

11.201, Gateway: Planning Action
Prof. Xavier de Souza Briggs
Lecture 14

I. Class Objectives

Xav began class by outlining the following objectives:

1. Examine your own 'moral compass' (assumptionist approach)
2. An argument is persuading those who don't already agree

He then said that based on past students professional writing that we want to overcome challenges. Though the Harper and Stein piece was dense for today's reading, it is nothing compared to the original version. The key focus of the Harper and Stein piece should be on early theories (those mentioned in the beginning of the piece): ethical theories are implicit, and locate your own approach and argue it well. Previously, writers have asserted fairness without argument – this can be overcome by locating your own approach and arguing it well.

II. Value of Theory

Annette Kim led the class today. She stated that theory can help us to:

3. Understand, conceptualize situations
4. Anticipate positions and stances of others
5. See implicit differences
6. Search for possible resolutions

The article we read for today was helpful in laying out these positions. Using the framework on the case from last time, Vietnam, China, and Connecticut, will help us list even more pros and cons about the case. Using the cases will also help better understand the four uses of theory outlined above, and in addition help us see what is not discussed in debates.

III. Principles of Ethics

There are two big principles to ethics:

7. Ends (Consequentialist)
 - Judging by what happens at the end takes precedent.
 - For example, "by any means necessary."
8. Means (Deontological)
 - how we treat each other, etc
 - derived from Kant's principle of Humanity where he treats the mean as ends
 - individuals can't be sacrificed for greater good
 - Friedman wrote on it also

IV. Examples of Ethical Stances

- b. Consequential Examples
 1. Utilitarian Framework

- a. Ends matter
 - b. Example: neoclassical economics
 - c. Maximize the sum
 - d. Criticisms:
 - i. Different incomes
 - ii. Currency is money, some things are not captured well like historical preservation or environment
 - e. Might lead to majority rule and sacrifice of minority rule
 - f. Very individualistic approach to decision-making
 - g. Devoid of power issues – people become limited in options
 - h. Doesn't address personal freedom
 - i. Can be expressed through cost benefit analysis
2. Environmental Ethics
- 1. Environmental ends are important
 - 2. Based on Leopold who said land use is also part of ethics
 - 3. It's a range from less anthropocentric to more
 - 4. Criticisms:
 - a. How we achieve these ends still matters
 - b. Environmental justice
3. Marxist
- 1. End Criteria is how disenfranchised are impacted
 - 2. from resolution to class structure
 - 3. how is worker class interest, etc, treated
 - 4. Criticism:
 - a. Is class appropriate to evaluate outcomes?
- c. Deontological Approaches
1. Pluralist
- 1. Find answer through open political process
 - 2. Criteria depends on discourse
 - 3. Criticisms:
 - a. How do you do that without power influence
 - b. How can this serve all types of societies?
 - c. Is everyone's idea given equal value?
 - d. Where costs are dispersed widely, who participates varies on level of care – people who are impacted the most participate the most
2. Nozic – Libertarian
- 1. humans have indelible rights that can't be sacrificed such as freedom
 - a. example: "individual freedoms"
 - b. can be groups of people who want to decide how to live
 - 2. Criticisms
 - a. Too individual
 - b. Doesn't account for society impact
 - c. Benefits those with initial resources
 - d. Doesn't account for power
3. Rawls
- 1. Procedural and substantive theory based on rational people and veil of ignorance

- a. How would you choose?
 - b. Therefore, help the least off person
- 2. Criticisms
 - a. This comes from a plural context and doesn't apply the same across cultures
 - b. Doesn't change structural problems of society
 - c. Unclear who's best or worse off
- d. Procedural Examples
 - 1. Habermas
 - 1. We live in constrained Society with domination on all levels therefore communication leads to distorted views
 - a. Remove constraint and produce new discourse
 - b. Use consensus
 - c. Work is to unravel distorted view about communication
 - 2. Critique:
 - a. Impasse
 - b. Time consuming
 - c. Privileges planner over plans

V. Group Exercise

The class was split into four frameworks: Utilitarian, Marx/Structuralist/Habermas, Libertarian, and Pluralist. In groups, think through Asian land practices and how would the frameworks be voiced from their perspective? Think about rebuttals also.

VI. Group Results

- e. Utilitarian
 - 1. benefits of displacing people outweighed loss (e.g. economic growth, future growth)
 - 2. measure of dollars, investment is good
 - 3. inefficiency of land use is corrected
 - 4. leads to more choices and options
 - 5. net aggregate for greater good
- f. Marxist/Structuralist/Habermasian
 - 1. Farmers were left out
 - 2. new narratives were occurring
 - 3. people felt led down because these countries were Marxist
 - 4. It was still a class struggle
 - 5. critical of the state and how elites served their own interest
 - 6. bureaucratic domination
 - 7. actions will cause major structural changes
 - 8. the young tend to benefit more
- g. Libertarian
 - 1. state ownership takings were wrong
 - 2. compensation is too low
 - 3. more private economic decision making is needed
- h. Pluralist
 - 1. expressed voice through protests had results in Vietnam
 - 2. back door deals took place

3. there were defining groups

VII. Overview

In cross cultural ethical challenges, it is hard to use this framework because there is not a democracy. Government here was more centralized to make decisions and there were more volatile politics. These frameworks are at odds. In international development, Utilitarianism is dominant because economic growth is the main argument. There other discourse such as the feminist, pluralist and environmentalist.

What are the roles for planners in international development? NGOS are big on social construction processes. Intellectual elites in China are trying to reform the economy.