

SYMPOSIUM 001

POLICE BRUTALITY

For the first time, Agora is dedicating a portion of its journal to one topic: police brutality. The Symposium serves as a time capsule. It is a space to recall past tragedies and to ruminate upon those that took place in 2014. This was the year that the nation reopened the discussion on police brutality and its disproportionate effects on minorities. 2014 dispelled the already tenuous argument that the U.S. has entered a post-racial society. This is also the first time that we have asked planning students: why does police brutality continue to happen, and what is our role, if any, in preventing it? Where does planning for safe communities end and enforcement of safety begin? The authors chosen for the symposium here discuss various ways that planners can re-examine their own practice to create inclusive and safe places.

CONTRIBUTORS

Harley F. Etienne, Michelle Bennett, Danielle Jacobs, and Lacey Sigmon

Planning, Brutality, and Race

Expanding Planning's Disciplinary Boundaries

We now find ourselves in a bad year in a string of bad years of race relations in the United States with seemingly unrelenting battery of senseless tragedy after senseless tragedy. The most high profile tragedies involved unarmed African Americans, most not violating the law, and gunned down by police or armed citizens. Several common threads tie these events together: 1) perpetrators who viewed African American victims as threats to their own safety; 2) a rush to assassinate the character of the victims; and, 3) empathy and compassion for the police and other assailants based on their fears of Black crime.

It must be said that there is something morally unacceptable about Americans so readily accepting those three threads as “normal.” The only context in which that is possible is one where African Americans and other men of color are so dangerous, immoral, corrupt and irredeemable that their deaths at the hands of police or armed citizens can be easily and routinely justified. Their assailants have found sympathetic police, prosecutors, juries, and judges, and even financial support by those who are sympathetic to their anxieties about African Americans.

In these incidents and the reaction to them, we can see evil and systemic oppression. There are varying definitions of both concepts that we can use but the idea that ties various definitions of each and them to each other is the inhumanity of the victims. Systematic violence, in these cases, can be justified against the different, the less than, and the presumed guilty who deserve their fates. That is only possible if the perpetrators are “good” and fundamentally

different than the victims. Oppression then becomes about the marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, exploitation and violence of the other group (Young, 1990).

Using Iris Marion Young's “Five Faces of Oppression” as a guide, we can connect violence to both oppression and a rational objective: “to defeat a formally defined enemy, or to prevent a subjugated group from challenging, or weakening or overturning authority structures” (Young, 1990, 149). Oppression and the evil we can associate with it stems from the normalization of the violence. In our current society, we have become so immune to the ubiquity of evil that it's almost impossible to find situations where it might actually apply (Delbanco, 1995). The ordinariness—or banality—of evil in our current lives makes it perhaps easy to evade a sense of moral outrage against acts such as the ones we have witnessed over the past several years (Arendt, 1994).

Using a concept such as “evil” to summarize the events of the past several years may seem inappropriate or even hyperbolic. However, the current tenor of race relations in the United States recently can be viewed as an opportunity for planning to critically examine the role of planners and planning thought in creating and reproducing the kinds of spatial segregation and isolation that make such tragedies possible. One way to achieve that objective is to employ concepts such as evil to create a sense of urgency about the need to exploit the moment for the purpose of reflexive thinking in planning. For academic and professional planners, to have no moral outrage about segregation and its unintended byproducts, such as systemic violence and increasing inequality, is to forfeit the ability to claim authority on the well-being and interests of the communities we claim to serve.

HARLEY F. ETIENNE
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF
URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

“BLACK CRIMINALITY, OR THE RACIALIZATION OF CRIME, CONTINUES TO SHAPE HOW AFRICAN AMERICANS ARE VIEWED AND HELPS WHITES AND BLACK ELITES TO JUSTIFY ONGOING DISCRIMINATION.”

If we use Yiftachel's (1998) definition of planning as a field that is about the “formulation, content, and implementation of spatial public policies,” then we must consider phenomenon such as mass incarceration, over-policing, police brutality, and violence as having a spatial rubric. Which is to say that such phenomena are not occurring randomly in space. They are happening where people of color are thought to not belong or in spaces where their behavior must be controlled. Urban geographers can also lay claim to such a position but lack the same connections to practice and policy planners claim to have. With our multidisciplinary approach to cities and human settlements, planning both studies and creates place (Pinson, 2004). In both circumstances, we are either setting the stage for tragic violence to occur or we are keeping our disciplinary gaze narrow enough to commit a form of moral evasiveness by declaring those phenomenon are beyond the disciplinary boundaries of our field.

Planning and police brutality are linked through one issue that planners do profess to care about: social justice. There is, and has been for some time, a substantial group of urban dwellers for whom economic mobility is limited, if not impossible (Sharkey, 2013). This same group is also the most targeted for detainment, arrest, wrongful conviction, and harsher penalties for the same crimes that others also commit, and if they can overcome that, stand a good chance of finding themselves unable to afford housing in other areas where they might find better economic opportunities. Since 1970, racial segregation has decreased significantly. However, African Americans remain “hypersegregated” from the rest of American society (Denton, 2006). With people of color, and African Americans in particular, spatially segregated in most major metropolitan

areas of the country. With such spatial divides and a lack of social connections across racial groups, popular images of African Americans as “sexually promiscuous, uncontrollably aggressive, drug crazed, self-indulgent, dangerous, worthless and irredeemable” persist (Baum, 2011).

As Khalil Muhammad writes in “The Condemnation of Blackness”, racist police, prosecutors, juries, judges and criminologists all conspired to reach a self-fulfilling prophecy about the inevitability of urban crime at the hands of dangerous, immoral, unintelligent, and licentious African American men. This narrative is backed by decades of unjust indictments, convictions and sentences. The very racialization of crime did not allow for the redemption of Black men as it did for Irish and Jewish immigrants who were also deemed dangerous and criminal upon their arrival. Social scientists at the turn of the century worked tirelessly to debunk these narratives, not only because they were not scientifically rigorous but also because their own identities, political interests, and redemption were tied to rewriting them (2010).

Black criminality, or the racialization of crime, continues to shape how African Americans are viewed and helps whites and black elites to justify ongoing discrimination. This logic has been dangerous and harmful to cities, urban communities, people of color, and whites themselves because it supports a narrative that Black pathology destroys cities and that neoliberal policy and control of these spaces will restore them. Understanding how these narratives operate and sustain themselves over time would require a dramatic expansion of the scope of planning research and thought. As of now, there is little evidence to support the assertion that the canon of planning scholarship

on cities and racial inequality comes anywhere close to covering the breadth and depth that area of inquiry.

Borrowing from a rational-technical and positivist traditions from the social sciences, planners often fail to critically examine the structures that sustain Black criminality in place and its implications for urban revitalization and more importantly, social justice. If actors in an urban environment are rational atomistic units that create the empirically tested trends and phenomenon we find, then we can obscure our own roles and remove the urgency to intervene. While race is of interest, planning does not fully engage it as a sociological concept that shapes what we do or how we understand cities. If we do consider it, we consider it after we have considered other factors, practices, and structures, and often do not do so as critically as we could (Mier, 1994). Both planning practitioners and academics rarely evaluate the “success” or “failure” of plans with the reduction of racial and economic inequality as a principle goal and focus. Even if we wanted to do so, the metrics of both are often highly subjective, easily challenged, and obtuse. An expansion of the field of planning might help create new discourses and subfields where such analyses could exist.

Even if we choose to cling to our positivist technical-rationality, and not examine the connections between the various structures that are complicit in the oppression of people of color, we have to appreciate the sheer cost of mass incarceration (Roeder et. al, 2015; Alexander 2010). We would have to consider the lost economic impact of the incarcerated population who are not contributing to the labor and housing markets through their wages and spending. We would also have to consider the economic and environmental impacts of race-inspired suburban sprawl. We would

have to consider how racism and segregation fragment regional economic development planning and stunt growth at both regional and national scales. Lastly, we would have to consider how much more effective planning practice would be if it could intervene in any of the abovementioned phenomena.

Yiftachel’s arguments are again useful for understanding that planning has straddled the fence between its more positive reform side and its “darker” control side. On the one hand, the reform functions of planning seek to create more justice, opportunity, and freedom for individuals in space. On the more obscure side, planning can be seen to contribute to the worsening of “intergroup disparities and inequalities and undemocratic domination” (1998). Trends of decreasing affordability and significant displacement in cities such as New York, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Chicago and others speak to our complicity to facilitate the dominance of capital in processes of planning and development. The dearth of planning scholarship that connects hypersegregation, decreasing affordability, overpolicing, police violence and mass incarceration as forces that are shaping how cities look and operate today is evidence of this dark side. To that end, planning scholarship has a vested interest in the functioning of the practice and may avoid exposing how planning practice actively participates in control and repression through its work. Analyzing planning’s darker side delegitimizes the larger project of planning in some ways. With no positive practice to examine, we lose the boundary between our body of knowledge and the more general field of urban studies. We also lose the prescriptive and normative policy edge that further separates us from our more opaque, self-referential, and discursive social sciences.

To say that planning has no interest, no stake, no expertise and no business interfering or interloping in the areas of police brutality and abuses of power, mass incarceration, and the decimation of public education means that we have marginalized planning to the business of making places pretty and amenable to speculative land development. We settle for being visionaries who assist the functioning of markets and keep blinders on tight enough to not see anything beyond what we chose to see. It suggests that we have no intellectual or practical interest in the harsh realities of life for the vast majority of people of color who inhabit the cities we claim to care so much for. It accepts there is nothing planning can do to interrupt the current state of affairs and will no longer even question it.

If planning continues to ignore the link between police brutality, mass incarceration and the increasing economic polarization of cities, we will use visionary planning to exercise

control over cities instead of acting as agents of reform. We will unintentionally (further) imperil the legitimacy and future of our field by choosing to ignore its most severe crises. History will not be kind to us for our failures as we simultaneously declare our commitment to fairness, democracy, inclusion and rigorous research that supports those ideals and so fundamentally forfeit our opportunity to intervene in the current course of events. It will simply not suffice to declare anything other than that making cities safer, more accessible, affordable, welcoming, beautiful and dynamic for all people is central to what planning is. The only way to ensure that this is possible is to expand our approach to our practice and to our study of urban phenomena. ■

The author would like to thank Scott Campbell for his critical feedback on this essay.

Community Policing

A Collaborative Approach to Ending Police Brutality

Likely causes for police brutality are more nuanced than the media's reports on historical racial segregation. The argument for segregation causing racialized police brutality implies that if Michael Brown and Darren Wilson were neighbors, Brown's death would not have happened. If Wilson had seen that Brown went to school regularly, ate dinner every night with his family, and played football with his friends, would he have killed Brown even if he felt threatened? Would Brown's actions on the day of his death have been dismissed as typical teenage boy behavior rather than that of a thuggish criminal had they been neighbors? This article looks at the missing link between planning, policing and community.

Examining Ferguson's socio-spatial conditions challenges the idea that residential proximity expedites the process of social cohesion. Spatial analysis of the location of households by race demonstrates that Ferguson "is a functioning multiracial community" in which "blacks and whites live side by side" (Rodden, 2014). While St. Louis is the 11th most segregated city in the United States, Ferguson, a suburb, is relatively racially heterogeneous. However, fruitful community building requires complete racial integration over mere spatial proximity of different races.

In 1968, Melvin Webber, a UC Berkeley professor, wrote in the "Post-City Age" that the riots that ensued after a violent event were misinterpreted as racial conflict. Webber observed that in the 1965 Watts Riot, "the police and the city were merely convenient symbols of the rioters' frustrating sense of powerlessness and of the many handicaps keeping them from bridging the social gap" (Webber, 1968). While blacks had a higher

standard of living than those of previous generations, the gap of relative wealth between blacks and whites was still noticeable, regardless of whether or not they lived in the same neighborhood. Webber also developed the idea of "community without propinquity." "Propinquity" connects two related ideas: proximity and kinship. Race relations today reveal the contradiction of these terms; your community is whom you associate with (kinship), which is not necessarily your neighbor (proximity). When neighborhoods remain in a state of fear and resentment for decades, planners have failed to achieve their fundamental task of creating safe and livable communities.

Heightened media coverage shows the public vociferously condemning police officers' unjust and fatal mistreatment of minorities. This coverage highlights the fact that American cities remain highly segregated even though the "dissimilarity index," a statistical tool that planners use, shows decreasing segregation in major metropolitan zones (Logan and Stults, 2011). While planners may understand the limitations this metric has in quantifying racial conflict, they continue using it and distance themselves from police brutality, riots, and continued segregation. By hiding behind "objective" metrics such as indices, economic models, and zoning, planners fail to capture the complex and poignant social history behind police brutality. As a result, they fail to prevent its recurrence. Responding to social turmoil as a technocrat is inappropriate and unacceptable. When the people you plan for must take to the streets to be heard, a new approach must be sought.

SOLUTION IN COLLABORATION

Questioning police brutality is not outside the scope of a planner's role; public safety, equitable policies, and improvements to quality of life are goals that planners strive

“IF WILSON HAD SEEN THAT BROWN WENT TO SCHOOL REGULARLY, ATE DINNER EVERY NIGHT WITH HIS FAMILY, AND PLAYED FOOTBALL WITH HIS FRIENDS, WOULD HE HAVE KILLED BROWN?”

for. Exposing the recent deaths of unarmed black youth and the ensuing public momentum towards correcting these injustices, coupled with instituting a paradigm shift towards inclusive processes, may be the necessary combination for addressing the disconnect between planning, policing, and community.

Fighting crime has limited effects on reducing crime. Arguably, planners are as important as police because “community institutions are the first line of defense against disorder and crime” (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994). Technological advances shifted the emphasis from preventing crimes to responding to crimes. Police officers, no longer patrolling the streets on foot, severed valuable relationships with residents, isolating themselves and exacerbating the “us versus them” mentality. In the 1990s, community policing emerged to confront swiftly changing demographics in cities. It aims to leverage the knowledge of the community and to use collaboration to prevent crime. Unlike previous policing methods, community policing “depends on optimizing positive contact between patrol officers and community members” (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994).

In 2001, the Cincinnati Police Department (CPD) was sued in a class action lawsuit for racial profiling. During the lawsuit, a police officer shot and killed an unarmed black teenager. The CPD had killed 15 black males in eight years. The city erupted into a three-day riot “more devastating” than any other race riot in the U.S. (Innes and Booher, 2010). A third-party mediator took on a year-long collaborative project to bring all of the stakeholders to the table.

Due to a history of complacency on improving race relations, the city became one of the many stakeholders in this process, not one of the leaders. Over the year, a total of 3,500 participants met regularly in four-hour sessions to discuss the community’s goals. In the end,

the white officer was acquitted, but the city did not riot. The CPD, the U.S. Department of Justice, and Cincinnati signed a Memorandum of Agreement to change police practices and how they were monitored, but the agreement is not binding and was written in vague terms (Innes and Booher, 2010).

Through interviews with police, a disconnect surfaced between how police officers view their role in the community and how the community views them. When police spoke frankly with community members, they were surprised to hear that residents were more concerned with issues of public safety than of crime. Police officers reported that they worried tending primarily to “softer crimes” undermines their relevance. Through candid interviews, police officers admitted to discourteous behavior toward blacks, a lack of professionalism, and pulling over minorities without probable cause. They are unsure how to balance liberty and order when blacks demand safer communities but resist increased patrolling and periodic frisking (Thacher, 2001).

Honest communication and democratic action have been missing but can be used to forge links between the formerly separated fields of planning and policing to examine interrelated social issues. Planners not only must continue to actively participate in collaborative efforts, but also must have the foresight to initiate them. When a city experiences 15 deaths of unarmed black males within eight years, planners must know that their policies have failed to correct racial and social imbalances. A first step in correcting these issues is for planners to engage in dialogue as stakeholders. Removing the social distance between themselves and citizens allows planners to operate as concerned stakeholders and engage in a pluralist setting. By shifting the process towards collaboration and civic engagement, planners can play a legitimate role in creating a safer place for their constituents. ■



A Broader Planning Practice

Considering Unconscious Biases and Institutionalized Racism

Recent deaths of African-Americans caused by police violence have ignited discussions around race and social justice. Police brutality is defined as “the use of excessive and/or unnecessary force by police when dealing with civilians” (Danilina, n.d.). However, police brutality is not limited to physical force. It also includes false arrests, verbal abuse, and racial profiling (Danilina, n.d.). Research shows that all forms of police brutality disproportionately impact African Americans (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2011). Police brutality is a product of, at a minimum, unconscious bias and institutionalized racism. Biases and racism are intertwined with urban planning practice, sometimes leading to discriminatory plans and policies. This essay is a call for planners to be more ethical and effective in our work, to examine our unconscious biases, to plan proactively in order to meet the needs of all community members.

UNCONSCIOUS BIAS AND DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT

Conscious and unconscious racial biases are some of the many causes of police brutality. Unconscious biases are unacknowledged tendencies towards a particular perspective, which interfere with our ability to be unprejudiced or objective (Winters, 2014). Everyone has these biases, no matter their profession, social identity, or racial group, and they do not necessarily mean that the individual is racist or sexist. In the context of police brutality, these biases often creep into police conduct, affecting whom officers target and how they preserve “safe” communities. Biases can lead to verbal abuse, racial profiling, and sometimes violence. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human

Rights determines that these predispositions often lead to police brutality in minority communities and writes that “indeed, many instances of police brutality against minorities begin with a misperception on the part of law enforcement officials – based purely on race – that a particular individual of color is a criminal suspect” (2015). Unconscious biases lead to unbalanced policing of minority communities, making those communities targets of police violence.

These unacknowledged tendencies also show up in urban planning decisions, resulting in policies that disproportionately burden low-income and minority communities. For example, in the 1990s, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) funded a costly rail rapid transit system to the suburbs, while simultaneously raising bus fares and cutting bus services in the city. Many argued that this transit policy benefited the majority-white transit riders commuting from the suburbs and harmed the mostly low-income, minority individuals relying on bus services in the inner city. The Bus Riders Union, a large grassroots mass transit advocacy group composed of mostly low-income bus riders, filed a civil rights lawsuit against the MTA, alleging that its policy discriminated against minorities. The court agreed and ordered the MTA to improve its inner-city bus service policy (Grengs, 2002). This recent case shows how urban planners are sometimes guilty of pursuing policies without considering the unintended impacts. Thus it is important for planners to take the time to become fully aware of our unconscious tendencies before we implement a policy or plan.

The recent police brutality events and the preceding MTA example should remind planners of our ethical duty to think proactively about how our actions and inactions affect the multiple communities for which we plan.

“UNCONSCIOUS BIASES LEAD TO UNBALANCED POLICING OF MINORITY COMMUNITIES, MAKING THOSE COMMUNITIES TARGETS OF POLICE VIOLENCE.”

The AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct states: “We shall seek social justice by working to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of the disadvantaged and to promote racial and economic integration” (American Planning Association, 2009). This alludes to the famous advocacy planner, Paul Davidoff, and his call to planners to challenge the notion that only one public interest exists and to support the intentional planning for multiple public interests (1965). This still holds exceptionally true today. Urban planners must be ethical planners, which requires continuous re-examination of how our biases shape planning practice for the multiple publics we serve.

INSTITUTIONALIZED RACISM

Police brutality is one of many products of a larger system of racial injustice. Institutionalized racism is “discriminatory treatment, unfair policies and inequitable opportunities and impacts, based on race, produced and perpetuated by institutions” (Lawrence & Keleher, 2004). Unconscious and conscious biases lead to stereotypes, which often cause unintended discriminatory norms and practices. In her new book, *The New Jim Crow*, Michelle Alexander (2011) powerfully writes about the norms and practices of the criminal justice system. She stresses that the Supreme Court allows police to use race as a factor when determining whom to stop and search for evidence of a crime, leading to heavy policing in African-American communities and mass incarceration of black and brown men. Such discriminatory policies and practices are often ingrained in institutions, which makes them difficult to dismantle.

Urban planning offices are also institutions that can create or perpetuate racial injustices if they do not carefully examine their own norms and policies. Overt racism in the traditional sense

is far less common today than prior to the Civil Rights Movement, as in the MTA example, more subtle discrimination exists and often results from not challenging injustice. As a predominately white profession, most urban planners have the privilege of ignoring racial inequities because we do not experience them personally.

It is on planners to fix this problem. Melba Joyce Boyd, an African-American poet and distinguished professor, spoke at the 2015 Taubman MLK Symposium about how she disliked being the only person in the room to speak up when racial issues arose, encouraging all planners to provide “backup,” or, in other words, to be brave and speak up when they see injustices. For example, a planner could respectfully question a coworker’s plan that would expand bus routes in predominately white, affluent neighborhoods, while maintaining the same level of service in predominately low-income or minority neighborhoods. Thinking of unintended impacts and questioning ideas before they become policies and plans is one way to create a more equitable planning institution. The power to change institutions comes from the people within them.

The unconscious biases and institutionalized racism that lead to police brutality have clear, applicable connections to urban planning work. Recognizing how unconscious racial biases cause police violence provides planners with an opportunity to see how our own biases or misconceptions may shape planning practice. Understanding that institutionalized racism exists outside of extreme contexts like police brutality should motivate planners to examine our actions and inactions. Reflecting on our biases and practices will ultimately make us better, more effective planners who design and plan for communities where everyone can thrive. ■

Spaces of Police Brutality

Why Planners Should Actively Disassemble Them

Police brutality is not new in America, yet recent public awareness reveals its importance as a topic for public discussion. While urban planning has become a jack-of-all-trades, its relative absence in discussions around police brutality is troubling. By being silent on the matter, planners sit idle while spaces of police brutality are created. There are two important contributors to spaces of police brutality: community policing and the broken windows theory. Research shows that rates of violent crime have decreased in America, yet police presence and non-violent arrests in impoverished neighborhoods are still prevalent (Nuno, 2013). By ignoring how community policing and the broken windows theory have affected minority communities experiencing disinvestment, planners have missed the opportunity to create safe spaces for all urban residents.

Community policing is a tactic police departments use to reduce crime and increase a sense of safety through informal patrolling. The logic behind community policing is that if police are more visible in their communities, residents will not only recognize that the police are available in an emergency, but also feel confident in police capacity to prevent crime (Veer et al, 2012). This tactic became prevalent in most urban areas in 1999 (Nuno, 2013). While the reasoning behind it seems sound, studies have shown that increased police presence does not necessarily lead to an increased sense of safety. Surprisingly, research shows that the presence of police can often make residents feel unsafe (Veer et al, 2012). Furthermore, informal police presence can make people, especially males, more vigilant and therefore

appear less calm (Veer et al, 2012). Despite unclear evidence of the actual effects of community policing, nearly 20 percent of urban police forces are dedicated to this tactic (Nuno, 2013).

The broken windows theory suggests that an area with high rates of physical disarray, such as broken windows that are not repaired immediately, has a higher likelihood of crime. Therefore, if minor offenses are punished harshly, major crimes will be committed less often for fear of punishment or because people committing minor crimes are also committing major crimes (Gau & Pratt, 2010). Despite the theory's purported logic, there is a lack of evidence showing that physical disarray leads to crime. Rather, what has become clear is that the institutional structures that lead to poverty create an environment of physical disarray and crime (Gau & Pratt, 2010).

Even though the theory has a tenuous foundation, it has fundamentally changed American policing. Rudy Giuliani made the first policy connection between this theory and crime mitigation. He helped create a zero-tolerance policy for minor quality-of-life offenses in New York City (Gau & Pratt, 2010). One detrimental effect of zero-tolerance policing is that the response to the crime committed is no longer required to be proportional; it is understood that the response need not be questioned (Lorenz, 2010). The interactions between race and poverty mean that zero-tolerance policing disproportionately affects poor minority Americans living in blighted communities. Because minorities in poverty tend to have less political power, there is little room to express grievances with this policy (Gau & Pratt, 2010). The outcome leads to heightened frustrations and increasing tensions.

“PLANNERS HAVE THE TOOLS TO HELP CHANGE THE DIALOGUE ABOUT DISINVESTED NEIGHBORHOODS... WE SHOULD BE ADDRESSING THE UNDERLYING ISSUES: LACK OF EQUITABLE ACCESS TO EDUCATION, HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND JOBS.”

The combination of community policing and the broken windows theory has contributed to spaces of police brutality in communities of poverty. Poverty underlies both tactics, but neither tactic addresses the root problem. In the cases of Michael Brown and Eric Garner, community policing and the broken windows theory played a role in the tragic outcomes. In both situations, the police engaged these men while patrolling disinvested neighborhoods. Neither police officer was responding to a crime. The police engaged Michael Brown and Eric Garner for allegedly committing minor offenses like walking in the street and selling cigarettes. Both Ferguson, where Michael Brown was shot, and the Tompkinsville neighborhood in Staten Island, where Eric Garner was killed, have significantly higher rates of poverty than the surrounding areas. Because of the higher rates of poverty, these areas are likely visually more blighted than more affluent surrounding areas. These areas also have a higher concentration of blacks (Smith, 2014; Mueller, 2014). While planners

do not have a hand in creating police policy, and arguably should not, planners do deal with spatial issues. The combination of community policing and zero-tolerance responses in areas of disinvestment and poverty has led to the concentration of tensions, mistrust, and injustices.

Planners can actively separate community policing and the broken windows theory from areas of poverty by addressing poverty itself. Planners must stop ignoring geographically concentrated and racialized poverty. Planners have the tools to help change the dialogue about disinvested neighborhoods. Rather than seeing them as dangerous places that require increased policing, we should be addressing the underlying issues: lack of equitable access to education, housing, transportation, and jobs. Planners can and should play a more significant role in decoupling police brutality from minority and impoverished communities by addressing these root causes. Black and minority lives matter. ■

REFERENCES

ETIENNE

- Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- Arendt, H. (1994). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Baum, H. (2011). Planning and the problem of evil, *Planning Theory*, 10(2), 103-123.
- Delbanco, A. (1995). *The death of Satan: How Americans have lost the sense of evil*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Mier, R. (1994). Some Observations on Race in Planning, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 60(2), 235-240.
- Muhammad, K.G. (2010). *The condemnation of blackness: Race, crime and the making of modern America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pinson, D. (2004). Urban planning: an 'undisciplined' discipline? *Futures*, 36: 503-513.
- Roeder, O, Eisen, L.B. & Bowling, J. (2015). What Caused the Decline in Crime? New York University, School of Law, Brennan Center for Justice.
- Sharley, P. (2013). *Stuck in place: Urban neighborhoods and the end of progress toward racial inequality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yiftachel, O. (1998). Planning and social control: Exploring the dark side, *Journal of Planning Literature*, 12(4), 395-406.
- Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

BENNETT

- Bureau of Justice Assistance. (1994). *Understanding community policing: A framework for action*. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commp.pdf>
- Innes, J., & Booher, D. (2010). *Planning with complexity: An introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy*. Oxford: Routledge, 52-58.
- Logan, J., & Stults, B. (2011). Persistent segregation in the metropolis: New findings from the 2010 Census. Retrieved from <http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/Data/Report/report2.pdf>
- Rodden, J. (2014). Is segregation the problem in Ferguson? *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/08/18/is-segregation-the-problem-in-ferguson/>
- Thacher, D. (2001). Conflicting values in community policing. *Law & Society Review*, 35.4: 765-98.
- Webber, M. (1968). The post-city age. *Journal of the American Arts and Sciences*, 1092-110.

JACOBS

- Alexander, M. (2011). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- American Planning Association (2009). AICP code of ethics and professional conduct. Retrieved from <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm>
- Boyd, M. (2015, January 15). Panel discussion & questions from audience. Hatcher Graduate Library, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2011). Use of force. Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=703>
- Danilina, S. (n.d). The law dictionary. Featuring Black's Law Dictionary Free Online Legal Dictionary 2nd Edition. <http://thelawdictionary.org/article/what-is-police-brutality/>
- Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 31 (4), 331-338.
- Grengs, J. (2002). Community-based planning as a source of political change: The transit equity movement of Los Angeles' Bus Riders Union. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 68 (2), 165-178.
- Lawrence, K. & Keleher, T. (2004). Chronic disparity: Strong and pervasive evidence of racial inequalities. *The Race and Public Policy Conference*.
- The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (2015). Chapter one: Race and the police.
- Winters, M. (2014). Unpacking our biases, unconscious and conscious-part 1: What are unconscious biases? Can we really change them? Retrieved from <http://www.theinclusionsolution.me/unpacking-our-biases-unconscious-and-conscious-part-1-what-are-unconscious-biases-can-we-really-change-them/>

SIGMON

- Gau, J.M., & Pratt, T.C. (2010). Revisiting broken windows theory: Examining the sources of the discriminant validity of perceived disorder and crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38.
- Lorenz, A.R.S. (2010). The windows remain broken: How zero tolerance destroyed due process. *Public Integrity*, 12(3).
- Mueller, B. (2014, December 4). Outcome of Eric Garner case bares as Staten Island divide. *The New York Times*.
- Nuno, L.F. (2013). Police, public safety, and race-neutral discourse. *Sociology Compass*, 7(6).
- Smith, J. (2014, August 17). In Ferguson, black town, white power. *The New York Times*.
- Van de Veer, E., De Lange, M.A., Van Der Haar, E., & Karremans, J.C. (2012). Feelings of safety: Ironic consequences of police patrolling. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(12).