CHAPTER 2
RE/PRESENTING PLANNING'S HISTORIES

Subversive historiography (Deleuze and Guattari 1988) allows us to move beyond the confines of traditional history. Deleuze and Guattari's approach encourages us to think of history as a process of becoming, rather than a fixed set of events. This perspective allows us to see history as a constantly evolving and dynamic process, rather than a static, linear sequence of events.

THE POWER OF HISTORY

Professions, like nations, are shaped by the interplay of power and resistance. The power of history lies in its ability to shape the present and future through its ability to resist and transform. In this chapter, we will explore the power of history in shaping planning's understanding of the past. We will look at how planning professionals use history to construct narratives that shape the present and future. We will also examine the resistance to these narratives and the ways in which they are contested.

1. "The power of history is its ability to shape the present and future." - bell hooks

2. "History is a contest between history and historiography." - bell hooks
because of these histories. One very powerful critique of planning practice that has emerged from these insights is the argument that planners are ignorant about, or show little respect for, local histories and local attachments. And historic preservation planning itself has come under attack for confounding only certain histories as worthy of preserving. Helene Hayden's Power of Place (1995) and Paul Hacker (1991, 1992, 1995) address some of these issues. In taking the planning dimensions of these debates further in this chapter, I concentrate on the United States for the sake of a single historical and geographical focus, while meaning that the line of questioning is internationally pertinent.

I begin with the official story of planning history, the story that we have to believe about ourselves. It is a heroic story. But is it a true story? Or is it a myth, a legend? At the very least, there is a near side to this story, which also needs to be told. Further, the official story is the story of planning by and through the state, part of a particular tradition of city-building and nation-building. But there are, and always have been, alternative traditions of planning, existing outside the state and sometimes in opposition to it. These inessary planning histories (Sandberg 1995) challenge our very notion of what constitutes planning. They also provide a foundation for an emerging alternative (the modernist) paradigm for planning in multicultural cities. In that sense, they provide us with a future imaginary.

THE OFFICIAL STORY

In the United States, a course in planning history is required part of any professionally accredited planning program. But what is it that students read in such courses? The subfield of planning history has emerged as part of the discipline of planning rather than as a subfield of history, like urban history, only in the last thirty years. Since the first major works in the 1960s—J. W. Keohane The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States (1965) and Hal Scott's American City Planning since 1800 (1965)—interest in the field has grown and its scope has broadened. There are now many volumes of essays on the subject—the best known and most widely used of which are those edited by Donald Knoblauch. The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections (1983) and Introduction to Planning History in the United States (1990), and Donald Scheller, Planned Communities of American Planning (1986). There is a more recent best-seller by Peter Hall, Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century (1988), the scope of which was less bound by US planning history. And there are a host of historical case studies of particular pieces of planning history, covering an era, an agency, a city, or a theme. Almost without exception these studies come from within planning, and are usually written by practitioners in their own time. What does this mean?

What is planning history? What constitutes its proper field of inquiry? The answer given by the historians identified above is a fairly simple one: to chronicle the rise of the profession, its institutionalization, and its achievements. There are various strains to these histories: from the emergence of the profession itself, to accounts of the key ideas and people (always great men) shaping the emergence of planning, to histories of specific policies within the field, housing, transportation, garden cities, and so on. All there works employ a descriptive approach in which the rise of planning is presented as a heroic, progressive narrative, part of the rise of liberal democracy with its belief in progress through science and technology and faith that 'the rational planning of ideal social orders' can achieve equality, liberty and justice (Harvey 1989: 11-23). The choice of individual heroes or heroines in these narratives may seem to be quite eclectic, with some championing Ebenezer Howard, others Patrick Geddes or Le Corbusier, as the founding fathers of the profession, and most giving prominence to such local heroes as Daniel Burnham, Frederick Olmsted and Robert Moses. But beyond these individuals, planning itself is the real hero, battling foes from left and right, steering the dragon of greed and irrationality and, if not always triumphant, at least always noble, on the side of the angels.

In these modernist portrayals of planning, which I have referred to elsewhere as mainstream planning history (Sandberg 1995b, 1998), planning has no final foes. If battles are sometimes, or even often, lose, it is not the fault of the hero but of the evil world in which he must operate. Common to these mainstream histories are the following characteristics. The role of planning and of planners is apolitical. It is assumed that planning is a 'good thing', a progressive practice, and that its opponents are reactionary, irrational, or just plain greedy. It is assumed that planners know what is good for people and possess an expertise that ought to prevail (in a 'rational' society, at least) over politics. It is taken for granted that planners have agency—that that they do and think has autonomy and power. It is seen as natural and right that planning should be 'solution-driven', rather than attentive to the social construction of what are held to be 'urban problems'. There is no scrutiny of the ideology, the class or gender, race or ethnic origin or biases of planners, or of the class, gender, or ethnic effects of their work. The rise of the profession is a cause for admiration rather than critical scrutiny.

For example, Hal Scott's American City Planning Since 1800 outlines what have become the traditional themes of US planning historiography—beginning with the attempts to grapple with issues of urban sanitation, slum housing, and population concentration on the part of late nineteenth-century reformers and settlement house workers, followed by transformations in the city's built environment according to the standards of the City Beautiful movement in the early part of the twentieth century, the development of a 'scientific' foundation for the profession under the banner of the City Functional movement, the emergence of planning at national and international scales by mid-century; and finally, a call for a renewed hierarchically comprehensive. In this sweeping narrative, Scott offers the history of urban planning practice as an almost seamless evolutionary continuum in
which ideas take root, move into legislative proposals, which in turn give birth to planning agencies and institutions, which must then develop procedures of policy implementation. Along the way there are many obstacles, which the hero, with his will to plan, must overcome.

Peter Hall's Cities of Tomorrow chooses a dozen major themes, raided up of the usual suspects - slum and sanitation reform, the garden city, the City Beautiful, the birth of regional planning, the Corbusian city of towers, the automobile age, and more - and divides a chapter to each. His method is to trace these themes in the ideas of a few "visitors," most of whom lived and wrote in the decades surrounding the turn of the twentith century, and then to follow the fate of these grand ideas and visions as others (implicitly lesser mortals) seek to implement them. Hall's main theme, which he describes as the real interest in history, is individual human agency. He wants to show, in the face of what he calls the economic reductionism of Marxist historians, that individuals can and do make a difference, especially the most intelligent and most original among them (Hall 1978: 3-5). Hall's heroes are Ebenezer Howard and Patrick Geddes, the fathers of modern city planning - "there were, also, almost no founding mothers" (Hall 1984: 7) - and their interpreters in the New World like Lewis Mumford, Clarence Stein, Stuart Chase, Berenice Ackerman, Reinald Tugwell, and Frank Lloyd Wright. In there is an elegiac note in his narrative in his lament over the gap between the visionary quality of the ideas and their diluted impact on the ground, where sometimes these great ideas are "almost suicidally disssociated, and indeed, after a hundred years of planning practice, after repeated attempts in piecemeal practice, we find we are almost back to where we started" (Hall 1984: 11). What begins as an evolutionary tale, ends in a kind of circular logic and sense. For Hall seems unable to offer any satisfactory explanation for this gap between vision and reality, perhaps precisely because he chooses to focus on individuals rather than on social forces. In his story, therefore, it is the idea of planning which is the true hero, rather than the practitioners.

What is missing from these mainstream/modernist histories? At the most fundamental level - ontological and epistemological - there has been a failure to address two basic questions. What is the object of planning history? And who are its subjects? The boundaries of planning history are not a given. Those boundaries shift in relation to the definition of planning (as both idea and practice) and in relation to the historian's purpose. If we define planning as bounded by the profession, and its objective an city-building, then we generate one set of heroes. If we define planning as the regulation of the physicality, sociality, and spatiality of the city, then we produce planning histories that try to make sense of those regulatory practices over time and space. But in emphasizing planning as a regulatory or disciplinary practice, we may miss its transformative potential, which in turn may be connected to histories of resistance to specific planning practices and regulatory regimes. The writing of history is not simply a matter of holding a mirror up to the past and reporting on what is reflected back. It is always a representation, a textual reconstruction of the past rather than a direct reflection of it. Mainstream planning historians have typically seen their subject as the profession, and their object as describing (and celebrating) its emergence. There have been two significant consequences of this approach. One is the absence of diversity in these stories. The other is the absence of any critical theoretical perspective. These sins of omission are the near side of planning.

THE NOSE OF PLANNING HISTORY

In his brilliant critical history of Los Angeles, City of Quartz, Mike Davis delineates an earlier tradition of biocentrism in the writing about the city that parallels what I describe as the mythologizing of the planning profession in mainstream planning histories. In the absence of a critical tradition of historical writing about the city in Los Angeles from the 1940s through to the 1970s, Davis argues that this city came to understand its past, instead, through a robust fiction genre known as noir, in which the image of the city is repeated as a detonated urban hell. The noir novelists (James Cain, Ross MacDonald, Nathaniel West, Raymond Chandler, are the best known) created a regional fiction concerned with parsing the image of Southern California as the golden kind of opportunity and the dark side (Davis 1990: 38). Most interesting of all was the brief appearance of "Black noir," embodied in the fiction of writers like Langston Hughes and Chester Himes, who portrayed Los Angeles as a racial hell in which blacks are destroyed or driven to self-destruction by the capricious and psychotic dynamics of white racism (Davis 1990: 43).

What follows is a parsing out or demythologizing of the heroic image of planning history by means of inquiring into a series of critical themes. Perhaps the most glaring omission from the nose of the tale of planning in the absence of all but white, professional, males as the actors on the historical stage. Were there no women? No African Americans, Mexican Americans, Japanese and Chinese Americans? Were there no gays and lesbians? Where are they, both as subjects - engaged in planning, contributing to city and community building, researching urban problems - and as objects, victims, of planners' neglect or desire to regulate these groups' particular existence, concerns, and needs in cities?

WOMEN . . .

Peter Hall justifies their absence from his study by the bold assertion that there were no "founding fathers of city planning," only forerunners (Hall 1984: 39). That is simply wrong, as the works of feminist scholars like Dolores Hayden (1981), Eugenie Birch
TOWARDS CONTINUITY

What of the absence of African Americans and other ethnic minorities from mainstream accounts? There is the unspoken assumption here that there are no African/Neosouthern American forebears or mothers of city planning. This is another implicit assumption in mainstream narratives— that planning has been non-racial in its practices, rather than supportive of a white power structure’s position of segregation and determinant. Joan Fitzgerald and William Howard have addressed the first assumption, making the case that there is indeed a black planning history, and that blacks were involved in planning around urban problems long before the civil rights era. They focus on the urban research of W. E. B. Du Bois, beginning with his monumental study, The Philadelphia Negro, in 1899, and continuing in his investigations reported in the Atlanta University Publications which provided a comprehensive portrait of urban African Americans. Through these publications, Du Bois made a great contribution to urban research and community development planning, especially as such planning related to the black community’ (Fitzgerald and Howard 1993: 30–31).

Along with the work of the Urban League, black churches, and black women working in their communities (Gillies 1990), there is a body of research, political activism, and urban social services that collectively represent a distinctive African American urban planning and community development tradition. Cheryl Gillies (1990) and Gill Drenov (1992, 1995) are among a growing group of researchers who are documenting the role of black women in community-building. If we redefine planning to include the community-building tradition—planning from below—then clearly we must include these narratives in our planning history. According to Fitzgerald and Howard, there are two ways why this tradition has been ignored both by the emerging planning profession and by mainstream inertia. First, the research of Du Bois and of the Urban League drew attention to histories of racial tension and strife in American cities. But in the emerging profession of city planning in this early half of the twentieth century, the matter of white racism seemed to have been an immutable subject, and this continued to be the case at least until the challenges of the civil rights era. Second, the planning tradition that came to dominate the profession was based on shaping the physical environment – the city-building tradition – while the focus of the African American tradition was on employment and economic concerns, social work and urban service delivery, and collective political action – a community-building tradition.

The silence of mainstream historians on the subject of the racism that has been so prominent in American cities, has led to an avoidance of the ways in which planning practice has often worked to reinforce racial segregation and discrimination. "Racial issues" are first mentioned on page 423 of Mel Scott’s American City Planning Since 1800, at which point he has reached the 1960s in his chronological narrative. It’s another 160 pages before there is any further...
The theme of the racial consequences of urban and regional planning schemes receives full engagement in recent works by June Manning Thomas (1994, 1996) and Clyde Woods (1993, 1995). Thomas argues for a more racially conscious perspective in planning history, one that is more sensitive to the history of African American urbanization. She suggests a new, four-part perspective for city planning history to bring it into line with black urban experience. This would begin with the era during and immediately after the First World War, which saw the first substantial migration of southern blacks to northern cities and, not coincidentally, the first major race riots of the twentieth century. This migration created industrial, social, housing, and religious issues for city officials. Their planning response was the creation of residential covenants, zoning for social segregation by race, and residential covenants built into land titles (Thomas 1994). The second stage is the era of public housing, after the passage of the Wagner-Steagall Act in 1937, and including Second World War housing and post-war urban renewal. This was a period in which residential segregation was reinforced and ghetto development consolidated as local politicians and planners responding to overt displays of white racism, and the planning system to keep black housing projects out of white neighborhoods. This was also the time of the second great migration of southern rural blacks to the north and west, and the clearance of 'black slums' for development. The third stage is the era of civil rights and civil rebellions, an era in which the planning profession developed a consciousness of and conscience about race and racism and when social planning and advocacy planning were required to this new awareness (Thomas 1994). In the era that Thomas describes as the 'truly separate metropolis' since the 1970s, the black community has experienced both an increase in political power (at least as measured by the number of black elected officials) and disastrous economic decline thanks to processes of deindustrialization and economic restructuring. Thomas describes how planning affects, and is affected by, race and racism, as well as showing the historical linkage between urban development and racial oppression of blacks by whites.

In a more recent essay, Thomas (1998) argues for making the issues of race and racism central to the history of urban planning in the United States. Criticizing existing histories for their divisive treatment of African Americans as either passive, or as passive victims of urban policies, or worse, as the purveyors of social pathologies, Thomas gives us a fine-grained account of the historical links between race, racism, and planning. While not avoiding the extent to which planners have been complicit with oppressive policies in the past, she also gives a subtle reading of the difficulties of urban improvement efforts in a social context of racial oppression. She describes the persistent struggles by African Americans to plan their own communities, emphasizing how these stories of struggle can empower present and future generations.

Similar studies are needed for other minorities, from the exclusionary nineteenth-century zoning actions against Chinese immigrants (Krysan and Heer 1989) to the restrictive covenants against Mexicans and Jews through the first half of the twentieth century (Kane 1983). In the whole system of 'planned reservations' for Native Americans as part of a broader reinterpretation of the work of planning against social control (immigrants in space — women, minorities), the poor, indigen-ous peoples. This is indeed a new side of planning history, something which planners would rather not acknowledge in their collective professional past. And yet, unless we discuss these hidden intentions and consequences of planning practices, we will continue to perpetuate them, as both Thomas (1998), and Bob Bruegman (1998) — talking about South African planning — have argued.

Diversity in the multicultural city has many faces. Alongside the struggles for recognition and place-claiming by racial and ethnic 'minorities' are those of gays and lesbians, a minority with a long history of oppression and of resistance. Like other groups, gays and lesbians have stories to tell about the ways in which their lives in cities and neighborhoods have been and are impinged on by planning's social and spatial policies, and how they, in turn, have contested certain policies. Making these stories an integral part of planning history requires us to address questions such as the following: have heterosexuals, as individuals or as couples, been excluded from particular housing developments and certain neighborhoods? How have planning and housing policies created or reinforced such barriers? How have policies affecting the design and use of public spaces impacted the ability of gays and lesbians to live openly and without fear of personal harassment? What assumptions about the 'normal' family/household are built into suburban planning...
Towards Consensus

There is a fundamental critique embedded in drawing attention to some of the glaring omissions in mainstream accounts of planning theory. These omissions are not innocent. They are systematic exclusions which emerge from the author's epistemological position concerning the proper subject and object of planning research.

Representing Planning's Histories

Concerning the writing of history, and concerning the relationship of planning to power and the power of systems of thought. In order to understand these systematic exclusions, we need theory. As a profession, historians have acknowledged the importance of theory at least since the inception of journals like History and Theory (1963), Radical History Review (1974), and Marxist Perspectives (1975). Over the past two decades there has been a proliferation of 'new histories' - feminist, postcolonial, ethnic, queer, cultural, and more. The very titles of some of these works - Remaking History (Krueger and Mattani 1989), The New Cultural History (Braudel 1986), Selected Indian Studies (Sinha and Sivak 1988), and Telling the Truth About History (Appleby, Baint, and Jacob 1994) - indicate the challenges across many fronts to 'traditional histories' not only of 'isms and genres' but of mainstream, white, and Eurocentric accounts. These new histories begin with the recovery of neglected, repressed, and forgotten cultures, the reorganization of names and faces erased from past accounts. This process of 'rescuing' or, what Joan Kelly (1986) has called 'comparative histories', is essential in disrupting mainstream accounts of planning history, and is also an important factor in the contemporary politics of identity. Recovering one's history is a first step in contesting or recontextualizing both individual and group identity. But the process of recovery is not the end of the story. There are further levels of examination and analysis. The awareness of new voices with new stories to tell has produced, as Fawcett described it, a 'new form of history that is trying to develop its own theory' (Krueger and Mattani 1989). Over the past two decades a new American urban social history has begun to be written, taking urban diversity as a starting point and recognizing the disparate experiences of class and gender. Urban history was for many years dominated by what Hayden calls city biographies, 'a single narrative of how city leaders or city fathers - almost always white, upper-and-middle-class men - forged the city's spatial and economic structure, making fortunes building downtown and imposing order on chaotic immigrant populations' (Hayden 1995: 39). Planning historians seem to have taken their cue from this earlier genre of urban history, and yet in the early urban histories there are many similarities to the 'universal histories' of the American West, as too have planning histories unfolded brief stories of the great white voluntary men who have shaped the planning profession and city-building processes in the twentieth century.

Beginning in the late 1980s, urban historians have begun to last to develop a more inclusive approach to the entire city, exploring the whole as seen from the perspective of different oppressed groups, while emphasizing the chain of spatial as well as cultural divisions and distinctions (Hayden 1995: 40). The new urban histories not only draw attention to the organization of different ethnic communities in the building of American cities. They also place women at the centre rather than at the periphery of economic and social life in the city. With a couple of notable exceptions - Christine Boyer's Dreaming the Rational City (1983) and Richard Wrigley's Planning the Capitalist City (1986) - planning historians throughout the 1980s remained immune to these new developments in
related field of history. By the mid-1990s this is finally beginning to change as new work, influenced by a range of critical theories, from Marxist to Foucaultian, from feminism to postcolonialism, poststructuralism, and queer theory, begins to re-


These are 'insurgent planning histories'.

INSURGENT PLANNING HISTORIES

It is the argument of this book that planning in the multicultural cities of today and tomorrow requires a very different approach from that of the modernist paradigm. In order to imagine the future differently, we need to start with history, with a re-

consideration of the stories we tell ourselves about planning's role in the modern and postmodern city. There is an important social science in which history is, as Herodotus said several millennia ago, stories we tell ourselves around a campfire. In telling new stories about our past, our intention is to reshape our future. If we can unlearn planning history from its obsession with the celebratory story of the rise of the planning profession, and demonstrate its multiple and insurgent histories, we may be able to link it to a new set of public issues — those connected with the challenge of planning for a future of multicultural cities and regions. The future multicultural city — cosmopolis — cannot be imagined without an acknowledge-

ment of the politics of difference (which insurgent planning histories embody), a belief in in-

clusive democracy; and the diversity of social justice claims of the disempowered communities in our existing cities. If we want to work towards a politics of inclusion, then we had better have a good understanding of the exclusionary effects of planning's past practices. And if we want to plan in the future for multiple cultures, acknowledging and nurturing the full diversity of the many social groups in the multicultural city, then we need to develop a new kind of multicultural literacy.

An essential part of that literacy is familiarity with the multiple histories of urban communities, especially as those histories intersect with struggles over space and place-claiming, with planning policies and resistance to them, with traditions of indigenous planning, and with questions of belonging and identity and acceptance of difference. What follows are some examples of insurgent planning histories, insurgent in their theoretical apparatus, to understanding what constitutes planning history as well as in the particular stories they have to tell, about Native American, African American, women and girls and lesbians. There is a difference between rewriting history by adding the forgotten or repressed contributions of particular groups and reconfiguring planning history by using gender and race as categories of analysis. In a landmark essay, historian Joan Kelly argued that women's history has shaken the foundations of historiography by making problematic these three basic concepts of historiographical thought — period-

ization, the categories of social analysis, and theories of social change (Kelly 1984).

One of the themes of feminist scholarship has been the issue of women's status.

REPRESENTING PLANNING'S HISTORIES

that is, the rules and positions women hold in society by comparison with those of men. In historical research, this means we look at ages or movements of great social change in terms of their liberation or oppression of women's potential. Once we do this, the period, or set of events, may take on a wholly different meaning from the normally accepted one.

If we apply Foucault's famous dictum — that the emancipation of women is an index of the general emancipation of an age — our notion of secular progressive development, such as classical Athenian civilization, the Renaissance, and the French Revolution, undergoes a startling reevaluation.

(Kelly 1994, 5)

Kelly's own work on the question 'Was there a Renaissance for women?' provides the substantive evidence for her theoretical argument. With her question in mind, as to whether significant turning points in history have the same impact for women as they do for men, we can turn to planning histories and examine their periods from very different points of view. Instead of celebrating every milestone in the evolution of planning as a profession, we need to ask whether women (and other minorities) were part of this emerging profession, and what effect each milestone had on the lives of women living in cities. My own period-

ization of Australian planning history fell into three eras an ideas phase (late

nineteenth century through to the First World War), a legislative phase (between

the two world wars and immediately after the Second World War); and an imple-

mentation phase, primarily post-Second World War (Sandbrook 1995). Applying a feminist framework to this periodization, a number of questions arise. With respect to the early formative ideas, were women active in writing or proposing any of these ideas? Were women organizing around urban issues at this time? How did the ideas of the "great men" or "building heroes" potentially affect the lives of women in cities? What were the male-female relationships implied in ideas about the 'good city' and 'good planning'? If women played only a marginal role in the emerging profession, why was that the case, and is that the end of the story, or should we broaden our horizon to include women's work in housing reform, social work, the playgrounds movement and community organizing? In the United States, we might want to focus on the split between the housing reform movement and the planning profession, analyzing the role of gender in this split. Similar questions can be asked of the phases of legalization and implementation. Were women involved as actors in those processes? More importantly, what were the consequences of particular pieces of legislation on women's lives in the cities. Has any planning legislation ever tried to broaden the opportunities for women to participate in public life? What assumptions about relations (of equality or inequality) between the sexes are built into planning legislation?

Finally, with Kelly's second challenge — the categories of social analysis, if gender is a category as fundamental to our analysis of the social order as other
towards cosmopolitanism

classifications such as class, and if we regard the relations between the sexes as socially rather than biologically determined, then this would lead a planning historian to ask, of any set of ideas or practices, 'What are the male-female relationships implied here?' For example, what roles are being assigned to women when we design houses and neighbourhoods and transportation systems?

Kaye's third challenge is based on the second. If the relation of the sexes is as necessary to an understanding of human history as the social relationship of classes, then a theory of social change that incorporates the relation of the sexes has to consider how gender changes in production and shape production in the household and, thereby, the respective roles of men and women. This in turn requires us to address the relations between the domestic and the public order, and to look at the organization of the productive forces of society to understand the domestic order to which women, historically, have been primarily assigned (although not all women, and not for all of history). Conversely, women's history also views women as agents and the family as a social and productive force, and asks us to analyze the positive aspects of women's lives within households and communities, producing new values and providing the growth and attachment without which both individual and social life is the power. Theories of social change that are derived from gender-neutral approaches to history assume that when things change for the better, those things are better for women too. A feministic approach to planning history needs to demonstrate that this has not always been the case, and is not always a reasonable assumption. Planners who want to create a better world for both men and women need a theory of social transformation which has at its heart a consideration of relations between the sexes, how those relations are shaped by and in the built environment, and how that built environment is socially produced in accordance with pre-existing norms of what constitutes appropriate relations between the sexes. (And all the above questions and arguments need to be repeated and adapted to race relations as well.)

The feminist work discussed above has as its starting point an understanding of gender as a social construction. There is a group of French feminists whose work has become influential, which begins from a rather different starting point, that of the body as a social construction. There is an increasing interest in the social construction of the self and on the social creation of 'social bodies', an increasing new line of inquiry emerges around questions of regulation and discourses about regulatory regimes. This comes together in the planning history field around discourses of bodies, cities, and social order.

bodies, cities, and social order

Paul Rabinow's French Modern (1995) was the first work to emerge from that intellectual milieu with a direct relevance to our understanding and representation of planning. French Modern is a study of the construction of norms and the search for forms adequate to understand and regulate modern society. While planning is not the focus of his study, Rabinow describes how, beginning in the nineteenth century, the 'correction society' of positivist social and natural science began to define and regulate norms - along the biocultural-hygiene-philosophical, normal-alternative, productive-useful, productive-useful, and so on - and to provide those norms with architectural and urban forms. He explores the ways in which the many professions and professional experts created disciplinary practices which served to control and regulate people in modern societies - essentially to regulate bodies in space. Rabinow does not pay up on the gender and other implications of applying Foucault's work to planning practices. Such an inquiry would ask how planning, as a profession, has functioned as a regulatory regime, specifically in its discourse on and rules concerning the 'appropriate' (or 'normal') place of women, or gays, or people of colour in the city.

We find a tantalizing beginning to such a project in Elizabeth Wilson's study of cities and planning, The Symbolic City (1993), and in an essay in New Left Review:

With the intensification of the public-private divide in the industrial period, the presence of women on the streets and in public places of entertainment caused enormous anxiety, and was the source for any number of moral and regulatory discourses.

(Wilson 1995: 99)

Wilson argues that during the nineteenth century there was an increasing preoccupation among urban social reformers, politicians, and writers, with the subject of urban disorder. One of the causes of this growing disorder was believed to be the presence of women in the new industrial towns. She further suggests that 'the ambiguous woman, the lesbian, the prostitute, the childless woman ... all aroused fear and created anxieties concerning the semiotics of life in the metropolis' (Wilson 1992, 106). Preoccupation served as 'a metaphor for the new regime of mid-nineteenth century urbanism' (Wilson 1992: 105), a regime in which women - their bodies, their sexuality - were suddenly on the streets, potentially both tempting and threatening male order, male self-discipline, and the male disciplining of the city. She also argues that the emerging planning profession was preoccupied with controlling intersecting sexualities in the city, thereby posing planners as early enunciators of homosocial lifestyles. These ideas demand further historical research and reading of classic planning texts and plans in order to reveal such agendas.

On this theme, Georges Chauvin's Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Modern Gay World, 1890-1940 is an important work for planning historians. Chauvin argues that the thinking about the city which ultimately coalesced into urban planning theory identified 'sexual deviants' as one of the causes of social disorder:

representing planning's histories
Reprenenting Planning's Histories

Richard Fouillée: Planning the Capitalist City. The Colonial Era to the 1920s. Inspired by German and French theorists (Friedmann, Ollier), Fouillée describes his task as both to apply the Marxist structuralist model to the story of American city planning and to discover what the actual story of this planning has to teach us about the adequacy of this theoretical approach. His themes are the relationship between planning and the contradictions of capitalist development, the relationship between planners, class interests, and the state; and the question of the relative necessity of planners from capital. Intrigued by Ollier’s formulation of the structural problems of the capitalist state, Fouillée concludes that planning in a capitalist democracy is both necessary and impossible. In some ways this is such an appealing and critical summary of the history of city planning that it is hard to disagree. But while it illuminates much, there is also much that it misses.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of Marxist approaches to planning history is the focus on class, and the deconstruction of the idea of "the public interest" in contrast to mainstream historians, Marxists have made transparent the class impact of planning practices over time, bringing to the forefront an analysis of why this is the case, and where, in the capitalist city, through the planning process. But this ascension of the primacy of class analysis has resulted in (ignoring the
gender and race effects of planning. Further, the Marxist structuralist paradigm becomes tautological and deterministic. Given the theoretical starting point - that planning is a function of the state, that the state in capitalist society is a capitalist state, and therefore every aspect of planning in the final analysis serves the needs of capital - that every idea and action of planners must be interpreted as 'system-maintaining.' Either it serves the accumulation needs of capital, or it serves the legitimization function. This conclusion, a necessary one given the theoretical starting point, is a revealing one for those who wish to change the world through planning, and may partially at least explain why Marxist urban scholarship is less influential now than it was a decade ago. Indeed, following himself seems trouble by this conclusion and, in its final chapter, seems to contradict it by asserting, rather than demonstrating historically, that 'there is indeterminacy and room for manoeuvre here - in short, there space exists for a left policy' (Rogers 1984: 256).

The problem with such a macro-theoretical approach as Marxism attempts to be (what Leonard has called a meta-narrative), lies in the very search for a unifying theoretical framework through which everything can be explained. The search for such a unifying theory seems a misguided one, pushing us toward a universal generalization, pre-determining what we are going to find in our research, ignoring the Foucaultian insight that power 'begins in little places and in terms of little things,' and closing off the possibilities of human agency. Unless we bring our analysis down from the level of grand theorizing, and away from the search for the meta-theory that will explain everything (like 'all planning is system-maintaining,' or 'all planning is covert control'), we will never be able to see the potential for transformation inherent in any city at any time. This seems particularly important in planning history, a field which is inevitably concerned with questions of action, of change, of transformation, of empowerment. It is also a concern with action, with change, with empowerment, which shapes the next two examples of insurgent planning histories. If planning relies on and builds up the state, then an alternative counter-agent is a model of planning which addresses the formations of insurgent citizenship,' argues anthropologist James Holloway (1995: 43-4), who argues planning theories and historians to study the grassroots mobilizations and everyday practices which subvert state agendas. The research of Clyde Woods and of Theodore Joly answers this call.

RECOVERIES (1): THE BLUES EPISTEMOLOGY

Clyde Woods' account of the failed effort at regional economic development planning in the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Commission (LMDCC) offers a new history of regional planning. His project is the recovery of the memory, voices, and visions of the African American community of the Delta. Drawing on Foucault's archaeological/genealogical method, he 'reconstruct[s] a repressed African American tradition of resistance to the hegemonic definitions of planning and development in the Delta. What Woods makes visible is the existence of a regional epistemology grounded in African American experience, what he calls the 'Blues epistemology' which, he argues, embodies an alternative theory of social, economic, and cultural development and change. Woods describes how the Blues operated to insist pride as a people facing daily degradation, as well as channeling folk wisdom, descriptives of life and labor, and critiques of bosses and sharecroppers, planters, and the plantation regime. He argues that the Blues operated as a self-referential system of social explanation, as an epistemology. This new epistemology proceeded from the assumption that the indigenously developed folk culture, its structure, its ethos, its tradition of social explanation, and its prescriptions for social action, were the basic representational grid of working-class African American consciousness. Woods also explains why these voices, that tradition, were systematically marginalized in the interests of a hegemonic modernization of which planning was and is a compliant partner.

Within the oral and written record of these 'insurgent agendas and movements' rests the locally indigenous knowledge upon which to construct new relationships and new regional structures of equality and democracy. Woods is concerned as much with an empowering vision of the future for the region as he is with the region's past. Re-presenting the region's past, however, is the first step in imagining a better future. Reacting to the appalling consequences of the modernization project for the African American population of the Mississippi Delta, Woods' insurgent historiography embodies an activist social imagination that draws on what already exists in the history of African American resistance as hegemonic distortions of planning and development in the Delta (Woods 1993, 1995).

RECOVERIES (2): THE ALL-INDIAN PEACE COUNCIL

There could be no more obvious absence from the pages of the planning history of the United States than that of its original inhabitants, Native Americans, who were forcibly removed from their lands in order for most American cities to be built and farms to be established. But, once we have acknowledged that tribal communities have been victims of modernization and urbanization, have we reached a point to their inclusion in the planning narrative - an appearance on stage only briefly, as visitors? The most important contribution to our understanding of this hitherto invisible part of our planning history is the work of Native American scholar and activist Theodore Joly (1989). In his essay 'Indigenous Planning, Class, Nationalism, Confederations, and the History of the All-Indian Peace Council,' Joly acknowledges that tribal communities have been victims of modernization, but the story he tells about this is useful. He argues that tribal communities themselves have a history and planning traditions which have been rendered invisible by virtue of not being
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now as part of the dominant narrative of modernization and nation-building. And he outlines a story of hundreds of years of resistance and survival despite overwhelming odds, a story of selective interpenetration and adaptation. He argues that this survival was possible precisely because of indigenous planning traditions, specifically the role of clan in community development and the tradition of consensus-seeking among inter-tribal confederations. Together, these constitute traditions of community and regional planning with a much longer history than their parallels in mainstream Euro-American planning. While Jojola's essay focuses on the history of those traditions among the Pacific Indian nations of the Southwest, he notes that there are variations on these same themes throughout what is known as Native America.

Planning as a tradition among Native Americans was not imposed by Euro-Americans. The hegemonic nation-building project that proscribed mainstream Euro-American histories of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see Appleby, Hunt and Jacob 1994), involved, by definition, a denial that Native Americans already constituted a nation with its own government, philosophy, and economy. Jojola examines nineteenth and early twentieth century historical and archaeological scholarship and notes its role as a tool enabling policy makers to dissolve tribal leadership and deny the ability of tribes to plan for themselves. The patronizing public policy approach toward Native American communities – policies of forced cultural assimilation developed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the 1890s and remaining in place until the 1960s – emerged as a result of this earlier scholarship and its allegedly scientific conclusions about the inferiority of Native Americans.

In contrast to that scholarship, Jojola describes how, at the time of European contact, there were planning traditions within Native American societies, traditions characterized by distinctive world views, with clans serving as the basic social unit for banding communities. Jojola likens the clan to the neighborhood unit in planning theory. And when clans of various cultural communities come together to form regionally based groups, those groups – or tribal confederations – become the means by which Native Americans organized their own political community. Jojola equates this with a regional planning model, arguing that the confederations established an interdependent economic system which in turn was tied to managing and maintaining a shared ecosystem. One of the surviving tribal confederations in the American Public Council of the Southwest, Jojola describes the unified actions of the Pueblo in resisting first Spanish intrusion and exploitation, continuing regional resistance after the 1821 transfer of Spanish authority to the Mexican government, and again, after the American territorial government was established in New Mexico. With the induction of New Mexico into the Union in 1822 the Pueblo continued to mediate against the unjust practices of local authorities.

Jojola's long march through the centuries can in fact be described as a success story – albeit with powerful tragic overtones. In the long view, in spite of decorative, assimilation, and alteration from their lands, tribal communities have survived and are being revitalized, and the indigenous planning traditions which have made this survival possible are being reassessed. In keeping with the notion of the past as future – with history writing directed toward present and future policy concerns – Jojola outlines the expanded policy role of the All-Indian Public Council today in matters of community and regional development and national policy, and advocates the formation and revitalization of other confederations which existed at the time of first European contact.

CONTESTING THE SPACES OF HISTORIC REPRESENTATION

Traditional planning histories have presented planning as the voice of reason in modern society, as the carrier of the Enlightenment mission of material progress through scientific rationality. The insurgent planning histories discussed above implicitly and explicitly challenge the accuracy of this representation of planning. Thomas, Woods, Jojola, Chaucer and Kennedy represent 'aboriginal consciousness' of black, tribal communities, and tribes in their own right, which has been subjected to pressure by those in power. Each has captured arguably aboriginal consciousness through interviews of oral history, political economy, cultural mapping, cartography, and cultural analysis. And each underscores ways in which, through resistance and accommodation, the aboriginal connects the world and remakes it.

The variety of insurgent planning histories outlined here all challenge the mainstream approach of planning history as synonymous with the history of the profession. They also, implicitly, challenge the very idea of the 'history of planning' emphasizing instead plural histories of planning practices and plural readings of planning texts, according to the theoretical lens in use. Nevertheless some common themes do emerge in these new planning histories. The theme of planning as an entering tool, as a kind of 'spatial policy', first surfaced in the 1970s in Marxist accounts of urban planning, but has taken a new turn under the influence of postmodernism as synonymous with disciplinary practices and regulatory regimes. Earlier Marxist writings tended to argue, monstrously, that all planning must be interpreted as social control, as a disciplinary practice essential to the maintenance of the modern social order. More recent writings make no such insulating claim. On the contrary, they are ever alert to the resistance that arose in the face of these disciplinary or controlling practices. The theme recurs of marginalized groups countering urban and regional histories of planning practices and plural readings of planning texts, (as in the historical preservation and public history practices that Libo and Lezien write about), as well as the spaces of historical narratives themselves. The themes of bodies, cities, and social order allow a radically different way of conceptualizing and understanding planning's inventions and practices. And a range of scholars are now challenging the notion of 'rational planning in the
public interest by deconstructing the class, gender, race and ethnic origin, biases, and effects of the planning profession.

There is no single theoretical framework that informs this new work, nor is there a dominant theme. The goal is not to produce a new, unified, postmodern or feminist or postcolonial interpretation of planning history, the new critical story. I began by critiquing the inadequacies of mainstream or traditional planning histories, what they have enshrined invisible, their core. Beyond this deconstruction, I have outlined new ways of thinking about and doing planning history, drawing on the work of scholars of the past decade. In part, this involves a reconceptualisation of the subject — of mainstream definitions of planning and the role of planners as well as the dominant definitions of who is and is not a planner. While we still need to see planning as, in part, a state-directed activity, a branch of city- and region-building, but this need not be seen as an exclusively top-down, expert-driven process. There have always been oppositional movements within and outside of mainstream planning, from the City Social tradition dominated by women urban theorists to the community-building traditions dominated by Wood, Jojola, Semmer, and Thomas for African American, Native American, and gay and Lesbian communities, as well as other white working-class and ethnic communities. Stories of resistance to 'planning by the state' are as important a part of the historical narrative as are the more familiar heroic stories of master plans and master planners, of planning legislation and state planning agencies. There is a tradition of community resistance (from people whose life space is at stake in the urban and regional development process) and of community planning which needs to be incorporated as a counterpoint to the modernist narrative.

Planning by the state is only one part of the story. Today, not all professionally trained planners work as agents of the state. Increasingly, planners work for diverse local communities, in a new dialogic relationship that goes far beyond advocacy. And planning as a profession has spread its wings to include environmental policy, historic preservation, community development, anti-poverty planning, and so on. There are many strands of planning, loosely held together through a common education and a professional culture that includes the teaching of some version of planning history. But is the subject taught in its full richness and diversity, its own as well as its triumphal versions? The diversifying of planning education over the past three decades — the influx of women, people of color, new immigrants, activist gays and lesbians — has brought to the fore the need to re-present planning history as part of a contemporary project of rethinking planning's future. We have moved from planning history to planning's histories.