. Schneider (Eds.), Housing for Degrowth: Principles, Models, Challenges, and Opportunities. New York City: Routledge.
- Xue, J. (2021). Urban planning and degrowth: a missing dialogue. Local environment, 1-19.