INTRODUCTION and OVERVIEW

One of the core requirements for the MCRP degree at the Bloustein School is that you complete a course in the history and theory of planning. The American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) tests your knowledge of the history and theory of planning when certifying you as a professional planner. So this is a course in the “History and Theory of Planning.”

Beyond that, nothing is very clear. That is because the meaning, significance, and content of the terms “history,” “theory,” and “planning” are in much dispute. There is no one history or theory of planning on which everyone agrees. There can be many different histories of the same period, people and events, depending on (among other things) who is doing the telling, whose history is being told, and who decides what to include and what to leave out. Who counts as a “planner” in the history of planning? Is the history of planning a story about those doing the planning or about those affected by the plan? Or is it about the relationship between the two? Is planning history a description of the development of the profession, a record of evolving methods or styles of planning practice, a heroic narrative about great planners in history, a history of ideas about what planning should be, or all (or none) of the above? Or is planning history about the introduction, rejection, and evolution of planning theories and, if so, which theories should it include? What is the relationship, if any, between theories of planning (theories about what planning is or should be) and theories in planning (theories about neighborhoods, cities or regions that planners use to do their work)?

This course explores these questions by placing planning history and theory in the context of their times. Planning—whether practice or theory—does not happen in a vacuum, disconnected from everything else going on in the world. The theory and practice of planning reflect, and sometimes influence, what is happening in the wider world of which they are a part. This much seems obvious. But the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when planning emerged as a formally institutionalized and professionalized activity, were dynamic, exciting, sometimes chaotic and often dangerous times, encompassing mass industrialization, rapid urbanization, demographic shifts, economic restructuring, world-wide wars, intellectual ferment, scientific breakthroughs, technological innovations, political realignments, social and cultural upheavals, global migrations, and much, much more.

We will seek to understand planning by asking how it arose and evolved in the midst of this ferment and how planning reflects the ambitions, contradictions, and challenges of its times. We will ask, in particular, how the practice of planning emerged within—and contributed to—prevailing ideological commitments to the project of modernism, defined as a belief in the possibility of progress and the application of scientific and technological knowledge to social and economic problems—what James C. Scott, in Seeing Like a State (1998, p. 4), called “the rational design of social order commensurate with the scientific understanding of natural laws.”
What can we learn by understanding the theory and practice of planning as informed by, and in reaction against, the project of modernism? Planning has embodied both the promise and the challenges of modernism, producing debates that continue to occupy planning theorists and practitioners alike. If planning relies on the possibility of progress, how is progress defined and is it best achieved through large-scale visionary designs or small incremental change? If planning seeks solutions to social and economic problems, how are such problems identified, and by whom? How can a commitment to a vision of the public interest and to collective problem-solving be reconciled with liberal individualism and free-market ideology? If planning entails the application of science to problem-solving, how is planning’s technical expertise aligned with the view from the street where people actually live their lives and experience the effects of technical interventions? Is planning a practice of science or of politics or both? The answers to these questions in particular times and places constitute the history and theory of planning that will engage us over the semester.

**LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

By the end of the semester, you should be able to:
- Demonstrate your familiarity with the major debates and issues in planning history and theory.
- Understand and evaluate the variety of answers to the question: “What is planning?”
- Situate the evolving theory and practice of U.S. planning in the context of broad intellectual, social, political, economic, and global trends.
- Identify and discuss reasons for divergence between what planning is and what planning should be.
- Establish your individual identity as a planner within the range of possibilities presented by the history and theory of the field.

**EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. **Reading and active participation in seminar discussions [40%].**
   This is a *graduate-level seminar*, in which each seminar member shares responsibility to actively participate in the teaching and learning that we accomplish in class each week. Active participation requires:
   - regular class attendance
   - completing the assigned readings in full in advance of each week’s class meeting
   - engaging with other seminar members in the respectful and constructive exchange of ideas
   - in-class oral presentation of research (more on this below)

2. **Completion of four written reflection papers (3-5 pages each) discussing and evaluating the assigned readings [30%].**
   You may select readings for *any four weeks* during the semester as the subject of your reflection papers—but you must submit four essays by the last class meeting on December 14th. Guidelines for preparing reflection papers are posted on the class Sakai site and will be distributed at the first class meeting. Your essays should not merely summarize the readings; rather, they should offer a critical assessment of, and engagement with, ideas or issues in the readings.

Reflection papers are due at the beginning of the class session in which the reading is assigned and discussed. *Late papers will not be accepted.* Submit your papers as an e-mail attachment (.docx or .pdf) before class, in hard copy at the beginning of the class period, or in the Dropbox on the class
Sakai site. Papers must be typed, double-spaced, in 12-point font and must conform to professional standards of grammar, punctuation, and citation format.

3. **Preparation of an 8-12 page written research paper and in-class oral presentation [30%].**

   Research and write an 8-12 page paper (excluding illustrations and references) on a topic in the history and theory of planning, selected from the *Themes* and *People* listed in the class schedule below. Guidelines for preparing research papers will be posted on the class Sakai site and will be distributed at the first class meeting. Written papers must be typed, double-spaced, in 12-point font and must conform to professional standards of grammar, punctuation, and citation format.

   Selection of a research topic entails responsibility to give a **15-20 minute in-class oral presentation** on the date for that topic indicated in the class schedule. Please note the following deadlines:

   - **Choose and sign up for your research topic:** in class on **January 30th** (week 2).
   - **In-class oral presentation:** on the date indicated in the class schedule corresponding to your chosen topic.
   - **Submit written paper:** one or two weeks following your in-class oral presentation.
     - If your in-class presentation occurs **on or before March 27th**, submit your written paper within **two weeks** after your oral presentation.
     - If your in-class presentation occurs **after March 27th**, submit your written paper within **one week** after your oral presentation.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Plagiarism, cheating, or any other form of academic dishonesty will not be tolerated, will result in a grade of ‘F’ or zero (0) for the assignment in question, and may jeopardize your continued enrollment in the program. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to the use of another’s words or ideas without proper attribution. Please familiarize yourself with the University’s policy on plagiarism and academic integrity found at the following sources:

http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/
http://gsnb.rutgers.edu/academic-integrity-grad-students

**REQUIRED READINGS**

The following required text is available at the Rutgers Bookstore:


All other required readings listed in the Class Schedule will be posted under “Resources” on the class Sakai site.
CLASS SCHEDULE AND READINGS

JANUARY 23  INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Themes: What is history? What is theory? What is planning? Why should you care?


American Planning Association (APA), Timeline of American Planning History
http://www.txplanning.org/files/183/download

JANUARY 30  SOCIETY, ECONOMY, AND THE CITY IN HISTORY

Themes: Feudalism, Enclosure Movement, Industrial Revolution, Urbanization, Liberalism, Market Economy

People: Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacque Rousseau, John Locke, John Stuart Mill, Adam Smith


Ch. 7 “The morality of improvement,” pp. 60-67


FEBRUARY 6  HIGH MODERNISM AND THE PROMISE OF SCIENCE

Themes: European Enlightenment, Scientific Revolution, Positivism, Paradigms, Sanitary Reform, Settlement House Movement, Rational Planning

People: Francis Bacon, Rene Descartes, Auguste Comte, Henri Saint-Simon, Charles Booth

Read: RIPT, Ch. 3 James C. Scott, “Authoritarian high modernism,” pp. 75-93.


FEBRUARY 13  PLANNING VISIONARIES—“MAKE NO SMALL PLANS”

Themes: Urban Utopianism, Garden City Movement, City Beautiful Movement, Chicago Columbian Exposition, Progressive Movement, Radburn, NJ

People: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier, Daniel Burnham, Frederick Law Olmsted, Lewis Mumford


FEBRUARY 20  ROBERT MOSES—PLANNING NEW YORK  
**Themes:** New Deal/WPA, Parkways, Jones Beach State Park, Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, Regional Plan Association  
**People:** Robert Moses, Rexford Tugwell, Edmund Bacon  

FEBRUARY 27  PLANNING IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY  
**Themes:** Capitalism, Circulation and Accumulation of Capital, Commodification of Land, Land Markets, State in Capitalism/Capitalist State  
**People:** Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, David Harvey  
**Read:** Ript, Ch. 5 Robert Fogelson, “Planning the capitalist city,” pp. 110-116.  

MARCH 6  PUBLIC PLANNING: REGULATION AND MARKETS  
**Themes:** Self-regulating (Free) Market, Market Failure, Regulation, Neoliberalism, Public Interest, Public Goods, Utilitarianism, Cost-Benefit Analysis  
**People:** Jeremy Bentham, Edmund Burke, John Maynard Keynes, Karl Polanyi, Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman  
**Read:** Ript, Ch. 9 Richard Klosterman, “Arguments for and against planning,” pp. 169-186.  

MARCH 13  NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK
MARCH 20  URBAN RENEWAL


People: Catherine Bauer, Charles Abrams, Robert Weaver, Edward Logue, Martin Anderson, Herbert Gans, Chester Hartman


MARCH 27  PLANNING FROM MODERNISM TO POSTMODERNISM

Themes: Systems Analysis, Postmodernism, Governmentality, Identity, Subjectivity

People: Herbert Simon, Michel Foucault, Nancy Fraser, John Friedmann

Read: RRIPT, Ch. 7 Patsy Healey, “The planning project,” pp. 139-155.

APRIL 3  JANE JACOBS: PLANNING FROM BELOW

Themes: Neighborhood Planning, Planning as Process, Forms of Expertise, Experiential vs. Technical Knowledge, Who plans?

People: Jane Jacobs

APRIL 10  
**ADVOCACY AND EQUITY PLANNING**  
*Themes:* Advocacy Planning, Equity Planning, Objectivity, Power, Politics and Planning  
*People:* Paul Davidoff, Walter Thabit, Norman Krumholz  
RIPT, Ch. 21 Paul Davidoff, “Advocacy and pluralism in planning,” pp. 427-442.  

APRIL 17  
**COMMUNICATIVE/DELIBERATIVE/PARTICIPATORY PLANNING**  
*Themes:* Public Sphere, Public Space, Communicative Rationality, Deliberative Democracy, Participatory Planning, Participatory Action Research  
*People:* Jurgen Habermas, John Forester, Patsy Healey, Judith Innes  
*Read:* RIPT, Ch. 17 Frank Fischer, “Participatory governance: from theory to practice,” pp. 348-362.  
RIPT, Ch. 19 Iris Marion Young, “Inclusion and democracy,” pp. 389-406.  
RIPT, Ch. 22 June Manning Thomas, “The minority-race planner in the quest for the just city,” pp. 443-463.  

APRIL 24  
**PLANNING, PROTEST, AND ACTIVISM**  
*Themes:* Community Organizing, Activism, Protest, Social Movements  
*People:* Frances Fox Piven, Iris Marion Young, Leonie Sandercock, Manuel Castells  
SUMMARY: PLANNERS, PLANNING, PRACTICE, ETHICS

Themes: Planning Theory, Planning Practice, Planning Ethics

Read: RIPT, Ch. 23 Martin Wachs, “The past, present, and future of professional ethics in planning, pp. 464-479.
“AICP code of ethics and professional conduct,” https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm