

# GATEWAY I (11.200)

## Fall 2022 Syllabus

### Class Times/ Locations:

Monday and Wednesday Lectures | 11a-12:30p, Room 37-212

Weekly Recitations | *Thursday*: R1 2:30-3:30p, R2 3:30-4:30p in 5-232

*Friday*: R3 2:30-3:30p, R4 3:30-4:30p, in 9-450

Instructors: **Jason Jackson**: [jbrj@mit.edu](mailto:jbrj@mit.edu) | office 9-535

Office hours: Mon 1:00-3:00p, sign up at <https://dusp.mit.edu/oh> or email for an alternate time

**Delia Wendel**: [wendel@mit.edu](mailto:wendel@mit.edu) | office 9-521 or via zoom

Office hours: Weds 1:30-3:30p, sign up at <https://calendly.com/wendel-ddb> or email for an alternate time

TAs: **Chenab Navalkha** [chenab@mit.edu](mailto:chenab@mit.edu) | Office 9-550

Office hours: Mondays 10:00am-11:00am, 1:00pm-2:00pm, sign up at <https://calendly.com/chenabn/officehours>

**Mrinalini Penumaka** [mpenumak@mit.edu](mailto:mpenumak@mit.edu) | Office 9-550 | Office hours: Mondays 10:00am – 11:00am; Thursdays 10:00am – 11:00am, sign up at <https://calendly.com/mpenumak/officehours>

Course Canvas Page: <https://canvas.mit.edu/courses/15397>

### Course Description:

Gateway I is the core History and Theory of Planning course in the Master in City Planning (MCP) curriculum. The course explores questions related to planning in “the public interest”. Gateway I is organized in two half-semester modules. The first aims to highlight the challenges inherent in planning’s focus on the public interest from a political economy perspective. The second offers engagements with the ethical dilemmas that practitioners confront in planning for the public interest in contexts of entrenched social and racial inequity. Using a combination of lecture and workshop formats, the course provides a primer for exploring relationships of power and difference that have shaped urban spaces and are poised to recast urban futures. Lectures in the first module introduce the structural forces and conditions—including those shaped by capitalism, imperialism, and state-market-society relations—from which modern planning has emerged. Lectures and workshops in the second module open up discussions of expertise, community knowledge, and transformative practice that support redress for harms and exclusion re/produced by design, planning, and development. The intention of Gateway I is to prepare students to continue onto Gateway II, the second course in the sequence oriented to professional skills, with case studies and value positions to guide ethical planning practice.

## **Learning Objectives:**

1. Develop familiarity with a subset of planning theory as means to understand how debates around the course themes of power and difference have shaped planning interventions around the world;
2. Exemplify the range of ways that relationships of power have shaped urban design and planning (e.g. capitalism, colonialism, state and market led initiatives, community mobilization, racialized logics, etc.);
3. Help students develop value positions to engage issues of difference in planning (such as inequality, pluralism and community voice, identity and positionality, place specificity, etc.); and
4. Provide space for individuals with varied backgrounds, goals, and expectations to hone the skills necessary for articulating their views and engaging in constructive debate—while fostering a safe space for others to do the same.

## **Course Structure and Grading:**

Gateway I meets three times a week: twice as a full class (Mondays and Wednesdays) and once in smaller discussion groups (“recitations” in MIT lingo). Attendance in all three sessions is required. Completing required readings before class will substantially enhance your engagement with the material. PDFs of all required readings can be downloaded from the class Canvas page: <https://canvas.mit.edu/courses/15397>

**Class Grading.** Your grade will be calculated as follows:

### Class and Recitation Participation (20% of your grade):

Attendance and active participation in class and recitation are an important part of the course. Communicate with your TA if you are absent from any session, especially if you wish to count that absence as excused (via OGE: for religious holidays, illness, or personal emergencies).

### Individual Assignments (30% of your grade):

These are assignments that are designed to help you unpack and delve further into the session content and will be graded on a point scale intended to help you track your progress on improvements in critical analysis and writing. See guides for writing reading responses and their evaluation at the end of the syllabus. You can opt out of one individual assignment per module (two total in the course) without penalty. If you complete all assignments, we will drop your lowest grade.

#### Module 1: Planning Debates

M, 19 Sep	250 word reading reflection
M, 26 Sep	250 word reading reflection
M, 03 Oct	250 word reading reflection

M, 12 Oct	250 word reading reflection
M, 17 Oct	250 word reading reflection

Module 2: Planning Futures

M, 31 Oct	Week 09	No reading reflection due
M, 07 Nov	Week 10	250 word reading reflection
M, 14 Nov	Week 11	250 word reading reflection
M, 21 Nov	Week 12	250 word reading reflection
M, 28 Nov	Week 13	250 word reading reflection
M, 05 Dec	Week 14	250 word reading reflection

Final Essays (30% of your grade):

Two longer essays will serve as cumulative assignments for each module. Each will be organized by a prompt related to the material we cover in the preceding module. The learning objective is for you to engage synthetically with the module’s content and develop an organized and critical analytic response of 1,000 words.

W, 26 Oct	Week 08	Module 1: 1,000 word analytic essay
W, 14 Dec	Week 15	Module 2: 1,000 word analytic essay

Group Exercises (20% of your grade):

These will be graded as “participated” or “did not participate” and are collaborative, in-class exercises intended to help students ground theories and ideas introduced in the sessions while offering space to speculate on alternative planning futures. Primarily occurring in Module 2, participation will be graded based on groups’ documentation of their discussion and work in response to the prompt.

For details on the individual assignments, see session descriptions below. Final essay prompts for Modules 1 and 2 will be published on Canvas at least two weeks before the deadline. For grade definitions and guidelines for writing and evaluating written assignments in this course, see the end of the syllabus.

Late submissions. We will grant extensions for genuine emergencies if you contact your section TA *in advance* to make your request. However, in fairness to your colleagues, unexcused late submissions will be penalized, with points deducted according to how late you submit.

If you are dealing with an issue that is impacting your ability to attend class or complete work, please write to Jason Jackson and Delia Wendel or contact GradSupport by email at [gradsupport@mit.edu](mailto:gradsupport@mit.edu) or via phone at (617) 253-4860.

The Gateway I Teaching Team is committed to equal access. Students who need disability accommodations, please contact [Disability and Access Services](#) so that they can evaluate and address your requests. You only need to do this once while at MIT; thereafter please just inform Jason Jackson and Delia Wendel via email that you have been approved for accommodations and we will work with DAS to assist you.

### **Land Acknowledgement Statement:**

MIT acknowledges Indigenous Peoples as the traditional stewards of the land, and the enduring relationship that exists between them and their traditional territories. The land on which we sit is the traditional unceded territory of the Wampanoag Nation. We acknowledge the painful history of genocide and forced occupation of their territory, and we honor and respect the many diverse Indigenous people connected to this land on which we gather from time immemorial.

In particular, we acknowledge that urban planning never takes place on a *tabula rasa*. The work for this course strives to understand how relationships of power have historically shaped planning and the marginalization that have emerged from these processes in order to seek ways towards a more just future.

### **Gateway I—Summary of Sessions and Topics:**

#### **Weeks 01-02: Course Introduction**

<i>Week</i>	<i>Day of Week</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>01</b>	<b>Course Introduction</b>		
	W	Sep 07	First Class: Ice Breakers + Syllabus overview
	Recitation	Sep 08/ 09	Introductions
<b>02</b>	<b>Gateway I Foundations</b>		
	M	Sep 12	Active Reading Tutorial
	W	Sep 14	Personal Theory of Practice
	Recitation		Reflections on Week 02

#### **Module 01: Planning Debates (led by Jason Jackson)**

<i>Week</i>	<i>Day of Week</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>03</b>	<b>Planning Debates: Historicizing Planning Theory</b>		
	M	Sep 19	Planning Debates I: An Capitalism and Planning
	W	Sept 21	Planning Debates II: Critical Perspectives on Planning Theory
	No Recitation	Sept 23	Student holiday
<b>04</b>	<b>Planning: Capitalism, Imperialism, Nature</b>		
	M	Sep 26	Capitalist Urbanization I: Nature & the Rise of the Modern Industrial City in the Global North
	W	Sep 28	Capitalist Urbanization II: Postcolonial Transformations in the Global South
	Recitation		Reflections on Weeks 03-04
<b>05</b>	<b>Urban Utopias</b>		
	M	Oct 03	Urban Utopias I: Authoritarian High Modernism
	W	Oct 05	Urban Utopias II: Urban Science, Urban Technology
	Recitation		Reflections on Week 05
<b>06</b>	<b>Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Planning</b>		
	M	Oct 10	No Class: Indigenous Peoples Day
	W	Oct 12	Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Planning
	Recitation		Reflections on Week 06

<b>07</b>	<b>Urban Governance</b>		
	M	Oct 17	Urban Governance I: Informality as a Mode of Governance?
	W	Oct 19	Urban Governance II: Race and the Right to the City
	Recitation		Reflections on Week 07
<b>08</b>	<b>Contemporary Debates in Urban Theory</b>		
	M	Oct 24	Contemporary Debates I: From the Universalizing to the Particularistic?
	W	Oct 26	Contemporary Debates II: Standpoints and Perspectives in Urban Theory <b>**Module 1 Final Essay due</b>
	No Recitation		

### Module 02: Planning Futures (led by Delia Wendel)

<i>Week</i>	<i>Day of Week</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>09</b>	<b>Introduction to Module 2</b>		
	M	Oct 31	Planning in the Public Interest
	W	Nov 02	<b>Workshop: Whiteness and Urban Planning</b>
	Recitation		Reflections on Week 09
<b>10</b>	<b>Gatekeepers of Possibility</b>		
	M	Nov 07	<b>Planning with Difference</b>
	W	Nov 09	Workshop: Disability Planning
	No Recitations	Nov 11	Veterans' Day
<b>11</b>	<b>Imagining Otherwise I</b>		
	M	Nov 14	From Equity to Reparative Planning
	W	Nov 16	Workshop: COVID-19 emergency response
	Recitation		Reflections on Weeks 10-11
<b>12</b>	<b>Imagining Otherwise II</b>		
	M	Nov 21	Affective and Therapeutic Planning
	W	Nov 23	Workshop: On Memory
	No Recitations	Nov 24-25	Thanksgiving Break
<b>13</b>	<b>Decolonizing Planning?</b>		
	M	Nov 28	Community Voice
	W	Nov 30	Workshop: Liberatory Plan Analysis
	Recitation	Dec 02	Reflections on Weeks 12-13
<b>14</b>	<b>Who and What is in the Public Interest?</b>		
	M	Dec 05	The Role of the Planner
	W	Dec 07	Roundtable: Public Interests & PTOps
	Recitation	Dec 09	Reflections on Week 14

### Final Week

<b>15</b>	<b>Course Conclusion</b>		
	M	Dec 12	Gateway I Class Review
	W	Dec 14	No class—Module 2 Final Essay due
	No Recitations		12/14 is the last day of classes

\* This syllabus is subject to change; we will endeavor to provide at least one week's notice for any substantial changes to readings and assignments.

## WEEK 01 | INTRODUCING GATEWAY 1

### **Sep 07 | W | First class meeting**

An overview of the learning objectives, assignments, and structure for Gateway 1. Introduction to the relationships between power, difference, and planning that animate sessions in the course. Discussion of the course as a response to the Black DUSP Thesis, an extension of the 2020 Racial Justice Teach-In, and part of the continued dialog on the role of DUSP in perpetuating and addressing issues of social and racial injustice within the institution and in the communities in which planners and designers work.

*Assignment:* none

#### *Required reading*

Black DUSP Thesis (Summer 2020): [website](#)

The Racial Justice Teach-In Book (Fall 2020): [website](#)

#### *Supplementary Reading/ Viewing*

Black DUSP Magic Roundtable Discussion, RJTI, 13 Oct 2020: [youtube](#)

[\(Partial\) List of Planning Schools/Institutional Responses to 2020 BLM Protests](#)

### **Sep 08/ 09 | R or F | Recitation Introductions**

Come to recitation having reviewed the above.

## WEEK 02 | GATEWAY 1 FOUNDATIONS

### **Sep 12 | M | Active Reading Tutorial**

*Assignment:* none

#### *Required reading*

Susan Fainstein and James DeFilippis. 2016. "Introduction: The Structure and Debates of Planning Theory" in *Readings in Planning Theory, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Blackwell: Malden, Mass.: 2016, pp. 1-18.

DUSP 2022 Active Reading Guide

*Supplementary:*

[MIT Writing Center Resources](#)

[Reading Techniques from Dartmouth](#)

[Reading Tips from Harvard's Academic Resource Center](#)

### **Sep 14 | W | Developing a Personal Theory of Practice**

**Led by CoLab's Katrin Kaeufer**

A Personal Theory of Practice (PTOP) is an evolving representation of your values and

reflections on professional experience that serves to guide your present and future practice. It is not all definitive; it is as much constituted by guiding questions or dilemmas that you seek to unpack. It is not only driven by personal experience either; it incorporates critical reflections on the contexts in which you work and your “theory/ies of change” grounded in communities in the world. In this session, we will begin the messy process of developing a personal theory of practice—an exercise to which we will return at the end of the semester.

Ungraded Assignment (begin in-class, due before recitation on Sep 15 or 16):

Develop a first draft Personal Theory of Practice (PTOP). Be creative: use visual diagrams, word clouds, or other ways of conceptually organizing your thoughts. Allow your PTOPTOP to look like a draft; for it to be messy and edited in future. Write a few sentences to describe your professional values and connect them to questions, dilemmas, experiences, or theories of change in practice. **You will start a PTOPTOP in class on Sep 14; this assignment asks you to further organize those thoughts before your recitation.**

Required reading

MIT DUSP CoLab, “Guiding questions for a Personal Theory of Practice” (2022)

Supplementary Reading/ Viewing

Reed Jordan, Erina Keefe, Danya Littlefield, Jonathan Tarleton, and Jessica Wolff, “Dear Incoming MCP2s: A Letter from Us” MIT DUSP CoLab website:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A4Rz\\_sDB0ctdpruZ5w3hwOIEgrcFSL8S0S6i30obHY4/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A4Rz_sDB0ctdpruZ5w3hwOIEgrcFSL8S0S6i30obHY4/edit)

MIT DUSP CoLab, “Techniques for PTOPTOPs”, CoLab website:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/10vHvGNCSKsPZui8pBqgQDHR74MP5bRVG5bDYSQv2vXM/edit#heading=h.x19ogyd07bbi>

## **Module 1: Planning Debates**

Led by Jason Jackson

### **WEEK 03 | PLANNING DEBATES: HISTORICIZING PLANNING THEORY**

*This first week of Module 1 offers an initial presentation of some of the longstanding debates that have structured the field of planning. The in-class discussion will center the course themes of power and difference as they have shaped perspectives on planning theory. In particular, it will allow us to think critically about the various perspectives that planners theorize from, and how those perspectives matter in shaping planning ideas and planning outcomes. While far from comprehensive, this week’s material and discussion will begin to provide an analytic grounding and conceptual vocabulary for the rest of the module.*



### ***Sept. 19: Planning Debates I: Capitalism and Planning***

- Robert Klosterman, 2016. "Arguments for and against planning," in Susan Fainstein and James DeFilippis, eds., *Readings in Planning Theory*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Blackwell: Malden, Mass.: 2016, 169-186.
- Ann Markusen, "Planning as craft and as philosophy," in Lloyd Rodwin and Bishwapriya Sanyal eds., *The Profession of City Planning: Changes, Images, and Challenges, 1950-2000*.
- Ellen Meiksins Wood. 2014. "Capitalism's Gravediggers." *Jacobin*, December 5, 2014. Available [here](#). (Read the first two sub-sections on "Defining Capitalism" and "What Capitalism Isn't"; you may skip the rest.)

#### ***Recommended***

- John Friedmann, "Two Centuries of Planning Theory: An Overview," *Explorations in Planning Theory*, eds. Seymour J. Mandelbaum, Luigi Mazza and Robert W. Burchell (Rutgers, 1996).
- Richard Foglesong. 1986. "The Problem of Planning," Chapter 1 in *Planning the Capitalist City: The Colonial Period to the 1920s*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 3-27.
- Friedrich von Hayek. 1945. "The Use of Knowledge in Society." *American Economic Review* 35(4): 519-530.
- Friedrich von Hayek, 1944. *The Road to Serfdom*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press). Introduction (pp. 57-63) and the following very brief selections: pp. 85-86 (from Chapter 3: "Individualism and Collectivism") and pp. 97-99 (from Chapter 4: "The 'Inevitability' of Planning").

### ***Sept. 21: Planning Debates II: Critical Perspectives on Planning Theory***

- David Harvey. 1985. "On planning the ideology of planning," in *The Urbanization of Capital*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 165-184.
- Ananya Roy, "Who's Afraid of Post-Colonial Theory?" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39.1, pp. 1-16.
- Oren Yiftachel, "Planning and Social Control: Exploring The 'Dark Side'" *Journal of Planning Literature* 12:2 (1998), 395-406. [Skim]

#### ***Recommended***

- Peter Hall. 1988. *Cities of Tomorrow: an intellectual history of urban planning and design in the twentieth century*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Peter Hall and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, "Planning, planners and plans," in *Urban and Regional Planning*, 5th edition. New York and London: Routledge, 2011, 1-10.
- Peter Hall, "The centenary of modern planning," in Robert Freestone ed., *Urban Planning in a Changing World*. London: Spon, 2000, 20-39.
- David Harvey. "The Political Economy of Public Space." Mimeo.
- Carolini, Gabriella Y. "Go South, Young Planner, Go South!" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 9, no. 2 (2018).
- Vanessa Watson, "Shifting Approaches to Planning Theory: Global North and South," *Urban*



- Planning* 2016, Volume 1, Issue 4, Pages 32–41.
- Vanessa Watson, “Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe’s Central Urban Issues,” *Urban Studies* 46:11 (2009), 2259–2275.
- Petra Doan, “Why Question Planning Assumptions and Practices about Queer Spaces,” in Petra Doan, ed. *Queering Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice* (Ashgate, 2015).
- Leonie Sandercock and Ann Forsyth (1992). “A Gender Agenda. New Directions for Planning Theory,” *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 58:1 (1992), 49-59.

*Individual Assignment due 21 Sep:* Develop a critical reflection on at least two concepts, passages, or aspects from the readings that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). Write no more than 250 words. Upload to Canvas.

## WEEK 04 | PLANNING: CAPITALISM, IMPERIALISM, NATURE

*This week grounds the history of planning in the context of capitalism and imperialism. It highlights the role of displacement, violence and ecology, while centering the role of power and the construction of racial and other forms of difference. The readings move across time and space showing how race is central in capitalism, imperialism and ultimately, planning, from 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century United States, to 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> century Qatar.*

### **Sept. 26: Capitalist Urbanization I: Nature & the Rise of the Modern Industrial City in the Global North**

William Cronon. 1991. *Nature’s Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapters 1 (read all) & Chapter 2 (read pp. 55-73, skim the rest).

#### *Recommended*

Maria Kaika and Erik Swyngedouw. 2014. “Radical urban political-ecological imaginaries: planetary urbanization and politicizing nature,” *Eurozine*, May 2014:  
<https://www.eurozine.com/radical-urban-political-ecological-imaginaries/>

Scott Campbell, “Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities? Urban Planning and the Contradictions of Sustainable Development,” *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62:3 (Summer 1996), 296-312. (if interested, see also celebration of 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the article in the most recent issue of [JAPA 82\(4\) 2016](#)).

### **Sept. 28: Capitalist Urbanization II: Postcolonial Transformations in the Global South**

Iskander, Natasha. "Qatar, the Coronavirus, and Cordons Sanitaires: Migrant Workers and the Use of Public Health Measures to Define the Nation," *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 34.4 (2020): 561-577.

*Recommended*

Farnak Miraftab. "Colonial Present: Legacies of the Past in Contemporary Urban Practices in Cape Town, South Africa." *Journal of Planning History* 11(4) 283-307.

Additional reading materials TBD

Individual Assignment due before class on 26 Sep: Develop a critical reflection on at least two concepts, passages, or aspects from the readings that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). Write no more than 250 words. Upload to Canvas.

**WEEK 05 | URBAN UTOPIAS**

*Utopic visions have been a central part of the construction of modernity, and crucially, have been implemented through the (oftentimes coercive) power of the state through its planning apparatus. This week addresses historic and contemporary utopic visions across the Global North and South, from mid-20<sup>th</sup> century projects of urban renewal and wholesale development of new national capitals, to 21<sup>st</sup> century smart (or surveillance?) cities, highlighting the tensions between top-down efforts and bottom-up resistance.*

Individual Assignment due before class on 3 Oct: Develop a critical reflection on at least two concepts, passages, or aspects from the readings that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). Write no more than 250 words. Upload to Canvas.

**Oct. 3: Urban Utopias I: Authoritarian High Modernism**

James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, CT: Yale, 1998), read "Introduction" pp.1-8 and Chapter 4 "The High-Modernist City: An Experiment and Critique" pp. 103-146. You may skim Chapter 3 "Authoritarian High Modernism" pp. 87-102.

Bruce Mazlish, excerpt from "The Idea of Progress," *Daedalus* (Summer, 1963), 456-7.

Jane Jacobs, excerpt of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," in *Readings in Planning Theory*, edited by Campbell and Fainstein (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003).

*Recommended*

Le Corbusier, *The City of To-morrow and Its Planning* (New York: Dover, 1947 [1929]):

Excerpts: 11. A Contemporary City; 12. The Working Day; 13. The Hours of Repose" (pp. 249-259 only).

Robert Fishman, "Urban Utopias: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, and Le Corbusier," in

- Readings in Planning Theory*, 3rd Edition, edited by Susan Fainstein and James DeFilippis (Blackwell, 2016), 23-51.
- Zeynep Celik. 1992. Le Corbusier, Orientalism, Colonialism. *Assemblage* 17, 58-77.
- Thomas Campanella, "Jane Jacobs and the Death and Life of American Planning," *Places* (April 2011).
- Leonie Sandercock, "Exploring planning's knowledges," in *Towards Cosmopolis*. New York: Wiley, 1998, 57-84.
- Dolores Hayden. 1980. "What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work" *Signs* 5:3, S170-S187.
- Eric Avila, "Nobody But a Bunch of Mothers: Fighting the Highwaymen During Feminism's Second Wave," in *The Folklore of the Freeway: Race and Revolt in the Modernist City* (Minnesota, 2014), 53-88.
- Tania Li. 2005. "Beyond 'The State' and Failed Schemes." *American Anthropologist*, Sep., 2005, Vol. 107, No. 3 (Sep., 2005), pp. 383-394.

### ***Oct. 5: Urban Utopias II: Urban Science, Urban Technology***

- Ruha Benjamin. 2019. "Introduction: Discriminatory Design, Liberating Imagination" in *Captivating Technology race, carceral technoscience, and liberatory imagination in everyday life*. Duke University Press

*Additional reading materials TBD*

*Recommended: Smart Cities, Google & Quayside Toronto*

- Ellen P. Goodman and Julia Powles. 2019. "Urbanism under Google: Lessons from Sidewalk Toronto". *Fordham Law Review*.

Google Sidewalk Labs - Reimagining Cities from the Internet Up (Dan Doctoroff)  
<https://medium.com/sidewalk-talk/reimagining-cities-from-the-internet-up-5923d6be63ba>  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-de988sw-c>

Sidewalk labs Toronto (Nerissa Moray, Associate Direction of Planning and Development)  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pv\\_eBO7d7PY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pv_eBO7d7PY) Watch from min 13 onwards

Sidewalk Labs - Fox & Henhouse <https://theconversation.com/sidewalk-labs-proposals-put-the-fox-in-charge-of-the-henhouse-121601>

"Toronto swaps Google-backed, not-so-smart city plans for people-centred vision" *The Guardian*. Leonard Cecco, March 12, 2021.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/12/toronto-canada-quayside-urban-centre>

"Waterfront Toronto to design 'complete community' after Sidewalk Labs split", Cailin Crowe, March 17, 2021. <https://www.smartcitiesdive.com/news/waterfront-toronto-to-design-complete-community-after-sidewalk-labs-split/596748/>

“Toronto moves on from Sidewalk Labs controversy with new waterfront vision” Sarah Wray, March 15, 2021 <https://cities-today.com/toronto-moves-on-from-sidewalk-labs-controversy-with-new-waterfront-vision/> Check out links to new vision in RFQ

*Further Recommended*

- Ruha Benjamin. 2019. *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity Press.
- Google Sidewalk Labs - Master Innovation & Development Plan (Proposed). Long, but intro chapter worth a quick skim. You can view parts of the rest as interested. <https://quaysideto.ca/sidewalk-labs-proposal-master-innovation-and-development-plan/>
- Shannon Mattern. 2017. “Interfacing Urban Intelligence,” in *Places Journal*, April 2014.
- Shannon Mattern. 2017. “Introduction: Ether/Ore” in *Code and Clay, Data and Dirt: Five Thousand Years of Urban Media*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Kian Goh. 2015. “Who’s Smart? Whose City? The Sociopolitics of Urban Intelligence.” In *Planning Support Systems and Smart Cities*, Stan Geertman, Joseph Ferreira Jr, Robert Goodspeed (eds). John Stillwell. Springer.
- Sheila Jasanoff, “Future Imperfect: Science, Technology and the Imaginations of Modernity.” Chapter One in Sheila Jasanoff and Sang-Hyun Kim (eds) *Socio-technical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Ananya Roy, “Postcolonial urbanism: speed, hysteria, mass dreams,” in Ananya Roy and Aihwa Ong (eds.), *Worlding Cities: Asian Experiments and the Art of Being Global*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2011, 307-335.
- Dorien Zandberg. 2017. “We are Sensemakers: The Anti-Politics of Smart City Co-Creation’, *Public Culture*, 29(3), pp. 539-562.
- Ayona Datta. 2017. “The Smart Entrepreneurial City: Dholera and 100 Other Utopias in India” in Marvin, S, Luque-Ayala, A and McFarlane, C, (eds.) *Smart Urbanism: Utopian vision or false dawn?* London: Taylor & Francis (Routledge).

**WEEK 06 | SETTLER COLONIALISM AND INDIGENOUS PLANNING**

*Individual Assignment due before class on 12 Oct:* Develop a critical reflection on at least two concepts, passages, or aspects from the readings that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). Write no more than 250 words. Upload to Canvas.

**Oct. 10: NO CLASS**                      \*\* Indigenous Peoples’ Day \*\*

**Oct. 12: Settler Colonialism: Legacies of Race and Ecology**

Mingwei Huang. 2021. “The Chinese Century and the City of Gold: Rethinking Race and Capitalism.” *Public Culture* 33, no. 2, 193-217.

Hannah le Roux and Gabrielle Hecht. "Bad Earth" *e-flux Architecture*. <https://www.e-flux.com/architecture/accumulation/345106/bad-earth/>

### *Recommended*

- Ching Kwan Lee. 2017. *The Global Specter of China: Politics, Labor and Foreign Investment in Africa*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dorothy Tang and Andrew Watkins. "Ecologies of Gold: The Past and Future Mining Landscape of Johannesburg." *Places Journal* (2011). Available [here](#).
- Huang, Mingwei. 2020. "The Chinatown Back Room: The Afterlife of Apartheid Architectures." In *Anxious Joburg*, edited by Nicky Falkof and Cobus Van Staden, 152–75. The Inner Lives of a Global South City. Wits University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18772/22020106284.16>.
- Von Schnitzler, Antina. 2013. "Traveling Technologies: Infrastructure, Ethical Regimes, and the Materiality of Politics in South Africa." *Cultural Anthropology* 28 (4): 670–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cuan.12032>.
- Jennifer Robinson. 1997. "The geopolitics of South African cities: States, citizens, territory" *Political Geography* 16:5 (p. 365-386).
- Farnak MirafTAB. "Colonial Present: Legacies of the Past in Contemporary Urban Practices in Cape Town, South Africa." *Journal of Planning History* 11(4) 283-307.

### *Additional Materials on Indigenous Planning*

- Theodore Jojola. 1998. "Indigenous Planning: Clans, Inter-tribal Confederations and the History of the All-Indian Pueblo Council" in Leone Sandercock (eds) *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*. UC Press.
- Libby Porter, "Indigenous People and Their Challenge to Planning," in *Unlearning the Colonial Cultures of Planning* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010): 21-42.
- Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and pluralism in planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* (1965).

## **WEEK 07 | URBAN GOVERNANCE**

*This week focuses explicitly on the political economy of urban governance. The discussion will reinforce the main themes of power and difference, by showing how they manifest in the governance of space. Building on the previous week on urban utopias, we first focus on urban informality, highlighting roots in colonial and postcolonial ideas of modernity, and then turn to consider the intersection of race and technology and discourses and struggles around the right to the city.*

*Individual Assignment due before class on 17 Oct:* Develop a critical reflection on at least two concepts, passages, or aspects from the readings that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation

practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). Write no more than 500 words. Upload to Canvas.

### ***Oct. 17: Urban Governance I: Informality as a Mode of Governance?***

Hernando de Soto. 2000. *The Mystery of Capital*. Bantam Press Chapter 1 & 2.

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

Ananya Roy. 2015. "Urban Informality: The Production and Regulation of Space". *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Volume 24.

Daniel Brook. 2014. "Slumming It: The gospel of wealth comes for Dharavi" *The Baffler*, No. 25. <https://thebaffler.com/salvos/slumming-it>

#### *Recommended*

Oren Yiftachel. 2009. "Theoretical Notes on Gray Cities: The coming of urban apartheid?" *Planning Theory*, Vol 8(1): 88–100.

Farnak Miraftab. 2009. "Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South" *Planning Theory*, Vol 8(1): 32–50.

Kerry Rittich. "Formality and Informality in the Law of Work" in S. Archer, D. Drache and P. Zumbansen, eds., *The Daunting Enterprise of Law: Essays in Honour of Harry W Arthurs*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2017.

Saskia Sassen. 1998. "The informal economy: Between new developments and old regulations", in *Globalization and its Discontents*, The New Press, pp.153-174.

Ananya Roy, "Urban Informality: Toward an Epistemology of Planning," in *Journal of the American Planning Association* (71:2, 2005), 147-158.

Ananya Roy. 2009. "Strangely Familiar: Planning and the World of Insurgence and Informality," *Planning Theory*, Vol 8(1): 7–11.

Lily Song. 2016. "Planning with urban informality: a case for inclusion, co-production and reiteration," *International Development Policy Research*, 38(4), pp. 359-381.

Mike Davis. 2004. "Planet of Slums: Urban Involution and the Informal Proletariat" *New Left Review* 26, 5-34.

### ***Oct. 19: Urban Governance II: Race and the Right to the City***

Walter Johnson. 2016. "What Do We Mean When We Say, "Structural Racism"? A Walk down West Florissant Avenue, Ferguson, Missouri." *Kalfou* Vol 3(1), Spring 2016.

Inwood, Joshua, Anna Livia Brand, and Elise Quinn, "Racial Capital, Abolition, and a Geographic Argument for Reparations." *Antipode* 53.4 (2021): 1083-1103

Peter Marcuse. 2009. "From Critical Urban Theory to the Right to the City". *City*, 13:2-3, 185-197. [Skim]

#### *Recommended*

Walter Johnson "Ferguson's Fortune 500 Company." *The Atlantic*, April 26, 2015.

Henri Lefebvre, "The Right to the City," English translation by Eleanor Kofman and Elisabeth



Lebas in *Henri Lefebvre: Writings on Cities* (Blackwell, 1996), pp. 147-159.  
David Harvey, "The Right to the City," *New Left Review* 53 (Sept/Oct 2008), pp. 23-40.  
Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse and Margit Mayer "Chapter 1" in *Cities for People, not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse and Margit Mayer (eds.) New York and London: Routledge, 2011, 1-11.  
Susan S. Fainstein. 2014. "The Just City", *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 18:1, 1-18.  
Delia Wendel. "Imageability & Justice in Contemporary New Orleans." *Journal of Urban Design*. Vol. 14. No. 3, 345–375, August 2009

## WEEK 08 | CONTEMPORARY DEBATES IN URBAN THEORY

*This final week of Module 1 highlights the role of the course theme of difference in perspectives on planning by focusing on one of the more compelling recent debates in urban theory. The materials will allow us to debate how we should approach theory, in particular, how to adjudicate perspectives from the universalizing to the particularistic. That is, is there a fundamentally unresolvable dialectic between the universal and the particular in urban theorizing? To engage with this question, we will read works from economic, geographic, post-colonial, feminist and queer theoretical approaches, while taking seriously the question of standpoint and perspectives in urban theorizing.*

**Individual Assignment due 26 Oct:** Analytic essay TBA. You will be provided with a prompt and asked to write an analytic essay of no more than 1,000 words, due 26 October.

### ***Oct. 24: Contemporary Debates in Urban Theory: From the Universalizing to the Particularistic?***

Michael Storper and Allen Scott. 2016. "Current Debates in Urban Theory: A critical assessment." *Urban Studies*, Vol. 53(6) 1114-1136.  
Jennifer Robinson and Ananya Roy. "Debate on Global Urbanisms and the Nature of Urban theory," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40.1, pp. 181–186  
Neil Brenner and Christian Schmid, "Planetary Urbanisation" in Matthew Gandy (Ed) *Urban Constellation*, Berlin: Javis, 2012, pp. 10-13.  
Hillary Angelo and Kian Goh. 2021. "Out in Space: Difference and Abstraction in Planetary Urbanization," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.

#### *Highly Recommended*

Neil Brenner and Ananya Roy, Podcast: [Dialogues on the Urban Question](#), Urban Theory Lab Harvard University GSD.  
Ananya Roy, "Who's Afraid of Post-Colonial Theory?" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39.1, pp. 1–16 [previously assigned, review/skim]

#### *Recommended*

Michael Storper and Allen Scott. 2015. "The nature of cities: the scope and limits of urban theory." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39.1, pp. 1–16.



- Neil Brenner and Christian Schmid. 2015. "Towards a New Epistemology of the Urban?" *City* 19 (2–3): 151–82.
- Ananya Roy, "The 21st-Century Metropolis: New Geographies of Theory," *Regional Studies*, 43:6 (July 2009), 819–830.
- Schindler, Seth. 2017. "Towards a Paradigm of Southern Urbanism." *City* 21 (1): 47–64.
- Natalie Oswin. 2018. "Planetary urbanization: A view from outside" *Environment and Planning D*. Volume: 36 Issue: 3, page(s): 540-546.
- Natalie Oswin. 2015. "World, City, Queer" *Antipode* Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 557–565.

***Oct. 26: Module 1 Review***

*No readings*

**\*\* END OF MODULE 1 \*\***

## **Module 2: Planning Futures**

Led by Delia Wendel

### **WEEK 09 | INTRODUCTION TO MODULE 2**

An introduction to the primary themes of Module 2: challenges to and definitions of the public interest and an overview of theories of difference. Week 09 will establish core arguments for the relevance of both to planning practice.

#### **Week 09 Assignment:**

No reading reflection due this week. See updated assignment for Week 10.

### **31 Oct | M | Planning in the Public Interest**

#### **Required Reading**

Gautam Bhan, **\*\*Read 639 to top of 642 (sections I-II-III); skim rest\*\*** “Notes on a Southern Urban Practice,” *Environment and Urbanization* 31, 2 (2019): 639-654.

Katherine Rankin, “Reflexivity and Post-Colonial Critique: Toward an Ethics of Accountability in Planning Praxis,” *Planning Theory* 9, 3 (2010): 181-199.

#### **Supplementary**

AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (revised 2016):

<https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode/>

Gautam Bhan, *In the Public's Interest: Evictions, Citizenship, and Inequality in Contemporary Delhi* (Athens: U. Georgia Press, 2016).

Heather Campbell, “‘Planning Ethics’ and Rediscovering the *idea of planning*,” *Planning Theory* 11, 4 (2012): 379-399.

Sue Hendler, ed., *Planning Ethics: A Reader in Planning Theory, Practice and Education* (New Brunswick, NJ: Centre for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers, 1995).

Ananya Roy, “Praxis in the Time of Empire,” *Planning Theory* 5, 1 (2006): 7-29.

Bish Sanyal, “Globalization, Ethical Compromise, and Planning Theory,” *Planning Theory* 1, 2 (2002): 116-123.

### **02 Nov | W | Workshop: A Truth Commission for Whiteness and Urban Planning**

A workshop to explore “Gatekeepers of Possibility” in Urban Planning (see Week 10). The workshop explores whiteness as a “neutral” planning positionality.

#### **Required Reading**

Edward G. Goetz, Rashad A. Williams, and Anthony Damiano, “Whiteness and Urban Planning,” *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 86, 2 (2020): 142-156.

#### **AND:**

- **EITHER** Review (skim, remind yourself of) the Johnson reading on Ferguson from Module 1: Walter Johnson, “What Do We Mean When We Say, “Structural Racism”? A Walk down West Florissant Avenue, Ferguson, Missouri.” *Kalfou* 3, 1 (2016): 36-62.
- **OR** Read 2 short essays if you’re interested in undertaking the workshop activity within the South African context:

- David Adler, “Story of Cities #19: Johannesburg’s Purge of Vibrant Sophiatown,” *The Guardian* (11 Apr 2016): <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2016/apr/11/story-cities-19-johannesburg-south-africa-apartheid-purge-sophiatown>
- Deborah M. Hart and Gordon H. Pirie, “The Sight and Soul of Sophiatown,” *Geographical Review* 74, 1 (1984): 38-47.

### Supplementary

Background of the South Africa Broadcasting Corporation’s video archive of the first two years of the post-apartheid Truth and Reconciliation Commission:

<http://sabctrc.saha.org.za/background.htm>

Paul Maylam, “Explaining the Apartheid City: 20 Years of South African Urban Historiography,” *Journal of Southern African Studies* 21, 1 (1995): 19-38.

Laura Pulido, “Rethinking Environmental Racism: White Privilege and Urban Development in Southern California,” *Annals of the Assn. of American Geographers* 90, 1 (2000): 12-40.

Ivan Turok, “Urban Planning in the Transition from Apartheid: Part 1, The Legacy of Social Control,” *The Town Planning Review* 65, 3 (1994): 243-259.

## **WEEK 10: GATEKEEPERS OF POSSIBILITY**

This week we consider the myriad ways that exclusionary logics and practices in design and planning have become normalized and impact contemporary cities and planning practice. These “gatekeepers of possibility” are markers of the past in the present: they locate the imperial logics, histories, and geographies that continue to shape life today (Gregory, 2004; Roy, 2006). They comprise institutional, intellectual, and positional frames that have limited possibilities for planning, especially for marginalized communities. **How does a direct confrontation with those “present pasts” shape our values and decisions as planners?**

### **Week 10 Assignment (250 words, due 07 Nov):**

Develop a critical reflection on a concept, passage, or aspect from the Nov 07 reading that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). 250 words; upload to Canvas.

### **07 Nov | M | Planning with Difference**

#### Required Reading

Vanessa Watson, “Deep Difference: Diversity, Planning and Ethics,” *Planning Theory* 5, 1 (2006): 31-50.

#### Supplementary

Lisa K. Bates and Marisa A. Zapata, eds. “Interface: Planning Just Futures” *Planning Theory and Practice* 22, 4 (2021): 613-642.

Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990). [see especially treatments of concepts: the matrix of domination and interlocking systems of oppression]

Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1990).  
Marisa A. Zapata, “Deliberating Across Difference: Planning Futures in Cross-Cultural Spaces,”  
*Policy and Society* 28, 3 (2009): 197-209.

### **09 Nov | W | Workshop: Disability Planning**

An interrogation of ableism as a “neutral” planning positionality.

\*Read the (short) required readings for background on the workshop activity.

#### Required Reading

Lisa Stafford, “Planners, We Need to Talk about Ableism,” *Interface: Disability Justice and Urban Planning, Planning Theory & Practice* 23, 1 (2022): 106-111.

Daniel Salomon and Minji Cho, “Ableism in Communicative Planning: An Autistic Perspective,” *Interface: Disability Justice and Urban Planning, Planning Theory & Practice* 23, 1 (2022): 121-124.

Aimi Hamraie, “Crip Mobility Justice: Ableism and Active Transportation Debates,”  
*International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* (2020):

<https://www.ijurr.org/spotlight-on/disabling-city/crip-mobility-justice/>

#### Supplementary

Rachel Adams, Benjamin Reiss, and David Serlin, “Disability” in *Keywords for Disability Studies*, Adams, Reiss, and Serlin, eds. (New York: NYU Press, 2015):

Shaun Grech, “Recolonising Debates or Perpetuated Coloniality? Decentering the Spaces of Disability, Development, and Community in the Global South,” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 15, 1 (2011): 87-100.

See other short articles in the Disabling City online “spotlight” issues of IJURR:

<https://www.ijurr.org/spotlight-on/disabling-city/introduction-the-disabling-city/>

Sins Invalid, “10 Principles of Disability Justice,” (2015): online

<https://www.sinsinvalid.org/blog/10-principles-of-disability-justice>

## **WEEK 11: IMAGINING OTHERWISE, PART 1**

Weeks 11 and 12 begin with the same question: How can we—and more importantly, how have others—imagine/d more just futures for cities, communities, and regions?

### **Week 11 Assignment (250 words, due 14 Nov):**

Develop a critical reflection on a concept, passage, or aspect from the Nov 14 readings that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). 250 words; upload to Canvas.

### **14 Nov | M | From Equity to Reparative Planning**

A comparative consideration of equity planning and reparative planning as forms of redress for the exclusion, oppression, and dispossession experienced by certain communities (often enacted through urban design, planning, and development).

### Required Reading

Norman Krumholz, “Urban Planning, Equity Planning, and Racial Justice,” in June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, eds. *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows* (London: Sage Publications: 1997): 109-125.

Rashad Akeem Williams, “From Racial to Reparative Planning: Confronting the White Side of Planning,” *Planning Research* 00 (2020): 1-11.

### Supplementary

Paul Davidoff, “Advocacy and pluralism in planning,” *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, 4 (1965): 331-338.

Nikole Hannah-Jones, “What is Owed,” *The New York Times Magazine* (June 2020):

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/06/24/magazine/reparations-slavery.html>

Robin D.G. Kelley, “‘A Day of Reckoning’: Dreams of Reparations,” in *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002):110-134.

Faranak Miraftab, “Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South,” *Planning Theory* 8, 1 (2009): 32–50.

Justin Steil, “Antisubordination Planning,” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* (Dec 2018): 1-10.

Marisa A. Zapata and Lisa K. Bates, “Equity Planning Revisited,” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35, 3 (September 2015): 245–48.

## **16 Nov | W | Workshop: Expanding the Time Horizon of Emergency Response**

In-class workshop to consider equity and reparative planning in practice.

### Required Reading

Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, “[The Black Plague](#)” *The New Yorker* (16 April 2020).

Manuel Tironi and Sarah Kelly, “[Care and Sovereignty: Territorial Control and the Decolonization of Disaster Risk Reduction](#),” *SSRC Items* online (25 June 2020).

### Supplementary Reading

Aziza Ahmed and Jason Jackson, “Race, Risk, and Personal Responsibility in the Response to Covid-19,” *Columbia Law Review* 121 (1 Apr 2021): 47-70.

Selam Gebrekidan and Matt Apuzzo, “Rich Countries Signed Away a Chance to Vaccinate the World,” *The New York Times* (21 Mar 2021):

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/21/world/vaccine-patents-us-eu.html>

Sue Halpern, “The Peril of Not Vaccinating the World,” *The New Yorker* (03 Jun 2021):

<https://www.newyorker.com/tech/annals-of-technology/the-peril-of-not-vaccinating-the-world>

## **WEEK 12: IMAGINING OTHERWISE, PART 2**

How might our imagination of planning futures change if we were to center the memories, voices, and visions of groups that have historically been excluded and dispossessed? How do those perspectives and related methods for listening to them contrast with the data and approaches that planners typically use to make decisions?

**Week 12 Assignment (250 words, due 21 Nov):**

Develop a critical reflection on a concept, passage, or aspect from the Nov 21 readings that you find interesting, strange, or puzzling. Provide evidence from the texts to support your views and interpretations; use consistent citation practices (Author Last Name, Year: Page Number). 250 words; upload to Canvas.

**21 Nov | M | Affective and Therapeutic Planning**

Required Readings:

Justin Garrett Moore, "Care, Where?" *Urban Omnibus* (12 Jan 2022):

<https://urbanomnibus.net/2022/01/care-where/>

Leonie Sandercock and Giovanni Attili, "Changing the Lens: Film as Action Research and Therapeutic Planning Practice," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 34, 1 (2014): 19-29.

Andrew Zitcer and Robert W. Lake, "Love as a Planning Method," Interface: What's Love Got To Do With It? Illuminations on Loving Attachment in Planning, *Planning Theory & Practice* 13, 4 (2012): 606-609.

Supplementary

Erfan Aftab, "Confronting collective traumas: an exploration of therapeutic planning," *Planning Theory & Practice* 18, 1 (2017): 34-50.

Lisa K. Bates and Marisa A. Zapata, "Dispatches from Dream City," Interface: What's Love Got To Do With It? Illuminations on Loving Attachment in Planning, *Planning Theory & Practice* 13, 4 (2012): 599-603.

Shannon Mattern, "Fugitive Libraries," *Places Journal* (October 2019):

<https://placesjournal.org/article/fugitive-libraries/?cn-reloaded=1>

Leonie Sandercock (2004) "Towards a Planning Imagination for the 21st Century," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70:2, 133-141.

Clyde Woods, *Development Arrested: The Blues and Plantation Power in the Mississippi Delta*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Verso, 2017 [1998]).

**23 Nov | W | Workshop: On Memory**

Individual, in-class exercise to explore affective planning, through collective and counter memory. You can choose to complete the exercise in class or on your own (I am providing this option for those who might be traveling). Workshop brief will be available on Canvas, exercise documentation should be uploaded to Canvas by the end of the day.

Required Readings:

Karilyn Crockett, "Preface: A Note on Memory and Ethnographic Method" in *People Before Highways: Boston Activists, Urban Planners, and a New Movement for City Making* (Boston: U. Massachusetts Press, 2018): vii-xi.

T.J. Demos, "Sites of Collective Counter-Memory," *Animate Projects Online* (2012):

[https://animateprojectsarchive.org/writing/essays/tj\\_demos](https://animateprojectsarchive.org/writing/essays/tj_demos)

### Supplementary

- W. James Booth, *Communities of Memory: On Witness, Identity, and Justice* (Ithaca: Cornell U. Press, 2006).
- Chandre Gould and Verne Harris, "Memory for Justice," (Nelson Mandela Foundation: 2014): online [www.nelsonmandela.org/uploads/files/MEMORY\\_FOR\\_JUSTICE\\_2014v2.pdf](http://www.nelsonmandela.org/uploads/files/MEMORY_FOR_JUSTICE_2014v2.pdf)
- George Lipsitz, *Time Passages: Collective Memory and American Popular Culture* (Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1990).
- Andrea Roberts, "The End of Bootstraps and Good Masters: Fostering Social Inclusion by Creating Counternarratives," *Preservation and Social Inclusion*, ed. by Erica Avrami (New York City: Columbia GSAPP, 2020): 109-121.

## **WEEK 13: DECOLONIZING PLANNING?**

Too often, planning research and practice extracts knowledge from communities without their participation and empowerment. In Week 13, we attend to forms of community (co)creation, knowledge, and engagement that support pluralism and decision-making by marginalized groups.

### **Week 13 Assignment (250 words, 28 Nov):**

How would you characterize the "epistemic location" or "epistemic lens" from/ through which you think and interpret the 'world'? What would you like to unlearn and what other ways of knowing would you like to affirm? 250 words; upload to Canvas.

### **28 Nov | M | Community Voice**

#### Required Readings

- Karen Umemoto, "Walking in Another's Shoes: Epistemological Challenges in Participatory Planning," in *Dialogues in Urban and Regional Planning Vol I*, ed. by B. Stiffler and V. Watson (London: Routledge: 2005 [2001]): 180-208.
- Patricia Wilson, "Building Deep Democracy in South Africa's Shantytowns," in *The Heart of Community Engagement: Practitioner Stories from Across the Globe* (New York: Routledge, 2019): 93-120.

#### Supplementary

- Libby Porter, "What is the Work of Non-Indigenous People in the Service of a Decolonizing Agenda?" *Planning Theory and Practice* 18, 4 (2017): 650-653.
- Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni, "Decoloniality as the Future of Africa," *History Compass* 13, 10 (2015): 485-496.
- Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is not a metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* 1, 1 (2012): 1-40.
- Ruth Wilson Gilmore, "Chapter 14: Abolition Geography and the Problem of Innocence," in *Futures of Black Radicalism*, ed. by G.T. Johnson and A. Lubin (New York: Verso, 2017): ebook.
- Tanja Winkler, "Black Texts on White Paper: Learning to See Resistant Texts as an Approach Towards Decolonising Planning," *Planning Theory* 17, 4 (2018): 588-604.



## **30 Nov | W | Workshop: Liberatory Plan Analysis**

### Required Readings

Harvey Gantt, “An Analysis of The Low-Income Housing Development Process: Soul City, North Carolina,” **MCP Thesis**, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (June 1970).

READ: Abstract and Introduction; SKIM “Ch 8: An Analysis of Probable Alternatives for Implementation”. Find at DSPACE: <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/74363>

John Friedmann, “The Good City: In Defense of Utopian Thinking,” *IJURR* 24, 2 (June 2000): 460-472.

### Supplementary

Kofi Boone, “Learning from Soul City,” *Places Journal* (Nov 2021):

<https://placesjournal.org/article/learning-from-soul-city/>

David Harvey, *Spaces of Hope* (Edinburgh: U. of Edinburgh Press, 2000).

Leonie Sandercock, *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities* (Wiley: New York, 1998).

Ash Amin “The Good City” *Urban Studies* 43, 5/6 (May 2006): 1009-1023.

## **WEEK 14 | WHO AND WHAT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?**

The AICP Code of Planning Ethics (revised 2016) commits to a set of ethical principles for planning practice that “derive from the special responsibility of our profession to serve the public interest with compassion for the welfare of all people”. The rampant conditions of entrenched inequality that continue to shape cities and regions throughout the world require further examination of that central principle underlying planning practice. In this final week of Module 2, we will open discussions on a perennial topic: who and what is in the public interest?

### **Week 14 Assignment (250 words, due 05 Dec):**

What is the role of the planner, if any at all, vis a vis the “public interest”? Reflect, dig into the readings this week, and consider others that we covered in the module. ALL positions are welcome—from those strident to ambivalent, to those that argue for a role and against—the objective of this exercise is to begin to articulate a position, drawing support from readings. 250 words; upload to Canvas.

## **05 Dec | M | The Role of the Planner**

### Required Readings:

Naomi Carmon, “The Profession of Urban Planning and its Societal Mandate” in *Policy, Planning, and People: Promoting Justice in Urban Development* ed. by N. Carmon and S. Fainstein (Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2013): 13-31.

Deshonay Dozier, “A Response to Abolitionist Planning: There is No Room for ‘Planners’ in the Movement for Abolition.” *Planners Network* (August 9, 2018)—rebuttal to UCLA Pamphlet on Abolitionist Planning (see supplementary)

### Supplementary Reading:

Sue Hendler, “Toward a Feminist Code of Planning Ethics,” *Planning Theory & Practice* 6, 1

(Mar 2005): 53-69.

Chapters in the Section “Ideas About Professional Reflection” in Sanyal and Vale, eds. *Planning Ideas that Matter: Livability, Territoriality, Governance, and Reflective Practice* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012):

<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/mit/detail.action?docID=3339462>

UCLA student and Ananya Roy designed Pamphlet: “Abolitionist Planning for Resistance” (2016) <https://challengeinequality.luskin.ucla.edu/abolitionist-planning>

### **07 Dec | W | Workshop & Roundtable: Personal Theories and Public Interests**

Workshop time will be dedicated to revising your personal theory of practice with reflections on Module 2 content. Group discussions will explore intersections and conflicts between your personal theory of practice and varied definitions on planning for “the public interest”.

#### Optional Readings:

Scott Bollens, “Urban Planning And Intergroup Conflict: Confronting A Fractured Public Interest,” in *Dialogues in Urban and Regional Planning Vol 1*, ed. by B. Stiftel and V. Watson (London: Routledge: 2005 [2002]): 209-247.

Teresa Córdova, “Refusing to appropriate: The Emerging Discourse on Planning and Race,” *APA Journal* 60, 2 (Spring 1994): 242-243.

Lisa Peattie, “Communities and Interests in Advocacy Planning,” *APA Journal* 60, 2 (Spring 1994): 151-153.

#### Supplementary Reading:

Alexander, E. R. “The Public Interest in Planning: From Legitimation to Substantive Plan Evaluation.” *Planning Theory* 1, 3 (November 2002): 226–49.

Moroni, Stefano. “Towards a Reconstruction of the Public Interest Criterion.” *Planning Theory* 3, 2 (2004): 151–171

Mick Lennon, “On ‘the Subject’ of Planning’s Public Interest.” *Planning Theory* 16, 2 (May 2017): 150–68.

Hashem Dadashpoor and Ailin Sheydayi. “Defining Public Interest in Planning: A Review,” *Journal of Planning Literature* (2021): 1-19.

**\*\* END OF MODULE 2 \*\***

## **WEEK 15: CONCLUDING GATEWAY I**

### **12 Dec | M | Final Class Discussion—Takeaways and Guiding Questions**

Readings: None

### **14 Dec | W | No Class**

Readings: None

Module 2 Final Essay Due (upload to Canvas)

## Grade Definitions and Guidelines

### Grade Definitions:

**5/ A Exceptionally good performance**, demonstrating a superior understanding of the subject matter, a foundation of extensive knowledge, and a skillful use of concepts and/or materials.

**4/ B Good performance**, demonstrating capacity to use the appropriate concepts, a good understanding of the subject matter, and an ability to handle the problems and materials encountered in the subject.

**3/ C Adequate performance**, demonstrating an adequate understanding of the subject matter, an ability to handle relatively simple problems, and adequate preparation for moving on to more advanced work in the field.

**2/ D Minimally acceptable performance**, demonstrating at least partial familiarity with the subject matter and some capacity to deal with relatively simple problems, but also demonstrating deficiencies serious enough to make it inadvisable to proceed further in the field without additional work.

Most students in Gateway I should expect to receive a final grade of A or B if expectations for the course are met. You should also expect to improve the quality of your work as the course continues and you are able to practice your engagements with active reading, critical analysis, and writing.

### Guidelines for Writing and Evaluating Reading Responses in Gateway I

Reading responses are individual assignments, assigned weekly, that are designed to help you unpack and delve further into assigned readings and the themes that emerge from them. They comprise 30% of your grade and will be evaluated as “check plus” (excellent), “check” (good), or “check minus” (needs substantial improvement). You will have a total of seven individual assignments in Module 01 (the analytic essay “counts” as two) and seven individual assignments in Module 02. You can opt out of one individual assignment per module (two total in the course) without penalty. That is, you can opt out of any assignment *except* the Oct 23 analytic essay and Dec 06 and 08 position statements (i.e. these are required). See the latest version of the syllabus for details and deadlines for all assignments.

We recommend you approach the reading responses as opportunities to practice critical thinking-writing and a means to archive your analytic reflections throughout the class. Expect to make steady improvements in this mode of analysis as the semester continues.

#### **A GOOD reading response:**

- Summarizes the main arguments or a couple of the core concepts from two or more readings
- Demonstrates that you understand the key ideas and themes
- Engages with a few quotes/passages from the readings, and identifies some key themes
- Proper citation, grammar, and spelling

#### **An EXCELLENT reading response:**

- Goes beyond summarizing to unpack the core arguments and critically engage with a couple of the core concepts from two or more readings
- Makes thematic connections (or disconnections/contrasts) across the readings and arguments. Include one or more of the following elements in a significant way:
  - using who/what/where/how/so what questions to assess whether the argument is compelling or convincing
  - discussing how the author has structured their argument and whether you find it convincing (why or why not or how would you have done it differently?)
  - discussing the nature of the evidence the author marshals and whether you find their choices effective
  - comparing/contrasting an interesting aspect of two or more authors or concepts (you may even connect this week's concepts to ones we've encountered in prior weeks!)
  - posing thoughtful questions about aspects of the argument that confused you or which you disagree with
  - *Note: See SQ3R and basic questions for critical analysis.*
- Connects the readings to personal experience, applies to an example, or puts it in conversation with other texts/ideas that you may have come across outside of Gateway.
  - connecting/applying the author's concepts substantially and without misrepresentation to another context
  - discussing the wider implications of the author's concept(s) for our profession or for society at large or for particular stakeholders/communities, etc.
  - Balance succinctness and the need for providing the reader context when discussing examples or works from other authors outside the course reading list.
  - Be explicit about how the example is working to illustrate/problematize a concept.
- Takes a clear position on how you see the arguments under discussion that week

### **MIT Writing and Communication Center (WCC)**

MIT Writing and Communication Center offers free one-on-one professional advice from communication specialists with advanced degrees and publishing experience. The WCC can help you learn about all types of academic and professional writing and further develop your oral communication skills.

You can learn more about WCC consultations at <http://cmsw.mit.edu/writing-and-communication-center> and register with the online scheduler to make appointments through <https://mit.mywconline.com>. Please note that WCC hours are offered Monday-Friday, 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. during the semester, and fill up fast.