

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY  
Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

**970:653:01 SOCIAL JUSTICE IN PLANNING & PUBLIC POLICY**  
**Wednesday 9:50 - 12:30 Civic Square, Room 168**

**ROBERT W. LAKE**  
**Spring 2017**

**OFFICE HOURS:** Mon & Wed, 2-4 p.m., or by appointment  
Civic Square Bldg., Room 363

tel: 848-932-2370  
e-mail: rlake@ejb.rutgers.edu

***INTRODUCTION and OVERVIEW***

Social justice has moved to a central place in planning theory and practice, building on prior commitments to advocacy, equity, and deliberative planning. But moving beyond the abstraction of justice to definition, institutionalization, implementation, and practice has proved challenging. Social justice—a term coined by 19<sup>th</sup> century theologians with roots in Aristotelian ethics—is one of those ideals that is easy to extol and hard to realize in practice. And the challenge of implementation has been heightened by existing conditions of structural inequality, social fragmentation, globalization, authoritarianism, demagoguery, institutional failure, and more.

This seminar will try to work through the possibilities and challenges of social justice in planning and public policy. We will explore the idea of social justice as a normative principle, motivating precept, guide to action, and evaluative standard in the practice of planning and public policy. We will grapple with enduring questions and emerging realities in assessing the promise and pitfalls of tying practice to the elusive ideal of social justice.

Reaching a usable specification of social justice requires, first, a clear understanding of the concept of justice and, second, clarification of what is delimited, included, and excluded by qualifying justice as specifically “social.” Probing both sets of questions is a tall order but that is our task in this seminar. First, what is the meaning of justice in the context of planning and public policy? Is justice a universal principle or is it context-dependent? Is justice a process for achieving desirable outcomes? Or is justice a standard for evaluating outcomes once they are achieved? Then, what is “social” about social justice? Is social justice a subset or domain of a larger or more encompassing ideal of justice? If so, what are its substantive limits, spatial boundaries, and analytical correlates? Or, rather than a substantive domain, does the social refer to a deliberative community or a collective process within which a specification of justice can be defined and applied? Our readings will work through these theoretical/conceptual considerations illustrated through empirical applications in housing, community development, the environment, transportation, diversity, inequality, and other examples.

Readings and discussions will proceed along four parts in seeking answers to these and related questions (see Class Schedule and Readings below).

**Part I** (weeks 1-2) will **introduce** the questions and issues raised by a commitment to social justice in the practice of planning and public policy. Why is social justice an appropriate, tenable, or necessary consideration for planners and policy-makers? What is entailed in thinking about justice in this context? What is the problem for which social justice is the solution?

**In Part II** (weeks 3-7), we will examine a range of contending **approaches** to understanding the nature, dynamics, and requirements of justice as an ideal and a guide to practice in planning and public policy. A voluminous literature in philosophy, politics, ethics, and the social sciences has defined and conceptualized justice in disparate ways, variously focusing on the fairness of outcomes, the legitimacy of process, the integrity of deliberation, the inclusiveness of knowledge claims, and a pragmatist understanding that seeks to transcend the dualism of process and outcomes. Each of these understandings and approaches entails priorities and commitments that situate the ideal of social justice differently with respect to the practice of planning and public policy. This diversity of approaches and perspectives, in turn, requires clarity and reflection on the meaning, implications, and requirements of justice that we choose to employ as a guide to practice.

**Part III** (weeks 8-11) will focus on the **contexts** of justice: issues and considerations that pose challenges to a commitment to social justice. (How) can the ideal of social justice be advanced under conditions of structural inequality and unequal power relations? How is social justice operationalized in the context of multiculturalism and diversity, and in the face of dynamics of inclusion and exclusion, citizenship, community, and understandings of the public interest? What is the appropriate spatial scale of justice in an era marked by both intensified localism and rampant globalization? What, if anything, is the role of the state in the realization of social justice?

Finally, **Part IV** (weeks 12-14) is devoted to **case studies** via in-class student presentations of research papers examining social justice in planning and public policy (more information on this below). The final class meeting will provide a summary and wrap-up discussion on what we have learned and what remains to be known.

## **LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

By the end of the semester, you should be able to:

- Understand and evaluate a variety of answers to the question: “What is social justice?”
- Articulate a rationale for social justice as among competing goals of planning and public policy.
- Recognize the barriers to the achievement of social justice in planning and public policy and be able to identify and assess strategies for reducing those barriers.
- Research and report on a case study of planning or policy in which social justice was explicitly invoked and/or played a role in development of the case.
- Advance the theory and practice of social justice in planning and public policy.

## **EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

### **1. Reading and active participation in seminar discussions [30%]**

This is a **graduate-level seminar**, in which each seminar member shares responsibility to actively participate in the teaching and learning that we accomplish in class each week.

Active participation requires:

- regular class attendance
- completing the assigned readings in full in advance of each week’s class meeting
- engaging with other seminar members in the respectful and constructive exchange of ideas

**2. Leading class discussion [10%]**

Each student will be responsible to lead the seminar discussion during one week of the semester. This involves:

- careful and thorough reading of the week's materials
- preparation of questions and topics for discussion in advance of the seminar meeting
- a summary of relevant related literature (critiques, reviews, illustrations, examples, etc.) for presentation to seminar members
- guiding the discussion of the week's readings

**3. Completion of two written critical reflection papers (approx. 5 pages each) discussing and evaluating the readings assigned in Parts II and III [30%]**

You may select any of the readings within Part II (Approaches to Justice) as the subject of your first essay, and any of the readings within Part III (Contexts of Justice) as the subject of your second essay. Your essays should not merely summarize the readings; rather, they should offer a critical assessment of, and engagement with, ideas or issues in the readings. Guidelines for preparing reflection papers will post posted on the class Sakai site and will be distributed during the first seminar meeting.

Reflection papers are due at the beginning of the class session in which the reading is assigned and discussed. Submit your papers as an e-mail attachment (.docx or .pdf) before class, in hard copy at the beginning of the class period, or in the Assignments folder on the class Sakai site. Papers must be typed, double-spaced, in 12-point font and must conform to professional standards of grammar, punctuation, and citation format.

**4. Researching, writing, and oral presentation of a seminar paper [30%].**

The paper should provide a theoretical and empirical analysis of a specific case study in which concerns of social justice played a role in the practice of planning or public policy. Data for your case study may be obtained through original research (e.g., interviews, participant-observation, etc.) or may rely on secondary sources or both. More information on this will be provided in class.

For your guidance in planning your work, the following due dates will apply:

- On **February 8<sup>th</sup>**, submit a one-page statement describing your selected research topic and the sources you expect to use in conducting your research.
- Oral seminar presentations (20 minutes + 10 minutes for discussion) are scheduled for **April 12<sup>th</sup>** and **April 19<sup>th</sup>**.
- Written papers (approx. 20 pages) are due **one week** following your oral presentation.

## ***ACADEMIC INTEGRITY***

Plagiarism, cheating, or any other form of academic dishonesty will not be tolerated, will result in a grade of 'F' or zero (0) for the assignment in question, and may jeopardize your continued enrollment in the program. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to the use of another's words or ideas without proper attribution. Please familiarize yourself with the University's policy on plagiarism and academic integrity found at the following sources:

<http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/>

<http://gsnb.rutgers.edu/academic-integrity-grad-students>

## **REQUIRED READINGS**

The following required texts are available at the Rutgers Bookstore:

Gary Craig, Tania Burchardt and David Gordon, eds. 2008. *Social Justice and Public Policy: Seeking Fairness in Diverse Societies*. Bristol and Chicago: Policy Press.

Susan Fainstein. 2010. *The Just City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Iris Marion Young. 2011. *Responsibility for Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Additional required readings listed in the Class Schedule below will be posted by week under "Resources" on the class Sakai site.

## **CLASS SCHEDULE AND READINGS**

### **PART I. INTRODUCTION TO JUSTICE**

#### **JANUARY 18 INTRODUCTION: SOCIAL JUSTICE THOUGHT AND PRACTICE**

"The Queen v. Dudley and Stephens," in Michael Sandel, ed. *Justice: A Reader*, 3-7.

#### **JANUARY 25 DEFINING THE PROBLEM**

Gary Craig et al. 2008. *Social Justice & Public Policy*.

"Introduction," pp. 1-16.

Ch. 1. "Social justice and public policy: a view from political philosophy," pp. 17-32.

Ch. 2. "Social justics and public policy: a social policy perspective," pp. 33-51.

Iris Young. 1990. "Five faces of oppression." Ch. 2 in *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press, pp. 39-65.

Heather Campbell and Robert Marshall. 1999. "Ethical frameworks and planning theory." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23,3: 464-478.

Heather Campbell and Robert Marshall. 2006. "Towards justice in planning: a reappraisal." *European Planning Studies* 14,2: 239-252.

Anna Brand. 2015. "The politics of defining and building equity in the twenty-first century." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35: 249-264.

E. Ferrari. 2012. Competing ideas of social justice and space: locating critiques of housing renewal in theory and practice. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 12: 263-280.

## **PART II. APPROACHES TO JUSTICE**

### **FEBRUARY 1 DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE**

Susan Fainstein. 2010. *The Just City*. Read all.

Robert Lake. 2014. Review of *The Just City*, in *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 34,3: 358-360

### **FEBRUARY 8 PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

Amartya Sen. 2009. *The Idea of Justice*.

Ch. 2. "Rawls and beyond," pp. 52-74.

Ch. 15. "Democracy as public reason," pp. 321-337.

Ch. 16. "The practice of democracy," pp. 338-354.

Iris Young. 2000. "Democracy and justice." In *Inclusion and Democracy*, pp. 16-51.

Andrew BurrIDGE and Nick Gill. 2017. "Conveyor-belt justice: precarity, access to justice, and uneven geographies of legal aid in UK asylum appeals." *Antipode* 49,1: 23-42.

Tom Wolff et al. 2017. "Collaborating for equity and justice: moving beyond Collective Impact." *Nonprofit Quarterly* Winter.

Gareth Edwards, Louise Reid, and Colin Hunter. 2016. "Environmental justice, capabilities, and the theorization of well-being." *Progress in Human Geography* 40,6: 754-769.

Corianne Payton Scally and J. Rosie Tighe. 2015. "Democracy in action? NIMBY as impediment to equitable affordable housing siting." *Housing Studies*  
DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2015.1013093

### **FEBRUARY 15 DELIBERATIVE AND EPISTEMIC JUSTICE**

Patsy Healey. 2012. "Re-enchanting democracy as a mode of governance." *Critical Policy Studies* 6,1: 19-39.

Iris Young. 1996. "Communication and the other: beyond deliberative democracy." In Seyla Benhabib, ed. *Democracy and Difference*. Princeton University Press, pp. 120-135.

Elizabeth Anderson. 1999. What is the point of equality? *Ethics* 109,2: 287-337.

Susan Dieleman. 2015. "Epistemic justice and democratic legitimacy." *Hypathia* 30,4: 794-810.

Alan March. 2004. "Democratic dilemmas, planning and Ebenezer Howard's Garden City." *Planning Perspectives* 19: 409-433.

Danielle Allen. 2004. "Epilogue: powerful citizens." In *Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship since Brown v. Board of Education*, pp. 161-186.

**FEBRUARY 22 PRAGMATIC JUSTICE**

Richard Rorty. 2010. "Justice as a larger loyalty." In *The Rorty Reader*, pp.433-443.

Robert Lake. 2017. "Justice as subject and object of planning," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, in press.

Robert Lake. 2016. "On poetry, pragmatism, and the urban possibility of creative democracy." *Urban Geography* DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2016.1272195.

Charles Hoch. 2002. "Evaluating plans pragmatically." *Planning Theory* 1,1: 53-75.

Justus Uitermark and Walter Nicholls. 2015. "Planning for social justice: strategies, dilemmas, tradeoffs." *Planning Theory* DOI: 10.1177/1473095215599027

Susan Dieleman. 2014. "Pragmatist tools for public administration." *Administration & Society* DOI: 10.1177/0095399714541268

Patricia Shields. 2003. "The community of inquiry: classical pragmatism and public administration." *Administration and Society* 35,5: 510-538.

**MARCH 1 RESPONSIBILITY FOR JUSTICE**

Iris Young. 2011. *Responsibility for Justice*. Read all.

**PART III. CONTEXTS OF JUSTICE****MARCH 8 STRUCTURAL INEQUALITY**

David Harvey. 1997. "The environment of justice." In *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 366-402.

Iris Young. 2006. "Taking the basic structure seriously." *Perspectives on Politics* 4,1: 91-97.

Thomas Piketty. 2017. "A practical vision of a more equal society." *New York Review of Books*, June 25

Robert Lake. 1996. "Volunteers, NIMBYs, and environmental justice: dilemmas of democratic practice." *Antipode* 28,2: 160-174.

Katherine Hankins and Andy Walter. 2012. "Gentrification with justice: an urban ministry collective and the practice of place-making in Atlanta's inner city neighborhoods." *Urban Studies* 49,7: 1507-1526.

**MARCH 15 [NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK]**

**MARCH 22 DIVERSITY, INCLUSION, COMMUNITY, AND MULTIPLE PUBLICS**

Gary Craig et al, eds. *Social Justice and Public Policy*

Ch. 3. "Multiculturalism, social justice and the welfare state," pp. 53-76.

Ch. 5. "Recognition and voice: the challenge for social justice," pp. 105-122.

Ch. 11. "The limits of compromise? Social justice, 'race' and multiculturalism," pp. 231-250.

Nancy Fraser. 2004. "Institutionalizing democratic justice: redistribution, recognition, and participation." In Seyla Benhabib and Nancy Fraser, eds. *Pragmatism, Critique, Judgment*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 125-147.

Jane Wills. 2016. "(Re)locating community in relationships: questions for public policy." *Sociological Review* 64: 639-656.

Malcolm Tait. 2016. "Planning and the public interest: still a relevant concept for planners?" *Planning Theory* 15,4: 335-343.

Christopher Maidment. 2016. "In the public interest? Planning in the Peak District National Park." *Planning Theory* 15,4: 366-385.

**MARCH 29 SCALES OF JUSTICE**

Gary Craig et al, eds. *Social Justice and Public Policy*

Ch. 6. "Globalization, social justice and the politics of aid," pp. 123-138.

Mustafa Dikec. 2001. "Justice and the spatial imagination." *Environment and Planning A* 33,10: 1785-1806.

Nancy Fraser. 2009. Who counts? Dilemmas of justice in a postwestphalian world. *Antipode* 41,1: 281-297.

Heather Campbell. 2006. "Just planning: the art of situated ethical judgment." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26: 92-106.

James DeFilippis, R. Fisher and E. Shragge. 2006. Neither romance nor regulation: Re-evaluating community. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30: 673-689.

Mark Purcell. 2006. "Urban democracy and the local trap." *Urban Studies* 43,11: 1921-1941.

**APRIL 5 JUSTICE IN/THROUGH THE STATE**

Richard Rorty. 1998. "American national pride: Whitman and Dewey." In *Achieving Our Country*, pp. 3-38.

Mark Purcell. 2016. "For democracy: planning and publics without the state." *Planning Theory* 15,4: 386-401.

Michael Novak. 2009. "Social justice: not what you think it is. *Heritage Lectures*, No. 1138. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.  
[www.heritage.org/Research/Religion/hl1138.cfm](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Religion/hl1138.cfm)

Robert Lake. 2002. Bring back big government. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26: 815-822.

#### **PART IV. CASES**

**APRIL 12      CLASS PRESENTATIONS**

**APRIL 19      CLASS PRESENTATIONS**

**APRIL 26      SUMMARY**