

# Introduction

Jean Hillier

## Planning at yet Another Crossroads?

*Planning theory for what? (Friedmann 2008: 248)*

In 1973, the year in which I first studied a module in urban planning (with Derek Diamond at the London School of Economics), David Eversley<sup>1</sup> wrote *The Planner in Society: The Changing Role of a Profession*.<sup>2</sup> Eversley began his book by announcing that British town planning faced a crossroads, repeating the metaphor invoked by Lewis Keeble in 1961. Eversley described a crossroads at which planners had a choice of paths:

*Straight ahead, perhaps, he (sic) can plod on with what he has been doing, and probably doing conscientiously enough: administering the law of the land. To one side: an abyss, a total disgrace, an abdication from social responsibility, the planner at the bottom of the heap and the scapegoat for all the evils of society. But in other directions, the road points to the possibility that the planner may be on the brink of greatness: a long, hard climb, not to a height where his judgment is unassailable, and not so far removed from the realities of the urban scene that he need no longer communicate. (1973: 304)*

Besides there being far more women planners and those from minority ethnic backgrounds than in Eversley's day, can we tell which path planners have taken since 1973? Clearly, many have chosen to 'plod on'; a few may have fallen into the abyss (as authors such as Jon Gower Davis (1974) and Peter Hall (1982) describe); and a few may have achieved Eversley's 'greatness' (such as Pierre Clavel and

---

1 David Eversley was Chief Strategic Planner at the new Greater London Council from 1969–1972.

2 I admit to not having read Eversley's book at the time, being far more influenced by another text published that same year: David Harvey's *Social Justice and the City*.

Norman Krumholz in the US).<sup>3</sup> But this is to exclude other definitions of ‘greatness’, non-Western planning and planners and, in particular, the role of planning theory.

Almost 40 years later, ‘planning’ in Britain has become more than the town and country planning of Eversley’s time,<sup>4</sup> as the Overall Introduction to *Critical Essays in Planning Theory* (Hillier and Healey 2008a) and the readings in the three volumes clearly indicate. The ‘planning idea’ (Hillier and Healey 2008a: ixv), at the beginning of the twenty-first century, is committed to a focus on the relations between theory and practice; to an increasing internationalization of knowledge of planning as theorized and practised; to an openness to intellectual ideas from other disciplines; and to a recognition of the importance of power and politics (Hillier and Healey 2008a).

Theorists and practitioners have always been faced with uncertainty, though positivists might not have admitted it in public! Such theorists and practitioners in the past sought robust laws and principles grounded in well-tested scientific propositions, which dealt with uncertainty by reducing its dimensions to those which could be managed, or rendered certain. Today, however, at a time of potentially radical changes in the ways in which humans interact with their environments – changes brought about through financial crises and resulting lack of investment and development in property; changes brought about through environmental crises of floods, droughts and global warming – the *raison d’être* of spatial planning faces substantial conceptual and empirical challenges. If one accepts the broad mission of spatial planning as being stewardship of the future wellbeing of the planet – comprising humans, non-humans and their natural and constructed environments – then planning is faced with challenges posed by both the potential and the limitations of that mission. Whilst I would not argue that planning is at yet another crossroads, I do suggest that the planning field, and planning theorists in particular, should be aware of some of the conceptual challenges which lie in wait. Attempts have been made for the past 25 years to live and plan with uncertainty, rather than to reduce it, but much more work still needs to be done.

This volume, the *Ashgate Research Companion to Planning Theory*, is Companion to the three volumes, *Critical Essays in Planning Theory (CEPT)* (Hillier and Healey 2008a). This consists of a series of papers and excerpts from books which, as editors, Patsy Healey and I regarded as being influential in the development of planning theory. The *Companion* does not, therefore, historically trace the field of planning theory. Rather, it seeks to interrogate planning theory in more complex ways, considering a wide range of conceptual challenges which the chapter authors regard as important for theorists of planning to engage with in the early twenty-first century. The chapters thus focus on important current and likely future conceptual challenges for spatial planning theory and practice.

As Nigel Taylor (2003: 93) indicates, concepts are fundamental to both planning theory and planning practice, ‘for they specify what, in its actions, town planning is trying to *do*’ (emphasis in original). As Taylor argues, debate is inevitable over

---

3 See Clavel, et al. (1980); Clavel (1986); Krumholz and Forester (1990); Krumholz and Clavel (1994).

4 In 1960s US, planning was already much more than ‘town and country planning’.

which concepts are more relevant and/or important; over which interpretations of the same concept (such as informality, economy, sustainability and so on) are more 'sound', and indeed over the meaning of 'concept'. The chapters in this volume engage planning theory and practice from a variety of perspectives, offering both contemporary analyses of planning itself – of 'planning ideas and planning practices' – and critical commentaries on several key issues with which planning practice and planners interact.

The authors focus on important conceptual challenges for planning theory, including new approaches to substantive (concerned with the substance of what the planning field deals with) and procedural (concerned with the processes of planning) questions; new and re-theorisations of uncertainty, conflict and political complexities. A key question for the early twenty-first century is, perhaps, not so much what planning theory is, but what can planning theory do?

Before I continue, it is important to clarify my usage of the terms 'spatial planning' and 'planning practice'. 'Spatial planning' is a predominantly European term which refers to the processes used by agencies (in both public and private sectors) in deliberate attempts to influence the spatial distributions of humans and non-humans and of various land-using activities. As such, spatial planning includes urban planning, regional planning, producing and implementing national spatial plans and also (in the EU) transnational plans. During the twentieth century, the domain of urban planning expanded to include economic development planning, community social planning and environmental planning issues. The EU Torremolinos Charter (1983) definition of spatial planning is: '[r]egional/spatial planning gives geographical expression to the economic, social, cultural and ecological policies of society. It is at the same time a scientific discipline, an administrative technique and a policy developed as an interdisciplinary and comprehensive approach directed towards a balanced regional development and the physical organisation of space according to an overall strategy.' (CEMAT 1983: 5)

Land-use planning (also 'planning' or 'zoning') involves the 'scientific, aesthetic and orderly disposition of land, resources, facilities and services with a view to securing the physical, economic, social and environmental efficiency, health and well-being of urban and rural communities' (CEMAT 2007: 17).

I regard 'planning practice' as an activity of spatial planning undertaken in different parts of the world by professionals trained in disciplines including planning, architecture, engineering, surveying, public administration and technical drafting, all of whom I loosely label as 'planners'.

Conceptual challenges for spatial planning practice include, 'what might it mean to plan in circumstances of complexity?' and 'what issues could planning theorists think about to help practices of planning and governance?'

In *CEPT* we argued that most 'theories' are actually associations of ideas, discussions and debates which are 'in conversation' with each other (Healey and Hillier 2008). They offer perspectives for viewing aspects of the world; a reasonable definition since the classical Greek origins of *theōria* meant 'visual sight' (as explained below). John Forester (2004) takes this further with his analogy of planning theory as a telescope through which we can look at an issue. Our ability to

see that issue clearly depends on the equipment we use – in this case, the theoretical frame we use for the questions we ask and how we understand the answers to those questions. As Forester suggests, when our theoretical telescope is good, it lets us see and understand more about the issue, its context and what we might be able to do about it. When that telescope is bad, we put it to the wrong eye, we use it backwards or forget to take the cover off the lens, it can give us a headache, eyestrain and a very confused picture.

Debates about planning ideas and theories are not conducted amongst a closed elite of dedicated academics, even though it may sometimes seem like it. Planning theory discussions are situated in the contexts of the intellectual environments, lived experiences and values of the time they are written. As a result, planning theories demonstrate many different philosophical and other referents and styles of argumentation. Readers may be tempted to conclude, after reading the various contributions to this volume, that planning theory is too slippery a term to be of much significance. As this Introduction and the chapter authors illustrate, there is a very wide range of theoretical approaches available. It is not our aim as editors to choose between approaches; to ‘recommend’ one over another; to fix the meaning of ‘planning theory’ or its vocabulary, but to open up different perspectives to provoke and stimulate readers to further investigate relationships between planning theories and perspectives from other disciplines and also relationships between planning theories and their roles in relation to planning practice. As Taylor (1998: 167) points out, there are different kinds of theories, posing and answering different kinds of questions in situations where more than one theory is often of relevance.

As editors, we believe that engaging in critical debate in and around planning theory ‘is essential to the vitality and continued relevance of planning as a profession’ (Friedmann, 2003: 9) and moreover, that there is a huge difference between treating theory as a dogmatic credo and as a guide to understanding action. We argue that planning theories should ask fundamental questions about a world which is never fully knowable and about the role of planning in such an unknowable world. We recognize the differing natures of ‘planning’ as a group of practices, including spatial planning, economic development planning, regional planning, transport planning and often urban regeneration, each of which may have referents in specialist theories and approaches. We have no space to include what would be a long list of conceptual challenges for all the specialized areas of planning. Our approach must inevitably lie in a broad engagement with the entangled terrains of planning as a disciplinary multiplicity, which, for our purposes, we term ‘spatial planning’: a perspective which draws out the spatial dimensions of how to think about deliberate efforts to manage and develop place qualities and to pay attention to spatial connectivities.

I find it helpful to focus on the interrelation of praxis between spatial planning theory and practice. The concept of praxis was one of Aristotle’s three basic activities of free men in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (c.350BC). Praxis was also important to Marxist thinking, exemplified by Karl Marx’s famous comment, in the 11th *Thesis on Feuerbach*, that ‘philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it’ (cited in Bernstein, 1971: 13), while Paulo Friere (1970) regarded praxis as a synthesis of theory and practice in which each informs the

other. Adopting the above connotations of praxis I ask, what might be the role of planning theories as a field of debate about the purpose and nature of spatial planning? Should they reflect or critique planning practice? Should they inform planning practice? Should they theorize understanding and explanation of what exists? Should they theorize what can be?, what might be?, what ought to be? Should they challenge and/or liberate ways of thinking about planning, about societies, and so on?

John Friedmann (2008) suggests that an important role for theorists is to translate knowledge and ideas generated in other fields into that of planning. For this volume, we have invited contributions from authors who have a particular interest in issues of spatiality and who have strong theoretical foundations for their work. We have especially invited authors from beyond what is often narrowly defined as the 'planning' field because we find their perspectives on space particularly stimulating and relevant. We have also aimed for a range of authorial ages and experiences, geographical spread and insights (although we recognize that we have tended to favour the global North-West).

The authors theorize the conceptual challenges which spatial planning might face in contexts of uncertainty, diversity and incommensurability.<sup>5</sup> The very nature of a conceptual challenge is that it questions traditional assumptions and ways of being, knowing and doing. Such challenges act as catalysts to help us to see spatial planning in a different way: to learn from different ontologies, to reflect on what planning practitioners are doing and even to reconsider reflexively the nature and purpose of planning itself.

From their different disciplinary traditions and theoretical frames, the authors explore different ways of understanding the field of spatial planning, networks, complexity and so on, through different ontological and epistemological lenses. Such 'free-thinking' offers a potentially rich collection of material. We have encouraged authors to go beyond the current boundaries of reading and understanding spatial planning theory and practice. We hope that this encourages readers to do similarly. Free-thinking, then, begins with a critical response to a particular concept, issue or text. It considers what else might be thought; what other options might there be, and how might such options perform – by including or excluding certain elements. It offers an evolving conversation with planning theory and practice about their meanings and values.

By involving scholars from disciplines other than that of spatial planning, we invite problematization of the planning project from the outside as well as the inside. A widely-held 'inside' view is that 'planning theory and practice are posited upon (largely unquestioned and overgeneralized) suppositions – often exported from the UK to the rest of the world – that space and environment have causal effects on individuals and citizens, populations and territories; and that spatial planning

---

5 Abstract values, such as equality and liberty, may be regarded as incommensurable in the sense that they are irreducible to a common comparative measure. Scientific incommensurability involves similar comparative irreducibility between rival theories or paradigms (see Feysabend 1978; Kuhn 1983).

systems, and planners as individuals, are (potentially) capable of bringing about significant positive social, economic and environmental outcomes' (Huxley 2007a: 156). It follows, therefore, that with better understandings of situations and contexts, more evidence-based policies and more able practitioners, spatial planning can become both more efficient in its shaping of places and more responsive to local needs (Huxley 2007a: 158). Such comments, however, fail to recognize what is, in several international administrations, a large and important gap between planning 'systems' as legislated and planning activities as performed.

I cite Huw Thomas (2007: 333): 'much of what is written as planning theory explicitly or implicitly takes as its focus the planning system broadly as it is'. If we really are looking for radical changes in our societies and economies, Thomas (2007: 334) suggests that we need to lose a concern with 'planning systems and institutions for their own sakes' in order to free up possibilities of thinking about radical transformation. As Thomas continues, '[w]ithin such an analysis the planning system may sometimes emerge as relatively unimportant, or a potential diversion from more promising areas of struggle', or thinking about social or economic processes (such as patriarchy, racism, capitalism and so on). One of the conceptual challenges for spatial planning praxis is, therefore, to 'require planning thinkers not to take the usefulness of planning as a given and ... cause them to challenge ... its very existence' (Yiftachel 2001: 7, cited in Thomas 2007: 333).

By inviting contributions from the outside of planning we aim both to make visible the limits of traditional planning theories – developing, in particular, from Volume 3 of *CEPT* – and to illustrate how, by thinking about new issues, or by regarding issues in different ways, through different theoretical lenses, we might begin a 'counter-discourse' (Law-Yone 2007: 321) which 'liberates us to think about the nature of the social changes we are struggling for, the complex ways and many fronts on which such a struggle needs to be waged (in general terms) and the particular opportunities offered in specific circumstances' (Thomas 2007: 334).

This is a book for planning practitioners interested in a theory-informed practice and for graduate students and academics interested in thinking about some of the conceptual challenges which are relevant to issues of spatiality, spatial planning and governance. Patsy Healey and I offer this book as a volume in which different theoretical frames approach and encounter each other, in a spirit of experiment and innovation, folding lines of the outside with those of more 'mainstream' spatial planning. In our Introductions to the three Parts of the book, Patsy (Part 1) and I (Parts 2 and 3) outline the purpose of the particular Part, key debates and current understandings relating to issues discussed and the conceptual challenges raised.

In the remainder of this Overall Introduction, I locate this Companion volume in a chronological trajectory of volumes which have debated the state-of-the-art of planning theory, including the *Critical Essays in Planning Theory* (Hillier and Healey 2008a) which this volume accompanies. I then discuss some definitions of planning, which themselves form a conceptual challenge for the field, before flagging some of the challenges which are addressed in various contributions. I outline the structure of the volume before concluding that whilst planning theory might not be at a crossroads as such, it does need to engage with several important conceptual challenges.

## A Trajectory of Companions: Context Matters

*[T]he need for different kinds of theories shifts as societies change. (Sandercock, 1998: 104)*

Planning practice is concerned with ‘imagining the future’ (Healey and Hillier 2008). Such planning work involves ‘taking risks, the consequences of which can be thought about, but cannot be known’ (Healey 2008: 28). The forces impacting transformation of the planet have changed and are continuing to change dramatically, yet spatial planning ‘systems’ across the world appear to have changed little (UN-HABITAT 2009). If planning practices are to be relevant in dynamic circumstances, there is a need to develop and/or to reference theories which will help practitioners to understand and cope with the messiness of uncertainty. On this point, context matters. ‘One cannot do anything, least of all speak, without determining (in a manner that is not only theoretical, but practical and performative) a context’ (Derrida 1988: 136).

Our Introductions to the three volumes of *Critical Essays (CEPT)* offer a chronologically-based overview of the contexts in which the approaches contained in the ‘essays’ were theorized. Several of the approaches have themselves formed intellectual contexts for current theorizations, either as re-recognition (such as Jamesian or Deweyan pragmatism), development (such as systems theories and complexity theories) or opposition (poststructuralism in opposition to structuralism, posthumanism to humanism and so on). ‘Boundaries’ between some theories may become blurred or destabilized and claims may be made for the value of metatheoretical perspectives (see, for example, the review by Del Casino Jr et al. 2000).

This volume adds to a growing series of ‘companions’ to the debates and conversations which comprise planning theory. There are clear differences between conceptualizations of planning and its ‘worlds’ evident in the various collections and conversations. For instance, the views associated with the 1970s and early 1980s that ‘planning’ was a spatially Euclidian, fixed, self-contained, unique entity, were increasingly rejected and replaced with the conceptual challenge of places as ‘relationally constituted, polyvalent processes embedded in broader sets of social relations’ (Jessop et al. 2008: 390). More recently, space is often regarded as an actor (or actant)<sup>6</sup> entangled in meshworks or rhizomes of relations of potentially unbounded connectivities (see, for example, Massey 2005; Hillier 2007). Space, therefore, is one among several factors influencing outcomes, rather than the sole determinant of outcomes, which some early twentieth-century planning writers used to think (see Huxley 2007a).

In 1978, Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb’s *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions*, consisted of 25 contributions by 29 authors, all of

6 An actant, after Greimas (1966), implies either a human or non-human entity. In actor-network theory, after Latour (1996), the term actant also avoids the problem of restricting actors to acting and systems to behaving, by conjoining both agent and agency.

whom were based in the USA and all but two were male. The aim of the volume was to 'attempt to provide insight to future directions for planning theory of the next decade' (Burchell and Hughes 1978: xvii). The main themes running through the papers reflect the major concerns at the time; some of which seem rather dated 30 years later, whilst others retain their relevance. For instance, 'the gap between the planner's capacities to deliver and the nominal goal structure' (Sternlieb 1978: xi) still exists – though for different reasons to the 1970s – but the 'long-range perspective' (Sternlieb 1978: xii) has become far less specific and rigid than was typical at that time.

There was a belief that 'the environment and its preservation through correct use is the prime basis of planning' and that 'rationality, a systems orientation, and non-biased, apolitical perspectives' (both quotations Burchell and Hughes 1978: xxiv and xxv) should dominate the tenets of environmental planning. Compare these assertions with the far more contingency-based, relational view of nature in this present volume. Similarly, in 1978, Burchell and Hughes could state, without fear of challenge, that 'the "commonsense" of planning rests on maximum utilisation of resources and perfect equilibrium of economics' (p. xxxi); a continuation of the post-World War II 'American Dream' of an upward trajectory of material and moral progress achievable through rational scientific management. (See Hillier and Healey 2008b, Part III.)

At about the same time in the UK, a conference was held, which resulted in the text, *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s* (1982), edited by Patsy Healey, Glen McDougall and Michael J. Thomas. There were 18 authors, of whom 5 were women, and an overlapping 5 from outside the UK (Denmark, Netherlands, Israel, South Africa). In contrast to the 1978 anthology edited by Burchell and Sternlieb, with its emphasis on a rational social choice of development trajectories, a key objective of the 1982 collection was to find ways to have a debate between what was identified as a plurality of positions in planning theory.

The editors' position paper (Healey et al. 1982) recognized the critiques of the rationalist and traditional physical design conceptions of the planning project, the rise of neo-Marxist political economy critique and the entry of Habermasian critical theory into the discussion of planning issues in an Anglo-Saxon context. Where the editors found a certain amount of confusion between theories and a 'general ignorance' among theorists of others' points of view (Healey et al. 1982: 2), there today seems to be a more general acceptance that our plural world calls for a multiple approach to planning which lends itself to theoretical diversity.

By 1996, and Seymour Mandelbaum, Luigi Mazza and Robert W. Burchell's *Explorations in Planning Theory*, the 'cast' of 31 authors included 13 from countries other than the USA and 8 women. The legitimate existence of multiple planning theories – or what Mandelbaum (1996: xiii) referred to as 'a capacious rhetorical form' – was recognized, as was the importance of the as-yet-incipient 'communicative turn' (Innes 1995) in planning theory, based, as several chapters illustrate, on the authors' empirical research experience.

Recurring themes in the 1996 papers included what was known as 'the structure/agency debate', a debate about the dominance of structures (especially the capitalist

system) or agents and what might accordingly be possible for planners and planning. A second major theme was that of plurality (not yet termed 'multiplicity'). A plurality of lifeworlds, of intentions and expectations was recognized, as was the potential of Habermasian-influenced consensus-building as a way forward in the theorization and practical design of planning processes. The theory-practice relation had also taken a different 'turn' by 1996. Several of the theories expounded in the volume were grounded in empirical research or experience of practice, notably in discursive forms; of talk, ritual, protocol, routine and so on.

The 1997 collection, *Town Planning into the 21st Century*, edited by Andrew Blowers and Bob Evans, presents a set of planning-related responses<sup>7</sup> to the dominant 'Thatcherite' period of governance in the UK from 1989–97.<sup>8</sup> Cliff Hague predicted that town planning in the twenty-first century would become 'an exercise in managing change rather than imposing comprehensive designs' (1997: 139) under the three market-economy-rooted influences of recession, resources and plurality. Hague (1997: 140–1) envisaged the central state continuing to facilitate the operation of a relatively free market, with planning practitioners in correspondingly weak bargaining positions in times of recession; a prediction which appears to have come true in 2009. Similarly, Hague's (1997: 149–50) anticipation that planning 'will become more broad-based, promotional and flexible', requiring 'imaginative thinking' and 'a vision of new possibilities' also holds.

*Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory* (2002) edited by Philip Allmendinger and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, continues this practice-based, communicative theoretical vein. 'Intentionally' taking collaborative planning theory as a focus (see *CEPT*, Volume 3, Part 1), the aim of the collection was to 'review' the then-current 'state of planning theory'<sup>9</sup> combined with 'critiques of the practical concerns of professional planning discussed within a strong theoretical context' (Allmendinger and Tewdwr-Jones 2002: xi). The theory-practice relation remains a strong focus in this 'post-positivist' collection.

The set of *Critical Essays in Planning Theory (CEPT)* (Hillier and Healey 2008a) – this volume's Companion – demonstrated how planning theories have been open to the intellectual waves and political movements which have swept across the social (and more recently, the physical) sciences since the mid-twentieth century, from the management-science influenced thinking of the US Chicago School, through cybernetic systems thinking in the 1960s, to structuralist political economy in the 1970s, to the post-modernist and other 'posts' of the 1980s and 1990s, the 'cultural turn' and post-structuralism in the 1990s and the interest in 'complexity' in the 2000s. As we wrote, '[t]his openness creates huge challenges in 'reading'

---

7 Presented originally at a conference in 1992.

8 Thatcherite neo-economic liberalism, inspired by Friedrich Hayek, was replicated in the 1980s and 1990s in various countries as, for example, Reaganism (after Ronald Reagan, President of the USA), Rogernomics (after Roger Douglas, Finance Minister in New Zealand) and Howardism (after John Howard, Prime Minister of Australia).

9 The volume is predominantly UK-related with 8 of the 12 authors working in British universities at the time.

planning theory contributions, as authors rarely have space to explain adequately how their ideas and vocabularies derive from these 'waves', and there are all kinds of time-lag effects, as foundational ideas of one group of authors are rediscovered and given a different colouring by a later group' (Healey and Hillier 2008: xiii). The 'porosity' of the field, its very openness, gives planning theory a capaciousness which helps to create a sensitivity to the multiple dimensions of the manifestations of planning as a practical activity.

In the final volume of the *CEPT* set, we offered some recent inspirations in order to give a sense of how ideas about the nature and purposes of planning theory and planning practices might evolve. In the twenty-first century planning theorists and practitioners are increasingly engaging issues and 'problems' which severely challenge many of their traditional assumptions. Planning theory and practice have to cope with uncertainty, insurgence, complexity and wildness through imagination and experimentation in attempts to understand events and to shape futures. Meaning and action, set in a context of extensive, often contested, relations, perform in complex and unanticipated ways. Meanings, and planning theories, are not fixed, static entities, but are likely to change as new interpretations emerge.

In introducing discussion of the latest debates and developments in planning theory in Volume 3 of *CEPT*, we stated that '[w]e have no crystal ball to predict which of the several different theoretical strands will 'travel' into the future to form new paradigms' (Hillier and Healey 2008c: 405). In this present volume, we have asked authors to identify and engage with what might be some of the main conceptual ontological and epistemological challenges, with regard to social, political, economic and environmental issues with which planning theorists and practitioners could engage.

## Some Definitions and Questions for Planning Theory and Practice

*Theoretical does not, of course, mean abstract. From my point of view, it means reflexive. (Roland Barthes, cited in Young 1981: 1, emphasis in original)*

Spatial planning theory and practice attempt to cope with complexity and uncertainty through imagination and experimentation in what is increasingly recognized as 'a world of continuous variation, becoming and chance' (Doel 1996: 421) rather than of stability and predictability. If the world comprises multiple fluxes and flows, how might spatial planners seek to affect and 'manage' environments in undecidable situations? Can we develop theories and practices which rely less on closure and more on discovery and provisionality, which reveal potentialities and opportunities and which open up difficult ambiguities (such as of conflict or agonism) and so on?

As the essays in Volume 1 of *CEPT* (Hillier and Healey 2008b) indicate, spatial planning practice was traditionally considered either without recourse to theory

or as an application of theory. In the everyday world of spatial planning practice, planners are more likely to rely on intuition or practical wisdom (phronesis) than explicitly on planning theory (Sanyal 2002). Yet, as Campbell and Fainstein (2003: 2) point out, this intuition may actually be assimilated theory or ‘cumulative professional knowledge’. One of the key roles of theory, therefore, is to stimulate critical reflection and constructive reflexivity in practitioners – and academics.

But can ‘theory’ be easily defined? The online *Etymology Dictionary* (Harper 2001) defines ‘theory’ as ‘conception, mental scheme, contemplation, speculation, a looking at’, from the Greek *theōria*, as mentioned above. Someone who practised *theōria* was a *theōros*: a ‘spectator’.<sup>10</sup> If theory entails looking at something and proposing or conceiving a mental scheme about it which unconceals it (see, for example, Gadamer 1999), I suggest that it involves speculation. To speculate may be defined as ‘to use the powers of the mind, as in conceiving ideas, drawing inference and making judgments’ (Hillier 2007: 76), all of which are incorporated in theorizing planning.

A theory, typically, was not regarded as ‘a theory at all, until it has been used [‘tested’] in practice over a considerable period of time’ (Reade 1987: 156). More recently, recognition of the innovative, experimental practices engaged by some spatial planners has led to practice inspiring theory, as indicated in *CEPT* Volume 3 in particular. I agree with Deleuze’s view that ‘practice is a set of relays from one theoretical point to another, and theory is a relay from one practice to another. No theory can develop without eventually encountering a wall, and practice is necessary for piercing this wall’ (in Foucault and Deleuze 1972: 3).

Rather than viewing spatial planning as simply a process or collection of policies, for instance, I have found it helpful to regard planning as a complex, performative multiplicity of practices, knowledges, human and non-human actants. Along with Patsy Healey, I am committed to an interactive relation between theory and practice. This relation often appears to be under challenge, however. It sometimes seems that the gap between theorists and practitioners resembles a yawning abyss, with neither group really understanding the other. Moreover, what actually *is* planning practice? Is it the planning of societal development, or the development and delivery of any public policy programme, or is it the planning of neighbourhoods, of cities and regions? What is the contribution of planning? Does it lie in an approach to government – perhaps a process idea of ‘good governance’ in general, or of transparent, inclusive, democratic, policy-driven government? Does it lie in the values about society which planning promotes, in considerations of social justice or cohesion, of environmental quality and sustainability, of economic vitality and ‘competitiveness’? Or does the *raison d’être* of planning lie in how these sets of values are combined? And what happens when such planning ideas are

---

10 Rausch (1982, cited in McNeill, 1999: 263) suggests that *theōros* can have several different, though related, meanings of relevance to spatial planning: someone seeking advice from an oracle; an envoy; someone announcing a festival or event; an official with a local authority who oversees and enforces the observance of laws; a beholder.

promoted in situations where these values are themselves marginalized? How then might planning perform?

A major conceptual challenge is thus the definition of planning itself. In the Introduction to Part 1 of this volume, Patsy Healey describes planning as 'about dreaming alternate futures about place qualities, their potentials and possibilities'. But, as she continues, 'it is also about actively shaping futures and the practices, now and in the future, which might bring more desirable futures into being'.

John Friedmann (1987) emphasizes the wide range of conceptual definitions of planning; from operational definitions, identifying what lies at the core of planning practice, to formal conceptualizations involving action, processes of societal guidance and/or societal transformation. I offer a few general definitions of spatial planning below, in chronological order of publication. The definitions range from those which regard planning practice as having power to achieve futures to those which are more uncertain, but all embrace an orientation towards the future:

*a forward-looking activity that selects from the past those elements that are useful in analysing existing conditions from a vantage point of the future – the changes that are thought to be desirable and how they might be brought about (John Friedmann 1987: 11);*

*the exercise of deliberate forethought (Ernest Alexander 1992: 13, cited in Connell 2009: 86);*

*the specification of a proposed future coupled with systematic intervention and/or regulation in order to achieve that future (David Byrne 2003: 174);*

*a form of persuasive storytelling about the future (Jim Throgmorton 2003: 146);*

*self-conscious collective efforts to re-imagine a city, urban region or wider territory and to translate the result into priorities for area investment, conservation measures, strategic infrastructure investments and principles of land use regulation. The term 'spatial' brings into focus the 'where of things', whether static or in movement; the protection of special 'places' and sites; the interrelations between different activities and networks in an area; and significant intersections and nodes in an area which are physically co-located (Patsy Healey 2004: 46, cited in Healey 2007: 3);*

*the investigation of 'virtualities' unseen in the present; the speculation about what may yet happen; the temporary inquiry into what at a given time and place we might yet think or do and how this might influence socially and environmentally just spatial form (Jean Hillier 2007: 225);*

*spatial planning is one of the few disciplines within social sciences that is preoccupied by not just understanding possible urban futures, but also*

*finding ways of changing them in the pursuit of collectively agreed preferable futures (Simin Davoudi 2008: 230);*

*collective place-shaping efforts aimed to improve the qualities and connectivities of places into the future for the benefit of present and future publics and their potential values (Patsy Healey 2008: 3);*

*the objective of cultivating particular place qualities and encouraging the emergence of particular development trajectories (Patsy Healey 2008: 8).*

This volume is concerned with conceptual challenges for planning theory – including concepts such as contingency, complexity, subjectivity, schemes of signification, creativity, etc. and the challenge of reconceptualizing or retheorizing planning practice – and for planning practice and its key concepts such as sustainability, multiculturalism and so on. We call for advances in both conceptual and empirical knowledges, which address theoretical and practical issues, if the future wellbeing of the planet and its inhabitants is to stand a chance of becoming more achievable.

## **Conceptual Challenges for Spatial Planning**

Specific conceptual challenges for spatial planning are discussed by the various chapter authors throughout this volume. In what follows here, I highlight several, more general, conceptual challenges for readers to bear in mind. These challenges include problematizing planning itself, the values which underpin planning, theory-practice relations and planning ethics.

## **Conceptually Challenging the Paradox of Planning**

Bernard Tschumi (1994) suggests that architecture is haunted by a ‘strange paradox’, which, I suggest, similarly haunts planning. This paradox is, in Tschumi’s words, ‘the impossibility of simultaneously questioning the nature of space and, at the same time, making or experiencing real space’ (1994: 67). Can planners ‘experience’ real places and ‘make’ real plans at the same time as they reflexively question the nature of space and the nature of planning as a practice which aims to manipulate space? I argue, following Tschumi (1994: 69), that planning constitutes the reality of subjective experience whilst this reality gets in the way of the overall concept of planning. Or, as Patsy Healey paraphrases, planners are always thinking about and making plans for possible futures while continually being dragged back to the messiness of ‘going on in the world’. As a means of coping, planners, therefore, choose not to reflexively question either the nature of space or of planning practice. Planning is thus always incomplete. As such, does planning miss both the concept

and the reality? Where is the junction between ideal planning and planning in reality?

I believe in the importance of planning theorists and practitioners attempting to confront the unthought of planning; that which definitively 'cannot be thought and yet must be thought' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 60, cited in Casarino 2002: xix). We can only grasp this paradox if planning, as a practice, is understood as constantly being influenced by the pressures of outside forces – whether in the form of the forces of capitalist exploitation (see Huxley and Gibson-Graham and Cameron, this volume), of colonialism (see Howitt and Lunkapis, this volume) or other forces.

Lost in the energy of action, practitioners may fail to ask what is the action for and why is it structured the way it is. How, then, does planning practice 'think itself' as practice? Casarino (2002: xxiii) suggests that there is a fissure of 'immanent interference' at the very heart of a practice; a zone of indiscernability between two distinct modalities: between a practice and its relation to itself as a practice. There is generally, to adapt Deleuze and Guattari's (1994: 1) words, too much desire to *do* planning to wonder what it *is*.

I advocate what Casarino (2002: xxv) terms 'the silent double questioning' of planning; a double questioning which is both a questioning of itself as a practice and of its practitioners and also a questioning of all the other practices and practitioners which come into active contact with planning. The problematization of planning practice and what it is, what it stands for (see below), would become an unavoidable problem, which should cause planning practice to reach beyond itself, to reflexively (Schön 1983) experiment with unthought possibilities.

## Conceptually Challenging Planning Values

Spatial planning, wherever practised, is driven by a set of values which underpin its normative aims: what planning should be attempting to achieve. Such aims might include social justice, environmental protection or facilitation of economic markets and city 'competitiveness'. The task for planning practitioners would then be to provide the technical means (such as land use zoning, development management) to achieve these aims. It has traditionally not been regarded as the task of planning practitioners to debate the aims themselves (see Taylor 1998). Practice, in such a reading, often entails working within, rather than challenging, given social categories and, thereby, working with the social relations of power that produce/d those categories (see Dixon and Jones III 1998). One of the key contributions of planning theory (as demonstrated in *CEPT*) is/has been to pursue critical debates about just these issues.

Planning practice has been informed by progressive ideas (see the Introduction to Part 1, this volume; also Forester 1989; Fainstein 2000), typically about how to make people's lived environments better, especially the poor. As Pierre Clavel (1986) explained, progressive political leaders and planners have formulated redistributive policies, in which the design and implementation of planning activity

is shared with grassroots organisations. Clavel regarded planning as a profession 'dedicated to visions and models that could be validated by catching the popular imagination' (1986: 18), rather than by marketing. Progressive planning is planning 'in the interests of the present populations' (Clavel 1986: 9) rather than 'business-backed managerialism' (p. 10) in support of the 'growth-oriented' programmes of developers, property investors and hoped-for, more affluent future populations. This is a statement which appears to directly contradict many recent urban regeneration programmes inspired by advocates of global competitiveness, such as Richard Florida (2000, 2002, 2004). Is much of today's, neo-economic influenced, urban regeneration, then, not 'progressive', or has the definition of 'progressive' changed? Moreover, as Huxley (2007a) indicates, planning, by itself, cannot effect permanent improvements in people's lives due to its inability to address the fundamental contradictions of capitalism.

A conceptual challenge for planning theorists and practitioners, therefore, is to problematize the assumptions which underlie key planning axioms. Very specifically, for instance, Le Corbusier's modulator, which has had a major influence on architecture, interior architecture and design, street design and furniture and so on, is a representation of an able-bodied, six-foot tall, Anglo-Saxon male (Estatopia, nd). The modulator is typical of the many universalizing assumptions about normality which planners make in both theory and practice.<sup>11</sup>

A second, generally unproblematized assumption underlying planning practice, is that planning is a 'good thing', which provides a better future, as in several of the definitions of planning above. Yet as Eisenschitz (2008) points out in detail, despite aims of social justice, such a 'better future' has not been associated with social reform, which is difficult to achieve through technical, physically-oriented means relating to land use. Eisenschitz (2008: 137) cites Peter Hall's 1972 assessment of some 25 years of town and country planning in England as 'the main distributive effect was to keep the poor, or a high proportion of them, poor' (Hall 1972: 267). The drivers behind such an outcome may well include some of the following forces as developed in many contexts:

- planning practice reduces economic impulses to spatial ones which are then given technical 'solutions' (Eisenschitz 2008: 139);
- planning practice reduces, or even evacuates, political impulses in its search for practical, technical outcomes (Blowers 1984; Swyngedouw 2005, 2007, this volume).

Back in 1844, Friedrich Engels identified the urban form of Manchester, with its segregation of rich and poor residential areas, as a product of private property ownership and political economic influences (2009: 86–7). Hunt argues that little has changed. In Manchester (and other cities of the global North West) gentrification programmes demolish working class neighbourhoods and privatize informal urban

---

11 See Gunder and Hillier (2009) for in-depth problematization of ten common planning universals, including 'sustainability', 'smart growth', 'multiculturalism' and so on.

spaces in the name of regeneration. 'While Manchester's city centre glistens amidst a revitalized historic core, glitzy bars and restaurants, high-rise hotels and buy-to-let penthouses, critics complain that the communities of Moss Side and Gorton have failed to benefit' (Hunt 2009: 27). One could probably substitute any number of Western cities for Manchester in this quotation and suburbs for Moss Side and Gorton. In the global South East, however, as authors such as Hunt (2009), Davis (2006) and Lee (2007) point out, Engels' critique of urban form resonates still.

The above discussion raises the question of whether spatial planning practice can possibly impinge on, or alter the logic of, capitalism in the absence of strong funding for public sector development or strong political will (see the Introduction to Part 2 of this volume). A conceptual (let alone practical) challenge is to destabilize hegemonic interpretations of 'the economy' and 'economic' and to legitimize new meanings and forms (see the chapters by Roy and by Gibson-Graham and Cameron, this volume).

It is also important to recognize that there is no universal culture of planning. If we adopt Sanyal's (2005: xxi) understanding of planning culture as 'the collective ethos and dominant attitudes of planners regarding the appropriate role of the state, market forces, and civil society in influencing social outcomes', it is inevitable that planning cultures will differ significantly around the world, between and within states. In many countries of the global North and West, a progressive 'people-centred' culture exists, although in Western Australia (see Hillier 2007: 15) several influential senior strategic planners continue to enact a culture of expertise, in which planners 'know best' and local people do not know what is good for them such that 'a process must be put in place to enlighten people' (Duc, 2005: 2). As one senior planner wrote, even though it may be 'empowering to pretend' that a plan responds to a community's wishes, 'a clear view of the plan's outcome [from the start] gives those preparing the plan a sound basis to say NO to those who seek to have their issues included' (McRae 2005: 10, cited in Hillier 2007: 15). In other jurisdictions, planning may be equated with development and, thereby, with economic growth and 'progress'. This may be particularly so for post-colonial states (Sanyal 2005), but is also experienced around the world, especially in times of economic recession.

Different social and philosophical traditions may also be reflected in planning cultures. In countries such as China and Japan, for example, communication may be indirect and symbolic rather than descriptive or rationally analytical, reflecting a correlative way of thinking very different to Western emphases on linear-thinking and its verbal and conceptual expression (Abe, 1990). The Japanese philosopher, Kitarō Nishida's conceptualizations of pure or lived experience and *Ba* as a place or epistemological platform for advancing individual and collective knowledge (Chia, 2003) – a shared physical, mental or virtual space of emerging relationships – may offer a more deeply-rooted metaphysical orientation to new Western ideas. Such an orientation would be relational, oriented towards experimental and ethical action which would reject the idea of an ultimate end-point in favour of continuous innovation and improvement; something which, I believe, is highly relevant to planning in uncertainty. In addition to Robert Chia's work on organizational analysis (1995, 1998, 1999; Chia and Tsoukas 1999, 2003), which I relate to spatial planning and governance elsewhere (Hillier 2007: 73–5), the concept of *Ba* has been

applied to transport planning by Ullrich Zeitler (2008) and to knowledge creation in urban planning by Joris Van Wezemael (2008). Ellen Shoshkes (2004) has also examined Japanese/Western influences on urban planning.

As Sanyal (2005) points out, even though a planning culture may appear to stabilize for some time, it is actually dynamic, affected by political change, technological innovation, economic crises, social traditions and so on. It is such forces, rather than a planning culture, in itself, which influence planning practitioners in different situations.

## **Conceptually Challenging Theory-Practice Relations**

In Campbell's (2000: 125) words, 'a thinking, learning planning profession should be both practically astute and theoretically informed'. Moreover, good theory offers a 'way of understanding action, or what a planner does' (Forester, 1987: 203). Hubert Law-Yone (2007: 318) makes a distinction between planning practice as technical and professional power, ('an applied science of social control located within a hegemonic space/time disciplinary framework'), and planning praxis as practical, social power – an application of knowledge/theory to action and planning theory. Is there an issue here? Do we need to worry about 'blending' or separating practice and theory?

A distinctive feature of this Companion (and also of *CEPT* more generally) is what Hudson (1979: 396) termed 'reciprocal feedback between theory and practice, knowledge and action, conceptual models and the real world'. We reproduced Hudson's article in Volume 1 of the *Critical Essays* (Hillier and Healey 2008a), in which we demonstrate a commitment to focus on the relation between theory and practice. That commitment is continued in this Companion volume, as most authors illustrate. However, I suggest that it is also important to conceptually challenge a relation in which failures of planning practice are sometimes blamed on attempts to implement impossibly abstract or Utopian theory, or in which practice-based discreditation of theoretical 'norms' is blamed on empirical 'freak occurrences' or 'grubby practice' (see Huxley, this volume) in unbridgeable gulfs between 'ivory towers and concrete cities' (Hall 2002: 372).

Unthinking, rigid application of theoretical concepts may be as environmentally and socially damaging as ignoring theories completely. For instance, the Stockholm Resilience Centre (2007) reveals that dogmatic application of theories of environmental management based on linear dynamics – which suggest the existence of optimal solutions to problems – has led to a loss of ecological support functions and a reduction in socio-ecological capacity to deal with change, resulting in an increase in system vulnerability.

Moreover, as Eyal Weizman (2006) illustrates, the Israeli army's application of the work of Deleuze and Guattari, Clifford Geertz and John Forester has redefined the practice of urban warfare. The extent to which Deleuze's or Forester's ideas influence military tactics raises questions about the relation between theory and practice. The authors' theories have been used to develop and 'even justify ideas that emerged

independently within disparate fields of knowledge and with quite different ethical bases' (Weizman 2006: 20). The idea of planning theory as an intimidating weapon of 'shock and awe' takes planning's 'dark side' to new extremes.

Whilst Kurt Lewin (1951: 169) might claim that 'there's nothing so practical as a good theory', perhaps practitioners might learn sometime to expect less from theory? (Richardson 2005). Theories cannot give definitive answers or solutions to what is right or wrong. They do not provide templates as to exactly how planning should be practised. As John Forester (1993: 1) perspicaciously wrote, 'theories do not provide answers to problems: people do'. As Forester continued, 'but a theory can provide a framework of analysis' for attempting to make some sense of the messiness of real world situations and to cultivate critical reflexivity.

### **Conceptual Challenges to Power**

Michel Foucault's conceptualization of power as a capillary process, and its potential spatial ramifications are well-known to planning theorists through discussions of governmentality,<sup>12</sup> of discourse and discourse-analysis of planning-related issues.<sup>13</sup> The Foucauldian-derived methodology of actor-network theory is also well known.<sup>14</sup> I leave interested readers to seek out these challenges for themselves. The interesting questions are where are those scholars working with these ideas in the planning field now taking them and what new conceptual challenges they might pose.

Several chapters in this volume contain conceptual challenges to the issue of power. It is important not to dismiss the significance of power-laden conflict in planning decision making. Practitioners' managerialist attempts to evacuate the political in favour of gaining easy, weak, consensual decisions, as described by Swyngedouw (2005, 2007) may temporarily put a sticking plaster over what may be deep-rooted underlying conflicts, but they will not make the conflicts disappear.

John Forester (1989, 1999, 2006, 2009) uses practice-based accounts to conceptually challenge notions of intractable conflict. He advocates mediation, rather than moderation, if deliberation is not to be swamped by the power-plays of vocal interests. Mediation centres on cultivation of socially-shared norms of moral standing; recognition of and respect for the histories and claims of others. It allows the political a place. For me, this is about turning antagonism into agonism: a positive channelling of conflict which does not seek to eliminate 'the other', but to confront and discuss differences with respect and concern for those holding different views (see Nietzsche, 1954; Arendt, 1968, Mouffe, 1992, 1993, 1996, 1999; Connolly, 1998; Hillier, 2002).

---

12 See, for example, Flyvbjerg 1998; Dean 1999; Raco and Imrie 2000; Flyvbjerg and Richardson 2002; Elden 2007; Huxley 2007b; Murakami Wood 2007.

13 See Richardson, 1996, 2002; Flyvbjerg 1998; Hastings 1999; Hajer 1995; Flyvbjerg and Richardson 2002; Hajer and Versteeg 2005; Jacobs 2006.

14 See Marsden et al. 1993; Thrift 1996; Murdoch 1998; Hetherington and Law 2000; Hillier 2007; Ruming 2008.

## Conceptual Challenges to Planning Ethics

Following discussions of values and power above, it is pertinent to raise questions about differences between doing good and doing right; what might be 'better'? How might 'better' actualize? Better for whom? Some will always lose: who should it be? What does responsibility mean in a globalized world of interconnected environmental, economic and social flows? As Campbell and Marshall (1998: 117) comment, 'moral judgments and ethical questions pervade the daily practice of planning'.

These are not new challenges, as the trajectory of work on ethics and planning indicates (see, for example, Marcuse 1976; Howe and Kaufman 1979, 1981; Wachs 1982, 1985; Howe 1990, 1992, 1994; Hendler 1994, 1995, 1996, 2005; Campbell and Marshall 2000, 2002; Campbell 2006). Gunder and Hillier (2007) note, however, the dominance of work from North America and, to a lesser extent, the UK. There is little, to date, easily available from the global South. The emphasis in the work cited above is on the micro-scale ethics of planning practice.<sup>15</sup> Most published material does not problematize the ontology of ethics as such, which constitutes the very meaning of the concept in relation to planning.

What is considered ethical practice is, of course, a social construct. Examples of 'unethical' practice, then, are not criticisms of planning in itself, but of the way in which the institutions and practices of planning may be manipulated and their ideals subverted by various interests (see Healey 2010; Kirkman 2004, 2009). This is a veritable 'dark side' of planning (Yiftachel 1998), brilliantly exemplified by Weizman's (2007) stories from Israel where the architects and planners of urban form are often the military and politicians, rather than design professionals. Weizman demonstrates how the architectural and planning methods of Israeli construction in the Occupied Territories have negatively impacted on the lives of Palestinians. 'Both in their form and their location, settlements were designed to bisect a Palestinian traffic artery, at others to surround a village; to overlook a major city or a strategic crossroad' (2007: 262). Weizman calls on architects and planners to incorporate the 'ethical motivations' and the 'methodological capacities' to 'bear professional witness to those crimes conducted through the transformation of the built environment' (2007: 260).

## Other Conceptual Challenges

I cannot provide an exhaustive list of conceptual challenges for planning theory and practice in the early twenty-first century as it is impossible to predict what might eventuate. Nevertheless, a rapid scan of disciplines outside spatial planning suggests a few challenges which could be influential on its future theoretical and practical evolution. For instance:

---

15 I retain a narrow definition of ethics at this point which does not include work on the wider aspects of values in planning or on professionalism.

- As poststructuralist views are increasingly accepted into planning, I envisage debates taking place concerning the degree of influence of structures, such as capital, legal and institutional structures.
- Issues of whether institutions – here and above in the sociological sense as used by Patsy Healey (2007) and others<sup>16</sup> – perform as structures, agencies, or both. As Healey (2007: 14–15) clearly explains, institutionalization involves the ‘fixing’ (albeit temporarily) of certain ways of thinking and doing as accepted practices. The family is an institution, with parents having more ‘power’ than children. Certain policy discourses and practices may be institutionalized in local planning authorities. Debates may take place about how these discourses and practices might be challenged and changed.
- Futures-thinking. As the limitations of ‘visioning’ and ‘scenarios’ are appreciated, how might futures be imagined more helpfully? Can we anticipate futures?
- How is place conceptualized? Are there differences between conceptions of space and place? What is ‘spatiality’? How might ‘spacing’ perform? What is ‘development’? What are place qualities? How are they expressed? What makes them important?
- Judgement and decision making – is there a role for provisionality? For temporary spaces or ‘temporary’ decisions, perhaps with sunset clauses?
- Contingency and the aleatory – chance occurrences and their role in planning theory and practice.

Within the messy, contentious field of spatial planning, I believe that consideration of the above concepts could help planning praxes to address current issues and to understand their deeper roots and potential trajectories, by framing strategies, mobilizing actants and generating transformative forces. This volume is composed of ‘directions in motion’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 21); a speculation on what directions theorizations of spatial planning and spatial planning practice might take. The papers in this collection cannot offer definitive answers to any of these questions, but they do engage critical debates.

## A Tangled Assemblage

*tangled beings ... rhizomes and networks. (Latour 2004: 24)*

As John Friedmann (2008: 254) writes: ‘[p]lanners’ work has mostly to do with urban and sometimes regional issues and their dynamics that cannot be properly understood except in a way that cuts across disciplines’. The disciplinary fields which contribute to enlarging the imagination of ‘planning’ theory include geography,

---

16 Institution is *not*, therefore, to be confused with organization. See Hall and Taylor (1996).

sociology, political studies, philosophy, anthropology, history, cultural studies, economics, mathematics, physics, engineering, architecture, design, aesthetics and so on. It would seem clear that the issues with which planning is concerned are far too complex to be theorized through any single discipline.<sup>17</sup>

I regard this volume as an assemblage of papers. It is a multiplicity, reflecting the necessarily open and contested theoretical object of planning (Friedmann 1998: 3) and our invitation as editors to the authors for ‘free-thinking’. We have asked authors to think across the frontiers of their subject. As such, the authors write from a range of ontological and epistemological positions. We have endeavoured to make the various elements of the book (the pages, chapters and so on) perform together, to constitute an open whole which creates new thoughts and ideas and which allows the encounter and connection of non-predetermined relations between elements. We have advocated a creative multiplicity of organisation, based on – often chance – encounter and connection, rather than a controlled pluralist structure based on a theoretical frame.

Following the principle that heterogeneity triggers the emergence of new ideas and prevents theories and processes solidifying or getting ‘locked in’, Joris Van Wezemael (2009) suggests that every setting gives rise to a space of potential becoming (to what it can ‘do’), which emerges on the basis of the connections of component parts. I regard this volume as a ‘setting’ in this manner: a product of the connections between its component chapters; encounters between manifold relations. I offer no hierarchy of chapters or ideas, but envisage this volume as a mesh or rhizome, comprised of a multiplicity of threads of thought and disciplinary genres, which, hopefully, reveal some of the many possible ways to assemble theorists in always-impossible processes of theorization. In my view, the individual chapters perform ‘lines’ which transgress the boundaries between disciplinary traditions, between theory and practice, making connections between papers, becoming intertwined in readers’ minds to provoke new modes of thought. My rhizome, or what Deleuze and Guattari would call a ‘book-machine’ (1987: 4), connects and assembles in movement. In this book-rhizome, international authors from several disciplines connect with texts from around the world, in hard copy and electronic form, in various languages. They also connect with each other.

This tangled assemblage is incomplete, however. Despite our attempts to involve scholars from around the world, there is a distinct North-Western emphasis in the contributors’ locations. We lack contributions especially from non-Anglophone scholars in the global South (including South America, Africa and Asia) who are directly able to engage with and theorize the framing realities facing spatial planning decision making and implementation. Our hope is that, by the time that

---

17 See also the paper by Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones (2008) which identifies similarities in the conceptual constructs informing writing in both geography and planning disciplines and Hajer and Wagenaar (2003) which brings together policy analysts and planners.

the next 'companion' to planning theory is published, this current lack will be rectified.<sup>18</sup>

## **On Naming of Parts**

Despite our insistence on the interrelations between theory and practice, we have decided to group chapters in three Parts: conceptual challenges from perspectives on spatial planning practice (Part 1); conceptual challenges for spatial planning theory (Part 2); and conceptual challenges for spatial planning in complexity (Part 3). The Parts correspond broadly to:

- Part 1, issues from practice to which planning theorists should give attention;
- Part 2, key concepts in current theorizing from mainly poststructuralist perspectives;
- Part 3, what discussion on complexity may offer planning theory and practice.

We recognize the inevitably reductionist nature of this (or indeed any) categorization. The Parts are an artificial heuristic device to facilitate reading. Many contributions cross-cut two or even three Parts, as they emphasize ideas, directions or re-directions which affect how planning is and may be theorized and practised. More detailed discussion is found in the Introductions to individual Parts.

## **Part 1: Conceptual Challenges from Perspectives on Spatial Planning Practice**

This Part includes seven contributions which address different ways to understand and advance how planning activity is and should be practised. They all reflect an appreciation that planning activity is situated in a wider context of governance dynamics, but they seek a much more nuanced and detailed grasp of the diversity of contexts and the contingencies of practices. This reflects the distaste for the 'grand, totalising narratives' of the mid-twentieth century, whether of the managerial variety or that of Marxist structural analysis. Several of the authors explore ways of moving beyond the inheritance of the 'heavy' states of Western European democracies in which many formal planning systems are embedded. They examine the potential of governance energy 'beyond the (formal) state', and the extent to which 'insurgent practices' have the possibility to challenge and limit the unravelling of formal government practices promoted by the so-called 'neo-

---

18 The volume edited by Healey and Upton (2010), on the international exchange of planning ideas, has promise in this respect.

liberal' project. In this way, they hope to identify more clearly the dynamics of who gets access to such arenas, who controls their practice dynamics and which future dreams may live on to shape future action.

## **Part 2: Conceptual Challenges for Spatial Planning Theory**

For Aristotle, in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1985), *theōria* is the highest form of praxis. Conceptual challenges for planning theory link to philosophical questions of ontology and epistemology. If, as defined above, spatial planning is concerned with 'dreaming alternative futures', 'understanding possible urban futures', 'deliberate forethought', 'the specification of a proposed future' and 'storytelling about the future', the authors in Part 2 indicate the complexity and contingency of the relations through which futures may actualize and the inevitable uncertainty of planning in shaping futures. As Marcus (1994: 567) suggests, it is all too-easy to assimilate 'the phenomenon of interest by given analytic, ready-made concepts'. The authors resist such temptation.

## **Part 3: Conceptual Challenges for Spatial Planning in Complexity**

Practitioners and academics in spatial planning have traditionally singularized 'town', 'country' and 'governance'. In texts, images and plans, 'they have fashioned an ordered and unifiable whole out of what is often a disordered, spontaneous, even intractable multiplicity of places, practices and people' (Robbins 1998: 37). There are well-known, but less well-accepted, contradictions between the assumptions and expectations of spatial planning and the complex realities of the 'systems' through which planning and governance take place. Karen Christensen (1999: 5) wrote that 'planning aims at ensuring future certainty in a complex, dynamic intergovernmental system that is rife with turbulence and uncertainty'.

Planning theory has moved on a long way from the positivist tradition outlined in *CEPT*, Volume 1 (Hillier and Healey 2008b). The time has passed for making 'accurate predictions' of spatial equilibria, based on positivist, logical empiricist epistemology (Plummer and Sheppard 2006). As theorists and practitioners are becoming more aware of the many, multiple and dynamic interrelations between entities, issues, places and so on, references to complexity theories in planning-related literature are increasing exponentially. In the final Part, the authors attempt to locate diagonals or transversals between various elements in earlier chapters and to identify possibilities that these connections might open up. Some attempt to 'map' future theoretical performativities. We have asked authors to identify connections and potentialities; to pay attention to affect and to trajectories of potential emergence; to think or speculate experimentally across boundaries.

## Conclusions

*Theory is something to do, not simply to read. (Calhoun et al. 2007: 20)*

Returning to Eversley's (1973) metaphor with which I commenced this Introduction, I do not consider planning theory to be at a crossroads as such. There are, however, always choices to be made: between forms of theory and practice which support either the collective good or the individual over the collective in which the idea of 'public interest' loses meaning; between efficiency and equity; between distribution and redistribution in favour of the poor; between linear and non-linear understandings; between path-dependent rigidity and experimentation.

In 1998, John Friedmann predicted that 'we will keep writing planning theory, because it's fun' (p. 5). In this spirit, Patsy Healey and I hope that the chapters in this assemblage will generate, not only critical reflection, but also creative ideas about some of the conceptual challenges with which planning theory and practice might engage. We hope that the authors' encounters and conversations with ideas and theories from both within and outside the field of spatial planning will stimulate readers to do likewise in ongoing conversations, discussions and debates. If the chapters appear speculative and provisional, this is because they form only one aspect of a wider, turbulent process which also includes empirical enquiry, close textual analysis and further theorization.

We thus offer this book as an event of thought. For Jacques Derrida (1977), an event constitutes 'the emergence of a disparate multiplicity' (cited in Tschumi, 1994: 257). For Michel Foucault, an event is not simply a sequence of words (or chapters), but the moment of questioning or problematizing the very assumptions of the setting in which the problematization takes place and which occasions the possibility of another, different setting (Rajchman 1991: viii; Tschumi 1994: 256). An event embraces the productive potential of the forces from which it developed (Deleuze 1990); a field of new possibilities which causes its readers/participants no longer to think about certain things in the same manner.

Conceptual research is in continual evolution, growing in its multiplicity, yet requiring some stability and temporary fixity through writing and publication. It is a constructive process of positive ontologies; a process of interconnection and movement between ideas, generating a multiplicity of configurations of possibilities from the interconnections. We regard the different conceptual frames in the book, not as competing, but as a multidimensional unfolding narrative of often complementary theories and challenges. The different authorial standpoints are indicative of the range of conceptualizations of planning and the spatial, the social, the political, the economic and so on. The various chapters may be read as mapping different ways of conceptualizing planning and the challenges it faces in the early twenty-first century. We gave authors no predetermined paths or destinations. We believe that theory is not oriented to apprehension of (a single) truth, but we regard theory as 'a practical means of going on' (Thrift, 1996: 304) which recognizes and transgresses its own contextual limitations.

We offer the papers in this volume as ‘a glint of lights in the fog’ and, like Marco Polo in Italo Calvino’s *Invisible Cities*, ‘if [we] tell you that the city toward which [our] journey tends is discontinuous in space and time, now scattered, now more condensed, you must not believe the search for it can stop’ (1997: 164).

*You do not go back to a theory, you make others and there are always more to be made. (Deleuze, 1972, cited in Ramonet, 2006: 1)*

## Acknowledgements

My thanks to Patsy Healey for maintaining my focus with invaluable comments through the various iterations of this Introduction.

## References

- Abe, M. (1990) ‘Introduction’, in Nishida, K. [1921] *An Inquiry into the Good* (trans. Abe, M.). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alexander, E.R. (1992) *Approaches to Planning: Introducing Current Planning Theories, Concepts and Issues*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.
- Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Allmendinger, P. and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2002) ‘Preface’ in Allmendinger, P. and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (eds) *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*. London: Routledge, xi–xii.
- Arendt, H. (1968) *Between Past and Future*, New York: Viking Press.
- Aristotle (1985) [c.350BC] *Nicomachean Ethics* (ed. Rackham, D.). Harvard University Press/Perseus Digital Library, <<http://perseus.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/>> [accessed January 2004].
- Ballantyne, A. (2007) *Deleuze and Guattari for Architects*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, R. (1971) *Praxis and Action*. Pittsburgh, PN: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Blowers, A. (1984) *Something in the Air: Corporate Power and the Environment*. London: Harper & Row.
- Blowers, A. and Evans B. (eds) (1997) *Town Planning into the 21st Century*. London: Routledge.
- Burchell, R.W. and Hughes, J. (1978) ‘Introduction: Planning Theory in the 1980s: a search for future directions’, in Burchell, R.W. and Sternlieb, G. (eds) (1978) *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, xvii–liii.
- Burchell, R.W. and Sternlieb, G. (eds) (1978) *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

- Byrne D. (2003) 'Complexity theory and planning theory: a necessary encounter' *Planning Theory* 2(3): 171–8.
- Calhoun, C., Gerleis, J., Moody, J., Pfaff, S. and Virk, I. (2007) 'General introduction', in Calhoun, C., Gerleis, J., Moody, J., Pfaff, S. and Virk, I. (eds), *Contemporary Sociological Theory* (second edition). Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1–22.
- Calvino, I. (1997) [1972] *Invisible Cities* (trans. Weaver W.). London: Vintage.
- Campbell, H. (2000) 'Interface: theory and practice should mix' *Planning Theory and Practice* 1(1): 125.
- Campbell, H. (2006) 'Just planning: the art of situated ethical judgment' *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25: 1–15.
- Campbell, H. and Marshall, R. (1998) 'Acting on principle: dilemmas in planning practice' *Planning Practice and Research* 13: 117–28.
- Campbell, H. and Marshall, R. (2000) 'Moral obligations and the public interest: a commentary on current British practice' *Environment and Planning B* 27(2): 297–312.
- Campbell, H. and Marshall, R. (2002) 'Utilitarianism's bad breath? A re-evaluation of the public interest justification for planning' *Planning Theory* 1(2): 163–87.
- Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. (2003) 'Introduction: the structure and debates of planning theory', in Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. (eds), *Readings in Planning Theory* (second edition). Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1–16.
- Casarino, C. (2002) *Modernity at Sea: Melville, Marx, Conrad in Crisis*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- CEMAT (European Conference of Ministers Responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning) (1983) *Chartre Européenne de l'Amenagement du Territoire (Chartre de Torremolinos)*, adopted 20/05/1983, Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <<http://www.siseministerium.ee/public/terr.harta.ingrtf.rtf>> [accessed 09/07/2009].
- CEMAT (European Conference of Ministers Responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning) (2007) *Spatial Development Glossary. Territory and Landscape, No. 2*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Chia, R. (1995) 'From modern to postmodern organisational analysis' *Organisation Studies* 16(4): 579–605.
- Chia, R. (1998) 'From complexity science to complex thinking: organisation as simple location' *Organization* 5(3): 341–69.
- Chia, R. (1999) 'A "rhizomic" model of organisational change and transformation: perspective from a metaphysics of change' *British Journal of Management* 10: 209–27.
- Chia, R. (2003) 'From knowledge-creation to the perfecting of action: Tao, Basho and pure experience as the ultimate ground of knowing' *Human Relations* 56(8): 953–81.
- Chia, R. and Tsoukas, H. (1999) *On Organisational Becoming: Rethinking Organisational Change*, WP No. 99/12. Colchester: Dept. of Accounting, Finance and Management, University of Essex.
- Chia, R. and Tsoukas, H. (2003) 'Everything flows and nothing abides: towards a "rhizomic" model of organisational change, transformation and action' *Process Studies*, 32(2): 196–24.

- Christensen, K. (1999) *Cities and Complexity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cilliers, P. (2005) 'Complexity, deconstruction and relativism' *Theory, Culture and Society* 22(5): 255–67.
- Clavel, P. (1986) *The Progressive City: Planning and Participation 1969-1984*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.,
- Clavel, P., Forester, J., and Goldsmith, W. (eds) (1980) *Urban and Regional Planning in an Age of Austerity*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Connell, D. (2009) 'Planning and its orientation to the future' *International Planning Studies* 14(1): 85–98.
- Connolly, W. (1998) 'Beyond good and evil: the ethical sensibility of Michel Foucault', in Moss, J. (ed.) *The Later Foucault*. London: Sage, 108–28.
- Davis, M. (2006) *Planet of Slums*. London: Verso.
- Davoudi, S. (2008) 'Key issues for planning futures and the way forward: Introduction' *21st Century Society* 3(3): 229–32.
- Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- del Casino Jr, V., Grimes, A., Hanna, S. and Jones III, J.P. (2000) 'Methodological frameworks for the geography of organisations' *Geoforum* 31: 523–38.
- Deleuze, G. (1972) 'Les intellectuels et le pouvoir' *Arc* 49 (May), Aix-en-Provence.
- Deleuze, G. (1990) [1969] *The Logic of Sense* (trans. Lester, M. and Stivale, C.). London: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) [1980] *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (trans. Massumi, B.) London: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994) [1991] *What is Philosophy?* (trans. Tomlinson H. and Burchill, G.). London: Verso.
- Derrida, J. (1988) [1977] *Limited Inc.* (trans. Weber, S. and Mehlman, J.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Derrida, J. and Eisenman, P. (1997) *Chora L Works*, (ed. Kipnis, J. and Leeser, T.). New York: Monacelli Press.
- Dixon, D. and Jones III J.P. (1998) 'My dinner with Derrida, or spatial analysis and poststructuralism do lunch' *Environment and Planning A* 30: 247–60.
- Doel, M. (1996) 'A hundred thousand lines of flight: a machinic introduction to the nomad thought and scrumpled geography of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari' *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space* 14: 421–39.
- Duc, E. (2005) 'Urban design – future or past' *Urban Design Forum* No. 70 (June): 2.
- Eversley, D. (1973) *The Planner in Society: The Changing Role of a Profession*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Eisenschitz, A. (2008) 'Town planning, planning theory and social reform' *International Planning Studies* 13(2): 133–49.
- Elden, S. (2007) 'Governmentality, calculation, territory' *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space* 25(3): 562–80.
- Engels, F. (2009) [1845] *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. London: Penguin.
- Estatopia (nd) *Inch Perfect: Le Corbusier's 'Modulor'*, <<http://www.users.zetnet.co.uk/estatopia/inch3.htm#lecorb>> [accessed 18/06/2009].

- Fainstein, S. (2000) 'New directions in planning theory' *Urban Affairs Review* 34: 451–78.
- Feyerabend, P. (1978) *Science in a Free Society*. London: New Left Books.
- Florida, R. (2000) *Competing in the Age of Talent*. Pittsburgh, PA: Mellon Foundation.
- Florida, R. (2002) 'The economic geography of talent', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 92(4): 743–55.
- Florida, R. (2004) *Cities and the Creative Class*. London: Routledge.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (1998) *Rationality and Power*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. and Richardson, T. (2002) 'Planning and Foucault: in search of the dark side of planning theory', in Allmendinger, P. and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (eds) *Planning Futures*. London: Routledge, 44–62.
- Forester, J. (1987) 'Critical theory and planning practice', in Forester, J. (ed.) *Critical Theory and Public Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 202–30.
- Forester, J. (1989) *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Forester, J. (1993) *Critical Theory, Public Policy and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Forester, J. (1999) *The Deliberative Practitioner*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Forester, J. (2000) 'Epistemology, reductive ethics, far too narrow politics: some clarifications in response to Yiftachel and Huxley' *IJURR* 24(4): 914–16.
- Forester, J. (2004) 'Reflections on trying to teach planning theory' *Planning Theory and Practice* 5(2): 242–51.
- Forester, J. (2006) 'Making participation work when interests conflict: moving from facilitating dialogue and moderating debate to mediating negotiations' *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72: 447–56.
- Forester, J. (2009) *Dealing with Differences: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1982) 'On the genealogy of ethics', in Dreyfus, H. and Rabinow, P. (eds) *Michel Foucault*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. and Deleuze, G. (1972) 'Intellectuals and power: a conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze' *L'Arc*, 49: 3–10. <<http://libcom.org/library/intellectuals-power-a-conversation-between-Michel-Foucault-and-Gilles-Deleuze>> [accessed 27/03/2008].
- Freire, P. (1970) [1968] *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (trans. Ramos, M.R.). New York: Continuum.
- Friedmann, J. (1987) *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, J. (1998) 'Planning theory revisited' *European Planning Studies* 6(3): 245–54.
- Friedmann, J. (2003) 'Why do Planning Theory?' *Planning Theory* 2(1): 7–10.
- Friedmann, J. (2008) 'The uses of planning theory: a bibliographic essay' *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 28: 247–57.

- Gadamer, H-G. (1999) 'In praise of theory', in *Praise of Theory: Speeches and Essays* (trans. Dawson, C.). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goodwin, B. (1997) 'Community, creativity and society' *Soundings* 5: 111–23.
- Gower Davies, J. (1974) *Evangelistic Bureaucrat: Study of a Planning Exercise in Newcastle-upon-Tyne*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Greimas, A.J. (1966) *Sémantique Structurale*. Paris : PUF.
- Gunder, M. and Hillier, J. (2007) 'Problematising responsibility in planning theory and practice: on seeing the middle of the string?' *Progress in Planning* 68: 57–96.
- Gunder, M. and Hillier, J. (2009) *Planning in Ten Words or Less*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Hague, C. (1997) 'Town planning into the 21st century: diverse worlds and common themes', in Blowers, A. and Evans, B. (eds) (1997) *Town Planning into the 21st Century*. London: Routledge, 137–51.
- Hajer, M. (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hajer, M. and Versteeg, W. (2005) 'A decade of discourse analysis of environmental politics: achievements, challenges, perspectives' *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 7(3): 175–84.
- Hajer, M. and Wagenaar, H. (eds) (2003) *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, P. (1972) 'Planning and the environment', in Townsend, P. and Bosanquet, N. (eds) *Labour and Equality*. London: Fabian Society, 262–75.
- Hall, P. (1982) *Great Planning Disasters*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hall, P. (2002) *Cities of Tomorrow* (3rd edn). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hall, P. and Taylor, R. (1996) 'Political science and the three institutionalisms' *Political Studies* XLIV: 936–57.
- Harper, D. (2001) *Online Etymology Dictionary* <<http://dictionary.reference.com>>
- Harvey, D. (1973) *Social Justice and the City*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hastings, A. (1999) 'Analysing power relations in partnerships: is there a role for discourse analysis?' *Urban Studies* 36(1): 91–106.
- Healey, P. (2004) 'The treatment of space and place in the new strategic spatial planning in Europe' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28: 45–67.
- Healey, P. (2006) *Collaborative Planning* (2nd edn). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Healey, P. (2007) *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: Towards a Relational Planning for our Times*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Healey, P. (2008) 'Making choices that matter: the practical art of situated strategic judgement in spatial strategy-making', in van den Broeck, J., Moulaert, F. and Oosterlynck, S. (eds) *Empowering the Planning Fields: Ethics, Creativity and Action*. Leuven: Acco, 23–41.
- Healey, P. (2010) *Making Better Places: The Planning Project in the 21st Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Healey, P. and Hillier, J. (2008) 'Introduction', in Hillier, J. and Healey, P. (eds) (2008) *Critical Essays in Planning Theory, Volume 1, Foundations of the Planning Enterprise*. Aldershot: Ashgate, ix–xxvii.

- Healey, P. and Upton, R. (2010) *Crossing Borders: International Exchange and Planning Practices*. London: Routledge.
- Healey, P., McDougall, G. and Thomas, M. (eds) (1982) *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s: Selected Papers from a Conference Held in Oxford, 2–4 April 1981*. New York: Pergamon.
- Healey, P., McDougall, G. and Thomas, M.J. (1982) 'Theoretical debates in planning: towards a coherent dialogue', in Healey, P., McDougall, G. and Thomas, M.J. (eds), *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 5–22.
- Hendler, S. (1994) 'Feminist planning ethics', *Journal of Planning Literature* 9(2): 115–27.
- Hendler, S. (ed.) (1995) *Planning Ethics: A Reader in Planning Theory, Practice and Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Centre for Urban Policy Research.
- Hendler, S. (1996) 'On the use of models in planning ethics', in Mandelbaum, S., Mazza, L. and Burchell, R. (eds), *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Centre for Urban Policy Research, 400–13.
- Hendler, S. (2005) 'Towards a feminist code of planning ethics' *Planning Theory and Practice* 6(1): 53–69.
- Hetherington, K. and Law, J. (eds) (2000) Special issue on actor-network-theory and spatiality, *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space* 18(2): 127–55.
- Hillier, J. (2002) *Shadows of Power: An Allegory of Prudence in Land-use Planning*. London: Routledge.
- Hillier, J. (2007) *Stretching Beyond the Horizon: A Multiplanar Theory of Spatial Planning and Governance*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hillier, J. and Healey, P. (eds) (2008a) *Critical Essays in Planning Theory*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hillier, J. and Healey, P. (eds) (2008b) *Critical Essays in Planning Theory, Volume 1, Foundations of the Planning Enterprise*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hillier, J. and Healey, P. (2008c) 'Introduction: the complexity 'turn' – hope, critique and postmodernism', in Healey, P. and Hillier, J. (eds) *Critical Essays in Planning Theory, Volume 3, Contemporary Movements in Planning Theory*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Howe, E. (1990) 'Normative ethics in planning' *Journal of Planning Literature* 5(2): 123–50.
- Howe, E. (1992) 'Professional roles and the public interest in planning' *Journal of Planning Literature* 6(3): 230–48.
- Howe, E. (1994) *Acting on Ethics in City Planning*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Howe, E. and Kaufman, J. (1979) 'The ethics of contemporary American planners' *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45(3): 243–55.
- Howe, E. and Kaufman, J. (1981) 'The values of contemporary American planners' *Journal of the American Planning Association* 47(3): 266–78.
- Hudson, B. (1979) 'Comparison of current planning theories: counterparts and contradictions' *APA Journal* 45: 387–98.
- Hunt, T. (2009) 'Introduction', in Engels F., *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. London: Penguin, 1–31.

- Huxley, M. (2007a) 'Planning, space and government', in Cox K. (ed.) *Handbook of Political Geography*. London: Sage, 153–74.
- Huxley, M. (2007b) 'Geographies of governmentality', in Crampton, J. and Elden, S. (eds) *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 186–204.
- Ingold, T. (1990) 'An anthropologist looks at biology' *Man* (NS) 25: 208–29.
- Innes, J. (1995) 'Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice' *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14: 183–9.
- Jacobs, K. (2006) 'Discourse analysis and its utility for urban policy research' *Urban Policy and Research* 24(1): 39–52.
- Jessop, B., Brenner, N. and Jones, M. (2008) 'Theorizing sociospatial relations' *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space* 26: 389–401.
- Keeble, L. (1961) *Town Planning at the Crossroads*. London: Estates Gazette.
- Kirkman, R. (2004) 'The ethics of metropolitan growth: a framework' *Philosophy and Geography* 7(2): 201–18.
- Kirkman, R. (2009) 'At home in the seamless web: agency, obduracy and the ethics of metropolitan growth' *Science, Technology and Human Values* 34(2): 234–58.
- Krumholz, N. and Clavel, P. (1994) *Reinventing Cities: Equity Planners Tell their Stories*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Krumholz, N. and Forester, J. (1990) *Making Equity Planning Work: Leadership in the Public Sector*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1983) 'Commensurability, comparability, communicability', in Asquith P. and Nickles, T. (eds) *PSA 198: Proceedings of the 1982 Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*. East Lansing, MI: Philosophy of Science Association, 670–73.
- Latour, B. (1996) 'On actor-network-theory: a few clarifications' *Soziale Welt* 47: 369–82.
- Latour, B. (2004) *Politics of Nature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Law, J. (2004) 'And if the global were small and noncoherent? Method, complexity and the baroque' *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space* 22: 13–26.
- Law-Yone, H. (2007) 'Another planning theory? Rewriting the meta-narrative' *Planning Theory* 6(3): 315–26.
- Lee, C.K (2007) *Against the Law: Labour Protests in China's Rustbelt and Sunbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lewin, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper.
- Mandelbaum, S. (1996) 'Introduction: the talk of the community', in Mandelbaum, S., Mazza, L. and Burchell, R.W. (eds) *Explorations in Planning Theory*, New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, xi–xix.
- Mandelbaum, S., Mazza, L. and Burchell, R.W. (eds) (1996) *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.
- Marcus, G. (1994) 'What comes (just) after "post"? The case of ethnography', in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 563–74.

- Marcuse, P. (1976) 'Professional ethics and beyond: values in planning' *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 42(3): 264–74.
- Marsden, T., Murdoch, J., Lowe, P., Munton, R. and Flynn, A. (1993) *Constructing the Countryside*. London: UCL Press.
- Massey, D. (2005) *For Space*. London: Sage.
- McNeill, W. (1999) *The Glance of the Eye: Heidegger, Aristotle and the Ends of Theory*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- McRae, I. (2005) 'How strategic planning is really done' *Western Planner* 24(10): 8–11.
- More, T. (1965) [1516] *Utopia*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Mouffe, C. (1992) *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: pluralism, citizenship and community*. London: Verso.
- Mouffe, C. (1993) *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.
- Mouffe, C. (1996) 'Deconstruction, pragmatism and the politics of democracy', in Mouffe, C. (ed.) *Deconstruction and Pragmatism*. London: Routledge, 1–12.
- Mouffe, C. (1999) 'Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism?' *Social Research* 66(3): 745–58.
- Murakami Wood, D. (2007) 'Beyond the Panopticon? Foucault and surveillance studies', in Crampton, J. and Elden, S. (eds) *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 245–63.
- Murdoch, J. (1998) 'The spaces of actor-network-theory' *Geoforum* 29(4): 357–74.
- Nietzsche, F. (1954) *Twilight of the Idols*. New York: Penguin.
- Phelps, N. and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2008) 'If geography is anything, maybe it's planning's alter-ego? Reflections on policy relevance in two disciplines concerned with place and space', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 33: 566–584.
- Plato (1992) [c.387–380 BC] *The Republic*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Plummer, P. and Sheppard, E. (2006) 'Geography matters: agency, structures and dynamics at the intersection of economics and geography' *Journal of Economic Geography* 6: 619–37.
- Raco, M. and Imrie, R. (2000) 'Governmentality and rights and responsibilities in urban policy' *Environment and Planning A* 32(12): 2187–204.
- Rajchman, J. (1991) *Philosophical Events: Essays of the 80s*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ramonet, I. (2006) 'Silent thought' *Le Monde Diplomatique* (May), 1.
- Rausch, H. (1982) *Theoria: von ihren Sakralen zur Philosophischen Bedeutung*. Munich: Fink.
- Reade, E. (1987) *British Town and Country Planning*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Richardson, K. and Cilliers, P. (2001) 'What is complexity science? A view from different directions' *Emergence* 3(1): 5–23.
- Richardson, T. (1996) 'Foucauldian discourse: power and truth in urban and regional policy making' *European Planning Studies* 4(3): 279–92.
- Richardson, T. (2002) 'Freedom and control in planning: using discourse in the pursuit of reflexive practice' *Planning Theory and Practice* 3(3): 353–61.

- Richardson, T. (2005) 'Environmental assessment and planning theory: four short stories about power, multiple rationality, and ethics' *Environmental Assessment Review* 25(4): 341–65.
- Robbins, E. (1998) 'Thinking the city multiple' *Harvard Architecture Review* 10: 36–45.
- Ruming, K. (2008) *Negotiating Development Control: Using Actor-network-theory to Explore the Creation of Residential Building Policy*. City Futures Research Centre, UNSW, Sydney. <<http://www.fbe.unsw.edu.au/cf/publications/othercfresearch/attachments/negotiatingdevelopmentcontrol.pdf>> [accessed 19/09/2008]
- Sandercock, L. (1998) *Towards Cosmopolis*. New York: Wiley.
- Sanyal, B. (2002) 'Globalization, ethical compromise and planning theory' *Planning Theory* 1(2): 116–23.
- Sanyal, B. (2005) 'Preface', in Sanyal, B. (ed.), *Comparative Planning Cultures*, New York: Routledge, xix–xxiv.
- Sanyal, B. (2007) 'Déjà-vu' *Planning Theory* 6(3): 327–31.
- Schön, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Free Press.
- Shoshkes, E. (2004) 'East-West: interactions between the US and Japan and their effect on utopian realism' *Journal of Planning History* 3(3): 215–40.
- Sternlieb, G. (1978) 'Preface' in Burchell, R.W. and Sternlieb, G. (eds) (1978) *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, xi–xiii.
- Stockholm Resilience Centre (2007) *Complex Adaptive Systems*. <<http://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/researchbackground/researchframework/complexadaptivesystems.4.aeea46911a3127427980006772.html>> [accessed 05/02/2009].
- Swyngedouw, E. (2005) 'Governance innovation and the citizen: the Janus face of governance-beyond-the-State' *Urban Studies* 42(11): 1991–2006.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2007) 'Impossible "sustainability" and the postpolitical condition', in Krueger, R. and Gibbs, D. (eds) *The Sustainable Development Paradox*. New York: Guilford Press, 13–40.
- Taylor, N. (1998) *Urban Planning Theory since 1945*. London: Sage.
- Taylor, N. (2003) 'More or less meaningful concepts in planning theory (and how to make them more meaningful): a plea for conceptual analysis and precision' *Planning Theory* 2(2): 91–100.
- Thomas, H. (2007) 'From radicalism to reformism' *Planning Theory* 6(3): 332–35.
- Thrift, N. (1996) *Spatial Formations*. London: Sage.
- Thrift, N. (1999) 'The place of complexity' *Theory, Culture and Society* 16(3): 31–69.
- Throgmorton, J. (2003) 'Planning as persuasive storytelling in a global-scale web of relationships' *Planning Theory* 2(2): 125–51.
- Tschumi, B. (1994) *Architecture and Disjunction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- UN-HABITAT (2009) *Global Report on Human Settlements: Planning Sustainable Cities*. London: Earthscan.
- Urry, J. (2005) 'The complexity turn' *Theory, Culture and Society* 22(5): 1–14.

- Van Wezemael, J. (2008) 'Knowledge creation in urban and knowledge environment', in Yigitcanlar, T., Velibeyoglu, K. and Baum S. (eds) *Knowledge-based Urban Development*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 1–20.
- Van Wezemael, J. (2009) 'Housing studies between romantic and baroque complexity' *Housing, Theory and Society* 26(2): 81–121.
- Wachs, M. (1982) 'Ethical dilemmas in forecasting for public policy' *Public Administration Review* 42(6): 562–7.
- Wachs, M. (1985) 'Introduction', in Wachs, M. (ed.) *Ethics in Planning*. New Brunswick, NJ: Centre for Urban Policy Research, xiii–xxi.
- Weizman, E. (2006) 'The art of war: Deleuze, Guattari, and Debord and the Israeli Defense Force'. <<http://info.interactivist.net/node/5324>> [accessed 11/05/2009].
- Weizman, E. (2007) *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. London: Verso.
- Yiftachel, O. (1998) 'Planning and social control: exploring the dark side' *Journal of Planning Literature* 12: 395–406.
- Yiftachel, O. (2001) 'Introduction: outlining the power of planning', in Yiftachel, O., Little, J., Hedgcock, D. and Alexander, I. (eds) *The Power of Planning*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic, 1–20.
- Young, R. (1981) *Untying the Text: A Post-structuralist Reader*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Zeitler, U. (2008) 'The ontology of mobility, morality and transport planning', in Bergmann, S. and Sager, T. (eds) *The Ethics of Mobilities*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 233–40.