

**CRP 8100 Seminar in Advanced Planning Theory (4 Credit Hours)**

Meeting time and place: Mondays and Wednesdays, 2:55 – 4:10 PM, Room 318 W. Sibley

Instructors: Kieran Donaghy, Room 315, W. Sibley, 607-254-4865, [kpd23@cornell.edu](mailto:kpd23@cornell.edu),

Office hours: Mondays 12:30 to 2:30 PM and by appointment

**Preliminaries**

The activity of *planning* consists in determining *who* is to do *what*, *when* and *where*, and by *how much* in order to bring about some intended future outcome. *Everybody* plans, from strategists of operations spanning continents and decades to homeless persons worrying about where their next meal will come from. In academic programs of city and regional planning we tend to be concerned with planning that affects settlement systems and the welfare of people residing in them.

There are at least two types of *theories*: causal explanations and justifications. Such theories may explain phenomena that are relatively more observable in terms of causal factors that are relatively less observable or they may provide reasons or justifications for particular conventions, value judgments, or perspectives. These theories answer ‘why’ questions—such as, ‘Why did leap-frog development of building lots occur in Los Angeles in the 1930s?’ or ‘Why should certain aesthetic standards or progressive income tax rates be instituted, observed or respected?’

Other forms of theories might also include coherent frameworks of non-predictive interpretations of behavior (e.g. learning by trial and error). Such interpretations answer not so much ‘why?’ but ‘how’ or ‘what’ questions. Examples are ‘Just what is happening in the informal public spaces of Ithaca?’ or ‘What is the meaning of an historic text or the intent of a piece of legislation?’ or ‘What do certain actors (e.g., members of ‘Occupy Wall Street’ or ‘Black Lives Matter’) understand themselves to be doing when they engage in certain practices?’ In this seminar we will be concerned with explanations, justifications, *and* interpretations.

What counts as a good or adequate theory varies with the field of inquiry and depends in part on the needs of its intended audience. It is arguable that a necessary, if not sufficient, condition for effective planning is the availability of good theories of *both* planning behavior (e.g., *explanations* of conditions under which planning is likely to succeed, *justifications* of, say, behavioral conventions to be followed by planners, or *interpretations* of social dynamics) *and* the workings of interdependent systems (e.g., the economy, social institutions, the political system, ecosystems) in which planning interventions are being considered. Of course, plans may fail for many reasons other than the adequacy of the explanations, justifications, and interpretations to which they appeal. Plans may fail because *planners* fail to pay close enough attention to, or ‘read’ or interpret correctly, what is transpiring in a given situation.

**Objective and Plan of the Seminar**

A major objective of the present seminar is to promote thinking about what work planning theory (really, a corpus of theories) should do, what its (or their) scope should be, and how theorizing should proceed. The qualifier ‘advanced’ in the seminar’s title partly reflects the fact that we are reaching beyond material covered in a typical introductory master’s degree level planning theory course. We will focus largely on planning theory *itself* and only to a lesser extent, at the end of the semester, on substantive matters that planning theories seek to explain, justify, or interpret.

We begin by considering recent writings by planning academics on what the distinguishing features of the planning enterprise are, what the intellectual heritage of planning theory has been, what role it plays in planning education, and (lamentably) what tenuous position the discipline of planning holds in the academic community. We will also consider how planning scholarship does or should engage with professional practice.

With this characterization before us, we'll take a step backwards—or move to a higher level of abstraction—and examine several different ways that philosophers of the natural and social sciences view 'progress' in the development of theories and the ways that theories can function. While clearly we cannot settle any of the debates in this contested area, we can at least take stock of positions that are relevant to the planning discipline.

In the balance of the seminar we will examine a series of questions that lend structure to or frame substantive issues and then consider recent academic planning scholarship—on planning for climate adaptation, greater social equity, and urban informality—in which authors self-consciously use planning theory to structure, conduct, and interpret their analyses. The questions we will examine include:

- How might theories of interpretation help us to assess narrative and performative qualities of planning practice?
- What models of rationality might help us make sense of planning behavior?
- How might the pragmatist tradition inform planning practice and possibilities?
- How might we analyze argumentation in planning and public policy arenas?
- How has modernism shaped our understanding of planning and planning research?
- How might theories of justice, power, and participation inform planning possibilities?
- How might we identify public interests and validate value judgments?
- What global imperatives do we face as planners (and world citizens) committed to sustainable development and the eradication of poverty?
- How might we understand not just the purposes but the craft and discipline of academic writing and the ethos of the peer review process?
- How might we assess the relative merits of different political configurations of societies?

Other advanced theory seminars led by other professors in other doctoral programs would likely be—and are—organized around a different set of questions. Let me offer some motivation for the selection I have made.

Part of what we do when we engage in planning is to try to determine how, by intervening in the workings of various systems, we might change the likely course of events to arrive at alternative futures (other 'possible worlds'). When we do so we make assumptions about the predictability of systems and individual behavior—i.e., about *systems rationality* and the *rationality of individual actors*. Upon examining some of these assumptions closely, we may find that they appear to be increasingly difficult to hold, and their slippery nature imperils other working assumptions of planners and planning theorists.

Practical rationality involves at least as much problem-framing as problem-solving; reasoning about what to do, in other words, depends on prior reasoning, perception and what Aristotelians call "discernment" regarding what's going on and what's problematic in the first place.

Because we might aspire to develop planning theories that help us understand how planners frame and reframe problems, how planners learn in the face of complexity and plurality, and how planners then seek to link knowledge and action, we will explore the legacy of pragmatism and the challenge of articulating a critical rather than an expedient pragmatism.

According to Aristotle, the ability to plan is what distinguishes human beings from other animals. On his view, we have engaged in planning as long as our species has existed. Yet, professional planning, particularly in the west, is viewed as a modernist enterprise that is locked into a dated set of inappropriate philosophical assumptions. To better situate contemporary professional planning within the spectrum of available intellectual traditions, we will examine the co-evolution of the sciences with political and cultural institutions in the development of modernism.

Power relations—legitimate and illegitimate—suffuse institutions and enable societies to operate in an orderly fashion and be governable. But the exercise of institutionalized power also oppresses minorities, excludes them from meaningful political participation, and denies them access to basic social goods. Power relations can also favor reproduction of grossly unequal allocations of resources, opportunities, and influence. When planners analyze the exercise of power in their communities, use their positions to attempt to right social wrongs, and broaden the base of participation in decisions affecting residents' lives, they need to be mindful of what theoretical frameworks they are invoking, what these frameworks enable them to see, and what these frameworks mask or obscure. So we will examine some perspectives on justice, power, and participation that planning professionals and academics have found influential and instructive about promising courses of action.

In planning we evaluate states of affairs that can result from plan implementation. When we do so, we proceed as if we have acceptable answers to a number of difficult questions that haunt applied ethics and welfare economics. To make headway, we must first determine where we stand on the question of whether or not value judgments can be inter-subjectively validated and truly *public* interests can be identified. If we hold to the affirmative position, it is incumbent upon us to spell out how such judgments and interests are possible in theory and recognizable in practice. This question, which lies at the heart of the so-called 'post-modernity crisis,' leads us to confront such further issues as if and how we can ever overcome our cultural and temporal situatedness to make valid assumptions about the preferences and values of others, and under what conditions meaningful agreement is at all possible.

Globalization has raised challenging issues for planners as practitioners, academics, and citizens that span continents and generations, requiring us to come to terms with human rights violations, environmental degradation, and persistent poverty within analytical frameworks that are less parochial and short-term and more global and long-term. We may find helpful recent works by development economists who introduce distinctions and arguments that enable us to see better our responsibilities as planning professionals and citizens and to act upon them appropriately.

In so far as progress in theory in any academic discipline takes place through the advancement, careful consideration, and revision of arguments, we need to pay particular attention to the ways in which arguments are made and how they can succeed or fail in discussions of planning issues. We also need to consider how arguments can succeed or fail in practical settings and in the context of academic writing. And, from the other side of the page, so to speak, we need to understand our obligations as readers and reviewers of academic writing.

Three substantive issues that have garnered much attention from planning professionals and academics alike in recent years—in no small part because of the urgency of matters with which they are associated—are climate adaptation, social equity, and the growing presence of urban informality. We will use these issues to examine how planning academics are bringing planning theory to bear in framing empirical analyses and eliciting lessons from and for professional practice.

Finally, planning theory has always embodied certain utopian strains of thought. Surely, engaging in planning embodies an act of faith in the potential of societies to make *progress* of some sort. (Otherwise, we would only engage in it because of some deep-seated anthropological compulsion.) *Which dimensions* we should be progressing along, *how we should measure and weight* progress along these dimensions, and *what political configurations* are most favorable to social progress are questions that lack obvious answers. So we conclude the course by considering a modern utopian tale that probes these matters in some depth but with a light touch.

### **Seminar Organization**

We shall meet twice a week and, as much as possible, in true seminar fashion. (The relative inaccessibility of some of the readings will probably entail that some background lecture material be introduced in places.) Because we are relatively few in number, conscientious preparation and active participation each week will be important for the seminar to succeed. At the close of each meeting, I will suggest a path to follow through the readings assigned for the next meeting, and at the beginning of each meeting I'll attempt to motivate the discussion of a number of salient points. But what gets transacted between the beginning and close of each meeting will be determined largely by the seminar participants.

There will be two short papers assigned that will fall due in late October and at the end of term. Grades will be determined on the basis of preparation, participation, and the quality of written work submitted.

### **Prerequisites**

There are no explicit prerequisites for this seminar, but students who have not taken at least an introductory course in planning theory may find themselves further out at sea than they find comfortable.

### **Academic Integrity**

Each student in this course is expected to abide by the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity. (See <http://www.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/docs/main.html>.) Any work submitted by a student in this course for academic credit must be the student's own.

### **Texts**

The following texts have been ordered from the campus bookstore.

Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, *The Craft of Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Steven Lukes, *The Curious Enlightenment of Professor Caritat*, London: Verso, 1995.

Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press and Harvard University Press, 2009.

Stephen Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Copies of these books and all assigned texts not included in them will be placed on reserve in the Fine Arts Library, temporarily located in the basement of East Sibley Hall. Most assigned texts will also be available from the seminar Blackboard site.

### **Meetings and Readings**

8/23 Organizational Meeting

8/28 Views of Planning, Planning theory and Planning Education from within the Profession

“Anchor Points for Planning's Identification,” Comments Section of the *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **16**, 1997, pp. 223-228.

Lewis D. Hopkins, "Planning as Science: Engaging Disagreement," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **20**, 2001, pp.399-406.

Linda C. Dalton, "Weaving the Fabric of Planning as Education," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **20**, 2001, pp.423-436.

Ann Forsyth, "Commentary: Alternative Cultures in Planning Research—From Extending Scientific Frontiers to Exploring Enduring Questions," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **32**, 2012, pp. 160-169.

Harvey Goldstein, "The Quality of Planning Scholarship and Doctoral Education," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **34**, 2012, pp. 493-495.

8/30 Engagement of Planning Scholarship with Practice

Andrew Whitmore, "Practitioners Theorize Too: Reaffirming Planning Theory in a Survey of Practitioners' Theories," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **35**, 2015, pp. 76-85.

Matti Siemiatycki, "The Role of Planning Scholar: Research, Conflict, and Social Change," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **32**, 2012, pp. 147-159.

Karen Christensen, "Both Process and Outcome are Essential to Planners," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **35**, 2013, pp. 188-198.

John Forester, "On The Theory and Practice of Interpretive Policy Analysis: From the Micro-Politics of Practice to Interpretive Analysis and Theorizing in Action," Keynote. Interpretive Policy Analysis Conference, Tilburg, Holland. July 5, 2012.

9/6 Models of Theory  
& 9/11

Richard W. Miller, *Fact and Method*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987, pp. 3-105.

9/13 The Work of Theory as Explanation and Justification

J. Runde, "Assessing Causal Explanations," *Oxford Economic Papers*, **50**, 1998, pp. 151-172.

Seymour Mandelbaum, "A Complete General Theory of Planning is Impossible," *Policy Sciences*, **11**, 1972, pp. 59-71.

Kieran P. Donaghy and Lewis D. Hopkins, "A Coherentist Approach to Planning Theories is Possible and Useful," *Planning Theory*, **5(2)**, 2006, pp. 173-202.

9/18 On Interpretation, Hermeneutics, Listening, and Narrative Analysis

Charles Taylor, "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," *Review of Metaphysics*, **25**, 1971, 3-51.

Robert Coles, "Stories and Theories," in his *The Call of Stories*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989, pp. 1-30.

Martha Nussbaum, "Finely Aware and Richly Responsible: Literature and the Moral Imagination" in her *Love's Knowledge*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 148-167.

(Suggested supplementary reading:

Susan Haack, "As for that Phrase "Studying in a Literary Spirit ...", in her *Manifesto of a Passionate Moderate*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998, pp. 48-68.)

9/20 On Performance and Ordinary Language Analysis

Gilbert Ryle, "Ordinary Language," *Philosophical Review*, **LXII**, 1953, 167-186.

John Austin, "Performative Utterances." in his *Philosophical Papers*, Oxford: Oxford U. Pr., 1961, pp. 220-239.

John Forester, "Envisioning Possibilities: How Humor and Irony Recognize Dignity and Build Power," Chapter 8 in *Dealing with Differences: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes*, New York: Oxford U. Press, 2009, pp. 155-173.

9/25 Models of Rationality

Amartya Sen, "Rational Fools," in Frank Hahn and Martin Hollis (eds.), *Philosophy and Economic Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979, pp. 87-109.

James G. March, "Bounded Rationality, Ambiguity, and the Engineering of Choice," *The Bell Journal of Economics*, **9**, 1978, pp. 587-608.

Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein, *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*, New York: Penguin Press, 2008, pp. 1-14.

(Suggested Supplementary reading:

Earnest Alexander, "Rationality Revisited: Planning Paradigms in a Post-Postmodern Perspective," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **19**, 2000, 242-256.)

9/27 Practical Rationality (I)

Rosalind Hursthouse, "XI – Practical Wisdom: A Mundane Account," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, **Vol. 106, Issue 1**, June 2006, 285-309.

Amartya Sen, "Reason and Objectivity," Chapter 2 in Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 31-51.

10/2 Practical Rationality (II)

Martha Nussbaum, "The Discernment of Perception: An Aristotelian Conception of Private and Public Rationality," in *Love's Knowledge*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 54-105.

John Forester, "Challenges of Mediation and Deliberation in the Design Professions," Chapter 3 in *The Deliberative Practitioner*, Cambridge: MIT Press. 1999. pp. 61-84.

10/4 Pragmatism and Critical Pragmatism: From Framing to Political Acknowledgement

Donald Schön, "The Structure of Reflection in Action," in his *The Reflective Practitioner*, New York: Basic Books, 1983, pp. 128-167.

John Forester, "From Good Intentions to a Critical Pragmatism," in Rachel Weber and Randall Crane, Eds., *Handbook of Urban Planning*, New York: Oxford U. Press. 2012, pp. 285-305.

[Note that the seminar will not meet on 10/09 during the fall break.]

10/11 Rationality and Argumentation

Wayne Booth et al., "Making a Claim and Supporting it," Part III of their *The Craft of Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995, pp. 85-148.

Des Gasper and Varkki George, "Analyzing Argumentation in Planning and Public Policy," *Environment and Planning B*, **25**, 1998, pp. 367-390.

(Suggested supplementary reading: Giandomenico Majone, "Policy Analysis and Public Deliberation," and "Analysis as Argument," in his *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, pp.1-41.)

10/16 Modernity and Postmodernity (I)

Stephen Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992, pp. 1-87.

10/18 Modernity and Postmodernity (II)

Stephen Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992, pp. 89-209.

10/23 Presentations of First Papers  
& 10/25

10/30 On Justice, Power, and Participation

Amartya Sen, "Beyond Rawls," Chapter 3 in Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 52-74.

Jurgen Habermas. "Three Normative Models of Democracy," in Seyla Benhabib, (ed.) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996, pp. 21-30.

Jane Mansbridge, "Using Power/Fighting Power: The Polity," in Seyla Benhabib, (ed.) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996, pp.46-66.

Chantal Mouffe, "Democracy, Power and the Political," in Seyla Benhabib, (ed.) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996, pp. 245-256.

Sophie Bond, "Negotiating a 'Democratic Ethos': Moving Beyond the Agonistic-Communicative Divide," *Planning Theory*, 10(2), 2011, pp. 161-186.

John Forester, "Planning in the Face of Power," Chapter 2 in *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley: U. Calif. Press, 1989.

11/1 Validating Value Judgments and Identifying Public Interests

Richard Rorty, "Solidarity or Objectivity?" in Stanley G. Clarke and Evan Simpson (eds.), *Anti-Theory in Ethics and Moral Conservatism*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989, pp. 167-184.

Seyla Benhabib, "Cultural Complexity, Moral Interdependence, and the Global Dialogical Community," in Martha Nussbaum and Jonathan Glover (eds.), *Women, Culture, and Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 235-255.

Lisa Schweitzer, "Restorative Planning Ethics: The Therapeutic Imagination and Planning in Public Institutions," *Planning Theory*, 2016, **15(2)**, pp. 130-144.

11/6 Development, Human Rights, and Global Imperatives

Amartya Sen, "Democracy as Public Reason," "The Practice of Democracy," "Human Rights and Global Imperatives," and "Justice and the World," Chapters 15, 16, 17, and 18 in Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 321-415.

11/8 On the Craft, Discipline, and Ethical Obligations of Academic Writing

George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," MS, 1946., pp. 1-10.

Aaron Wildavsky: selections from *Craftways* ("Things I Never Knew...", Rationality in Writing: Linear and Curvilinear")



John Forester, "Notes on the Craft of Academic Writing," in Elisabete Silva, Patsy Healey, Neil Harris and Pieter van den Broeck, Eds. *The Craft of Research in the Planning Field* (tentative title), collection for publication in 2013-4.

Irene Hames, "COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers," Committee on Publication Ethics, 2013, pp. 1-5. [www.publicationethics.org](http://www.publicationethics.org)

#### 11/13 Planning for Climate Adaptation

Philip R. Berke and Mark R. Stevens, "Land Use Planning for Climate Adaptation: Theory and Practice," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **36 (3)**, 2016, pp. 283-289.

Shakil Bin Kashen, Bev Wilson, and Shannon Van Zandt, "Planning for Climate Adaptation: Evaluating the Changing Patterns of Social Vulnerability and Adaptation Challenges in Three Coastal Cities," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **36 (3)**, 2016, pp. 304-318.

Isabelle Anguelovski, Linda Shi, Eric Chu, Daniel Gallagher, Kian Goh, Zachary Lamb, Kara Reeve, and Hannah Teicher, "Equity Impacts of Urban Land Use Planning for Climate Adaptation: Critical Perspectives from the Global North and South," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **36 (3)**, 2016, pp. 333-349.

Stephen Zacks, "Climate Change Displacement is Becoming the new Gentrification—Here's How to Stop It," *The Architect's Newspaper*, December 6, 2016. Available at <https://archpaper.com/2016/12/climate-change-displacement-gentrification/>

#### 11/15 Equity Planning

Marisa A. Zapata and Lisa K. Bates, "Equity Planning Revisited," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **35 (3)**, 2015, pp. 245-248.

Greg Schrock, Ellen M. Bassett, and Jamaal Green, "Pursuing Equity and Justice in a Changing Climate," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **35 (3)**, 2015, pp. 282-295.

Willow Lung-Aman, Stacy Anne Harwood, Gerardo Francisco Sandoval, and Siddhartha Sen, "Teaching Equity and Advocacy Planning in a Multicultural 'Post-racial' World," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **35 (3)**, 2015, pp. 337-342.

Norman Krumholz, "An Optimistic Comment," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **35 (3)**, 2015, pp. 343-346.

Victoria Beard, Anjali Mahendra, and Michael I. Westphal, "Towards a More Equal City: Framing the Challenges and Opportunities," Working Paper. Washington, D.C.: World Resources Institute. Available online at [www.citiesforall.org](http://www.citiesforall.org).

11/20 Acknowledging and Planning for Urban Informality

Neema Kudva, "The Everyday and the Episodic: The Spatial and Political Impacts of Urban Informality," *Environment and Planning A*, **41(7)**, 2009, 1614-1628.

Ananya Roy, "Why India Cannot Plan its Cities: Informality, Insurgence, and the Idiom of Urbanization," *Planning Theory*, **8(1)**, 2009, 76-87.

Raewyn Connell, "Using Southern Theory: Decolonizing Social Thought in Theory, Research, and Application," *Planning Theory*, **13(2)**, 2014, 210-223.

Vinit Mukhija and Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris, "Reading the Informal City: Why and How to Deepen Planners' Understanding of Informality," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **35 (4)**, 2015, pp. 444-454.

[Note that the seminar will not meet on 11/22, due to the thanksgiving break.]

11/27 A Utopian Literary Postlude  
& 11/29

Steven Lukes, *The Curious Enlightenment of Professor Caritat*, London: Verso, 1995.

Finals week Second paper presentations will be scheduled at a time convenient for all.