

Planning capitalist urbanization: theory, history, critique

(Official course title: Sociology of urban planning: cities, territories, environments)

SOCI 20521 / ENST 20521 / SOCI 30521 / GEOG 20521 / ARCH 20521 / CHST 20521 / PBPL 20521 / PLSC 20521 / PLSC 3052 / PPHA 30521 / KNOW 30521

University of Chicago

Winter Quarter 2022

T/Th 12:30pm to 1:50pm

Fridays: mandatory 1-hour weekly discussion section (various times)

Note: *all classes are remote/synchronous: Zoom, until further notice*

Instructor

Neil Brenner

Email: neilbrenner@uchicago.edu

Teaching Assistants

Luke Cianciotto

Email: lukecianciotto@uchicago.edu

Shannon Morrissey

Email: smorrissey@uchicago.edu

Noa Neumark

Email: neumark@uchicago.edu

Joshua Silver

Email: jsilver4@uchicago.edu

Overview

Capitalist urbanization is a world-transforming process, at once intensely creative and brutally destructive, of both human and non-human life. It involves the building and constant restructuring of cities as well as the transformation of regions, territories and environments that support city-making processes, from the local and the national to the continental and the planetary scales.

To what degree, and in what ways, has this process been reflexively shaped through “planning”? What does it mean to “plan” urban life and urban development in a social formation in which material wealth (use values) are produced through a profit-driven process of capital accumulation? In what ways are the built environments of modern capitalism shaped through earlier rounds of planning—their “successes” as well as their unintended consequences and failures? How is the project of planning intertwined with power, inequality, exclusion, expropriation and dispossession? How has planning evolved since its institutionalization by Euro-American imperial powers during the last quarter of the 19th century? How should we understand the legacies of “modernist” urban planning, whether in relation to the crises of 20th century capitalism or—perhaps more urgently—the exploding social, political and environmental emergencies of the early 21st century world? What is the role of urban planning in shaping collective planetary futures? Can the future of urbanization be planned, and if so, by whom, through what means, and towards what ends?

This course seeks to engage these questions through the tools of critical urban theory and critical urban social science. Building upon an interdisciplinary literature drawn from urban sociology, planning theory and history as well as urban social science, architecture and design studies and critical environmental studies, we will explore the emergence, development and continual transformation of urban planning in relation to changing configurations of capitalist urbanization,

modern state power, sociopolitical insurgency and environmental crisis. Following an initial exploration of divergent conceptualizations of “planning,” the “city” and “urbanization,” we investigate (a) the changing sites and targets of planning intervention; (b) the evolution of political and institutional struggles regarding the instruments, goals and constituencies of planning; (c) the contradictory connections between planning and diverse configurations of inequality, power and domination in modern society (including class, race, gender and sexuality); and (d) the question of whether and how planning strategies might help produce alternative (more socially just and environmentally sane) forms of urbanization in the future.

Part One surveys several key theoretical, social-scientific and normative perspectives on the nature of planning in modern capitalist social formations. Key questions include: What is planning, and how, when, where and why does it emerge? How are planning practices and visions linked to broader structures of political-economic life, including formations of social power, domination and ideology? How are the sites and targets of planning constructed, and how do they change across time and space? How does planning construct, regulate and transform the web of nonhuman life and planetary ecologies? Do planners serve private, particularistic interests or the public good? How should we approach the histories and geographies of planning under modern capitalism? How are cycles of planning intervention linked to processes of capitalist industrialization, urbanization, formations of state power, patterns of environmental transformation and waves of sociopolitical insurgency?

Part Two explores some of the key episodes, movements and approaches in the history of modern urban planning since the 1850s. Although we focus in some detail on certain influential ideas, visions and practices of major urban, regional and territorial planners, we embed their activities within the historically and geographically specific constraints, opportunities, contradictions and struggles associated with each of the major phases of modern capitalist urbanization and associated formations of national state power, regulatory capacity, ecological transformation and political contestation. We explore the conflictual interaction of capitalist firms/corporations, property developers (rentiers), political institutions and social movements at various spatial scales, and the consequences of that interaction for the institutional, legal, spatial and ideological terrains of planning, and for the broader geographies and ecologies of urbanization. Here we also attend to the question of “roads not taken” during the history of urban and territorial planning in the US and beyond—suppressed possibilities for constructing what we might think of as “alter-urbanizations,” other ways of organizing, producing and transforming the urban fabric of collective life.

The course is, at core, a reflection on and critique of what we might term “urban strategies”—efforts by states, capitalists, communities and social movements to shape and reshape the urbanizing worlds in which we live together. We will critically interrogate some of the dominant intellectual and ideological paradigms through which planners have mobilized urban strategies in the modern world and their contradictory consequences for social life, spatial arrangements and environmental conditions, within and beyond the sites to which they have been directed. The course is intended, above all else, to enhance students’ capacity to interrogate critically the major frameworks that are currently being used to shape planetary urban and territorial futures. This critical reflexivity is understood here as an essential precondition and orientation for any adequate form of urban praxis that might facilitate more socially just, democratic, and ecologically sane forms of urban life.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students will understand the main theoretical and normative traditions that underpin contemporary approaches to urban planning, especially in Euro-America, but also in global-comparative perspective. They will be able to relate those theoretical traditions to earlier rounds of debate and political struggle regarding urbanization and the attempt to plan, manage and modify its sociospatial expressions and ecological consequences.

Additionally, students will be well equipped to assess the underlying normative, conceptual and political assumptions that mediate major contemporary approaches to urban planning and policy, globally and locally. Students will also be acquainted with some of the major social science approaches to the study of cities and urbanization, and will be able to relate those approaches to the study of planning strategies, across contexts and scales.

Finally, students will be well equipped to assess planning discourses—for instance, regarding social and spatial justice, equity, sustainability, resilience and diversity—in relation to hegemonic and insurgent practices of urbanization, and to ongoing social struggles for alternative urban worlds.

In the most general sense, this course will help students build critical capacities for understanding, and contributing to, the effort to shape and reshape urban life—at once through the professional methods of the planning, design and policy disciplines, through social science analysis, and through everyday social struggles and political mobilizations.

- The course is open to anyone who is interested in the issues outlined above, regardless of degree program or area of specialization. There are no prerequisites; the course is framed to be accessible to any U Chicago student.
- Ph.D. students and students in the professional schools are welcomed; materials covered here may be of broad relevance for general field exams as well as specialized research in a number of research areas that engage with questions about urbanization, planning and the historical geographies of capitalism.
- Auditors are warmly invited to attend lectures, but space in discussion sections is reserved for enrolled students.
- The course will be of particular relevance to anyone working in, or interested in, urban studies, planning, policy, architecture and design, especially in relation to questions of social and environmental (in)justice. Students interested in questions of economic and environmental governance, whether or not in urban contexts, will also encounter arguments and perspectives that are essential to their work.

Course format

The class combines lectures and discussion. We will use breakout rooms as needed. Except in extenuating circumstances, we ask that you please keep your Zoom camera on, with microphone muted unless you are speaking to the class. For students who, due to the pandemic, are based in time-zones in which synchronous participation is complex, recordings will be made available of all lectures and discussions. Arrangements will also be made for periodic meetings with the teaching team to discuss the course content.

Requirements

- *Regular attendance and participation* in all sessions (including 2 lectures and 1 discussion section per week). You may miss one class (lecture *or* discussion section) without penalty (no explanation needed). If you miss three (or more) classes without an appropriate rationale, you will be at risk of an automatic “Fail” for the class. This is high-intensity class and, without regular attendance at lectures and participation in discussions, it will be difficult to absorb the materials effectively.

Note: If you are confronting any issues that are impeding your studies this term, please reach out to the teaching team so we can help you find appropriate support.

- *Intensive preparation* for all discussions by reading all assigned texts in advance.
- Meet all *deadlines* for writing assignments, as specified below.
- *Discussion posts*. These are brief (1 paragraph) responses to / reflections on the week’s readings, to be uploaded to your section’s Discussions page of Canvas each Thursday by 6pm. Details to be explained in class. These are due weekly, starting in Week 1 of the term. These should not be summaries of the readings but critical reflections on issues on the key claims and issues under discussion for the week. You are also expected to read the other discussion posts from your section prior to each Friday meeting.

You may skip the Discussion post for one week of your choosing during the course of the Winter term. Please be sure to inform your TA if you are opting out of a discussion post during a given week.

- *Two analytical essays* (AEs). These are ~5 pages each (approximately 2000 words). Deadlines are **February 15** and **March 15**. For each AE, we will provide a list of question prompts, from which you will select a topic. The specifics of each assignment will be explained in class, one week in advance of the due date.
- *Extra credit work* (EC). Extra credit opportunities will be announced during the course of the term. Generally, EC credit involves attending (via Zoom, as appropriate) events related to urban social science and contemporary urban transformations in Chicago and beyond. To receive extra credit, please submit a brief response paper (much like the RP) reflecting on the event and its relation to any reading(s) or issue(s) that have been discussed in class.

Grading

- 25% Attendance and participation
- 25% Discussion posts
- 25% Analytical essay #1
- 25% Analytical essay #2
- The impact of EC work on your final grade depends on the excellence and amount that is submitted. This may result in a “boost” to your final grade by up to ½ a grade (e.g., from B to B+, from B+ to A-, or from A- to A).

Academic Honesty

Plagiarism will result in a failing grade for the assignment and possibly for the course, as well as a referral to the Dean of Students. Plagiarism is the accidental or intentional copying of phrases or sentences without proper citation to the author or source. This may include published texts, material found on the internet or the work of students and colleagues.

Be sure to document the exact sources of everything you write down in your notes; use quotation marks if you are quoting anything, be it a phrase or a sentence. These are essential habits to “lock in” now to avoid making any future mistakes in this regard, whether as students or in future professional / academic contexts.

SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS AND READINGS

NOTE: All readings will be posted to the “Files” section of Canvas. Look for the “Readings” folder, which is subdivided into “Part One” and “Part Two.”

Day	Date	Topic and reading	Assignment
T	1/11	Topic 1.1: Introduction, background and overview <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Peter Hall and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, “Planning, planners and plans,” in <i>Urban and Regional Planning</i>, 5th edition. New York and London: Routledge, 2011, 1-10.• Peter Hall, “The centenary of modern planning,” in Robert Freestone ed., <i>Urban Planning in a Changing World</i>. London: Spon, 2000, 20-39.• “Abolitionist Planning for Resistance,” manifesto / pamphlet by planning students at UCLA, 2016.	Please be sure to read these essays immediately after the first class meeting.

**PART 1:
'PLANNING' CAPITALIST URBANIZATION:
THEORIES AND CRITIQUES**

Th	1/13	<p>Topic 1.2: Planning and capitalist urbanization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Harvey, “On planning the ideology of planning,” in <i>The Urbanization of Capital</i>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985, 165-184. • A. J. Scott and S. T. Roweis, “Urban planning in theory and practice: a reappraisal,” <i>Environment and Planning A</i>, 9, 1977, 1097-1119. • Richard Foglesong, “The problem of planning,” in <i>Planning the Capitalist City</i>. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986, 3-27. • Reiner de Graaf, “Architecture is now a tool of capital, complicit in a purpose antithetical to its social mission,” <i>The Architectural Review</i> (April 2015): http://www.architectural-review.com/8681564.article 	Discussion post 1
T	1/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue analysis and discussion of above readings. 	
Th	1/20	<p>Topic 1.3: How planning constructs its target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jorge Luis Borges, “On Exactitude in Science,” in <i>Collected Fictions</i>, trans. by Andrew Hurley. New York: Penguin Press, 1999 [1960]. • James C. Scott, “State simplifications: nature, space, people,” <i>The Journal of Political Philosophy</i>, 3, 3, 1995, 191-233. • Aaron Vansintjan, “The craven mode of production: introduction,” <i>Uneven Earth</i>, April 9, 2018: http://unevenearth.org/2018/04/the-craven-mode-of-production-introduction/ • Dennis Cosgrove, “Carto-city,” in <i>Geography & Vision: Seeing, Imagining and Representing the World</i>. London: Tauris, 2008, 169-182. 	Discussion post 2

T	1/25	<p>Topic 1.4: Grand plans, their failures and their critics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rexford G. Tugwell, “The principle of planning and the ideology of laissez faire,” <i>American Economic Review</i>, 22, 1, Supplement (1932), 75-92. • Charles M. Haar, “The master plan, an impermanent constitution,” Eugenie Birch ed., <i>The Urban and Regional Planning Reader</i>. New York: Routledge, 2009, 140-147 [originally published in 1955]. • Melvin Webber, “Comprehensive planning and social responsibility: toward an AIP consensus on the profession’s roles and purposes,” in Andreas Faludi ed., <i>A Reader in Planning Theory</i>. New York: Pergamon, 1973, 95-112 [originally published in 1963]. • Charles Lindblom, “The science of muddling through,” in Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstein eds., <i>Readings in Planning Theory</i>. 2nd Edition. Blackwell: Malden, Mass.: 2003, 196-209 [originally published in 1959]. • Thomas Elmqvist et. al., “Urban tinkering,” <i>Sustainability Science</i>, 6 August 2018, 1-16. 	
Th	1/27	<p>Topic 1.4, continued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Davidoff, “Advocacy and pluralism in planning,” <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>, 31, 4, 1965, 331-338. • Ananya Roy, “Why India cannot plan its cities: informality, insurgence and the idiom of urbanization,” <i>Planning Theory</i>, 8, 1, 2009, 76-87. 	Discussion post 3

T	2/1	<p>Topic 1.5: the neoliberal critique and the defense of planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friedrich von Hayek, “Chapter 4: The ‘Inevitability’ of Planning” and “Chapter 5: Planning and Democracy” in <i>The Road to Serfdom</i>. London: Routledge: 1944, 45-74. • Jamie Peck, “Chicago School suburbanism” [Note: focus on section titled “Milton’s paradise”] in Pierre Hamel and Roger Keil eds., <i>Suburban Governance: A Global View</i>. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015, 130-152. • Anthony Fontentot, “Notes towards a history of non-planning,” <i>Places Journal</i>, January 2015, 1-7. • Patrick Schumacher, “Coup de Grâce,” <i>Volume</i>, 47, 2016: http://volumeproject.org/coup-de-grace/ • Patrick Schumacher, “Brexit: a chance to roll back the interventionist state and unleash entrepreneurial creativity,” <i>Architect / UK</i>, 8 July 2016: http://uk.architect.com/features/article/149956426/brexit-a-chance-to-roll-back-the-interventionist-state-and-unleash-entrepreneurial-creativity-op-ed-by-patrik-schumacher?ukredirect • Ann Markusen, “Planning as craft and as philosophy,” in Lloyd Rodwin and Bishwapriya Sanyal eds., <i>The Profession of City Planning: Changes, Images, and Challenges, 1950-2000</i>. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 261-274. <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charles Tiebout, “A pure theory of local expenditure,” <i>The Journal of Political Economy</i>, 64, 5, 1956, 416-424. • Robert Kloosterman, “Arguments for and against planning,” in Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstein eds., <i>Readings in Planning Theory</i>. 2nd Edition. Blackwell: Malden, Mass.: 2003, 86-101. • John Friedmann, “The good city: in defense of utopian thinking,” in John Friedmann, <i>Insurgencies: Essays in Planning Theory</i>. New York: Routledge, 2011, 144-161. 	
---	-----	--	--

Th	2/3	<p>Topic 1.6: Postcolonial, feminist, queer critiques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vanessa Watson, “Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe’s Central Urban Issues,” <i>Urban Studies</i>, 46, 11 (2009): 2259-2275. • Leonie Sandercock, “Exploring planning’s knowledges” and “The difference that theory makes,” in <i>Towards Cosmopolis</i>. New York: Wiley, 1998, 57-104. • Dolores Hayden, “What would a non-sexist city be like?,” in Susan Fainstein and Lisa Servon eds., <i>Gender and Planning</i>. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2005, 47-66. • Vanesa Castán Broto, “Queering participatory planning,” <i>Environment & Urbanization</i>, 33, 2 (2021): 310-329. 	Discussion post 4
T	2/8	<p>Topic 1.7: planning and environmentality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anne Whiston Spirn, “Ecological urbanism,” in Tridib Banerjee and Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris eds., <i>Companion to Urban Design</i>. New York: Routledge, 2011, 600-610. • Mohsen Mostafavi, “Preamble: Why ecological urbanism? Why Now?” <i>Harvard Design Magazine</i>, 32, 2010: http://www.harvarddesignmagazine.org/issues/32/why-ecological-urbanism-why-now • Frederick Steiner et. al., “The ecological imperative for environmental design and planning,” <i>Frontiers in Ecology</i>, 11, 7, (2013): 355-361. • Maria Kaika and Erik Swyngedouw, “Radical urban political-ecological imaginaries,” <i>Eurozine</i>, May 2014: http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2014-05-14-swyngedouw-en.html • Maria Kaika and Erik Swyngedouw, “Cities, Nature and the Political Imaginary,” <i>AD: Architectural Design</i>, 82, 3, 2012. • David Wachsmuth, Daniel Aldana Cohen and Hillary Angelo, “Expand the frontiers of urban sustainability,” <i>Nature</i>, 536, 25 August 2016. 	AE1 topics distributed

**PART TWO:
HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHIES OF PLANNING AND URBANIZATION**

Day	Date	Topic and reading	Assignment
Th	2/10	<p>Topic 2.1: Industrialization, urbanization and the housing question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friedrich Engels, "The Great Towns," in Richard LeGates and Frederic Stout eds., <i>The City Reader</i>. 3rd Edition. New York: Routledge, 2003, 58-66. • Lewis Mumford, "Commercial expansion and urban dissolution" and "Paleotechnic paradise: coketown," in <i>The City in History</i>. New York: Harcourt, 1961, 410-481. • Richard Foglesong, "Colonial town planning" and "Early housing reform," in <i>Planning the Capitalist City</i>. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986, 28-123. • David Madden and Peter Marcuse, "The Permanent Crisis of Housing," <i>Jacobin</i>, 10.2.16: https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/10/housing-crisis-rent-landlords-homeless-affordability/ 	Discussion post 5
T	2/15	<p>Topic 2.2: Hausmannization / urbanization by dispossession</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Moses, "What happened to Haussmann?," <i>Architectural Forum</i>, 77, July 1942, 57-66. • Sigfried Gideon, "The street becomes dominant: the transformation of Paris, 1853-1868," in <i>Space, Time, and Architecture</i>. 5th edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982/1941, 739-776. • Andy Merrifield, "Cities under tension" and "Strategic embellishment and urban civil war," in <i>The New Urban Question</i>. London: Pluto, 2014, 27-44. • David Harvey, "Modernity as break," "Prologue," "The organization of space relations," "Rent and the propertied interest," "The State," "Consumerism, spectacle and leisure," "Natural relations," and "The geopolitics of urban transformation," in <i>Paris, Capital of Modernity</i>. New York: Routledge, 2003, 1-22, 93-116, 125-152, 209-224, 245-252, 293-310. 	AE1 due

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barbara Hooper, “The poem of male desires: female bodies. Modernity and ‘Paris, capital of the nineteenth century’,” in Leonie Sandercock ed., <i>Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History</i>. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1998, 227-254 • Stavros Stavrides, “The Modernist Fantasy of the Perfect Flow (of Traffic),” excerpt from <i>Common Space: The City as Commons</i> (London: Zed, 2016): https://www.zedbooks.net/blog/posts/modernist-fantasy-perfect-flow-traffic/ 	
Th	2/17	<p>Topic 2.3: Parks planning, ‘public’ space and enclosure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alvaro Sevilla-Buitrago, “Central Park against the streets: the enclosure of public space cultures in mid-nineteenth century New York,” <i>Social and Cultural Geography</i>, 15, 2, 2014, 151-171. • Sonja Dümpelmann, “Layered landscapes: parks and gardens in the metropolis,” in Dorothee Brantz et. al. eds., <i>Thick Space: Approaches to Metropolitanism</i>. Berlin: Transcript, 2012, 213-238. • Richard Foglesong, “Parks and park planning” and “Planning the city beautiful,” in <i>Planning the Capitalist City</i>. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986, 89-166. <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daphne Spain, “Men build Chicago’s skyline, women redeem the city,” in <i>How Women Saved the City</i>. Minneapolis, MN.: University of Minnesota Press, 2001, 205-235. • Mike Davis, “Hausmann in the tropics,” in <i>Planet of Slums</i>. London: Verso, 2006, 95-120. • Kriston Capps, “Rio 2016: The Calamity Games,” <i>CityLab</i>, 1 August 2016: http://www.citylab.com/work/2016/08/rio-olympics-disaster-calamity-doom/493784/ 	Discussion post 6
T	2/22	<p>Topic 2.4: Garden cities—the diagram, site and territory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard Foglesong, “Roads not taken,” in <i>Planning the Capitalist City</i>. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986, 167-198. • Ebenezer Howard, “Author’s Introduction,” “The town-country magnet,” “Social cities” and “The future of London” in <i>Garden Cities of To-Morrow</i>. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1965 (1898), 41-57, 138-159. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Otto Wagner, “The development of a great city,” <i>Architectural Record</i>, New York, May 1912, 485-500. • Eve Blau, “Supranational principle as urban model: Otto Wagner’s Großstadt and city making in Central Europe,” in <i>Histoire de l’art du XIX^e siècle (1848-1914)</i>. (Paris: Collections des Rencontre de l’Ecole du Louvre, 2012), pp. 501-514. <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Marcuse, “The grid as city plan: New York City and <i>laissez-faire</i> planning in the nineteenth century,” <i>Planning Perspectives</i>, 2, 1987, 287-310. 	
Th	2/24	<p>Topic 2.5: The exploding city, round 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volker Welter, in “The city and geography,” in <i>Biopolis: Patrick Geddes and the City of Life</i>. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2002, 54-81. • Volker Welter, “The Valley Region: From Figure of Thought to Figure on the Ground,” <i>New Geographies 6: Grounding Metabolism</i>, ed. by Daniel Ibañez and Nikos Katsikos 2014, 78-87. • Lewis Mumford, “The regional framework of civilization,” in Donald Miller ed., <i>The Lewis Mumford Reader</i>. Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1995 [original: 1931 and 1925], 207-216. • Lewis Mumford, “The fourth migration,” in <i>The Urban Prospect</i>. New York: Harcourt, 1956 [original: 1925], ix-xx. • Lewis Mumford, “Garden cities and the metropolis: a reply,” <i>The Journal of Land & Public Utility Economics</i>, 22, 1, 1946, 66-69. • Benton MacKaye, “London bridge and Times Square,” “Planning and revelation,” “Regional city vs. metropolis” and “Controlling the metropolitan invasion,” in <i>The New Exploration: A Philosophy of Regional Planning</i>. University of Illinois Press: Urbana-Champaign, 1956 [original: 1928], 3-15, 146-200. • M. Christine Boyer, “Traversing a regional domain,” in <i>Dreaming the Rational City</i>. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990, 171-200. 	Discussion post 7

T	3/1	<p>Topic 2.6: Modernist planning—the creative destruction of urban space on a massive scale</p> <p><u>Primary authors:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ludwig Hilberseimer, “The metropolis,” “City planning,” and “Metropolisarchitecture,” in <i>Metropolisarchitecture and Selected Essays</i>, ed. Richard Anderson. Columbia University GSAPP: New York, 2012, 84-134, 264-281. • Le Corbusier, <i>The City of To-morrow and Its Planning</i>. New York, NY: Dover Books, 1987 (original: 1929): 159-179, 277-289. • Josep Lluís Sert, “Dwelling,” <i>Can Our Cities Survive?</i> Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942, 11-40. NOTE: entire book is uploaded to Canvas for students who would like to read further into this classic modernist manifesto. • Robert Moses, “Slums and city planning,” <i>The Atlantic Monthly</i>, January 1945, 1-15. • Constantinos Doxiadis, “The death of our cities,” speech delivered by C. A. Doxiadis during the 5th Working Conference on Urban Renewal, NAHRO, at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 21 March 1960, Document R-GA, 190, Doxiadis Associates 1960. • Albert Pope, “Megalopolis is everywhere,” in Alexander Eisenschmidt ed. <i>Chicagoisms</i>. Zurich: Park Books, 2013, 100-111. <p><u>Contextualizations (recommended):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard Foglesong, “Planning the city practical,” in <i>Planning the Capitalist City</i>. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986, 199-232. • Christopher Klemek, “Interlocking foundations of the urban renewal order,” in <i>The Transatlantic Collapse of Urban Renewal: Postwar Urbanism from New York to Berlin</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011, 17-78. • Michael Neuman, “Does planning need the plan?” <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i> 64, 2, 1998, 208-220. • James Scott, “Authoritarian high modernism,” in Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstein eds., <i>Readings in Planning Theory</i>. 2nd Edition. Blackwell: Malden, Mass.: 2003, 125-141. 	
---	-----	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teresa Caldeira and James Holston, “State and urban space in Brazil: from modernist planning to democratic interventions,” in Aihwa Ong and Stephen Collier eds, <i>Global Assemblages</i>. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005, 393-416. 	
Th	3/3	<p>Topic 2.7: The collapse of high modernism—critiques and insurgencies</p> <p><u>Primary authors:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jane Jacobs, "The uses of sidewalks," in Philip Kasinitz ed., <i>Metropolis</i>. New York: NYU Press, 1995, 111-129. • Jane Jacobs, “The death and life of great American cities,” in Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstein eds., <i>Readings in Planning Theory</i>. 2nd Edition. Blackwell: Malden, Mass.: 2003, 61-74. • Jane Jacobs, “Downtown is for people,” in Eugenie Birch ed., <i>The Urban and Regional Planning Reader</i>. New York: Routledge, 2009, 124-131. • Lewis Mumford, “Home remedies for urban cancer,” in Eugenie Birch ed., <i>The Urban and Regional Planning Reader</i>. New York: Routledge, 2009, 132-139. • Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, “Black power: its need and substance,” and “The search for new forms” in <i>Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America</i>. New York: Vintage, 1967, 34-56, 164-177. <p><u>Contextualizations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-read: Paul Davidoff, “Advocacy and pluralism in planning,” <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>, 31, 4, 1965, 331-338. • Thomas Campanella, “Jane Jacobs and the death and life of American planning,” <i>Design Observer</i>, 4.25.11. • Brian D. Goldstein, “‘The search for new forms’: Black Power and the making of the postmodern city,” <i>The Journal of American History</i>, September 2016, 375-399. • Christopher Klemek, “Outsider’s revolt: Jane Jacobs and outright rejection from beyond the urbanist establishment” and “The transatlantic collapse of the urban renewal order,” in <i>The Transatlantic Collapse of Urban Renewal: Postwar Urbanism from New York to Berlin</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011, 109-174. 	Discussion post 8

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Max Holleran, "Bright lights, small government: why libertarians adore Jane Jacobs," <i>New Republic</i>, 22 November 2016: https://newrepublic.com/article/138071/bright-lights-small-government 	
T	3/8	<p>Topic 2.8: The exploding city, round two</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Josep Lluís Sert, "The size and growth of cities," <i>Can Our Cities Survive?</i> Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942, 196-206. Kevin Lynch, "The pattern of the metropolis," in Lloyd Rodwin ed., <i>The Future Metropolis</i>. George Braziller: New York, 1961, 103-127. Jean Gottmann, "How large can cities grow?" in <i>Since Megalopolis: The Urban Writings of Jean Gottmann</i>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990, 149-181. Jean Gottmann, "Megalopolitan systems around the world," <i>Ekistics</i>, 41, 1976, 109-113. John Friedmann and John Miller, "The urban field," <i>Journal of the American Institute of Planners</i>, 31, 4, 1965, 312-320. Constantinos Doxiadis, "The city: ecumenopolis, world-city of tomorrow," <i>Impact of Science on Society</i>, 19, 2, 1969, 179-193. 	AE2 topics provided (due 3/15)
Th	3/10	<p>Final session: new geographies of the urban</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> David Harvey, "The right to the city," <i>New Left Review</i> 53, 2008, 25-40. Allegra M. McLeod, "Envisioning abolition democracy," <i>Harvard Law Review</i>, 132, 1613, April 10, 2019: https://harvardlawreview.org/2019/04/envisioning-abolition-democracy/ 	Discussion post 9