Comparison of "Advocacy" and "Conflict Resolution" Approaches to Planning

Planning theory is a slippery subject, for there are many approaches that can be brought to it. Even the definition of planning is open to discussion. Peter Hall defines it as "...an orderly sequence of action that will lead to the achievement of a stated goal or goals."[1] Andreas Faludi says it is the art of making social decisions rationally, and refers to it as "synoptic" planning. Friedmann explains, "Planning attempts to link scientific and technical knowledge to actions in the public domain."[2]

There are probably as many definitions as there are planning theoreticians. However, the definition of planning depends very much on one's perspective. Planning as a generalist field of study can be seen as serving many roles. Each planning practitioner must rely on various value systems in determining appropriate responses to "actions in the public domain."

Traditionally, planning theory is based on a traditional/rationalist approach. However, two approaches contrast with this traditional perspective—the "advocacy" approach to planning and a "conflict resolution" approach. Both challenge the traditionalist reliance on a "plan," and stress the dynamics of people and their value systems as critical to the planning process.

Traditional planners serve as advisors to those in power or in decision-making roles. Under the logic of this approach, alternatives are considered and evaluated, and the preferred alternative is pursued. Kaufman recognized this logic is typically lost on the decision-makers, who see many other factors which impact decisions. "...the approach is premised on the belief that decisionmakers will be favorably disposed towards and thereby influenced by a process that follows logical processes of analyses, development of alternatives, and evaluation of consequences. Would that it be so

---

[1] Peter Hall. 1992. *Urban and Regional Planning* (3rd edition). New York: Routledge. p. 3.

[2] John Friedmann. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowleedge to Action*.. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. p. 38.

1

simple. Unfortunately, most decisionmakers rarely behave so responsively."[3] As stated by Paul Davidoff, "Appropriate planning action cannot be prescribed from a position of value neutrality, for prescriptions are based on desired objectives."[4]

Paris[5] was a theorist who felt it was important to distinguish between the "plan" of the rational school versus consideration of the plan's context and social impact. In the same vein, Thomas[6] refers to the "contentless" versus content. Other characterizations include natural vs. social science or rationalist vs. reformer tradition. Bracken[7] has described it as classical empiricism vs. social phenomena, with social phenomena having not just fact, but "meaning," with the search not for regularities, but for significant actions.

Faludi recognizes the non-traditional approach as "normative" planning, or truth based not simply on facts, but on ethical principles and values. He suggests, "...normative theory is concerned with how planners ought to proceed rationally. Behavioural approaches focus more on the limitations which they are up against in trying to fulfil their programme of rational action."[8] Planning decisions are made up of both <u>fact</u> and <u>values</u>, and must be "factually grounded, ethically attuned, and politically astute."[9]

This need for a broader base is what has encouraged the development of the two other approaches to planning listed in your question—the equity/advocacy approach and the negotiation/mediation/conflict resolution approach. Both are what John Friedmann refers to as "action-oriented" planning. In action-oriented planning, it is understood

---

3 Jerome L. Kaufman. 1979. "The Planner as Interventionist in Public Policy Issues." from Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb (Editors). *Planning Theory in the 1980's*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: The Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University. p. 181.

4 Paul Davidoff. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 31:4 (November 1965).

5 Chris Paris. 1982. *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*. New York: Pergamon Press. p. 5.

6 Michael J. Thomas 1982. "The Procedural Planning Theory of A. Faludi." *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*. Chris Paris (ed.). New York: Pergamon Press. p. 14.

7 Ian Bracken. 1981. *Urban Planning Methods: Research and Policy Analysis*. New York: Methuen. p. 110.

8 A. Faludi. 1973. *Planning Theory*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. p. 4.

9 John Forester. 1994. "Judgment and the Cultivation of Appreciation in Policy-Making." *American Behavioral Scientist*. Vo. 38, No. 1, September 1994. pp. 67.

that decisions are more important than knowledge, and planning must bring about change to be worthwhile. The assumptions forming its base are the following:

- Knowledge is based on experience, not simply on universal principles;
- Our communication and knowledge is highly personal, not universal;
- To understand knowledge, one must understand personal or shared beliefs;
- There will be resistance to change to be overcome.[10]

The question inherent in this approach is, Whose beliefs should be used as the base? the powerful? or the weak? And should planners have beliefs as well, for planners are asked to deal with information in an objective way. Planning is attuned to information flow, but information cannot be processed in a completely objective manner. As Forester explains, planners:

- not only give information on fact, but also on how to evaluate fact;
- not only inform, but educate imaginations;
- not only report, but cultivate appreciation and good judgment;
- not only exercise power, but also empower.[11]

How do planners go beyond the simple base of fact and interpolate it into an "action-oriented" approach? They must first have a foundation in both ethical principles and planning values. The basic ethical principles for planners are stated in the AICP Code of Ethics and the APA's Statement of Ethical Principles for Planning. These ethics have four distinct dimensions:

1. The ethics of everyday behavior
     e.g., Is it a deductible expense?
2. The ethics of administrative discretion
     e.g., Where should a landfill be located?
3. The ethics of planning techniques
     e.g., Is the Urban Transportation Modeling System value neutral?

---

[10] John Friedmann. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowleedge to Action.*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

[11] John Forester. 1994. "Judgment and the Cultivation of Appreciation in Policy-Making." *American Behavioral Scientist*. Vo. 38, No. 1, September 1994.

4. The ethics of plans and policies
    e.g., How far should environmental laws limit individual property owners?[12]

While incorporating ethical principles, planners also need to bring to their role a set of planning values. So[13] has listed the appropriate values as follows:

- Health
- Conservation of resources
- Efficiency
- Beauty
- Equity
- Pluralism and individuality
- Democratic participation and democratic responsibility
- Rational management

Comparison of Rational, Conflict Resolution, and Advocacy Planning

The impact both Conflict Resolution and Advocacy Planning has had on traditional Rational planning can most clearly be seen through a direct comparison of these three approaches. The following outline compares them in the following ways: their primary tool; the time frame they are most adapted to; the process utilized in each approach; its primary goal; and the major criticism of each.

Traditional/Rational Approach

    Primary tool: Comprehensive Plan

    Time frame: Long range

    Process: Traditional 8-step process[14]

    Goal: Rational, long-range master vision

    Criticism: Too "ivory tower"-ish; almost impossible

Conflict Resolution/Negotiation/Mediation Approach

---

[12]   Martin Wachs. 1985. *Ethics in Planning*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center for Urban Policy Research.

[13]   Frank So. Reference unknown.

[14]   1. problem identification; 2. assets and constraints; 3. goals and objectives; 4. identify alternatives; 5. evaluate alternatives; 6. select appropriate alternative(s); 7. implementation; 8. evaluation

Primary tool: Political suasion

Time frame: Elections

Process: Negotiation, Persuasion

Goal: Work efficiently within the democratic, representative process

Criticism: No sense of vision

Advocacy/Equity Approach

Primary tool: Alliance with a particular group

Time frame: Defined by interest span of group

Process: Represent issues from the perspective of group

Goal: Include perspectives normally ignored in traditional process

Criticism: Doesn't look at broader considerations

Advocacy Planning Approach

Advocacy planning grew out of the movement toward pluralist politics during the 1960s. Its roots go much further back, however, for it can be seen as evolving from the Utopian movement of the 19th century. Utopianism brought the idea of establishing ideal communities located away from the mainstream, where many of the social inequities found in urban areas could be redressed. It emphasized the importance of the social and physical environment on improving human character, and attempted to establish a balance between the industrial and agricultural sectors that were being torn apart during the Industrial Revolution.

Robert Owen (1771-1858) is perhaps the best-known of these Utopian planners. He built ideal "intentional communities" in both England and the United States, attempting to have capital and labor working harmoniously together. As an industrialist, he felt happy workers meant increased productivity, and he took the unusual position of advocating on their behalf.

Out of this Utopianism came a new movement, that of Social Anarchism. Established through the labor movement, self-managing communes were encouraged as a way for

5

residents to be free of state interference. They had a deep-rooted suspicion of hierarchical relationships, especially the state, and were willing to use mass action in defiance of state control. Pierre Joseph Proudhon may have been the first to espouse such ideas, which included a minimalist state, communalism, and government through a loose federation of communal communities.

Others brought different theories to the problem of dealing with the underclass. As described in Harper and Stein[15] these various theories included the following:

Utilitarian Ethical Theory:
    evaluates the rightness or wrongness of acts by their consequences
    the best act is one that maximizes good (usually happiness or well-being)

Negative Rights Theory: (Nozick)
    evaluates acts based on whether they respect or violate rights of others
    any interference with the rights of individuals must be morally justified
        otherwise, individuals are simply tools

---

[15] Harper, Thomas L. and Stanley M. Stein. 1992. "The Centrality of Normative Ethical Theory to Contemporary Planning Theory." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. Vol. 11, No. 2 (Winter 1992). pp. 105-116.

Rawls' Ethical Theory:

> decisions made as if one didn't know their own position in society
>> disinterested and fair

> leads to 2 overriding principles—individual liberty and equality

> economic equality
>> worst-off group is better off than under any other system

Habermas' Ethical Theory

> our society is too reductionist—sees everything as objective and scientific

> planner's role is consciousness-raising of society for open discussion

Communitarian Ethical Theory:

> moral values come from the community in general
>> values of individuals discovered from various communal attachments

Friedmann presents it as an alternative to the rational decision-making model, made up of five elements:

1. Normative: value oriented rather than efficiency-oriented
2. Innovative: innovation rather than resource allocation studies
3. Political: politically involved vs. neutral and non-political
4. Transactive: empowering vs. status quo
5. Based on social learning: social learning process vs. document orientation[16]

Planning has always been seen as an arm of the state, and planners have not been well situated to represent the needs of disenfranchised segments of society. To minority groups, planning has been the tool of the rich and powerful which allows them to keep control. This is most obvious in the use of zoning as a tool of planning.

Peter Marcuse, in an article written for the *APA (American Planning Association) Journal*, listed a number of "critical junctures" in the history of planning where planners could have had a significant impact, but instead waived their responsibility. One of those key junctures took place in the 1920s, when zoning was being first

---

[16]   John Friedmann. 1993. "Toward a Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 59, No. 4. pp. 482-485.

becoming accepted. Marcuse contends that planners defaulted by not embracing zoning, but rather seeing it as a threat to them professionally. Because of this, they lost the opportunity to mold the concept of zoning to also deal with social ills, and "...reject its use to exclude the poor, blacks, or unconventional households, from entrenched residential communities, which made zoning more a tool to protect real estate values than to improve the quality of life in democratic communities."[17]

In a sense zoning has created a situation likened to that of a private club. The community, through adoption of zoning ordinance provisions, creates exclusive enclaves open only to those meeting its requirements. Thus, it becomes a government supported and mandated selection process which determines who is economically eligible and who is not. Indeed, since private residential communities cannot, by law, discriminate based on race, religion, et cetera, there is little real difference between the selection process of a private residential community and the process effectively resulting from zoning.

Sometimes the discriminatory nature of zoning was much more obvious and overt, as shown in the following description.

> "The basic purpose of suburban zoning was to keep Them where They
> belonged -- Out. If They had already gotten In, then its purpose was to
> confine Them to limited areas. The exact identity of Them varied a bit
> about the country ... The advocates of exclusionary zoning justified it with
> euphemisms and technical jargon that sometimes even provoked protection
> of the environment ... It was racism with a progressive, technocratic veneer
> ... zoning gave every promise of continuing to keep many suburbs closed to
> all but affluent acceptable whites."[18]

Because zoning was such an overriding force in planning, and because of its discriminatory nature, the needs of the disenfranchised were not being properly represented in the halls of city government. The Advocacy Planning movement

---

[17] Marcuse, Peter. "Who/ What Decides What Planners Do?". APA Journal, Winter 1989: 79-81.

[18] Popper, F.J. *The Politics of Land Use Reform*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981. p. 54-55.

evolved to address these oversights. Saul Alinsky, a radical community organizer from Chicago, was the first of these community organizers to gain national recognition for his advocacy approach. His belief was that the "basic truth" was with the people themselves, and that if people have the power to act, they will in the long-run, most of the time, reach the right decisions. His goal was for the poor of America to get what they wanted, without establishing value judgments on what that should be. As he said, "Do you know what the poor of America or, I might add, the poor of the world want? They want a bigger and fatter piece of these decadent, degenerate, bankrupt, materialistic, bourgeois values and what goes with it."[19] This approach was counter to others, who argued the poor needed their own counter-ideology. Alinsky was an accommodationist, who felt the poor should get a better deal without societal transformation.

Advocate planners such as Alinsky were not interested in seeing planning in a comprehensive sense. Such "unitary planning," conducted under the auspices of a single central agency whose goal was to develop a comprehensive plan, was seen as a major problem. Advocate planners were interested only in advocating the causes of the groups with which they were working. As stated by Davidoff, "If a planner is not working directly for the objective of eradicating poverty and racial and sexual discrimination, then she or he is counter-productive."[20]

Advocate planners work toward "plural planning," understanding the appropriateness of alternative plans being developed by groups with alternative goals. Supporters have argued that advocacy planning relieved planning agencies of the responsibility for representing positions they did not fully support. It also forced planning agencies to compete with other groups for support by the city, and this competition of interests led

---

[19] Saul D. Alinsky. 1969. *Reveille for Radicals*. New York: Vintage Books. (Original 1946) pp. xii-xiii.

[20] Paul Davidoff. 1979. "The Redistributive Function in Planning: Creating Greater Equity Among Citizens of Communities." from Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb (Editors). *Planning Theory in the 1980's*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: The Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University. p. 69.

9

to better planning. In this arena advocate planners were forced to go beyond the role of critics, and come up with their own plans.

Kaufman recognized this new role for planners as being interventionists. "Within any system, decisions are continuously made to allocate or withhold resources with or without the planner's input, the process having a momentum of its own. Furthermore, a number of different interest groups operate on multiple issues to advance their own policy preferences... So to increase the chances that their 'special' interests will be embodied more in eventual system decisions, many contemporary planning bodies compensate at times by planing a more active, interventionist role."[21] This is the role of the advocate planner.

Advocacy planning took a "pluralist" approach to planning. It challenged the notion that there was a single, common "public interest" that was the same for everyone. Such unitary planning perpetuated the monopoly of the powerful over the planning function, and discouraged participation. Paul Davidoff, in his classic article titled, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," argued that planning needs to be more inclusive and participatory. He advocated a shift from the traditional emphasis on land use planning to social-economic planning which incorporates the goals and values of various segments of society.

Advocacy planning's pluralist approach recognizes there are many conflicting interests, some of which are irreconcilable. Planning policies and programs can, by their nature, create winners and losers. Typically the losers are the groups without access to power, and policies and programs will not address many of their needs unless there is a dedicated attempt to redress this balance of power and decision-making

My own experience with advocate planning was as a member of the staff of the Baltimore Neighborhood Design Center from 1970 to 1971. The Center solicited architects and planners in the city of Baltimore, encouraging them to volunteer their services to community groups around the city and enable those groups to develop preliminary plans for projects the groups felt had a high priority. These preliminary

---

[21]   Kaufman. pp. 183-184.

plans would typically lead to gaining funding which would likely not have been obtained without such advocate services. There were many advocacy centers established in the 1970s in cities across the U.S., but few have survived the political changes of the late 70s and 1980s. It is very satisfying to know that the Baltimore Neighborhood Design Center is still active and successful as an advocacy design and planning agency, and still keeps its autonomy from city government, relying almost exclusively on volunteers for its support.

Robert Goodman presents the alternative approach in his influential book from the period when advocacy planning was coming to the fore. In *After the Planners*, he lays waste to the traditional planning approach, arguing that a new, advocate, form of planning must take its place. But in 1971, when the book was written, advocacy planning had already had its weaknesses exposed. As he explains,

> "Indeed, we were able to delay or make changes in some urban-renewal and highway plans. But we were to learn the limited extent of our influence... Contrary to popular mythology, [advocacy] planning did not bring socialism—in fact, it became a sophisticated weapon to maintain the existing control under a mask of rationality, efficiency, and science.

> "Advocacy planning and other citizen-participation programs could help maintain this mask by allowing the poor to administer their own state of dependency. The poor could direct their own welfare programs, have their own lawyers, their own planners and architects, so long as the economic structure remained intact—so long as the basic distribution of wealth, and hence real power, remained intact."[22]

Under the advocacy planning defined by Alinsky, power was to be given to the disenfranchised to be used however they saw fit. However, as described above by Goodman, the decision-making wielded by minority groups impacted only on themselves, and had little impact on the larger economic structure of society. The traditional structure of power remained intact. As a result of this frustration of not being able to gain the reigns of decision-making power through an advocacy approach,

---

22   Robert Goodman. 1971. *After the Planners*. New York: Simon and Schuster. pp. 171-172.

planners shifted their emphasis to "equity planning." Equity planning recognized that the poor and disenfranchised would only be served if they were served from within the corridors of power, rather than from the neighborhood. Equity planners gained positions of authority and then used that position to institute policies and programs to better serve the underserved population.

In 1979 Davidoff argued for incorporating a "redistributive function in planning," since all planning issues have a distributive impact. "The redistributive function in planning is aimed at reducing negative social conditions caused by great disparities in the possession, by classes of the population, of important resources resulting from public or private action. It aims to create conditions of greater justice, equality, or fairness—which is usually termed equity."[23]

Equity planning, as an arm of advocacy planning, has been less combative and more willing to use the traditional power structure as a means to address the issues of urban inequalities. It is a "kinder and gentler" form of advocacy planning which stresses the substance of programs rather than the level of participation. "The issue thus shifts from who governs to who gets what. Planners begin with the everarching goal of increasing equality; who determines the means and intermediate goals depends on the situation."[24]

The planner best representing the equity planning aspect of advocacy planning is Norman Krumholz. In his work as Director of Planning Commission for the City of Cleveland, he consciously tried to counter policies and programs "beneficial in the aggregate" with policies and programs that attempted to redress the distribution of costs and benefits. He saw this not creating conflict, but expressed faith "that equity in the social, economic, and political relationships among people is a requisite condition for a just and lasting society."[25] Krumholz felt "Conventional planners basically view

---

[23] Paul Davidoff. 1979. p. 69.

[24] Susan S. Fainstain and Norman Fainstain. 1996. "City Planning and Political Values: An Updated View." from Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstain (Editors). *Readings in Planning Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, Inc. p. 270.

[25] Norman Krumholz and J. Forester. 1990. *Making Equity Planning Work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. p. 51.

12

themselves as giving their bosses choices—or finding the most efficient means to an end chosen by their bosses, whom they assume represent the people through the democratic process."[26] In contrast, equity planners assume the existing democratic institutions are biased against the interests of those at the bottom of the social system. Equity planners seek a system of better downward redistribution.

Under his tenure the Cleveland City Planning Commission acted in a way that was "activist and interventionist in style and redistributive in objective."[27] He pushed policies and programs that gave a wider range of choices to residents who had few choices. Although politically risky, Krumholz and his coworkers felt an obligation to this planning approach. He outlined four reasons he felt this approach was needed and appropriate: "(1) the urgent reality of conditions in Cleveland, (2) the inherent unfairness and exploitative nature of our urban development process, (3) the inability of local politiecs to address these problems, and (4) our conception of the ethics of professional planning practice."[28] The fourth reason listed is especially appropriate, for planning which expands opportunities and representation to all segments of our society is a core tenet of the profession. The AICP Code of Ethics specifically states this as follows: "A planner must strive to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons, and must urge the alteration of policies, institutions and decisions which oppose such needs."[29]

In spite of Krumholz's many notable years pushing along equity planning principles in Cleveland and elsewhere, he saw its impact on other planners as limited. This view was expressed in a retrospective article written in 1982.

---

[26] Krumholz, Norman and Pierre Clavel. 1994. *Reinventing Cities: Equity Planners Tell Their Stories*. Philadelphia: Temple University.

[27] Norman Krumholz. 1983. "A Retrospective View of Equity Planning: Cleveland 1969–1979." from Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstain (Editors). *Readings in Planning Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, Inc. p. 345.

[28] Krumholz. 1983. p. 345.

[29] AICP Code of Ethics and Profession Conduct (Adopted October 1978—as amended October 1991). American Institute of Certified Planners. Washington, D.C.: American Institute of Certified Planners.

"How did our work in Cleveland affect the work of other practicing city planners? Probably not to any great degree, so far as I could tell. Out model, after all, asked city planners to bne what few public administrators are: activist, resk-taking in style, and redistributive in objective. As I got around to other cities, I began to perceive that most planners were not so inclined. Despite an ideological mystique, which stresses a liberal point of view and selfless service to a broad public interest, planning practice actually is cautious and conservative."[30]

Being on the fringe of political decision-making, planners have been uncomfortable pushing the limits of planning to redistribute the assets of society on a more equitable basis. Planners have largely withdrawn into the relatively protected realm of technician, and both advocacy and equity planning have faded into the shadows of applied planning theories.

Advocacy, or equity, planning should not be seen simply as a subfield of planning, but as an approach that can be used in any planning activity. It relies on building coalitions within City Hall and in the communities, winning over key leaders, and developing participatory planning processes.

Colin Kelley, a graduate student in the planning program at the University of Pittsburgh, studied how equity planning should be considered as a viable option for his city of Pittsburgh.[31] He recognized the city's political agenda was focused on professional sports, downtown department stores and budget trimming. Referred to locally as the "Cleveland Model" of urban redevelopment because of its focus on large-scale urban projects, little attention was being paid to the alleviation of poverty or the provision of affordable housing. The "trickle down" effect of this approach did not seem to be happening, and many doubted it ever would. He argued the need for equity planning within city government as a way to redress this shortcoming, linking downtown development with neighborhood renewal. This has been done, with mixed

---

[30] Krumholz. 1983. p. 358.

[31] Kelley, Colin P. 1996. "Equity Planning: A Viable Option For Pittsburgh." taken from Internet: http://www.pitt.edu/~cpkst3/netcon.html.

success, in Boston, where downtown developments must contribute to a fund to build neighborhood housing.

The Negotiation/Mediation Approach to Planning

As stated by Sager, "It seems to be a consensus in contemporary planning literature that the modern role of the planner is by no means only technical and analytical. The role includes various forms of conflict management, like facilitation, negotiation, and mediation."[32] Problems are complex, and include people—people with ideas of how things can and should be done. This precludes a total reliance on a rational approach, for not all things can be determined; some must be resolved through negotiation and mediation. This approach allows planning to be done "...without paternalism and the touch of contempt tending to go along with the suspicion of irrationality."[33]

The negotiation/mediation approach to planning emphasizes that planning is not an "ivory tower" design exercise, but involves working with people. Objective data should inform good decisions, but people's opinions, hopes and goals should also be part of the process. Therefore, good planning should include dialogues with individuals who will be impacted by policies and decisions, as well as various interest groups representing such individuals.

In considering multiple perspectives, sometimes the goals of one group will be in direct conflict with goals of another. It is then up to the planning process to include a way to respond to such conflicts of interest. A negotiation/mediation approach becomes necessary. In their national bestseller of the 1980s, *Getting to Yes*, Fisher and Ury,[34] of the Harvard Negotiation Project, have outlined a procedure for negotiation that relies neither on the hard approach (trying to dominate) or the soft approach (making concessions and compromise), but instead encourages focusing on issues, rather than personalities. Their method includes a four-step process:

---

[32] Tore Sager. 1995. "Teaching Planning Theory as Order or Fragments." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 14:3 (Spring 1995). p. 172.

[33] Sager. p. 172.

[34] Fisher, Roger and William Ury. 1983. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Penguin Books.

15

1. Separate the people from the problem.

    People tend to tie their personalities with their positions. Separating the relationship from the substance can best be accomplished by understanding the perspectives of various interests, putting yourself in their shoes. Attempts should be made to understand there relational concerns and addressing them directly outside of the process of addressing their planning-based problems.

2. Focus on interests, not positions.

    Behind opposed positions can lie shared and compatible interests. It should be the planner's concern to deal with the real interests of various parties, rather than with the positions they take, which may misrepresent their true interests.

3. Invent options for mutual gains.

    A necessary part of the process often is to be innovative, searching for options that weren't apparent in initial negotiations and position statements. This can often be successfully accomplished in a group process of brainstorming. Brainstorming accomplishes a number of things—it opens up the number of options; it invests more people in the search for common agreements; it encourages the finding new solutions incorporating dovetailed interests.

4. Insist on using objective criteria.

    By using objective criteria, the focus is away from personalities and directed toward the facts of a situation. It also encourages not a battle of wills, but a shared look for fairness, efficiency and equity. Objective criteria should apply to all sides in a dispute or conflict, and offer a means for negotiation to all sides.

Susskind and Cruikshank[35] have outlined a procedure for resolving disputes based on a three-step process—pre-negotiation, negotiation, and post-negotiation. In the pre-negotiation stage, the need for initiating a conflict resolution process must be initiated, agreed to by concerned parties, and ground rules established. Fact-finding provides a common basis for information to be used by everyone. During negotiation, the interests of all parties should be made clear, rather than the fixing of positions. In this

---

[35] Susskind, Lawrence and Jeffrey Cruikshank. 1987. *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. New York: Basic Books.

16

way, options can be explored and areas of agreement and common interests used to develop agreements and commitments. Finally, in the post-negotiation phase, the ratification of all interested parties and organizations must be solicited, and then implementation of the agreements can take place.

Lewicki lists more explicitily the processes that can be used in conflict resolution. They are shown below:

An excellent example of negotiation being used to advance a planning goal is found in "Confrontation, Negotiation, and Collaboration: Detroit's Multibillion-dollar Deal."[36] In this report is described the effort by the Detroit *Free Press* to study the question of whether the city's lending institutions had been holding back investment money and loans in the central city's African-American neighborhoods. The newspaper's thorough research and analysis showed this practice was common, even if banks did not realize they were doing it. Through a period of challenge by the banks, the newspaper held to its facts. Eventually banks found they could not pick a fight, but had to address the problem. Without being forced to admit guilt, the city and the banks began a process of increasing the level of investments within the city. As commented on by Bernard Parker, one of the leaders of the neighborhood coalition involved with this controversy:

> One thing I have found by talking to other communities is that they have a more adversarial process. They challenge the banks and sign agreements, then the community groups move on and forget how to work with the banks until the next big controversy in the next few years. They never establish a working relationship... I seems like, in these other cities, they attack, negotiate, then attack again. I hope we never have to do that in Detroit.[37]

Negotiation/conflict resolution planning is action-oriented, rather than reflective, and encourages planners to be involved directly in the day-to-day struggle of decision-making, even in the political realm. It concentrates on current issues, rather than future issues, and is largely built on strategies used in the private sector by businesses. Norman Krumholz has long been associated with a more politicized approach to planning. As he has stated, "A great many students enter the profession believing that public policy decisions are made within an orderly, rational context that hinges heavily on planners' recommendations. Nothing could be further from the truth. The public

---

[36] David Everett. 1992. "Confrontation, Negotiation, and Collaboration: Detroit's Multimillion-dollar Deal." from Gregory D. Squires. *From Redlining to Reinvestment: Community Responses to Urban Disinvestment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. pp. 109-132.

[37] Everett. p. 131.

decisionmaking process ...is generally irrational ...and chaotic and always highly politicized. The institutional role of planners is almost inconsequential."[38]

John Friedmann, one of the world's foremost planning scholars, refers to planning which is actively involved with social issues, and which involves the full community rather than just decision-makers, as "transactive planning." In his influential book from 1973,[39] he outlines a type of planning which stresses the involvement of diverse levels, all of equal importance. Transactive planning stresses the importance of the individual part as well as the whole, and is built on the concept of an "active society."

> An active society is one that is capable of learning about itself and utilizing that knowledge to effectively guide its own development. Achieving an active society is the end product in a series of factors. The first factor is dialogue or face to face communication which prompts an exchange of information and ideas among the learning group. This exchange leads to the second factor, mutual learning, whereby participants are learning *from each other*. Lastly, societal learning transpires when society is able to transform knowledge into a consensus of community action.[40]

Transactive planning means engaging in dialogue, opening yourself to another person or another group in such a way as to validate the differences in the perspectives—what Melvin Webber has referred to as the "permissive planner." By understanding others we are better able to understand ourselves. Such dialogue may lead to conflict, but it is meant to be a positive conflict which leads to better understanding. Resolution of conflict comes from finding an alliance based on shared interests and commitments. A crucial component of transactive planning is when there is a coalescence of diverse knowledge, form a holistic spectrum.

---

[38] Krumholz, Norman, Janice Cogger, and John Linner. 1978. "Make No Big Plans ... Planning in Cleveland in the 1970's." in Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb. *Planning Theory in the 1980's: a search for future directions*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Reseach, Rutgers University.

[39] John Friedmann. 1973. *Retracking America: A theory of transactive planning*. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing, Inc.

[40] Marlene K Rebori and Michael H. Legg. "Transactive Planning: A Holistic Approach for Environmental Education." taken from Internet: http://tlc.edu.uleth.ca/cicctc/naceer.pgs/pubpro.pgs/pathways/pubfiles/IV.ConfPres/StrandV/MarleneR.htm, 8 July, 1996.

19

In the 1960s Alan Altshuler argued that planning could not incorporate disparate viewpoints, for the profession was built on the principle of the comprehensive plan, and didn't have the intellectual grounding for a more pluralistic approach. Judith Innes, in a recent article, postulates the time is now ripe to incorporate consensus building techniques in planning. "Communicatively rational" decisions can be reached through deliberations "...involving all stakeholders, where all are equally empowered and fully informed, and where the conditions of ideal speech are met (statements are comprehensible, scientifically true, and offered by those who can ligitimately speak and who speak sincerely)."[41] The value of this approach is that it blends the rational unitary approach with more socially-conscious pluralistic approaches, and that it can produce decisions that approximate the public interest.

The Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has used this approach successfully in managing wilderness areas. It consciously establishes planning committees made of individuals with widely varying perspectives, including ranchers, hunters, environmentalists, and others with special interests. Policies are then formulated by finding areas of convergence within these diverse perspectives, while taking advantage of the broad areas of knowledge and expertise included.

Ian MacHarg argued for the need for planners to broaden their perspective to include those of the affected groups. "The most critical factor is the value system, for it determines the planning solution. I strongly object to much of the current planning philosophy as it is emerging in both teaching and practice, for it assumes that the planner imposes values and exercises for the good of the people. I resist this. Given a set of data, the planning solutions will vary, not with respect to the set, but with respect to the value systems of the people who seek to solve the problem. Most of the

---

[41] Judith E. Innes. 1996. "Planning Through Consensus Building: A New View of the Comprehensive Planning Ideal." *Journal ofthe American Planning Association*, 62:4 (Autumn 1996) p. 461.

important values are particular and there is no substitute for eliciting them from the constituents themselves. These values themselves become the data..."[42]

John Friedmann described four major traditions of planning theory in his book, *Planning in the Public Domain*—policy analysis, social learning, social reform, social mobilization. The first two emphasize knowledge, and the last two emphasize action, either as maintenance (social reform) or transformation (social mobilization). Although social reform represents the mainstream of planning theory, social mobilization was the precursor to the advocacy planning movement, and constituted a more activist approach to solving problems.

Judith Innes has put forward a new paradigm for planning theory which works off all of the elements described above. She refers to it as "Communicative Action." Built on the ideas of Jürgen Habermas, it is a theoretical base which looks not at what planning ought to be, but at what planners do. It assumes first that planning is an interactive, communicative activity. Communicative action theory looks at planners as actors rather than observers and neutral experts.

Based largely on the writings of people like John Friedmann and Donald Schön, these theorists question the dependency of rational planning as a tool of control. As Innes explains, "...critical theorists contend that the scientific method not only does not produce simple truth, it can conceal as much as it reveals. Science can be a tool for manipulation. Science and other ways of knowing are shaped and distorted by power in a society."[43] She goes on, "Social processes turn information into meaningful knowledge and knowledge into action. As a profession, however, we know little about developing or carrying out such processes. If professionals actually create such processes instead of following the rules of scientific inquiry, they have far more power and discretion than is legitimate, according to the norms that govern public choice."[44]

---

[42] Ian MacHarg. "Ecological Planning: The Planner as Catalyst." 1978. Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb. *Planning Theory in the 1980's: a search for future directions*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Reseach, Rutgers University.

[43] Innes, Judith E. 1995. "Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 14:3 (Spring 1995). p. 186.

[44] Innes. p. 185.

Conclusion

Tore Sager has categorized five prototype planning theories which largely overlap with those compared above. However, he uses another interesting and useful comparative tool—the relationship of knowledge to power to action (knowledge–power–action) in each approach. To paraphrase his analysis:

> *Synoptic planning* is directly comparable to the rationalist approach, with emphasis on option seeking, forecasting, impact assessment, and evaluation of alternatives. Power is not treated separately from action, so the relationship of knowledge, power and action is:
>
> $$\text{knowledge} \longrightarrow \text{action}$$
>
> *Disjointed incrementalism* is a learning-by-doing process; one takes a small step and sees what happens. Power is not addressed as a problem, and the operative relationship is:
>
> $$\text{knowledge} \longleftarrow \text{action}$$
>
> *Transactive planning* (as described by Friedmann) also does not pay much attention to power, but depends on mutual learning and action. The knowledge is based on the interchange of the processed knowledge of experts and the personal knowledge of local inhabitants, which leads to action which leads to more knowledge:
>
> $$\text{knowledge} \longleftrightarrow \text{action}$$
>
> *Advocacy planning* is based on the assumption that the knowledge of planners can empower local groups that are in danger of being run over by society at large or by powerful interests. It is a process of empowerment, and is represented by:
>
> $$\text{knowledge} \longrightarrow \text{power}$$
>
> *Radical planning* relies on gaining power through action. It relies on direct action through organizing grass roots protests and mobilizing urban social movements. Its relationship is:
>
> $$\text{power} \longleftarrow \text{action}$$

22

As is shown above, there is currently no consensus on a contemporary planning theory paradigm. Since the Rationalist approach was challenged in the 1980s, there has been a diversity of theories attempting to establish a new paradigm. These new approaches have often attempted to create stronger links between theory and practice

Gill-Chin Lim has dealt with the categorization of planning theories in a different way. He has set forth a synthetic framework. "The framework provides a general conceptual scheme to explain the reasons for diversity in planning theories in relation to the nature of planning activities and also to synthesize and bring coherence to these theories."[45] He posits that planning is a threefold activity requiring goals, instruments, and resources. These are represented in the Typology Matrix shown below:

Point A represents a process where all three have been well defined; Point B a point where none have. Planning would include the effort to increase the fuller "identification" of all three, The "Identification search" would build consensus, which would in turn increase confidence, and result in greater rigor. The Identification search process is affected by three factors—technical, intersubjective, and critico-

45   Gill-Chin Lim. 1986. "Toward a Synthesis of Contemporary Planning Theories." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 5:2 (Winter 1986). p. 75.

ethical. Technical competency is the planner's ability to apply technical rationality. Intersubjective competency is a function of the negotiative and political skills of planning. Critico-ethical competency refers to the evaluation of the legitimacy of goals and values inherent in the process.

The purpose of Lim's matrix is to provide a framework for analyses of planning approaches. It is a way to recognize the three primary threads that make up both planning theory and practice, and allows for clearer discussion of these approaches in relation to each other. Many planners concern themselves almost exclusively with the technical analyses of planning problems. This matrix forces one to recognize what is not being included as well, and encourages planners to see these approaches as complementary rather than contradictory.

Bibliography

Alexander, Ernest R. [1986] 1992. *Approaches to Planning: Introducing Current Planning Theories, Concepts, and Issues*. Philadelphia: Gordon and Breach.

Alexander, Ernest R. 1992. "A Transaction Cost Theory of Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 58, No. 2. pp. 190-200.

Alexander, Ernest R. 1994. "The Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning: What Is It To Be?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 60, No. 3. pp. 372-373.

Alinsky, Saul D. 1969. *Reveille for Radicals*. New York: Vintage Books. (Original 1946)

AICP Code of Ethics and Profession Conduct (Adopted October 1978—as amended October 1991). American Institute of Certified Planners. Washington, D.C.: American Institute of Certified Planners.

Barry, Brian and Douglas W. Rae. 1975. "Political Evaluation." *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. 1. Fred I Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, pp. 337-401.

Beauregard, Robert A. 1989. "Between modernity and postmodernity: The ambiguous position of U.S. planning." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 7 (4).

Beauregard, Robert A. 1991. "Without a Net: Modernist Planning and the Postmodern Abyss." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. Vol. 10, No. 3 (Fall 1991?). pp. 189-194.

Boyer, M. Christine. 1983. *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Boyer, M. Christine. 1988. "The Return of Aesthetics to City Planning." *Society*. Vol. 25, No. 4. pp. 49-56.

Bracken, Ian. 1981. *Urban Planning Methods: Research and Policy Analysis*. New York: Methuen.

Branch, Melville C. (ed.). 1975. *Urban Planning Theory*. Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania: Dowden, Huchinson and Ross, Inc.

Brooks, Michael P. 1988. "Four Critical Junctures in the History of the Urban Planning Profession." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 54, No. 2. pp. 241-248.

Brooks, Michael P. 1993. "A Plethora of Paradigms." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 59, No. 2. pp. 142-145.

Burchell, Robert W. and George Sternlieb. 1978. *Planning Theory in the 1980's: a search for future directions*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

Calthorpe, Peter. 1993. *The Next American Metropolis: Ecology, Community, and the American Dream*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Caro, Robert. 1975. *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York*. New York: Vintage Books.

Carpenter, Susan L. and W.J.D. Kennedy. 1988. *Managing Public Disputes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cartwright, T.J. 1991. "Planning and Chaos Theory." *Journal of the American Planning Association,* Vol. 57, No. 1 (Winter 1991). pp. 44-56.

Chadwick, George. 1978. *A Systems View of Planning: Towards a Theory of the Urban and Regional Planning Process*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr. 1965. "Toward a Theory of Urban Growth and Development." from *Urban Planning Theory*. Melville C. Branch (ed.). 1975. Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania: Dowden, Huchinson and Ross, Inc. pp. 144-163.

Checkoway, Barry. 1994. "Paul Davidoff and Advocacy Planning in Retrospect." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (Spring 1994). pp. 139-143.

Churchman, David. 1995. *Negotiation: Process, Tactics, Theory*. New York: University Press of America, Inc.

Dalton, Linda C. 1993. "The Dilemmas of the Times." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 59, No. 2. pp. 149-152.

Davidoff, Paul. 1979. "The Redistributive Function in Planning: Creating Greater Equity Among Citizens of Communities." from Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb (Editors). *Planning Theory in the 1980's*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: The Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

Davidoff, Paul. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 31:4 (November 1965).

Everett, David. 1992. "Confrontation, Negotiation, and Collaboration: Detroit's Multimillion-dollar Deal." from Gregory D. Squires. *From Redlining to Reinvestment: Community Responses to Urban Disinvestment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fainstain, Susan S. and Norman Fainstain. 1996. "City Planning and Political Values: An Updated View." from Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstain (Editors). *Readings in Planning Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Fainstein, Norman I. and Susan S. Fainstein. 1982 (orig. 1979). "New Debates in Urban Planning: the Impact of Marxist Theory within the United States." *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*. Chris Paris (ed.). New York: Pergamon Press.

Faludi, A. 1973. *Planning Theory*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Faludi. A. 1986. *Critical Rationalism and Planning Methodology*. London: Pion Limited.

Fisher, Roger and William Ury. 1983. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Penguin Books.

Forester, John. 1984. "Bounded Rationality and the Politics of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 44 (January/February 1984). pp. 23-31.

Forester, John. 1989. *Planning In the Face of Power*. Berkeley, Calkifornia: University of California Press.

Forester, John. 1993. *Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Forester, John. 1994. "Bridging Interests and Community: Advocacy Planning and the Challenges of Deliberative Democracy."*Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (Spring 1994). pp. 153-158.

Forester, John. 1994. "Judgment and the Cultivation of Appreciation in Policy-Making." *American Behavioral Scientist*. Vo. 38, No. 1, September 1994. pp. 64-74.

Friedmann, John. 1973. *Retracking America: A theory of Transactive Planning*. Garden City, New York: (Anchor Books) Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Friedmann, John. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowleedge to Action.*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Friedmann, John. 1992. *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell. (not yet read)

Friedmann, John. 1993. "Toward a Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 59, No. 4. pp. 482-485.

Friedmann, John. 1995 (orig. 1989). "Planning in the Public Domain: Discourse and Praxis." *Classic Readings in Urban Planning*. Jay M. Stein (ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Garreau, Joel. 1991. *Edge City*. New York: Anchor Books (Doubleday).

Gerstein, Arnold and James Reagan. 1986. *Win-Win: Approaches to Conflict Resolution*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith, Inc. (Peregrine Smith Books).

Greed, Clara H. 1994. *Women and Planning: Creating Gendered Realities*. New York: Routledge.

Golany, Gideon S. 1995. *Ethics and Urban Design: Culture, Form, and Environment*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Goodman, Robert. 1971. *After the Planners*. New York: Simon and Schuster.Hall, Peter. 1989.

Hall, Peter. 1992. *Urban and Regional Planning* (3rd edition). New York: Routledge.

Harper, Thomas L. and Stanley M. Stein. 1992. "The Centrality of Normative Ethical Theory to Contemporary Planning Theory." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. Vol. 11, No. 2 (Winter 1992). pp. 105-116.

Harvey, David. 1973. *Social Justice and the City*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hoch, Charles J. 1992. "The Paradox of Power in Planning Practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. Vol. 11. pp. 206-215.

Hoch, Charles. 1993. "Racism and Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 59, No. 4. pp. 451-460.

Innes, Judith E. 1995. "Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 14:3 (Spring 1995). pp. 183-189.

Innes, Judith E. 1996. "Planning Through Consensus Building: A New View of the Comprehensive Planning Ideal." *Journal ofthe American Planning Association*, 62:4 (Autumn 1996) pp. 460–472.

Kartez, Jack D. 1989. "Rational Arguments and Irrational Audiences: Psychology, Planning, and Public Judgment." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Autumn 1989). pp. 445-456.

Kaufman, Jerome L. 1979. "The Planner as Interventionist in Public Policy Issues." from Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb (Editors). *Planning Theory in the 1980's*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: The Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

Kelley, Colin P. 1996. "Equity Planning: A Viable Option For Pittsburgh." taken from Internet: http://www.pitt.edu/~cpkst3/netcon.html.

Kemp, Roger L. 1988. *America's Cities: Strategic Planning for the Future*. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Knox, Paul. 1987. *Urban Social Geography: An Introduction* (2nd edition). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Knox, Paul. 1993. *The Restless Urban Landscape*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Krueckeberg, Donald A. 1983. *Introduction to Planning History in the United States*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: The Center for Urban Policy Research.

Krueckeberg, Donald A. (editor). 1994. *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*. New York: Methuen, Inc. 1994.

Krumholz, Norman. 1983. "A Retrospective View of Equity Planning: Cleveland 1969–1979." in *Introduction to Planning History in the United States*. Donald A. Krueckeberg, editor. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University. pp. 258-302.

Krumholz, Norman and John Forester. 1990. *Making Equity Planning Work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Krumholz, Norman and Pierre Clavel. 1994. *Reinventing Cities: Equity Planners Tell Their Stories*. Philadelphia: Temple University.

Levy, John M. 1992. "What Has Happened to Planning?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 58, No. 1. pp. 81-84.

Levy, John M. *Contemporary Urban Planning*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1994.

Lewicki, Roy J., Joseph A. Litterer, David M. Saunders, and John W. Minton. 1993. *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises, and Cases*. Boston: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Lim, Gill-Chin. 1986. "Toward a Synthesis of Contemporary Planning Theories." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 5:2 (Winter 1986). pp. 75-86.

Lindblom, Charles E. 1995 (orig. 1965). "The Science of 'Muddling Through.'" *Classic Readings in Urban Planning*. Jay M. Stein (ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Lucy, William H. 1994. "If Planning Includes Too Much, Maybe It Should Include More." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 60, No. 3 (Summer 1994). pp. 305-318.

Lynch, Kevin. 1987. *Good City Form*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

McClendon, Bruce W. and Ray Quay. 1988. *Mastering Change: Winning Strategies for Effective City Planning*. Washington, D.C.: Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Mandelbaum, Seymour J. 1985. "Thinking About Cities As Systems: Reflections on the History of an Idea." *Journal of Urban History*. Vol. 11, No. 2 (February 1985). pp. 139-150.

Paris, Chris. 1982. *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Sager, Tore. 1995. "Teaching Planning Theory as Order or Fragments." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 14:3 (Spring 1995). pp. 166-172. *(Discussion of the centrality of normative theory in planning)*

Sandercock, Leonie and Ann Forsyth. 1992. "A Gender Agenda: New Directions for Planning Theory." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 58, No. 1. pp. 49-59.

Schaffer, Daniel (editor). 1988. *Two Centuries of American Planning*. London: Mansell Publishing Limited.

Sillince, John. 1986. *A Theory of Planning*. Hampshire, England: Gower Publishing Company Limited.

So, Frank. 1984. "Strategic Planning: Reinventing the Wheel?" *Planning* (February, 1984). American Planning Association. pp. 16-21.

Stein, Jay M. 1995. *Classic Readings in Urban Planning: An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Susskind, Lawrence and Jeffrey Cruikshank. 1987. *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. New York: Basic Books.

Thomas, Michael J. 1982. "The Procedural Planning Theory of A. Faludi." *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*. Chris Paris (ed.). New York: Pergamon Press.

"The Turbulent Eighth Decade: Challenges to American City Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 55, 3 (Summer, 1989).

Ury, William. 1993. *Getting Past No: Negotiating Your Way from Confrontation to Cooperation*. New York: Bantam Books.

Van der Ryn, Sim and Peter Calthorpe. 1986. *Sustainable Communities*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Wachs, Martin. 1985. *Ethics in Planning*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center for Urban Policy Research.

Wildavsky, Aaron. 1973. "If Planning Is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing." *Policy Sciences*. 4:127-53.

Wirth, Louis. 1938. "Urbanism As a Way of Life." pp. 143-164. *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities*. R. Sennett (ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.