



URBDP 592
ADVANCED PLANNING THEORY
Winter 2020

Mark Purcell
Gould 410F
mpurcell@uw.edu

Office hours: by appointment
(just e-mail me!)

Class meeting times and location:
Wednesday, 1:30-4:20
Gould 100

Course website:
<https://canvas.uw.edu/courses/1358317>



Introduction

“The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influence, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. I am sure that the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas.”

– John Maynard Keynes, 1936

“Society’s course will be changed only by a change in ideas. First you must reach the intellectuals, the teachers and writers, with reasoned argument. It will be their influence on society which will prevail, and the politicians will follow.”

– Friedrich Hayek, 1954

Planning theory concerns itself with the *ideas* of planning. If, as Keynes and Hayek argue, ideas are indispensable to action, if every plan or action is underlain—and even driven by—ideas, then it is essential for all planners to be *critically literate* in planning theory. Being literate involves seriously examining and understanding the arguments of important theorists. Being critical means subjecting those arguments to sustained scrutiny, both from your own perspective, and from the perspectives of other planning theorists. The principal goal of this course is to develop your critical literacy in planning theory.

Course Goals

This course is a graduate seminar. Its goal is to provide you with the opportunity to read, engage with, and critically question planning theory. To that end, we will read, discuss, and write about past and contemporary ideas and debates in planning. The course is not designed to impart applied techniques that you can use to fill your “toolbox” for professional practice. It is designed instead to give you the intellectual literacy that is essential to making informed and wise judgments about planning theory and practice. Therefore, the course goals are to develop:

- Critical literacy in past and current debates in planning theory
- Developing your academic reading, writing, and discussion skills

Student Responsibilities

In thinking about how I am going to evaluate you, you need only to understand clearly what I expect from you in this class. For me the most important responsibility is to take your own education seriously. That means sincerely engaging the readings and reliably completing each assignment. It means attending each class, prepared and on time. It means impressing me with a sincere intellectual curiosity about the subject of planning theory. Secondary to that, only by just a little, is the quality of the work you produce.

Professor Responsibilities

My responsibilities mirror yours: to take the class, the material, and your work seriously. That means ensuring a safe and respectful classroom, providing timely feedback, and being present, prepared, and engaged at each class.

Course Readings

In the Course Reader, available in pdf format on the course website.

Assessment

Your final assessment in this course will be based on your performance on the following:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Date due</i>
Participation	33	Every class
Reading Assignments	34	Every class
Final Paper/Project	33	March 16

Academic honesty

The University takes the offenses of cheating and plagiarism very seriously, and so do I. Cheating is taking advantage of the work of others. Plagiarism is representing the work of others as your own, without giving appropriate credit. If you are unsure what is OK or not OK, make sure to ask!

CLASS SCHEDULE

WEEK 1

Wednesday, January 8

Topic: Introduction to course and each other, as well as a discussion of supplemental readings

WEEK 2

Wednesday, January 15

Topic: Introduction to Planning Theory

Readings:

- Friedmann, J. (2003) Why Do Planning Theory? *Planning Theory* 2(1): 7-10.
- Friedmann, J. (2008) The Uses of Planning Theory: A Bibliographic Essay. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 28: 247-257.
- Friedmann, J. (1987) *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, pp. 3-85.
- **Optional:** Hall, P. (2002) *Cities of Tomorrow*, Malden, MA, Blackwell, pp. 353-377.

Read all three (or four), but in class we will probably focus our time relatively more on the third one.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #1

WEEK 3

Wednesday, January 22

Topic: Planning Theory in Context

Readings:

- Campbell, S. and S. Fainstein (2003) Introduction: The Structure and Debates of Planning Theory. *Readings in Planning Theory*. S. Campbell and S. Fainstein, Eds. Malden, MA, Blackwell: 1-16.
- Klosterman, R. (2003 [1985]) Arguments for and against Planning. *Readings in Planning Theory*. S. Campbell and S. Fainstein, Eds. Malden, MA, Blackwell: 86-101.
- Watson, V. (2016 [2009]) Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe's Central Urban Issues. In S. Fainstein and J. DeFilippis, eds. *Readings in Planning Theory*. Wiley, pp. 540-560.
- **Optional:** Campbell, H. (2012) Planning to Change the World: Between Knowledge and Action Lies Synthesis. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 32(2): 135-146.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #2

WEEK 4

Wednesday, January 29

Topic: Rational/Systems/Comprehensive Planning (or not)

Readings:

- Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*, New York, Palgrave, Chapter 3, pp. 53-80.
- Faludi, A. (1973) *Planning Theory*, New York, Pergamon, pp. 1-53.
- Lindblom, C. (2003 [1959]) The Science of 'Muddling through'. *Readings in Planning Theory*. S. Campbell and S. Fainstein, Eds. Malden, MA, Blackwell: 196-209.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #3

WEEK 5

Wednesday, February 5

Topic: Marxism and Feminism in Response to Rational Planning

Readings:

- **Optional:** Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*, New York, Palgrave, Chapter 4, pp. 81-104.
- Fogelson, R. (2003[1986]) Planning the Capitalist City. *Readings in Planning Theory*. S. Campbell and S. Fainstein, Eds. Malden, MA, Blackwell: 102-107.
- Harvey, D. (1978) On Planning the Ideology of Planning. *Planning Theory in the 1980s*. R. Burchell and G. Sternlieb, Eds. New Brunswick, Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University: 213-233.
- Sandercock, L. and Forsyth, A. (1992) A Gender Agenda: New Directions for Planning Theory. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 58(1): 49-59.
- Snyder, M. (1995) Feminist Theory and Planning Theory: Lessons from Feminist Epistemologies. *Berkeley Planning Journal* 10: 91-106.
- **Optional** (but you just *have* to read this): Hayden, D. (1980) "What Would a Non-sexist City be Like?" *Signs* 5(3): pp. S170-S187.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #4

WEEK 6

Wednesday, February 12

Topic: Advocacy and Equity

Readings:

- **Optional:** Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*, New York, Palgrave, Chapter 7, pp. 146-167.
- Davidoff, P. (1965) Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31(4): 331-338.
- Davidoff, P. (1978) The Redistributive Function in Planning: Creating Greater Equity among Citizens of Communities. *Planning Theory in the 1980's*. R. Burchell and G. Sternlieb, Eds. New Brunswick, The Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University: 69-72.
- Krumholz, N. (1999) Equitable Approaches to Local Economic Development. *Policy Studies Journal* 27(1): 83-95.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #5

WEEK 7

Wednesday, February 19

Topic: Pragmatism

Readings:

- **Optional:** Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*, New York, Palgrave, Chapter 6, pp. 127-145.
- Harrison, P. (2002) A Pragmatic Attitude to Planning. *Planning Futures: New Directions in Planning Theory*. P. Allmendinger and M. Tewdwr-Jones, Eds. New York, Routledge: 157-171.
- Hoch, C. (1996[1988]) A Pragmatic Inquiry About Planning and Power. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. S. Mandelbaum, L. Mazza and R. Burchell, Eds. New Brunswick, Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University: 30-44.
- Forester, J. (2012) On the Theory and Practice of Critical Pragmatism: Deliberative Practice and Creative Negotiations. *Planning Theory* 12(1): 5-22.
- Healey, P. (2009) The Pragmatic Tradition in Planning Thought. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 28: 277-292.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #6

WEEK 8

Wednesday, February 26

Topic: Communicative/Collaborative/Consensus Planning

Readings:

- **Optional:** Harris, N. (2002) Collaborative Planning. *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*. P. Allmendinger and M. Tewdwr-Jones, Eds. London, Routledge: 21-43.
- Healey, P. (2003[1996]) The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory and Its Implications for Spatial Strategy Formation. *Readings in Planning Theory*. S. Campbell and S. Fainstein, Eds. Malden, MA, Blackwell: 237-255.
- Forester, J. (1999) Dealing with Deep Value Differences. *The Consensus Building Handbook*. L. Susskind, S. McKernan and J. Thomas-Larmer, Eds. Thousand Oaks, Sage: 463-493.
- Innes, J. (1995) Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14(3): 183-189.
- Innes, J. (2004) Consensus Building: Clarifications for the Critics. *Planning Theory* 3(1): 5-20.
- **Optional:** Forester, J. (2006) Making Participation Work When Interests Conflict. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72(4): 447-456.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #7

WEEK 9

Wednesday, March 4

Topic: Critics of Communicative/Collaborative Planning

Reading:

- Sandercock, L. (1998) The Death of Modernist Planning: Radical Praxis for a Postmodern Age. *Cities for Citizens: Planning and the Rise of Civil Society in a Global Age*. M. Douglass and J. Friedmann, eds. New York, Wiley, pp. 163-184.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (1998) Empowering Civil Society: Habermas, Foucault and the Question of Conflict. *Cities for Citizens: Planning and the Rise of Civil Society in a Global Age*. M. Douglass and J. Friedmann, Eds. New York, Wiley: 185-211.
- Roy, A., (2001) A Public Muse: On Planning Convictions and Feminist Contentions. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21: 109-126.
- Purcell, M. (2008) Resisting Neoliberalization: Communicative Planning or Counter-Hegemonic Movements? *Planning Theory* 8(2): 140-165.
- **Optional:** Hillier, J. (2003) 'Agon'izing over Consensus: Why Habermasian Ideals Cannot Be 'Real'. *Planning Theory* 2(1): 37-59.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #8

WEEK 10

Wednesday, March 11

Topic: Positive Alternatives: post-colonial/feminist/anarchist/ecological approaches

Reading: TBD – see some possibilities below

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #9

EXAM WEEK

Monday, March 16, 6:30-8:20pm

Same room

Topics:

- Retrospective/Class Desire

Reading:

- TBD

Assignments:

Final Paper is due during this period

Some ideas for the readings for Week 10:

Global South (Post-Colonial)

- Roy, A. (2016 [2012]) Urban Informality: The Production of Space and Practice of Planning. In S. Fainstein and J. DeFilippis, eds. *Readings in Planning Theory*. Wiley, pp. 524-539.
- Devlin, Asking 'Third World questions'...
informality (desire vs. need), GN can learn from GS
- Connell, Using Southern theory
Global North knowledge and intelligentsia is different from Global South knowledge and intelligentsia, and we must decolonize both to develop new knowledge projects
- Winkler, Black texts on white paper...
the colonial era is not over, planners are not well versed in decolonizing theories – need to use “resistant texts” to help with “decoloniality”: de-linking from Western knowledges

Anarchist

- Newman, S. (2011) Postanarchism and Space: Revolutionary Fantasies and Autonomous Zones. *Planning Theory* 10(4): 344-365.

Feminist

- Speak, S. (2012) Planning for the Needs of Urban Poor in the Global South: The Value of a Feminist Approach. *Planning Theory* 11(4): 343-360.
- Schweitzer, Restorative planning ethics...
how can planners heal relations when they have caused harm? Sandercock's therapeutic imagination

Race/Intersectionality

- Osborne, Intersectionality and kyriarchy...
intersectionality and kyriarchy (the power structures that intersectionality produces) – we should pay more attention to both in planning
- Song, Race, transformative planning...
race is, believe it or not, not that common a topic in planning, uses Dubois' idea of race as 'double consciousness' to examine race and help realize the just city and connect to neo-pragmatism

Complexity Theory

- Chettiparamb, Complexity theory...
uses fractals (the idea that a given entity has the same structure at all scales) to think about planning also: Chettiparamb A (2005) Fractal spaces in planning and governance. *Town Planning Review* 76(3): 317-340.
- Moroni, Complexity and the inherent...
applying complexity theory and ideas of self-organization and autopoiesis to planning

Non-representational, post-human, affective, Deleuze & Guattari

- Buser, Thinking through non-representational...

- non-representational, post-human, affective, performative, and Deleuzian ideas applied to planning
- Ansaloni and Tedeschi, Ethics and spatial justice...
applying D&G's becoming to the unpredictable assemblages of bodies in cities...looks pretty opaque and hard to parse
 - Purcell, M. (2013) A New Land: Deleuze and Guattari and Planning. *Planning Theory & Practice* 14(1): 20-38.
Deleuze and Guattari are rarely read and not well understood in planning. If they were, they would force planners to ask existential questions about planning
 - Banville and Torres, On embracing...
follows on from the above piece, to say that embracing D&G's immanent ethics would profoundly destabilize planning

Reading Assignments

Overview

For each discussion, you will prepare a reading assignment. This exercise provides you with an opportunity to develop your critical understanding of the topic at hand. It also helps you process the ideas in the readings so you will be prepared to discuss them when we meet. There are two elements to this assignment:

Understanding: For *each* reading, you will articulate the author's main *argument* in one or two sentences. You should not *summarize* the reading (e.g. "first the author talked about x, then she talked about y, etc."). Rather you should distill and articulate the main argument the author is wanting to convince you of (e.g. "Purcell argues that *democracy*, properly understood, is the best political idea for guiding contemporary struggles for an alternative urban future.>").

***Note: For some readings, the author is mainly reporting the arguments of other writers (e.g. when Allmendinger is writing about rational planning), so for those readings state the main argument of the tradition the author is reporting on.

Maximum 70 words for each reading

Reflection: you will write your reaction to the readings as a whole for that week. This can be a critique of the arguments, a deconstruction of them, an idea in the readings that you are excited about, an application of the ideas to a particular case...there are a range of appropriate ways to reflect on the reading. Use this exercise to do something useful for you and your work.

Optional Maximum 300 words

There will be a reading assignment for every class. All together they are worth 34% of your course grade. Each reading assignment will be graded on a scale of 0 to 10. They should be entirely your own work.

Format

The assignment should be typed and single-spaced, and uploaded on the course website in the appropriate place.

The assignment for a particular set of readings are due the day we discuss the readings. See the syllabus for specific dates.

You should do the "understanding" exercise for *each* reading (for the optional readings, of course, it is optional). In the "reflection" component of the assignment, you can pick one or more or all readings to address.

Participation

Participation makes up 33% of your course grade. It is important. And there is no way around participating. In a discussion format, especially at the Ph.D. level, each of you has a *responsibility* to others in the class to share your ideas and insights. The way this happens is by you speaking during class. If you do not share your questions and ideas with everyone, they can't benefit from what you have to offer. Each of you has important questions and ideas to share that we can all learn from. Therefore, since you all have something important to contribute, you all have a responsibility to contribute it. The intellectual value of this class (and any seminar) depends on the active and engaged participation of its members. Such participation depends on a sincere desire to learn more, and a desire to learn from others. Hence the quality of class discussions rests on how well everyone meets their responsibility to participate.

You will be graded on participation class-by-class. Effective participation is not measured by sheer amount. If you consistently share your ideas and questions and concerns in an honest effort to explore the material in the spirit of intellectual curiosity, you will receive a good grade for participation.

So, the strategy for participation is this: do not hesitate to share your thoughts. Do not think that they have to be fully formed and 100% defensible before you offer them. Do not think that they have to be brilliant or dazzling. Do not think that you can't contribute until you've read the book that intimidating guy in the corner referred to obliquely. Do not think you should remain quiet because you have different ideas about a topic than most others in the class. And do not think that you have to *know* before you speak. *Honest questions and true struggles within yourself that you have not yet resolved are a great way to contribute.*

Remember also that *listening* is as important as talking. Asking *genuine* questions (for which you have not already decided on an answer) is a good way to listen. If you ask a question that you do not already have an answer for, you will genuinely want to *hear* what others have to say. What we are shooting for are true *dialogues* in which you engage the comments and questions of others rather than following them up with unrelated comments and questions. We want to steer clear of a series of unrelated monologues. Be *curious* about what others have to say.

I understand that oral participation may be a struggle for some. I am willing to explore any and all ways to help you participate. If you feel uncomfortable with speaking in class, you should come see or e-mail me so we can think of ways to make it more comfortable. I stand ready to help you find ways to speak, but the responsibility for participating is yours. Again, the structure of the class means there is no way around participation. The quality of learning in the class depends on it, and a large portion of your grade depends on it.

Final Paper/Project

The goal of the final paper is to bring your own work into sustained and productive engagement with the ideas of the course. I encourage you *not* to undertake new research for this paper. Rather, it is better to draw on your existing research projects or ideas, using this material as the subject matter that you bring into dialogue with the ideas and arguments from the course. As I read your paper, my main focus will be the way you engage with the ideas in the course.

The framework of this project is deliberately vague, because there are many ways this exercise can be carried out. It depends greatly on your topic and how you choose to bring it into conversation with the course ideas. So, the way this works best is an iterative process where you come up with an idea, I give you feedback, you come up with a refined idea, I give you more feedback, etc. On each step, below, I encourage you to go through this iterative process with me (and with your peers).

Step 1: select a topic: an element of your work and the course idea you will engage with (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 2: formulate a thesis about the relationship between your work and the course idea (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 3: lay out a work plan: what kind of document will you produce, what work will you need to do to make your project work, etc. (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 4: come up with an outline for the document (feedback, refinement, feedback, etc.)

Step 5: write the final document (& I evaluate it)

The paper should have *at least* 15 pages of text (assuming all the standard formatting—double-spaced, 1” margins, 12-point font). Ideally, you should think about this project as a potential working paper, conference paper, journal article, report, or other career-relevant product. The length of these products varies by format and subdiscipline, so let your vision for what the paper will become guide you as to length (with the minimum of 15 pages as a baseline).

As with your reading assignments, you should upload these to the course website in the appropriate place.