

UP 580 Advanced Planning Theory

Instructor: Professor Faranak MirafTAB

Time: Thursdays 2:30 -5:20 PM, Spring 2016

Place: Temple Buell Hall, Room 19 or Conference room (111)

Office hours: Tuesdays afternoons by appointment (218 TBH--level 2)

Email: faranak@illinois.edu

Course Description

Planning is a contested field of interacting practices by multiple actors that concern development of human habitat and social life within them. Planning theories aim to explain/ guide/ transform the complex relationships amongst, and practices by, these actors. In achieving the desired process and outcome while some theories stress the role of planning professionals and the significance of their immaculate scientific rationality, others stress the role of market institutions and economic forces, the power and process of communication and distribution of knowledge; and the race-, gender-, class- and ethnicity-based societal hierarchies. How these interacting practices are theorized and which actors are assumed as their protagonists vary depending on who is theorizing (positonality); how the theory is arrived at (methodology); and what knowledge and values are validated (epistemology). Planning theoretical perspectives have changed across time in a dialogical relationship with each other and within the larger societal and disciplinary contexts.

This advanced seminar in Planning Theory tries to capture some of the key conversations in theorizing planning endeavors predominantly held amongst academics and scholars of the North American and the European institutions. It is a required course for doctoral students in planning but open to Master students who would like to build a deeper knowledge of planning and its theoretical constructs. It is assumed that the course participants have completed UP 501 or its equivalent and are familiar with the basics of planning theory and practice. The course readings are selected with UP 501 in mind to avoid repetition in assigned texts.

This advanced seminar is designed to move in between the social theories and planning theories. It aims to develop graduate students' ability to assess planning theories in terms of their epistemological and methodological promise and limitation, by understanding the larger scholarly traditions they are influenced by and affiliated with. As planning is a professional field it brings in and makes use of influential theories in multiple disciplines. UP 580 introduces the students to some of the key social theories that have been influential in planning theories. This exercise is hoped to allow students to assess critically and sharply the theories that can most productively explain the object of their own research. Towards that goal students are asked to reflect on the assigned readings and on whether and how those theoretical constructs can inform their specific topic of research interest. As no single theory can explain everything, students' theoretical exposure in this class will help them gain a better sense of the range of theories that can explain various aspects of the complex problems they are trying to examine for their dissertation research.

Course requirement and performance evaluation

The course requires students' active participation in class discussions. This means they will have to come to the class prepared by not only reading the assigned texts but also preparing a 2-3 page essays with

critical examination and reflection on the assigned readings. These weekly short essays and class participation in discussions will count towards 60 percent of the final grade. The other 40% of the course grade is based on a final essay due at the end of the semester.

○ **The weekly short essays (40 points)**

Weekly short essays need to be posted on the course COMPASS *before the class meetings latest by Tuesdays noon*. They need to be treated seriously representing student's rigor and analytical ability to engage the literature in the field. In these weekly notes the students will elaborate and critically reflect on the theoretical constructs that are put forth by the week's readings. They will also discuss aspects of the theory they find challenging, problematic, or useful in dealing with their own topic of research; and the questions they would like to pose for a group discussion. As such each short essay consists of three sections: a) critical review of the assigned readings; b) the relevance to the students' specific research area; c) the debate questions they would like to raise for class discussion. For the first section (critical review of assigned readings) students will briefly synthesize the arguments put forth by each of the assigned texts for that week and identify the ways in which the arguments and approaches presented converge or diverge amongst authors of that week and in respect to previous text discussed in earlier classes. Depending on the number of the assigned readings, I expect the synthesis and discussion section of this essay to take about 1000 words.

As a general guide to draft your critical reflective pieces think through the following questions: What is the argument? How is theoretical perspective constructed/ arrived at? How is this planning theory/ approach influenced by the larger social theories and theoretical debates? How does it converge or diverge from other assigned readings? What are the relevance or limitations of this theoretical framework for your specific research topic? How does it speak to your research interest?

○ **Active participation in class discussion (20 points)**

Active participation includes participation in class discussions and facilitation of selected sessions. The student facilitator will kick start the discussions by highlighting the main theoretical points and conceptual elements of the readings; and they will raise certain broad questions that can provoke a debate. Moreover, the facilitator for each session will also try to identify and present to the class a concrete case through which the theoretical debate of that week can be best grounded. Sometimes such concrete example is a case study that the planning theorist we are studying has documented in their writings other times student facilitator needs to identify such a case in consultation with the instructor. It is important that students use the seminar as an opportunity to strengthen their ability to verbally articulate their ideas, and better prepare themselves for a scholarly career in which they might have to teach planning theory and engage in respectful but critical debates with students and colleagues.

Final essay (40 points)

In this literature review essay you review the planning theories in relation to your doctoral research. You choose one or two distinct theoretical approaches to planning that you consider most relevant to your field of dissertation research and pursue the following: (a) introduce their theoretical framework and discuss the broader social theories and epistemological constructs that have informed and inspired them; (b) discuss how this body of theoretical literature in planning could inform your doctoral research. Imagine you are able to bring into one room important and influential social and planning theorists from different

eras, with distinct intellectual traditions and epistemological aspirations. They engage in a debate about your subject matter. They have to not only introduce to you what their argument is and where it comes from, how it is shaped and how it is different from others who come before or after them, they also have to guide you in terms of setting up the theoretical and conceptual framework of your research. They will engage in a debate on influential and/or determining factors in your research. Substantiated in their own intellectual traditions, they discuss what you need to look for, and how you need to find answer to your questions. Your literature review needs to highlight the distinct scholarly traditions that influence these theories and implications they will have for researching your subject matter. You focus on theories discussed in class but introduce additional text and authors. The final essays are expected to be around 7000 words in length. A preliminary outline of the final essay needs to be approved by the instructor.

Grading:

The grading scale below will be used for assessment of student’s performance. Students taking this course towards their PhD in Regional Planning degree need to complete this class receiving a final grade B- (B minus) or above. See PhD in Regional Planning Probation Policy for Performance Below Minimum Requirement http://www.urban.illinois.edu/academic-programs/phd/phd_probationpolicy.html

<i>Numerical Grade</i>	<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>Equivalent on 4.0 scale</i>
≥ 98	A+	4.0
94-97.9	A	> 3.7
91-93.9	A-	> 3.3
88-90.9	B+	> 3.0
84-87.9	B	> 2.7
81-83.9	B-	> 2.3
78-80.9	C+	> 2.0
74-77.9	C	> 1.7
71-73.9	C-	> 1.3
68-70.9	D+	> 1.0
64-67.9	D	> 0.7
61-63.9	D-	> 0.0
< 60.9	F	

Course Readings

Most required readings for this class are available on course Compass. In addition students may wish to purchase (optional) the following or refer to them via library. With the exception of the first one the rest should be on reserve at CPL for this class.

- [*Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism, Second Edition \(2010\). The New Social Theory Reader*](#) 2001, (eds.) Steven Seidmann and Jeffrey Alexander. New York: Routledge.
- *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, 2007 (1995), (eds.) Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. New York: Routledge.
- *Contemporary Sociological Theory and its Classical Roots*, 2007, (ed.) George Ritzer. New York: McGraw Hill.
- *Blackwell City Reader* 2002, (eds.) Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. 1987. Friedmann, John. Princeton: NJ: Princeton University Press.

The CPL library will also have on reserve the three volumes edited by Jean Hiller and Patsy Healey (eds.) 2008. *Foundations of the Planning Enterprise: Critical Essays in Planning Theory*, volumes I, II and II. Hampshire: Ashgate. [Please note: In this syllabus the volume is referred to as *H&H*.]

An excellent resource is available to students through the Center for Criticism and Interpretive Theory's course titled The Modern Critical Theory Lecture Series <http://criticism.english.illinois.edu/MCT.htm> All readings are available on their website and some of the lectures are recorded and available to public. I strongly suggest you take advantage of this resource.

Academic Integrity

Cheating and plagiarism of any kind will be investigated and penalized in accord with Rule 33 (Academic Integrity) of the University's Code of Policies and Regulations Pertaining to All Students. (This may be found at the following URL: www.uiuc.edu/admin_manual/code/rule_33.html). The definitions of plagiarism contained in Rule 33 include papers or portions of papers purchased or otherwise plagiarized from Internet sources. You should note that penalties include failing the course and having a letter inserted into your permanent file. All students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the Code's definitions of infractions of academic integrity.

Respect in the classroom and other learning environments

By enrolling in a course at the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, students agree to be responsible for maintaining a respectful environment in all DURP activities, including lectures, discussions, labs, projects, and extracurricular programs. We will be governed by the University Student Code. See Student Code Article 1—Student Rights and Responsibilities, Part 1. Student Rights: §1-102 http://www.admin.uiuc.edu/policy/code/article_1/a1_1-102.html

Referencing style

For APA style, consult with:

<http://www.uwsp.edu/psych/apa4b.htm>

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_apa.html

For MLA style, consult with: <http://webster.comnet.edu/mla/index.shtml>

For some general help with your writing style see: <http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/style.html>

Course in a Glance

I. Overview

Wk1. 1/26 Introduction: What is theory?

Wk 2. 1/28 What is Planning Theory?

II. Modernism and the Scientific Paradigm

Wk 3. 2/4 Planning as a Rational Scientific Management

Wk 4. 2/11 Rational Comprehensive and Synoptic Planning

Wk. 5. 2/18 Modernity and Planning

III. Taking a Standpoint

Wk 6. 2/25 Neo-Marxism and the City

Wk.7. 3/3 (Neo)Marxism and Planning

Wk 8. 3/10 Feminism and Planning

Wk 9. 3/17 Post-Modernism and Planning

SPRING BREAK

Wk 10. 3/29 Post-Structuralism and Critical Social Theory

Wk 11. 4/7 Communicative and Collaborative Planning

IV. The Normative Turn in Social Theory and Planning

Wk 12. 4/14 Difference, Justice and Ethics

Wk 13. 4/21 Post-Colonialism and Post-Colonial Critique of Planning Theories

Wk 14. 4/28 Synthesis Discussion

Wk 15. 5/3 If need be

Weekly Schedule of Readings

UP 580 Advanced Planning Theory
Professor Miraftab

I. Overview

Wk1. Introduction:

Introduction to the three volumes JH and PH (pp. ix-xxvii)

Wk 2. The Project of Planning Theory: What is Planning Theory?

H&H intro to vol 1

Friedmann, J. (1996). *Planning in the Public Domain*. Chapter 1 and 2, The Terrain of Planning Theory; Two Centuries of Planning Theory: an Overview.

Wildavsky, A. (1973). If Planning is Everything Maybe it's Nothing. *Policy Sciences*, **4**, 127-153.

Webber, M. M. and Rittel, H. (1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences*, **4**, 155-169.

Further readings:

Fainstein, S. (2005). "Planning Theory and the City." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* **25**: 121-130.

Beauregard, R. A. (2001). The Multiplicities of Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. **20**(4), 437-39.

Faludi, A. (Ed.) (1973b). 'What is Planning Theory?' in *A Reader in Planning Theory*, Pergamon, Oxford, 1-10.

Breheny, M. J. (1983). A Practical View of Planning Theory. *Environment and Planning B: Planning Design*. **10**, 101-15.

Faludi, A. (1973). Chapter 1. The Problem of Planning Theory. *Planning Theory*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 3-20.

Friedmann, J. (1995). Teaching Planning Theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. **14**(3), 156-62.

Gregory, D. (1994). *Geographical Imaginations*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Healey, P., McDougall, G., and Thomas, M. (1982). Theoretical Debates in Planning: Towards a Coherent Dialogue. In *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s*, eds. P. Healey, G. McDougall and M. Thomas. New York: Pergamon Press. 5-22.

Hudson, B. M. 1979. Comparisons of Current Planning Theory: Counterparts and Contradictions. *APA Journal*. 387-406.

McDowell, L. 1995. Chapter 17. Understanding Diversity: The Problem of/for "Theory." In *Geographies of Global Change: Remapping the World in the Late Twentieth Century*, eds R. J. Johnston, P. J. Taylor and M. J. Watts. Oxford: Blackwell. 280-94.

Sager, T. 1995. Teaching Planning Theory as Order or Fragments. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. **14**(3), 166-72.

II. Modernism and the Scientific Paradigm

Wk 3. Planning as a Rational Scientific Management

H&H intro to volume 1 part 3

McLoughlin, J. B. (1969) 'The Guidance and Control of Change: physical planning as the control of complex systems' in *Urban and Regional Planning: A Systems Approach*, Faber and Faber, London, 75-91.

Faludi, A. (1973) 'The Rationale of Planning Theory' in *Planning Theory*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 35-53.

Dyckman, J. (1966) Social planning, social planners and planned societies, *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 32, 66-76.

Further readings

Davidoff, P. and Reiner, T. A. (1962) A choice theory of planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 28, [reprinted in Faludi A. 1973, *A Reader in Planning Theory*, Pergamon, Oxford: 11-39].

Alexander, E. 1994. The Non-Euclidean Mode of Planning: What is It to Be? *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 60(3), 372-76.

Etzioni, A. 1968. *The Active Society: A Theory of Society and Political Process*. New York: Free Press.

Faludi, A. 1996. Rationality, Critical Rationalism, and Planning Doctrine. In *Explorations in Planning Theory*, eds. S. Mandelbaum, L. Mazza, and R. Burchell. New Brunswick: Center for Urban Policy Research. 65-82.

Faludi, A. 1973. Chapter 2. The Underlying Theory Models. *Planning Theory*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 21-31.

Friedmann, J. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 3: planning as social reform; Chapter 4 planning as policy analysis; Chapter 5 planning as social learning; and Appendix A planning as a form of scientific management pp. 421-435.

Friedmann, J. 1993. Toward a Non-Euclidean Mode of Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 59(4), 482-5.

Flyvbjerg, B. 1998. *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hoch, C. 2007. Making Plans: Representation and Intention. *Planning Theory*. 6(1), 16-35.

Hopkins, Lew. 2001. Planning as Science: Engaging Disagreement. *Journal of planning education and research* 20: 399-406.

Hull, A., and Vigar, G. 2001. Structures and Processes in Strategic Spatial Plan Preparation: The Participatory Agenda. In *The Governance of Place: Space and Planning Processes*, eds. A. Madanipour, A. Hull, and P. Healey. Aldershot: Ashgate. 203-21.

Khisty, C. J. 2000. Can wicked problems be tackled through abductive reasoning? *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*. September pp. 104-118.

Lindblom, C. 1973 [1959]. The Science of Muddling Through. In *A Reader in Planning Theory*, ed. A. Faludi. New York: Pergamon Press. 151-69.

Mandelbaum, Seymour 1972. A complete general theory of planning is impossible." *Policy Sciences* 11. pp. 59-71.

Moore, Terry. 1978. "Why allow planners do what they do? A Justification from Economic Theory." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 44(4): 387-398.

- Perloff, H. 1957. *Education for Planning: City, State, and Regional*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.
- Rittel, H., and Webber, M. 1973. Dilemmas in General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences*. 4(2), 155-69.
- Sanyal, B. 2005. Planning as Anticipation of Resistance. *Planning Theory*. 4(3), 225-45.
- Thomas, M. 1982. The Procedural Planning Theory of A. Faludi. In *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*, ed. C. Paris. Oxford: Pergamon. 13-25.
- Webber, M. M. 1983. The Myth of Rationality Reconsidered: Development Planning Reconsidered. *Environment and Planning B: Planning Design*. 10, 89-99.

Wk. 4 Rational-Comprehensive and Synoptic Planning

- Sen Amartya. 1977. Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 6(4): 317-344
- Alexander, Ernest R. 2000. "Rationality Revisited: Planning Paradigms in a Post-Postmodernist Perspective." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(3):242-256
- Mandelbaum, Seymour. 1979. A Complete General Theory of Planning is Impossible. *Policy Sciences* 11(1):59-71.
- Fischer, Frank. 1991. Risk assessment and environmental crisis: toward an integration of science and participation . *Organization & Environment* 5: 113-132. [also in *Planning Theory* (eds.) Cambell and Fainstain pp. 485].

Further readings

- Faludi, A. 1973. Chapter 2. The Underlying Theory Models. *Planning Theory*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 21-31.
- Thomas, M. 1982. The Procedural Planning Theory of A. Faludi. In *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*, ed. C. Paris. Oxford: Pergamon. 13-25.
- Hoch, Charles. "Research and Rationality." *What Planners Do*. Chapter 4.
- Greenwood, Ernest. "Relationship of Science to the Practice Professions." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 24:4.
- Donaghy, Kieran and Lewis Hopkins. 2006. Coherentist Theories of Planning are Possible and Useful. *Planning Theory* (5):173 - 202.

Wk. 5 Modernity and Planning

- Scott, J. C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapters 1,2,3 and 4.
- Legates, R. T., and Stout, F. 2000. Modernism and Early Urban Planning, 1870-1940. In *The City Reader*, second edition, eds. R. T. Legates and F. Stout. London: Routledge. 299-313.

Further readings

- Holston, J. 1989. *The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasília*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 31-98 (it also appears in Blackwell city reader Pp. 513-)
- Escobar, A. 1992. Planning. In *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, ed. W. Sachs. London: Zed Books. 132-45.
- Yiftachel, O. 1995. The Dark Side of Modernism: Planning as Control of an Ethnic Minority. In *Postmodern Cities and Space*, eds. S. Watson and K. Gibson. Oxford: Blackwell. 216-42. [Yiftachel: dark side of modernism.... in *Blackwell City reader*]
- Flybjerg, Bent Nils Bruzelius, Werner Rothengatter. 2003. *Megaprojects and Risk: an Anatomy of Ambition*
- Frayne, B. 2000. Political Ideology, Social Change, and Planning Practice in Namibia. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 20(1), 52-65.

Hall, P. 1980. *Great Planning Disasters*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Holston, J. 1989. Chapter 4. The Death of the Street. *The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 101-44.

Sandercock, L. 1998. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons. 32-83.

Sandercock, L. 2003. *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities in the 21st Century*. London: Continuum.

III. The Critical Turn in Social Theory and Planning

Wk 6. Neo-Marxism and the City

In *The New Social Theory Reader* (2001) Steven Seidmann and Jeffrey Alexander, Introduction (Pp.1-26)

In *Blackwell City Reader*:

Introduction to part II and Chapters 14 and 15. Reading Urban Economies. Harvey and Castells (pp. 107- 146).

Dear, Michael and Allen Scott 1981. "Towards a Framework for Analysis" in (eds.) Michael Dear and Allen Scott *Urbanization and Urban Planning in capitalist Society*. New York: Methuen & Co ltd. Pp. 3-18

Also see *Contemporary Sociological Theory and its Classical Roots* (2007). George Ritzer, Marx Capitalism to Communism (pp. 19-27).

Supporting resource:

On line lectures by Harvey on Marx and capital <http://www.indymedia.ie/article/88015> and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qOP2V_np2c0

Further readings:

Castells, M. 1972. *City, Class, and Power*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Castells, M. 1977. *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Harvey, D. 1973. *Social Justice and the City*. London: Edward Arnold. 50-95.

Castells, M. 1983. *The City and the Grassroots*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 289-336.

Dear, Michael and Allen Scott 1981. "Towards a Framework for Analysis" in (eds.) Michael Dear and Allen Scott *Urbanization and Urban Planning in capitalist Society*. New York: Methuen & Co ltd. Pp. 3-18.

Wk 7. Neo-Marxism and Planning

In *H&H* intro to volume 2 and intro to vol2 part 1.

Susan Fainstein and Norman Fainstein (1979) New debates in urban planning: the impact of Marxist theory in the United States. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 3, 381-403. (in JH and PH)

David Harvey (1985) 'On planning the ideology of planning', Chapter 7 in Harvey, D. (1985) *The Urbanisation of Capital*, Blackwells, Oxford. Pp. 165-184 (in JH and PH)

Norm Krumholz (1994), 'Dilemmas of Equity Planning: a personal memoir', *Planning Theory*, Vol 10/11, pp. 45-56 (in JH and PH)

Further readings:

- Campbell, Heather. 2008. "Middle-class Places...and the Dangers of Leaving Economics to Economists." *Planning Theory & Practice* 9 (1):??
- Clavel, P. 1983. *Opposition Planning in Wales and Appalachia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Friedmann, J. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Chapter 6 Planning as Social Mobilization, pp. 225-308. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Davidoff, P. (1965) 'Advocacy and pluralism in planning' *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 31, 331-8.
- Dear, Michael and Allen Scott (eds.) 1981. *Urbanization and Urban Planning in capitalist Society*. New York: Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Goodman, R. 1971. *After the Planners*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Krumholz, N., and Forester, J. 1990. *Making Equity Planning Work: Leadership in the Public Sector*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Needleman, J., and Needleman, C. E. 1974. *Guerrillas in the Bureaucracy*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Peattie, L. R. 1968. Reflections on Advocacy Planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 34(2), 80-88.
- Piven, F. F., Arnstein, S. R., Davidoff, P., Davidoff, L., Funnyé, C., and Hartman, C. W. 1972. Symposium on Advocacy Planning: Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve? In *The View from Below: Urban Politics and Social Policy*, eds. S. S. Fainstein and N. I. Fainstein. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 228-64.
- Scott, Allen and S.T. Roweis (1977) Urban planning in theory and practice: a reappraisal. *Environment and Planning A*, 9, 1097-1119.

Wk 8. Feminism and Planning

- In *Contemporary Sociological Theory and its Classical Roots* (2007). George Ritzer.. Chapter 8 Feminist theories (pp. 185-214).
- Sandercock, L. and Forsyth, A. 1993. Feminism Theory and Planning Theory: The Epistemological Linkages. *Planning Theory*. 7(8), 45-7.
- Fainstein, S. S. 2005. Feminism and Planning: Theoretical Issues. In *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, eds. S. Fainstein and L. Servon. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 120-138.

Further readings:

- Hayden, D. 2005. What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work. In *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, eds. S. S. Fainstein and L. J. Servon. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 47-64.
- Blunt, A., and Rose, G. 1994. *Writing Women and Space: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Fainstein, S. S. and L. J. Servon (eds.) 2005. *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, eds. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Fenster, T. ed. 1999. *Gender, Planning and Human Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Greed, C. 1994. *Women and Planning: Creating Gendered Realities*. London: Routledge.
- Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McDowell, L. 1999. *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Miranne, K. B., and Young, A. H. eds. 2000. *Gendering the City: Women, Boundaries, and Visions of Urban Life*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Moser, C. O. N. 1993. Chapter 5. Towards Gender Planning: A New Planning Tradition and Planning Methodology. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice, and Training*. London: Routledge. 83-107.

Rose, G. 1993. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits to Geographical Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sandercock, L., and Forsyth, A. 1992. A Gender Agenda: New Directions for Planning Theory. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 58(1), 49-59.

Wilson, E. 1991. *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women*. London: Virago.

Wk 9. Post-Modernism and Planning

In H&H intro to volume 2 part 2

In *The New Social Theory Reader* (2001) Steven Seidmann and Jeffrey Alexander, Chapter 16 David Harvey (1982) "The conditions of post modernity" (pp. 176-183).

In *Contemporary Sociological Theory and its Classical Roots*, George Ritzer 2007. Chapter 9 Postmodern Grand Theories (pp. 210-252)

In *Foundations of the Planning Enterprise* (2008) Volume 2 part ii
12. (in JH and PH)

Beauregard, R. A. (1989) Between modernity and postmodernity: the ambiguous position of US planning". *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 7, 381-395. (in the Blackwell city reader pp. 502

Milroy, B. M. 1991. Into Postmodern Weightlessness. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 10(3), 181-87.

Further readings:

Dear, Micheal (1986) 'Postmodernism and planning', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 4: 367-384. (In *Foundations of the Planning Enterprise* (2008) Volume 2 part ii)

Harper, T. L. and Stein, S. M. 1995. Out of the Postmodern Abyss: Preserving the Rational for Liberal Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 14(4), 233-44.

hooks, b. 1990. Chapter 3. Postmodern Blackness. In *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. 23-31.

Manning Thomas, June (1994) Planning history and the black urban experience: linkages and contemporary implications, *Journal of Planning Education & Research*, 14, 1-11.

Sandercock, L. 1998. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Soja, E. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.

Watson, S., and Gibson, K. eds. 1995. *Postmodern Cities and Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Beauregard, R. 1991. Without a Net: Modernist Planning and the Postmodern Abyss. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 10(3), 189-94.

Alexander, Earnest 2000. "Rationality revisited: planning paradigms in a post modern perspective," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 19. pp. 242-256.

SPRING BREAK

Wk 10. Post-Structuralism and Critical Social Theory

In *H&H* intro to volume 3 and to vol 3 part 1 and vol 3 part 2.

Introduction, Chapters 1 and 2 in Patsy Healey's book Collaborative Planning.

Extract on Habermas from D. Mann's book.

Further Readings:

In *The New Social Theory Reader* (2001) Steven Seidmann and Jeffrey Alexander Chapter 1 Jurgen Habermas, Communicative action. (pp 30-38)

Chapter 5 Foucault, Power/ knowledge (pp. 68-75)

In *Culture and Society: Contemporary Debates*. (1990) Jeffrey Alexander and Steven Seidmann

Chapter 3 Antonio Gramsci, Culture and Ideological Hegemony (pp. 47-54)

Chapter 30 Modernity versus post modernity, Jurgen Habermas. (Pp. 342-354.)

Wk 11. Communicative and Collaborative Planning

Healey, P'. 1992b. Planning through debate: The communicative turn in planning theory. *Town Planning Review* 63(2): 143-162.

Innes, J and Booher D (1999) Consensus-building as role-playing and bricolage *Journal of the American Planning Association* 65, 9-26 (in JH and PH)

Alexander, E.R. 1988. "After Rationality." *Society* 26(1):15-19.

Huxley, M., and Yiftachel, O. 2000. New Paradigm or Old Myopia? Unsettling the Communicative Turn in Planning Theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 19(4), 333-42.

Further readings:

Xavier de Souza Briggs communication in community building JPER 1998.

Patsy Healey (1997) Chapter 8, 9 and 10 from *Collaborative planning: shaping places in fragmented societies*, London, Macmillan, pp. 243-339.

Forester, John. 1982. "Planning in the Face of Power." *Journal of American Planning Association* 48 (1): 67-89.

Fischler, R. (2000) Communicative planning theory: a Foucauldian assessment. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19, 358-368.

Rydin, Y. 2007. Re-Examining the Role of Knowledge Within Planning Theory. *Planning Theory* 6(1), 52-68.

Flyvbjerg, B. 1998. *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Forester, J. 1989. *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Friedmann, J. 1973. *Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Healey, P. 1997. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Healey, P. 1999. Institutional Analysis, Communicative Planning and Shaping Places. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 19, 111-21.
- Huxley, M. 2000. The Limits to Communicative Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 19(4), 369-77.
- Innes, J. E. 2004. Consensus Building: Clarification for the Critics. *Planning Theory*. 3(1), 5-20.
- Innes, J. E. 1995. Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 14(3), 183-89.
- Lauria, M. 2000. Introduction to the Symposium: The Limits to Communicative Planning Theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 19(4), 331-2.
- Neuman, M. 2000. Communicate This! *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 19(4), 343-50.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 2005. Out of closet: the importance of stories and story telling in planning practice" in (eds.) Stiffel, Bruce and Vanessa Watson Dialogues in urban and regional planning volume 1 London and New York: Routledge. Pp. 299-321.

IV. The Normative Turn in Social Theory and Planning

Wk 12. Difference, Justice and Ethics

- Young, Iris M. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Introduction, Chapter 2, pp. 3-14, 39-65, and last chapter.
- Stanley Stein and Thomas Harper, 2005. "Rawls's Justice as Fairness: A Moral Basis for Contemporary Planning Theory." *Planning Theory* 4(2): 147-172.
- McConnell, Sean 1995. "Rawlsian Planning Theory" in (ed.) Sue Hendler *Planning Ethics*. Pp. 30-48.

Recommended readings:

- Blanco, Hilda 1995. "Community and the Four Jewels of Planning" in (ed.) Sue Hendler *Planning Ethics*. Pp. 66-82.

Further readings:

- Oelofse, Mike. 2003. "Social Justice, Social Integration and the Compact City: Lessons from the Inner City of Johannesburg," in Philip Harrison, Marie Huchzermeyer and Mzwanele Mayekiso (eds.) *Confronting Fragmentation: Housing and Urban Development in a Democratizing Society*. Cape Town: Cape Town University Press. (pp. 88-105).
- Sandercock, Leonie 1998. "The Theory That Difference Makes," in *Towards Cosmopolis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Campbell, H. and Marshall, R.J. (1999) Ethical frameworks and planning theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, **23**, 464-478. (in JH and PH)
- Harper, Thomas and Stanley Stein 1995. "Contemporary Procedural Ethical Theory and Planning Theory" in (ed.) Sue Hendler *Planning Ethics*. Pp. 49-65.
- Lefebvre Henry. *Right to the city*

Wachs, Martin (ed). 1985. *Ethics in Planning*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University. Chapters 4, 5, 10, 14, pp. 70-117, 193-215, 259-287.

Watson, Vanessa. 2006. "Deep Difference: Diversity Planning and Ethics." *Planning Theory* 5(1): 31-50.

In *The New Social Theory Reader* (2001) Steven Seidmann and Jeffrey Alexander

John Rawls, Chapter 10, political liberalism (pp. 123-128)

Nancy Fraser, Chapter 29, from redistribution to recognition. (pp. 285-293)

Will Kymlicka, Chapter 20, Multicultural Citizenship (pp. 212-222.)

Wk 13. Post-Colonialism and Post Colonial Critique of Planning Theories

H&H Intro to vol 3 part 3

*Ania Loomba 1998. *Colonialism and Post Colonialism*, NY: Routledge. Pp.i-69.

In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (2007, 1995) Bill Ashcroft et al. (eds.)

*Ashcroft et al., General intro, intro to second edition and introduction to part 1. Pp. 1-8 and pp. 9-13.

Spivak, Can subaltern speak? Chapter 4, Pp. 28-37.

*Edward Said, Orientalism. Chapter 3, pp. 24-27 and Chapter 16. pp. 95-98.

*Franz Fanon, The fact of blackness. Chapter 66 pp. 291-294.

Foucault

Miraftab, f. (2009). Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South. *Planning Theory* 2009.

Roy, A. 2006. Praxis in the Time of Empire. *Planning Theory*. 5(1), 7-29.

Yiftachel, O. 2006. Re-Engaging Planning Theory? Towards 'South-Eastern' Perspectives. *Planning Theory*. 5(3), 211-22.

Further reading

Mbembe, Achille and Sarah Nuttall. 2004. "Writing the World from an African Metropolis" *Public Culture* 16(3):347-372.

Watson, Vanessa. 2003. "Conflicting Rationalities: Implications for Planning Theory and Ethics." *Planning Theory & Practice* 4(4): 395.

Watson, Vanessa. 2002. "The Usefulness of Normative Planning Theories in the Context of Sub-Saharan Africa." *Planning Theory* 1(1):27-

Wk 14. Readings of Choice

CRITICAL PRAGMATISM

See part II in Volume 2 of the Hillier and Healey (eds.) *Critical Essays in Planning Theory*. Including contributions by Donald Schon: from technical rationality to reflection-in-Action; Verma: pragmatic rationality; Forester: understanding planning practice: an empirical, practical and normative account; and Hoch: pragmatic inquiry.

NEW INSTITUTIONALISM and PLANNING

See volume edited by Niraj Verma on Institutions and Planning. In particular intro by Niraj Verma and chapter by Mike Titz. Also see Alexander on transaction cost theory and Patsy Healy the chapter on institutions in her collaborative planning book.

PLANNING ETHICS

See volume edited by Sue Hendler titled planning ethics.

PLANNING CULTURES

Kudva, Neema (forthcoming). Teaching Planning, Constructing Theory. *Planning Theory and Practice*.

Sanyal, Bish 2005. "Hybrid Planning Cultures: the Search for the Global; Cultural Commons," in (ed.) Bish Sanyal *Comparative Planning Cultures*. Pp. 3-38.

John Friedmann's Planning Culture in Transition

INSURGENT PLANNING

See Special issue of Planning Theory 2009 issue 1.(ask me for a copy of the forthcoming volume). Also see

Beard, V. A. 2003. Learning Radical Planning: The Power of Collective Action. *Planning Theory*. 2(1), 13-35.

Miraftab, F., and Wills, S. 2005. Insurgency and Spaces of Active Citizenship: The Story of Western Cape Anti-eviction Campaign in South Africa. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 25(2), 200-17.

Beard, V. A. 2002. Covert Planning for Social Transformation in Indonesia. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 22(1), 15-25.

=====

FURTHER READINGS

On pragmatism and planning: intro to vol 2 part 3 in H&H

Clavel, P. 1983. Chapter 6. Planning. *Oppositional Planning in Wales and Appalachia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 177-212.

Douglass, M. 1999. Geographies of Resilience: Slums, Squatters, and Community-State Relations in Seoul and Bangkok. *Plurimondi*. 1(2), 213-33.

Friedmann, John. 2002. *The Prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis/ London: University of Minnesota Press.

Grabow, S., and Heskin, A. 1973. Foundations for a Radical Concept of Planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 106-14.

Kraushaar, R. 1988. Outside the Whale: Progressive Planning and the Dilemmas of Radical Reform. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 54(1), 91-100.

Kenney, M. R. 1998. Chapter 5. Remember, Stonewall was a Riot: Understanding Gay and Lesbian Experience in the City. In *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, ed., L. Sandercock. Berkeley: University of California Press. 120-32.

Leavitt, J. 1994. Planning in the Age of Rebellion: Guidelines to Activist Research and Applied Planning. *Planning Theory*. 10-11, 111-29.

Rangan, H. 1999. Bitter-Sweet Liaisons in a Contentious Democracy: Radical Planning Through State Agency in Postcolonial India. *Plurimondi*. 1(2), 47-66.

- Sandercock, Leonie. 1998a. "Framing Insurgent Historiographies for Planning" in Leonie Sandercock (ed.) *Making the Invisible Visible: a Multicultural Planning History*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/New York: University of California Press.
- Scheyvens, R. 1998. Subtle Strategies for Women's Empowerment: Planning for Effective Grassroots Development. *Third World Planning Review*. 20(3), 235-53.
- Wekerle, G. 1999. Gender Planning and Insurgent Citizenship: Stories from Toronto. *Plurimondi* 1(2), 105-26.