



**URBDP 592**  
ADVANCED PLANNING THEORY  
Winter 2022

Mark Purcell  
[mpurcell@uw.edu](mailto:mpurcell@uw.edu)

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

Class meeting times and location:  
Wednesday, 1:30-4:20  
Gould 442

Course website:  
<https://canvas.uw.edu/courses/1519728>



### **Health and Safety Information**

Before we get to the content of the course, it is important to address health and safety. As you know, this quarter UW is continuing its status as a fully in-person campus (with the exception of the first week). Obviously, everyone wants to do this as safely as possible. The UW has a very detailed plan for ensuring the safety of all students, faculty, and staff this quarter. The primary points of this plan are:

- **Vaccination** is required for all students and faculty unless they have a medical or religious exemption. Prior to the first day of class, each of us was required to attest that we have been vaccinated (or exempted). Make sure you have done so.  
<https://www.washington.edu/coronavirus/vaccination-requirement>
- **Masks** are required inside all UW buildings for every person, no matter your vaccination status.  
<https://www.ehs.washington.edu/covid-19-prevention-and-response/face-covering-requirements>
- **Testing** is free, widely available, and encouraged for everyone. If you have received a medical or religious exemption from vaccination, you are required to be tested weekly and submit your results to the University.  
<https://www.washington.edu/coronavirus/testing>
- **Ventilation** improvements have been made to classrooms to both increase air flow and filter the air.
- Some students may have documented medical conditions that place them at higher risk for complications from COVID-19. Requests for accommodations related to COVID-19 will be handled in the same manner as for other medical conditions. Students should request accommodations from Disability Resources for Students. <https://depts.washington.edu/uwdrs>

- If you are experiencing any symptoms of COVID-19, you should not come to campus.

Everyone in the class is expected to participate fully in this plan so that we can keep each other safe.

The UW's main hub for information about COVID-19 and a safe return to in-person classes can be found here: <https://www.washington.edu/coronavirus/winter2022/>

The main hub for such information in our college, the College of Built Environments, is:

<https://intranet.be.uw.edu/students/faqs>

## 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 ideas in planning theory. 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 17 at noon

## Academic honesty and integrity

The University takes academic misconduct – cheating and plagiarism – very seriously. So do I. Both are violations of the university’s Student Conduct Code, and so I am required to report them immediately to the university’s office of Community Standards & Student Conduct. Such violations are less common in Ph.D. programs, of course, but they do happen, and they are reported.

Cheating is using the work or ideas of others in the class to write your assignments or paper instead of doing the work yourself. Plagiarism is representing the work of others as your own without giving appropriate credit. If you are unsure what is OK or not OK, don't hesitate to ask!

## CLASS SCHEDULE

### WEEK 1

Wednesday, January 5

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

### WEEK 2

Wednesday, January 12

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.

In class we will probably focus our time relatively more on the third one.

#### Assignments:

Reading Assignment #1

### WEEK 3

Wednesday, January 19

Topic: Planning Theory in Context

Readings:

- S. Fainstein and DeFilippis (2016) 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 26

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 2

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 9

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 16

Topic: Pragmatism

Readings:

- **Optional:** Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*, New York, Palgrave, Chapter 6, pp. 127-145.
- **Optional:** 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 23

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. McKearnan 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.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #7

## WEEK 9

Wednesday, March 2

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 9

Topic: A Red Velvet Cake of Planning Theory

Readings:

- Porter, L. (2010) Chapter 3 of *Unlearning the Colonial Cultures of Planning*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate.
- Mycoo, M. (2017) Reforming spatial planning in anglophone Caribbean countries. *Planning Theory and Practice* 18(1), pp. 89–108.
- Williams, R. (2020) From Racial to Reparative Planning: Confronting the White Side of Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. DOI: 10.1177/0739456X2094641.

Assignments:

Reading Assignment #9



**EXAM WEEK**

Monday, March 14, 6:30-8:20pm

Topics:

- Retrospective/Class Desire

Reading:

- TBD

Assignments:

Final Paper is due on Thursday, March 17 at noon.

## 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. "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 submitted on the course canvas page, on the assignments tab.

The assignment for a particular set of readings are due at the beginning of class 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.

Things are definitely getting back to in person, but there will be times this quarter (at least the first week, we know) when we will need to meet remotely. When we do, here are some guidelines. Be focused and engaged. Have your camera on. In discussions, we really need to be able to *see* each other. (Of course, things that come up and here and there you will need to turn your camera off for a minute. That is fine, just make sure to let me know by private chat why you need to do so.) Zoom, bless its heart, also has a chat feature. Some limited use of the chat *can* be effective, but we do not want two streams of conversation going, one in voice/video and one in chat. Please use the voice/video feature to participate orally in discussion, just like you would in person. Use the chat feature almost never. If there is something really important, like a link, or something that makes sense in written form, you can use the chat for that.

## 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, bring this existing work 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 for a paper, I give you feedback, you come up with a refined idea, I give you more feedback, etc. This process is sketched roughly below. You are not required to follow each of these steps strictly, but rather to follow an iterative process that you think will work best for the project you have in mind.

**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). I am happy if this paper can become 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 this final paper to the course website, on the assignments tab.