

Land Use Planning, Sustainability, and Security in Terrains of Terror (80)

Charles Geisler and David Kay
Cornell University

Landscapes disfigured by terrorism are the terra nullius of the modern era. Terrorism redistributes populations; destroys infrastructure and public goods; convulses property values and housing markets; and interrupts ecosystem services and life support systems. In contrast to Schumpeter's gale of creative destruction, the technologies of terrorism are profoundly destructive. All too often their antidote, counter-terrorism, spawns civilian check-points, militarizes zoning, and limits access to public facilities. Private property rights are forfeited to make homelands secure. The opportunity costs of counter-terrorism efforts weaken social services, democratic planning, and sustainability initiatives.

This paper examines several relationships land use planning can take to terrorism; it draws on the three response ecologies considered by Rozenzweig (2004) for conservation purposes. Reservation ecology creates enclaves and strongholds reserved for some species over others as a first line of defense. Examples in the human realm are exclusionary zoning, gated cities, and protected enclaves; with proper enforcement, they appear impregnable. Restoration ecology, redefined to confront terrorism, becomes emergency preparedness planning and concerted efforts to recolonize devastated areas. Finally, reconciliation ecology, in human terms, brings conflicting land uses into harmony through a variety of means. These share in common a commitment to public goods and ecosystem services. In theory, reconciliation land use planning is potentially transformative, and finds tenure solutions that replace terrorist threats and violence with trust, reciprocity, and rescaled security. Though the contribution of this paper is largely conceptual, each of these response ecologies will be illustrated with case material and evaluated from the standpoint of both security and sustainability.