

## The spatiality of injustice and the injustice of spatiality

Faramarz Rostami

*Ph.D. Candidate in Urban Planning, Faculty of Arts, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

Hashem Dadashpoor<sup>1</sup>

*Associate Professor in Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Arts, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

*Received: 23 December 2017*

*Accepted: 8 December 2018*

### Extended Abstract

#### 1. Introduction

One of the most important signs of the intensity of injustice in a city is the emergence of spatial structures of the advantages and prevalence of a place in which this structure becomes a stable and powerful structure over time, making it more difficult to deal with injustice and increasing the intensity of injustice. One of the reasons is to look at injustice regardless of its content, structure, and process, as a result, a product and a concept that describes the present situation in the city. And on the same look has faced it. Therefore, it is necessary to take a dynamic look at injustice and not consider it static and created in a linear process.

Given that identifying and solving urban problems and reducing spatial inequalities has always focused on rural migrations to the city and the unceasing growth and management weaknesses, the circulation and accumulation of capital, the commercialization, and exploitation of certain groups and areas of urban development are still hidden in the shadow (Mousavi, 2012; Yazdani & Firouzi Magdalene, 2017). The focus of planning and decision-making in solving the problems of the first case has led the

second case to make the most of these policies and solutions from top to bottom, and the consequence has been the escalation of inequity and injustice in space.

#### 2. Review of Literature

Studies in spatial justice can be divided into three viewpoints:

2.1. Cartesian view of space and the issue of distribution;

It takes place in three-dimensional space; it follows instrumental and technocratic rationality, and in the form of comprehensive and top-down plans without essentially paying attention to the social, economic, political, and spatial relationships, which has led the city to the present point. Recommended prescriptions only help the domination of these top-down approaches. It ignores why citizens are not sensitive to the construction of public services and the government virtually reduces the availability of these services to the average and low-income urban population by shifting its responsibility to the private sector, and these groups would not share the growth of the city and its public services when the circulation and accumulation of capital is high in the city.

2.2. Distribution justly achieved in a dynamic environment with production-based structural dynamics

This view was proposed by Davies (1968), Harvey (1973), Pirie (1983), Rawls (1971),

1. Corresponding author, E- mail : h-dadashpoor@modares.ac.ir

and (Smith, 1994). Among the keywords of this view is the emphasis on the relationship between the urban space and the social situation of citizens, distribution justly achieved, the departure from the Cartesian space, the focus on the production problem in structural dynamics, and finally the justly and democratic distribution of social interests and responsibilities in space.

Some of the questions proposed in this view are who decides? Rather than for whom must be decided; control and authority of resources and services are working in what ways and for what? rather than who is the provider (supplier) and the needy (demander); how does the residents' living space has been excluded from facilities? rather than disadvantaged residents deployed in which underprivileged area. But in our study of spatial justice, the focus is still on areas instead of people.

2.3. The third view explains the role of distribution in the spatialization of injustices with emphasis on the structural productives that generate domination.

From this view (see Young, 1990; Harvey, 1992, 1996; Dikec, 2001), the purpose of spatial justice as a critical discourse is to eliminate discrimination and also reduce poverty, social segregation, and domination. Justice is a shared responsibility of engaged actors in the socio-spatial systems in which they inhabit or (re)produce them (Bromberg et al., 2007). From this perspective, it is possible to reduce the priority of the prescriptions of top-down planning and technical standards, address the city's condition, and change the focus from how it should be to how it is and how it can be.

Therefore, we can better understand the working processes and mechanisms from different aspects of the city and avoid the view that is unaware of the political/social/historical context and the trajectory of the city and its inhabitants and that does not hear diverse voices. In measuring the spatial injustice, one can not ignore development policies to improve the conditions and reduce the spatial inequalities or in parallel or opposite to them in urban

areas. In this research, the urban development plan and the manner of public services distribution have been simultaneously examined to see to what extent these plans have had an impact on spatial justice or helped stabilize and strengthen injustice. It also looks for the structures that turn the just policies into their own contradictions.

Thus, the study examines the formation of a specific social, economic, and an environmental combination called *urban duality*, the adaptation of deficiencies to socioeconomic conditions; the concentration of spatial backwardness and uneven spatial development; and the possibility of creating a continuous spatial structure for spatial advantage in the interconnected relationship between the distribution of public services and urban policies. Meanwhile, the city of Kashan is selected as a case study.

### 3. Method

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the distribution of urban services and its dependence on urban spatial structures and the creation of spatial advantages in urban development from the perspective of spatial justice. To this end, the study of spatial justice requires a look at three categories of recognition of injustice, its causes, and consequences. The injustices in this case study (Kashan) have been considered and explored.

The research method is quantitative following a descriptive-analytic approach. Using a network access analysis model, the AHP model, and using various software, 15 types of urban services were analyzed. The data were collected from the statistical sources of the Statistics Center of Iran (2006) and the comprehensive Plan of Kashan City (2005).

The variables considered for this research focus on three main categories: (a) how to distribute the social and economic conditions of the inhabitants, the distribution of services and urban utilities; (b) the distribution of the population in the present and future conditions of the city; and (c) the

conditions affecting the removal or increase injustice. All the results will indicate whether there is the possibility of creating a continuous spatial structure for the advantage of a place in a typical city.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

The results of the achievement rankings in Kashan indicate that 27 percent of the city's population is deprived, 20 percent is relatively deprived, and only 19 percent is favorable. The proportion of the population of the city of Kashan in the spatial justice category in the integrated distribution of services in terms of population size also shows that 55% of citizens are in the relative fair condition. Of the other citizens, 29% of their public services is much less than their share of the population and 16% is much larger than their population share.

The results of studying the relationship between the achievement rate and the economic and social conditions indicate an inverse relationship. In this case, with an increase in the level of achievement in the regions, the positive economic and social indicators of the inhabitants of those areas have a downward trend. An increase of 50% in the city's population over the past two decades along with a growth of about 30% to the periphery and a mere 15% of service development indicates that the capital flow generated in these years has played a minor role in the growth of public services. The worst area in Kashan's injustice category has 39% of the city's newly built residential buildings, and land price (residential and commercial) is close to other parts of the city.

The prediction of a comprehensive plan for the future population of the city (based on the implementation of construction density)

will reduce the share of low-income areas from 68% to 48%, which will be very effective in the city's balance and justice. But the placement of these areas in the medium density and municipality density sale will virtually turn them into densely populated areas, and the city is more vulnerable to injustice.

#### 5. Conclusion

The results of the findings show that the trend of displacement and change of attention has caused the separation of the historical and intermediate-range from the growing area of the city and its capture in the spatial trap and the formation of a particular type of development (social, economic and environmental) in the periphery. The spatial duality and the creation of a continuous spatial structure for the advantage and spatial prevalence occur when public services do not actually play a role, and the value of the exchange of land and housing will also serve to reduce spatial inequity policies.

Therefore, it is suggested that the resolution of the spatial injustice be sought in structures that produce and reproduce it, and it becomes more injustice in the gears of these structures without any consideration whatsoever of any action towards justice. Therefore, the elimination of injustice not through redistribution from the top, and proactive planning coming from planning the demand and focusing the right of the city on the part of the people can occur with active participation in decision making.

**Keywords:** spatiality of injustice, Injustice of spatiality, Spatial justice, Spatial advantages, Kashan City

#### References (in Persian)

1. Ahenejad Rushti, M., Mousavi, M., Mohammadi Hamidi, S., & Visian, M. (2016). بررسی و تحلیل عدالت اجتماعی در برخورداری از خدمات شهری [Analysis of social justice in the utilization of urban services]. *Geography and Urban Space Development*, 3(1), 33-51.

2. Amir Fakherian, A., & Rahnema, M. R. (2017). برنامه‌ریزی دسترسی غیرفضایی به خدمات بهداشتی-درمانی [Planning of non-communicative access to health services in Mashhad]. *Journal of Geography and Urban Space Development*, 8(26), 1-16.
3. Azizi, M. M., & Shokoochi Bidhandi, M. S. (2015). تحلیل سیر تحول تاریخی مفهوم عدالت اجتماعی در [An analysis of the historical transformation of the Concept of Social Justice in Urban Development Programs of Iran (1390-1390)]. *Journal of Social History Research*, 5(2), 125-149.
4. Dadashpoor, H., & Alvandipour, N. (2017). عدالت فضایی در مقیاس شهری در ایران. هنرهای زیبا. [Spatial justice in urban scale in Iran: Metastudy of the selected articles' theoretical framework]. *Journal of Fine Arts*, 21(3), 67-80.
5. Dadashpoor, H., & Alvandipour, N. (2017). گونه‌شناسی مفهومی عدالت در نظریه‌های برنامه‌ریزی شهری در [Conceptual typology of justice in urban planning theories based on an interdisciplinary perspective]. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 9(2), 1-27.
6. Dadashpoor, H., & Rostami, F. (2011). بررسی و تحلیل نحوه توزیع خدمات عمومی شهری از دیدگاه عدالت فضایی [The investigation and analysis of urban public services distribution from the perspective of spatial equity: The case of Yasuj City]. *Journal of Geography and Regional Development*, 9(16), 171-198.
7. Dadashpoor, H., & Rostami, F. (2011). سنجش عدالت فضایی یکپارچه خدمات عمومی شهری بر اساس توزیع [Measuring the integrated index of spatial justice in the distribution of urban public services based on population distribution, accessibility, and efficiency in Yasuj City]. *Urban and Regional Studies and Research*, 3(2), 1-22.
8. Dadashpoor, H., Alizadeh, B., & Rostami, F. (2015). جایگاه عدالت فضایی در نظام برنامه‌ریزی شهری ایران [The place of spatial equity in urban planning system of Iran]. *Development Strategy Journal*, 43, 181-206.
9. Dadashpoor, H., Alizadeh, B., & Rostami, F. (2015). *ریزی شهری گفتمان عدالت فضایی در برنامه [Spatial justice and city]. Tehran: Azarakhsh Publications.*
10. Dadashpoor, H., Rostami, F., & Alizadeh, B. (2014). بررسی و تحلیل توزیع عادلانه خدمات شهری و [The analysis of justice distribution of urban services and their spatial distribution pattern in Hamadan City]. *Journal of Urban Studies*, 3(12), 5-18.
11. Haidari, J. (2016). تحلیل توزیع فضایی کاربری‌های خدمات عمومی شهری در نواحی شهر بوشهر [The analysis of the spatial distribution of urban public services in Bushehr city]. *Geography and Regional Development*, 14(2), 129-153.
12. Kazemian, Gh., & Jalili, M. (2015). تحلیل قدرت ذی‌نفعان کلیدی در فرایند سیاستگذاری طرح جامع تهران [The analysis of key stakeholders in the planning process of Tehran's master plan (1999-2001)]. *Architecture and Urban Development Journal*, 15, 139-158.
13. Kazimyan, Gh. (1383). تبیین رابطه ساختار حاکمیت و قدرت شهری با سازمان یابی فضا، تلاش برای طراحی مدل [Explaining the relationship between governance structure and urban power with space organization: An attempt to design a model (sample of the metropolitan area of Tehran) (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)]. Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran.

14. Mirgholami, M., Keynejad, M., Alizadeh, B. (2018). ارزیابی عدالت فضایی در توسعه مجدد فضاهاى [The Evaluation of Spatial Justice in Redevelopment of Urban Spaces; Case study: Atigh Local Plan in the City of Tabriz]. *Monthly Scientific Journal of Bagh- E Nazar*, 15(67), 43-52.
15. Mohebi, M. (2017). تحلیلی بر قضاوت ذهنی شهروندان در مورد عدالت فضایی و توزیع عادلانه کارکردهای شهری [An analysis of the citizens' judgment about the justice of space and the fair distribution of urban functions]. *Environmental Studies of Seven Hesar*, 6(22), 111-123.
16. Mousavi, M. (2012). شکل پایدار شهر و عدالت اجتماعی (مطالعه مورد: شهر میاندوآب) [Sustainable city form and social justice (Case study: Miandoab City)]. *Journal of Human Geography Research*, 44(80), 192-177.
17. Nagsh Jahan-Pars Consulting Engineers. (2010). طرح توسعه و عمران (جامع) شهر کاشان [Development project (comprehensive) of Kashan City]. Kashan, Iran: Nagsh Jahan-Pars Consulting Engineers.
18. Nedaie Tusi, S., & Noori, A. (2017). ارزیابی یکپارچه عدالت بالفعل فضایی در دسترسی به تسهیلات پایه [Integrated real-time justice assessment in access to the urban base facility through multi-criteria space assessment]. *Sofeh*, 2778), 105-136.
19. Pourahmad, A., & Wafaei, A. (2016). تأثیر مدرنیسم بر ساختار کالبدی فضایی شهر ایرانی-اسلامی (مطالعه) [The effect of modernism on the physical-spatial structure of the Iranian-Islamic city (Case study: Kashan City)]. *Studies of Islamic Iranian City*, 7(28), 63-76.
20. Rahnama, M. R., & Rezaian, B. (2013). سنجش میزان پراکنش و فشردگی شکل کلانشهرهای ایران با استفاده از مدل‌های کمی [Measuring the distribution and compression of the shape of metropolitan areas of Iran using quantitative models]. *Journal of Geographical Studies in Arid Areas*, 4(16), 87-107.
21. Rahnama, M. R., Ahmadian, M. A., & Mohammadian, M. (2012). مدیریت شهری و ساماندهی [Urban Management and Organizing Informal Settlements (Case Study: Nidah Mashhad Koi)]. *Journal of Geography and Regional Development*, 10(18), 43-73.
22. Shateryan, M., & Akbari Ermaki, Z. (2015). رهیافت تجدید حیات شهری در راستای کاهش فرسودگی و [Urban rehabilitation approach to reduce urban burnout and poverty (Case study: Old tissue of Kashan City)]. *Journal of Geography*, 13(44), 119-142.
23. Tabei, N., Movahed, A. T. S., & Kamranoudi Kojuri, M. (2016). بررسی نقش عدالت فضایی در [Investigating the role of spatial justice in urban management (Study area: District 6 of Tehran)]. *Spatial Planning (Geography)*, 6(2), 23-36.
24. Varesi, H., Zangi Abadi, A., Vafaei, A., & Shateryan, M. (2013). تحلیلی بر ساختارهای اقتصادی و [An analysis of the economic and social structures of the old texture of Kashan City]. *Amiyah Mohit*, 6(23), 1-26.
25. Yaghefoury, H., Qasemi, S., & Ghasemi, N. (2017). بررسی عدالت فضایی در توزیع خدمات، با تأکید بر [The study of spatial justice in the distribution of services: Emphasizing urban management (Case study: District 91 of Tehran)]. *Geographic Research*, 32(3), 114-128.



26. Yazdani, M., & Firouzi, M. A. (2016). بررسی توزیع فضایی کاربری‌های عمومی از منظر عدالت فضایی (مطالعه موردی: شهر اردبیل) [The study of the spatial distribution of public usage from the perspective of spatial justice (Case study: Ardabil City)]. *Geography and Planning Journal*, 21(61), 363-383.

### References (in English)

1. Bozorg, L. (2010). *Spatializing social equity through place-based policies: lessons from the Green Impact Zone of Missouri, in Kansas City, MO* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Manchester, England.
2. Bromberg, A., Morrow, G. D., & Pfeiffer, D. (2007). Editorial note: Why spatial justice? *Critical Planning*, 14, 1-6.
3. Dadashpoor, H., & Rostami, F. (2017). Measuring spatial proportionality between service availability, accessibility, and mobility: Empirical evidence using spatial equity approach in Iran. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 65, 44-55.
4. Dadashpoor, H., Rostami, F., & Alizadeh, B. (2016). Is inequality in the distribution of urban facilities inequitable? Exploring a method for identifying spatial inequity in an Iranian city. *Cities*, 52, 159-172.
5. Davies, B. (1970). Social needs and resources in local services. *Public Administration*, 48(2), 214-215.
6. Dikec, M. (2001). Justice and the spatial imagination. *Environment and Planning A*, 33(10), 1785-1805.
7. Harvey, D. (1973). *Social justice and the city*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
8. Harvey, D. (1992). Social justice, postmodernism, and the city'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 16(4), 588-601.
9. Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature and the geography of difference*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
10. Ibes, D. C. (2015). A multi-dimensional classification and equity analysis of an urban park system: A novel methodology and case study application. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 137, 122-137.
11. Macedo, J., & Haddad, M. A. (2015). Equitable distribution of open space: Using spatial analysis to evaluate urban parks in Curitiba, Brazil. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43(6), 1096-1117.
12. Oakley, D., & Tsao, H. S. (2007). Socioeconomic gains and spillover effects of geographically targeted initiatives to combat economic distress: An examination of Chicago's empowerment zone. *Cities*, 24(1), 43-59.
13. Pirie, G. H. (1983). On spatial justice'. *Environment and Planning A*, 15(4), 465-473.
14. Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
15. Routledge, P. (2010). Introduction: Cities, justice and conflict. *Urban Studies*, 47(6), 1165-1177.
16. Smith, D. M. (1994). *Geography and social justice*. Oxford, London: Blackwell.
17. Taleai, M., Sliuzas, R., & Flacke, J. (2014). An integrated framework to evaluate the equity of urban public facilities using spatial multi-criteria analysis. *Cities*, 40, 56-69.
18. Wu, J., He, Q., Chen, Y., Lin, J., & Wang, S. (in press). Dismantling the fence for social

justice? Evidence-based on the inequity of urban green space accessibility in the central urban area of Beijing. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808318793139>

19. Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**How to cite this article:**

Rostami, F., & Dadashpoor, H. (2019). The spatiality of injustice and the injustice of spatiality. *Journal of Geography and Urban Space Development*, 5(2), 81-104.

URL <http://jgusd.um.ac.ir/index.php/gud/article/view/60653>

ISSN: 2538-3531