

Reading Tips and Study Questions: The clash of planning styles—October 24th

Required reading:

1. *RPT* (Chapter 11) **Paul Davidoff**, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning."
2. (case) **Judith Innes and Judith Gruber**, "Planning Styles in Conflict," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71(2):177-188 (2005).

Recommended:

Aaron Wildavsky, "If Planning is Everything, Maybe It is Nothing," *Policy Sciences* 4(1973):127-153.

Tips and questions

This session covers our final "planning classic" in the Western planning tradition—Paul Davidoff's widely discussed argument for advocacy planning—in the context of a rich case of transportation planning. The case poses a very fundamental question to help wrap up this unit of the course: Can planning be an effective tool if the parties "at the table" subscribe to very different notions of what good planning and "the good plan" are?

1. The political and cultural context for **Davidoff's** (1965) essay, like that of Arnstein's on the "ladder of citizen participation," was the U.S. in the turbulent late 1960s. Davidoff's article is one of the purer expressions of discontent toward the rational planning model—discontent that Sanyal, Healey, and others outlined in their histories of planning. Davidoff urges planners to be advocates for client interest groups (as attorneys are), not just technicians, and to engage in the "contentious work" of developing policy. He also proposes that there be multiple plans ("plural plans"), including "community" plans, rather than a "unitary" public plan. What are the strengths of his argument? That is, what does advocacy, as an orientation, do to help remedy the limits of the rational planning model? How is it different from the Susskind-Cruikshank model? What problems with his proposal does Davidoff himself identify, and what others do you see, if any?
2. Forty years later, **Innes and Gruber** examine a clash of "styles" in transportation planning, showing the range of players that become involved, how they act to influence plans and outcomes, and what they assume. Note that Innes and Gruber treat Davidoff as part of the "social movement" style and specifically as part of "oppositional" politics. What are the authors' main conclusions about the clash of styles, and in your

view, what do these conclusions suggest about the implications of Davidoff's call for advocacy in planning?

After the midterm exam, in the weeks ahead, we will build on these ideas by exploring a wider range of planning contexts, including the developing world, and cover planning ethics, "multi-level" planning, planning with and for increasingly multicultural societies, and the managing higher expectations for stakeholder participation in planning and implementation. We will also shift to professionally oriented writing assignments.