

Insurgent Planning as Social Reform

Invented Spaces and the Right to the City

Arson Rashidmardani · Bachelor of Urban Planning (Hons) · University of Auckland · 2026

Institutional **invited spaces** routinely co-opt dissent. The **invented spaces** communities seize outside official permission are the real engine of social reform. The planner’s task is to enable and discipline that counter-hegemonic capacity, not to lead it.

01 INTRODUCTION


Planning is not the neutral administration of land use. It is a field in which dominant interests are reproduced or contested, and whose city gets built is often settled before any plan is notified. I argue for insurgent planning as social reform, and I write as a planner whose task is to enable the counter-hegemonic capacity of marginalised communities rather than direct it. Extending Friedmann’s (1987) social mobilisation tradition, insurgent planning reframes the work as contestation from the margins and names a structural exclusion that collaborative and communicative planning cannot resolve (Miraftab, 2009). That capacity is not automatically progressive, a limit I answer rather than evade.

02 THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Insurgent planning is not a break with planning theory but an extension of an older current. Friedmann (1987) maps four traditions; the fourth, social mobilisation, locates planning in transformation from below and takes the standpoint of those whom development displaces. Miraftab (2009) sharpens this spatially. Invited spaces are the participatory channels created and legitimised by the state and donors; invented spaces are the collective actions through which the poor confront authority and challenge the status quo (pp. 38–39). The two are mutually constituted, and insurgent practice is counter-hegemonic, transgressive, and imaginative (p. 32).

Advocacy must be separated from insurgency. Davidoff (1965) established that planning is never value-free and that planners should plead plural plans before decision-makers, but that pleading occurs within the democratic-institutional process: the very invited space Miraftab argues co-opts dissent. Advocacy is the most progressive form of invited-space planning; insurgent planning moves past it. Gramsci’s (1971) war of position supplies the mechanism; Laclau and Mouffe (1985) add that hegemony has no single location, so it can be contested at many points at once. Space is produced and political (Lefebvre, 1991), not the inert extension the Ihumātao rezoning presumed.

FIG. 1 · THE CONCEPTUAL HINGE: INVITED VS INVENTED SPACES (MIRAFTAB, 2009)



Mutually constituted: invented action can prise open new invited spaces.

03 CRITICAL ANALYSIS

REFORM DEPENDS ON INVENTED SPACE

If invited spaces pacify, reform depends on invented ones. Institutional participation absorbs and neutralises dissent (Miraftab, 2009, p. 41), which the consultation around Ihumātao did (Elers & Dutta, 2019). After the 2014 designation of land beside the Ōrūataua Stonefields as Special Housing Area 62, the block passed to Fletcher Residential for 480 houses (Radio New Zealand, 2020). The submissions were made. They did not move the outcome. What moved it was the occupation Save Our Unique Landscape began in 2016, sustained past the July 2019 eviction notice and the Kīngitanga intervention. In December 2020 the Crown bought the land back for NZ\$29.9 million. The invented space achieved what the invited space could not.

ANSWERING HABERMAS

The strongest objection is Habermas’s: legitimate change must come through inclusive, consensus-seeking deliberation, so an occupation that bypasses procedure is illegitimate (Habermas, 1984). Flyvbjerg (1998) answers it empirically. The Aalborg plan was rational and democratic on paper, yet dissolved under organised interest; rationality in practice is subordinate to power. The ideal speech situation assumes a level field that structural asymmetry denies. Invented spaces respond to deliberation’s capture; they are not a refusal to deliberate.


THE HARDER OBJECTION, AND THE PLANNER’S ROLE

The harder objection is the course’s own: invented spaces are not automatically progressive, and informal politics can be captured by criminal or despotic interests serving the status quo (Miraftab, 2009, p. 43). I concede this; it defines the planner’s role rather than defeating the argument. Gramsci (1971) holds that spontaneous movements need direction, not domination: they must be educated and purged so they are neither dissipated nor captured (pp. 280–283). The planner does not lead the insurgency, which would reinstate the expert, nor treat all grassroots action as just. My task is to use knowledge of where the cracks lie for the marginalised rather than for capital, and to judge which mobilisations advance the right to the city (Bahmanteymouri & Mohammadzadeh, 2019). I read whenua as relational, not zonable extension, an obligation the Manukau inquiry recognised (Waitangi Tribunal, 1985) before that process erased it.

PRECEDENT: BASTION POINT

Bastion Point confirms durable reform. The 506-day occupation of 1977 to 1978 (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, n.d.) forced open the Waitangi Tribunal route; the Ōrākei claim returned land, won a NZ\$3 million settlement, and led to the Ōrākei Act 1991 (Waitangi Tribunal, 1987). Invented action prised open a new invited space.

FIG. 2 · IHUMĀTAO: FROM INVITED CHANNEL TO INVENTED SPACE



04 MY ROLE IN SHAPING CITIES

As a planner and policymaker, my role is to widen and protect invented space, not to occupy it. That means ceding authority to ahi kā and to communities organising from the margins, and treating planning expertise as a resource for counter-hegemonic capacity rather than a licence to lead. Reform of this kind is enabled from below; it is not delivered from above. The only question is whose cracks the planner chooses to find.

REFERENCES · APA 7

Bahmanteymouri, E., & Mohammadzadeh, M. (2019). Mashhad: Claiming the right to the city: Informal urbanization in the holy city of Mashhad. In R. Rocco & J. van Ballegoijen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook on informal urbanization* (1st ed., pp. 182–192). Routledge.

Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 31(4), 331–338.

Elers, C., & Dutta, M. J. (2019). *Ihumātao protest, colonization, and cultural voice* (CARE White Paper Series, Issue 4). Centre for Culture-Centred Approach to Research and Evaluation.

Flyvbjerg, B. (1998). *Rationality and power: Democracy in practice* (S. Sampson, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.

Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action*. Princeton University Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Eds. & Trans.). International Publishers.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Vol. 1. Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press. (Original work published 1981)

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. Verso.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell. (Original work published 1974)

Ministry for Culture and Heritage. (n.d.). *Occupation of Bastion Point begins*. NZHistory.

Miraftab, F. (2009). Insurgent planning: Situating radical planning in the Global South. *Planning Theory*, 8(1), 32–50.

Radio New Zealand. (2020, December 16). *Ihumātao: Deal struck between government and Fletcher Building to buy disputed land*. RNZ.

Waitangi Tribunal. (1985). *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Manukau claim* (Wai 8). Department of Justice.

Waitangi Tribunal. (1987). *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Orakei claim* (Wai 9). Department of Justice.