Designing justice? Race and the limits of recognition in greater Miami resilience planning

Kevin Grove[a,*], Allain Barnett[a], Savannah Cox[b]

[a] Department of Global & Sociocultural Studies, Florida International University, United States
[b] Department of City & Regional Planning, University of California, Berkeley, United States

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the relation between resilience, justice and recognition through a case study of resilience planning in the Greater Miami Region. Greater Miami resilience plans, prepared through the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities program, have foregrounded equity as a cross-cutting theme – a surprising move given the region's history of anti-Black violence, segregation, and racially exclusionary governance, and the recent focus of resilience-building initiatives on sustaining property values. Bringing together literatures on resilience and justice, recognition, critical race theory, and design theory, we ask how Miami resilience initiatives extend the structures of anti-Black violence *through* efforts to address the region's extreme racial and economic inequalities in the name of equity and shore up the regional economy against complex socio-ecological shocks and stressors. Our analysis details how Miami's resilience-building efforts are uneasily situated across at least two distinct styles of recognition. On the one hand, contextually-specific norms of recognition shaped through the region's history of racial capitalism valorize the security of Miami's racialized real estate markets. On the other hand, design-driven resilience planning initiatives valorize diverse forms of knowledge on racially uneven development for the pragmatic utility they offer planners and professionals seeking holistic solutions to complex socio-ecological problems. While designerly approaches to resilience-building have created new possibilities for incorporating equity concerns (promoted by local social and climate justice organizations) into decision-making processes, they ultimately fail to unsettle the libidinal economy of dehumanizing anti-Black violence that continues to structure who can author(ize) what a resilient Miami might become.

1. Introduction

N.D.B. Connolly's (2014) *A World More Concrete* begins with a description of the 1969 opening of the Athalie Range Park in Overtown, Miami's historically Black community. The city's dignitaries turned out to celebrate a distinctly Miami-flavored innovation: a children's playground, constructed under a heavily-trafficked overpass of Interstate 95. Ten years earlier, in the name of urban renewal, the highway's construction had torn through the heart of Overtown, then known as the Central Negro District. But as traffic roared overhead, civic leaders praised Range Park as an example of how the city refused to "shove socio-economic problems under the rug," but, "in the spirit of enterprise, cop[e] with them" (Connolly 2014:2). The absurdity of urban reformers claiming to provide "the good life" to marginalized communities, through constructing a park that exposed children and families to physically and psychologically damaging levels of air and noise pollution, was not lost on Connolly. In his reading, the event

encapsulates two defining features of Miami's history of racialized development. First, as in other settler colonial cities (Pulido, 2017; Ranganathan, 2016; Rutland, 2018), the creation of value for (white) property owners and downtown development interests occurred through the active underdevelopment and, as Overtown's history illustrates, destruction of the region's Black communities. Second, Miami's history of stark racial inequalities and segregation cannot be relegated to the Jim Crow-era past. Both continue to shape the region's physical, social and institutional landscapes.

Range Park's opening offers another poignant lesson in light of Miami-area local governments' well-publicized resilience-building initiatives (see Cox and Cox, 2016; Wakefield, 2019): in regions shaped by persistent racialized inequalities, well-intentioned reformers' efforts to recognize historically marginalized communities and improve their well-being often repeat the underlying structural violence of anti-Blackness. With a half-century's hindsight, we cringe along with Connolly at the way civic leaders saw the harmful installation as meriting

* Corresponding author.
  E-mail addresses: kgrove@fiu.edu (K. Grove), allain.barnett@gmail.com (A. Barnett), savannah.cox@berkeley.edu (S. Cox).

celebration. But as he details, their assertions that socio-economic problems commanded political attention (rather than being figuratively swept aside) occurred in a wider context of racialized development that tied the norms, expectations and political imaginations of Miami residents to white, downtown development interests (see also Rose, 2015; Wright-Austin, 2018). Rather than progressive redemption, Connolly reveals the park as a site of horror: the horror of Overtown's impoverished Black residents once again becoming dehumanized objects of others' future-making projects (Patterson, 1982; Wilderson, 2020). They were not only objects of racialized violence and dispossession that created and sustained white and Black middle-class property owners' wealth; nor were they simply objects cast aside in the service of white downtown development interests' mid-century urban renewal schemes. Overtown residents also became objects of well-intentioned reformers' attempts to recognize and "cope" with extreme socio-economic inequality in headline-grabbing, "innovative" ways.

Fifty years later, greater Miami civic leaders are similarly celebrating regional governments' resilience initiatives that claim to enhance the lives of Miami's marginalized communities. This celebration comes after many of these leaders have, through the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities (100RC) planning process, identified social equity as a theme that intersects with core planning issues such as transportation, economic development, housing, public health, disaster management and local governance (Murley et al., 2017). To be sure, there is *something* to celebrate. The recognition of equity is a major accomplishment in Miami, where racial minorities long excluded from decision-making processes routinely find themselves on the losing end of the region's historically winner-take-all urban politics (Wright-Austin, 2018). Further, social and climate justice activists have succeeded in using the region's "resilience moment" to bring attention and public resources to issues such as affordable housing, improved public transportation, and minority participation in urban governance, even as many resilience initiatives continue to emphasize securing the region's hyper-speculative real estate economy (Grove et al., 2020; Wakefield, 2019; Taylor, 2020). But in this paper, we are interested in their celebrations, read against Connolly's horrific rendering of Range Park's opening, for a different reason: namely, to situate this pursuit of equity-oriented resilience initiatives in relation to the region's wider history of racial capitalism. In particular, we explore whether or not, and how, resilience initiatives extend the structures of anti-Black violence *through* efforts to (1) address the region's extreme racial and economic inequalities in the name of equity; and (2) shore up the regional economy against complex socio-ecological shocks and stressors.

This paper uses a case study of recent greater Miami resilience initiatives to unpack how the racialized dynamics of recognition complicate efforts to advance social justice and equity concerns through resilience programming. Some resilience scholars suggest that resilience programming can, in principle, address distributional and procedural injustices while ensuring that ecological systems adapt to future shocks and stressors (Schlosberg, 2012; Holland, 2012). Others caution that many resilience initiatives struggle to address core questions of recognition, or the formal and informal norms and practices that structure who is able to make claims of harm, loss and suffering, and have these claims recognized as concerns worthy of ethical and political attention (e.g., Chu and Michael, 2019; Matin et al., 2018; Meerow et al., 2019). Set in the context of greater Miami resilience planning, we thus ask three interrelated questions: How has the history of racialized development in Miami shaped contextually-specific norms and practices of recognition in Miami urban politics? What mechanisms and practices of recognition do resilience initiatives introduce? How does the juxtaposition of these styles of recognition enhance or limit how Miami resilience initiatives can address equity and social justice concerns?

Bringing literature on critical race theory and design into conversation with work on resilience, recognition and justice, we advance two arguments: First, recognition in Miami resilience planning embodies tensions created through place-specific juxtapositions of racial capitalism and design-driven resilience. Each carry specific norms of recognition, forged through distinct historical and political dynamics, that structure whose claims of harm, suffering and insecurity can be recognized as worthy of ethical and political attention to urban governance actors. In Miami, the history of Jim Crow segregation has oriented local governance around the ethical imperative to preserve property ownership and maintain the political power of white downtown development interests. This implicitly requires accepting everyday experiences of racial violence, exclusions and deprivations that produce racial difference and create and sustain white value and political power. Design-driven resilience, in turn, reflects ongoing epistemological and ethical transformations of modern science and governance in response to problems of complexity. The 100RC planning process is organized around designerly strategies and techniques that value difference as an expression of partial, bounded knowledge that can be pragmatically synthesized with other, equally bounded knowledges. Design-driven resilience accommodates difference to the extent that difference can be synthesized to identify and develop pragmatic solutions to complex problems. Miami resilience planning has created new possibilities for recognition precisely because it instrumentally values the experiences and knowledge of marginalized groups (or their representatives in social and climate justice organizations) as useful "inputs" in preparing for social and ecological problems that increasingly confront Miami governance.

Second, while this designerly recognition of difference has facilitated Miami resilience planning's focus on equity, its intersection with the libidinal economy of the city's dominant racial formation brackets the efficacy of recognition.[1] Design-driven resilience initiatives introduce an *impasse* (Povinelli, 2011; Berlant, 2011), a suspension of judgement on claims for recognition of the region's racially uneven vulnerabilities. This impasse straddles rational calculations of the need to extend recognition in a performance of the cosmopolitan, designerly transvaluation of difference, on the one hand, and an affective compulsion to withhold recognition in the name of securing white authorship of "resilient" Miami on the other. Caught in this impasse, the inclusion of equity concerns in Miami's resilience planning fails to address the wider structural and material "environment" that absorbs racialized violence, abandonment and deprivations in the rhythms of everyday life.

Our paper proceeds as follows: section two introduces equity-focused resilience initiatives in the greater Miami region and situates these within resilience and justice literatures. This section draws out the need for greater attention to the way resilience initiatives intersect with contextually-specific intersubjective norms of recognition. Sections three and four detail the history of racial capitalism in Miami, and design-driven resilience in 100RC, respectively, in order to identify two styles of recognition that circulate within Miami resilience planning and structure how claims of injustice are (or are not) acknowledged and addressed. Sections five and six draw on fifteen months of participant observation in Miami resilience planning activities, and 35 interviews with actors involved in Miami resilience planning, to explore how the intersection of these styles of recognition create new possibilities for transforming the norms of recognition in Miami urban governance and for extending the influence of racial capitalism on resilience planning. A brief conclusion draws out the implications of this analysis for future work on resilience and justice.

---

[1] Our use of the term "libidinal economy" draws on Afro-Pessimist readings of the social and psychic investments in anti-Black violence within white supremacist societies (Hartman 1997; Sexton 2016; Wilderson 2020). As Sexton (2016: no pagination) writes, in "discerning the libidinal economy that underwrites and sutures" political economy, Afro-Pessimist thought analyzes "how anti-black fantasies attain objective value in the political and economic life of society and in the psychic life of culture as well."

2. The limits of recognition

Miami resilience initiatives offer a unique window on questions of resilience, recognition and justice. As the introduction suggested and as we have detailed elsewhere (Grove et al., 2020), these initiatives embody several tensions that currently suffuse research on these topics. Greater Miami resilience programming involves a variety of more-or-less conventional infrastructure and institutional reforms, ranging from road-raising and affordable housing initiatives to the creation of new institutions to enhance community participation in local government advisory boards (Murley et al., 2019). The region's major local governments – Miami Dade County (MDC), the City of Miami (MIA), and the City of Miami Beach (CoMB) – also participated in 100RC under the umbrella organization "Greater Miami and the Beaches" (GMB), which resulted in a 2017 preliminary resilience assessment and a May 2019 launch of GMB's Resilient305 resilience plan. While many participating cities in 100RC have struggled to address equity and justice (Fitzgibbons and Mitchell, 2019), GMB's Resilient305 plan stands out for its identification of social equity as a cross-cutting theme that can enhance local governmental capabilities (Murley et al., 2017, 2019). Resilient 305's focus on equity is particularly notable given the region's history of racialized exclusion from urban governance, a practice with roots in the Jim Crow era. While local government has historically under-represented and under-served minority communities, some (although by no means all) local resilience-building efforts are explicitly addressing some marginalized residents' public service needs.

GMB's focus on equity thus seems to confirm some scholars' cautious arguments that resilience might open new possibilities to address distributional, procedural and recognition justice concerns (Bulkeley et al., 2014; Meerow et al., 2016, 2019). Given that misrecognition of the sources of harm and vulnerability is a major driver of maldistribution (Schlosberg, 2007, 2012), more inclusive resilience-building activities may create space to address longstanding structural inequalities and thus advance distributional and procedural justice goals, while mediating long-term climate change stressors (Ziervogel et al., 2017; Harris et al., 2017). Indeed, some environmental justice scholars initially argued that resilience is an essential quality for achieving justice framed in terms of capabilities: because capabilities require reliable access to resources, building resilience can enhance the systemic meta-stability – the capacity to maintain form, function and identity while undergoing systemic transformation – that can reliably provision resources to marginalized communities in the face of environmental shocks and stressors (Schlosberg, 2012; Walker, 2012; Holland, 2012).

However, critical scholars caution that there is no inherent slant towards justice in resilience initiatives (Popke et al., 2016). For example, Fainstein (2015, 2018) argues that the systems science and underlying functionalism of New York City's resilience initiatives create barriers to addressing distributional justice concerns. Similarly, critics working in other contexts have noted the inability of urban resilience initiatives to adequately address racial inequalities, producing instead depoliticized, technocratic interventions that prioritize expert-driven definitions of resilience (Bonds, 2018; Leitner et al., 2018). While resilience may, in theory, hold out the promise of more equitable development trajectories, in practice, the concept's operationalization produces social and environmental governance reforms that are often detached from, if not directly at odds with, climate and development justice concerns (Grove, 2014; Brown; 2016; Sealey-Huggins, 2017; Pugh, 2018; Davoudi, 2018; Ranganathan and Bratman, 2019; Gahman and Thongs 2019; Rice et al., 2019).

Some environmental justice scholars have likewise more recently emphasized the need to distinguish between the pragmatically conservative aims of resilience initiatives and the transformative agendas of environmental justice (Schlosberg and Collins, 2014; see also Pelling, 2010). While individual resilience projects may address some distributional or procedural injustices, they often struggle to address the complex interlinkages between different forms of justice (Bulkeley et al., 2014). The resulting advances often fail to engage with other justice issues at different temporal and spatial scales, and thus inadvertently exacerbate harmful forms of exclusion and inequality.

Given these problems, scholars have increasingly emphasized the need for research on resilience and justice to engage in a more sustained manner with questions of *recognition* (Chu and Michael, 2019; Matin et al., 2018; Fitzgibbons and Mitchell, 2019; Meerow et al., 2019). Recognition, which emphasizes the cultural and political dynamics that shape how marginalized groups can represent themselves and their interests, first emerged in political and philosophical work on justice during the 1990s. Political philosophers used the concept to move debate beyond political economy questions of (mal)distribution and deliberative concerns with communication and participation in decision-making processes (Young, 1990; Fraser, 1995). Subsequent theoretical and empirical work detailed how lack of recognition could increase marginalization and stigmatization, and thus drive maldistributions of risks, harms and benefits while legitimizing the exclusion of marginalized communities from decision-making processes (Schlosberg 2007). Just as these early debates shed new light on traditional justice concerns, studies of resilience and justice have begun to mobilize recognition to explore the geo-historically specific factors that shape procedural and distributive injustices and create socially and spatially uneven vulnerabilities (Chu and Michael, 2019). Indeed, the oft-repeated mantra that resilience scholarship should focus attention on "people-oriented" questions of resilience *of what* and *for whom* implicitly adopts a recognition framing by focusing attention on whose interests resilience initiatives advance, and whose interests become marginalized (Fitzgibbons and Mitchell, 2019).

Here, we want to build on these debates by highlighting three limits of recognition that complicate work on resilience and justice. The first is epistemological: in practice, work on recognition often reads injustice off of pre-determined indicators of structural inequalities, such as race, class, or gender. These are then assumed to indicate axes of misrecognition that determine procedural and distributive injustices. But as Barnett (2017: 10) cautions, this deductive approach relies on ontological modes of reasoning that "always find what they were already looking for (or its absence)." In contrast, more recent theoretical work emphasizes that the struggle for recognition is one over contextually-specific, intersubjective norms of recognition. These norms determine whose claims of harm, suffering and insecurity can be recognized as legitimate and worthy of ethical and political attention (Kompridis, 2007; Barnett 2017). Viewed this way, the meaning and work of recognition, like definitions of injustice more broadly (Barnett, 2018), cannot be specified through the deductive, *a priori* identification of abstract, structural inequalities or categorical indicators such as "participation." Rather, the meaning and work of recognition are heterogeneous and unstable, contingently assembled through arrays of strategies and techniques for knowing and governing difference.

The second limit is ethical and political. Work on resilience and justice tends to adopt an instrumental view of recognition, in which recognition provides the means to a pre-determined end (e.g.., the realization of justice as distributional or procedural equality). In part, this reflects the processual understanding of justice that early advocates of recognition articulated, which positioned (mis)recognition as the driving force behind (un)just distributional and procedural outcomes (Connolly and Steil, 2009). While this created space for studies of justice focused on empirical situations rather than abstract theorizing (Young, 1990), it tended to assume that recognition is by definition good, and that problems of injustice can be traced in the final analysis to a lack of recognition. Recent critical scholarship from a variety of research traditions casts doubt on these assumptions. For example, Yitfachel et al. (2009) highlight three distinct styles of recognition – affirmative, indifferent, and hostile – to show how the granting of recognition can ameliorate *and intensify* stigmatization and inequalities. Recognition plays out in particular legal, juridical, cultural and political

contexts that shape how subjects are differentially interpellated as, *inter alia*, harmful, threatening or beneficial to social order. Similarly, work in critical race theory and indigenous critical theory situates recognition within wider transformations of liberal governmental rationalities in response to the challenges anti-racist and anti-colonial movements posed to liberal universalism (Hartman, 1997; Povinelli, 2002, 2011; Coulthard, 2014). Recognition operates through a suite of legal, cultural and political economic techniques that create a space for difference *within* practices of liberal rule. These practices have historically been organized around the universalizing image of a sovereign, de-racinated individual subject of human rights and liberties. Granting recognition, in contrast, *polices* difference (after Rancière, 1995): that is, it determines which forms of social and ecological difference can be integrated and celebrated within liberal social orders; which forms of difference threaten these orders and warrant surveillance, regulation, and possible elimination, and which expressions of difference remain illegible and thus subject to indifferent abandonment on the margins of liveability (Povinelli, 2011).

These first two limits offer an important cautionary note to instrumental affirmations of recognition as the solution to problems of resilience and justice. Specifically, they show how, rather than a means to an end, recognition becomes a potential vector for power relations that can render populations legible and governable through, rather than in spite of, social (and ecological) difference. At issue is how experiences of violence, suffering and harm become absorbed into the rhythms and expectations of everyday life (Berlant 2011; Povinelli 2011; Anderson et al., 2019). To grant indifferent or hostile forms of recognition, or to deny claims that harms and injustices require attention, is to accept these harms and injustices. The act of recognition can thus *sustain* harmful conditions as much as it might challenge them.

This brings a third limit into sharp relief: the racial limit of recognition. As critical race theorists have demonstrated, the biopolitical imperative to secure the health, development and well-being of valued life – in other words, securing the future for the self-writing liberal subject of modernity – hinges on spatially and socially demarcating that segment of the population that can be dispossessed of humanist possibilities for self-determination (Sexton, 2010; Weheliye, 2014; Anderson et al., 2019). For example, Hartman's (1997) genealogy of freedom in pre- and post-Civil War US details how the norms and expectations of the "good life" – the privileges, rights, protections and expectations that white citizens could claim from the state – were defined through the legal determination of what privileges, rights, protections and expectations the white supremacist state could legitimately *deny* Black individuals. As she details, particular forms of everyday anti-Black violence – routine degradations, deprivations and acts of psychic and physical violence – became legally and culturally acceptable *as the foundation for* a white supremacist social order. Importantly, this is a form of structural violence that cannot be analogized; rather, it is the condition of possibility for the identification of the Human as such (Sexton, 2010; Wilderson, 2020). The process of recognition is bound up in a racialized biopolitics that structures who is capable of occupying the position of a Human subject, the liberal individual that author(ize)s their own, proper(tied) future, and who can be denied this capacity, reduced to a dehumanized object, an instrument in others' future-building projects. As Smith and Vasudevan (2017: 216) caution, "ironically, efforts to include the marginalized within the biopolitics of the human serve to naturalize and reinscribe the functioning of race rather than attacking the hierarchy of humanity that produces the uneven distribution of life and death."

Together, these epistemological, ethico-political and racial limits of recognition point to the need for inductive research that teases out how practices of recognition intervene in specific "environments," or the structural and material-affective conditions that absorb violence, insecurity and suffering into everyday life (Berlant, 2011). Bringing this question to bear on the case of Miami means that we cannot assume that Resilient305's equity concerns signal a break with the region's prevailing racial formations. Instead, it requires us to attend to how the techniques and practices of resilience efforts intersect with inter-subjective norms of recognition – and the wider social, cultural and political economic dynamics that shape them – to transform, extend, and/or challenge racially uneven distributions of futurity. As we will see, at least two distinct styles of recognition circulate through Miami resilience planning: the first shaped by the region's history of racialized development, and the second shaped by 100RC's design-driven approach to resilience. Each is considered in turn.

3. Racial capitalism and recognition in Miami

Resilience initiatives in Miami, as in other large US cities, play out against histories of racialized development that have created highly unequal social and environmental vulnerabilities (Fainstein, 2015; Derickson, 2018; Bonds, 2018; Ranganathan and Bratman, 2019). As Gilmore (2007) reminds us, racism is fundamentally about "the state-sanctioned or extra-legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death." As a technology for dividing the population and managing its relation to an indeterminate future, race is thus not a biological or ontological condition. Rather, it is an expression of what Weheliye (2014) calls racializing assemblages, contingent arrangements of materialities, discourses, institutions, norms, knowledges, techniques and landscapes that inscribe racist discourse onto specific bodies. This means that there is always a *history* and *geography* to racialization: the production of valued white spaces of growth and development occurs through a variety of intertwined carceral and biopolitical techniques that produce devalued Black spaces – and accordingly (de)value those bodies that inhabit racially differentiated spaces (Gilmore, 2007; McKittrick, 2007, 2013; Shabazz, 2015).

For example, local economic development and urban governance in Miami reflects shifting assemblages of racializing techniques that produce and maintain segregated geographies of white supremacy and anti-Black violence (Pulido, 2017; Ranganathan, 2016; Rutland, 2018). Despite boosters' long-running efforts to paint Miami as a moderate, modern Southern US city, the region's growth has been sustained through techniques, such as segregation, centralization and gradualism, that produce and maintain the racialized difference that produces value in the metropolitan economy. Practices of racial violence, state abandonment, and exclusionary governance created and reinforced color barriers, withheld vital public services and utilities from these segregated neighborhoods, and actively discouraged minority participation in local government (Connolly, 2014; Rose, 2015).

Recent resilience initiatives have reconfigured how these racializing assemblages reproduce an uneven distribution of futurity (Grove et al, 2020). For example, while physical segregation and diminished service provisioning persist, they are now complemented by new forms of racialized exclusion from various resilience committees, which police membership through educational and professional certification requirements beyond the reach of most of the region's minority residents. Similarly, while the creation of numerous resilience task forces and working groups offers new opportunities for community organizers to engage with local decision-makers, these groups' limited statutory power has the gradualist effect of stretching organizers' resources thin while slow-walking meaningful change.

Importantly, this dominant racial formation has also structured intersubjective norms of recognition that shape whose claims of (past or future) harm, loss, and hardship become recognized as worthy, and thus capable of provoking a response in others. These norms are tightly interwoven with the demands, expectations and privileges of white property ownership and downtown development interests. As Connolly (2014: 3–4) writes, "acceptable governance in Jim Crow America required minimizing the discomforts of white Americans, protecting the political power of property owners, and ensuring that poor people continued to generate other people's wealth." The topological

reconfiguration of Jim Crow-era racializing technologies into contemporary resilience governance likewise transforms and extends these norms into the present-day visions of the propertied, white good life endowed with the capacity to claim a prosperous future. As we will see below, the granting of recognition to claims of injustice remains contingent on limiting the discomforts and abrogation of white privilege, even as resilience thinking is transforming what these privileges entail. More than the valorization of individual property rights, this involves the valorization of, and libidinal investment in, the dominant racial formation that produces value through the production of racialized difference (note 1). Claims of harm, loss, suffering or injustice that call into question techniques of racialization risk being dismissed out of hand as illegitimate, impractical, nonsensical, radical, or dangerous (Rose, 2015).

As we will see, these racialized norms of recognition also delimit the possibilities for effectively linking resilience and justice through GMB resilience initiatives. But their persistence and potential transformation in the face of calls for equitable and just forms of resilience reflects how they intersect with, complement, and contradict another set of techniques for knowing and governing difference: those of design-driven resilience.

4. Designing resilience in Greater Miami and the Beaches

Resilient305′s focus on equity partially reflects local social and climate justice advocacy groups' successful efforts to leverage local governments' interest in resilience into expanded opportunities for public participation and oversight (Grove et al., 2020). But this leveraging was also conditioned by a designerly style of recognition introduced through the 100RC planning process. Designerly thinking is a distinct mode of thought organized around a unique set of ontological, epistemological and ethical assumptions that transvalue difference and recognition. As we will demonstrate, design-driven resilience decouples the process of recognition from its history in place-specific racial formations, and recalibrates recognition around a distinct set of intersubjective norms. It extends recognition to marginalized communities (and their representatives) in ways that challenge their historical exclusion from local governance. But at the same time, it qualifies recognition around a designerly compulsion to synthesize difference into pragmatic solutions to complex problems. This is a key distinction: rather than recognizing injustice claims originating from and referencing *political* subjects – coherent, self-sovereign individuals whose claim on the good life is interrupted by histories of anti-Black violence – design-driven resilience instead recognizes injustice claims as originating from *partial and bounded experiences* of social and environmental complexity that potentially offer instrumental utility to the design process.

This distinct style of recognition reflects the influence of pragmatism and mid-twentieth century cybernetics on designerly thought and practice (Collier, 2017; Grove, 2018; Grove et al., 2019; Nelson, 2020). Key here is how Herbert Simon's reformulation of neoclassical economic models of rationality in terms of "bounded rationality" and adaptive decision-making introduced ways of understanding and governing through complexity that continue to shape resilience planning initiatives such as 100RC (Collier et al., 2016; Grove, 2018). For Simon, complexity exceeds the individual's cognitive capacity. Perfect knowledge of a complex environment, and thus predictive certainty, are impossible. Rather than optimizing, the individual pursues *satisficing* solutions: acceptable, if sub-optimal, outcomes that reflexively align their interests to an emergent complex reality. In Simon's cybernetic reading, rationality becomes an adaptive process rather than an ontological property of the liberal individual: the boundedly-rational individual exercises rationality as they engage with and adapt to a complex environment from a position of necessarily partial knowledge, adjusting their goals as their ongoing interactions with the system yield new knowledge on systemic dynamics. Simon positioned this adaptive

decision-making process as the essence of design. In his influential definition, "everyone designs who devises courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones" (Simon, 1996: 112).

To be sure, design thinking has developed along a number of pathways since Simon's discipline-defining work (Johansson-Sköldberg et al., 2013). The field features a wide range of epistemological and ethico-political approaches, and many designers focus on social and environmental justice concerns (Manzini, 2015; Escobar, 2018). But for our purposes here, Simon's influence stands out for two reasons. First, he offers an explicit formulation of design as a "liberal art of technological culture" (Buchanan, 1995, in Passim, 2019: 107): an art of relating an interior to an exterior in the absence of transcendental determinants of value (Grove, 2018). Rather than providing an analytical understanding that explains hwo social or environmental phenomena work (a mode of knowledge production found in the physical and social sciences) or a hermeneutic interpretation of meaning (as in the humanities), design attempts to pragmatically synthesize otherwise discrete and bounded forms of knowledge on complex phenomena into pragmatic solutions (Cross, 1982; Buchanan, 1992). Second, this designerly compulsion to synthesize difference into pragmatic, partial solutions to complexity animates the ecological resilience theory developed by C.S. Holling and colleagues and its operationalization in 100RC (Grove, 2018). The 100RC program mobilizes a variety of designerly techniques and procedures that allow member city governments to design their own resilience-building agendas. In Miami, for example, the Resilient305 preliminary resilience assessment process enabled local government officials to work with design consultants contracted through the 100RC program to produce (synthesize) a holistic, integrative vision of the region's social, environmental and technological assets and capacities, and its specific resilience challenges (Murley et al., 2017). To be sure, the resilience planning process featured a suite of familiar disaster management and participatory planning techniques – such as surveys, focus groups, charrettes, and vulnerability analyses – to collect knowledge from local civic and community leaders and the wider population on the region's strengths, weaknesses, shocks and stresses. Design-driven resilience offers a novel attempt to synthesize these different forms of information in order to visualize social and environmental conditions in their functional relations to each other (Chandler, 2018). Beyond providing resilience planners with an operational understanding of the complex relations that make up the city, it enabled them to identify areas where the urban system is functioning well ("highlights" such as a large, diverse population, quality of life, and global business activity) and areas where it is not or likely will not in the future ("shocks and stresses" such as sea level rise, flooding, affordable housing, transportation, and hurricanes; Murley et al., 2017). This systemic view allows planners to rethink traditional areas of urban practice, such as public service provision, in relation to other social and environmental phenomena, and thus reconceptualize how urban governance should operate in the face of complexity (Wakefield, 2019).

The 100RC planning process deployed designerly techniques to fashion a systemic understanding of matters of concern – in this case, complex shocks and stressors facing local governments. Its ability to synthesize distinct forms of knowledge expresses the designerly transvaluation of socio-ecological difference and recognition alluded to above. Designerly thinking does not grasp conditions such as impoverished communities or degraded landscapes as markers of unequal social structures or underlying class and racial conflict. Difference is not something to be assimilated through a liberal biopolitics of development or eliminated through racialized violence, for difference is unassimilable to the self in a complex world (see Chandler and Reid, 2019). Instead, designerly thinking approaches difference instrumentally, as partial and bounded experiences of a complex socio-ecological reality that can be synthesized with other, equally partial and bounded experiences of this reality (Grove, 2018; Chandler, 2018). Design-driven resilience thus recognizes difference to the extent that partial, bounded experiences of a complex reality offer useful insights

into systemic functioning that planners might synthesize with other experiences and knowledge. Impoverished minority residents, in the design process, are on epistemologically equal footing with wealthy downtown developers, insurance professionals, anonymized survey responses, and hazard maps: all offer potentially useful knowledge on the region's adaptive capacities and resilience challenges.

In the Miami resilience planning process, social and climate justice advocates leveraged this instrumental form of recognition to engage with GMB resilience officials around issues that the preliminary assessments had identified as "weaknesses" impeding systemic performance. These included issues such as "pronounced poverty," "aging infrastructure," "lack of affordable housing," and an "overtaxed and unreliable transportation system" (Murley et al., 2017: 81). Their engagements helped social equity emerge as a cross-cutting theme that could link traditionally siloed urban problems such as infrastructure provisioning, transportation, economic development, public health, disaster management and local governance (each a focal point of resilience planning activities, respectively; *Ibid.*: 97–123). But as we have seen, the designerly styles of recognition that brought equity to the fore struggle to highlight or address the underlying forms of racial and class conflict that allowed unequal public service outcomes to occur in the first place. With roots in pragmatism and cybernetic behavioral science, design-driven resilience grasps social and ecological difference and conflict as indicators of systemic maladaptation that present opportunities for pragmatic resilience solutions that can improve systemic functioning (Grove, 2018; see Lee, 1993; Ostrom, 1980, 1997). This thinking does not, as we see, *necessarily* advance transformative social and environmental justice goals, for its ontopolitical assumptions position conflict and difference as natural outgrowths of complex reality, rather than contingent products of geo-historical racial and class dynamics (Chandler, 2018). The next section examines how the juxtaposition of two distinct styles of recognition in Miami resilience planning created competing visions of resilience organized around largely incompatible claims for protection against past and future harms.

5. Centripetal and centrifugal resilience

During Miami's 100RC resilience planning process, and as indicated above, we carried out 15 months of participant observation at public city and county government meetings and 100RC events and workshops, and conducted interviews with 35 actors involved in Miami-area resilience activities.[2] While we initially sought to examine rationalities and techniques for governing resilient infrastructure, our observations of interactions between various social and climate justice advocates, municipal leaders and other resilience proponents led us to focus on competing visions of resilience and how they engaged with socially and spatially uneven vulnerabilities. Our interviews, begun in spring 2018 after an initial nine months of participant observation, focused on encouraging respondents to reflect on how they defined resilience, and how they saw their resilience-oriented activities addressing the region's socio-ecological inequalities. While our subsequent analysis highlighted multiple views of what a resilient Miami might look like, we focus on how these views indexed conflicting articulations of vulnerability and (in)security that reflect the region's history of racialized development.

First, the prevailing strand articulated what we might call a *centripetal* vision of resilience. As a metaphor, *centripetal* signals a centering movement of thought that seeks to anchor what "resilience" means in a unified and coherent socio-spatial and temporal imaginary. For

example, many (although by no means all) respondents referred to a unified spatial whole (the "city" or "region") and a single temporal orientation (the future) that resilience must protect and secure. These assumptions lend themselves to technocratic approaches to resilience-building that, in Miami, attempt to secure continued circulation of capital through the metropolitan economy (Grove et al., 2020; see also Derickson, 2018). For example, a respondent agreed on the importance of addressing pressing local issues such as gentrification and affordable housing. But they cautioned:

> "It's great to come up with solutions, but how are you going to implement them if the economics have changed so much?… what will happen to businesses investing in South Florida? And I think that's, to me, the area that I focus on the most is the economics… especially insurance that will drive the market…" (Interview with developer and committee member, 22 March 2019).

This respondent's remarks demonstrate the centering effect of centripetal visions of resilience: any existence of social inequality is immediately subsumed beneath biopolitical appeals to "the economy's" well-being (see also Wakefield, 2019; Taylor, 2020; Grove et al 2020). Rather than a field of division and political struggle, the social appears here as a more or less undifferentiated field, a functional system embedded in wider complex environmental and economic systems – "Greater Miami and the Beaches" – whose performance becomes knowable, legible and, potentially, improvable through resilience interventions.

The respondent's concern over the influence insurance wields over the region's investment potential also gestures towards the way centripetal visions of resilience orient thought towards the (risk-filled) future. This temporal imaginary is shared by many local government officials. For example, at the 30 May 2019 launch of the GMB Resilience Strategy (the culmination of the 100RC resilience planning process), CoMB's mayor touted to news agencies the benefits his government had begun to see from the city's pricey infrastructure investments (field notes, 30 May 2019). He proclaimed that the city government's medium-term efforts had improved its bond ratings and its National Flood Insurance Program community rating score. The former will save the city government (and taxpayers, he stressed) millions on interest payments, while the latter provides residents with an increased discount on their flood insurance premiums. These concerns implicitly reflect a future-oriented temporal imaginary, in which the effects of climate change and sea level rise threaten the value of real estate markets (and thus local governments' property tax receipts), and local governments' credit ratings. These future harms do not only imperil real estate owners' future returns on their investments, they also imperil local government capacity to fund future loss-reducing infrastructure projects.

Proponents thus articulated centripetal visions of resilience through socio-spatial and temporal imaginaries that center resilience around the threats complexity poses to privileged claims on futurity. Here, resilience ensures that future sea level rise and climate change impacts, for example, will not threaten investors' and residents' expectations of the Miami real estate market's continued growth, or continued levels of municipal service provisioning that sustain the experience of the good life.

Importantly, these visions are *not* articulated through explicit language of racial privilege. But as we saw above, these expectations of continued growth and development – and the attendant biopolitical claim on state resources that these expectations command – cannot be separated from Miami's history of racial capitalism that conditioned the possibility of futurity. As we will see below, the coherent, unified, *human* subject that articulates centripetal visions of resilience is constructed through Black dehumanization and de-subjectification.

However, these centripetal visions of resilience are countered by centrifugal visions of resilience. The latter work to destabilize the racialized coherence of centripetal resilience. For example, one

---

[2] In Miami, the 100RC process formally began with a September 2016 launch event (described below), and ended with the May 2019 public release of the Resilient305 plan. While our formal fieldwork activities were carried out between summer 2017 and winter 2019, the authors began preliminary research and participated in resilience events open to the public, beginning in January 2016, and continuing through the time of writing.

community organizer, who was also an active participant in equity-themed 100RC workshops, provided us with their definition of what a resilient Miami might look like. They began conventionally enough – "a resilient Miami-Dade would be our buildings, our infrastructure is in place" – but quickly tied resilience to the historical legacies of racial inequalities: "the most vulnerable communities have access to the resources that they need, folks are well educated, folks are living- are you receiving $15 an hour to live here. That's resiliency" (interview with community organizer, 1 June 2018). Another respondent from a municipal committee argued that "every neighborhood has a different concern," and that we need to "start working differently in different places…other than that, we are building resilience for some, not all, and we shouldn't claim to be doing it" (interview with committee member, 16 October 2018).

Acknowledging differentiated needs in this manner recognizes that "Miami" is not a unified, blank slate on which experts can inscribe their vision of a perfect(ed) Miami. Instead, it is a disjointed landscape with distinct vulnerabilities that resilience-building activities can address. As we saw above, these affirmations of difference can lend themselves to design-driven resilience initiatives that synthesize difference into pragmatic resilience solutions. But they also can introduce a distinct temporal orientation towards the problems resilience should address. Rather than focusing on future threats, some centrifugal visions of resilience focus on the interwoven temporalities of past and present harms and insecurities and the potential for future environmental changes to exacerbate them. A member of the City of Miami's Sea Level Rise Committee conveyed this temporal orientation to us. They began with the recognition of past injustices and their extension into the present-day exclusion of minority (Black and Latinx, as they stressed) community members from climate change-oriented local government committees:

> "Community members who have dealt with disenfranchisement since the inception of cities like Miami should not be expected to turn off their anger when it comes to climate change, because this is another example of the fact that the city of Miami doesn't care about Black people. It's just another example, right? I've been here for six years but many people have been here for decades, when you have people who have experienced this [disenfranchisement] for decades, how can you tell them how to feel about it? […] This is an existential threat" (interview with committee member, 7 July 2018).

Their reiteration – "this is another example… it's just another example" echoes the repetition of anti-Black violence (Sharpe, 2016). Climate change impacts do not simply threaten future returns on investments and tax revenues. Past injustices, present insecurities, and future threats limn together in a centrifugal vision of resilience that de-centres a myopic, centripetal focus on future vulnerabilities. The "existential threat" envisioned here signals how the intersection of ongoing sea level rise impacts *and* the history of racial segregation and exclusionary governance will affect marginalized communities in the region.

Moreover, their invocation of *anger* disrupts the designerly compulsion for synthesis. If synthesis presumes a common temporality of futurity – a system state that *can be* improved through adaptive decision-making procedures – then anger points to an arrhythmia, a claim of injustice that cannot be recognized without calling into question Miami's prevailing racial formation that makes "the system's" futurity as such possible in the first place.

Centripetal and centrifugal visions of resilience thus do not only index distinct experiences of the Miami region's racially uneven economy of futurity, they also exert *competing pressures* on the affective environment that normalize anti-Black violence and suffering. In Miami, resilience is a site of multiplicity and contestation, not only because competing interests struggle over whose definition of resilience becomes operationalized, but because centrifugal visions of resilience can de-stabilize the racializing dynamic that determines who has the status of subjecthood – and thus who is capable of *having* an interest in

the first place. Indeed, the Sea Level Rise Committee member stressed to us that impoverished residents speak a truth about the city, but one articulated in ways that some civic leaders can easily dismiss. Rather than the quantified language of benefit-cost analyses, this respondent stressed, "the only voice that they have is their lived experience. The only way that they have of telling a story is anecdotal" (interview with committee member, 7 July 2018).

Their concern that these "voices" may be "blocked out" because they are not conveyed through proper(tied) modes of articulation speaks to the persistence of the norms of recognition that the region's history of racial capitalism has shaped. At stake here is not only the instrumental potential for resilience planning to address social and spatial inequalities, but the very structure of white privilege to author (ize) the region's future through the denial of Black subjectivity. The penultimate section turns to a vignette from our participant observation at GMB's 100RC launch event to unpack this racialized politics of recognition.

6. The impasse of recognition

Over 250 civic leaders packed a downtown Miami hotel ballroom for 100RC's September 2016 GMB resilience planning launch event. One author attended as well, as one of twenty-five volunteer small group discussion session facilitators who received training from Arup consultants.[3] In addition to holding a series of small-group breakout exercises designed to capture participants' visions of local capacities and resilience challenges, the event featured a panel discussion with chief resilience officers (CROs) from MDC, MIA, and CoMB governments, as well as a visiting keynote speaker, the CRO of Norfolk, Virginia. During the panel, participants expressed enthusiasm for how resilience thinking could help address income inequality, a sentiment that had been repeated by other civic leaders and Rockefeller Foundation executives who spoke at the event. However, after a fieldworker from Catalyst Miami, a local community empowerment organization, asked the panel how resilience planning could address the region's history of structural racism, the room fell silent. After a few tense seconds, Norfolk's CRO broke the silence by describing how resilience planning enabled civic leaders to engage with Norfolk's legacy of slavery and racial divisions. This answer seemed to please the panel, if not the activist (who was seated next to the author), as the panel chair quickly fielded another audience question (field notes, 29 September 2016).

It would be easy to pass this incident off as minor and focus instead on subsequent developments, such as the triumph of "equity" in Miami resilience efforts. However, we want to dwell on those few uncomfortable seconds when panellists suspended making a decision about the Catalyst fieldworker's claim for recognition of past and present injustices. Povinelli (2011) uses the term *impasse* to describe this suspension of judgment. In her usage, *impasse* signals an aporia, in which a claim for recognition has been articulated in a manner that destabilizes sedimented intersubjective norms of recognition. As she emphasizes, recognition has both an affective and rational register. The affective component of recognition speaks to the pre-cognitive atmosphere that suffuses situations in which claims are articulated: affects of disgust, shame, doubt, excitement, buoyancy, or apprehension "color" how a claim for recognition circulates between speaker and receiver. At the same time, the claim is subjected to rational calculation, the self-reflexive consideration of how the claim measures up against cultural, social, political and economic norms that structure what counts as common sense. The uncomfortable pause in the hotel ballroom reflects

---

[3] As a volunteer facilitator, the author did not receive compensation for participating in the public launch event. Other volunteer facilitators included mid-level local government officials, prominent community organizers, local scientists, and members of the local arts community.

an impasse shaped by, in our reading, a disjuncture between (at minimum) the rational calculation of the need to acknowledge and affirm inequality, and the affective compulsion built into the norms of Miami politics to recoil from assertions of racial inequalities as political problems. Indeed, the only sound during the pause came from one CRO, a veteran planner with decades of experience in Miami governance, who slowly repeated the Catalyst fieldworker's phrase as a question: "structural…racism?"

The fieldworker's question thus foregrounded the libidinal backdrop of Miami's racialized politics, the social and psychic investment in the privilege and comfort of white property owners and development interests. At stake in this pause was not simply the meaning and scope of resilience, but the question of whose claim to harm and injustice could attain recognition. Notably, their question followed a heated debate during a small-group breakout session the author chaired, in which one participant (a middle-aged white-identifying Cuban male employed in the energy sector) loudly and angrily denied the existence of racism in Miami. His forceful denials came in response to the fieldworker's suggestion that the persistence of racism contributed to social vulnerabilities in the region. This energy sector employee countered that racism does not determine vulnerabilities because, he became "successful" in spite of discrimination he and his family faced upon migrating to South Florida (field notes, 29 September 2016). According to his logic, if he could become "successful," then so too could anyone.[4]

It would be misguided to address this denial through rational argument – the region's history of structural racism has clearly shaped its uneven vulnerabilities. Instead, the energy sector employee's denunciations were, in our reading, an affective response to the implicit challenge to white privilege that the Catalyst fieldworker's remark conveyed. The fieldworker was attempting to articulate the persistent insecurity and long-term vulnerabilities that characterize impoverished minority residents' everyday lives. In political-philosophical terms, he was attempting to claim a position as an agent capable of "ontological resistance" (Wilderson, 2020) – that is, a subject whose speech, actions and claims have an *impact* and make a difference on the receiver. The structure of white supremacy denies this capacity to those marked as Black. As we have detailed above, Blackness, as a paradigmatic parameter constructed through plantation violence (rather than immutable ontological condition) is a marker of objectification (Wilderson, 2020; Sexton, 2010). To be marked as "Black" is to become designated an instrument in other (non-Black) people's projects of future-making. The affective environment of Miami's urban politics has been premised on the continued denial of subjectivity and the instrumentalization of the city's impoverished Black communities, which this fieldworker's claims challenged. To those invested in Miami's libidinal economy of white supremacy, his comments embodied the ultimate affront to limitless white desire. The energy sector official responded so forcefully because he was triggered, on an affective level, by a person historically relegated to the status of a de-subjectified instrument "talking back,"

attempting to claim an ethical and political status whose recognition would undermine the exclusive (and exclusionary) privilege of white-identifying property owners to determine who and what resilience should become.

At issue in the question of recognition is thus who can author, and authorize, what resilience can be and might become. Beyond engaging important, human-focused questions of resilience for whom and in whose interest, struggles over recognition in Miami resilience planning foreground the need to problematize the way styles of recognition unevenly police who can claim the status of the human in the first place. Political norms institutionalized through decades of racial capitalism continue to bracket recognition, even as design-driven resilience initiatives create new possibilities for articulating racial injustices and having these recognized as objects of ethical and political concern. Thus, while Miami resilience planning has created new possibilities for incorporating equity concerns into decision-making processes, claims of injustice that refuse to accept the affective and material structures of white privilege continue to be subject to angry dismissal and curious indifference.

7. Conclusions

This paper has detailed how Miami resilience initiatives sit at the intersection of at least two distinct ways of knowing and governing difference. On the one hand, norms of recognition that emerged through the region's history of racial capitalism valorized the security of the region's racialized real estate markets. These norms have implicitly accepted racially uneven geographies of diminished public service provisioning, educational opportunities, and psychic and physical violence in minority (predominantly Black) neighborhoods as the wages of (white) growth and development. On the other hand, norms of recognition shaped through a designerly ethos, institutionalized through the 100RC-led resilience planning process, valorized diverse forms of knowledge on racially uneven development. Here, difference mattered because it allowed resilience planners to develop a more holistic vision of the region's strengths, weaknesses, threats, and capacities. The convergence of these two styles of recognition complicates local governments' well-received efforts to foreground equity as a crosscutting theme in their resilience planning. As we have detailed, design-driven resilience creates new possibilities for expanding public participation and recognizing differential insecurities and vulnerabilities, and thus holds out the promise of addressing longstanding procedural and distributional inequalities. But at the same time, designerly approaches to inequality that strive to creatively and pragmatically improve systemic performance for all may (inadvertently) reproduce racialized dehumanization. In Miami, the libidinal economy of anti-Black violence that structures local politics confounds the synthetic logic of design. The banal insecurities and vulnerabilities confronting racialized bodies are irreducible to partial and bounded knowledge. Their conditions are expressions of recurring anti-Black violence and abandonment that have made possible adaptive white subjects striving to navigate a turbulent future by becoming resilient. Social and climate justice advocates' efforts to advance justice and equity concerns through resilience programming thus run aground against the racialized limits of recognition: the persistent denial of Black subjecthood, or the capacity to author(ize) a resilient Miami.

Just as importantly, our focus on the racialized limits of recognition helps clarify and complicate critical scholars' engagements with resilience and justice. On one level, it shines new light on the growing awareness, among resilience scholars, that many resilience initiatives tend to focus on distributional rather than procedural and recognition injustices. In Miami, the designerly compulsion to synthesize difference into pragmatic resilience solutions abstracted and transformed the region's legacy of anti-Black violence into an uneven distribution of public sector resources that could be redressed through investments in minority communities. Just as Athalie Range Park nominally

---

[4] The complex dynamics of racialization in Miami are interwoven with the history of US geopolitics and successive waves of Cuban immigration during the Cold War. Given the energy sector official's descriptions, he and his family likely migrated during the second wave of Cuban migration during the late 1970s and early 1980s. Second-wave migrants were subject to discrimination from first-wave migrants (those migrated following the 1959 Cuban Revolution), who saw them as second-class citizens. Scholars of Miami migration emphasize that Cuban migrants of both waves benefitted from substantial state and federal government support given Cold War geopolitical dynamics – resources that were not available to residents of impoverished Black communities. The state's preferential treatment of Cuban migrants contributed to the further impoverishment of Black communities (see Dunn 1997; Stepick et al., 2003). Nonetheless, the white supremacist ideology of the heroic self-authoring individual who overcomes barriers to become successful continues to resonate strongly among many of the region's Cuban communities who identify with the privileges of whiteness.

confronted inequality while perpetuating the region's dominant racial formation, the functionalism of design-driven resilience can potentially transform structural racism into a distributional problem that deflects rather than directs attention to the underlying anti-Black violence that creates these inequalities in the first place.

On another level, this analysis cautions that deductive analyses of recognition may repeat these same deflections. Well-meaning efforts to pragmatically address inequality through resilience initiatives may inadvertently reinforce the libidinal economy of anti-Black violence that refuses subjecthood to minority communities and repeats the objectification and instrumentalization of Black life. As we saw in the example of the Catalyst fieldworker, the attempt of minority communities and their representatives to occupy the position of the subject, to articulate their experiences and desires in an unmediated manner and have these claims impress on the receiver, was met with dismissive indifference and vehement denial. The danger for researchers is that the pragmatic determination of what resilience "should" be often takes place through a suite of social and environmental scientific techniques and norms, such as technical assessments of future vulnerabilities and hazards or population-level measurements of social and economic inequality. These moves, well-intentioned as they may be, may continue to deny Black communities the ability to author(ize) what a resilient future may entail. Instead, they interpellate Black communities as objects in scientific endeavours to secure complex social and economic systems in the face of novel shocks and stressors.

As cities founded on white supremacy plan for resilience, to raise the question of recognition is to ask how resilience efforts intervene in racially uneven economies of futurity. Raising this question means analyzing recognition and resilience as problems for thought and action rather than as instrumental solutions. Methodologically, it compels us to unpack how techniques of racialization intertwine in design-driven resilience efforts, paying close attention to the contextually-specific ways in which recognition and resilience can *reproduce* inequality, and how they may be made to meaningfully address inequality. Most importantly, raising this question calls for a scholarly ethos of recognition as transformation, not affirmation, and a rejection of those which suggest otherwise.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Kevin Grove: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Project administration, Writing - original draft. **Allain Barnett:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Savannah Cox:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing - review & editing.

Acknowledgements

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.09.014.

References

Anderson, B., Grove, K., Rickards, L., Kearnes, M., 2019. Slow emergencies: temporality and the racialized biopolitics of emergency governance. Prog. Hum. Geogr. 44 (4), 621–639.

Barnett, C., 2017. The Priority of Injustice: Locating Democracy in Critical Theory. University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA.

Barnett, C., 2018. Geography and the priority of injustice. Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr. 108 (2), 317–326.

Berlant, L., 2011. Cruel Optimism. Duke University Press, Durham.

Bonds, A., 2018. Refusing resilience: the racialization of risk and resilience. Urban Geogr. 39 (8), 1285–1291.

Brown, K., 2016. Resilience, Development and Global Change. Routledge, Abingdon.

Buchanan, R., 1992. Wicked problems in design thinking. Des. Issues 8 (2), 5–21.

Buchanan, R., 1995. Rhetoric, humanism, design. In: Buchanan, R., Margolin, V. (Eds.), Discovering Design: Explorations in Design Studies. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 23–66.

Bulkeley, H., Edwards, G., Fuller, S., 2014. Contesting climate justice in the city: examining politics and practice in urban climate change experiments. Global Environ. Change 25, 31–40.

Chandler, D., 2018. Ontopolitics in the Anthropocene. Routledge, Abingdon.

Chandler, D., Reid, J., 2019. Becoming Indigenous: Governing Imaginaries in the Anthropocene. Rowman & Littlefield, London.

Chu, E., Michael, K., 2019. Recognition in urban climate justice: marginality and exclusion of migrants in Indian cities. Environ. Urbanization 31 (1), 139–156.

Collier, S., 2017. Neoliberalism and rule by experts. In: Higgins, V., Larner, W. (Eds.), Assembling Neoliberalism: Expertise, Practices, Subjects. Palgrave, New York.

Collier, S., Cox, S., Grove, K., 2016. Rebuilding by design in post-Sandy New York. Limn 5 (7).

Connolly, J., Steil, J., 2009. Introduction: Finding justice in the city. In: Marcuse, P., Connolly, J., Novy, J., Olivo, I., Potter, C., Steil, J. (Eds.), Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice. Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 1–16.

Connolly, N.D.B., 2014. A World More Concrete: Real Estate and the Remaking of Jim Crow South Florida. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Coulthard, G., 2014. Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Cox, S., Cox, P., 2016. How the World Breaks: Life in Catastrophe's Path, from the Caribbean to Siberia. The New Press, New York.

Cross, N., 1982. Designerly ways of knowing. Des. Stud. 3 (4), 221–227.

Davoudi, S., 2018. Just resilience. City Community 17 (1), 3–7.

Derickson, K., 2018. Urban geography III: Anthropocene urbanism. Prog. Hum. Geogr. 42 (3), 425–435.

Dunn, M., 1997. Black Miami in the Twentieth Century. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Escobar, A., 2018. Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy and the Making of Worlds. Duke University Press, Durham.

Fainstein, S., 2015. Resilience and justice. Int. J. Urban Reg. Res. 39 (1), 157–167.

Fainstein, S., 2018. Resilience and justice: planning for New York City. Urban Geogr. 39 (8), 1268–1275.

Fraser, N., 1995. From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. New Left Rev. I/212.

Fitzgibbons, J., Mitchell, C., 2019. Just urban futures? Exploring equity in "100 Resilient Cities". World Dev. 122, 648–659.

Gahman, L., Thongs, G., 2019. Development justice, a proposal: reckoning with disaster, catastrophe, and climate change in the Caribbean. Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12369. Online early view accessed 23 Aug 2020.

Gilmore, R., 2007. Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis and Opposition in Globalizing California. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Grove, K., 2014. Agency, affect and the immunological politics of disaster resilience. Environ. Plann. D: Soc. Space 32 (2), 240–256.

Grove, K., 2018. Resilience. Routledge, Abingdon.

Grove, K., Cox, S., Barnett, A., 2020. Racializing resilience: assemblage, critique and contested futures in Greater Miami resilience planning. Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr. 110 (5), 1613–1630.

Grove, K., Krivy, M., Rickards, L., Schliwa, G., Gandy, M., Collier, S., Cox, S., 2019. Interventions on design and political geography. Polit. Geogr. 74, 102017.

Harris, L.M., Chu, E., Ziervogel, G., 2017. Negotiated resilience. Resilience: Int. Policies Pract. Discourses 6 (3), 196–214.

Holland, B., 2012. Environment as meta-capability: why a dignified human life requires a stable climate system. In: Thompson, A., Bendik-Keymer, J. (eds.), Ethical Adaptation to Climate Change: Human Virtues of the Future.

Hartman, S., 1997. Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Johansson-Sköldberg, U., Woodilla, J., Çetinkaya, M., 2013. Design thinking: past, present and possible futures. Creat. Innov. Manage. 22 (2), 121–146.

Kompridis, N., 2007. Struggling over the meaning of recognition: a matter of identity, justice, or freedom? Eur. J. Polit. Theory 6 (3), 277–289.

Lee, K., 1993. Compass and Gyroscope: Integrating Science and Politics for the Environment. Island Press, Washington, D.C.

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E., Webber, S., Colven, E., 2018. Globalizing urban resilience. Urban Geogr. 39 (8), 1276–1284.

Matin, N., Forrester, J., Ensor, J., 2018. What is equitable resilience? World Dev. 197–205.

McKittrick, K., 2007. Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

McKittrick, K., 2013. Plantation futures. Small Axe 17 (3), 1–15.

Manzini, E., 2015. Design, When Everybody Designs. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Meerow, S., Newell, J., Stults, M., 2016. Defining urban resilience: a review. Landscape Urban Plann. 147, 38–49.

Meerow, S., Pajouhesh, P., Miller, T., 2019. Social equity in urban resilience planning. Local Environ. 24 (9), 793–808.

Murley, J., Gilbert, J., Torriente, S. 2017. Resilient Greater Miami and the Beaches: Preliminary Resilience Assessment. Available at: http://www.mbrisingabove.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Welcome-and-Introduction.pdf (accessed 14 June 2020).

Murley, J., Gilbert, J. and Torriente, S. 2019. Resilient305. Available at: https://resilient305.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Full-Strategy-2.pdf (accessed 14 June 2020).

Nelson, S., 2020. Resilient arts of self-government: the birth of a systems-cybernetic governmentality. In: Chandler, D., Grove, K., Wakefield, S. (Eds.), Resilience in the Anthropocene: Governance and Politics at the End of the World. Routledge, Abingdon.

Ostrom, V., 1980. Artisanship and artifact. Public Administ. Rev. 40 (4), 309–317.

Ostrom, V., 1997. The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Passim, N., 2019. Building on Bauhaus: design as the liberal art of the twenty-first century. In: Forlano, L., Wright-Steenson, M., Ananny, M. (Eds.), Bauhaus Futures. The MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 107–118.

Patterson, O., 1982. Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Pelling, M., 2010. Adaptation to Climate Change: From Resilience to Transformation. Routledge, Abingdon.

Popke, J. Curtis, S., Gamble, D.W., 2016. A social justice framing of climate change discourse and policy: adaptation, resilience and vulnerability in a Jamaican agricultural landscape. Geoforum. 73, 70–80.

Povinelli, E., 2002. The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism. Duke University Press, Durham.

Povinelli, E., 2011. Economies of Abandonment: Social Belonging and Endurance in Late Liberalism. Duke University Press, Durham.

Pugh, J., 2018. Postcolonial development, (non)sovereignty and affect: living on in the wake of Caribbean political independence. Antipode 49 (4), 867–882.

Pulido, L., 2017. Geographies of race and ethnicity II: environmental racism, racial capitalism and state-sanctioned violence. Prog. Hum. Geogr. 41 (4), 524–533.

Rancière, J., 1995. Dis-agreement: Politics and Philosophy. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Ranganathan, M., 2016. Thinking with Flint: racial liberalism and the roots of an American water tragedy. Capitalism Nat. Soc. 27 (3), 17–33.

Ranganathan, M., Bratman, E., 2019. From Urban Resilience to Abolitionist Climate Justice in Washington, DC. Antipode 2020https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12555. (accessed 23 Aug 2020).

Rice, J., Cohen, D.A., Long, J., Jurjevich, J., 2019. Contradictions of the climate-friendly city: new perspectives on eco-gentrification and housing justice. Int. J. Urban Reg.

Res. 44 (1), 145–165.

Rose, C., 2015. The Struggle for Black Freedom in Miami: Civil Rights and America's Tourist Paradise, 1896–1968. LSU Press, Baton Rouge.

Rutland, T., 2018. Displacing Blackness: Planning, Power and Race in Twentieth-Century Halifax. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Schlosberg, D., 2007. Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Schlosberg, D. 2012. Justice, ecological integrity, and climate change. In: Thompson, A., Bendik-Keymer, J. (eds.), Ethical Adaptation to Climate Change: Human Virtues of the Future.

Schlosberg, D., Collins, L., 2014. From environmental to climate justice: climate change and the discourse of environmental justice. WIREs Clim. Change 5 (3), 359–374.

Sealey-Huggins, L., 2017. '1.5°C to stay alive': climate change, imperialism and justice for the Caribbean. Third World Quart. 38 (11), 2444–2463.

Sexton, J., 2010. People of color-blindness: notes on the afterlife of slavery. Social Text 2, 31–56.

Sexton, J., 2016. Afro-Pessimism: the unclear word. Rhizomes 29, 2.

Shabazz, R., 2015. Spatializing Blackness. University of Illinois Press, Champaign.

Sharpe, C., 2016. In the Wake: On Blackness and Being. Duke University Press, Durham.

Simon, H., 1996. The Sciences of the Artificial, third ed. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Smith, S., Vasudevan, P., 2017. Race, biopolitics and the future. Environ. Plann. D: Soc. Space 35 (2), 210–221.

Stepick, A., Greneir, G., Castro, M., Dunn, M., 2003. This Land is Our Land: Immigrants and Power in Miami. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Taylor, Z., 2020. The real estate risk fix: Residential insurance-linked securitization in the Florida metropolis. Environ. Plann. A 52 (6), 1131–1149.

Wakefield, S. 2019. Miami Beach forever? Urbanism in the back loop. Geoforum 107 The real estate risk fix: Residential insurance-linked securitization in the Florida metropolis The real estate risk fix: Residential insurance-linked securitization in the Florida metropolis, 34–44.

Walker, G., 2012. Environmental Justice: Concepts, Evidence and Politics. Routledge, Abingdon.

Weheliye, A., 2014. Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human. Duke University Press, Durham.

Wilderson, F., 2020. Afropessimism. Livefree Press, New York.

Wright-Austin, S., 2018. The Caribbeanization of Black Politics: Race, Group Consciousness and Political Participation in America. SUNY Press, Albany.

Yitfachel, O., Goldhaber, R., Nuriel, R., 2009. Urban justice and recognition: affirmation and hostility in Beer Sheva. In: Marcuse, P., Connolly, J., Novy, J., Olivo, I., Potter, C., Steil, J. (Eds.), Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice. Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 120–143.

Young, I., 1990. Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Ziervogel, G., Pelling, M., Cartwright, A., Chu, E., Deshpande, T., Harris, L., Hyams, K., Kaunda, J., Klaus, B., Michael, K., Pasquini, L., Pharoah, R., Rodina, L., Scott, D., Zweig, P., 2017. Inserting rights and justice into urban resilience: a focus on everyday risk. Environ. Urbanization 29 (1), 123–138.