
URBDP 564 A
Planning History, Theory, Ethics

Instructor: Bob Mugerauer
Time: Wednesday, 1:30-4:20
Place: Gould 100

Educational Objective:

The course is an advanced lecture/seminar for graduate students, focusing on foundational issues. It is intended to engage students in the “big questions” concerning the goals, values, and strategies which shape our social and physical environments and the activities and roles of professional planners. The course provides an opportunity to become knowledgeable about and to critique what planning has done in the past hundred and fifty years. We also will focus on what usually remains in the background as taken for granted or unchallenged: the character of planning knowledge and contending the world-views and assumptions. The project amounts to becoming conscious of the structural possibilities and limitations of planning and more responsible for our personal contributions, especially in regard to social justice.

Educational Approach:

The course will be a classical lecture/seminar, with the instructor providing some lecture material, but mainly the faculty member and students together analyzing the subject matter by focusing on readings and problems through discussions and written exercises. Both written and oral skills will be developed. Note: **While learning about ethical theories gives us knowledge, in itself it does not make us any more capable of better ethical conduct—that comes through practice making good judgments about particular cases and acting appropriately (from which, over a life time, perhaps bit of wisdom might emerge). Our class discussions will concentrate on practicing making such judgments and on debating processes of legitimate decision-making.**

Course Content:

The course will consider major historical, theoretical, and ethical alternatives. As to the historical development of planning, we will consider the major landmark projects, persons, and institutions since the Civil War, as well as the ideas of capital development, tensions among the public and private spheres, social control, professionalism, and the desired forms for society, including the troubled issues of environmental well-being, inequality, and justice in relation to economic development. Major theoretical models and world views considered will include the varieties of rational planning (including communicative action), with a special focus on exploring the increasingly important complexity theory. We will treat ethical issues such as distributive justice, value hierarchies, and principles of professional conduct (professional-client relationships, deception, confidentiality, consent). The course will include synthetic exercises focusing on current social-planning problems.

Texts:

- Judith Innes and David Booher, *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy* (New York: Routledge, 2010).
- shorter excerpts to be posted on the Canvas system **EVERYTHING IS UNDER FILES**
 - Dorceta E. Taylor, *Toxic Communities: Environmental Racism, Industrial Pollution, and Residential Mobility* (New York: New York University Press, 2014).
 - Kristin Shrader-Frechette, *Environmental Justice: Creating Equality, Reclaiming Democracy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

(A Reader on Planning History will be on reserve in the CBE Library for consultation for the class presentations on planning history, but does **not need to be read** for the course)

Assignments:

There will be regular reading assignments and two writing projects (one an essay examination on the history of planning; the other a 9-12 page paper engaging complexity theory, both of which will be **due on Tuesday, March 13**—that is, at what would be the scheduled final exam time—this will be further explained as we go). It is expected that students will come to class prepared to discuss the assigned material and ideas, and to participate actively. Students will a) contribute a short reading—“case”—from current news systems concerning the gaps between those who have and those who don’t, b) be responsible for being part of a group leading one of the ethics discussions based on these student-selected cases, and c) make a short presentation analyzing and debating the landmarks of planning history. There is almost no other outside work for the course. The focus will be on reading, interpretation, analysis, and honest discussion.

Evaluations: Grades to be determined by

I. Participation

A) Mandatory report about your reading of the assignments, to be posted on canvas by 10 am of that class day. I will use this information to figure out how to conduct that class session.

Reminder: DO NOT LIE in an ethics class; be honest. There is **not a grade for this**; but there is a **penalty** if you fail to do it. For each time you fail to report, one point will be deducted from your final grade (so missing all 10 would severely limit your final grade). Saying “I forgot” won’t cut it; it either is posted by 10 am or it is not.

The format is simple: along with your name, provide the following information:

On this week’s assignment I read:

___ all or almost all

___ most

___ not very much

B. Ethics

Find a short 2-5 page personal account—1st person stories—of someone’s experience of encountering barriers to resources. This may come from any valid source: direct personal accounts, diaries, even novels or other sorts of fiction; it may come from a magazine or newspaper report **IF** the article includes substantial quotations of what people say (their own words). [An example will be provided in class.] Then load the story to the canvas system. Finally, as part of a group panel make a presentation on your self-chosen topic. – 10%

C. History

Presentation as part of a group on one of the landmark cases – 10%

II. Major Papers

Examples and details on separate pages

History:

Mastery of the historical subject matter as demonstrated in a written essay examination covering a major theme that winds through the last 150 years of planning (there will be an individual option of taking the exam in one or two stages and as a take-home or in-classroom examination),
2 options-

- Comprehensive final -- **due on Tuesday, March 13** (that is, at what would be our scheduled final exam time)—40%.
- Midterm (**approximately on Jan 31**) & non-cumulative final—**due Tuesday, March 13**

Theory/Ethics—also 2 options

You can choose either of two assignments.

- One is in the format of a traditional essay
- the other applying complexity theory in the form of a complex diagram with explicit description of the feedback loops (which will become clearer in the next several weeks)

The 9-12 page paper will be due on **Tuesday, March 13** (the scheduled exam time)—40%.

Further explanation and guidance-hints about how to do these assignments will be given throughout the quarter.

Student Class Presentations on History Landmarks

Each student will make a presentation with two parts. The first part will be to the class, with a short handout; the second part will be a transformation into **SHORT** written form, to be handed in and graded. Note, only the written version is graded.

In-Class

In each class we will devote 30 minutes to student led discussion of a history topic—I will give you a broad issue on which to focus. Presenters can either coordinate with each other or work independently as they choose.

The format is intended to focus the topic and facilitate class discussion (potentially also to provide a good study aid) on one of the planning landmarks. The goal is to stimulate, not deaden, discussion. This requires practiced, brisk, and focused presentations. Because several students present each day and we want to stimulate class discussion (**NOT** make a long mini-lecture), each presentation should be brief (say 5 minutes). If you choose, presenters can briefly “debate” the issue, then open it up to the class.

For the in-class presentation:

- Reflect on the lecture and supplemental readings (usually on the web, but there also will be a Reading List and a *Course Reader* on reserve in the CBE library). This will increase your expertise and allow you to see what others have to say on the topic.
- Generate a short (1 page maximum) handout covering your main points in a clear “outline” format.
- Be as clear, precise, and concrete as you can. Good presentations work from the handout, using it as notes, but not read verbatim. You do not—should not—try to cover everything on your handout. Do **NOT** repeat the lecture. Do not be afraid to lead with an interesting point and let the class take it up, without feeling that you have to hold the floor and read through all your points. An excellent presentation may be one that disappears and doesn’t get finished because the class has run off with the issue in a lively discussion.

Written version—due at class-time **the following week**

Because presentations mysteriously fail or succeed, often for reasons having nothing to do with the quality of preparation/delivery, the grade for this assignment is not based on the actual class presentation, but on the written version. You will be graded on the basis of the best possible presentation that could have been made, not on how it actually went.

For the written version,

- Pay attention to what the other presenters and the class say, since you may think of new points or change your mind, and so on.
- Flesh out the presentation (if appropriate, revising what you have to say on the topic) into a short paper (**1 page; bullet points in an outline form are ok**, or put your ideas into sentences and paragraphs).

EXAMPLE ONLY

EXAMPLE ONLY

HISTORY EXAMPLES FROM THE PAST

Examples of planning history themes I have used as the basis for exam questions—all of these have emerged in the history lectures:

Planning as Scientific: How have the identity and authority of planning developed because of planning's evolution as scientific, that is as rational, objective, and with impact on the practices, procedures, and techniques of practice? (Taking account of the varying "definitions" of rationality would be part of the consideration.)

Planning as Communicative Action: It often is asserted that the two main roots of American Planning are the impulse to become scientific-rational and the impulse to reform. It also has been pointed out that an additional dimension is found in the importance of "rhetoric, persuasion, and image shaping (through verbal, visual, and quantitative means). As we will see later, the theorist Jurgen Habermas speaks of this third dimension as "communicative action" in a view which would define planning as "the shaping of attention, as defining what counts as a problem and what solutions might look like." Describe and Explain how and to what extent planning has developed as such communicative action.

The Complex, Changing Relationship between Physical Planning and Social-Economic (Policy) Planning: Trace and explain the various relationships between these two dimensions over the last 150 years. For example, sometimes they are opposite, sometimes coordinated, one or the other may dominate, one may be submerged, etc.

Planning as "Done Unto Others": Describe and explain the extent to which planning developed as "planning being done 'unto' others." Give the details by specifying and accounting for who, did what, in what manner, on half of whom; also make explicit any patterns that emerge, such as "group or type X tends to plan using economics on behalf of group Z, while group or type A tends to plan using physical environments on behalf of group C.

Planning as an Instrument of Capitalism: Whether deliberately or not, to what extent has planning, through its practices and social-physical outcomes, in fact primarily facilitated the development of private or corporate capital (that is, of the private sector's opportunities, interests, and profits, rather than that of general public or civic interests)? (In addition to the explicit use of planning to support capitalism, have not even what appeared to be alternatives ultimately been bent to capitalism's purposes?)

On the History Paper/Exam

I find it very strange to write this, especially to a graduate class, but it seems necessary to try to increase student success.

Each year, surprisingly, 3-5 students do not successfully answer (or barely pass) the planning history test/essay because they fail to follow one of the crucial, non-optional directions:

“Write as much as you can in 3 hours; it is more important to cover all the relevant landmarks in some detail rather than only a few in great detail—you are called on to exercise judgment as well as knowledge.”

This is unnecessary and avoidable. The test is not difficult: it simply asks you to show competence in basic material (that does not require outside or additional readings or study). Listening, participating, and taking notes in the traditional fashion facilitates a more engaging, effective learning experience (which obviously is inhibited if you dis-attend by engaging with content on your electronic devices).

- **In order to use all the relevant planning landmarks and precedents that we have covered in lecture you obviously need good notes from each and every lecture.**
- **If you miss a class it is important to get notes from a classmate.**
- **I understand that listening to a lecture and taking notes is difficult if English is not your first language. (I learned that through my own experience outside the U.S.) If this is the case you should find some way to cooperate with some of your classmates—through study groups or other methods—to generate a good complete set of notes that you understand.**

Note: listening to oral presentations and being able to have notes from them is an essential skill for a planner. You need to be able to do so when dealing with public participation sessions, accurately preparing or revising projects as directed by a commission, being able to correctly testify before a hearing board or in court, absorbing and being ready to implement a change in direction mandated by a new regime of power, and so on. If you can't do this your career will be very limited, if not short-lived.

Planning History, Theory, Ethics
URBDP 564 A
Wednesday, 1:30—4:20

Winter, 2018
Bob Mugerauer
Gould 100

Planning Theory Complexity Diagram-Text Option

As we will learn in some of our readings, Jane Jacobs has been a major force in opposing top-down planning that destroys urban systems. Her wonderful writing provides both the details of phenomena such as “busy inner-city streets being safe” and “streets as a social meeting place matching American habits and preferences,” then clarifies the relationships among the major features. She did her work when opposing her nemesis, authoritarian New York city planner Robert Moses, and arguing for an incremental, bottoms-up approach.

General Idea & Goal

Your assignment is to show a dimension of recognizing/understanding and acting on the city as a complex system. To do this, present a diagram and text describing the multiple factors and their complex feedback loops for an urban phenomena-problem area of interest to you. Choose something that REALLY MATTERS TO YOU (e.g. public transportation, homelessness, etc.). Then work out a visual diagram or map of what underlies and branches out from that social or built environment problem-tangle. Along with the diagram you need to explicitly describe the connections, lines of positive and negative influence, possible points of reversal, etc. (as we will learn to do during the course). Finally, your writing should include at least a short section that indicates a strategy for action: “Given that the phenomenon is as described, we could begin to positively change the overall dynamic by).

The goal is to provide the empirical detail and conceptual analysis that would help official planners understand and plan in light of complexity. Your description and analysis is supposed to show how it is that many specific factors interact to generate the complex overall phenomena—that is, to enhance the system’s dynamic, generative processes. In turn, this would be a basis for arguing that/how an incremental approach (of small-scale changes) can help facilitate positive complex interactions. In the end, your paper should provide a case for incremental, bottoms-up action that convincingly would counter the imposition of big top-down planning.

Specifically, what to do FOR YOUR PHENOMENA:*

To discern and show/describe the pattern and carry out an initial analysis

1. PRESENT A DIAGRAM, SHOWING AT LEAST THE MAJOR FEEDBACK LOOPS
[CONNECTIONS/INTERACTIONS/BASIC IMPACTS]
2. DESCRIBE IN WORDS THE DYNAMICS OF WHAT IS GOING ON

Then

3. **BRIEFLY** MAKE EXPLICIT HOW MODEST, INCREMENTAL CHANGES COULD POSITIVELY CHANGE THE OVERALL OUTCOME..

*There are zillions of such phenomena: Economic-Social (jobs, real estate values, homelessness, distressed communities, mass transit); Ecological (ecosystem collapse, pollution, loss of species, habitat change); Health (diabetes, drug addiction, famine),

Reminder: the paper is due on **Tuesday, March 13**

You might like to play around with such dynamics on the MIT StarLogo website:

<http://www.media.mit.edu/starlogo>

& <http://beelab.cas.psu.edu> which is related to a book: *Self-Organization in Biological Systems*

Planning Theory Paper

As we will learn in some of our readings, Jane Jacobs has been a major force in opposing top-down planning that destroys urban systems. Her wonderful writing provides both the details of phenomena such as “busy inner-city streets being safe” and “streets as a social meeting place matching American habits and preferences” then clarifies the relationships among the major features. She did her work when opposing her nemesis, authoritarian New York city planner Robert Moses, and arguing for an incremental, bottoms-up approach (you may have such a struggle in mind, but perhaps not). We also will practice a complexity theory analysis of parallel social-ethical issues during the quarter.

Your assignment is to write a 9-12 page essay in the mode of Jane Jacobs that makes the case for recognizing/understanding and acting on the city **or** social-ethical issues as complex systems. Your case will be made by giving a dense description of the multiple factors and their many feedback loops for a built environment or social-ethical phenomena of interest to you. Your task is to provide the empirical detail and conceptual analysis that would help official planners understand and plan in light of complexity. Your description and analysis is supposed to show how it is that many factors interact to generate the complex overall phenomena. This would be a basis for arguing that/how an incremental approach (of effective small-scale changes) that recognizes, respects, and creates the right conditions for the complex interactions constituting the phenomena would be the most effective—that would best enhance the resilience or transformation of the system’s dynamic, generative processes. In sum, your essay is supposed to provide a bottoms-up case that convincingly would counter the imposition of a big top-down plan.

FOR YOUR OWN CHOSEN PHENOMENA:*

(following from your own observations/ideas and keeping our applications of complexity theory to ethical issues in mind) DESCRIBE THE DYNAMICS OF WHAT IS GOING ON and then briefly make explicit how modest, incremental changes could change the overall “outcome.” THIS IS TO WORK AT DISCERNING THE PATTERNS and DOING AN INITIAL ANALYSIS; YOU **MUST INCLUDE A DIAGRAM**, SHOWING THE INTERACTIONS/FEEDBACK LOOPS AMONG THE ELEMENTS AS WELL AS CONVEYING A SENSE OF THE OVERALL “REALITY” THAT EMERGES. (The fundamental description should be roughly 7-10 pages and the ideas for change no more than 2 pages.)

*There are zillions such phenomena: Physical (mass transit systems, parks, gentrified neighborhoods), Economic-Social-Ethical (jobs, real estate values, homelessness, distressed communities); Ecological (ecosystem collapse, pollution, loss of species, habitat change); Health (diabetes, drug addiction, famine),
.....

- Reminder: the paper is due on Monday, March 13

Paper: Ethics & Theory (knowledge/action):

Engagement and exploration of the theoretical and ethical subject matter is demonstrated in a 9-12 page paper, due on Tuesday, March 13 (the scheduled exam time)—40% of grade.

General Issue:

What should/can planning do to help alleviate [some major aspect of] problems of Unequal Access to Resources, to reduce—if not eliminate—[some of] the barriers?

Chose-specify a basic need/resource which is not satisfied/available for many people—pick one that is important for you. Then provide an actual answer to the points below, including explicit discussion of a legitimate basis for your position from ethics and theory. The paper must include the following four dimensions—I suggest allocating 1/3 of the paper to 1 & 2; then 2/3 to 3 & 4.

■ first, an emphasis on **SHOULD, WHAT, WHY**

Provide a basis for your answer to 1 & 2 using our ethics material.

1. Planners SHOULD [at least try to] DO WHAT regarding increasing Access?

2. WHY should we increase access to whatever basic resource you have chosen? Assume for the purpose of the paper that the reason is the ethical obligations of Justice. There are many definitions of Justice, and many sub-categories. For this paper the task is to use one of the most important ones: **Distributive Justice**. Here you should briefly explain what Distributive Justice is and how it applies in this issue.

■ Second, an emphasis on **CAN, WHAT, HOW**

Provide a basis for your answer to 3 & 4 using one of our major theories (or a combination of theories) of knowledge & action.

3. Planners **CAN [realistically] **DO WHAT**?**

4. **HOW would we know what to do and how to do it?**

NOTES & HINTS FOR WRITING YOUR THEORY/ETHICS PAPER

Recall the simple version of the steps in the handout on Theories—complexity theory:

EXPLORE YOUR CHOSEN PHENOMENON & DESCRIBE IT

1. THINK ABOUT

Q: WHAT FACTORS BEAR ON EACH OTHER?

Q: IN WHAT DIRECTION IS THE “FORCE”?

Q: WHAT IS THE **VALANCE OF THE INFLUENCE?**

+ → +

+ → -

- → -

- → +

(if you have time and Energy-- Q: What is the Relative Intensity?)

2. AS YOU GO ALONG MAKE SOME MESSY DIAGRAMS OF RELATIONS AS WE HAVE DONE IN CLASS
3. WRITE OUT A CAREFUL DESCRIPTION OF THE FACTORS AND THEIR RELATIONSHPHS
4. MAKE A FINAL, NICE VERSION OF THE DIAGRAM
5. FOR THE LAST PART OF THE WRITTEN ESSAY--IDEAS FOR INCREMENTAL CHANGE: YOU ARE PLANNERS AND HAVE CHOSED A TOPIC OF INTEREST TO YOURSELF. YOU CAN'T SOLVE THE WHOLE PROBLEM ALL AT ONCE—IT IS TOO COMPLICATED. SO, WRITE ABOUT HOW YOU WOULD GO ABOUT UNPACKING THE TANGLE, WORKING TO RESOLVE SOME OF THE MAJOR PROBLEM DYNAMICS. WHAT MIGHT YOU START WITH? HOW WOULD THAT LEAD TO A CHANGE OR TWO THAT WOULD THEN RELIEVE PART OF THE PROBLEM.

Note, for your problem, you do **not** need to consider an issue of fundamental needs to be met (as we have been doing). You can consider anything of personal/professional interest (how to rezone land for ecological preservation, how to maximize the sales for discredited Volkswagen, how to plan for veterans' health care, etc.)

Use common sense; you don't need to do a big data search with all kinds of footnoted research, though all “evidence” is welcome.

Planning History, Theory, Ethics
 URBDP 564 A
 Wednesday, 1:30-4:20

Winter, 2018
 Bob Mugerauer
 Gould 100

Readings and Discussion Topics

<u>Date</u>	<u>History Lecture Topic</u>	<u>Student History Presentations</u>	<u>Theory & Ethics Assignments</u> [TENTATIVE-MAY CHANGE]
1/3	Course Mechanics & Tenement Reform/Parks	X	Initial discussion on Ethical Issues of Access/Barriers to Resources
1/10	Utopias, Company Towns Garden City & Lecture: Major Planning Theories	---	Jane Jacobs, handout Innes & Booher, Chs 1 & 2 1 st application of Complexity Theory:
1/17	Chicago: 1893 World Fair & 1909 Plan & Lecture: Basic Ethical Concepts	---	EXAMPLES OF EXPERIENCES DUE 2 nd application of Complexity Theory
1/24	City Beautiful & Practical	...	Ethics Reading-Discussion: Environmental Justice -- Taylor, Shrader-Franachette
1/31	Rockefeller Center	1 st Discussion of Student-generated ethics cases
2/7	Regional Planning Assoc. America/ National Resources Planning Board	2 nd Discussion of Student-generated ethics cases
2/14	Post-WWII Highways.....	More on Complexity/Innes & Booher
2/21	Post-WWII Housing.....	More on Complexity/Innes & Booher
2/28	Urban Renewal.....	3 rd Discussion of Student-generated Ethics Case More on the 2 paper assignment
3/7	X X	4 th Discussion of Student-generated cases

The last UW class day of the quarter is March 9.

Reminder: THE FIRM, NON-NEGOTIABLE, DUE DATES OF BOTH ASSIGNMENTS: THE PAPER ON THEORY-ETHICS AND THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION ON HISTORY WILL BE DUE THE END OF THE DAY WHEN OFFICES ARE LOCKED (+/- 4:45-5:00) ON TUESDAY, MARCH 13

NAME _____

I. Sign-up for presentations on History Topics. Indicate 1st and 2nd choices.

<u>1ST choice</u>	<u>2nd choice</u>	<u>History Topic for Presentation</u>
		Tenement Reform/Parks
		Utopias, Co. Towns, Garden City
		Chicago: 1893 World Fair & 1909 Plan
		City Beautiful & Practical
		Rockefeller Center
		Regional Planning Association of America/ National Resources Planning Board
		Post-WWII Highways
		Post-WWII Housing
		Urban Renewal

The stories you gather will be the basis (“the texts”) for our class debates on ethics & theories (and perhaps for your long ethics-theory paper due at the end of the quarter).

BARRIERS/ACCESS TO RESOURCES
WHAT’S PLANNING GOT TO DO WITH IT

Find a short 2-5 page personal account--1st person stories—of someone’s experience of encountering barriers to resources. This may come from any valid source: direct personal accounts, biographies, diaries, or an anthropological or sociological city, even novels and other sorts of fiction; it may come from a magazine or newspaper report **IF** the article includes substantial quotations of what people say.

Areas of Human Need for a Decent Life: FIRST SET OF IDEAS FROM CLASS #1

Winter, 2018

Bob Mugerauer

Contact info:

Email all the time = drbobm@u.washington.edu

Be sure to put in the “m”

Phone: I rarely answer it because either I am with someone or am not in my office, but it is 206-221-4415

Office: Gould 448 G-H (inside a suite on the north-east corner)

Office Hours:

- Wednesdays 12-1:30 – on days when there are no faculty meetings
- Wednesdays 4:20-5:00
- Thursdays 12:30- 1:30
- THE EASIEST OF ALL by appointment

On the fly: I am around more on Tu, Wed, Th; not so much on Mon & Fri

Health care

Housing

Adequate

Any at all -- homelessness

Food

Clean water

Safety

Environmental Well-being vs Hazards

Decent Employment [Good Work] or Income Source

Freedom of Movement (Transportation)

Social & Political participation

Autonomy/Self-determination

Education

2nd class: debate—**Provide/Not Provide**

How can/on what grounds can

50%/50% of population hold that we should/should not provide

for what kind(s) of need?

Need 4 volunteers:

2 for each opposite basic stance:

Should/Should Not Provide

The Debate is to fill in-argue

on **what grounds? &**

for what kinds of needs?

N.B. NO Lies Allowed

Distributive Justice – covers goods/benefits & harms

Participatory Justice – covers autonomy (self-determination, informed consent)

Because there normally are both benefits and harms associated with the manner in which we distribute and use goods, the core idea of Distributive Justice is that both the burdens (or harms, or costs) and the benefits associated with our providing, having access to, and using resources need to be fairly or equitably or legitimately spread across different groups (across different societies; within societies, equitably spread among diverse members or groups; over time, across generations into the future).
