Lecture 2: Planning History and Traditions

Today's Learning Objectives:

1. **Synthesize lessons of the RLA case: move from theory to practice and back again.**
   - **Utilize cases to gain experience which can build and inform our practice**
2. **Understand major chapters of modern planning history and risks of the "life-cycle" interpretation of same place historical developments in global perspective**
   - **Where is planning coming from and where is it going?**
3. **Create conceptual transition to team assignment with preview of traditions.: Design, Policy, Empowerment.**

RLA revisited
1. Crisis moment: – with crisis comes tremendous opportunity but also high responsibility and expectations. Extreme visibility. Highly unusual.
2. Film spotlighted an entrepreneurial "partnership" with a narrow strategy, complimentary of government with the expectations of full cooperation – 8 years later, RLA insiders were still confusedb(Larry Vale's *The Resiliant City*, spotlights on this – anecdotally offers that RLA had little impact.)

Developments in LA since RLA:
- Emphasis on retail revitalization. Keep $ in the neighborhood
- Large scale immigration – Mexico – also Pacific Rim. Gigante opened a grocery store, in 2002, in the central corridor of the riots.

Some strategic options for RLA

RLA was not MECE (definition: mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive)

Re-position:
> – redefine role and relationships to public private and non-governmental sectors

Re-orient strategy:
> – target major activities to businesses affected by riots; focus on recovery and growth; work closely with established organizations

Build support:
> – RLA never developed a coalition of support or navigated the public realm – instead should have actively develop constituencies (take none for granted) that understand and support role.

Diagnosis of RLA: too exclusive an approach

The Value of Theory:

Why do we use theory? How did the class employ theory?

The Diagnostic Essays covered:

1. Legitimacy
* How can we apply Klosterman's arguments to a private initiative
* Beauregard – applies better
* Did RLA bring legitimate results?
* Illegitimate means/approach is where RLA comes up short
* A failure in partnership – but an investment success.

2. Klosterman:

* Economic Arguments – improving market function with information
* Spillovers – leverage value of projects for the sake of creating new ones
* Distributional - equity – RLA, in the film, does not directly address this issue
* Pluralist arguments – RLA was unitary, exclusive, not plural. Had ritual participation but not actual.
* Marxists – transformation? Or a protection of the status quo? Was not a weapon? Is this a new wolf in sheep's clothing? Where does control lie?

The Value of Theory: Highlights the issue of what justifies planning's ends and means (revealing cases as analogies, points of reference for planners everywhere).

Planning history: Simple Version of History
* Cleaning up and ordering things: Planning emerges as the 20th century response to the 19th century industrial city

* One-way global: planning invented in the west and transferred to "the rest."

* Life cycle: modernist tecnhincal capability celebrated, then revilesd, then overthrown in favor of "bottom-up planning" and planning as processs management not expert design and choice). Rise of modernist city (imperative of industrial growth) – apex at mid-century, period of crisis, society no longer wants to let it do its job, one replaces the other.

* Modernism – believing you can involve science, carried out by technicians, technical modernism – positivism? Modernist rational planning. Management science

Problems with simple version

The industrial city story covers the development of city planning better than planning generally. Much planning is non-local, non-physical.

Different societies = different trajectories and cultures (norms and institutions) that define planning's legitimate role, scope, practices.

Are there different planning culture?

- Modernist, rational, assumptions.

- Technocrats. Only concerned about technical tools, deliberation, styles of planning. What do we mean when we say it should be participatory. Is it an advocacy project?

- The academy is not the world of practice: intellectual debate vs planning practice and practice of politics – what do planners need to know? How can deliberation happen better?

(Point of information: Relevance of 1968 – Paris uprising, assaination of Bobby Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr. – along with an intensification of post WWII critiques. Read the book – "1968")

Notion of global influence:
- Colonial structures, post-war "development" ideology, models tied to money (aid agencies)

- Government is not the solution, it is the problem. Masterful politicians
- Marketization and neo-liberalism trend in affluent nations:

- Reagan-Thatcher "government is the problem vs. Blair-Clinton "Third Way" – make government smarter, sometimes leaner, neo-liberalism. Modify the state apparatus, Blair's labor initiative, make government smarter, not leave the disadvantaged behind. Global institutions like IMF/World Bank.

- If planning is more than a technical product – it invites political dialogue and conflict, and some traditions of planning and deliberation came way before European enlightenment.

Friedman:
- Planning as "the effort to guide history with reason"
- Not orthogonal design, emphasis on the rational-trained, moved toward science.

Baum:
- Planning as "organizing hope about the future"

- More timeless, universal, and open-ended as to what constitutes "organizing" and "hope" not to mention who can organize and define hope and alternative futures legitimately.

Part 3 – Models of Planning and New Orleans Assignments

Design Tradition:
- Outgrowth of architecture and engineering mainly

- Debates over forms of "urbanism" (how people experience cities, beauty, culture)
- Plus physical requirements of structuring the environment to make it healthy, sustainable, cost effective.
- Adopt an expansive definition of what design is - creating meaningful places
- Be gadflys, not allies

Empowerment tradition:

- Not a traditional part of planning, modern practice. Does not reflect wide interests – mainly middle class.

- Rooted in political economy, debates over role of historical inequalities today, hopes for transformation.

- Planning as a fundamentally political practice with technical tools
- multiple philosophies and modes of practice, limited consensus

- Has to interrogate who gets what and why

- Invocation of history, not always Marxist, how did history delivery us, where are inequalities rooted? What are our responsibilities? Mixed with social movements. Consider actual functions, simple outgrowth. Design traditions, no widespread agreement

- "freedom is an endless meeting"

Policy Analysis:
- Most direct outgrowth of enlightenment – purports to offer a value neutral means to provide results.

- Economics, operations research, organizational science, concern for optimal decision, "maximizing welfare" under constraints, value-neutral mechanics of choice.

- Optimized decisions:

    1.   define goals,
    2.   identify options
    3.   predict consequences
    4.   valuate by objectives and criteria
    5.   decide
    6.   implement
    7.   generate feedback
- Works for narrow problems, but not something broad, requires some modesty.

Is there a dominant tradition? Most planning offices simply issue permits. Very non-governmental, difficult questions, formalistic models. Forms that planning can take.

Has moved from being a part of government decision support, has since spread to other sectors.

Teamwork:

Discuss the Unified New Orleans plan and what it covers.
Materials/Questions to cover:
Specifics of Citywide and district plans
Deploy team resources, division of labor
Production of plan – where does New Orleans find itself today

Who is authorized to plan? Formally or informally? For whom? What makes planners trustworthy?

How did the disaster define the good city? For whom? A marker of a good city? How are decisions made?

What defines success? Political viability, technical defensibility, other? Not a direct democracy, through agents and professionals. How do we judge success?