

# URPL-GP 2660-002 / History and Theory of Planning / [Fall 2024]

## Instructor Information

Ranjani Srinivasan (they/them) Email: [rs9560@nyu.edu](mailto:rs9560@nyu.edu)

Office Hours: On Zoom by appointment

## Course Information

Class Meeting Times: 1:30 PM - 3:10 PM Thursday

## Course Description

This course provides a survey of key historical moments and contemporary theoretical debates that have shaped the field of urban planning under global capitalism. Building upon an interdisciplinary literature drawn from planning and urban social sciences, we trace the development of planning in both shaping and responding to urban transformation. In doing so, it examines not only the changing nature of planning responses in a roughly teleological manner but additionally surveys city-centric procedural debates on planning, ontological debates on ‘how to *know* cities’, and questions on the multiple spatial extents that characterise the urban.

The course is organised into five parts:

1. **Part 1** surveys critical intellectual perspectives on the role of planning within modern social formations. We examine: What is planning? What is the role of the planner? How are planning practices/visions linked to broader structures of political, economic and social life? How are sites of planning intervention conceptualised?
2. **Part 2** explores some of the specific episodes, movements, and approaches in the history of modern urban planning since the Second Industrial Revolution of the 19th century. We will focus on key influential ideas and visions of prominent urban and regional planners while noting the historical and geographical constraints they worked within. Relatedly, we will study how has the ontological nature of the ‘urban’ evolved over time. Finally, we will examine the opportunities, contradictions, and struggles arising from these interventions.
3. **Part 3** examines the socio-political contentions that have emerged to challenge the ‘normative’ theoretical assumptions underpinning erstwhile planning interventions. By incorporating Black, feminist, queer, and Marxist perspectives, we will critically examine the notion of a ‘body politic’ and the ways in which the spatial and social are intrinsically linked.
4. **Part 4** builds on the previous section to examine the role of the planner as a mediator between private interests and the public(s) good, especially in relation to land, property, and the law. We will ask: What is progress? What is justice? And who has the ‘right’ to have rights?
5. **Part 5** concerns the future of planning in an era of systematic crises: fiscal austerity, a global financial crisis, inequality, increasing militarisation, and accelerated climate change; all which are occurring alongside a significant depoliticisation of the planning discipline. We consider several approaches that attempt to illuminate the changing nature of the contemporary urban condition and the possible role of planning in structurally reshaping cities, regions, territories and ecologies.

## Course Objectives

The course has four objectives.

1. First, it introduces students to key paradigms in planning thought that have emerged from urbanisation across the global north and south.
2. Second, the course gives students an in-depth understanding of how spaces are developed, governed, lived, and contested, emphasising the struggles that have shaped the field and the spatial justice debates central to planning practice.
3. Third, it invites students to reflect on the role of the planner-practitioner and, by extension, the complexities accompanying planning interventions.
4. Fourth, it enables students to develop their research skills and abilities to communicate ideas in writing.

## Assignments and Evaluation

### Class Attendance and Participation, 10% of final grade

The class meets weekly for 1 hour 40 minutes (1:30 PM - 3:10 PM Thursday). Students should attend classes regularly and on time, having read the assigned readings. You are expected to actively participate in the broader class discussions, group exercises, and one-to-one discussions with peers.

Readings: All required readings are posted on Brightspace. No textbooks are needed for purchase.

### Reading Responses (15%):

We have 14 weeks of readings. Students will be responsible for submitting three responses on material from any three weeks through the semester. These responses should be short (350-500 words) and submitted to Brightspace on the selected weeks before class.

The responses SHOULD NOT be summaries of the readings. Instead, I hope you engage with the readings. What did you find interesting? Were there things in the readings you agreed with?

Disagreed with? What didn’t you understand? End your reading response with at least two questions that could be the basis for further inquiry in the following assignments.

### Reflection Essays (40%)

These 1000-word essays must be based on critical issues raised in the readings. You can either explore (1) vastly different issues in each essay OR (2) build on a specific theme across the two essays.

The essays are not summaries but critical engagements with the readings where you connect material discussed in class with contemporary urban planning issues. You may choose any topic, but these essays must have a title and main line of argumentation.

### Final Research Paper OR Podcast (35%)

**Paper:** This 4000-5000-word project asks students to pick a planning case study to critically examine using texts, visuals, multimedia, and/or interviews.

**Podcast:** This will comprise a 15-minute podcast with a clear research theme. The podcast must include the following components: 1) Theoretical framework, 2) Background, 3) Case studies, and 4) Reflection. (A specific rubric will be provided for this)

Reflection and vision. (Specific criteria and rubric to be handed out).

* + Stage 1: Proposal including abstract, outline & annotated bibliography. Due: November 22 (10% total class grade)
  + Stage 2: Final Research Project. Due on TBD (25% total class grade)

#### Grade Breakdown

Participation and Attendance: 10% Reflection Essay 1 20%

Reflection Essay 2 20%

Reading Responses 15% (5% each)

Final Research Paper Project 35% (10% Stage 1; 25% Stage 2)

TOTAL 100%

##### Due Dates to Remember

Reading Responses Any three weeks between Sep 3 and Dec 12 Reflection Paper 1 September 27

Reflection Essay 2 November 1 Research Paper Proposal November 22 Final Research Paper TBD

## Class Policies

Submission Policies: Text assignments are due as digital copies on Brightspace at the beginning of class on the specified date. Papers should be well-written and typed in 12-point font, double-spaced. Please include citations and a list of references.

Late Submissions: Extensions will be granted only with prior written communication out of respect to those who abide by deadlines. Late submissions without prior communication will be penalised with a 10% deduction per 24-hour period. Please email me if you are subject to extenuating circumstances. Artificial Intelligence: This class will adopt a conditional AI tool usage policy in accordance with Wagner's policies*.* While using AI tools for copyediting is permissible, I require you to complete and submit your own work. Using AI tools to generate your submissions will significantly reduce what you learn in this course and violate the school’s norms. You will be held to Wagner’s Academic Integrity Policy.

E-communication: All students are responsible for checking their emails and Brightspace daily, as these are our avenues of communication. Please ensure your phones, tablets, and computer notifications are off during class.

Privacy: To ensure that our class is a safe space for everyone and to protect each other’s freedom of speech, lectures will not be recorded, but I will upload lecture presentations to Brightspace. We all know there are workarounds for recording lectures. I urge you not to record them personally. Please respect the privacy of your peers.

Ethics of Scholarship: Plagiarism is a severe offence and includes falsely claiming the work of others as one’s own, using material without adequately quoting and documenting its sources, academic dishonesty, papers written by someone else, not acknowledging multiple authors, or collaboration on submitted work, and not declaring multiple submissions of the same work.

Outline of Topics

Part 1: PLANNERS, PLANNING & CAPITALIST URBANISATION

1. Why Plan?
2. Theorising the role of the Planner.

Part 2: FROM PLANNING HISTORY TO PRACTICE

1. The Industrial City
2. Colonial Planning

Reflection essay 1 *[Sep 27]*

1. State Developmentalism & Modernist Planning
2. Markets and the Neoliberal Turn

Part 3: CONTEMPORARY DEBATES AND PLANNING CRITIQUES

1. Racialised Planning, Segregation, & Enclaving
2. Gentrification and Class Formation
3. Feminist Perspectives on Planning

Reflection essay 2 *[Nov 1]*

Part 4: DEMOCRACY, PARTICIPATION, & POWER

1. Property and (Re)distribution
2. From the Right to the City to the Just City
3. Occupancy, Insurgency, and Abolitionist Planning

Research Proposal *[Nov 22]*

*\*\*Thanksgiving recess\*\**

Part 5: PLANNING FUTURES

1. Urban Data, Technology & Smart Cities
2. Planning amidst Crises

Final Paper *[Dec TBD]*

# READINGS

# *The readings are listed in the order in which you should read them. Every week, you will have a reading/s that provides a ‘theoretical framework’ to set the tone for the other, more empirical pieces.*

## PART 1: PLANNERS, PLANNING & CAPITALIST URBANISATION

## Week 1: Why Plan? (September 5)

**\*\***Foglesong, R. E. (1986) ‘One. The Problem Of Planning’, in *Planning the Capitalist City*. [Online]. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 1–27.

* + Wildavsky, Aaron. “If Planning Is Everything, Maybe It’s Nothing.” Policy Sciences 2, no. 4 (1973): 27.
  + Fainstein, S. S. (2005) Planning Theory and the City. *Journal of planning education and research*. [Online] 25 (2), 121–130.
  + Watson, V. (2009) Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe’s Central Urban Issues. *Urban studies (Edinburgh, Scotland)*. [Online] 46 (11), 2259–2275

## Week 2: Theorising the Role of the Planner (September 12)

**\*\***Yiftachel, O. (1989) Towards a New Typology of Urban Planning Theories. *Environment and Planning.*

*B*. [Online] 16 (1), 23–39.

* Brooks, M.P. (2002) ‘Centralized Rationality: The Planner as Applied Scientist’, in *Planning theory for practitioners*. Chicago, Ill: Planners Press, American Planning Association, pp. 81–96.
* Lindblom, C. E. (1959) The Science of ‘Muddling Through’. *Public administration review*. [Online] 19 (2), 79–88.
* Davidoff, P. (2020) ‘Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning: Journal of the American Institute of Planners (1965)’, in *The City Reader*. 7th edition [Online]. Routledge. pp. 480–491.
* Healey, P. (1992) Planning through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory. *Town planning review*. [Online] 63 (2), 143–162.
* Bell, J.P. (2018) *We Cannot Plan from Our Desks*, *American Planning Association*. Available at: <https://www.planning.org/publications/planningmagarticle/9159433/> (Accessed: 1 August 2024).

### PART 2: FROM PLANNING HISTORY TO PRACTICE

#### Week 3: The Industrial City (September 19)

\*\*Engels, F. (2020) ‘The Great Towns: from The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844 (1845)’, in *The City Reader*. 7th edition [Online]. Routledge. pp. 60–69.

* Hall, P. (2014) 'The City of Dreadful Night' and ‘The City in the Garden’, in *Cities of Tomorrow*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. pp. 13-36; 88-97.
* Plunz, R. (2016) ‘Legislating the Tenement’, in *A History of Housing in New York City*. revised edition [Online]. United States: Columbia University Press. pp. 21–49.
* Sevilla-Buitrago, A. (2014) ‘Central Park against the streets: the enclosure of public space cultures in mid-nineteenth century New York’, *Social & Cultural Geography*, 15(2), pp. 151–171.
* Davis, M. (2007) ‘Hausmann in the Tropics’, in *Planet of slums*. Paperback ed. London ; New York: Verso, pp. 95–120.

#### Week 4: Colonial Planning (September 26)

**\*\***Said, E. W. (1979) “Imaginative Geography and its Representations,” in *Orientalism*. First Vintage Books edition. New York: Vintage Books. pp. 49-72.

* Çelik, Z. (1992) Le Corbusier, Orientalism, Colonialism. *Assemblage*. (17), pp. 58–77.
* Cowen, D. (2020) ‘Following the infrastructures of empire: notes on cities, settler colonialism, and method’, *Urban Geography*, 41(4), pp. 469–486.
* Rabinow, P. (1989) Governing Morocco: modernity and difference. *International journal of urban and regional research*. [Online] 13 (1), 32–46.
* Sa’di-Ibraheem, Y. (2021). Privatizing the production of settler colonial landscapes: ‘Authenticity’ and imaginative geography in Wadi Al-Salib, Haifa. Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space, 39(4), 686-704.

#### Week 5: State Developmentalism, Modernist Planning, and its Discontents (October 3)

**\*\***Scott, J. C. (1995) State Simplifications: Nature, Space and People. *The journal of political philosophy*. [Online] 3 (3), 191–233.

* Caro, Robert (1974) “One Mile” in The Power Broker. New York: Vintage, pp. 850-884.
* Jacobs, J. (2016) "19: Visual Order: Its limitations and possibilities" in *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 344-362.
* Caldeira, T. & Holston, J. (2007) ‘State and Urban Space in Brazil: From Modernist Planning to Democratic Interventions’, in *Global Assemblages*. [Online]. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

pp. 393–416.

* Hart, G. (2001) Development critiques in the 1990s: Culs de sac and promising paths. *Progress in human geography*. [Online] 25 (4), 649–658.

#### Week 6: Markets and the Neoliberal Turn (October 10)

**\*\***Rodgers, D. T. (2011) "The Rediscovery of the Market" in *Age of Fracture*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. pp. 41-76

* Peck, J. & Tickell, A. (2002) Neoliberalizing Space. *Antipode*. [Online] 34 (3), pp. 380–404.
* Harvey, D. (1989) From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografiska annaler. Series B, Human geography*. [Online] 71 (1),

pp. 3-.

* Fields, D. (2017) Urban struggles with financialization. *Geography compass*. [Online] 11 (11), .
* Graham, S. et al. (2004) Splintering urbanism: networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition. Journal of Urban History 30 (4) pp.627–635.

Optional:

* Logan, J. & Molotch, H. (2005) ‘“The City as a Growth Machine”: From Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place (1987)’, in *The Urban Sociology Reader*. 2nd edition [Online]. Routledge. pp. 109–117.

### PART 3: CONTEMPORARY DEBATES AND PLANNING CRITIQUES

#### Week 7: Racialised Planning, Segregation, and Enclaving (October 17)

\*\*Goetz E, William RA, & Damiano, A. (2020), “Whiteness and Urban Planning”. Journal of the American Planning Association, 86(2), 142–156.

* Rothstein, R. (2014) *The Making of Ferguson: Public Policies at the Root of its Troubles*, *Economic Policy Institute*.
* Taylor, K.-Y. (2019) "Introduction: Homeowner's Business" in *Race for profit : how banks and the real estate industry undermined Black homeownership*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. pp. 1-24.
* Miraftab, F. (2016) "Introduction: The Global Heartland" in *Global heartland : displaced labor, transnational lives, and local placemaking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 3-24.
* Waldinger, R. (1993) The ethnic enclave debate revisited. *International journal of urban and regional research*. [Online] 17 (3), 444–452.

Optional:

* Loyd, J. M. & Bonds, A. (2018) Where do Black lives matter? Race, stigma, and place in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. *The Sociological review (Keele)*. [Online] 66 (4), 898–918.
* Sugrue, T. J. (2014) ‘Homeowners’ Rights: White Resistance and the Rise of Antiliberalism’, in *The Origins of the Urban Crisis*. STU-Student edition [Online]. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

pp. 209–230.

#### Week 8: Gentrification and Class Formation (October 24)

**\*\***Teitz, Michael B., Karen Chapple. 2013. “Planning and Poverty: An uneasy Relationship.” In N. Carmon, and S. Fainstein, ed., “Planning and Poverty: An Uneasy Relationship.” Policy, Planning, and People, Promoting Justice in Urban Development, 205–23.

**\*\***Smith, Neil. 1996. “From consumer sovereignty to the rent gap.” In The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city, Routledge.

* Marcuse, P. (1985). Gentrification, abandonment, and displacement: Connections, causes, and policy responses in New York City. Wash. UJ Urb. & Contemp. L., 28, 195.
* Vale, Lawrence J. 2013. “Public Housing in the United States: Neighborhood Renewal and the Poor.” Policy, Planning and People, Promoting Justice in Urban Development. Philadelphia.
* Ghertner, D. Asher. “Why Gentrification Theory Fails in ‘Much of the World.’” *City* 19, no. 4 (July 4, 2015): 552–63.

Optional:

* Stabrowski, F. (2014). New-Build Gentrification and the Everyday Displacement of Polish Immigrant Tenants in Greenpoint, Brooklyn. Antipode, 46(3), 794–815.

#### Week 9: Feminist & Queer Perspectives on Planning (October 31)

**\*\***Michael Frisch. 2002. “Planning as a Heterosexist Project,” Journal of Planning Education and Research 21(3): 254–266.

* Markusen, Ann R. “City Spatial Structure, Women’s Household Work, and National Urban Policy,” in The Urban Sociology Reader (second edition) edited by Jan Lin and Christopher Mele. Routledge. London and New York
* Gilbert, Melissa R. 1998. “‘Race,’ Space, and Power: The Survival Strategies of Working Poor Women.” Annals of the Association of American Geographers 88 (4): 595–621.
* Doan, Petra L. and Harrison Higgins. 2011. “The Demise of Queer Space? Resurgent Gentrification and the Assimilation of LGBT Neighborhoods. Journal of Planning Education and Research. Vol 31, Issue 1
* Doan, Petra L. 2010. “The Tyranny of Gendered Spaces – Reflections from beyond the Gender Dichotomy.” Gender, Place & Culture 17 (5):635–54.

### PART 4: DEMOCRACY, PARTICIPATION & POWER

#### Week 10: Property and (Re)distribution (November 7 )

\*\*Krueckeberg, D. A. (1995) The Difficult Character of Property: To Whom Do Things Belong? *Journal of the American Planning Association*. [Online] 61 (3), 301–309.

\*\*Dorries, H. (2022) ‘What is planning without property? Relational practices of being and belonging’,

*Society + Space*, 40(2).

* Blomley, N. (2004) ‘Welcome to the Hotel California’, in *Unsettling the City*. [Online]. United Kingdom: Routledge. pp. 23–50.
* Roy, A. (2017) Dis/possessive collectivism: Property and personhood at city’s end. *Geoforum*. [Online] 80A1–A11.
* Benjamin, S. & Raman, B. (2011) Illegible Claims, Legal Titles, and the Worlding of Bangalore.

*Revue Tiers monde*. [Online] 206 (2), 37–54.

* Kuyucu, T. (2014) Law, Property and Ambiguity: The Uses and Abuses of Legal Ambiguity in Remaking Istanbul’s Informal Settlements. *International journal of urban and regional research*. [Online] 38 (2), 609–627.

#### Week 11: From the Right to the City to the Just City (November 14)

\*\*Soja, E. W. (2010) ‘On the Production of Unjust Geographies’, in *Seeking Spatial Justice*. United States: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 31-66.

\*\*Fainstein, S. S. (2009) ‘Planning and the Just City’, in *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice*. [Online]. pp. 19–39.

* Bhan, G. (2009) “This is no longer the city I once knew”. Evictions, the urban poor and the right to the city in millennial Delhi. *Environment and urbanization*. [Online] 21 (1), 127–142.
* Maricato, E. et al. (2009) ‘Fighting for Just Cities in capitalism’s periphery’, in *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice*. [Online]. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 194–213.
* Steil, J. & Connolly, J. (2009) ‘Can the Just City be built from below? Brownfields, planning, and power in the South Bronx', in *Searching for the Just City: Debates in Urban Theory and Practice*. [Online] Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 173–193.

#### Week 12: Occupancy, Insurgent, and Abolitionist Planning (November 21)

\*\*Miraftab, F. (2009) Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South. *Planning theory (London, England)*. [Online] 8 (1), 32–50.

* Benjamin, S. (2008) ‘Occupancy Urbanism: Radicalizing Politics and Economy beyond Policy and Programs: Debates and Developments’, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(3), pp. 719–729.
* García-Lamarca, M. (2017) From Occupying Plazas to Recuperating Housing: Insurgent Practices in Spain. *International journal of urban and regional research*. [Online] 41 (1), 37–53.
* Summers, B. T. & Fields, D. (2024) Speculative Urban Worldmaking: Meeting Financial Violence with a Politics of Collective Care. *Antipode*. [Online] 56 (3), 821–840.
* Simpson, S.-A., Steil, J. and Mehta, A. (2020) ‘Planning beyond Mass Incarceration’, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 40(2), pp. 130–138.

*\*\*Thanksgiving Recess\*\**

### PART 4: PLANNING FUTURES

#### Week 13: Urban Data, Technology, and Smart Cities (December 5)

\*\*Mattern, S. (2017) ‘A City Is Not a Computer’, *Places Journal* [Preprint].

* Kitchin, R. (2014) Real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. *GeoJournal*. [Online] 79 (1), 1–14.
* Hill, D. (2013) *Essay: On the smart city; Or, a ‘manifesto’ for smart citizens instead*, *City of Sound*. (Accessed: 29 August 2024).
* O’Reilly, T. (2011) ‘Government as a Platform’, *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, 6(1), pp. 13–40.
* Taylor, L. & Broeders, D. (2015) In the name of Development: Power, profit and the datafication of the global South. *Geoforum*. [Online] 64229–237.

Optional:

* Mattern, S. (2013) ‘Methodolatry and the Art of Measure’, *Places Journal* [Preprint]

#### Week 14: Planning amidst Crises (December 12)

*[Last class and Wrap up]*

\*\*Swyngedouw, E. (2010) Apocalypse forever?: Post-political populism and the spectre of climate change. *Theory, culture & society*. [Online] 27 (2), 213–232.

\*\*Madden, D. J. (2021) Disaster Urbanization: The City Between Crisis and Calamity. *Sociologica (Bologna)*. [Online] 15 (1), 91–108.

* Fields, D. J. & Hodkinson, S. N. (2018) Housing Policy in Crisis: An International Perspective.

*Housing policy debate*. [Online] 28 (1), 1–5.

* Brenner, N. & Ghosh, S. (2022) Between the colossal and the catastrophic: Planetary urbanization and the political ecologies of emergent infectious disease. *Environment and planning. A*. [Online] 54 (5), 867–910.
* Goh, K. (2020) Planning the Green New Deal: Climate Justice and the Politics of Sites and Scales.

*Journal of the American Planning Association*. [Online] 86 (2), 188–195.

* Vale, L. J. (2014) The politics of resilient cities: whose resilience and whose city? *Building research and Information : The International Journal of Research, development and Demonstration.* [Online] 42 (2), 191–201.