



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Fragmentation and cohesion

Thinking about ideology in planning

Davoudi, Simin; Galland, Daniel; Inch, Andy; Lake, Robert; Shepherd, Edward

Published in:
ACSP 2020 Annual Conference

Publication date:
2020

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Davoudi, S., Galland, D., Inch, A., Lake, R., & Shepherd, E. (2020). Fragmentation and cohesion: Thinking about ideology in planning. In *ACSP 2020 Annual Conference: Book of Accepted Abstracts* (pp. 904-905)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

- Harjo, L. (2019). *Spiral to the Stars: Mvskoke Tools of Futurity*. The University of Arizona Press: Tucson.
- Porter, L. (2010). *Unlearning the Colonial Cultures of Planning*. Ashgate, University of Glasgow, UK.
- Simpson, L.B. (2017) *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resurgence*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London.
- Simpson, L.B. (2011) *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence*. Arbeiter Ring Publishing, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Key Words: Decolonization, Indigenous Planning

FRAGMENTATION AND COHESION: THINKING ABOUT IDEOLOGY AND PLANNING

Abstract ID: 322

Roundtable

DAVOUDI, Simin [University of Newcastle Upon Tyne] simin.davoudi@ncl.ac.uk, participant

GALLAND, Daniel [Aalborg University] dgalland@plan.aau.dk, participant

INCH, Andy [University of Sheffield] a.inch@sheffield.ac.uk, participant

LAKE, Robert [Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey] rlake@rutgers.edu, participant

SHEPHERD, Edward [University of Reading] edward.shepherd@reading.ac.uk, organizer, moderator

We appear to be living in an era of crisis of political ideas which is challenging various political settlements which have secured relative stability over recent decades. Whether it is the rise of populism in Europe and the Americas, the possible fragmentation of the European Union, political unrest in Hong Kong or the battle for the soul of the United States of America it seems that all around us there is evidence of intensified political rupture and discontent.

Dominant political ideas therefore seem to be losing their grip and the post-political order of things is giving way to a period of marked ideological confusion and struggle. If the analysis of ideologies is concerned with carefully revealing patterns of ideological bias and preference and examining their effects, the contemporary historical moment demands a renewed commitment to the study of ideology in all its theoretical and practical complexity.

Given the highly political nature of planning it is therefore essential that we develop tools and techniques to think through the relationship between patterns of ideological bias and planning practice whether it be at the level of national policy, local implementation or spaces in between. Although far from a dominant concept in planning theory, ideology has made repeated appearances throughout the history of the discipline, evoked in a variety of terms to address foundational questions for the field, including:

- problems of incoherence and fragmentation in the contested meanings of planning and the status of the knowledges underpinning its practice;
- the need for planning to establish its own rationale and meaning and the challenges to achieving this, whether due to inherent instability of meaning, vested interests of professionals or the structural contradictions inherent to planning's position in capitalist societies;
- the psycho-social ambiguity of concepts central to planning which can serve to legitimise and secure investment in the dominant order;
- the need to engage in pluralist debate through open, rational communication geared towards overcoming distortions and achieving agreement;
- the apparent post-political domination of neoliberalism over planning thought and practice, including through the 'totalitarianism' of consensus;
- the effects of political ideologies on change in planning ideas and practices;
- the variation in cultural expressions of planning practice and the politics and power-relations involved in their transformations. These treatments of ideology in the planning literature adopt various normative and methodological stances but are united by a common acceptance that ideas, concepts, the ideologies they comprise and the discourses through which they find expression

matter, and that they matter because they have the power to shape the terms by which political and social reality is understood, articulated and (re)shaped through planning practice.\

This roundtable starts from the premise that the significant potential of the concept of ideology for analysing planning can only be realised if its role is brought to the fore of analysis and that this is an essential move now more than ever. The discussion will seek to contribute to established academic debates by exploring some of the ways ideology can be explicitly deployed as a tool in the analysis of planning problems. It is hoped that the participants will explore how we might clarify our thinking regarding the relationship between ideology and planning and think through some of the ways in which this relationship is expressed. The roundtable is therefore part of a project to bring the concept of ideology out from the shadows and into the open so that we may examine its value and what it can tell us about the politics of contemporary planning.

Note: This abstract draws from an Editorial for a recent special issue of Planning Theory journal (see bibliographical citations).

Citations

- Gunder M (2010) Planning as the ideology of (neoliberal) space. *Planning Theory* 9(4): 298–314.
- Guttenberg AZ (2009) Planning and ideology. *Journal of Planning History* 8(4): 287-294.
- Harvey D (1985) On planning the ideology of planning. In: *The turning point: the urbanization of capital: studies in the history and theory of capitalist urbanisation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp.165-184.
- Shepherd E, Inch A, Marshall T (2020) Editorial: Narratives of power: Bringing ideology to the fore of planning analysis. *Planning Theory* (special issue), 19 (1): 3-16.
- Thornley A (1993) *Urban planning under Thatcherism: the challenge of the market*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Key Words: ideology, crisis, discourse, power, politics

ACSP-AESOP JOINT ROUNDTABLE: THEORISING THE FUTURE OF THE 'PROFESSIONAL' PLANNER

Abstract ID: 653

Roundtable

KAZA, Nikhil [University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill] nkaza@unc.edu, moderator
MAIDMENT, Christopher [University of Reading] c.s.maidment@henley.reading.ac.uk, participant
PARKER, Gavin [University of Reading] g.parker@henley.reading.ac.uk, participant

This is a joint ACSP-AESOP roundtable which will follow on from a similar session to be presented at the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP) 2020 Annual Congress in Bristol.

The aim of this session is to bring together perspectives from both sides of the Atlantic that explicitly focus on the future role of the planner. The session will provide an interactive opportunity for the participants and the audience to explore how emerging practical and theoretical insights frame the normative role of the planner.

As an academic discipline, planning is thriving, energised by the exploration of new theoretical insights, drawing on, for example, complexity and the post-political, and the urgency of addressing social and environmental crises. Elsewhere, scholarship on the relationship between communities and planning continues to develop, as does work on what planners do in their day-to-day practice.

However, the identity of the profession is at a crossroads. Especially in a neoliberal political paradigm, there has been a move away from thinking of planning as a state led activity, characterised by technocratic and communicative methods. In reality, much of planning is done in conjunction with, or in