Reading Tips and Study Questions:
Planning as facilitation—October 22nd

Required reading:

1. Pp. 238-242, 251-253 only in RPT (Chapter 13) **Patsy Healey**, "The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory."

2. **(Textbook)** Pp.4-5 and chapters 7-9 in **John Forester**, *Planning in the Face of Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

Recommended:

3. Chapters 3 and 4 in **Forester**

Tips and questions

As we have seen, modern planning was born on very big and debatable assumptions—mostly about who could and should "guide society" and how. Not surprisingly, modernist or rational planning came under severe criticism, especially on political grounds. But much of that criticism stayed at the broad, structural level without offering much advice on the micro-level, everyday settings in which planners actually practice. Sticking with the focus on planners as facilitators, today's aim is to focus on the micro level.

1. **Healey** claims that rational planning clashed with a very structural political economy perspective, which focused on "who gets." She further claims that the who-gets perspective has important limitations vis-à-vis the planning challenges that confront today's world. What are the major implications of the "communicative" alternative that Healey presents as a paradigm shift? (She offers a re-definition of planning based on that alternative, for example.)

2. **Forester** is one of the major thinkers in the communicative school of thought. In *Planning in the Face of Power*, start on page 4 with the paragraph that begins "The vocation of planning …" and stop on the next page, toward the bottom, where the paragraphs ends "… a substantively democratic planning process." Then read the three core chapters, the last of which is the synthesis of Forester's arguments about how planners should think about their practice. Why is *listening* so vital for effective planning practice, according to **Forester**, and what defines "critical" listening, in particular? Does he convince you that the model of design as a "search process" is inadequate? Why or why not? What required planning skills or competencies are implied by the alternative model he offers: *design-as-sensemaking*?