# CHAPTER 2: SOCIETY, POLITICS AND PLANNING: THEORETICAL DEBATE AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

# INTRODUCTION

> "… Any evaluation and critique of planning systems and practices needs to engage with understanding of the social processes through which concerns about space, place and biosphere are generated, and with the political process [….] through which societies develop ways of managing their common affairs. The understanding and practice of planning is thus the interlocking of the study of the dynamics of urban and regional change and the study of normative practice of governance…" (Healey 1997, p. 4)

All societies have some kind of mechanisms and urban planning systems in dealing with land development, which vary according to, first, the social context within which land is given meaning. Second, the political and economic context within which land is produced as an environmental good to be consumed by different interest groups within society, each of which has its goals and agendas (Healey 1997, pp. 73-87). This means that the way in which such mechanisms and systems are established and the built environment that they give rise to, are always affected by the changes in the political economy, socio-political and socio-economic contexts as well as the interaction of interests and values of societal groups, institutions, agencies, and individuals in society.

Brindley *et al* (1996, p. 7) argue that the establishment of such mechanisms as well as urban planning systems of practice are specifically affected not only by the international and national changes in political economy but also by the political economy changes at the level of the locality. Brindley *et al* (*op. cit.*), Healey (1997), and Rose (1981) stress that the continuous change in the relationship between the national and local contexts, central- local governments, and public-private sectors are also seen as the direct, and in some way the natural, result of the change of the global and national political economy contexts as well as the interaction environment of interests and values of the institutions, agencies and individuals in society at both the national and local levels. Therefore, urban development planning policies and its subsequent physical planning practice mechanisms and systems, promoted by the state, were initially built to respond to the demand on services, utilities, and resources such as land required for development by the various interests represented in institutions, agencies, and individuals in society.

While stressing the socio-political, socio-economic, and political economy contexts underpinning the urban development planning process, Mocine (1966, p. 33)

claims that it is widely accepted that regardless the urban development planning approach or style adopted by the state in dealing with land development, physical planning practice is recognised as the end stage of the whole urban development planning process. Mocine (*op. cit.*) also stresses that Physical planning practice has conventionally been concerned with single, end-state blue print physical plans, which are meant to reflect an overriding 'public interest'. The size, scope, legal standing and position of such outcome physical plans used to be relative to specific regulations (e.g. land use planning, zoning, etc). Although the previous claim is generally associated with the traditional rational comprehensive planning approach, which dominated the planning field after the second world war for two decades in much of Europe and the USA, the above system of practice can still be recognised in both developed and developing countries under different planning approaches (see Hameed 2000, pp. 81-6)

Nevertheless, one of the major problems resulted from physical planning practice is the continuously reported gap between the original physical plans (e.g. zoning, master plan, land use plans, detailed plans) and the implemented land use patterns (Devas 1993, pp. 73-4; Hai 1981). As a consequence, planning practitioners and analysts have tried and are still trying to describe, explain, and analyse such gap that affects the physical distribution of activities within the built environment. As it is well documented in both developed and developing countries, such outcome patterns are usually critical when dealing with the location of polluting industrial activities that produce risks for both the surrounding natural environment and people's health (Jacobs 1993, See also Appendix VII). Many analysts and scholars have linked such gap with local conflicting political interests, corruption, and decision-making process (Devas 1993, pp.77-8), others with the inefficiency of the institutional arrangements that are responsible for the Physical planning process, legislative weakness, and lack of enforcement (Foglesong 1996; Mattingly 1993, p.113). Few, however, have tried to explain such gap in relation to the broader concepts of structure and agency, which help providing an insight into the reasons and causes behind the existence of the above problems and conflicts in the first place (Healey and Barrett 1990).

Critically examining and analysing the physical planning practice in specific time and space edge, with specific reference to the concepts of structure and agency, provides an opportunity to describe, explain, and analyse the reasons and causes behind the emergence, as well as the disappearance, of specific interests, institutions, agencies that have significant influence on such practice. It is also seen as an effective broad

framework by which the impact of the changes in the local and national political economy on state-society, central-local government, and public-private relationships, with respect to the urban development planning process and physical planning practice, could be critically examined, analysed and documented. In this sense, the concepts afford the opportunity to analyse the various forces (i.e. political, economic, social, and physical) underpinning the urban development planning process and physical planning practice and their outcome in the context of the case study.

## 2.1 SOCIAL STRUCTURES

In order to better understand how interest groups within society affect the physical distribution of activities, an understanding of the role of the state and its relation with different societal groups is necessary. Such relationship affects the political framework adopted by the state through which it can mitigate, neutralise, or adopt some of these interests in order to continue to govern. Not only a better understanding of state-society relationship is important, but also analysing the context within which such relationship takes place, and the underlying constraining and admissible conditions that either hinder or enable agents to pursue their interests, become crucial. In other words, the understanding of different approaches to explain, describe and analyse social structures from a structure and agency perspective is a core issue to evaluate and criticise planning systems and practices and its outcome in any society (Healey 1997; Walsh 1998, p.8). The core theoretical debate between the broader structure and agency concepts and their related social structure approaches emerged from two specific questions. Do social relationships achieve an autonomous identity that determines the activities of members or individuals of society as they interact and relate to it? Or is society a collection of individuals who actively interact with each other and in doing so they create society?

A positive answer to the first question is the basis of the notion of 'structuralism' and the concept of 'structure', which treats society as a 'system' of social relationships. Such system is seen as an external and/or internal pressure, which always constrains and directs the behaviour and activities of members of society. The second question leads to the notion of 'individualism' and the concept of 'agency', where society is viewed as an aggregation of actions of its members each of which is an enabled agent of his/her own action without any 'external' and/or 'internal' pressure to direct such actions (Giddens 1995; Walsh 1998; Carlstein 1981; Bhaskar 1979).

However, both approaches (i.e. structuralism and individualism) have been proven to be problematic when attempting to adopt either of them to deal with the actual nature (i.e. the reality) of social relationships (Cuff and Payne 1979). As a consequence, many analysts and theorists such as Giddens (1995), Walsh (1998) and others argue that social relationships are neither only an aggregation of individuals whose actions create society nor are only a system that controls and directs individual actions but they are rather a combination of both. Social relationships are both products of human agency and conditioned by social structures within society. Such argument led to the emergence of another new approach in dealing with social structure that is known as the inter-relational approach or the 'structuration theory' (Giddens 1995).

This approach emphasises the link between the power interaction between the enablement conditions in society, which trigger the creation and empowerment of certain institutions, agencies and individuals in specific time-space edge, and the constraining conditions of existing social structures, which either admit or resist such empowerment (Giddens 1995). Healey (1996) argues for such an approach, after building the collaborative planning approach in dealing with land and development on its principles, as an efficient framework to explain and analyse land and development plans in relation to power relations and interest groups strategies within society and how such interest groups can affect and are affected by public policies. She supports her argument by the claim that interests and strategies of actors and the nature of the relationship between them have been well identified, described and analysed in research as well as the institutional forms, rules and regulations. However, as she stresses that the link to what generates interests and strategies and how interests affect existing structures is often weakly developed (Healey and Barrett 1990, p.91; Healey 1997).

The three approaches to analyse social structures, with specific reference to the concepts of structure and agency, will be presented and examined through the following sections: structuralism, individualism, and structuration theory. The presentation, analysis, and critique of arguments, debates, and claims provide the basis and principles of each approach to help building the research analytical framework through which the physical planning practice in 10th of Ramadan City will be presented, explained and analysed.

## 2.1.1 Structuralism

The notion of 'structure' is at the core of structuralism. Giddens (1995) claims that although the concept of structure is very prominent in the writing of most functionalist authors, it has lent its name to the traditions of 'structuralism'. Functionalism[1] and structuralism have some notable similarities, in spite of the marked contrasts that exist between them. Both of them share the tendency to express a naturalistic standpoint and both of them are inclined towards objectivism. This means both tend to recognise social structures as fixed and repetitive 'patterns' of social relations or social phenomena (e.g. tribe or family members relationships) within time-space edge. In other words, both see social structures as 'systems', each has its own constraining conditions that affect and direct the social behaviour of society members, agencies, institutions, and groups.

However, Functionalist thought has particularly looked towards biology as the science providing the closest and most compatible model for social science. For them, Biology has been taken to provide a guide to conceptualising the structure and functioning of social systems and to analysing process of evolution via mechanisms of adaptation. On the contrary, structuralism thought has been hostile to the notion of 'evolutionism' and the free form of biological analogies. Such notable difference can be seen, as Carlstein (1981, pp. 52-3), Layder (1981), and Giddens (1995) point out, in the difference between natural and social science. Giddens (1995) concludes the following:

> "…. Here the homology between social and natural science is primarily
> a cognitive one in so far as each exposed to express similar features of
> the overall constitution of mind. Both structuralism and functionalism
> strongly emphasise the pre-eminence of the social whole over its
> individual parts (objects)…."                              (Giddens 1995, p. 1)

Although functionalists and yet the vast majority of social analysts usually understands the concept of structure as 'external' to human actions, as a source of constraints on the free initiative of the independently constituted subject, both traditional structuralists and post-structuralists argued against such definition as

---

[1] 'Functionalism' is an influential theory that developed in Sociology and Anthropology before the 1960s. It supposes that all social action and all social institutions operate with a purpose, that is, they function to the benefit of the totality. The causes of all behaviour can thus be explained in terms of function. Such theory has trouble explaining behaviour that it sees as deviant, destructive and therefore dysfunctional (see Durkheim 1962; Bottomore and Rubel 1965; Cohen 1968; Cuff and Payne 1979; Giddens 1995; and Walsh 1998).

'incomplete'. For them structure not only refers to the 'external' but also the 'internal' constraints, such as the norms and values of social agencies. This is evident in the work of Marx when discussing the notion of 'class' and Durkheim when introducing the issue of 'culture' (see Durkheim 1962, 1982; Scott and Roweis 1977; Harvey 1996; and Giddens 1995).

Despite such agreement, there is usually ambiguity between the traditional structuralists and post-structuralists over whether the concept of 'structure' refers to rules of transformation or a matrix of admissible transformations (Giddens 1995, p. 17). Such ambiguity led to the confusion that whether structure is to be equated only with constraint or it can be both constraining and enabling. Giddens (*op. cit.)* stresses that the latter argument resulted in the introduction of the expression 'the duality of structure'. This means that the structured properties of social systems are extremely difficult to be prevented from stretching away, in time and space, beyond the control of any individual actor while, at the same time, the power and activities of social agencies help reifying and changing those existing structures in specific time-space edge.

On the structuralism side, the thoughts of Karl Marx and Emile Durkheim can be recognised[2]. Cohen (1968) claims, for Marx, human beings as agents make their own history but in the existence of specific circumstances that have to be met within the context through which their actions take place and allow them to do so. This means, such circumstances are not of their own choosing and act as constraints on their actions. Marx developed an analysis of how agents' actions are organised by such circumstances (i.e. the material conditions of production), which determine and structure social relationships generated by particular material forces including raw materials, technology, and labour force (Cohen, 1968). For Marx, social structures are always created by, what he calls, material forces of production. Such forces not only create social structures but also control and direct agents' actions externally and internally. In other words, they control not only the behaviour of agents when dealing with each other but also agents' consciousness, which was clearly presented through arguments about 'class structure' and 'class struggle'. Given the latter argument, Walsh (1998) refers to Marxian thought regarding the constraining factors within the concept of structure as follows:

---

[2] Presenting arguments for and against, discussions about, and even detailed exposition of Marxian and Durkheim thinking is beyond the scope of this research. However, their thoughts, with specific reference to the concepts of structure and agency, are presented briefly as examples of structuralism to strengthen and clarify the debate about the concept of structure.

"…So, for Marx, the material forces of production create a mode of production, which is a system of social relationships that is determined by it and which generates the whole institutional and cultural framework of society. At the heart of this system is the class structure of society which differentiates its members into opposed social groups with competing interests and this determines how individuals participate in society and the way in which they act within it [….] in these terms then it is clear that, for Marx, human actions as a productive activity are circumstanced by the material conditions within which they take place and which establish their organisational limits and structure the social relationships that emerge between the members of society and the institutional forms which they can take"

(Walsh 1998, pp.16-7)

For Marx, the material conditions of production, which govern social relationships within a particular mode of production, yet can be changed by human activities. The basis on which workers, collectively, can become agents for the creation of a society which can meet their needs is still conditional on the emergence of a mode of production that can give them the chance to use labour power to change the existing one and to become agents of their own lives (Bottomore and Rubel 1965). Although building his thoughts on the constraining factors that exist in the concept of structure regarding class structure, labour force, and modes of production, yet when discussing the notion of agency, Marx recognised, in certain circumstances, the ability of agents, not individually but collectively, to challenge and change existing social structures. This means that the concept of structure in Marxian thought does not only refer to constrained transformations but also to admissible transformations, and though structure is not always constraining but sometimes enabling and, in other words, yet has a duality feature.

Contrary to Marxian thinking, Giddens (1995) claims that most forms of structuralism from Durkheim onwards have been inspired only by the idea of the constraining properties within the concept of structure rejecting arguments about the admissible transformation and duality feature of such concept. Although Marx and Durkheim, as structuralism scholars, were both inspired by the same constraining properties of the structure concept, each of them built his thoughts on different core arguments. While Marx was inspired by the constraining factors of social structures presented in the arguments about modes of production and class struggle, Durkheim

was attracted to the constraining factors of 'cultural inheritance'. After analysing Durkheim thought, Walsh (1998) concludes the following:

> "…His very starting point is that human actions create an entirely new level of reality with its own properties. And this reality consists of social facts which are typical forms of the actions of human beings, and they are not derived from the individuals who engage in them but from society itself, which is an external and constraining force upon the individuals who live within it [….] the original foundation of society is a collective consciousness – a collective body of ideas, values and norms – which binds the members of society into a community through their resemblance to one another, as the consciousness of the individuals is only a reflection of the collective consciousness installed in each person"                                                  (Walsh 1998, p. 19)

In this sense, individuals' actions are constrained by pre-installed norms, values, and beliefs. So, for Durkheim, no individuality or individual action can exist in society. Although Marx accepts agents' action, collectively not individually, to change existing social structures, however in specific circumstances, Durkheim denies such action either individually or collectively and in doing so, he rejects the existence of the concept of agency. Even when challenged to explain the changes that happened in modern society, regarding industrialisation process that took place in western European countries, Durkheim argued that such change was produced by labour force and technology that changed the pre-installed values, norms, and beliefs within society members to new ones. Such change happened through the participation of society members in the new mode of production by taking positions and roles within society in terms of the tasks and rules, which it involves (Archer 1982). This means that individuals have neither the 'free will' to plan for the future nor control over their past and present actions as they are acting as cogs in a 'complicated machine' called society operated by a pre-installed programme of norms, values and beliefs.

For Durkheim there are three senses of constraints within the concept of structure. First, what has been argued before regarding the pre-installed norms, values, and beliefs that constrain actions of individuals. Second, the structural properties of social systems are exterior to the activities of the agents. As he argues that, by giving the example of bronze and water, each individual within society has his/her own norms, values, and beliefs and by interacting with each other they create a new set of norms,

values, and beliefs that are not certainly the same as their own ones (Bhaskar 1979, p.42). Durkheim clarifies this point within his writings as follows:

> "…. The hardness of bronze lies neither in copper, nor in tin, nor in the led, which have been used to form it, which are all soft and malleable bodies. The hardness arises from the mixing of them. The quality of water, its sustaining and other properties, are not in the two gases of which it is composed, but in the complex substance which they form by coming together. [….] If, as granted to us, this synthesis *sui generis*, which constitutes every society, gives rise to new phenomena, different from those, which occur in consciousness in isolation, one is forced to admit that these specific facts reside in society itself that produces them and not in its parts – namely its members. In this sense therefore they lie outside the consciousness of individuals as such, in the same way as the distinctive features of life lie outside the chemical substances that make up a living organism"                    (Durkheim 1982, pp. 39-40)

The third constraint is related to agent actions. For Durkheim, as Giddens (1995) concludes, social facts are just obligations that confront each single individual as limits to the scope of their action. In this sense they are not just external constraints but also extremely defined, incorporated in what other members of society consider proper, right, or bad to do (Giddens 1995, p. 172). Supporting such argument Durkheim (1982) gives the following example among several:

> "… When I perform my duties as brother, husband, or citizen, and carry out the commitments I have entered into, I fulfil obligations, which are defined in law, and custom, which are external to myself and my actions. […] Even if they conform to my own sentiments and I feel their reality within me, that reality does not cease to be objective. For it is not I who have prescribed those duties"    (Durkheim, 1982, pp.50-2)

Unlike Marx, Durkheim rejects the admissible transformation feature, in other words the 'duality' feature of the concept of structure. He always discusses the concept of structure form a constrained transformation perspective rejecting the concept of agency as a whole. So, for structuralism scholars including both Marx and Durkheim, the constraining properties in the concept of structure can be easily recognised. However the widely agreed rejection to the ability of agents, as individuals, to change existing social structures, there is ambiguity between structuralism scholars over the recognition of the concept of agency itself. In this sense, when adopting the structuralism approach to analyse social relationships, for many analysts, researchers,

and practitioners, it proved to be problematic to describe, explain, and analyse interests and strategies of actors and the nature of the relationship between them and how they, as individuals or agencies, change social structures (Healey and Barrett 1990, pp.90-1).

## 2.1.2 Individualism

Just as the concept of structure is at the core of structuralism, the concept of agency is at the core of individualism in dealing with social structures. From the literature, the arguments that deal with explaining and analysing social structures, with specific reference to the concepts of structure and agency concepts, take many forms such as constraining versus admissible, rules and regulations versus actions, and constraining versus enabling. Like the ambiguity over the understanding of the concept of structure presented in the previous section, there is a discrepancy over the concept of agency. On the one hand, individualism scholars use the concept of agency referring only to powerful individuals who have the power to act, in other words, as Giddens (1995) states, "to make a difference". On the other hand, 'agencism'[3] scholars tend to use the concept of 'agency' not only referring to powerful individuals but also to social institutions, agencies, and interest groups who have the power and resources to act and change existing social structures (Walsh, 1998). In other words, it is, again, the recognition of the difference between individuality and collectivism in actions. Despite such distinguishing difference between individualism and 'agencism', both of them share the same underlying assumptions and principles.

While structuralism scholars argue that individuals' actions are controlled and directed by existing social structures, individualism scholars' challenge the latter argument by the claim that history is not an autonomous process of change that governs and controls itself but changes occur because humans make them happen. So, for individualism scholars, such as Max Weber, society consists of a collection of individuals and they are the authors of their actions. In this sense, agents are the actors who create social structures through their interaction with each other to meet their needs and interests, and to settle their priorities. Bhaskar (1979) points out that in many contexts of social life the reproduction of social structures is not an operation of repetitive casual loops but, rather, it includes a process of selective "information

---

[3] There is no distinctive word in the literature that refers to agency as an approach rather than the word agency itself. Therefore, seeking clarity and avoiding confusion between agency as a concept and agency as an approach, the researcher uses the term 'agencism' referring to agency as an approach in dealing with social structures.

filtering" made by individuals in society. Such individuals, reflexively as agencies, use the information power to challenge and change the overall existing social structures (Bhaskar 1979, pp.78-9; Giddens 1995, pp.27-8). Such connection between the concept of agency and power is evident in the writings of Giddens and Mackenzie:

> "…. To be able to 'act otherwise' means being able to intervene in the world, or to refrain from such intervention, with the effect of a specific process or state of affairs. This presumes that to be an agent is to be able to deploy (chronically, in the flow of daily life) a range of causal powers, including that of influencing those deployed by others. Action depends upon the capability of the individual to ' make a difference' to a pre-existing state of affairs or course of events. An agent ceases to be such if he or she loses the capability to 'make a difference', that is, to exercise some sort of power…"
>
> (Giddens and Mackenzie 1982, cited in Giddens 1995, p. 14)

In this sense, agents do not only create social structures through their interaction with each other but also they continuously challenge and change existing social structures to meet their interests as well as others. The way in which agents can change existing social structures depends upon the kind of resources (including information) they obtain through their interacting with each other. Walsh (1998) summarises the individualism argument as follows:

> "…. The starting point of the action position […] is the individual and his or her action, which is essentially and subjectively meaningful to an individual in the sense that it is directed and undertaken in terms of interests, purposes, values, and motives of the individual as a subject in the light of his or her needs. […] This leads to the development and construction of mutual forms of the regulation and organisation of relationships between individuals that are based upon a reciprocity of understanding and expectations which then license and control their interactions with one another […] but these understandings, expectations, rules, and regulations […] are not objects and forces in their own right […] ultimately structures are what people do together with one another" (Walsh 1998, p. 12)

The enabling feature in the concept of agency inspired individualism scholars such as Max Weber who is recognised as the chief protagonist of such approach. For Weber, Runciman (1978, 1983) claims, action is meaningful to the actor in the sense that it is determined by his or her needs, interests, values, and beliefs, which leads to a

pattern of social interactions (i.e. social structures). Therefore, social relationships are organised and structured through shared interests, purposes and values, and shaped by actors interacting with one another on this basis. For Weber, social institutions such as the state institutions and social classes reflect the way in which individuals interact with each other and are not autonomous entities. In this sense, Giddens (1976) points out, social institutions have their basis in shared interests that lead to rational organisation of such interests to attain the needs of the members of society. This means that the form of social structure depends on the fixed patterns of relationships between members of society according to their own interests, purposes, and values and beliefs.

Nevertheless, when Walsh (1998) analysed Weber's approach to explain social structures, he argues that Weber is forced to admit the autonomous property of social structures in the sense that the outcome of purposeful rational actions can lead to a pattern of irrational actions. This means that the outcome of purposeful actions does establish a pattern of social relationships that was not necessarily intended by actors. This new pattern, as Weber characterises, is a 'supra-individual' character, which shapes the possibilities of consequent activities and in this sense it can enforce itself upon actors in society (Walsh 1998, pp. 23-4). Yet, for Weber, as interactions between agents create social institutions and social relationships, they affect individual actions and cannot easily change at the will of actors.

While for structuralism scholars, namely Marx, the role of agents to change existing social structures, rules, and regulations cannot be denied, for individualism scholars, the constraining properties that are embedded in the concept of structure cannot be avoided. For such recognition, in 1984 Anthony Giddens introduced a new approach to explain and analyse social structures by combining both structuralism and individualism in his well-known book "*The Constitution of Society*". Such approach is known as the Structuration Theory (Healey and Barrett 1990).

### 2.1.3 The Structuration Theory

There has to be a clear distinction between the theoretical basis of the Structuration Theory with respect to the concepts of structure and agency and its resulting echo in the political and social science with specific reference to the area of public policies (i.e. the Third Way approach). The Structuration Theory, the 'inter-relational approach', and 'Giddens Theory' are different names for the same theory. On the one hand, both the duality feature of the structure concept and the enabling features

of the agency concept regarding agencies abilities to change social structures theoretically inspired Anthony Giddens to introduce the Structuration Theory in 1984 (Giddens 1995). On the other hand, he was practically inspired by the interlocking relationship between the global and national political economy and the rapid change of the former in the past five years, especially after the meeting of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in Seattle in late 1999 to discuss the consequences of the globalisation movement; and the shift of the politics of the elections in the USA and UK during the 1990s and the re-labelling of the New Democrats and New Labour (Giddens 2000). The Third Way approach[4] was first documented and introduced to the political and social science academia in (1998) and (2000) via Giddens' relevant key texts " *The Third Way*" and "*The Third Way and its Critics*" respectively.

Regarding the Structuration Theory, the starting theoretical point for Giddens is that, as he argues, to be an agency (individual/agency) is to be able to deploy a range of causal powers, including that of influencing those deployed by others. In this sense, actions of agents depend upon their power to change, or as he wrote to 'make a difference' to the pre-existing state of affairs or course of events. Starting from the previous argument, like the individualism scholars, Giddens underpins the connection between action and power. And in doing so, he goes to the debate over the concept of power. Giddens argues that power not only constrains the actions of agents but also enables them[5]. He defined power as "the capacity to achieve outcomes, whether or not these are connected to purely sectional interests" (Giddens refers here to the debate over 'class struggle' in Marxian thought). He added that power is not an obstacle to freedom, not necessary linked with conflicts of interests, and not inherently oppressive supporting his argument by writings of scholars in both sides who argue for and against the constraining properties of power, as follows:

> ".... Power is very often defined in terms of intent or the will, as the capacity to achieve desired and intended outcomes. Other writers, by contrast, including both Parsons and Foucault, see power as above all a

---

[4] The 'Third Way' term is an old one that has surfaced often in the history of political thought and political practice. It has been used by a diverse of political groups some more from the right than the left. It was resurrected by Bill Clinton and the Democratic Leadership Council in the USA in the late 1980s, and was taken up by Toney Blair and the New Labour in Britain. Hence some social democrats – inside those countries and elsewhere as well – have come to identify the Third Way either with policies adopted by the New Democrats and New Labour, or with the socio-economic frameworks of the USA or UK (Giddens 2001, p. 1).

[5] This study focuses on the practice of power rather than power as an abstract philosophic concept. For further in depth theoretical arguments and debate over the concept of power, see for example Giddens and Mackenzie (1982); Lukes (1974); and Bachrach and Baratz (1962).

property of society or the social community […] Bachrach and Baratz are right when, in their well-known discussion of the matter, they say that there are two faces of power (not three as Lukes declares) (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; Lukes, 1974). They represent these as the capability of actors to enact decisions which they favour on the one hand and the mobilisation of bias that is built into institutions on the other"                                                                    (Giddens 1995, p. 15)

Giddens is inspired by the thoughts of Weber regarding the notion of power and its relation with individual actions, specifically his argument for the power of agents to change existing social structure depending upon information they obtain through their interaction with each other. However, unlike Weber, Giddens connects another dimension to the previous argument that is the notion of 'resources'. For him, as he states, resources are structured properties of social systems, drawn upon and produced by 'knowledgeable' agents in course of interaction (Giddens 1995, p. 15). He even goes further classifying resources into two interconnected categories in relation to the arguments around the 'external' and 'internal' constraining features of the concept of structure. The first category, connected to the Marxian arguments about the material forces of production, is the 'allocative resources' (i.e. the material resources) including: the material features of the environment (raw materials, material power resources), means of material production and reproduction (instruments of production, knowledge and technology), and produced goods (artefacts created by the interaction of 1 and 2).

The second category is the 'authoritative' resources, which he named the 'unseen' or the 'hidden' resources. The authoritative resources include: 1) Organisations of social time-space, which refer to the form of regionalisation within and across societies in terms of which the time-space paths of daily life such as the 'unseen' features that govern hunting-and-gathering societies across time and space including the notions of culture and class. He supported his argument by the example that "hunting-and-gathering societies have been the most typical form of human social organisation upon this earth until very recent times" (Giddens 1995, p. 260). 2) Production and reproduction of social relations (organisation and relation of human beings in mutual association). This refers to the resources that either constrain or enable the production and reproduction of specific type of social relations either between individuals or between individuals and system organisations and social institutions. 3) Organisation of life chances (constitution of chances of self-development and self-expression).

For Giddens it is clear that it is not complete enough to present his theory without giving attention to the notion of time-space edge. He stresses that all social interactions are suited interactions in both time and space edges. Such time and space edges, for Giddens, refer to the interconnections, and differentials of power and resources, found between societal types as between agents and agents and social institutions. Given the latter argument, societies as he defines, therefore, are social systems, which stand out from a background of a range of systematic relationships in which they are embedded. They stand out because definite structural principles serve to produce a specifiable overall clustering of institutions across time and space (Giddens 1995, p.164). Moreover, the more social institutions of social systems exist into time and space the more resistant they are to the manipulation or change by social agency. From this view, he defines structure as follows:

"…. Structure refers to the structuring properties allowing the 'binding' of time-space in social systems, the properties which make it possible for discernibly similar social practices to exist across varying spans of time and space and which lend them 'systematic' form."

(Giddens 1995, p. 17)

In this sense, yet Giddens started with the critical link between actions of social agencies and knowledge and information they can obtain from their interactions with others and existing social structures. Then he emphasised the connection between knowledge and the two types of resources that enable social agencies (provide them with the needed power) to act reflexively to meet their needs, interests, and purposes. Developing this line of argument, Giddens stresses the following:

"…. Rules cannot be conceptualised apart from resources, which refers to the methods whereby transformative relations are actually incorporated into the production and reproduction of social practices. Structural properties thus express forms of *domination* and *power*"

(Giddens 1995, p.18)

From the previous arguments, Giddens, on the one hand, connects rules with resources in the sense that rules cannot be implemented without the supporting resources; and on the other hand, such resources are needed to change rules in connection with agents' actions. Following the same argument, this means that existing social structures can be changed or neglected if social institutions such as the state institutions do not have the needed resources to sustain the production and reproduction

of such structures. In this sense, agents, who have resources, have the power to change existing social structures and *vice-versa*.

Boucher (2004) points out that Giddens' theoretical arguments, debates, and methodological stance and positions in social theory, illustrated above, were elaborated in the core arguments upon which the Third Way approach to the politics of public policy was built. Since the late 1980s, after introducing the Structuration Theory to the field of political and social science, and for the next fifteen years, yet Anthony Giddens simultaneously maintains that philosophy cannot dominate social theory and so refuses a strictly philosophical discussion of his theoretical position introduced in the Structuration Theory. Instead,

> "Giddens concentrates on finding specific solutions to context-bound problems, in line with his belief that social practice fundamentally represents the effort to respond to the perennial social question, 'what is to be done?' philosophical positions and social theories represent tools for the solution of political problems and for the investigation of social question".                                    (Boucher 2004, p.1)

Nevertheless, despite using the 'Third Way' term, Giddens (1998) argues against the traditional identification of the Third Way approach in the political thinking as "advocating the Anglo-American society as a desirable model for others to follow or simply to be identified solely with the outlook and policies of the New Democrats, New Labour, or indeed any other party". He stresses that the Third Way is rather a global ideological stream that combines social solidarity with a dynamic economy (Giddens 2000, p.5).

The Third Way approach, therefore, was constructed to explore, analyse, and guide the politics of public policies in relation to the changing global political economy in specific time-space edge. Despite Giddens (2001, p. 3) emphasis that the Third Way approach is "still in the process of construction rather than being a fully developed approach", it was practically built upon two main core stands. First, it was built upon the analysis of the development and rapid change of the global political economy in the past five years. Second, it stresses, through an in depth analysis, the failure of the existing 'two ways' based on the structuralism and agencism thoughts (i.e. the traditional socialism and neoliberalism respectively), dominated political thinking since the Second World War, to deliver equality and social justice (Giddens 2001). In doing so, Giddens was also pushing towards empirical support for the Structuration Theory

debate in explaining the 'reality' of social structures (Giddens 1998, 2000). The latter stand was illustrated in Giddens words as follows:

> "… Traditional socialist ideas, radical and reformist, were based on the ideas of economic management and planning – a market economy is essentially irrational and refractory to social justice […] The 'Keynesian welfare compromise' has been largely dissolved in the West, while countries that retain a nominal attachment to communism, most notably China, have abandoned the economic doctrines for which they once stood. The 'second way' – neoliberalism, or market fundamentalism – has been discarded even by most of its rightist supporters. The East Asian crisis of 1997-8 showed how unstable, and destabilising, unregulated world markets, especially financial markets, can be. They do little to help alleviate the extreme inequalities that exists between the poorest and richest countries"   (Giddens 2001, p. 2)

The former critical stand was introduced via the analysis of three significant global transformations, which are altering the landscape of politics and are posing as significant challenges to governments in both the developed and less developed countries that are: globalisation, the emergence of the knowledge economy, and the profound change in people's everyday lives (or the rise of individualism as he stresses) (Giddens 2000). Giddens (2001, p. 3) points out that there had been some doubt about whether globalisation was a reality prior to the meeting of the WTO in Seattle in late 1999. Nevertheless, since the early 2000, discussions continue about how to conceptualise globalisation where few would any longer deny its influence given the evident impact of the global financial markets on national economies all over the world and the new developments in the electronic communication and the geopolitical transitions for instance in Europe (also see Galston and Kamarch 2001; Kapstein 2001; Held 2001).

It has to be stressed that there is still much disagreement about how the knowledge economy should best be understood and what its dynamics are. Nevertheless, Giddens (2000) stresses that the origins of knowledge economy stretch back some thirty years, to the time when information technology started to influence production and distribution processes. Giddens (2001) emphasises the impact of the knowledge economy on global manufacturing as well as employment as follows:

> "…. Technological innovation is the main factor involved in the rapid and progressive shrinking of the manufacturing sector in the advanced

economies […] the blue-collar working class is disappearing. It is not true that manufacturing jobs are simply being replaced by routinised service occupations or 'Mcjobs'. It is skilled workers, especially, who are in demand in the knowledge economy, not unskilled workers, who are in fact threatened with marginality […] the coming of the internet will push these changes even further. No one knows what the full effect of the internet is going to be. Finance and banking are among the areas where internet and intranet technologies have already promoted large-scale restructuring"                                        (*ibid,* p. 4)

The third significant transformation is the rise of individualism. Galston and Kamarch (2001) stress that many of the left politicians tend to perceive the rise of individualism as equivalent to economic selfishness or consumerism promoted by the expansion of a market economy. Nevertheless Giddens (2001, p. 4) argues against such perception by stressing that individualism is "a structural phenomenon in societies breaking free from the hold of traditions and customs". The rise of individualism is evident in the areas of, for instance, family and gender relations, Women in development and labour force, and the emphasis on the private sector in development since the mid 1980s.

Given the two critical stands upon which the Third Way approach was built, it has to be stressed that there will never be a single version of Third Way politics where the national reaction to the above global challenges as well as others, discussed in section 2.3.4, varies substantially from country to another as the interaction between existing socio-political and socio-economic structures, interests of the powerful international and national agencies, and the interests and values of powerful individuals varies significantly within each context (Giddens 1998, 2000, 2001; Merkel 2001; Latham 2001). Although stressing the latter ideology, Giddens identified ten key areas of structural reform, which serve as the corner stones of the Third Way approach to the politics of public policy, to guide governments in tackling the above global challenges. The ten suggested key areas of structural reform are:

"…. 1) Reform of government and the state as a first priority. 2) The state should not dominate either markets or civil society, although it needs to regulate and intervene in both. 3) An understanding of the core role of civil society. 4) We need to construct a new social contract linking rights to responsibilities. 5) We must not give up on the objective of creating an egalitarian society. 6) The creation of a dynamic, yet full employment economy. 7) Social and economic policy

should be connected. 8) Reform of the welfare state. 9) Active policies are needed to combat crime in the here and now, as well as in a long-term sense. 10) Policies have to be forged to cope with the environmental crisis"                                        (Giddens 2001, pp. 5-12)

Both the Structuration Theory and its elaboration in the political science, the Third Way approach to the politics of public policies, were mainly criticised by scholars from within the social and political stances.

On the one hand, the Structuration Theory was mainly criticised in relation to the theoretical perception of the agency concept. It has to be stressed that there is much confusion and conflict over the interpretation of the definition of the agency concept in the structuration theory. Scholars, such as Gimenez (2004), interpret Giddens' arguments over the concept of agency as perceiving society as a collection of individuals where others, such as Mouzelis (1989) and Sewell (1992), stress that Giddens emphasises the individual agents to the neglect of collective action. Such confusion and contradicting interpretations mainly resulted from, as Boucher (2004) points out, Giddens strict refusal to participate in a philosophical debate over his theoretical position. Nevertheless, after consulting the original text of the Structuration Theory, '*The Constitution of Society*' (1995), there are much evidence to endorse that Giddens defines the concept of agency as being collective as well as individual in nature (see also Macintosh and Scapens 1990; Macintosh 1994; Buhr 2004). Archer (1982) and Bertilson (1984) criticise the Structuration Theory for the lack of insight as to when agents become transformative, have the ability to challenge and change existing social structures, instead of being reflexive to them, while Sewell (1992) argued that the capacity of agency to be transformative not only depends on, as Giddens stresses, knowledge and resources but also on social positions. Nevertheless, Giddens debate and discussions over the notion of power, action, and resources and their interlocking relations, illustrated above, provide a solid stand against such criticism.

On the other hand, the Third Way approach was criticised for being an amorphous political project, difficult to pin down and lacking directions. Such criticism was presented, for instance, in an article in *The Economist* (1998), titled 'Goldilocks of Politics', stressing the "fundamental hollowness" of the Third Way approach "like wrestling with an inflatable man. If you get a grip on one limb, all the hot air rushes to another". In line with the above criticism, Faux (1999) argues that the Third Way is not in fact a systematic political approach at all, but developed as a tactical response to

Democratic failures in the USA presidential elections of 1980 and 1984. He added that the claim that Third Way thinking has fashioned a strategy effective in the new global political economy is not persuasive. For Faux (1999), Third Way thinking seeks to expand opportunities, but is silent about the unequal distribution of wealth and power. Ryan (1999) elaborates that the Third Way attempts to avoid an excessive domination of the state over social and economic life, but does not accept that the market can be left in its own devices. He adds, such stand is not a new one, it is the exact views held by the neoliberalism and in fact it accepts its basic framework with respect to the global marketplace. He even extends the argument to stress that the Third Way approach has no distinctive economic policy rather than this of neoliberalism thought.

Despite the above criticism, both the Structuration Theory and the Third Way approach attracted a great deal of interest in the sphere of practical politics over the past five years. They also have very wide purchase, since political parties and governments all over the world have to respond to the above illustrated global transformations while promoting public policies that position equality and social justice as core objectives (see, for example, Meyer 2001; Daziel 2001; Ferrera *et al* 2001; and Downes 2001). Nevertheless, despite the significant impact the Structuration Theory has on the area of practical politics and social science, illustrated above, there has been an exceptionally limited debate and discussions in the literature of planning theory and practice in relation to such theory with specific reference to the concepts of structure and agency.

This research attempts to cover such gap in literature through constructing an analytical framework for the analysis of physical planning practice that underpins the debate over the concepts of structure and agency and the political economy change at the global as well as the national and local levels. Before constructing such analytical framework, an in depth theoretical and empirical understanding to the area of planning theory and practice as well as the planning paradigm shift is a must. The aims are to explore, illustrate, and analyse, first, the fundamental arguments, claims and discussions of each planning theory and approach and their underlying assumptions about social structures within which they suppose to operate with specific reference to the concepts of structure and agency; and second, the effect of the global political economy change on the planning paradigm shift and the consequences in the field of physical planning practice.

## 2.2 PHYSICAL PLANNING PRACTICE

There is misuse, vagueness and generalisation in the literature of planning theory and practice over the use of the 'planning' term. This is seen as a direct result of, on the one hand, ignoring the shift of the planning paradigm where 'planners' are treated as doing the same type of activities and as if the 'planning' term refers to a fixed and well-defined set of practices; and on the other hand, the extreme complexity of the planning paradigm to tackle and to define where it is neither developed within nor belongs to specific well defined boundaries of literature. From the literature review, those who have explored the area of planning practice including Michael Safier (1983,1990, 1996, and 2002), Caroline Moser (1993), Patsy Healey (1996), Robert Beauregard (1996), John Forester (2000), and others, often identify planning practice as " a professional activity, a range of different traditions, each with an associated methodology and relative perception relating to the 'neutrality' of such activity" (Safier 1990 cited in Moser 1993, p. 83). In other words, a Safier defines[6], it is the way in which planners identify themselves and the fellow planners and their activities in the field of practice.

Hence Kuhn (1963) defines the notion of paradigm as "a set of values, beliefs and practices of empirical reality together with a body of theory used by scientists to explain and understand practice", planning like any other paradigm comprises three intersecting dimensions. First, a body of theory that reflects different concerns, principles, assumptions and debates in connection to planning practice. Second, planning methodology defined as "the process of providing organised technical guidance for planning practice". The third dimension is planning traditions referring to "the different forms of planning, each with its own focus and objectives, knowledge base, process and organisation" (Safier 1990 cited in Moser 1993, p. 83). Given the above dimensions as well as the wide range of academic disciplines underpin each dimension, therefore, the definition of the planning term depends on some hard to tackle variables including the academic, social, and political background of agencies, their values and interests as well as the context within which they define planning. But before going into exploring the three dimensions of the planning paradigm and its link with physical planning practice, as a part of planning practice, it is crucial to present a brief background about the origin of physical planning. This is to understand its complexity and traditional linkage with the social and political science.

---

[6] In an interview with Michael Safier in January 26, 2003

Although the origin of physical planning can be traced in Europe and the European colonies back to the seventeenth century (see Foglesong 1996), in both the USA and the UK, state physical planning lies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and with local responses to the issue of built environment including its degradation, functional chaos, and the miseries suffered by the working class all over their main cities resulted from the industrial revolution (Scott 1969; Sharp and Wallock 1987). Such interest in the control over the built environment together with social problems related to massive in-migration (rural-urban migration) and population growth in urban areas triggered vast interest in the institutionalisation of physical planning practice across industrialised countries.

Physical planning practice started to shape as a part of several social movements across Europe and the USA, which was centred on middle white class male and supported by two groups of reformers (Fairbanks 1988; Beauregard 1996). On the one hand, social movements interested in public health and population congestion grabbed the attention of the first group of reformers. They with the help of the grassroots lobbied the state to issue several local and national legislations and building and housing codes in relation to improving working class slums and houses. Given their interest in housing, healthcare, and living and working environment, they were known as the "housers" group. They helped to focus public attention on the importance of the provision of sewage, sanitation, clean water supply and garbage collection to control the over spreading epidemics within cities across Europe and the USA. Such attention was intersected with the imposition of public health regulations such as the fire-prone laundries regulations issued in the USA (Peterson 1983). On the other hand, another group of reformers, working out of state structure, known as the "Utopian Planners" with very close connection to the field of architecture, focused on the more broadly emerging forms of industrial cities and their chaotic distribution of land uses (Beauregard 1996).

Both "housers" and "Utopian Planners" merged to lobby the state to support as well as to control the rapid urban growth through the establishment of state planning (Beauregard 1996). Together they formed the start of physical planning practice and undertook various individually conceptualised 'master plans' which focused on the physical arrangements of activities, in relation to their functions and aesthetics within the built environment, in other words the physical distribution of land uses and economic activities (Levy 2003). Their very starting actions were the base upon which

the 'master plan' tool was founded and developed in the field of practice over time. They were supported by the belief that "organised and physically coherent cities grounded in good functional and aesthetic principles are better than those are not" (Beauregard 1996, p. 215). Walker (1978) stresses that such belief was practically inspired and influenced by the awareness of and the need to confront the inequalities of capitalist urban development promoted over time during the industrial revolution and after. Beauregard also emphasises the later point as following:

> "…Planners grasped early on that different capitalists pursue different spatial investment strategies in an uncoordinated fashion, thus creating an intra-capitalist competition alongside a capital-labour struggle for control over environment. If the industrial city is to be an efficient mechanism for capital accumulation, and if labour was to be allowed respite from the ever expanding oppression of the factory system and be given protection from unrestrained property capital (Walker, 1978), someone had to bring order to its fragmented form"      (*ibid*, p. 215)

While stressing the emergence of these two groups and the physical direction that planning practice took, several scholars including Michael Safier, Caroline Moser, Patsy Healey, and Robert Beauregard point out that it was not until the 1890s that physical planning started to be recognised as an emerging profession, when in 1893 the Chicago World's Fair set forth one model of downtown design that could be used to situate public buildings (e.g. post office, library, and city hall) and capitalist infrastructure (e.g. railroad station and office buildings) around public space. From the year 1893 and on, several planning traditions started to emerge in the field of planning practice, each with specific focus, interest, objectives, type of activities, and methodology, and some key globally supporting institutions (see table 2.1). With the emergence of such new traditions, developed within a wide range of academic disciplines, into the field of planning practice, the planning paradigm started to adapt considerably and the planning term was to be defined and redefined numerously.

It is essential to clarify three commonly confusing issues in relation to the field of physical planning practice. First, a distinction should be made between planning traditions, planning approaches, and planning methodologies while understanding their link with the area of physical planning practice. Secondly, is the need to acknowledge that different planning traditions have adopted different planning approaches and methodologies developed over time. Third, is the connection between planning approaches and the broader debate over the concepts of structure and agency.

Table 2.1 The Planning Traditions Involved in Urban Affairs in the Period 1890 - 2002

| TRADITIONS | PHYSICAL (CLASSIC) TRADITIONS | | | | APPLIED TRADITIONS | | | | TRANSFORMATIVE TRADITIONS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTS | URBAN DESIGN | TOWN PLANNING | REGIONAL PLANNING | TRANSPORT PLANNING | SOCIAL PLANNING | CORPORATE PLANNING | ECONOMIC PLANNING | PROJECT PLANNING | DEVELOPMENT PLANNING | ENVIRONMENT PLANNING | GENDER PLANNING | CULTURAL PLANNING |
| **ORIGIN** | Europe 1890-1920 | Britain 1890-1914 | USA/USSR 1925-1935 | USA 1950s | UK 1945 | UK 1965 | Global 1970s | Global 1970s | LDCs 1960 | USA/UK 1965 | UK 1975 | LDCs 1980 |
| **DISCIPLINE** | Architecture | Estate Management | Geography | System Engineering | Sociology | Management Studies | Economics | Finance | Development Studies | Environment Studies | Women/gender Studies | Global |
| **FOCUS** | 'Built Form' | Urban Land | 'Space' | 'Movement' | 'Community' | 'Organisation' | 'Resources' | 'Investment' | 'Needs' | 'Environment' | Gender | Culture |
| **OBJECTIVE** | 'Function' | 'Order' | 'Balance' | 'Mobility' | 'Welfare' | Integration' | 'Growth' | 'Efficiency' | 'Development' | 'Sustainability' | 'Emancipation' | 'Diversity' |
| **PLANNING ENTERPRISE (Why do we need it?)** | Creating a functionally aesthetic urban space to accommodate required functions of modernisation | Organising Compatible land uses to improve the living and working environment of cities accommodat-ing changing activities | Efficient and equitable distribution of population, economic activity and social provision between areas and locations | Optimum Movement system for predicted pattern of movement requirements | Equitable distribution of economic resources between social/client groups in need | Maximum organisation resources-use to achieve corporate strategy | Productive use of economic resources for maximising level of income and wealth | Maximum benefits achievable from optimum selection of projects portfolios | Maximum contribution of the urban system to satisfaction of basic needs | Conservation and enhancement of urban habitat and ecological system | Achieving gender-specific equality, equity and status | Achieving reorganised equivalence and expression of diverse cultural traditions |
| **PLANNING AGENDA (What is to be planned?)** | - Human activity patterns<br>- Construction materials<br>- Building types<br>- 'Created' urban space | - Land issues<br>- Land tenure<br>- Infrastructure<br>- Movement patterns<br>- Building densities and layouts | - Territory<br>- Resources<br>- Infrastructure<br>- Settlement system<br>- Inter/intra regional relations | - Movement demands<br>- Activity locations<br>- Infrastructure technologies<br>- Transport modes | - Social groups Communities<br>- Socio-economic structures<br>- Sectors of welfare provision<br>- Institutions | - Departments<br>- Budgets<br>- Manpower<br>- Management operations<br>- Corporate environment | - Macro economic relations<br>- Production factors<br>- Externalities Social investments<br>- Institutional allocations | - Investment resources<br>- Financial resources<br>- Project portfolios<br>- Cost components<br>- Institutions | - City system<br>- City resources<br>- Categories of need<br>- Spatial and physical organisation | - Habitat ecology<br>- Energy systems<br>- Waste and pollution patterns<br>- Environm-ental externalities | - Understan-ding of household relations<br>- Household economy<br>- Division of labour<br>- Service provisions<br>- Institutional directions | - Culture and civilisation traditions<br>- Transnation-al systems<br>- Cultural industries<br>- Communal relations<br>- Urban forms |
| **METHODOLOGY** | Blue-Print Methodology ·······> Scientific Rational Methodology | | | | Scientific Rational Methodology | | | | Scientific Rational Methodology ·······> Communicative Rationality Methodology | | | |

Continue Table 2.1 The Planning Traditions Involved in Urban Affairs in the Period 1890 - 2002

| TRADITIONS | PHYSICAL (CLASSIC) TRADITIONS | | | | APPLIED TRADITIONS | | | | TRANSFORMATIVE TRADITIONS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTS | URBAN DESIGN | TOWN PLANNING | REGIONAL PLANNING | TRANSPORT PLANNING | SOCIAL PLANNING | CORPORATE PLANNING | ECONOMIC PLANNING | PROJECT PLANNING | DEVELOPMENT PLANNING | ENVIRONMENT PLANNING | GENDER PLANNING | CULTURAL PLANNING |
| **SOCIAL STRUCTURE** (View about society) | Individualism (Conflict-free society) "Public interest" will be reached using only a technical methodology | | | | 'Agencism' (Conflict-free society) "Public interest" will be reached in the end of a negotiating process based on a combination of both technical and political rational | | | | 'Agencism' However the conflict in society, "Public interest" will be reached in the end of a negotiating process based on both technical and political rationality ···············> | | Structuration Theory (Conflict-ridden society) Growth cleavages in society on the basis of class, race, ethnicity, gender, age, etc, as groups express diversity and challenge exclusion | |
| **ECONOMIC PROCESS MODEL** | Economic Growth Model (i.e. Accelerated Growth Model) Opposing capitalist mode of production and its effect on the built environment | | | | (Redistribution with Growth Model) Opposing market processes and stressing the importance of state to provide goods and services for the "needy" people and to create waged employment | | (Accelerated Growth Model) Stressing the importance of investment in large scale infrastructure and the modernisation of agriculture Investment can be national or with the help of foreign aid to help generate waged employment and more cash for consumption | | (Redistribution with Growth Model) Stressing the distribution of costs and benefits between members of society ···············> | | "We are a reality in global society but we have to reflect locality" | |
| **KEY GLOBALLY SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS** | CIAM RIBA UNESCO | RTPI UNCHS | IRSA UNCRD | PTRC | UNICEF | UNPTC | UNDP | IBRD | IBRD UNCHS | UNEP | UNIFEM DAC | UNU UNESCO |

Source: adapted from

Beauregard R., 1996, Between Modernity and Post-modernity: The Ambiguous Position of U.S. Planning, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Readings in Planning Theory*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, pp. 213-234;

Levy C., 2003, Urban Policy, Planning and Management, UO2 Module on MSc in Urban Development Planning, Development Planning Unit, University College London; Safier M., 2000, Lecture on Planning Traditions in Urban Affairs, MSc in Urban Development, Development Planning Unit, University College London;

Moser c., 1993, Moser C., 1993,Gender Planning and Development: Theory Practice and Training, Routledge, London and New York, Chapter 5: *Towards Gender Planning: a New Tradition and Methodology*, pp. 83-108;

 (Also see Healey 1996, 1997 and the various references provided within the text for every tradition)

## 2.2.1 PLANNING TRADITIONS AND METHODOLOGIES

From the literature review, it was recognised that few scholars have touched the issue of planning traditions, which is related to the development of planning as a profession over time. Apart from the several attempts by many scholars and analysts to trace back the history of planning traditions (see Beauregard 1996; Sandercock 1998; Hardoy and Satterthwaite 1997; Moser 1993; and Healey 1996), in 1990 Michael Safier introduced the most extensive and focused classification for planning traditions. Such classification categorises planning traditions into three broad and distinct groups or 'generations'. Such traditions are: the physical traditions (or the classic tradition as Beauregard 1996 and Moser 1993 named), the applied traditions, and the transformative traditions.

Although the focus of this research is the physical (or classic) planning traditions, the practice of such traditions are always being influenced by the concerns, assumptions, interest, and practice of the other traditions as well as the development of planning methodology over the time. Presenting not only the physical planning traditions but also the other traditions and their underlying thoughts about society and economic processes is crucial to understand the planning paradigm shift and the influence on the physical planning traditions in an integrated perspective.

### 2.2.1.1 The Physical (Classic) Traditions

The first group of planning traditions is the physical traditions concerned with the physical and spatial problems of city growth. They are seen as various extensions of the different activities practiced by the merged reformers groups (i.e. housers and utopian planners). Moser (1993) points out that although the four traditions (i.e. urban design, town planning, regional planning, and transportation planning) have different objectives, foci and planning agendas, they commonly followed the traditional 'blue-print' planning methodology at the early period of their emergence.

> "…. The planning most widely identified with these traditions was the traditional survey-analysis-plan, or the so-called 'blue-print' approach to planning. Product oriented in its focus on plans […] the methodology comprises straightforward stages from survey to analysis, both of which social scientists undertake. Implementation of the plan follows. Most frequently spatial in nature, engineers and architects usually execute it. The methodology assumes a consensus on values

and policy directions in the management of change, encapsulated in the notion of 'public interest'"                    (Moser 1993, p.84)

Around the mid 1940s, after the Second World War, the scientific rational methodology, recognised as an extension development of the blue-print methodology, was introduced to the field of practice while the increasing complexity of the global economic system and the dominance of both the functionalism approach in social science, which believe that society is made of components that function together to make the whole body in a "comprehensive" way. Second, is the dominance of the scientific approach to problem solving in natural science based on technicalities and rationality (i.e. logic and reason) in connection with the debate over the notion of 'ends-means'. In other words, focusing on the means to achieve specific and pre-stated ends using a scientific rational methodology[7] (Healey 1983a, 1996). It was seen as the pragmatic alternative to the failure of the blue-print methodology regarding its lack of "comprehensiveness" and "rationality" (Healey 1983b; Moser 1993).

The scientific rational methodology "consists of several logical stages. These start with problem definition, and develop through data collection and processing. The formulation of goals and objectives and the design of alternative plans follows. Finally there are the processes of decision-making, implementation, monitoring and feedback" (Moser 1993, p. 85). Healey *et al* (1982) stress that scientific rational methodology and its application in practice remains the predominant planning methodology and yet the vast institutions including government institutions, donor agencies, NGOs, and private corporations use it for their planning procedures. Despite its popularity, it has been heavily criticised over time, as been "contextless" and "contentless" because of its inflexible step-by-step procedures, pre-stated and fixed assumptions about society, and lack of recognition to social, economic, and political context within which planning practice takes place. In other words, it is the same set of procedures and assumptions applied to different contexts in the same systematic manner (Scott and Roweis 1977, p. 1113; Moser 1993, p. 86; Hambleton 1986).

From the above quotation, the physical traditions share the same basic assumptions about society and economic processes. They base their traditions, as Healey (1989) argues, on the assumptions that, on the one hand, state bureaucrats as

---

[7] Scientific rational methodology includes a systematic and explicit relation of ends to means and vice versa, the logical presentation of argument, and the systematic relation of evidence to argument (Healey 1983a, p.20)

agents in charge of the development process from the planning to implementation stages, with the help of experts (as individual agents) could translate knowledge about economic, social and environmental needs into spatial and physical forms. Like the individualism approach to social structures, the physical traditions share the belief that individual agents, as experts using their knowledge, can "make a difference" to the existing course of events or status of affairs, direct the future development of social structures through controlling the physical arrangement of the built environment, and provide wealth and welfare to members of society (Althshuler 1973, p. 197; Lindblom 1996). On the other hand, they assume reaching a consensus on values and needs of the "public", regardless the debate over the notion of "diversity".

Around the mid 1980s, these two very basic assumptions were the main reasons to lead to the questioning of the scientific rational methodology upon which the physical planning traditions can bring about change to the physical, social, economic, political and environmental arrangements. This led many scholars such as Healey (1989) to conclude that the scientific rational methodology is both politically authoritarian and epistemologically naïve (Moser 1993; Healey 1983b). Though, there was an ambiguity within planning scholars over the rejection of such methodology and its basic assumptions about society. Some scholars such as Davidoff (1996), Harvey (1996), Cornwall (2002), Krumholz and Clavel (1994) undertook interest in its development to add to the on going criticism regarding the notions of "diversity", "participation", "democratic pluralism" and "interests". And others such as Safier (1990), Healey (1996), Moser (1993), Sandercock (1998), Allen and You (2002), reject and challenge such methodology as a valid one within the ongoing challenges of post-modernity in connection with issues of "globalisation", "culture", "identity", "gender", and "sustainability". Table 2.2 shows the challenging of stereotype assumptions about households in planning intervention that had led to biased planning processes.

Levy (2003) points out that physical planning traditions not only share the very basic assumptions regarding their perception about society but also the interest in the economic growth model (or the accelerated growth model) - the model based on the belief that through physical planning (i.e. the investment in large-scale infrastructure and mechanisation and modernisation of agriculture), the state can bring order, welfare and better social processes. This model, which triggered the debate over formal/informal labour introduced by the ILO (International Labour Organisation) and the arguments about its connection to the widely spread phenomenon of the informal

settlements and income inequality, proved to be "utopian" and naïve as investment only in the physical infrastructure is necessary but not enough to generate waged employment to provide more cash for consumption for everyone in society (Mishan 1977; Bowen and Svikhart 1974).

The urban design tradition, originally formulated within Europe around the 1890s, is heavily influenced by the field of Architecture and is supported internationally by CIAM (*Les Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne*), RIBA (The Royal Institute of British Architects), and UNESCO (United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation). It is seen as doing for the city what architecture does for the home. This means that its main purpose is to improve the built environment to raise amenity levels and to promote health, safety, and convenience. In other words, is to create a "functionally" aesthetic urban space to accommodate required functions of modernised society (Hall 1988, 2002). Given the focus of this planning tradition, it underpins the importance of studying, gathering data about, and analysing human activities patterns; search for new construction materials and new types of construction; and creating a healthy and functional urban space. Its practice follows simple linear procedures that start from the project briefing to functional analysis (e.g. the functional bubble diagram) and then the design stage ending with project specification (Gosling and Maitland 1984; Banerjee and Southworth 1990; Cerver 1996; Klosterman, 1996).

Like the urban design tradition, the town planning tradition was introduced in Britain around the 1890s. However, it focused the attention on the notion of "urban land" and is deeply rooted within the estate management discipline. The UNCHS (United Nations Centre for Human Settlements) and RTPI (The Royal Town Planning Institute), among others, globally support the practice of this tradition. Its main objective is to create an "orderly" planned city. This means that the aim is to organise a compatible set of land uses to improve living and the working environment of cities. Town planners' main activities are linked with issues of land tenure, infrastructure, and building densities and layouts (Banister *et al* 1999; Berry and McGreal 1994; Grayson 1990; Barlow 1984; Delafons 1969). Yet town planning process starts from surveying and collecting data to stating the goals and objectives then planning studies and analysis stage to generating planning alternatives and then the evaluation of alternatives and the choice of the "best" alternative then finally the plan specifications step (Safier 2000; Kivell 1993; Darin-Drabkin 1977; Linchfield and Darin-Drabkin 1980; Larsson 1993).

Table 2.2 Challenging Stereotype Assumptions About Households in Planning Intervention

| ASSUMPTIONS | | EMPIRICAL CHALLENGE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | GENDER | AGE | ABILITY | CULTURE |
| **The structure of the household** | Nuclear Household (hh)<br><br>Ageing is an issue of the North but not the South<br><br>Disabled hh members are taken care in special community clinics and institutions | High proportion of other hh structures (e.g. extended and women-headed hhs) | Elderly parents and relatives of different age can be found in all types of hhs and in both the North and South | Possible presence of different disabled hh members with varied age and sex | All these assumptions are 'western'- result in western bias in planned intervention which in turn result in:<br><br>−    Makes differences in access to and control over resources by gender, age ethnicity, religion and ability<br><br>−    Traditional cultural is viewed as constraint on development<br><br>Increasing mix of people in cities because of<br><br>−    Effect of globalisation and its impact on cities, including increasing global mobility<br><br>There is an increasing sense of cultural revival and reassertion of identities |
| **The organisation of tasks in the household** | The man is the house breadwinner and the family representative in the politics sphere<br><br>The woman is a housewife<br><br>Elderly and disabled hh members are a drain on hh | Women primarily responsible for childcare and domestic work<br><br>But in the same time, they share men in income learning under different conditions | Elderly women and men, boys and girls contribute to domestic chores<br><br>Elderly women and men, boys and girls contribute to hh income | Depend on the disability problem<br><br>Their care is the responsibility of women and possibly children<br><br>If the disabled hh member is the woman and has to contribute to hh chores, they are pushed to earn income | |
| **The access to and control over resources and decision-making in the household** | All hh members have equal access to and control over resources<br><br>The hh works as a harmonious unit<br><br>(The hh is treated as a unit) | Often there is unequal access to and control over resources by different hh members<br><br>The hh works on the basis of co-operative conflict<br><br>(Must disaggregate the hh) | Elderly women and men differ in how they can look after themselves and may not get the support and resources they need<br><br>Boys and girls have different access to and control over resources<br><br>(Must disaggregate the hh) | Disabled hh members may not get the support ad resources they need and may receive different treatment depend on their gender and age<br><br>(Must disaggregate the hh) | |

Source: adapted from
Levy C., 2003, Urban Policy, Planning and Management, UO2 Module on MSc in Urban Development Planning, Development Planning Unit, University College London;
Moser c., 1998, "Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs", *World Development, Vol.17, No. 11*
(see also Beall 1993; Elison 1995; ESCAP 1999; Nieuwenhuys 1994; Tamang *et al* 1996; and Wilson and Frederiksen 1994).

The period of the mid 1920s till the mid 1930s (i.e. just before the start of the Second World War) had witnessed greater emphasis on highway and subdivision planning (i.e. detailed planning), and the emergence of zoning as a local regulatory device to displace the master plan. In addition to the previous interests that emerged into the field of practice, the specific recognition of the notion of "space" on the regional level directed the planning practice towards a new tradition that is the regional planning tradition. Such tradition was introduced in both the USA and USSR and is originally rooted in the discipline of geography and is globally supported by UNCRD (United Nations Centre for Regional Development) and IRSA (International Rural Sociology Association). Its main concern is the notion of the regional "balance" between cities within same or different regions within a country. This includes the efficient and equitable distribution of population, economic activities and social provision between areas, localities, and cities. Of course, driven by its focus on the notions of both 'space' and 'balance', town planning tradition directed its activities towards the areas of territory, resources, infrastructure, settlement systems, and inter-regional and intra-regional relations (Johansson *et al* 2002). Yet the regional planning process starts by survey and stating goals, then sectoral and location analysis, regional projects plans, then recommending the needed, either existing or new, supporting institutions (Barnier 2001; Safier 2000)

After the Second World War most of cities across Europe were destroyed. This led to the active involvement of all states across Europe and the USA in the process of reconstruction, as the scale of destruction was huge. This was accompanied with the formulation of many legal planning acts in European countries mainly focusing on urban land uses, such as the 1947 planning act in the UK. Such planning acts boosted and strengthened the planning practice as it gives planning, as became part of the state, the legal "muscle" to act on behalf of the "public" (Healey 1983b). Issues of housing, zoning, and transportation planning tradition had flourished. At the same time urban renewal was added to the practice of planning, itself helping to revive, though only temporarily, the master plan tool (Beauregard 1996)

Transportation planning found its roots in the USA within the discipline of Systems Engineering and is globally supported by PTRC (Planning and Transport Research and Computation). Such tradition focuses on the notion of "movement" that aims at discussing the 'mobility' of humans and goods (Vigar 2002; Beauregard 1996). This means to focus on the optimum movement system for predicted pattern of

movement requirements (Safier 1990). Given the distinct focus of this planning tradition, the emphasis shifted towards issues like movement demands, activity locations, infrastructure technology, and transport modes. While shifting the focus of planning practice, transportation planning process still has the same linear pattern of procedures starting from flow forecasts to system coasts then system modelling to evaluating and finally project design (see Cardia and Junyent 2000; Giorgi *et al* 2002; and Mahmassani 2002).

## 2.2.1.2 The Applied Traditions

The second 'generation' (or group) of planning traditions is called the applied traditions (i.e. social, corporate, economic, and project planning traditions) as they borrow their analysis from other areas of knowledge such as Sociology and Political Science. At the time of their emergence, after the Second World War, planning practice started to take on board the interests in the economic, political and social factors that underpin the development process together with the traditional physical interest. And though the focus of applied planning traditions has shifted from the physical and spatial current towards the underlying economic, social, and governance systems that generates contemporary patterns of growth. Unlike physical traditions, which only emphasises individuals' knowledge and their ability, as experts, to reach the "public interest" using technical methods, applied traditions not only focus on individuals but also on the importance of public institutions, societal groups, government agencies, non-government organisations (NGOs), community based organisations (CBOs), as agents, to determine future course of events and directions of development as a core issue. And though they call for reaching the "public interest" using a combination of both technical and political procedures, based on "logic" and "reason", under the umbrella of scientific rational methodology within a pluralism environment. In other words, they took the stand of the 'agencism' approach to social structures.

Nevertheless, there is an ambiguity over the assumptions about economic processes. Although both economic and project planning traditions analyse economic processes from the accelerated growth model perspective, social and corporate traditions based their practice on the redistribution with growth model to economic processes. Supporters of the later model claim that the accelerated growth model did not simply work, it did not end up solving all problems of cities, and this is mainly because of ignoring the notion of "distribution" stressed by both the social and corporate

traditions. They support their claim by several reports from the UN stating that "rich are getting richer and poor are getting poorer". While supporting and strengthening their later argument, they contributed to the emergence of the redistribution with growth model. They build their vision on two main elements; first, it is not only the market that creates waged employment but also, and in the first place, governments have the main share of doing so. Second, on behalf of the needy people, defined as the "poor", governments have to find ways to distribute growth and to provide goods and services. Unlike the accelerated growth model, which aims at providing more cash for consumption, the redistribution with growth model calls for providing more basic needs for the "poor" such as water, sanitation, and housing (Adams 1993; Rees 1999; and Haughton 1999).

Social planning tradition was originally introduced in the USA in the mid 1940s, was formulated within the sociology discipline and is supported globally by the UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund). Developed during the period of the emergence of several grassroots social movements concerned with issues of housing location, healthcare, policing and occasionally jobs, its core focus is community welfare, mainly within the neighbourhood level (see Krumholz and Clavel 1994; Checkoway 1994). Healey *et al* (1982) claim that social planning is recognised as "the idea of using a plan or planning process as a programme through which society controls and directs itself" (ibid, p. 18). And in this sense, the need for social planning tradition stems from the urge to aid establishing an equitable distribution of resources between social/client groups in need, in other words, is to practically help support the notion of 'social justice' regarding its distributive dimension (Young 1990; Visser 2001). By touching the notion of "distribution" and "social Justice", social planning tradition is much linked with issues of interest groups, community needs, socio-economic structure, sectors of welfare provision, and social institutions. Its planning process starts by client and community identification and needs analysis, then resources availability then finally programmes design and delivery stages (Safier 2000; also see Kleinman and Piachaud 1992; Le Grand 1993; O'Malley 1977).

Corporate tradition, which emerged into the field of planning practice around the mid 1960s, has its roots within the management studies discipline in the UK and finds the support within the United Nations institutions in general and specifically within the UNPTC (United Nations Programme of Technical cooperation). Taking the notion of "organisations" as a core focus, such tradition focused the attention of planning practice

on the area of resources management, manpower, budgets, and institutional arrangements. Corporate planners argue for the need for this tradition within the planning practice in the sense that exploring, analysing, and managing the issue of resource-use organisation to achieve corporate strategy is crucial. They also call for the maximum integration between central co-ordination departments within the state and its executive agencies to achieve the overall pre-stated goals. For them, the corporate planning process starts from stating programme goals then formulating strategies and their related projects to achieve such goals then followed by the budgeting step and finally programmes specifications (see Lynch 2002; Dunphy *et al* 2003; and Moingeon and Soenen 2002)

Economic planning tradition, which was shaped within the discipline of economics, was globally supported by the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) in the 1970s. Its core focus is the notion of "resources" with specific objective towards achieving economic "growth" using the accelerated model of growth. The core practice activity is to maximise the productive use of economic resources for maximising levels of income and wealth. Given its core activity and focus, economic planners became attached to issues in connection with macro-economic relations between countries and regions, factors affecting the production process, the notion of "externalities" and "competitiveness" that affects the local and national productivity, sectoral investment, and institutional allocation for managing resources (Moser 1993; also see Harris 1983; Mishan 1977; Dobb 1960; Bowen and Svikhart 1974).

The fourth tradition that belongs to the applied traditions is the project planning tradition. It was introduced globally by IBRD (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) to the field of planning practice during the 1970s and developed within the discipline of finance. Project tradition is mainly interested in the notion of " investment" with specific focus on "efficiency". This means that project planners core activity is to "maximise benefits achievable from optimum selection of projects portfolios" (Safier 2000). By focusing their activities towards investment, they linked the practice of this tradition to the issues of investment resources, financial resources including foreign aid, project portfolios, cost components, and institutions. Project planning process starts with project cycle[8] then project identification and analysis

---

[8] Each project passes through a cycle that with some variations, is common to all [….] each phase leads to the next, and the last phase in turn produce new project approaches and ideas and lead to the identification of new projects, making the cycle self-renewing (Baum 1982, p. 5)

design then the appraisal choice and finally the implementation and evaluation (Baum 1982; also see Barbant 1987; Padoa-Schioppa 1987).

### 2.2.1.3 The Transformative Traditions

The transformative traditions are the third group of planning traditions that emerged into the field of planning practice around the early 1960s, still currently undergoing evolution, and yet to be fully established. Their very starting point is that the current planning practice is not enough to deal with the growing problems in cities mainly those that are related to issues of "diversity" and "globalisation". The challenges facing the planning practice by such issues forced them to deconstruct planning practice from its core starting by totally rejecting the notion of "public interest" and ending with the claim that planning practice is just like any other social practice in society, and though it reflects the "power structure" in society (Levy 2003). Given the ongoing challenges to the planning practice, it is no longer an issue of adding new layers of planning traditions to deal with each challenge separately, however, the call is to formulate new planning traditions that are able to cut across all existing ones. In other words, they call for, as Levy 2003 named, "intellectual infrastructure". For transformative planners, it is not only an issue of economy or spatial and physical arrangement of the built environment within the context of, as Safier (2002) calls, "turbodynamic globalisation" but also an issue of "communicative actions" and respecting differences (Healey 1996). Within the transformative traditions, development planning, environmental planning, gender planning, and cultural planning traditions can be recognised.

All transformative traditions, upon their emergence to the field of planning practice, were interested in the notion of equitable distribution of resources with specific reference to the redistribution with growth model to economic processes using the scientific rational methodology. However, upon the recognition of the post-modernism thoughts around the mid 1980s, over time one by one started to take on board some distinguished features of such thoughts. The starting point of transformation was that planning practice should not only focus on the material perception of distribution but also on the perception of power distribution, which cleavages other than economic class, notably those of gender, race, age, ethnicity, religion and ability. In other words, appreciating diversity and recognising differences requires collective action to be informed by principles of tolerance and respect (or communicative rationality

methodology). This led transformative planners such as David Harvey, Patsy Healey, and Caroline Moser, to start questioning the validity of the scientific rational methodology (see section 2.2.1.1), and start formulating the so-called "communicative turn in planning" (Healey 1996, p. 242). Patsy Healey, as one of the core founders of the communicative approach to land and development, summarised the transformation process of thoughts both about society and economic processes as follows:

> ".... The notion of the self-conscious autonomous individual, refining his/her knowledge against principles of logic and science, can be replaced by a notion of reason as inter-subjective mutual understanding arrived at by particular people in particular time and places, that is, historically situated [....] "right" and "good" actions are those we can come to agree on, in particular times and places, across our diverse cultures and inclinations. We don't need recourse to common fundamental ideals or principles of "the good social organisation" to guide us. Planning and its contents, in this conception are a way of acting that we can *choose* after *debate* [....] to be liberating rather than dominating, inter-communicative reasoning for the purpose of "acting in the world" must accept that differences between which we must communicate are not just differences of economic and social position, or in specific wants and needs but in *system of meaning*"
>
> (ibid, pp. 243-4)

From Healey's quotation, the transformation process happened within three main elements. First, it is not only an issue of agents' (individuals or agencies) knowledge to direct future course of events but also the recognition of the varied social structures (e.g. culture, gender, age, class, ethnicity, religion, and ability) constraining agents' actions in specific context within specific period of time is crucial. This means to acknowledge that the limits of agents' power to change existing social structure depend on the level of conflict between interests and power obtained by different agencies in society.

Second, as society is no longer viewed as "conflict-free" as consensus will be reached in the end of technical and/or political process based on scientific rationality, however, society has to be seen as "conflict-ridden" environment. Though we, as planners, have to engage in a communicative process with the very different groups in society based on "rationality" and "respect". However, in their criticism to the scientific rational methodology, transformative scholars kept the notion of rationality in the newly introduced methodology (i.e. communicative rationality methodology). They believe in

that the effort of constructing mutual understanding as the locus of reasoning (or rational) activity replaces the subject-centred 'philosophy of consciousness" (Habermas 1987). In other words, a conscious inter-subjective understanding of collective communicative work is a force to sustain an internally critical democratic effort, resisting the potential domination of "one-dimensional" principle whether scientific, moral or aesthetic. Healey (1996) concludes the following:

> "…. Such interaction assumes the pre-existence of individuals engaged with others in diverse, fluid, and overlapping "discourse communities", each with its own meaning systems and hence, knowledge forms and ways of reasoning and valuing. Such communities may be nearer or farther from each other in relation to access to each other's languages, but no common language or fully common understanding can be arrived at. Communicative action thus focuses on searching for achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purposes in hand, while retaining the awareness of that which is understood (that is, we may not understand why someone says no, but we should recognise the negation as valid; that we know there is a reason "          (*ibid*, p. 247)

Third, the economic processes are not the only factor that affects agents' actions, however, a combination of the multiple factors stated above. And though there is no "good" or "right" economic model that can be applied in any context across time rather through communicative rationality methodology society would come to agree upon the common "good" and "right" model for them at specific point in time. This means, through communicative action societies not only would be able to invent new models for economic processes that match their contexts, but also constructing arenas within which these new models and programmes are formulated and conflicts identified and mediated (Forrester 1987).

The development planning tradition started to emerge in the field of practice around the early 1960s and was introduced in the LDCs (The Less Developed Countries) under the umbrella of both the UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) and UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). It first emerged and developed as a part of the development studies discipline and is supported globally by the IBRD and UNCHS. The notion of "needs" is the core focus of this tradition aiming at achieving maximum contribution of the urban system to satisfaction of basic needs. It touches the areas of city system (economic, social, political, and environmental), city resources, categories of needs, and the spatial and physical

organisation of the built environment. Upon its emergence and yet till mid 1990s, however its efforts to introduce a new tradition to cut across all previous traditions, the development planning tradition got caught in the economic "zone". Its interest in the notion of 'needs' with specific reference to the LDCs (Less Developed Countries) focused its attention towards the notion of 'poverty' and forced its practice continuously towards the economic dimension rather than all development dimensions. And in doing so it drifted towards the applied traditions taking the redistribution with growth model to economic processes as a guiding mechanism towards achieving development and adopting the scientific rational methodology through planning process (see Peattie 1981; Conyers and Hills 1984; Moughtin *et al* 1992, Moser 1993; and Safier 2002).

Environmental planning tradition was first introduced in the mid 1960s in both the USA and the UK and is supported by the UNEP, accompanying several grassroots environmental movements, such as the green movement, interested in the notion of environment as "nature", resources, waste generation, pollution control, health, activities locations within the built environment. Its main focus is the "environment" with specific objective towards the notion of "sustainability". Given its focus and objectives, environmental planning tradition is linked with issue of habitat ecologies, energy systems, waste/pollution patterns, natural resources, and environmental externalities. Upon its emergence, like the development planning tradition, environmental planning tradition commonly used the scientific rational methodology as a planning methodology to achieve its objectives. This starts with environmental assessment and impact analysis, mainly using the EIA tool (Environmental Impact Assessment), then responsive strategies, to programme design and then finally the regulatory interventions (Healey 1996; Satterthwaite 1999, 2000; Thomas 2002; Brownhill and Rao 2002; Zetter and White 2002; and WB 2003). Although, for more than three decades, environmental planning tradition took the stand of the agencism approach by stressing the command and control approach and the market based approach in solving environmental disputes (see Bernstein 1991, 1993; Dryzek 1997; Hajer 1995; Glasson 1995; Tharivel *et al* 1992; Amsberg 1995; OECD 1997; Connelly and Smith 1999), it started to shift its perception about society in mid 1990s towards the third way approach to social structure and to adopt and apply the communicative rationality methodology with the emergence of the co-operative governance and the self-regulation approaches to manage environmental conflicts (see Lee 1993; Marsh and

Rhodes 1992; Glasbergen 1996; Fiorino 1995, 1996;  Meadowcroft 1997, 1998; Afsah *et al* 1996; O'Connor 1993, 1994a, 1994b, 1996; World Bank 2000).

Gender planning tradition, which was introduced to the field of planning practice in the UK around the mid 1970s, is supported globally by UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women) and DAC[9] (the Development Advisory Committee of the OECD). The popularity of the practice of this tradition specifically within the UN institutions during the period of 1976 to 1985 (the first UN decade on women) gave it the inertia to continue evolving yet so far. Gender planning tradition takes the notion of 'gender' at the core of its practice with specific objective to achieving gender specific equality, equity and status. The practice of this tradition focuses its activities on issues in relation to understanding of household relations, household economy and division of labour, service provisions, and institutional directions. Safier 1990, 2000; and Moser 1993 point out, yet like all other transformative traditions, gender planning tradition has adopted and applied the scientific rational methodology as the dominant methodology upon its formulation. This starts with gender diagnosis including gendered consultation and participation, then the gender entry strategy for implementation of gender planning practice (or the socio-economic and political interventions), which includes institutional structures, operational procedures, planners' gender training, and societal blockages and opportunities, then monitoring, evaluation, and feedback step leading back to gender entry strategy step. Unlike development planning tradition, which considers the 'poor' as the needy people, gender planning tradition focused on the oppressed and excluded people as the needy for support as the oppression can not only from the economic perspective but also includes social status, thoughts, rights, division of labour. In this sense, upon its formulation, gender tradition was interested in the redistribution with growth model to achieve the equitable distribution of goods and services  (see Moser 1993; Safier 2000; Duncan 1990; Duncan *et al* 1991; Macdonald 1994; Little 1994; and Bingaman *et al* 2002)

Like the development planning tradition, the cultural planning tradition was introduced to the field of planning practice via the LDCs, however, during the 1980s with the support of both the UNU (United Nations University) and UNESCO. It can be recognised that the issues of "culture" and "diversity" are at the core focus of this

---

[9] DAC is the principal body through which the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) deals with issues related to co-operation with developing countries.

tradition aiming at achieving recognised equivalence and expression of diverse cultural traditions (Safier 2002). Given such focus and aim, cultural planning tradition directs its practice towards issues of cultural / civilisation traditions, communal relations, communicative actions, and urban forms. It adopts the communicative rationality methodology which starts with the step of issue/ component and pattern analysis, then analysing the alternative development model and conflict management then determining the needed socio-cultural interventions (see Safier 1983, 1990, 1996, 2002; Sandercock 1998; Castells 1983; Harvey 1989b; Burbidge 1997; Sassen 2000; and Evans 2001)

From the above illustration of the development of planning traditions and methodology, partially explaining the planning paradigm shift, the physical planning traditions are seen as the origin of the planning traditions. This is to stress that the criticism of physical planning traditions (mainly from social and political perspectives) as well as social change took place mainly in the USA and the UK since the end of the Second World War triggered the development of the other traditions (Beauregard 1996; Moser 1993; Friedmann 1987). Nevertheless, in turn, the physical planning traditions had been significantly influenced by the development of as well as the changing foci, objectives, enterprise, and agendas of the other emerged planning traditions. They had also been impacted upon by the development of planning methodology, where the physical planning traditions progressively adopted the blueprint, scientific rationality, then communicative rationality methodology in practice (Beauregard 1996; Davidoff 1996; Healey 1997; Levy 2003). Nevertheless, the physical planning traditions kept their original foci, objectives, enterprises and agendas, specifically linked to the control over the built environment, land use activities and its distribution, urban growth, and mobility urban growth. In other words, their practice kept focused on the issues of land and urban development. Friedmann (1987); Beauregard (1996); and Moser (1993) stress that with the emergence of the other traditions, the physical planning traditions shifted from being the focus of the lead towards development to be the tools through which powerful agencies can further their interests in the built environment, specifically land.

As the development of planning traditions and methodology partially explains the planning paradigm shift, exploring the area of planning education and theory is crucial. Given the wide range of academic disciplines involved in the development of all planning traditions as well as the volumes of theories constructed in relation to each planning tradition, it is extremely complex, if not impossible, to comprehensively review all such volumes. Therefore, seeking an integrated perspective for illustrating the

planning paradigm shift in relation to physical planning practice, the following section explores, illustrates and analyses the development of assumptions, critique, and debate for and against the different planning approaches to land and development. This is also to present and theoretically debate the links and gaps between physical planning practice and theory (or "styles" as Safier 2003 calls it). In other words, is to confront planning practice with theory.

## 2.2.2 PLANNING APPROACHES TO LAND AND DEVELOPMENT

In 1914 RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architects) introduced the first planning syllabus into the field of planning education, which was transported across Europe by CIAM (*Les Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne*). It was not until the late 1920s that university-based planning education started to emerge and, however, remained relatively vocational until after the 2$^{nd}$ World War (1939-1945). As the scale of destruction was huge, the need for physical planners to guide state interventions had never been greater. However, at this time planning education began to fracture into two camps: practitioners with professional degrees and theorists ordained as doctors of philosophy. Although the former camp has no problem to define planning (of course from physical/spatial perspective), the later camp claimed that planning has always been difficult to define and it can be said to have had only briefly a dominant paradigm and remained on the fringes of critical social theory (Friedmann 1987, Beauregard 1996). For such planning has always been defined in a broad, and sometimes vague, sense. For instance, Brindley *et al* (1996, p. 2) defines planning as "all activities of the state that are aimed at influencing and directing the development of land. In this sense, state intervention can be concerned with many different purposes, managed through diverse institutions, and can bring into play a variety of social and economic interests".

The year 1947 was a visible mark in the history of planning theory – the year in which the Programme in Education and Research in Planning at the University of Chicago was founded with the goal of training PhD students and thereby establishing planning as a legitimate academic discipline rather than solely as a profession (Beauregard 1987, 1996; Sarbib 1983). Beauregard (1996) points out that this had two main consequences. First, planning education was fragmented into sub-disciplines and students learnt through texts rather than studio model based on direct problem solving and learning by doing, and second, the emergence of planning theorists.

Table 2.3 Planning Approaches to Land and Development

| PLANNING APPROACH (STYLE) | | RATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING | ADVOCACY PLANNING | POLITICAL ECONOMY PLANNING | ENTREPRENEURIAL PLANNING | COLLABORATIVE PLANNING |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PERIOD EMERGED** | | After the 2nd World War (1950s/1960s) | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1980s/1990s |
| **ASSUMPTIONS** | **SOCIAL STRUCTURES (View about Society)** | Individualism<br>Consensus/ (Conflict-free society)<br>"Public interest" will be reached using only a technical methodology<br>(Society is seen as homogeneous) | 'Agencism'<br>Pluralism/ (Conflict-free) society<br>Public interest" will be reached in the end of a negotiating process based on a combination of both technical and political rational<br>(Society consists of different interest groups, each with its own agenda and interest) | Structuralism<br>(Conflict-ridden) society<br>Represented in the notion of "class struggle"<br>(Society consists of two groups: capitalist and labour) | Individualism<br>Society consists of individuals and by maximising their productivity and managing their interests impact of market processes (i.e. inequalities) would be mitigated | Structuration theory<br>(Conflict-ridden society)<br>"Knowledge of conditions, cost and effect, moral values, and aesthetic worlds is not reformulated but is specifically created anew in our communication through exchanging perceptions and understanding and through drawing on the stock of life experience and previously consolidated cultural and moral knowledge available to participants"<br>(Healey 1996, p. 246) |
| | **PLANNING** | Neutral/ technical activity located with the state | Representative of different group's interest | Open to class alliance | Support individuals and market processes | Open to diverse alliance |
| | **ROLE OF STATE** | Neutral arbiter looking for stable society based on technical knowledge | Representative of different group's interest parallel to CBOs and NGOs | Open to class alliance<br>Support capitalist interest by sustaining the "status quo"<br>Mediator between labour interest and capitalist interest to guarantee the social reproduction of capitalist society | Support individuals and market processes<br>(State is seen as ineffective and inefficient when trying to control market processes) | State is the general controller and regulator and open to "insurgent practices" (Healey 1997)<br>Open to domination by different factions of capital; and to pressure of political constituencies in insurgent practices (i.e. can dominate, oppress, or can be progressive)<br>State works with link between efficiency and equality |
| | **ROLE OF PLANNER** | Neutral technical expertise<br>Scientific rationalist controller | No longer controller but rather an advocate who can translate groups interests and needs into plans | Radical activist within the state (politician)<br>Building alliances and bargaining | Entrepreneurial manager<br>Deal maker and city seller | Communicative rationalist who works as a mediator and facilitator of different groups interests<br>Planning to support insurgent practices where state conservative and to promote of the state where is progressive |

Continue Table 2.3 Planning Approaches to Land and Development

| PLANNING APPROACH (STYLE) | RATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING | ADVOCACY PLANNING | POLITICAL ECONOMY PLANNING | ENTREPRENEURIAL PLANNING | COLLABORATIVE PLANNING |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ATTITUDE TO MARKET | Market critical<br><br>Redressing imbalances and inequalities created by market processes | Market critical<br><br>Redressing imbalances and inequalities created by market processes | Market led<br><br>Correcting inefficiencies while supporting market processes | Market led<br><br>Correcting inefficiencies while supporting market processes | "… Capacity for locally-sensitive and globally-aware understanding of trajectories of the mixture of firms existing in a place, from which to identify the local assets and relationships which could help to 'add value' to their operations […] planning to build particular assets, and more importantly develop the 'relational infrastructure' of places" (Healey 1997, p. 161-2) |
| PURPOSE | Environmental improvement and management in the "public interest" | Improvement of quality of life through participation of all groups | Redistribution of resources through structural change to achieve equity and efficiency | Enable, market and promote city competitiveness internationally to achieve efficiency | Find a new way out !!!!!!! |
| SCOPE | Physical/ spatial and socio-economic | Interests and needs of the client groups | Scope of analysis: political economy<br><br>Scope of intervention: initially debated whether planner had role<br><br>In 1990s trends to building planning constituencies among communities and workers | Minimal economic and physical/spatial intervention by state to support market<br><br>Shift from state planning to private sector and management | Scope of analysis; interactive; power relations into class, gender, ethnicity, age, etc<br><br>Scope of intervention: socio-political, economic, environmental, physical/spatial dimensions of cities |
| PLANNING PROCESS | Problem recognition & definition of planning task (s)<br>Data collection<br>Data processing and analysis<br>Goals, objectives and criteria formulation<br>Design of alternative plans<br>Decision-making<br>Implementation<br>Monitoring and feedback<br>(technical Decision-making politics) | Similar to RCP except:<br>Problems defined by client groups<br>Goals and objectives set by client groups motivated and supported by the advocate planner<br>(Decision-making through improved local democracy) | Explanation of planning activity in socio-historical context and initially ignored planning process<br>1990s recognition of mobilisation and communication methods (communicative rationality) to interact with communities and workers (like equity planning) | Skeleton RCP focusing on private sector economic management and management techniques (e.g. real estate techniques, corporate co-ordination tools) | Deconstruction of knowledge based on scientific empiricism and reconstruction of knowledge based on communicative rationality and intersubjective mutual understanding<br>"… Expansion from notion of reason as a pure logic and scientific empiricism to encompass all ways we come to understand and know things and to use that knowledge in acting" (Healey 1996, p. 242-3)<br>Listening (as different from hearing) is an important tool in this praxis (Frorrester 1989) |

Continue Table 2.3 Planning Approaches to Land and Development

| PLANNING APPROACH (STYLE) | RATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING | ADVOCACY PLANNING | POLITICAL ECONOMY PLANNING | ENTREPRENEURIAL PLANNING | COLLABORATIVE PLANNING |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CRITIQUE | Provide identifiable set of procedures<br>**But**<br>Planning viewed as technical value-free process undertaken by neutral expert planner who can identify "public interest"<br>No recognising to social diversity<br>'Contentless' and 'contextless'<br>If consultation included, usually towards the end of planning process<br>View as step-by-step process with no recognition of 'disruption of uncertainty or power relations | Recognises different interest groups in plural society and challenges idea of a consensual "public interest"<br>Need for consultation and participation central to problem and goal definition<br>Recognises that some groups are under-represented in decision-making and local democratic processes and need for 'advocacy'<br>**But**<br>Does not recognise powerful and often subversive interests undermining democratic processes and role of planning<br>Some slot back into RCP procedures once problem and goals have been identifies by client groups (i.e. step-by-step approach resumed) | Recognises wider class and ideological interests in capitalist society and their impact on the role of the state<br>Recognises political/technical content of planning (i.e. planning is not neutral activity)<br>Recognises need for autonomous political action for structural change along with any transformative planning<br>**But**<br>With some exceptions, little attention to the planning process and to planning methods<br>Some see no or marginal role for planner as seen being co-opted in the interest of the powerful | Recognition of city within changing global economic forces<br>**But**<br>De-linking and demotion of equity from efficiency<br>Depoliticises planning through technical focus<br>Undermines democracy through privatisation of public goods into structures with no/limited political accountability | Recognition of diversity of identities and means of expressing them<br>Recognition of power and its influence in planning at macro/micro levels<br>More attention to institutionalisation of change (e.g. bias of procedures, language, other visible and invisible mechanisms of exclusion)<br>**But**<br>Implications of methods are developing<br>Guard against relativism<br>Guard against idealist fundamentalism<br>Ideal, utopian, and eclectic |

Source: adapted from

Albrechts L., 1991, Changing Roles and Positions of Planners, *Urban Studies, Vol 25, No 1*, pp. 123-137;

Altshuler A., 1973, The Goals of Comprehensive Planning, in A. Faludi (Ed.), *A Reader in Planning Theory*, Pergamon, pp.149-213;

Beauregard R., 1996, Between Modernity and Post-modernity: The Ambiguous Position of U.S. Planning, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Readings in Planning Theory*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, pp. 213-234;

Davidoff P., 1996, Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Reading in Planning Theory*, Blackwell, pp. 305-322;

Harvey D., 1996, On Planning the Ideology of Planning, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Readings in Planning Theory*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, pp. 176-198;

Healey P., 1983a, "Rational Method as a Mode of Policy Formulation and Implementation in Land Use Policy", *Environment and Planning B*, Vol 10, pp. 19-39;

Healey P., 1996, Planning Through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Reading in Planning Theory*, Blackwell, pp. 234-257;

Healey P., 1997, *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, Macmillan press Ltd, London;

Levy C., 2003, Urban Policy, Planning and Management, UO2 Module on MSc in Urban Development Planning, Development Planning Unit, University College London; and

Lindblom C., 1996, The Science of Muddling Through, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Reading in Planning Theory*, Blackwell, pp. 288-304

(see also the various references provided within the text for every approach)

"…. Once graduated, only a dose of on-the-job training was needed […] the result was to sever professional training from academic training by creating a career path for teachers of planning that did not necessarily intersect with planning practice. This allowed for the emergence of planning theorists who erected the intellectual base for planning practice but did not themselves act as practitioners. Dual career paths, however, undermined the contribution to practice; theorists looked for validation within academia rather than without. The combination of an academic pedagogical model, severance from practice, and creation of alternative career paths was fertile ground for the emergence of abstract theorising distance from the performative demands of practitioners" (*ibid*, p. 217)

The first planning approach (i.e. rational comprehensive planning) to land and development emerged as a set of procedures that would serve as a joint object for theory and practice and guide practitioners in their daily endeavours. Although from the early 1960s and onward, planning theory is being developed in a separation from planning practice, they kept in contact through planning education. At this time, 1960s, planning theorists started challenging and questioning the very core assumptions of the rational comprehensive planning approach resulting in the emergence of different distinguished planning approaches to land and development each with its own assumptions, scope, purpose, planning process, and intervention methods. As the emergence of various planning approaches to land and development rooted in a variety of disciplines, the field of planning theory became a very complex one. And though, many theorists and analysts had/have tried to clarify such complexity by presenting different classifications to planning approaches based on specific factor(s). Campbell and Fainstein (1996) identify four reasons for the complexity of the field of planning theory and the various attempts to classify planning approaches as follows:

"…First, many of the fundamental questions concerning planning belong to a much broader inquiry concerning the role of the state in social and spatial transformation […] planning theory appears to overlap with theory in all social science disciplines and it becomes hard to limit its scope or to stake out a turf specific to planning. Second, the boundary between planners and related professionals is not mutually exclusive. Third, the field of planning is divided into those who define it according to its objective (land use patterns of the built and natural environments and those who do so by its method (the process of decision-making) […] yet planning commonly borrows the diverse

methodologies from many different fields, and so its theoretical base
cannot easily be drawn from its tool of analysis"

(Campbell and Fainstein 1997, p: 2)

For instance, from the latter quotation, it can be recognised that Campbell and Fainstein (1996) created one of many planning classifications through which planning approaches can be classified based on the planning stages factor. Healey *et al* (1982) created their own planning classification using the attitude to the rational comprehensive approach as a classifying factor. They classified planning approaches to those, which are developed from such approach and those, which oppose it. The same was used by Leonie Sandercock to present a typology of planning approaches and their relation to the rational comprehensive approach (Sandercock 1998). However, Healey (1983b, p.271) and Nuffield Commission of Inquiry (NCI) (1986) point out that that the latter classification raised the tension between planning practitioners, analysts and scholars each of which tried to convince planners about the achievements that can be reached when being adopted. While recognising such tension, they emphasise the importance of the attitude to market process as factor for classifying planning approaches. Such emphasis was presented by the NCI (1986) as follows:

"…. We have to distinguish between planning that takes a positive view of the market, while attempting to correct inefficiencies, and planning that takes a positive role in attempting to redress the inequalities of the market and to make good its omission by measures to increase the access of the disadvantaged to housing, health, recreation and communal activity. This is one of the most important of the dimensions, which we shall analyse"                     (ibid, p. 184)

Healey *et al* (1982) point out that positions to classify planning approaches, in dealing with land development, can be presented in many ways. Planning approaches can be classified according to those that take a critical stance towards the present structure and values of advanced capitalist societies and those that generally accept the nature of existing society and suggest adjustments to the way in which society operates. Moreover, they can be classified to those that adopt a structural perspective on social organisation and those that emphasise individual interaction and behaviour (Healey *et al* 1982, p. 7). From the various above examples, it is obvious that planning approaches to land and development can be classified using many different factors. Each of which will result in producing different and distinguished planning classification. However, the problem with such different classifications is their narrow focus on specific factor(s),

which may lead to citing conflicting planning approaches in the same classified group. For instance, if we classify planning approaches using the attitude to market factor, rational comprehensive planning and entrepreneurial planning would be cited into opposing classified groups. However if a planning classification is based on the view to social structures, the same previously opposing planning approaches, this time, would be cited in the same classified group as both believe in individualism.

In this sense, using specific factor(s) to classify planning approaches would mislead seeking the clear understanding of each approach. For such, the aim of presenting and analysing different planning approaches to land and development is not to classify them but rather than to critically understand the underlying assumptions, scope, purpose and interests of each approach. Over the following subsections, five distinguished planning approaches will be presented and analysed that are: rational comprehensive planning, advocacy planning, political economy planning, entrepreneurial planning, and collaborative planning (see table 2.3).

**2.2.2.1 Rational Comprehensive Planning**

For more than two decades after the Second World War, the rational comprehensive approach dominated both fields of planning theory and practice all over the world. It was shaped by and exported from the University of Chicago Planning Programme. The belief in great rationality in public policy decision-making in addressing the public interest, addressing imbalances and inequalities created by the market, the role of experts, including planners to judge and present solutions for urban problems within cities, and the important role of the state intervention in market and social processes, guided this approach in the planning field (Campbell and Fainstein 1996).

From its name, rational comprehensive planning adopts the view of both "comprehensiveness" and "rationality". Comprehensiveness in city planning, Altshuler (1973) concludes, refers primary to the awareness that the city is a system of inter-related, interlocking, and complementing social, political, economic, and environmental variables extending over space. And though, functional programmes (including planning programmes) must be consonant with the citywide system of relationships in the physical and spatial sense; the costs and benefits of such programmes have to be calculated on the broadest possible basis; and all "relevant" variables must be

considered in the design of individual programmes. In other words, it adopts a "holistic" view based on experts' comprehensive knowledge (Altshuler 1973, p. 212-3).

This view is clearly influenced by and shaped within the era of the domination of the functionalist approach in social science presented above in section 2.4.1. On the other hand, the notion of "rationality" often used in evaluating public choices based on both "reason" and "logic". This is in accord with the usage of natural science philosophers but not, as Altshuler (1973) points out, with that of contemporary economic and social theorists later on, as for the later the notion of "rationality" refers to the efficiency of means where ends are known. For rationality planners, "reason" and "logic" replace "greed" and self-regulating behaviour within capitalist societies and the "public interest" would be revealed through scientific understanding of the "organic" logic of society (Beauregard 1996, p. 220; also see Dryzek 1997; Williams and Matheny 1995; and Silva 1995).

Such emphasis on the important role of planner as a technical expert and scientific rationalist controller and regulator to guide state intervention cited the comprehensive approach within the individualism approach to social structures. The belief that planners using their knowledge would be able to meet "public interest" and to guide the future course of events, give rational comprehensive planners a neutrality status. Rational comprehensive planner is recognised as the "knower", expert, scientists who judge, and guide using scientific codes and criteria, and thus his/her actions are far from being influenced by any force within society. Bernstein (1987) claims that as planners laid their activities on scientific and objective logic, this allowed them to be disengaged from the interest of any particular group, to avoid accusations of self-interest, and to identify actions in the "public interest" – actions that benefit society as an organic and "homogeneous" whole. Reiner (1967) summarised the rational comprehensive planners' (or the traditional planners') outlook as follows:

> "…. An appealing and plausible idea attracts planners the world over: we are scientists, or at least capable of becoming such. As scientists, or technicians, we work with facts to arrive at truth, using methods and language appropriate to our task, and our ways of handling problems are not subject to outsiders' criticism" (Reiner 1967, p. 232)

In this sense, rational comprehensive planners could, as Jameson (1984) emphasises, position themselves within the state without having to be labelled "political"; and assert a meditative and neutral role between capital and labour without

been influenced by either of them. Although the "public interest", for rational comprehensive planners, is defined in a unitary term, it always refers to the "white middle class" in industrialised countries as if planners have tried to take the 'median' of society. Beauregard (1996); Hayden (1984); and Gans (1968) support such claim by stating the following:

> "…. The holism that modernist planners propound was dependent both on the economic dynamics of the industrial city and on the parallel rise of a middle class [….] the contradiction between demands made on the work force by industrialists and the consumption demands of an emerging professional and managerial elite were reconciled in the minds of planners by the belief in the *embourgeoisement* of the working class. As capitalism was tamed, the city organised and prosperity diffused socially and spatially, the lower classes would rise to affluence and take the values and behaviours of the middle class (Gans 1968). The expansion of the middle class also validated the belief that society was not ridden by contradictions, and thus the city could be organised physically for "public interest". Invidious class distinctions were being erased by economic growth; thus the city could be viewed as the physical container for the working of a conflict-free society (Hayden 1984)"                                             (Beauregard 1996, p. 219)

From Reiner's (1967) quotation, the main objective of the physical planner, working under the rational comprehensive approach, is the orderly development of the urban environment. Goals of land use plan are derived from standards that supposedly measure desirable physical arrangements (e.g. the ratio of green space relative to the total industrial or residential area, and the minimum distance between industrial areas and residential areas regarding the industrial classes location in the city such as polluted industries, non-polluted industries) (Fainstein and Fainstein 1996). McNeill (1983, p.118) and Devas (1993, p.71) claim that tools such as master plan, structure plan, land use planning, zoning, detailed plans, legal plans and new towns/settlements have been introduced to the planning field by the rational comprehensive planning approach in dealing with physical land development. Although the potentials of physical planning practice using the rational comprehensive approach in dealing with land and development, it has widely documented constraints (see Appendix 1.1, Torgerson 1990; Walker *et al* 1998, p. 100).

Nevertheless, the rational comprehensive planning approach perceives the implementation process as a separate stage from planning design. This stage is viewed

as a process of compliance by both state agencies under state authority, and by society agencies. State agencies, as the regulator, must establish a mechanism of enforcement of rules and regulations and society agencies being regulated are told exactly what are the permitted bounds of action. They are also bounded by rules of administrative law, the requirements of public interest, and burdened by personal (i.e. managers and government officials) penal responsibility on the decision-making. This approach to implementation is called the regulative or controlled implementation mode, which is the prevalent implementation mode in land use planning (Alterman 1982). Although, there are many books, reports, and articles criticising this approach, Judith Innes (1995) has summarised the critiques as follows:

> "….Rittel and Webber (1973) [….] pointed out "wicked problems" which could not be solved because the problem definition kept shifting and there was no way to aggregate incommensurable values. The unsolvable puzzles were many, including the tragedy of the commons (Hardin, 1968) [….] the failure of collective action (Olson, 1965), the limitation of cost-benefit analysis and other systematic analysis methods (Rivlin, 1971), the indeterminacy of implementation process (Bardach, 1977 & Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973), the inevitability of uncertainty in goal and technology for planning problems (Christensen, 1985), the impossibility of aggregating the public interest so that its optimisation can be amenable to rational systematic analysis (Altshuler, 1965), and the impossibility of relying on the large-scale model for societal guidance (Lee, 1973)"                    (Innes 1995, p. 184)

By perceiving the notion of "public interest" from a unitary, homogeneous and consensus stand, rational comprehensive planning failed to link the interests and objectives of planning as a process and the varied interests and agendas of the political, economic, environmental and other societal groups. And thus it failed to recognise the evident dilemma of power structure in any society. This separation between planning process and the context within which it takes place led many scholars to criticise the rational comprehensive approach as being naïve, utopian, 'contentless' and 'contextless' (Faludi 1986; Davidoff 1996; Desai 1996; Scott and Roweis 1977, p. 1113; Moser 1993; Hambleton 1986; Healey 1983a). Evidence from all over the world shows that using such approach to formulate and implement planning policy proved to be problematic in achieving the original planning goals (see the development plan for Kumasi Metropolitan area (1966-2000) 1996; Devas and Korboe 2000; Shetawy 2000).

Hai (1981) implicitly stresses such separation when analysing the Malaysian land use planning system and planning-implementation gap as a consequence as following:

> "…It would be futile to deny that the gap exists […] it is frequently the more brilliantly prepared plans and reports, heavily packed up with massive and impressed collections of data and supporting studies […] fail to go beyond the planning stage. Whilst the sketchily drawn plans, often based on inadequate data and incomplete surveys […] are implemented swiftly, with modifications being accepted […] at each successive phase of the implementation process. Is this the result of administrative perversity or political opportunism, or are there more fundamental reasons […] which seems to be particularly evident in developing countries?" (Hai 1981, p. 38)

From the later quotation it became evident, in both developing and developed countries, that one of the main constraints of rational comprehensive planning is the separation of the planning process from the social, political, and economic relations within society, which affects the physical and environmental outcomes and, moreover, are affected by planning policy itself. Despite the intense criticism, rational comprehensive planning approach to land and development remained the dominant, if not the only, planning approach in the field of planning till the mid 1960s with the emergence of the civil rights movement in the USA.

### 2.2.2.2 Advocacy Planning

Advocacy planning approach emerged in the field of planning theory in the mid 1960s parallel to the social movements in 1964-5 in the USA[10]. It was introduced within an article written by Paul Davidoff, a geographer and lawyer and was published

---

[10] Those social movements include the civil rights movement which resulted in putting black Americans in the voting process to have a constitutional role; and the women movement which was concerned with the percentage of women participating in both local and national government. By the end of the 1960s the UK followed the lead of the USA as in 1968 Skeffington Report became the first report in the UK to talk about "consulting of people" (Skeffington 1979). This was because of the several anti-colonialism movements across the world. And so, colonial powers recognised the emergency for governing parties to give the people say to calm down this social unrest through a "controlled participation" (Goetz and O'Brien 1995). By the late 1960s and early 1970s, the whole debate concerning "squatter areas" and "land invasion" within city regions, and governments' recognition that there is a limit to bulldoze squatter areas, helped pushing the idea of "involve people and don not bulldoze them" (Cornwall 2002). As a reaction to the growing calls for involving people in the planning process, ILO has introduce the basic needs approach to development in relation to the distribution with growth approach to economy (Levy 2003). This notion of participation triggered the intensive debate over the objective of participation, whether it is a mean to achieve more effective, efficient and cost sharing planning or it is an end of the planning process, and so pushing for community empowerment and building beneficiary capacity (Moser 1989). By 1990s, the issue of participation became much linked with the notions of "democracy" and "governance"; and scholars started to view society, unlike the 1960 as public/private relationship, as public/private/community (Cornwall 2002).

in the *journal of the American Institute of Planners*, titled "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning". In this article, Davidoff built his approach on the criticism of three main inter-locking core assumptions of the pre-dominant rational comprehensive planning approach. These assumptions are those that are linked to the issues of "public interest", "individualism", and "knowledge". His argument over the issue of "public interest" led him to recognise the need for adopting a pluralism perspective that underpins the role of the state to act as a mediator between and a representative of different groups parallel to CBOs and NGOs in society within a liberal democratic environment (Sandercock 1998; also see Lindblom 1982; Mayfield 1996; Nordlinger 1981; Gary 1989; and Polsby 1985). Davidoff (1996) supports such arguments by stating the following:

> "…. Appropriate planning action cannot be prescribed from a position of value neutrality […] values are inescapable elements of any rational decision-making process and that values held by planners should be made clear […] the recommendation that city planners represent and plead the plans of many interest groups is founded upon the need to establish an effective urban democracy, one in which citizens may be able to play an effective role in the process of deciding public policy. Appropriate policy in a democracy is determined through a process of political debate […] the welfare of all and the welfare of minorities are both serving of support: Planning must be so structured and so practiced as to account for this unavoidable bifurcation of public interest […] why is it that no other organisation within a community prepares a plan? Why is only one agency concerned with establishing both general and specific goals for community development? Why are there not plural plans?"
>
> (Davidoff 1996, p. 306-7)

From the later quotation, Davidoff argues against the unilateral and decision centred planning process, as society can no longer be seen as a homogeneous unit, however, it has to be seen from a pluralism stand, which calls for the recognition of the various interests and needs of different groups in society. Arnistein (1969) claims, when analysing the advocacy planning approach in relation with the physical planning, that such approach is calling for many land use plans rather than one master plan and for an in-depth discussion of the values and interests represented by different land use plans. This was developed by introducing the so called "neighbourhood plans" based on, unlike the master plan tool, community participation and short-term goals; and the widely spread sectoral urban programmes and projects to provide basic needs using foreign aid during the 1960s and 1970s promoted by the IBRD and UNCHS. This stems

from stressing the questions about who gets what and, as a consequence, the distribution of goods and services to meet different interest groups within society. This is evident in Davidoff's words:

> "…. Who gets what, when, where, why, and how are basic political questions that need to be raised about every allocation of public resources. These questions cannot be answered adequately if land use criteria are the sole or major standards for judgement. The need to see an element of city development, land use, in broad perspective applies equally well to every other element, such as health, welfare, and education" (Davidoff 1996, p. 317)

Although putting its faith in planners' knowledge as experts who advocate such knowledge in support of specific set of values, advocacy planning approach dismissed the individualism approach to social structures. It rejects the argument that underpins only planner's (or individual agents) role as a technical guide of future development. However, it calls for pluralism and democracy by stressing the important values and beliefs held by each and every group in society. In other words, advocacy planning stresses the call for adopting the view of the 'agencism' approach to social structures. Davidoff confirms such claim by stating the following:

> "…. Here I will say that the planner should do more that explicate the values underlying his prescription for course of action; he should affirm them; he should be an advocate for what he deems proper […] planners should be able to engage in a political process as advocates of the interests both of government and of such other groups, organisations, or individuals who are concerned with proposing policies for the future development of the community […] the planner as advocate would plead for his own and his client's views of the good society. The advocate planner would be more a provider of information, an analysts of current needs, a simulator of future conditions, and a detailer of means […] he would be a proponent of substantive solution" (Davidoff 1966, p. 307)

For Davidoff and the advocacy scholars, if planning process is to be performed in a democratic and pluralism environment, consensus regarding planning goals, both general and specific, can be reached as the different negotiating groups backed by the knowledge and technicality of their advocate planners will discuss, cross examine, and decide the appropriate set of values of future development. And thus planning activity can be recognised as representative activity of different client groups including, as Davidoff (1996) points out, the state presented in politicians, interest groups including

CBOs and NGOs, and the *ad hoc* protest associations that may form in opposition to some proposed policies.

Clavel (1994) claimed that the main criticism for this approach came from its original questions, presented above. Many practitioners recognise that advocacy approach is, after all, an expert-centred approach through which planners decide for their client groups without encouraging them to participate in the negotiation process by themselves. He claimed that this approach expanded the role of the planner and architect profession and left the power intact confident in the working of plural democracy. Healey *et al* (1982) and Clavel (1994) point out, although advocacy planners assumed the equality in terms of power between the negotiating groups, over time they recognised the fact of disproportional distribution of power.

As a consequence to such recognition, two advocacy practitioners from different backgrounds, chief planner of the city of Cleveland, Norman Krumholz, and head of economic development in Chicago, Robert Mier Krumholz had developed and introduced the equity approach to the field of planning in the 1970s through the planning experience of Cleveland City in the United States[11]. They presented and described the link between the equity approach and the advocacy planning presented by Davidoff as following:

> "…His (Paul Davidoff) article offered practitioners like me a way of broaden our area of concern beyond purely physical planning. We could also accept the deep political nature of our craft, reach out forward the poor, to minorities, and other un-presented groups, and in the process try to serve a more inclusive pluralism. Davidoff's ideas, along with those of Herbert Gans and others, have had a great impact on my work and on the work of many planning professionals, from the 1960s to present"                    (Krumholz 1994, p. 150)

Unlike advocacy planning, equity planning stresses the need to address power inequalities and disproportional distribution of resources.  And thus, for equity planners, all public policies have winners and losers, and usually the losers are those who are already suffering from social and economic disadvantages. Therefore, the role of the equity planner is to advocate his/her knowledge to support and to give wider choices for those interest groups who were left behind rather than planning for all interest groups

---

[11] Equity planning is recognised as the extension development of the advocacy approach and both are known as the pluralism approaches (Brindley et al 1996).

within society (Krumholz and Fosters, 1990). Marris (1994) concludes that in the advocacy approach each group of the negotiating groups has its own planner who uses his/her technical skills to meet the group interest. On contrary, in the equity approach the planner has to present only the previously un-presented groups, including poor, working class, and ethnic minorities, in the political arena presented in the negotiation process.

In the same period of presenting equity planning as a development of the advocacy approach, the political economy planning approach was introduced to the field of planning theory rejecting and destructing the core assumptions of both the rational comprehensive and advocacy planning approaches as being utopian, naïve, and out of touch with the real political and economic processes that happen within society and their major influence on planning and planners activities (Harvey 1996). Over the following section the arguments, claims, and vision of the political economy approach will be presented and analysed.

### 2.2.2.3 Political Economy Approach

> "… By the mid-1970s it became clear that the planning inspirations of the 1960s (pluralist planning approaches) had faded and that our main task was to define new horizons for planning into the 1980s – new technologies, new instrumentalities, new goals ……… new everything, in fact, *except* new ideology. Yet if my analysis is correct, the real task was to plan the ideology of planning to fit into the new economic realities rather than to meet the social unrest and civil strive of the 1960s"                                  (Harvey 1996, p. 192)

David Harvey is recognised as the first radical planner to introduce the political economy approach into the field of planning theory in 1973. By the mid 1970s, he recognised that although the benefits and potentials that pluralism and its planning approaches (the advocacy and equity approaches) presented to the planning field, it became no longer a valid ideology to solve city problems within the changing conditions within which the planning paradigm is being practiced. He stressed such change by underpinning several key events that happened in the USA during the early 1970s till mid 1970s. In 1969-1970, stagflation emerged as the most serious problem resulted in the negative growth rate of the 1970, which indicated that the fundamental processes of accumulation of capital were in deep trouble. And however the boom that happened during the 1972 heavily dependant on the over investment in the land,

property and construction sector, by the end of 1973, it was very obvious that the built environment could absorb no more surplus capital, and decline in property investment and construction sector together with financial instability triggered the subsequent depression. And as a consequence, Harvey points out:

> "…. Unemployment doubled, real wages began to move downward under the impact of severe "labour-disciplining" policies, social programmes began to be savagely cut, and all of the gains after a decade of struggle in the 1960s by the poor and underprivileged were rolled back almost within the space of a year. The underlying logic of capitalist accumulation asserted itself in the form of crisis in which real wages diminished in order that inflation be stabilised and appropriate conditions for accumulation be established. […] Local budgets had to shift towards fiscal conservation and had to alter priorities from social programmes to programmes to stimulate and encourage development often by subsidies and tax benefits"                    (Harvey 1996, p. 194)

How to protect the success of the 1960s became the core question around which the political economy approach was built and introduced to the field of planning theory. Political economy planners started with the claim that planning is no longer about participation but rather about understanding how capitalist society works. Society works, after all, on the basic principles that most important activity is that which contributes to its own reproduction (Scott and Roweis 1977). Political economists based their analysis on the assumption that we live in a society that is founded on capitalist principles of private property and market exchange. It is a society that presupposes certain basic relationships with respect to production, distribution and consumption, which themselves have to be reproduced if the existing social order is to survive (Harvey 1996). It is clear that political economists adopted the Marxist approach, in other words a structuralism approach to social structures as the guiding approach to their scope of analysis, which is built on the notion of "class struggle". For them society consists of two main classes that are the capitalist and labour classes.

But what has labour/capital struggle to do with issue of land? Asking such question is essential in dealing with land and development within the context of capitalist society. David Harvey clarifies such link as follows:

> "…. We recognise that social reproduction depends upon the perpetual combination of these elements (land, labour, and capital) and that growth requires the recombination of these factors into new

configurations that are in some sense more productive. These categories, we often admit, are rather too abstract, and from time to time we break them down to take account of the fact that neither land nor labour is homogeneous and that capital can take productive (physical) or liquid (money) form […] we know that land and property ownership comprises residual feudal institutions (e.g. the church), large property companies, part-time landlords, and so on. We know also that the interests of rentier "money Capitalists" may diverge substantially from the interests of producers in industry and agriculture and that the labouring class is not homogeneous because of the stratifications and differentials generated according to the hierarchical division of labour and various wage rates"

(Harvey 1996, pp. 178-9)

Interests in land in a capitalist society differ according to the different perception of each class (labour/capitalist). On the one hand, labour class looks to the built environment as a mean of consumption (e.g. housing, transportation, education, health, and so on); and is very sensitive to the issues of cost of and access to such means, which facilitate survival and reproduction at a given standard of living. On the other hand, capitalists recognise the built environment, first, as a mean of production (e.g. factories, buildings, land, property, machinery, ownership commodities, banks, legal and administrative services, and so on); and second, as a dumping ground in case of over production – the case when market cannot absorb the surplus of production and capitals search for ways to dump such surplus in public infrastructure[12] (Scott and Roweis 1977; McDougall 1982). Given such interests, it can be recognised that competitions for the use of resources, including land, in a monopolistic competitions in space are evident, where capitalists can compete with capitalists to gain extra access to resources and where labourers compete with labourers for survival.

But in all this complexity of social relationships and market processes, what does planning mean? And what is the exact role of both state and planners? While Sandercock (1998) confirms that the political economy approach is an extension of Marxist point of view about planning, she presented the thoughts of Marxian scholars, including the political economists, about planning as follows:

"…. In the Marxist story, planning was no longer the hero but something more like divine fool, naïve in its faith in its own

---

[12] Political economists define the built environment as the diverse elements that make the totality of physical infrastructure. The houses, roads, factories, offices, water and sewage disposal facilities, hospitals, schools, and the like are elements that constitute the built environment (Harvey 1996, p. 176)

emancipatory potential, ignorant of the real relations of power which it was serving […] the Marxist urban scholars in university departments […] enjoyed a decade or so 'in the sun', as a powerful critique of mainstream planning, focusing on planning as a function of the capitalist state" (Sandercock, 1998, P: 91)

While constructing a vision about planning activities, political economists started, in addition to the above criticism to advocacy planning, with an aggressive criticism to the rational comprehensive approach as being idealised *optimum optimorum*, utopian, contextless, contentless and fruitless (Harvey 1996; Scott and Roweis 1977). For them, planning is certainly not a neutral activity but rather is influenced, structured and determined by interests of labour/capitalists classes; and it has to be seen from within the historic, social, economic, and political contexts. It is a very important activity used by the state in order to serve labour/capitalists interests and to maintain the *status quo* of existing social reproduction (Mcdougall 1982). In this sense, the state should both support capitalists interests by maintaining and sustaining the reproduction of existing social structures; and to work as a mediator between labour and capitalists to guarantee such reproduction. Harvey (1996) stresses the role of state as follows:

"…. What is important is that it (the state) should ensure the creation of a built environment that serves the purpose of social reproduction and that it should do so in such a manner that crises are avoided as far as possible [13] […] state institutions and the process whereby state powers are exercised must be so fashioned that they too contribute, insofar as they can, to the reproduction and growth of the social system […] it should 1) help to stabilise an otherwise rather erratic economic and social system by acting as a "crisis manager", 2) strive to create the conditions for "balanced growth" and smooth process of accumulation, and 3) contain civil strive and factional struggles by repression (police power), cooptation (buying off politically or economically), or integration (trying to harmonise the demands of warning classes or factions)" (Harvey 1996, p. 185)

But what can planners do within this very structured society? It seems they have nothing to do with planning in the traditional sense. They are no longer planners but rather radical activists and politicians within the state - building alliances and

---

[13] A "crisis" is a particular conjuncture in which the reproduction of capitalist society is in jeopardy. The main signals are falling rates of profits; soaring unemployment and inflation; idle productive capacity and idle money capital lacking profitable employment; and financial, institutional, and political chaos and civil strive (Harvey 1996, p. 183)

bargaining using a mixture of cooptation and integration policies that facilitate social control and that serve to re-establish social harmony, to defend the success planning gained in the 1960s in the USA, to redistribute resources through structural change, and to achieve equity and efficiency. To be able to carry out such task, planners need to understand how the built environment works in relation to social reproduction and how the facets of competitive, monopolistic and state production of the built environment relate to one another in the context of often conflicting class and factional requirements. Political economy scholars reached such conclusion after analysing the role of both the rational comprehensive and advocacy planners as follows:

> "… The technocrats helped to define the outer bounds of what could be done at the same time as they sought for new instrumentalities to accomplish dispersal and to establish social control. The advocates for the urban poor and the instrumentalities that they devised provided the channels for cooptation and integration at the same time as they pushed the system to provide whatever could be provided, being careful to stop short at the boundaries that the technocrats and "fiscal conservatives" helped to define. Those who pushed advocacy too far were either forced out or deserted planning altogether and became activists and political organisers"                                  (Harvey 1996, p. 193)

The introduction of the political economy approach into the field of planning theory triggered a widely spread frustration among theorists and practitioners. It is understandable why practitioners should be angry, but what about theorists? Glen McDougall (1982) presented a comprehensive criticism to the political economy approach within three categories that are: 1) methodological, 2) theoretical, and 3) practical. First, political economy approach shares the criticism made against Marxists regarding their methodology. They were criticised as their work is held to be essentially ideological as they are not only charged with interpreting reality in terms of fixed analytical categories but also with ignoring aspects of reality which may lead to a refutation of such categories. Second, it has been criticised for its perception that such analysis is universally applicable ignoring the uniqueness of specific socio-economic formation within every society. Third, it was criticised for its little attention given to the planning process and methods; and the marginal or neglected role of planners hence they are viewed as being co-opted in the interest of the powerful. As a consequence, they (i.e. planners) have to abandon the profession of planning as a whole and to become radical activists (McDougall 1982, pp. 262-3).

In practice, when adopting the political economy approach to land and development, the traditional physical planning tools presented in the master plan, land use planning, detailed planning, and planning regulations no longer exist. However, they are replaced by more loose physical planning tools to meet the capitalists' interests (Brindley *et al* 1996). Tools such as simplified planning zones, which is presented in Britain, Essex, Colchester area, under the 1986 Housing and Planning Act, assure that developers' interests are to be met with less planning rules and regulations (Farnell 1983; Thornley 1986, p. 63). As a consequence, planners within the state have tried hard to support people to buy buildings and to own properties; and to bargain with the powerful capitalists on planning permissions to provide key facilities for communities all over the UK. However, it is evident, as Brindley *et al* 1996 claim, that whenever adopting the political economy approach to land and development, the results are non-strategic planning policies and decision-making processes. Thus, Brindley *et al* (1996, pp. 15-7) conclude that in practice, political economy planning, as they named 'trend' planning, is only to be adopted in areas that have free urban problems and no public support and subsidies are needed to be invested in. They supported their claim as follows:

> "…. Trend planning in structure and local plans helps private investors and developers to coordinate and manage their investment plans […] Trend planning therefore currently represents the end result of reorienting regulative planning from the public interest to the private interest. The response to the exposure of weakness in development control is not to reform or strengthen it, but to strip it to the bare bones. Only those aspects of planning are retained which seem to be functional for private development […] As such, trend planning is only suited to areas broadly free of urban problems"    (Brindley *et al* 1996, p. 17)

After introducing this approach into the field of planning, planning started to face many challenges and the dream of the early reformers seemed to be destructed and wiped out. However the criticism, the theory and practice of planning were deeply undermined and the need to re-establish new counter-attacking ideology to rebuild the early planners dream and re-establish the authority and importance of planners had never been crucial.

### 2.2.2.4 Entrepreneurial Planning

> "…Two factors have led to the lack of discussion about equality. The first is the much increased emphasis on market driven approaches to development over the past 10 to 15 years. The second is an increased willingness to perceive income inequalities as important in providing individual incentives for entrepreneurship. Redistributative strategies have been replaced by a naïve assumption that all can join the market and that those who cannot join the market cannot be helped effectively by intervention from either the state or from development assistance agencies"
>
> (Miltin *et al* 1996, p. 3)

The opportunity, which planning theorists have been waiting for to present a new approach to land and development, had emerged globally in the 1980s. Jencks (1985) and Hutcheon (1987) point out that during the 1960s and much of 1970s, planners believed in a future in which social problems could be tamed and humanity liberated from the constraints of scarcity and greed. However, in the 1980s, the state has become more ideologically conservative and more subservient to the needs and demands of capital, turning away from the simultaneous pursuit of both economic growth and welfare (Beauregard 1996). In other words, the focus is no longer how to minimise the socially negative consequences of urban development through redistributive measures, but how to maximise opportunities given to individuals within the changing conditions on the global scale (Albrechts 1991). This refocus was echoed globally through books, articles, and reports on "urban productivity", "urban management", "enabling" market to work, "partnership", and "privatisation" (Levy 2003).

But what are the reasons behind this change? The answer can be found in the revival of the principles of 18<sup>th</sup> century liberalism, which stresses freedom and individualism and, as a corollary, *laissez-faire* capitalism (Begg 1988). Those thoughts were echoed in the 1980s with the emergence of the expansionist paradigm within the economic discipline and environmental and development studies. While clarifying the influence of such paradigm on the environmental planning tradition, William Rees (1999) laid down the basic principles of such paradigm as follows:

> "…. Sustainability sometimes seems a simple business from the expansionist perspective. If there are no general environmental constraints on the economy and we can find technological substitutes for particular resources, then the shortest route to sustainability is to stay our

present course. If we continue freeing up markets, privatising resources and government services, and eliminating barriers to trade, a new round of growth in both rich and poor countries will provide the wealth needed both to redress poverty and inequality and to generate the economic surplus needed, particularly in the developing world, better to husband the natural environment (see Beckerman 1974 for full exposition). In short, "…. The best way to improve your environment is to be rich" (Beckerman 1992, p. 491 cited in Rees 1999, p. 30)"

(Rees 1999, pp. 29-30)

Together with the introduction of the expansionist paradigm into the field of planning through the neo-liberal approach to development and its related structural adjustment and urban management programmes introduced by the IBRD and UNDP. Harvey (1989a) distinguished four basic reasons for the shift towards urban entrepreneurialism. The first reason is the intensive competition within the international division of labour. Harvey (1989b), Ashworth (1989) and Solesbury (1987) stress that during the 1980s, such competition occurred because of both the classical advantages that resulted from some specific geographic and management factors (e.g. the availability of resources, location, climate, regulations and laws, and so on); and the advantage that emerged from the different abilities of both the public and private sector within each country to invest in physical and social infrastructures which strengthen the economic base and the attraction of urban investments. This was presented clearly by Louis Albrechts (1991) as follows:

"…. In activating markets, the emphasis tends to be on the supply rather than demand side. Thus, in general, the favoured package includes training to increase and update skill levels, assistance and support to entrepreneurs in establishing and expanding businesses, relaxation of planning control as in enterprise zones and simplified planning zones, abolition or relaxation of rent controls, diversification of housing tenure, together with financial leverage to stimulate property development to development confidence and attract inward investment"

(*op. cit.*, p. 128)

Second, the aim to improve the competitive position of cities with respect to the spatial division of consumption led to the shift towards entrepreneurialism. This is evident within cities all over the world, where there are intensive competitions to attract consumers looking for quality of life (e.g. tourism, shopping, investment, and so on). To be a winner in such competition, cities have to find ways and to invest heavily in the

physical upgrading of the built environment, consumer attractions and entertainment and cultural innovation (see Harvey 1989b; Albrechts and Swyngedouw 1989). This is to stress that the new aim of planning is to create and present safe to visit, invest, entertain, live, consume in, exciting, creative, innovative cities (Harvey 1989b).

The third reason is the competition for the acquisition of key control and command functions in high finance, government, or information gathering and processing (Albrechts 1991). It is clearly that this reason is in much link with the later. To be able to attract consumers from all over the world, countries have to compete globally to control the key elements that influence the development process; and cities within each country have to compete nationally to control the key factors that direct the national distribution of resources as a matter of survival. This reason led Louis Albrechts (1991) to stress on the emergence of "placeless powers and powerless places" phenomenon (ibid, p.127), David Harvey (1989b) to present and stress such competition as the "intra-urban" and "inter-urban" competitions, and Norman Krumholz and John Forester (1990); and Donald Haider (1992) to warn from "places wars" impact on social equity. However, Albrechts (1991) points out that not all countries or cities are able to plug into such competition as the provision of the needed infrastructure is very expensive. He supported his claim as follows:

> "… These functions need particular and often expensive infrastructure provision. That makes inter-urban competition in this realm very expensive and particularly tough because this is an area where agglomeration economics remain supreme and the monopoly power of established centres (London, New York and Tokyo, but also Paris, Frankfurt, Brussels, etc.) particularly hard to break. Since command functions have been a strong growth sector the pursuit of them within the last two decades has appealed increasingly as the golden path to urban survival. The effect is to make it appear –wrongly - as if the city of the year 2000 is going to be a city of pure command and control functions, an information city, or post-industrial city in which the export of services (financial, informational, knowledge-producing) becomes the economic basis for urban survival (see Harvey 1989b)"
>
> (Albrechts 1991, p. 128)

Finally, it is the "cut-throat" competition for a share of the redistribution of surplus (LeGates *et al* 1996). Although this growing competition to plug into the globalisation process and the un-resting governments, which adopts the neo-liberal policies to economic processes such as the UK government under Margaret Thatcher,

efforts all over the world to cut back spending on public services (e.g. health, education, transport, and so on), it had proven to be extremely difficult to reach such aim as different groups within society compete to gain access to such services as a matter of survival. Harvey (1989b) concludes that the urban ruling alliance with the different groups in society manage to seize every single available opportunity to exploit redistributive mechanisms as a matter of survival.

Within these global changes that had happened in the 1980s, planning is seen as a synonym of inefficiency, control, regulations and excessive cost, and too much bureaucracy (Levy 2003). Albrechts (1986) stresses that during the 1980s planning (state planning) was often recognised as irritating activities that hinder individual freedom and free market economy. Though, planning had to refocus its objective from the how to plan focus dominated the planning theory over 1950s, 1960, and 1970s to the outcome of the planning process focus that would help cities to plug into the globalisation process of the 1980s and times to come. In this sense, planning main focus is to adjust the physical and institutional settings in which international and national economic forces operate  (Sorenson and Day 1981). This led to the refocus on individual experts together with individual entrepreneurs as they have the needed skills and knowledge to achieve such focus. The stress on individualism revived the planners' early dream and gave them the lost confidence wiped out by the political economy approach (Albrechts 1991). However, unlike the vision of the rational comprehensive planning to planners as controllers, entrepreneurial planners are seen as supporters of individuals and market processes. And though, entrepreneurial planners, acting as dealmakers, have to use their skills, knowledge, and technical expertise to "sell the city" and to attract national and international capitals along with their ability to act as entrepreneurial managers, as they will have to negotiate with the various sectors and departments involved in the planning process while taking into account, in a strategic sense, existing power structures between and within social groups. This is to be able to persuade such departments and groups to integrate specific planning proposals into their own programming and budgeting (Albrechts 1986,1991).

The entrepreneurial approach is, as Brindley *et al* (1996) claim, an approach that puts the willingness of state institutions to support private agencies in dealing with land development, including the public-private partnership, in its core. Unlike the traditional technical politics and decision-making in the rational comprehensive approach, the change in the relationship between state institutions and private agencies in the

entrepreneurial approach from regulator/regulated to partnership relationship, directed the state in many countries, such as the UK in the Docklands area (Hall 1983), to adopt a different type of politics in dealing with the decision-making process. Brindley *et al* (1996) and Young (1985) argue that the entrepreneurial approach, the leverage approach as they name it, has a corporatist political style[14] (see Mayfield 1996; Nordlinger 1981; Stepan 1978; Cawon 1978; Schmitter 1974). This is because, as they supported their argument, state officials share some of their decision-making authority with selected interest groups, and while doing so, the selected interest groups recognise the payback action need to be done in terms of their compliance to follow and support the agreed policies which they take part to formulate (Brindley *et al* 1996, p.165; Young, 1985, p.21).

The support of the state can be recognised in both direct and indirect ways. On one hand, Massey (1982) suggests that, the direct support of the state can be in the forms of low land tax, tax allowance, subsidies, and grants. Boyle (1985) stated that such tools have been used in the UK and other forms of financial support such as the Urban Development Grants (UDG) that seeks to support certain firms involved in specific projects. On the other hand, Forrest and Muric (1984) point out that the indirect support of the state to private agencies can take many forms such as the practice of public sector clearing sites and providing physical infrastructure aiming at reducing or eliminating site acquisition costs.

The state has to present and create a distinctive type of institutional arrangement that aggregate both state officials and private agencies to share the decision-making process of development and planning goals, priorities, and policies. Whatever the name given to the institutional arrangements to deal with land and development in this approach such as quasi-government agency, corporation agency, or enterprise agency, they share the same basic principals. LDDC (1987) and Brindley *et al* (1996) states that these agencies have a special purpose that is to stimulate the market in the areas within which it operates. They have to be centrally funded by the state and responsible to a government minister, observed by Parliament, and directed by government officials whose roots, most of cases, in large-scale property development and city finance. Such

---

[14] Corporatism is " a system of interest representation in which the constituent units are organized into a limited number of singular, compulsory, non-competitive, hierarchically ordered and functionally differentiated categories, recognized or licensed (if not created) by the state and granted a deliberate representational monopoly within their respective categories in exchange for observing certain controls on their selection of leaders and articulation of demands and supporters." (Schmitter, 1974, p. 104)

principles are to allow them to bypass the local government and other related government and society agencies. Furthermore, such enterprise agencies make an extensive use of consultants in drawing up area framework, engineering, quality surveying, architecture, and finance and marketing to meet the pre-agreed planning policies.

However, as the entrepreneurial approach using consultants, including planners and architects, to prepare the physical plans in order to start implementations, it adopts most of the physical planning tools that works under the rational comprehensive approach such as structure plan, land use planning, zoning, detailed planning. This is because, as Heseltine (1986) concludes, such approach is more concerned with the physical arrangement of activities within the built environment to stimulate market processes. Meadowcroft (1998) claims that unlike the view to the implementation process in the rational comprehensive planning approach as a separate stage, it is no longer excluded from the planning process in such approach. However, concerned with the process within which decisions have been made and who decides what and why, the entrepreneurial planning approach assume that using the negotiation process, solutions and agreements can always be reached. For the entrepreneurial planning scholars, such solutions reflect the notion of "public interest" and, in this sense, the implementation of such solutions will happen in a natural way without any conflicts throughout the planning process (Meadowcroft 1998, pp.24-25).

The entrepreneurial planning approach has been criticised for more than two decades, however still being used in many countries such as the UK and the USA. Many reports and articles done by government, community groups and private agencies, reported that such approach does not bring direct benefits to existing residents, however, on the contrary it frequently brings real disadvantage including environmental and social disadvantages. They have repeatedly listed the needs for low-income housing to support the working class population, industrial employment, and wide range of social and environmental facilities that are poorly catered for (Brindley *et al* 1996, p. 118). One of such articles presented by Colin Davies criticising the outcomes of such planning approach adopted in the Docklands areas in London states the following:

> ".... Profoundly depressing to those who care about the future of European cities. If cities are about community, democracy, accessibility, public space, and the rich mixture of activities which

creates a culture which all can participate, then Docklands does not
deserve to be called a city"                                            (Davies 1987, p. 32)

The critique of the entrepreneurial planning can be summarised in the worries of Mollenkopf and Castells (1991) and Goldsmith and Blakeley (1992) about the phenomenon of "dual cities with poverty and inequality among some segments of the population as others prosper"; and the impact of the refocus of planners activities, who are desperately seeking to attract or retain business and "will shoot anything that flies" (LeGates *et al* 1996), while most local economic planning is focusing on trying to reverse the downward slide of cities which are not global cities. It is also evident in the writings of Levy (1990) and Haider (1992) when stressed their worries over the domination of "sale type activities" within cities, which Haider (1992) stresses on as " not social equity activities"; and in Webber *et al* (1991) concerns over the UNDP and WB practice of the neo-liberal approach to development using structural adjustment and urban management policies in Madras, India, as follows:

> "…. It is striking that these direct concerns with economic development and with human development are not counted in the core of Madras' urban development projects. The formal project objectives [...] seem only implicitly related. It seems these concerns are central neither to Madras' urban agenda. Each agency involved in the programme has chosen to focus on less direct influences on the economy and human welfare, on the physical environmental infrastructure that only indirectly affects economic and human development"     (Webber *et al* 1991, p. 16)

It seems that the field of planning theory was not capable of catching up with the rapid transitions happening globally. It is clearly evident from the above critique that the gains of the 1960s and early 1970s, regarding the focus on programmes and projects to achieve social equity, social justice, participation, and democracy in the name of "public interest", have been washed away. This led many planning scholars and theorists to name the 1980s as the "planning crisis" decade (levy 2003). But what is the way out from all this mess? How can planners revive their traditional dream and defend the gains of the 1960s while plugging their cities into the rapid global transitions? How can planners rebuild their profession without being seen as mercenaries? Well, some answer to these critical questions and others started to take shape while the emergence of the postmodernism movement around the mid 1980s, however, the complete answers are yet so far to be fully developed.

### 2.2.2.5 Collaborative Planning

Around the mid 1980s, much of literature on planning theory is devoid of attempts to view planning theory through the lens of the postmodern cultural critique. Urban geographers including Michael Dear, Philip Cooke, David Harvey, Edward Soja, Edward Relph have initially led such attempts, and later on many others such as Patsy Healey and others joined in. The postmodernism movement in planning has drawn on a terminology first developed in art and architecture critique. Although postmodernism in architecture is primarily a critique of a particular paradigm or style within Western art and architecture, postmodernism in planning is primarily a critique of systematic reason in modern western thought (Healey 1996, p.237).

But first of all, what does "modernity" (or "enlightenment" as Healey (1996) calls it) refer to in planning theory? There is a common agreement among planning scholars that modernity in planning started when traditional planners, after the 2$^{nd}$ world war, started to diminish the dominance of industrial capitalists while mediating the instrumental frictions among capitalists that had resulted in a city inefficiently organised for production and reproduction – "it was modern because it engaged the city of industrial capitalism and became institutionalised as a form of state intervention" (Beauregard 1996, p. 217). Moreover, for postmodernists, modernity in planning theory ended with the globally emerging changes in the 1980s (see table 2.4 for the key global changes in the modernist conditions). Caren Levy (2003) points out that many scholars, including Anthony Giddens, do not recognise postmodernism as a separate period (or era) in planning theory, however, rather than a natural extension of modernism. This perception, as levy (2003) stresses, is problematic as it could be misused to support the idea that underdeveloped countries have to walk the same path of developed countries to achieve development goals. Beauregard summarised the modernity thoughts as follows:

> ".… Modernist project is derived from beliefs about knowledge and
> society; and is inextricably linked to the rise of capitalism, the formation
> of the middle class. The emergence of a scientific mode of legitimation,
> the concept of an orderly and spatially integrated city that meets the
> needs of society, and the fostering of the interventionist state. Technical
> rationality is viewed as a valid and superior means of making public
> decisions, and information gathered scientifically is regarded as
> enlightening, captivating, and convincing. The democratic state contains
> an inherent tendency to foster and support reform, whereas its planners

maintain a critical distance from specialised interests. Such beliefs repeat and mimic beliefs about enlightenment that are associated with the rise of capitalist democracies and with the modernist quest for control and liberation"                                    (Beauregard 1996, p.220)

Stressing on key changes to conditions underpinning the modernism thoughts in planning theory, postmodernists started challenging such thoughts as being irrelevant. First, they stress the change that happened to the economic processes associated with capitalist development. Economic processes are no longer associated with the rise of industrial capitalism (or Fordist) that guided modern planners to seek orderly and functionally organised cities to accelerate capital accumulation. Location is no longer important as technology and communication have been 'revolutionalised'. As a consequence, industrial capitalism is no longer the power, which drives the planning process, but rather financial capitalism becomes more important.

Albertsen (1988) and Cooke (1988) point out that the traditional Fordist means, techniques, and social relations of production no longer exist. They have been replaced by (what they called post-Fordist forms) postmodern forms of production including high-technology products and processes, an expanded emphasis on financial circuit of capital, more flexible procedures and regulations of in the workplace, and a defensive and weakened labour force. Such challenge is linked to Albrechts (1996) terms of "placeless powers (financial capitals) and powerless places (cities that cannot plug into the globalisation process)" presented in the above section.

Second, postmodernists challenge issues of 'embourgeoisement', unitary notion of urban planning, and "conflict-free" society. Davis (1987) emphasises that the increasing fragmentation of capital and labour in the postmodern era resulted to unequal economic growth on local, national and international levels. Soja (1986) stresses that the emergence of modern cities neither achieved its dream of equal participation to different societal groups nor erased the manifestation of past injustices. Beauregard (1996) presents the postmodernist view about society while criticising the modern assumption about conflict-free society as follows:

".... The increasing fragmentation of capital and labour in the postmodern era [....] makes ludicrous any assumption of unitary plan. The postmodern city is layered with historical forms and struggled over by fractions of capital and labour, each of which is dependant upon economic activities that are industrial and post-industrial, formal and

informal, primary and secondary (Davis 1987; Soja 1986). Under such conditions, it is difficult to maintain the modernist commitment to a conflict-free public interest. National attempts to obliterate class distinctions through prosperity and collective consumption and the local attempts to provide events (e.g. multiethnic affairs) that celebrate yet minimize differences have not led to *embourgeoisement* of working class"                                                                (ibid, p. 223)

The third change is related to the changing role of the state. Many analysts and scholars such as Feagin (1988) and Gitlin (1988), argue that the modernist assumption that the sate had progressive tendencies, in the sense that it can represent people and support the growth of democracy, no longer exists. The postmodern hyper-mobility of capital and labour together with the four reasons presented by David Harvey (1989b) explaining the shift towards entrepreneurialism, forced the state to retreat to its conservative forms as a matter of survival. In other words, it was forced to de-link the notion of efficiency by supporting market processes from social welfare. This led Feagin (1988) to warn from the result of such de-link in creating a wide-range of environmental and social costs, when analysing the case of Huston in the USA.

Nevertheless, Healey (1997) stresses that the state can no longer been seen as monolithic (i.e. as a one unitary entity), however, it has to be seen as an entity that comprises many sub interacting and competing entities, each of which is open to the domination of some factions of capital and labour power. And though, this may explain the state repression and tolerance in different time and space. The final change is the challenging notion of scientific rationality and its replacement by the communicative methodology (see section 2.2.1.3). Given the main key changes through which postmodernist challenges the modernism thought, Beauregard (1996) summarised the postmodernist critique to modernity from within very succinctly:

"…. The postmodernist cultural critique is a complex one. It includes a turn to historical allusion and spatial understanding, the abandoning of critical distance for ironic commentary, the embracing of multiple discourses and the rejection of totalising ones, a scepticism towards master narrative and general social theories, a disinterest in the performativity of knowledge, the rejection of notions of progress and enlightenment, and a tendency toward political acquiescence (Bernstein 1987; Cooke 1988; Dear 1986; Gregory 1987; Jameson 1984a, Jencks 1985; Lyotard 1984; Relph 1987; Soja 1989)" (Beauregard 1996, p. 224)

Table 2.4 Postmodernism Challenge to Modernism: Key Changes in the Modernist Conditions

| Issues | Economic processes associated with capitalist development | The form of social relations | The role of the state in capitalist development | Methodology |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Modernist conditions** | Associated with the rise of industrial capitalism<br><br>".... Fordist means, techniques and social relations of production" (Beauregard 1996, p. 221) | Rise of capitalism linked to 'embourgeoisement', reduction of class differences and diffusion of middle class (while male) values<br><br>(Conflict-free society) | State had progressive tendencies (despite alliances with industrial capital<br><br>Progressive in the sense of appearance of representation and support of growth of democracy) | " Reason […] as logic coupled with scientifically constructed empirical knowledge" (Healey 1996, p. 237) |
| **Postmodernist conditions** | Rise of financial capital<br><br>Globalisation of economic processes (information and communication technology, flexible and fragmented production processes, weakened workforce) (Harvey 1987) | Unequal economic growth (locally, nationally, and internationally<br><br>Growth cleavages in society on the basis of class, race, ethnicity, age, etc, as groups express diversity and challenge exclusion through insurgent practices (Healey 1997)<br><br>(Conflict-ridden societies) | State has become conservative, in the name of efficiency (because of alliance with financial capital)<br><br>Conservative in the sense of abandoning the link between efficiency and welfare; and focus on the market | Deconstruction of scientific rationalism as methodology of 'truth' it is narrow and dominating and excludes 'other ways of being and knowing' (Healey 1996, p. 237)<br><br>Reconstruction of knowledge through communicative rationality |

Source: adapted from

Beauregard R., 1996, Between Modernity and Postmodernity: The Ambiguous Position of U.S. Planning, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Readings in Planning Theory*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, pp. 213-234;

Healey P., 1996, Planning Through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory, in S. Campbell and S. Fainstein (Eds.), *Reading in Planning Theory*, Blackwell, pp. 234-257;

Healey P., 1997, *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, Macmillan press Ltd, London; and

Levy C., 2003, Urban Policy, Planning and Management, Module on MSc in Urban Development Planning, Development Planning Unit, University College London

(see also Allmendinger 2001; Forester 2000; and Sandercock 1998, 1998a).

In 1992 Patsy Healey presented a new theoretical alternative to the existing planning theory, collaborative planning, in an article titled "Planning Through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory" published in *Town Planning Review*. Such article together with Anthony Giddens (1995), *The Constitution of Society,* were the base upon which Patsy Healey wrote *The Collaborative Planning* in 1997. She started her argument by analysing and deconstructing the rational comprehensive planning for not providing a mechanism for critiquing the discourse itself rather than a narrow, economistic, and functionalist conception of the dimensions of lifeworlds; and pluralist conception of interest mediation for being interested only in the notion of participation without putting any effort toward "learning about" the interests and perceptions and, with that knowledge, revising what each participant thinks about each other's and their own interest. As a consequence, participation has become manipulated by the powerful and is used to legitimise planning actions (Healey 1996, pp. 250-1).

Although her tolerance towards the political economy approach for its critical analysis and perception about society, state, and planning process, Patsy Healey criticised political economy for focusing their analysis only on the notion of class and ignoring other aspects such as race, age, ethnicity, religion and so on; and for not providing any room for manoeuvre for planners. She also criticised political economy planners working within the state for becoming oppressive by using the rational comprehensive planning tools to legitimise their decisions whether to meet capitalist interests or to support market processes (Healey 1997). Patsy Healey was also tolerant to the entrepreneurial planning approach for understanding the global-local conflict and recognising the changes in modernism conditions. However, she was very critical to such approach for being exploitative to cities' resources, which helps in deteriorating the environment though reducing environmental standards to attract capital and investment; for de-linking efficiency from social welfare and social justice by defining efficiency in terms of the cost and benefits analysis; and for perceiving democracy as something important of its own as a human right issue away from planning decision-making process (Healey 1997).

By adopting the Structuration theory together with the postmodernist cultural critique to modernism assumptions as a background of her perception about society and planning processes, Patsy Healey views society as a conflict-ridden society that consists of different groups, each with different interests, who interact with each other in a co-operative conflict process to achieve communicative action. To achieve such

communicative action, respect for and tolerance toward each group to present their argument through communicative rationality process (see section 2.2.1.3 on the transformative traditions) are crucial. But to put this argument in a reality context in relation to planning activities, what can planning mean in this postmodernist world? What purposes and practices should it have? Healey (1996) states the following:

> "…. Planning is an interactive and interpretive process, focusing "deciding and acting" within a range of specialised allocative and authoritative systems but drawing on the multidimensionality of "life worlds" or "practical sense", rather than a single formalised dimension […] formal techniques of analysis and design in planning processes are but one form of discourse. Planning process should be enriched by discussions of moral dilemmas and aesthetic illustration of experiences […] such interaction assumes the pre-existence of individuals engaged with others in diverse, fluid, and overlapping "discourse communities"
>
> (*ibid*, p. 247)

In this sense, planning is open to diverse alliances internally in terms of planning institutions and agencies engaged in the planning process, and externally by different societal groups with different interests and agendas (Healey 1996, 1997). This is strongly connected to Healey's perception about the state, which she shares with the postmodernist thoughts. She perceives the state as a multi-faction entity (not as a monolithic unit) that each faction is open to diverse alliance, internally by other state factions, and externally by interest groups, including capital and labour, and other agencies involving in the planning process.

Therefore, Patsy Healey calls upon planners to practice what she calls "insurgent practices", which refers to a collective movement of people applying pressure on state to achieve their goals and interests. She echoed political economists call on planners to adopt the principle of " things to defend and things to extend" by searching for strategic entry points to different state agencies to achieve equity and effectiveness within local, national and global processes (Healey 1997, also see table 2.5). Although the emphasis on the role of state to have the capacity for locally sensitive and globally aware understanding of the needs and interests of firms existing in a place, state is regarded as the general controller and regulator that works between efficiency and equality. She supports her argument by stating the following:

Table 2.5 A Review of Intervention in Urban Development: Theory and Practice

| CLASSICAL (PHYSICAL) TRADITIONS | APPLIED TRADITIONS | TRANSFORMATIVE TRADITIONS |
|---|---|---|
| **Rational comprehensive**<br>– Master plan<br>– National/regional policies on urban development focus on rural areas to lessen population growth in cities<br>– Zoning and detailed planning<br>– New settlements/towns programmes | **Advocacy**<br>– Neighbourhood plans (local focused plans with short-term goals developed with community participation<br>– Sectoral urban programmes for basic needs programmes that are connected with foreign aid<br><br>**Political economy**<br>– Activist politics because planners can do nothing as planners in the state<br>– National policy focuses on equality<br>– Urban plans and programmes (things to defend and things to extend) through building alliances and bargains<br><br>**Entrepreneurial**<br>– Urban management programmes as a way to co-ordinate activities of different actors (state, private sector, community organisations, etc)<br>– Partnership projects, structural adjustment programmes and privatisation<br>– Urban policy (performance criteria to measure efficiency) | **Collaborative**<br>– National cross sectoral policies<br>– Urban policies look for strategic entry points to achieve equity and effectiveness in local, national and global processes<br>– Constituency-based plans and programmes (local and groups) |

"…. The critical challenge for local governance capability is how to 'strike a bargain' with businesses, including property interests, which will constrain businesses where it could trample on social relations or undermine environmental capacities; while enabling business activity to flourish […] A major function of local governance is to help firms to overcome hurdles and market barriers, to improve their internal operating conditions. The quality of the way this is done will affect the extent to which 'being in a particular place' adds value to a firm's activities [….] economic activities needs to be understood from the point of view of 'business world'. From that point of view, the qualities of places in which firms are located are an amalgam of physical assets and particular environment qualities, labour market attributes, company networks and market opportunities, spatial organisation and institutional relations through which knowledge about products, markets, opportunities and constraints flows around"     (Healey 1997, pp. 160-1)

While building the collaborative planning approach to land and development on the structuration theory to social structures, Patsy Healey based her scope of analysis on the issues of interactive, power relations into gender, class, ethnicity, religion, age, ability, and so on. As a consequence, collaborative planning expanded its scope to all existing discourse, as it is formulated to guide planning practice to work as a cross-cutting practice to all existing planning traditions (Healey 1996). However its recognition of diversity and power structures; and attention to institutionalisation of changes (e.g. bias of procedures, language, and other visible and invisible mechanisms of exclusion); the collaborative approach has been criticised for many aspects. It has been criticised for not providing yet new practical planning methods in dealing with land and development; and although calling for mutual respect and tolerance, it is in much collision course with both fundamentalism and relativism (Healey 1996). Moreover, it has been criticised regarding its communicative rationality methodology as being utopian ideal and highly eclectic as Beauregard (1996) concludes:

"…. As a body, planning theorists became highly eclectic, pursuing theoretical projects for their own sake. Collectively, they lost the object, the city, which had given planning its legitimacy. Their new objects – the planning process, policy making, and so on – were only tangentially the objects of practitioners; they were procedurally relevant but not substantively. This postmodern fragmentation of planning theory would have been acceptable if it had paralleled a corresponding adoption of an integrative framework that criticised society and advanced planning practice […] practitioners and theorists must rededicate themselves to

the built environment as the object of action and inquiry. At present, the physical city exists within planning as a serious of unconcerned fragments rather than as a practical and theoretical synthesis of planning action and thought […] the physical city is the object of practice and theory that historically enabled state planning to be established. To abandon it is to abandon the meaning of urban planning as well as the source of its legitimacy as a state activity"                    (*ibid*, p.228)

Given such criticism to collaborative planning, planning theory and practice has never looked as fragmented and apart. Almost all physical planners practitioners had given up the faith in theorists to present applicable and practical, not analytical or theoretical frameworks and models, upon which they can carry on their practice while continue destructing the "traditional ways". In the same time, theorists gave up trust in planning practitioners to adopt and apply planning theories from a moral and ethical ground. Each group accuses the other for being ignorant about reality and stubborn to accept the other side's arguments and beliefs. Paradoxically, one cannot imagine that these two groups shared once the same aim, beliefs, way of thinking and moral ground.

Given the underlying, historical context, assumptions and beliefs of each theoretical approach (style) to land and development, it can be recognised that each approach, which emerged into the field of planning theory was dominant within and attached to specific planning practice tradition(s) (see table 2.5). This is not to say that physical planning traditions were consistent and systematic in adopting and/or applying a specific planning approach or methodology. However, they progressively and simultaneously adopted and applied different planning approaches and methodologies as a result of the continuous shift of focus and scope of both planning theorists and practitioners. Using the arguments, debate, and analysis illustrated in sections 2.1 and 2.2, the following section will construct the research analytical framework upon which the urban development process and physical planning practice in the context of Egypt in general and of the case study in specific will be explored, analysed and documented.

**2.3 An Analytical Framework for the Understanding of Physical Planning Practice**

Despite the planning paradigm shift, the fragmentation of planning theory and practice, as well as the widening gap between planning theorists and practitioners, illustrated above, the research identified some systematic entry points to the analysis of the urban planning process and physical planning practice with respect to the arguments and debate over the concepts of structure and agency (see figure 2.1).

First, given the dynamics of the global political economy and its significant impact on the national and local political economy contexts and on the way in which the state relates to interest groups within society and adopts certain urban development planning approaches to land and development in specific time-space edge, it becomes crucial that physical planning practice should not be analysed separately from a critical understanding of such contexts. The impact of change at the levels of global, national, and local political economy on physical planning practice can be easily recognised in the debated notions of the 'places wars' and 'inter-urban' and 'intra-urban' conflicts and its devastating social and environmental impacts both in the developed and less developed countries. It can also be recognised, since the mid 1980s, in the evident global shift in: the economic processes associated with capitalist development, the form of social relations, the role of state in capitalist development, and planning methodologies (see sections 2.1.3, 2.2.2.4, and 2.2.2.5 and table 2.4). In this sense, it is critically important to understand the link between the change of the global political economy and the national and local political economy contexts. Such critical understanding provides, on the one hand, the basic background upon which the change in the state-society relationship, specifically state-private sector relationship at the national and local levels, might be historically recognised, explored, analysed, and documented within a given time and space edge. On the other hand, it provides the tool by which the questions of who gets what, when, why and how could be explored and analysed.

The second entry point is a critical understanding of the environment of interactions between power and interests (i.e. the action environment) in society both at the national and local levels, which has an interlocking relationship with changes at the global, national and local political economy scales. Each country, and even locality, has its unique action environment that depends upon the interlocking dynamic relations between the unique historical development of its socio-political and socio-economic structures across time, the international as well as the national interests of the powerful agencies that influence changes in the political economy at the national and local levels, and the political leadership and the significantly powerful individuals in each society.

Figure 2.1 An Analytical Framework to the Understanding of Physical Planning Practice

Although, the first three identified factors can be easily recognised in both the developed and less developed countries, the latter factor (i.e. the political leadership and powerful individuals) is less influential in the context of countries with an extended history of constitutional democracy. In this sense, in contexts where practice of constitutional democracies were denied for long periods of time, such factor is seen as one of the most influential on the action environment and its outcome public policies and social institutions.

The environment of interactions between power and interests is seen as the driving force that determines as well as controls, on the one hand, the way in which the state decides upon future national and local course of events, and the goals and objectives of the development process. In other words, it is seen as the prime factor that controls the decision-making process upon which the national, regional, and local development policies are created, directed, and controlled in specific time-space edge. The action environment is also recognised as the triggering factor behind the adoption and application of specific aims and objectives of the national, regional, and local urban development policies and physical planning practice as well as the adoption and application of specific planning approaches to land and development in specific time-space edge. On the other hand, such environment is seen here as the driving force behind the establishment, the disappearance, as well as the empowerment and weakening, of certain institutions and agencies that significantly affect the urban development process and physical planning practice in specific time-space edge both at the national and local levels. In other words, it has a significant role in setting the parameters of the dynamics of the central/local government relationship. In this sense, the in depth understanding of the environment of interactions between power and interests (i.e. the action environment) provides a mean to document, explore, and analyse urban development planning process and the reasons behind decisions about physical planning practice within each society.

The third entry point of the analysis is the recognition of a link between the action environment and the institutional arrangements established to carry out the task of physical planning formulation and implementation at the national and local levels. These power and interests interactions are seen as the driving force behind the emergence, disappearance, empowerment and weakening of certain institutions and agencies within society with respect to urban development planning and physical planning practice. As such, it contributes to and influences the interaction environment

between an existing set of institutions and newly established ones. In this sense, the action environment is viewed as the prime force that on the one hand, affects and influences the way in which institutions are being arranged, and on the other hand, determines the resulting intra-institutional and inter-institutional conflicts and the power structures between and within such institutions and agencies responsible for the urban development planning process and physical planning formulation and implementation in specific-time and space edge. In other words, the action environment significantly affects and influences the environment of institutional interaction and its resulting power structures. The new institutional arrangements and its power structures result in triggering new international, national, local interests and values with respect to physical planning practice, which in turn significantly contribute to the changes in the action environment settings.

The fourth interlocking entry point to the analysis of physical planning practice is the critical link between the institutional arrangements and power structures and the decision-making process. It is clear that such a link is one of the most influential factors affecting physical planning practice where the distribution question, inclusion and exclusion debate, and the dilemma of addressing the 'public interest' could be empirically understood (see section 2.2). Critically understanding such link helps explore the impact of the action environment as well as the institutional interaction on physical planning practice. This is through examining the control of and access to the decision-making process as well as the domination of specific institutions, agencies, and individuals over the urban development process and physical planning practice decisions at the national and local levels in specific time-space edge. It also helps provide a set of tools with which the reasons and causes of the urban development planning process and decisions of physical planning practice might be recognised, explored, analysed and documented.

The final critical interlocking point is the reverse impact of the urban development planning process and physical planning practice on both the power and interests interaction (i.e. the action environment) and institutional interaction environment. This point is seen as crucial to understand when analysing physical planning practice at the national and local levels, where such practice results, in most case, in triggering an emergence of new international, national, and local interests. As a consequence, such new interests join the pace of the action environment both at the national and local levels that usually results, as explained above, in creating,

demolishing, empowering, or weakening of specific institutions and agencies to join the institutional arrangements of the urban development process and physical planning practice. And in turn, such institutions and agencies and their related newly arranged power structures join the institutional interaction environment to produce a new set of institutional arrangements and power structures that affects the decision-making process of the urban development planning process and physical planning practice at the national and local levels in specific time-space edge.

The following analytical chapters will use these entry points to explore, examine, analyse, and document the links between the changes in the national political economy context, the action environment, the institutional arrangements and power structure, and physical planning practice in the context of the case study to present the empirical evidence, which endorse the research hypothesis.