



## **URBDP 564: Planning History, Theory, Ethics**

**AUTUMN 2021**

**Lecture:** Friday | 10:00 am-12:50 pm

**Instructor :** Bob Mugerauer, Professor

### **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 focus on what usually remains in the background as taken for granted or unchallenged: the discourse and historical-cultural practices which delimit and shape the outcomes of our activities and which constitute the identity of planners. The project amounts to becoming conscious of the structural possibilities and limitations of planning and more responsible for our personal contributions.

### **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.

### **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 in relation to economic development. Major theoretical models and world views considered will include rationalism and communicative rationality/action, but the major focus will be on exploring the increasingly important complexity theory. We will treat ethical issues such as distributive justice, value hierarchies, and principles of professional conduct (such as professional-client relationships, deception, confidentiality, consent). The course will include synthetic exercises focusing on current social-planning problems.

### **Texts:**

There will be one required textbook for this course. Dorceta Taylor’s, *The Environment and the People in American Cities, 1600s-1900s: Disorder, Inequality, and Social Change*.

Amazingly, this is available in a digital version via UW Library system.

[Of course, I always encourage students to buy books in order to read carefully using notes in margins, underlining, etc.]

## Assignments:

- There will be regular reading assignments and two writing projects
  1. one essay presenting your view after a debate in which you participate. I will provide specific debate questions—You will be able to choose your topic/date.
  2. the other an incremental-cumulative paper to demonstrate engagement and “mastery” of material on landmarks of planning history.
- It is expected that students will come to class prepared to discuss the assigned material and ideas, and to participate actively.

## Evaluations:

Course grades will be determined by:

- Mastery of the historical subject matter as demonstrated in the over the last 150 years of planning, with attention to what you would/could have done at the time. The complete set is due on **Monday, March 15.**
- Debate assignment, with other class members. **I will provide specific questions and a sign-up sheet for you to choose your preferred topic**  
Demonstration of competence in articulating and defending a position on an important historical-ethical issue arising in the history of society and planning. First a class presentation, then after that a 3-5 page paper presenting your considered view. This should be turned in the week after your presentation, but I will accept them until **March 15.**
- Grades:
- Class participation on a regular basis -- 10%
- The completed debate assignment -- 25%.
- Incremental Descriptions-Analyses - 65%  
(of landmark cases)

# Readings and Discussion Topics

## Course Mechanics

Discussion: What sort of Planner will you be?

- Rational: objective practices + management
- Advocacy for disadvantaged groups/causes
- Social Change Agent
- ???

## History Lecture Topics

Readings for Ethics, Theory Debates [TENTATIVE]

TAYLOR, *The Environment & the People*

All readings are for the next class after the lecture

HEAR LECTURE, DO READING FOR THE NEXT WEEK

### Tenement Reform

Utopias, Company Towns  
Garden City

221-284, 287-319/337;  
contemporary 359-363

Chicago: 1893 World Fair  
1909 Plan

ARCHER, BAKER, MARZOLF  
?maybe more time here?

City Beautiful & City Practical

437-439 (also a reading to be provided)

Regional Planning Assoc. America/  
National Resources Planning Board

sanitation 198; zoning 365-404

Rockefeller Center

Work-pollution environmental activism  
Taylor, 446-499

Post WWII Highways

Data Gathering & Social Science-  
Taylor- 181-198-mapping,

Post-WWII Housing

Reading to be provided

Urban Renewal

Reading to be provided

—last class day

– both writing assignments due—this is a hard deadline

### **Student Debates on History Landmarks**

Each student will make a presentation with two parts. I will pose a specific **Debate Question**.

The first part will be to the class, with a short **1 PAGE** handout; the second part will be a transformation into a more complete written form, to be handed in and graded. Note, only the later written version is graded.

#### In-Class

The debate 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 among themselves, then open it up to the class.

For the in-class presentation:

- Reflect on the lecture and explicitly use the readings assigned from Dorceta Taylor. 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 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 Monday, March 15

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.

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 (**3-5 printed pages**)—instead of the outline form of the in-class version, put your ideas into sentences and paragraphs. Or, an even better strategy would be to write a draft of the paper, then summarize some points for the 1 page in-class handout, then afterward go back and develop-polish the paper. Remember, it counts 35% of your grade

INCREMENTAL-CUMULATIVE DESCRIPTION & ANALYSIS OF LANDMARK CASES—turn in all of these together at the end of the quarter

Use this format to show thinking and understanding for each historical planning landmark—to describe and analyze the multiple contending forces and actors; to sort out what was done and what could have been different.

**BASED ON THE LECTURE AND DORCETA TAYLOR READINGS**

1. a) **Identify the individuals/groups** who actively generated the situational dynamic:        bad conditions/problems    improvements  
       b) **Describe/explain what they did:** what were their major strategies/actions
2. What were the positive accomplishments? What were the negative shortcomings (the critique)?
3. As a college graduate AT THE TIME what would you have done to improve things & how would you have done it?

You do not have to do this in a three column format. This grid may simply help to see the project. The more detail and completeness/complexity, the better

**For example,**

1. Players and Their Actions	2.Positive/Negative Outcomes	3 <u>At the time,</u> What would you have done? How
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Immigrants</b> Arrive, in poverty, in large numbers requiring jobs, housing, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>overcrowding, spread of disease</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Property Owners/Landlords</b> Connived to gain profits by sub-sub-dividing apartments</li> </ul>	<p>profits for this group but worse and worse conditions for tenants</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>CCP</b> (Committee on the Congestion of the Population), proposed moving industry out of city</li> </ul>	<p>many good ideas, not all adopted at the time foreshadow suburbs</p>	

