Course description

In this course we will examine urban planning practice in rapidly growing cities in the “Global South,” focusing in particular on Latin America and on planning in contexts of urban informality. Our first goal is to illuminate the role of everyday urban planning practices in reproducing or challenging the multiple relations of power associated with urban development. To achieve this, we will 1) situate urban planning within the broader discourse of international development, 2) examine the articulations between urban planning and the production of urban space, 3) critically assess the role of planning in the (re)production of difference and subjectivities, and 4) consider the emancipatory or disempowering impacts of knowledge production in urban planning.

A second goal is to develop a critical understanding of the principal themes, schools of thought, and theoretical debates in the contested and loosely defined field known as “international planning,” “international studies in planning,” or “international development planning,” which is the term used by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP). From the perspective of ACSP, “international development planning” is the study of planning and related issues “directly relevant to developing countries.” Such research is pursued through “comparative scholarship as well as in-depth analysis of specific countries, regions, rural contexts, cities and networks” in order to elucidate specific planning challenges facing countries in the global south in comparison to what is referred to as the global north.

However, from the perspective of scholars engaging with critical planning and development theories, the dissemination of international planning practice is associated with the spread of global capital and serves to spread western rationalities. From the perspective of feminist and postmodern theories, international planning serves to produce particular subjectivities, which in turn buttresses global relations of power and cements neocolonial forms of development. Post-colonial scholars, meanwhile, suggest that international planning research should illuminate alternative planning rationalities and practices in order to furnish not only a normative but also pragmatic critique of dominant forms of planning, and in so doing expand the definition of what constitutes “planning” also in the global north.

Our reading lists are drawn from authors situated both inside and outside the “Western” academia, focusing in particular on scholars who offer expanded visions of post-colonial planning practice and thus illuminate and challenge assumptions of “international planning.” We will ground our discussion of urban planning in critical and feminist theories of development, but we will also examine literature in urban studies; planning theory; and anthropology, sociology and other social science disciplines.
Course requirements:

Participation:

This is a small seminar, so your active participation is very important! Recall that we will read literature from many different academic disciplines and from different world regions. In such a multidisciplinary exploration, it is important to share our own experiences and openly engage with others’ perspectives. This will help us together develop an understanding of what “international planning studies” is all about. Remember, this seminar is a safe place to explore controversial issues, ideas, and arguments. To keep this class a safe place for exploring multiple perspectives, respect for fellow students is mandatory, especially if you disagree. Respectful and engaged participation is an important part of your grade.

Reflection papers (3):

Reflection papers should be a minimum of 2 pages and maximum of 3 single-spaced. Use only a few sentences to summarize the main argument, and then devote the rest of the paper to your own analysis. Did you see any particular strengths or flaws in one or more authors’ argument in light of the other readings? Do you feel the argument contradicts that of other articles or authors, and if so, how and why? Have the authors made effective use of a certain theoretical framework, or not? Have the authors presented sufficient data or examples, or drawn effectively on the work of other scholars, to support their argument? Also consider the “positionality” of the writer: a Marxist scholar may frame her article differently and privilege different data than a post-structural theorist, for example.

Class facilitation (twice):

You will work in pairs to facilitate up to one hour of class discussion on two different occasions on the dates you signed up for in class. You will give a short presentation of some of the previously assigned readings and also the reading/case that you will select for the rest of the class to read (see below). Then you should pose questions and facilitate the class discussion for an additional 30 minutes. You should research and include examples (drawings, photos, video clips, maps, etc.) that illustrate the readings. You should prepare a draft power point presentation by Monday morning before class and be prepared to meet with me on Monday to plan the class session. This is your opportunity to practice your teaching skills, to experiment with different approaches to group facilitation, and to try out an in-class activity/exercise to engage the class in meaningful and lively interaction.

Selection of additional readings:

You should select two additional readings for all of us to read; one for each time when you present and facilitate the class discussion (see above). These readings can be academic journal articles, websites, or reports, but they should clearly relate to the readings for the week when you will be facilitating class discussions. You need to select and distribute these readings by the Friday afternoon before they are due. This will give us enough time to perhaps substitute one or more of the previously assigned readings for your selected readings, if appropriate. This assignment is included in your participation grade.

Session summary:

You will be responsible for taking notes of our discussion at least once during the semester. The goal is to document the important points and observations made by all of you in order to move towards one of the class goals: to develop a critical understanding of the principal themes, schools of thought, and
theoretical debates in the loosely defined field known as “international planning,” “international studies in planning,” or “international development planning.” These notes will be useful as we develop our case study project and website (see below). This assignment is included in your participation grade.

Case study project:

In lieu of a final paper, you will work in teams of 2 or 3 to develop a case study of alternative planning practices in a non-European, non-US context. The goal is 1) to illuminate the role of everyday planning practices in reproducing or challenging the multiple relations of power associated with urban development, and 2) to develop a critical understanding of the principal themes, schools of thought, and theoretical debates in the loosely defined field known as “international planning,” “international studies in planning,” or “international development planning.” Your case study will be published on a website we’ll develop together, so you will need to produce a series of short texts instead of a longer narrative, and you will need to gather photographs and other illustrations as well as links. You will develop your case study in several steps, starting with an initial proposal, followed by drafts of your website texts and submission of links and supporting illustrations, and finally submission of the final text.

Final presentation:

You will present and critically analyze your case study in class, focusing on the ways in which your case 1) illuminates the role of everyday urban planning practices in reproducing or challenging the multiple relations of power associated with urban development, and 2) helps us develop a critical understanding of the principal themes, schools of thought, and theoretical debates in the contested and loosely defined field known as “international planning,” “international studies in planning,” or “international development planning.”

Grading Summary and Due Dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Grade weight:</th>
<th>Due date/time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>5% (50 points)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Submission of additional reading)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Friday before the relevant class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Session summary)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>By the following class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection paper 1</td>
<td>20% (200 points)</td>
<td>February 17 by class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection paper 1</td>
<td>20% (200 points)</td>
<td>March 23 by class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection paper 1</td>
<td>20% (200 points)</td>
<td>April 13 by class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class facilitation (2 times)</td>
<td>5% (total 100 points)</td>
<td>Draft ppt Monday morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study proposal</td>
<td>5% (50 points)</td>
<td>March 2 by class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study texts and illustrations</td>
<td>20% (200 points)</td>
<td>March 30 by class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study final texts</td>
<td>5% (50 points)</td>
<td>April 20 by class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late work:

Except in the case of an excused absence (see below), work submitted after an assigned deadline will lose 10% off the maximum grade. For example, the maximum grade for a late reflection paper will be 180 points instead of 200 points. Please communicate with me if you are having problems keeping to the schedule. It is better to talk through problems than ignore them.
Student Accommodations:

Students with a documented disability may request appropriate academic accommodations from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 512-471-6259 (voice) or 1-866-329-3986 (video phone). [http://ddce.utexas.edu/disability/about/](http://ddce.utexas.edu/disability/about/). Please request a meeting as soon as possible for us to discuss any accommodations. Please notify me as soon as possible if the material being presented in class is not accessible, and if any of the physical space is difficult for you. The only absences that will be considered excused are for religious holidays or extenuating circumstances due to an emergency. If you plan to miss class due to observance of a religious holiday, please let me know at least two weeks in advance. You will not be penalized for this absence. If you must miss a class or an assignment in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

Academic Integrity:

Each student in the course is expected to abide by the University of Texas Honor Code: “As a student of The University of Texas at Austin, I shall abide by the core values of the University and uphold academic integrity.” Plagiarism is taken very seriously at UT. Therefore, if you use words or ideas that are not your own (or that you have used in previous class), you must cite your sources. Otherwise you will be guilty of plagiarism and subject to academic disciplinary action, including failure of the course. You are responsible for understanding UT’s Academic Honesty and the University Honor Code which can be found at the following web address: [http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acint_student.php](http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acint_student.php)

Important Safety Information:

If you have concerns about the safety or behavior of fellow students, TAs or Professors, call BCAL (the Behavior Concerns Advice Line): 512-232-5050. Your call can be anonymous. If something doesn’t feel right – it probably isn’t. Trust your instincts and share your concerns. The following recommendations regarding emergency evacuation are provided by the Office of Campus Safety and Security, 512-471-5767, [http://www.utexas.edu/safety/](http://www.utexas.edu/safety/).

Occupants of buildings on The University of Texas at Austin campus are required to evacuate buildings when an alarm or alert is activated. Alarm activation or announcement requires exiting and assembling outside, unless told otherwise by an official representative.

Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of each classroom and building you may occupy. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when entering the building. Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructor in writing during the first week of class.

In the event of an evacuation, follow the instruction of faculty or class instructors. Do not re-enter a building unless given instructions by the following: Austin Fire Department, The University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.

Link to information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at: [www.utexas.edu/emergency](http://www.utexas.edu/emergency)
THE DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSE AND INTERNATIONAL PLANNING: SETTING THE STAGE

January 20: Course introduction and presentations

January 27: International development and international planning 1: distinctions and connections


Today we introduce our big questions: How to distinguish between international development and international planning? What relations of power are produced and reproduced through international development and planning? This class focuses on the themes of space/place, difference and subjectivity, and knowledge production, asking how globalizing theories and practices of planning are reproduced, complicated, or challenged across these fields.

February 3: The development discourse and international planning 2: assumptions, theories, and practices


Today we take a broad look at the dominant ideas that inform international development as discourse and practice, asking how these ideas may shape the ways in which development policy is put into practice through governance mechanisms such as “planning.” What are some of the paradigmatic assumptions and theories of development, where have they originated, and how have they spread? How does the development discourse reflect and shape knowledge formations, subjectivities, and uneven relations of power?

February 10: The development discourse and international planning 3: major actors and forms of governance


We conclude the introductory discussion of international development and international planning by examining the institutions that drive development on a global scale, such as the World Bank, but we also map out the multiple actors that shape everyday planning practice, from the mayor’s office to neighborhood organizations. How does daily planning practice shape the development discourse, and vice versa? How do “planners” of various stripes work with multiple actors in different contexts, and what are broader lessons emerging from such engagements in practice? How are uneven relations of power reproduced through forms of governance?
February 17: The global city, the mega city, and the informal city


We begin our discussion of the geographies of international planning by reviewing the various conceptualizations of the city and their implications for theories and practices of international planning. How does assumptions of formality and informality shape the planning project, and vice versa, specifically in terms of uneven relations of power? How can planning practices in the informal city inform “formal” planning? How is globalized planning practice remaking cities, and in what image? How does this matter for international planning studies?

**Reflection paper 1 due.**

February 24: TBA

March 2: Space and the significance of place


This week we discuss how place attachment, spatial practices, and social constructions and productions of space influence planning practice. How does “place” persist in an age of globalization? How are planners engaged in “place-making” and how does this shape relations of power in planning? And how does this matter for international planning studies?

**Case study project proposal due.**

**March 9:**  **Mobilities, migrations, and the unsettling of place**


This week we present perspectives that may seem to contradict those of the previous week: we focus on the movement of ideas, people and things and how such “mobilities” alternatively complicate or reproduce globalizing planning paradigms and practices. How can planning operate in an unsettled and shifting environment? How does this matter for international planning studies?

**March 16:**  **SPRING BREAK**

**DIFFERENCE, SUBJECTIVITIES, AND THE OBJECTS OF INTERNATIONAL PLANNING**

**March 23:**  **The overlooked, the hidden, and the overt: who is international planning for?**


We begin this section of the course by reviewing international planning literature and cases that critically examine the “objects” of international planning and their “subjectification”. Planning scholarship has belatedly begun to shed light on marginalized groups that have traditionally been excluded from formal planning in “northern” and “western” cities. At the same time, critical development theory suggest that certain groups have become reified as objects of development, while planning has served the interests of the powerful. In this session, we will ask, how do planners participate in subject-making through their daily practice, and how do those who are “planned-for” consent to their own subjectification? How can critical perspectives on intersectionality inform a critical international planning theory?

**Reflection paper 2 due.**

**March 30: Gendering international planning**


Although much of the literature so far in the course has emerged from critical and feminist theories of development, this week is dedicated to cases of international planning that specifically examine the role of gender. After a quick review of gender and development theory, we discuss different perspectives on participation and gendering of international planning. What are the implications of gender and development theory for international planning studies?

**Draft case study texts and illustrations/links due**
KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION AND POWER IN/OFT INTERNATIONAL PLANNING

April 6: Conflicting rationalities and the paradigm of participation


In the final section of the course we examine how certain rationalities shape how knowledge is produced through the planning project. We begin in this session by asking how different and often conflicting rationalities inform dominant assumptions and practices of planning. What are these planning rationalities, how and why have they have become intrinsic to international planning, and what are the implications of this globalization and mainstreaming of certain rationalities? We focus in particular on the dominant concept of “participation.” How does participation differ under different governance contexts, and how is participation thought of the same way? How does participatory planning challenge or reproduce relations of power? And how do these perspectives inform a critical international planning theory?

April 13: Multiple epistemologies and co-production of knowledge

We turn from discussing the rationalities that shape participatory approaches to international planning, to a critical discussion of how knowledge is produced through such participatory forms of planning. We will examine forms of planning premised on knowledge formations and epistemologies that challenge the dominant forms of planning. How can international studies in planning be thought of as a field premised on multiple and negotiated forms of learning and co-production of knowledge? And, how can critical pedagogies inform a critical international planning theory?


**Reflection paper 3 due.**

**April 20:** Final presentations.

**April 27:** Final case study texts and illustrations due

**May 4:** LAST CLASS DAY. Final presentations and conclusions.
TEMPLATES, MODELS AND FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS
SESSION SUMMARY TEMPLATE

1. TITLE
Here you provide the title for the day’s session listed in the syllabus.

2. DATE

3. YOUR NAME

4. SUMMARY
Here you summarize what was said. I.e. provide a one-paragraph ‘executive summary’ of the session, including the principal points and debates raised in discussions.

5. DISCUSSION
This should be the longest section, approximately 2-3 pages single-spaced. Here you present in greater detail what was said by different speakers and presenters. You don’t have to provide a complete verbatim transcript or to develop this into a concise narrative, but try to capture the flavor of the discussion. Try to indicate who said what, especially if you cite someone verbatim.

6. ANALYSIS
Here you should try to succinctly synthesize the lessons from what was said. I.e. provide your own analysis in one to two paragraphs of the implications of our discussions for the principal questions in the class: 1) the role of everyday planning practices in reproducing or challenging the multiple relations of power associated with urban development, and 2) what are the principal themes, schools of thought, and theoretical debates in the loosely defined field known as “international planning,” “international studies in planning,” or “international development planning.”
SAMPLE SESSION SUMMARY

SESSION SUMMARY

Conference and Job Talk Strategies
March 24, 2015
[Name]

SUMMARY

This session focused on communication strategies at conferences and job talks, most commonly referring to individual presentations. Session leaders offered advice and relayed experiences from their own performance and attendance at conferences and job talks. Many of their key recommendations refer to striking a balance between a delivery that relays research competence, and being respectful and affable as a potential faculty member. Graduate students were particularly advised to prepare very well for major presentations, which will help control the problems that could arise.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Young described appreciation that this class existed; as Cornell kept these issues as mysteries.

Conferences
On presentations, he mentioned a trend towards escaping PowerPoint, or at least to reduce the stress on it. People are reducing the number and content of slides, re-focusing on images and longer discussion on each slide. Splitting talking and detailed slides divides the participants’ attention. Have a nice, crowd-pleasing scene at the end of the talk. If you use a quote, build it into your discussion, rather than expecting people to read it while you talk. You can bring your manuscript with you, if available, to refer back to if needed. Graduate students should not read their paper, but rather prepare very well. The more you practice out loud, the more competent your delivery will be (go for three times). There’s a 7-second lag between when a speaker loses their place, and the audience recognizes. Dr. Young stressed the importance of keeping your audience comfortable with you, “In the United States, half of getting hired is affability”.

Dr. Sletto added that a complex point can be delivered as a prepared quote to read, but just as a brief paragraph to weave into the presentation. Dr. Young recommended complex or theoretical quotes be read once through, then unpacked sentence by sentence to convey your interpretation of the quote.
Never say that you’re nervous. Slow down to ensure participants get something from your talk, and remember you. Dr. Sletto asked about how to address rhythm. Dr. Young responded that you can use a watch to get a sense of timing for the talk. Dr. Sletto recommended varying speed and pausing for certain moments to stress important points (such as quotes of local leaders for emphasis). Dr. Young also mentioned these pauses help transition sections.

People think that presentations are to disseminate data, but it’s really a performance. Think about how to pull the attendees attention in, perhaps by punctuating an experience, similar to the cannons in the 1812 Overture. Use these opportunities to take command of the audience and be memorable.

Greg asked about how to prepare for the differences between conferences common for our field. Dr. Young replied that ACSP is really good for looking for a job, but there’s a broad range of quality in presentations. Urban Affairs is more professional and rigorous. ACSP is a bit like high school, talking about who will talk to who. Dr. Sletto added a different perspective, noting the carefully organized sessions and roundtables at ACSP, where there was real learning of new things and sharing ideas. He also mentioned he goes to the presentation room the day before the event to get comfortable with the surroundings.

Attend the presentations of people important to you, such as presenters that may be helpful for tenure review. These people should be at schools that are peers or above, and folks that are likely to understand your work.

Raksha asked about how to connect with senior faculty at a conference. Dr. Young advised to think first about what specific question or issue to discuss, and do not be afraid to contact them. Good researchers are typically open to direct, critical engagement that can be constructive. Dr. Sletto asked if Dr. Young has contacted people before conferences; and Dr. Young replied that generally, he does not, but it is fine to contact someone to meet up.

Conferences are also a social opportunity, and it’s nice to meet others. Dr. Sletto recommended attending all graduate student receptions to meet peers, who will be peer faculty in a few years. Both faculty commented on the opportunity to learn about related sub-fields from attending other sessions.

Job Talks
Dr. Young began by referring to the end of the job talk, and later addresses the beginning: Regarding questions at the end, just answer them succinctly, rather than risking offering an answer that rambles. Another job talk presentation he participated in focused on a weak study of a grad. student’s work that only included 10 study participants. He recommended choosing a portion of the dissertation that has been peer-reviewed; show how you’re a good mechanic and can get it done.

As an introduction, talk about 60 seconds on your hometown to introduce how you got into planning. Then go into the research discussion, focusing on the issues you anticipate to be
interesting to your audience. At the end, talk about your future research briefly, and that you are going to be headed interesting places.

Dr. Sletto mentioned that the audience in a job talk will be diverse, and some will want to shoot you down. Dr. Young added that it’s helpful to review the bios of the tenured faculty to weave their interests into your talk.

Dr. Sletto pointed out concern about receiving a question that is either unanswerable, or hostile, and asked Dr. Young how to address it. Dr. Young replied that it’s okay to respond that you don’t know, and compliment the questioner. He recommended not speculating on issues that the questioner is likely an expert on—it is all right to say it is outside of your field.

Dr. Sletto relayed a story from Cornell when he was in a fellowship colloquium, and that one participant was opposed to participatory mapping as an idea. He recalled that he was taken aback by this comment. Dr. Young pointed out that some people need to be contained when they are attacking the speaker. So, show respect, not fear of the people that may be out to get you; and show competence to those you suspect are supportive.

Greg asked about broadly divergent planning programs that could be paired with engineering or political science, and how to deal with the potential perspectives of participants in a job talk. Dr. Young replied that the key is to have fun connecting different ideas and learning from others. Dr. Sletto recommended being cognizant of the diverging viewpoints to prepare for the job talk. Job talkers need to relay the ‘so what’ of their research to the audience, recognizing a broad range of qualitative and quantitative expertise. Take the opportunity to be generous to your critics, and ensure that you are seen as a good faculty member.

SYNTHESIS

- Make your presentation memorable. Provide an overview of key points, deliver them interestingly, and review the key points. Be entertaining.
- Prepare presentations extremely well, including at least three spoken rehearsals.
- Never state that you are nervous or unprepared. Minor mistakes can be covered and will likely be not noticed.
- Time your practice runs, practicing your presentation with friends, in front of the mirror, or on videotape.
- Minimize dependence on PowerPoint; using it as a supplement rather than a guide.
- Visit the presentation space early, to familiarize yourself with the room and equipment.
- Practice strategies to prevent overly repetitive physical movements like hands or pacing.
- Build in pauses and connections to the audience to keep them engaged.
- At conferences, plan to attend sessions that are interesting, and/or include key people, but leave flexible time as well.
- Prepare a brief ‘elevator talk’ about your research to share at conferences.
- Focus on the events that you get the most from, but prepare well to make your investment count.
Today’s set of readings about boundaries, skateboarding, graffiti, and street children in Kampala are examples of much of the conceptual, theoretical material we’ve been reading this semester. In this discussion paper, I’d like to focus on the short Borden articles about skateboarding and boundaries. Specifically, I will write about how the counter-cultural elements associated with skateboarding hearken back to readings from Carmona, Németh, Sandercock, and others; and I will discuss how the boundaries discussed connect with those same authors, as well as Long.

In “Boundaries,” Borden discusses what a boundary is – that it can be physical, either “two-dimensional vertical planes” or a “momentary portal” (Borden, 21). But most importantly, boundaries are socially constructed. This connects back to my own background as sociology and philosophy undergraduate. Those fields have a strong sense that much of what we experience is socially constructed, especially among Postmodern thinkers; John R. Searle is a particularly helpful thinker along these lines, arguing that much is socially constructed. Searle, I believe would agree with Borden that boundaries that we face are “simultaneously the product of social relations and their control” (Borden, 21). Borden goes on to explain that boundaries don’t just control where we can and can’t go, but go beyond to provoke questions in our minds about whether we’re meant to be somewhere or not: “am I a welcomed guest, an ambiguous transgressor, or an unwanted trespasser?” (Borden, 21). This is something I am experiencing in my group’s research of public spaces, whether we’re being physically kicked out or don’t feel welcome because of subtle, socially constructed boundaries.

The subtle, feeling boundaries that we experience in a space hearkens back to Carmona and “soft controls” (Carmona, 142-143). The “symbolic restrictions that passively discourage undesirable activities” that Carmona (142) talks about, is something Borden, I believe, would agree with. Those symbolic restrictions are powerful sociological forces that do in fact control what we do, Carmona and Borden would agree. Németh also identifies the force of subtle social cues; in his paper proposing a method for scoring public spaces, he gives negative point values to sociological boundaries such as the presence of security guards and surveillance cameras (2486-2487). While a camera or security guard standing 100 feet away doesn’t present the barrier that a wall, or even a “no entry” sign, does, it has a social element that makes one question whether he or she is allowed there, Borden would argue. On the other hand, Carmona’s discussion of over-management of a public space through physical barriers to entry would fit with Borden’s physical boundaries that prevent passage. In Long, we read about Austin’s issues with affordability. The rising cost of living closer to acts as a boundary. Namely, the figure 3 in Long (16) shows a big fence around downtown Austin. Long (16) explains “local journalists have noted that increases in house prices and cost of living are occurring in an observable spatial pattern, resulting in an Austin divided along ‘concentric rings of affordability circling the city.”

In his piece “Skateboarding” Borden nicely lays out the history of the practice, how it began “in the 1960s on the sweeping roads of calm suburban subdivisions” (Borden, 227). Skateboarding was increasingly regulated, and skateboarders began appropriating various public spaces for their use. Ultimately, “since the 1980s, skateboarding has taken on a more aggressive, and more
political identify and space” (Borden, 227). His paper then goes on to discuss how skateboarders create and impose their own values on space, for example “suggesting that use values are more important than exchange values” (Borden, 227). He concludes describing how skateboarders are essentially creating their own space, cities and architecture (Borden, 228).

Underlying the paper’s focus on skateboarding’s culture, I felt was Sandercock’s idea of storytelling. Namely, the story of skateboarders is important; they have their own story and act on it in practicing their sport. Skateboarders are in effect “planning” their cities: “Planning is performed through story” (Sandercock, 12). To enact change in a neighborhood, the story of skateboarders would be important, Sandercock would say. That is, the “Skateboarding is not a crime” campaign Borden (228) identifies connects with Sandercock’s idea that stories act as a catalyst for change (18-19). Furthermore, Carmona’s ideas of management practices, namely through “repression and legislation” (Borden, 228), come up. Skateboarding is often managed in public spaces, either through hard or soft controls or the creation of segregated space (Carmona, 130-131, 142-144). Skaters can also be discouraged through “sadistic” design elements, such as raised up pieces of metal on otherwise smooth concrete paths (Davis cited in Van Melik et al, 27-28). Jorge Rousselin even explained that such design elements are typically part of public plazas downtown to deter skateboarders. Németh, a critic of privately owned public space, would probably dislike such a plaza with deterrents meant to keep out skateboarders. The idea from Borden that skateboarders value use more than exchange value, I believe, also connects with Talen and Ellis’ idea of the importance of good urban form. While I’m not sure this may translate to Talen and Ellis saying all spaces should be appropriated for skateboarding, the idea that use value is more important than exchange value comes in their discussion of “a renewed focus on substance” (Talen and Ellis, 36). Just as skateboarders see the value of the substance of urban design, for example that a concrete ledge can be a nice space for performing tricks, Talen and Ellis are saying design needs to be valued as part of planning. Skaters see this when they appropriate a space for skating because they deem it as having good design. However, Talen and Ellis’ standard of democratic urban form (43) is at direct odds with the anarchistic sentiments of skateboarding (Borden, 228). The first chapter of Hou is also closely connected with Borden, as skateboarders are a clear example of insurgent users of public space. It would be interesting to take on a more detailed analysis of how skateboarding plays out in the different typologies of actions and practices in Hou (13-14): appropriating, reclaiming, pluralizing, transgressing, uncovering, contesting spaces.

To conclude, the two Borden articles about boundaries and skateboarding are closely connected with many of the theoretical readings we’ve looked at this semester. Namely, the papers show examples of practices and acts that relate to issues of management of public space, equity in access to space, storytelling in planning, and other ideas.