

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING:  
A NEW SOCIAL INSTITUTION

Thesis for the Degree of M. U. P.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
CLIFFORD ALBERT HUDSICK



3 1293 10276 6858

LIBRARY  
Michigan State  
University

~~ACT 22-1977-296~~

2 ~~035~~  
~~St 19-36-7-2~~  
~~OST 000000~~ ~~1300~~

a 308

9 ~~141~~  
0000001

~~000000~~ 087

NA 147

APR 20 1999

## ABSTRACT

### CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING: A NEW SOCIAL INSTITUTION

By

Clifford Albert Hudsick

This thesis has sought to investigate the strategy that is required for a planning effort, that has as a part of its goals the establishment of citizen participation in planning. It has, thus, lead to an attempt at understanding that if citizen participation is to be successful, planning must develop access to the decision-making process for participation organizations. In this development, citizen participation represents an interest to be equaled with social institutions and their ability to influence planning.

Views of citizen participation today are examined in light of the evolution of citizen participation in planning and discussed with past and present determinations of the public interest in planning. Emphasis has been placed upon the public interest, since adopted plans must be considered as the articulation of interests which were able to influence the planning process.

The framework for the examination of citizen participation as a social institution is established by the recognition that "politics" is the medium through which the influence of power and authority of a social



institution is exercised. These are the same influences which determine the public interest in planning. Since citizen participation efforts will confront these influences, the regulative and economic institutions are specifically examined.

The development of planning strategy for citizen participation is viewed in terms of the required components of a social institution, then the overall organizational effort and the preliminary requirement of power and authority. In further development of citizen participation as a social institution, the objectives and aims of participation are established. The objectives seek to set on a broad scale the strategy of citizen participation in relation to the planning process, and the aims are established as an expression of the strategy of citizens to citizen participation. Possible secondary consequences of the aims and objectives are also examined; i.e., community control and the development of political power.

Finally, an evaluation is made of the practical difficulties in the establishment of participation as a social institution in planning. The practical impediments, both internal and external, of the participation effort are cited, as well as the obstacles the planner must overcome. Existing programs are also evaluated for the provisions they contain, which are

readily adaptable to the organization of citizen participation as a social institution. The task of the development of strategy is then related to planning and its professionals and society at large.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING:  
A NEW SOCIAL INSTITUTION

By  
Clifford Albert Hudsick

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Master in Urban Planning

Department of Landscape Architecture  
and Urban Planning

1970

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The task of completing a thesis and graduate study by an individual is only possible with the support and encouragement of family and friends. My family, known to others as "those Hudsicks," never ceased in giving me their support, encouragement and love no matter how different our expressed ideas may have been. Thank you Mom, Pop, Monya, George, Linda, Eugene, Daniel, Norma Jean and Walter.

The friendship that Lou, Richard and Joseph have given is surely more than most would hope to have in two lifetimes. Thank you my friends. The academic understanding and guidance that I needed in pursuing this study was always generously given by Professor Keith M. Honey. I want to thank Keith for his understanding and advice; and fulfillment of a professor-student relationship that is at the heart of the educational process, but is hardly found among others at today's mega-university.

To the Selective Service System, Local Board No. 33A in Brooklyn, who followed their guidelines during my graduate study, I say that I followed my guidelines.

Since getting to Michigan State University was half the graduate school journey, Pamela deserves so

much of the credit in helping me to earn the admission ticket, my undergraduate degree.

Once at Michigan State University, day-to-day problems were solved only with the understanding that Janyce always provided. It was during this time that her care and concern for me grew to Love, as mine did for her.

C.A.H.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I:	INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1 BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION. . . . . 5 Divergent Views of Citizen Parti- cipation . . . . . 6 Evolution of Citizen Participation in Planning. . . . . 10 Planning and the Public Interest(s) 24
CHAPTER II:	VIEWING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION . . . . . 32 Institutional Structure. . . . . 34 Government and Economic Institu- tions. . . . . 38 Citizen Participation Institu- tionalized . . . . . 47 Promotion of Citizen Participation by Existing Institutions . . . . . 50
CHAPTER III:	REQUIREMENTS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION. . . . . 61 A Framework of Citizen Participation in Planning. . . . . 63 Purpose. . . . . 64 Organization . . . . . 64 Personnel. . . . . 65 Procedures . . . . . 66 Equipment. . . . . 67 Citizen Participation in the Devel- opment of Planning Strategy. . . . 68 Means and Ends . . . . . 69 Process and Conflict . . . . . 70 Structure and Power. . . . . 71 Power and Authority in Relation to Planning Strategy. . . . . 74 Planning Strategy for Citizen Participation. . . . . 77
CHAPTER IV:	THE OBJECTIVES AND AIMS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS STRATEGY. . . . . 81 Objectives of Citizen Participation 83 Aims of Citizen Participation. . . 86

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

	Page
Secondary Consequences of the Objectives and Aims. . . . .	90
Decentralization and Community Power. . . . .	90
Development of Political Power. . . . .	92
Achievement Elements of the Objectives and Aims . . . . .	95
CHAPTER V: IMPEDIMENTS TO CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, AND EVALUATION OF SELECTED PROGRAMS . . . . .	
Impediments. . . . .	104
Motivation-Cause . . . . .	106
Leadership-Participation-Past Activities. . . . .	107
Representativeness-Constituency Purpose-Interest-Perpetuation. . . . .	109
Political Education. . . . .	110
Technical Assistance . . . . .	112
Evaluation of Selected Programs. . . . .	113
Model Cities Programs. . . . .	115
Neighborhood Corporations. . . . .	115
Citizen Planning Boards. . . . .	123
CHAPTER VI: SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING OUTLOOK . . . . .	
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	129
	147

## INTRODUCTION

At one time or another during most planning efforts the words "citizen participation" are bound to be mentioned. During a few planning efforts, attempts are made to apply a concept of citizen participation. Once in a while, and not very often, a planning program will achieve its goals as it places citizen participation into practice. Why one planning effort will pay lip service to citizen participation and another will succeed in its application appears to lie in the control of access to decision-making in planning.

Although this is not a new explanation for the success or failure of citizen participation, the support of this position is relatively new. This Thesis seeks to investigate the strategy that is required to support a planning effort that has as a part of its goals the establishment of citizen participation in planning. The Thesis has, thus, lead to an attempt at understanding why, if citizen participation is to be successful, planning must develop access to the decision-making process for participation organizations. In this development, citizen participation represents an interest to be equated with social institutions and their ability to influence planning. Therefore, the role of citizen participation in planning as a new social institution dominates this Thesis.

Chapter I searches the background and history of citizen participation with an examination of reasons behind probable views of citizen participation today. These views are then compared against the evolution of citizen participation in planning. From this perspective, attention is placed upon the past and present determinations of the public interest in planning. The public interest is in turn examined for a delineation of the problem areas which surround access to the decision-making in planning. Emphasis is placed upon the public interest, since adopted plans must be considered as the articulation of interests which were able to influence the planning process. The problem areas delineated will indicate the direction of a developing strategy for citizen participation in gaining access to decision-making in planning.

Chapter II investigates citizen participation as a social institution. The framework for this examination is established by the recognition that "politics" is the medium through which the influences of the power and authority of social institutions is exercised. These are the same influences which determine the public interest in planning. Since citizen participation efforts will be confronting the influences of social institutions, the regulative and economic institutions are specifically examined for their ability to shape

the determination of the public interest in planning.

Chapter III organizes the development of planning strategy for citizen participation in planning as a social institution. First, citizen participation is viewed in terms of components of a social institution. Next, the overall organization of a participation effort is examined as a process to be utilized in the development of planning strategy. After this, the process of developing citizen participation strategy in planning is examined for its preliminary need of power and authority. These needs are evaluated in terms of the potential that can be provided for the development of planning strategy.

Chapter IV, as it pursues a further development of citizen participation as a social institution, establishes the objectives of citizen participation. The objectives seek to set on a broad scale the strategy of citizen participation in relation to the planning process. Next, the aims of participation are established as an expression of the strategy of citizens to citizen participation. The objectives and aims are then examined for their possible secondary consequences; i.e., community control and the development of political power.

Finally, the chapter attempts to bring into focus the practical difficulties of the establishment of a

participation in a planning process. This is done by making an examination of "achievement elements," which indicate stages in the development of a participation effort as they relate to the objectives and aims.

Chapter V investigates the practical impediments of initiating citizen participation within planning. These impediments are seen as being both internal and external to the participation organization. They are also viewed with consideration as obstacles that the planner must overcome.

The latter part of the chapter examines the structure and organization that has been promoted as citizen participation in some selected programs. As existing programs, they are evaluated for the provisions they contain, which are readily adaptable to the organization of citizen participation as a social institution.

Finally, Chapter VI provides a summary and concluding outlook to the development of citizen participation in planning as a social institution. It attempts to relate various aspects of development and strategy to planning, its professionals, and the background and attitudes of planners.



## CHAPTER I

### THE HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

The idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you.

Sherry R. Arnstein

### Divergent Views of Citizen Participation

If planners, urban and suburban residents, members of minority groups, and politicians were asked the question "What is citizen participation in planning?" there is no doubt that a variety of answers and views of citizen participation could be obtained. The answers and views given would probably yield and relate a broad spectrum of attitudes toward participatory democracy and decision-making. Accordingly, these attitudes should be considered in relation to how past planning efforts may have affected the individual and/or his public or vested interests.

When speaking specifically of citizen participation in an urbanized area, it seems reasonable that a response from an urban resident would include a view that citizen participation is a guise for giving specific neighborhoods or business interests special attention. An example of this would be the instances where urban renewal planning has affected either the black neighborhood or downtown businesses in the larger cities. Whether or not this view of citizen participation in urban renewal planning could change depends upon numerous variables; e.g., politics, federal funds and planning programs, but, most importantly, the neighborhood group participating.

"These groups, after all, are usually concerned about neighborhood, not city-wide, problems, and the member's attachment is often at most to his immediate family and neighbors, not to the community as a whole."<sup>1</sup>

The response of a planner working with a municipal planning agency might be that citizen participation occurs when the agency and city government attempt to inform, involve and advise citizens of the various aspects of a planning program that will directly affect the citizens. The planner might also point out that this task is attempted in the face of a public interest that is continually apathetic.

"The city official, despairing of the apathy and indifference of those he tries to serve and guide toward wholesome city living blames the failure of his programs to gain support and operate as he had planned upon this presumed impersonal aspect."<sup>2</sup>

The nature of a response from a member of a minority group in an urban area would probably depend upon a sense of "community struggle" and/or "black awareness," shaped by such factors as age and income. These factors could

---

<sup>1</sup>James Q. Wilson, "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXIX (November, 1963), p. 249.

<sup>2</sup>Massachusetts, Dept. of Commerce, Housing Association of Metropolitan Boston, Inc., Housing and Home Finance Agency, Urban Renewal Administration Demonstration Branch, Community Organization for Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal. (Boston, 1957), p. 2.

influence a view that citizen participation represents a mechanism which is aimed at keeping down the voice and/or opposition of a community toward a planning program.

"Another citizen participation practice is to involve citizens in an organization in order to prevent anticipated obstructionism. In this sense citizens are not seen as a means to achieve better planning goals nor are they seen as partners in assisting an organization in achieving its goal; rather, they are viewed as potential elements of obstruction or frustration whose cooperation and sanction are found necessary."<sup>3</sup>

Another response, the tone of which would not require a significant amount of militancy, could view citizen participation as a white man's trick of coopting ghetto residents.

The response of an urban politician could very well reflect a view that citizen participation is grass-roots involvement in the democratic decision-making process. The politician would probably indicate that this type of involvement is required to guide the policy formulation of the elected and appointed decision makers. According to Walter Wilcox, this type of response may be given; although, in actuality the elected politician has "very imperfect information about constituency preference" and

---

<sup>3</sup>Edmund M. Burke, "Citizen Participation Strategies," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXIV (September, 1968), p. 291.

the constituent's awareness of the representative's position is "slight."<sup>4</sup>

The response of a suburbanite might exemplify a view of citizen participation as the ability to participate in local board meetings and public hearings. Yet, because of the relatively small size of many suburban areas and ease of accessibility to the local decision makers, the ability and opportunity to participate regularly has often gone unused. In vacating this opportunity, the suburbanite has assumingly placed his confidence with the local elected officials and decision makers. But, does this abdication of participation cause other effects?

"If the earnest citizen has surrendered control over many local issues, if few party leaders intervene, and if public affairs are the responsibility of the non-partisan amateur, how are politics of suburbia managed? A detailed answer is difficult to come by, but it is at least certain that in one form or another, alignments and associations exist to form some sort of power structure."<sup>5</sup>

The purpose of establishing these probable views of citizen participation is to illustrate some recurring

---

<sup>4</sup>Walter Wilcox, "The Congressional Poll and Non-Poll," in Political Opinion and Electoral Behavior: Essays and Studies, ed. by Edward C. Dreyer and Walter A. Rosenbaum (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1966), p. 397.

<sup>5</sup>Robert C. Wood, Suburbia: Its People and Their Politics (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958), p. 175.

factors, which contribute to an image of citizen participation in planning. Generalizing, these factors indicate that: (1) there is no one single view of citizen participation, nor is there an established amount of activism to be associated with any participation effort, (2) different views of the role of citizen participation are likely to be found between citizens and administrators of government, and (3) the socio-economic-political status of groups could represent in itself an opportunity to participate or the desire to participate.

Although these three statements are generalizations, they are set forth here to illustrate the types of considerations which will influence almost every planning effort which seeks to either include or exclude citizen participation in the decision-making of its planning process.

#### Evolution of Citizen Participation in Planning

The examination of citizen participation in planning and the course of its evolution has special importance in light of the recent re-evaluation of the goals, aims and objectives of planning. The commonality of planning and citizen participation lies in the means by which these goals and objectives are formulated and the means employed to achieve these aims. To the extent that planning is not a recognized part of our democratic



heritage - "Citizen participation is part of our democratic heritage, often proclaimed as a means to a perfect democratic process."<sup>6</sup> Stated simply, it is viewed as the ultimate voice in community decision-making.

A phase in the evolution of the planning process and citizen participation groups that is shared is the re-evaluation of means employed in the political, decision-making and planning process to activate and vocalize citizen participation. The planning profession only recent, and under pressure of its own membership, sought means of obtaining in urban areas the opportunity for citizen participation and endorsement that is found at the local town meeting level. The breakdown of elements of community structure, which pervented this participation in the urban areas, was not hard to find. In pursuing their methods, planners became aware of the shortcomings of strict physical planning. The consequences of these shortcomings evidenced themselves in a need for political, economic and social policies, in addition to physical development policies. The need also stressed the development of policies to re-establish forms of participation as a first step toward achieving valid planning efforts.

---

<sup>6</sup>Burke, op. cit., p. 287.

The re-evaluation made by many divergent citizen participation groups in reference to the means to vocalize their participation was to consider a more militant posture.

Furthermore, both the magnitude and the complexity of urban areas today has demanded more than a "unitary plan" which represents a single public interest. The different public interests that do exist were the motivators that led to the re-evaluation of the planning process. A major portion of the motivation for a modification of the concept of one public interest was also largely due to the active civil rights movement of the **sixties**, and the beginnings of federal development of social policies and planning programs. Yet, this happened only after America had for so long avoided acknowledgement of ther Other America.<sup>7</sup>

Eventually, planners and politicians began to realize the failure of their planning and its implementation; and it was pointed out (sometimes forcefully) that the inability of citizens to participate in the democratic process was due to economic, political or racial determinants. Planning itself began to realize that because of these same restrictions perhaps more than the technical competence of its planning, the

---

<sup>7</sup>Michael Harrington, The Other America: Poverty in the United States (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1962).

confidence in the representation of the different public interests in the establishment of planning goals, aims and objectives had been affected by this inability of various sectors to participate.

From the simple goal of including citizen participation in planning, the task has become progressively confusing and complex. When a policy to provide for an active form of citizen participation is adopted, then the dilemma of knowing who participates and to what extent they participate can become the fulcrum of the planning effort.

The pragmatic consideration for citing citizen participation as a fulcrum in a number of planning efforts is based upon various legislative requirements that call for the development of planning efforts only after an attempt has been made to establish some community consensus. Since these requirements can be sidetracked by the often sundry acceptance of "representatives of the community" and judgment based on the term "consensus," the unbalancing of a planning effort by participation can work without formal representatives and consensus. An example of this is the halting of poorly planned projects by the defacto veto of citizens. This type of participation has only been given notice when it has taken on more militant dimensions. The Village Voice

reports that the following "preventive participation" occurred because of the proposed construction of a New York State Office Building (SOB) at 125th Street and Seventh Avenue:

"An angry meeting at a Harlem church, a mass of pickets at the SOB site, some frantic communications between Deputy Mayor Robert Sweet, Rocky, and Harlem State Senator Basil Paterson, and construction on the \$28 million building had been indefinitely postponed. Swift Action; even in this politically hot summer.

"But the protest at the site was more than just a protest. The people of Harlem have not only stopped dead the building, for which all contracts had been let, but they have 'reclaimed' the land and are determined to make use of the huge empty lot as they see fit."<sup>8</sup>

The report further notes:

"The sudden flame of conflict over the SOB exposes the familiar dangers of 'planning from above' and confirms the desperate need of local communities to establish their own priorities, particularly in the ghetto where the gap between the planner and the plannee is so formidable."<sup>9</sup>

This type of "preventive participation" by community residents also existed in the early days of the urban renewal era, which were also the early days of

---

<sup>8</sup>Jonathan Black, "This Is Our Land, We're Here to Stay," Village Voice, July 17, 1969, p. 15.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 44.

the present issue of the validity and acceptance of the issue of citizen participation.

"Many of the earliest redevelopment projects were completed with little organized opposition. Somehow, however, people learned from the experience of others, and today in cities which have been engaged in renewal for several years planners often find prospective renewal areas ready and waiting for them, organized to the teeth."<sup>10</sup>

With this type of opposition in mind, one of the most important questions which should be asked is, "If the aim of having citizen participation has become so reversible, then what was the strategy of citizen participation?" An examination of the historical development of citizen in planning legislation appears to indicate varying degrees of participation in four stages of planning development with no consistent strategy for participation within planning.

The City Beautiful Movement (approximately 1900 to 1915) was the beginning point of comprehensive planning, and it occurred during the Reform Movement period of American politics and government. Each of these movements helped planning achieve a semi-official stance in terms of planning's function for government at that time, and each movement in its own way was reflective of a "grass-roots" concern. The City Beautiful Movement established two aspects of local planning that remain in

---

<sup>10</sup>Wilson, op. cit., p. 243.

common use today, the professional planning consultant and the quasi-planning commission composed of leading citizens.<sup>11</sup> The effect of the movement was also to "create a special upper-middle class constituency for planning."<sup>12</sup> The City Beautiful Movement is attributed its sense of grass-roots concern, since it used concerned citizens; i.e., garden and civic clubs, as a basis for "doing something" in a planned way for the physical environment.

The turn of the century planner saw governmental officials involved in the behind the scenes interplay of private interests, which created the machine-run city. Quite obviously, the machine politicians did operate on the principle of satisfying private interests. Thus, it was natural that the planner should ally himself with the municipal reformer who was also dedicated to the ideals of a "good" government, which supposedly serves the public interest in an "efficient manner."

Additionally, during this era, the Tenement Housing Acts were passed in New York City, and the municipal reformers, saw slum removal as a method of social reform. Thus, by allying themselves with the reformers planning

---

<sup>11</sup>William I. Goodman and Eric C. Freund, ed., Principles and Practice of Urban Planning, International City Managers' Association (Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 22.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

was seeking re-establishment; based upon social concern, a true public interest, and the involvement of some citizens. The actual planning practiced since then may have deviated and lost emphasis, but clearly it was there.

During the 1920's, city planning became increasingly "popular" and in 1922 the U. S. Department of Commerce published the first edition of A Standard State Zoning Enabling Act. By 1926, the Supreme Court established the constitutionality of comprehensive planning.<sup>13</sup> Then, in 1928 the U. S. Department of Commerce gave additional sanction to the use of planning commissions in its model law, A Standard City Planning Enabling Act. Yet, because the leadership of most local planning commissions fell into the hands of Chambers of Commerce and the well-to-do citizen, "their plans paid no attention to slums or poverty."<sup>14</sup> This occurred even though the legal opportunity and mechanism for "fuller" citizen participation existed in these enabling acts, in their provision for public hearings.

Thus, local planning on the eve of the great Depression had attained status and self-identity. Yet, the relevance of most planning programs to basic urban

---

<sup>13</sup>Village of Euclid, Ohio, V. Amber Realty Co., 272 U.S. 363 (1926).

<sup>14</sup>Goodman and Freund, op. cit., p. 23.

problems seemed questionable. "Organization for planning was in the hands of quasi-independent commissions composed of business executives, realtors, and the high priests of economic order - lawyers, architects, and engineers."<sup>15</sup> For the most part, these lay leaders looked upon planning as a citizens' effort, to be "sold" to recalcitrant politicians.<sup>16</sup>

The Depression experience provided an impetus toward a redefinition of local planning when attention became focused on creating new institutional structures and coordinating their activities with old ones. The realization came about that planning could not escape questions of administration and organization. An analysis of the status of planning and a plea for an alternative model to the quasi-independent planning commission was established in Robert Walker's book, The Planning Function in Urban Government. It was then becoming favored that effective local planning required that the planning function be organized as a staff aid to the municipal executive.

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>16</sup>See Robert A. Walker, The Planning Function in Urban Government (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), pp. 143-62 and p. 205.



"In addition to forging new relationships to municipal government, planners during the Depression were also broadening the focus of their activities. Social problems assumed equal stature with physical layout as a legitimate claim on professional attention. Federal programs were of great assistance in producing the new emphasis."<sup>17</sup>

However, the greatest emphasis of federal programs which related planning to citizen participation and planning was within the workable program of the Housing Act of 1954.<sup>18</sup> The importance of this legislation and reshaping of the planning process is that it gave birth to the concepts of "maximum feasible citizen participation in the federal legislation of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and to 'widespread citizen participation' of the Model Cities Legislation."<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, the strength of this legislation and its importance was placed before the public and the planning profession with the Supreme Court's re-affirmation of the rights of the black minority.<sup>20</sup>

However, it appears that only in this period of a strong (but unclear) federal stance and the frequent

---

<sup>17</sup>Goodman and Freund, op. cit., p. 27.

<sup>18</sup>U.S. Congress, House, Title I, Housing Act of 1949 (as amended, Section 101), Public Law 171, 81st Congress, H.R. 1450.

<sup>19</sup>U.S. Congress, House, Title I, Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (as amended), Public Law 754, 89th Congress, H.R. 3301.

<sup>20</sup>Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas, 394 U.S. 294 (1954).

occurrence of urban disorders did the planner seem "to be convinced that it is both ethical and necessary to play the political game."<sup>21</sup>

Briefly, it is seen that planning and citizen participation have had some general parallelisms in their developments. The most important of these parallel is with respect to decision-making. It appears that as the planning process developed its plans more towards people planning and less toward physical planning, its role became officially adopted by the government with a corresponding increase in the size of urban areas. Emerging directly with this growth came an increase in the communicating distance between the government, its administration and the citizens of the community. As this distance increased, there was a decrease in the trust and confidence by the people of the community toward the elected and appointed officials who were responsible to larger and larger numbers of persons and more public interests. Added to this was the fact that the voting of the minority groups became less significant compared to the whole of the public interest, and this further removed them from the mainstream of participation in civic affairs. Then, the inability of some citizens to participate became greater, and their

---

<sup>21</sup>Alan Altshuler, The City Planning Process, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965), pp. 355-356.

ability to protest this tendency through structured means and make this situation known was to become virtually silent. The changes that the federal urban renewal legislation imposed upon this condition, however, were not as far reaching as they possibly could have been.

"The results have been generally ineffective, although it should be recognized that any efforts in this direction are to be encouraged and facilitated. The objective is worthy, although the methods, means, and techniques have not been perfected or developed to the point of becoming genuinely meaningful. However, in isolated instances, special efforts in relation to particular urban renewal projects have proved to be quite effective."<sup>22</sup>

Until federal policies made a clearer statement of the aims and goals of the community participation it expected from its programs, citizens continued to be left out of the decision-making of the planning process.

The frustration of this dilemma now partially rested upon those planners who sought to correct the wrongs in the representativeness of the planning process, but were handicapped by the lack of clear policy statements by the federal government. It was this type of clear policy statement which could have been made by local units of government to promote increased participation

---

<sup>22</sup>Goodman and Freund, op. cit., p. 573.

in planning at the local level. Thus, the concern and the burden of finding the means and methods for participation then rested with the citizen being affected by plans developed without his participation. Clearly, the desire "to take part" was developing into the most comprehensive aspect that the planning process would have to concern itself with. Since the catalyst for the struggle for access to the decision-making process of planning was the federal urban renewal programs, and the unsatisfactory solutions to this participation problem has focused this struggle, an examination of this federal citizen participation legislation is in order.

Jewel Bellush and Murray Hausknecht cite in Planning Participation and Urban Renewal:

"Urban renewal programs have opened a vast complex of activities requiring the skills and knowledge of planners. At the same time, that the contributions of the planners are called upon, the urban renewal administration calls for participation of citizens in renewal programs. The law specifies that a community submit a workable program for community improvement which must include provisions for 'citizen participation.'"<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Jewel Bellush and Murray Hacscknecht, "Planning, Participation and Urban Renewal," in Urban Renewal: People, Politics & Planning, ed. Jewel Bellush and Murray Hacscknecht (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1967), p. 278.

As an example of this intent, a statement of the then Department of Housing is cited:

"...and we mean by that not just a passive acceptance of what is being done, but the active utilization of local leadership and organizations which can profitably assist in the community effort."<sup>24</sup>

Of this intention, Bellush and Hacscknecht feel that as "admirable as this is a statement of values, it ignores some inevitable problems of 'democratic planning.'"

"For example, if we consider planning as a continuous decision-making process, at the crudest level of analysis we can distinguish three major stages of decision-making. First, there is the decision of the community to embark on urban renewal. Second, there is the formulation of a general plan for a given area which involves decisions as to what kinds of policies are to be emphasized; e.g., a decision to convert a mixed industrial and slum area to all residential use. Third, the development of specific proposals; e.g., drawing up detailed architectural and engineering plans providing for projected land use and the design of structures in the area. Does the notion of citizen participation mean that members of the community have a chance to participate in the construction of these designs; have the power to propose revisions; and have the power to approve or reject the final plans?"<sup>25</sup>

The argument of their article goes on to question whether all individuals within a community have the necessary prerequisites or resources for effective

---

<sup>24</sup>Address, Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency at the Family Service Association of America, November 13, 1961.

<sup>25</sup>Bellush and Hacscknecht, op. cit., p. 278.

participation regardless of their location within the social structure of the community.

However, although this type of questioning is obviously needed, much of the responsibility for planning is borne by the planner. His concept of the public interest and the planning process makes it just as important that the following questions be asked and answered. Does the planner and the planning process have the necessary prerequisites for initiating and adopting the means and methods to formulate a plan representing both a given public interest and the whole public interest? How long and how much effort will the planner spend in pursuit of each interest? What is the strategy of the planner towards each public interest and citizen participation?

#### Planning and the Public Interest

Through some of the words of Paul Davidoff, in "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," the cry of tribunal has been aroused.<sup>26</sup> The text of the article speaks directly to the problem of "unitary planning" and the dilemma facing the planner who is to plan for two or more public interests. In addressing the planner directly, Davidoff states that:

---

<sup>26</sup>Roger Starr, Editorial, American Society of Planning Officials Newsletter, XXXIII (December, 1967).

"Appropriate planning action cannot be prescribed from a position of value, neutrality for prescriptions are based upon desired objectives."<sup>27</sup>

One conclusion drawn from this is that "values are inescapable elements of any rational decision-making process."<sup>28</sup> When the "unitary plan" is defined as process whereby only one agency in the community should prepare a plan, the strategy and attitude of the individual planner towards citizen participation takes on increased importance. However, even if the unitary plan "has discouraged full participation by citizen in plan-making in the past," its weakness is a strength for citizen participation in another way.<sup>29</sup> That is, unitary planning can be a method of drawing into the public arena the views of both the residents and the planning agency toward citizen participation and access to decision-making in planning. This can be accomplished through controversy or confrontation.

Drawing positions on issues of importance into the public arena, which can affect the general public, is often called politics. If the planning process is to

---

<sup>27</sup>Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXI (November, 1965), p. 331.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 331.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 332.

encourage democratic urban government by its planning efforts, then it must operate to include rather than exclude citizens from participating in the process.

"Inclusion means not only permitting the citizen to be heard. It also means that he be able to become informed about the underlying reasons for planning proposals, and be able to respond to them in the technical language of the professional planners."<sup>30</sup>

The mentioning of urban politics may very well be the key to a dialogue between government, planners and potential participants of a planning effort. Although it should also arouse the fears of all those who had an underlying suspicion that political organization was the aim of citizen participation in the first place, and that the taxpayer's money is being used to promote a single political movement. However, it is extremely doubtful that questions will be publicly asked as to whether this approach is the needed solution for the participation and decision-making problem. It is not difficult to ascertain that the political history of those groups rallying for a larger share of decision-making in planning for their community indicates a distinct breakdown in the traditional political linkage between people and the central decision makers.

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 332.



Dr. Kenneth Clark writes in the Black Ghetto:

"Democratic government tends to be limited in its capacity to respond to the demands of minority or lower status groups because its necessity is dependent either upon majority support or upon those groups that already have economic, political, and social status and power. The successful politician seeks to find a balance between the demands of those who wish to change and the resistance of those who are determined to prevent it. American political history is the record of adjustment to the needs of those minorities most restless at one time and a postponement or solution of the requests of those groups that are, at the time, relatively satisfied or quiescent. The strategy of such compromise responds to tension among competing forces and is inevitable in a democratic society."<sup>31</sup>

Some of the reasons and explanations of why there is no particular breakthroughs from this pattern are explained by the examination of the limitedness of the ghetto.

"The effective exercise of power in the urban ghetto is crippled severely by the inexperience of the ghetto's own political leaders. Their inexperience and political unsophistication have a fundamental root - the psychology of the ghetto with its pervasive and total sense of helplessness. It is difficult, if not impossible, to behave as one with power when all one's experience has indicated that one has none. Because their house of political power is built on sand without a solid base of economic or social influence, ghetto politicians are likely to accept a limited jurisdiction and to seek immediate and concrete rewards. They often

---

<sup>31</sup>Kenneth B. Clark, Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 155.

subject themselves to the control of others they believe to hold the primary power, and some are prepared to make petty deals and to toy with political corruption. But even in corruption the Negro is accorded second-class citizenship."<sup>32</sup>

The continuation of the breakdown of the traditional sources of political power throughout the city are also emphasized when it is considered that its present development must compete with other participants of the political structure.

"American mayors today are faced with the problems of governing cities in which to a great extent the traditional sources of political power have been dispersed or eliminated. The old style political machine is gone except in a very few big cities. Party organization is generally weak. Mayors must still assemble the power to govern but they can rarely do so today by relying on loyal party lieutenants who occupy the lesser city offices and who sit on the council. Instead, the mayor must try to piece together that power out of the support he can receive from city-wide interests, such as newspapers, civic associations, business organizations and labor unions."<sup>33</sup>

Aside from having control over a political structure by position and power, the change of the political structure may be achieved by the vote. At least this is what the standard bearers of the present democratic process believe; but in actuality, does the voting power of the ghetto and unorganized groups promote itself as that

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

<sup>33</sup>Wilson, op. cit., p. 248.

much of a potential for political and social change?

"The most obvious of the social sources of power is political, yet Negroes have failed so far to translate their vote into effective action in their own behalf.

"There is a circular pattern in political behavior, for ineffective use of the vote limits a group's political influence while its political powerlessness may in turn seem convincing evidence that voting is useless, leading to apathy. But votes alone do not necessarily imply actual political power, in the sense of control of the direction of social change, for seldom are the issues of an election clearcut enough for a victory to imply a mandate for a particular program."<sup>34</sup>

For planning and for politically estranged citizens, consideration must be given to how citizen participation in planning can work in a manner that promotes its own recognition while engaging in a strategy of improving the practice of planning and participatory democracy. It must further be stated that the pursuit of a basic framework to promote citizen participation and access to the decision-making process is as complex as the human emotions of the planners, decision-makers and participants.

The direction that this Thesis will follow is that of examining why citizen participation should be considered, planned with and promoted as a social institution, if it is to provide access to the decision-making process in planning. The problems, conflicts and

---

<sup>34</sup>Clark, op. cit., p. 155.

needed solutions noted in the history and background of citizen participation indicate that today the sphere of activity in which the interactions of planning, politics, citizen participation and decision-making occur could be described as the "quasi-public and political arena" of urban areas. It is in this arena that the values which were associated with past citizen activism and potential citizen responses will be expressed. It will also be in this arena that the differing views of citizen participation will be expressed through various organizations, groups and social institutions. However, if change is to be expected, it must involve the regulative institutions, whose functional domain embodies the formal and informal adoption of social control and change. In addition, this movement must occur by the interaction of institutional influences which either promote or restrict access to the decision-making process and the direction of the planning process.

From a planning standpoint, if it were possible to become convinced that institutions, politics, planning and citizen participation and participatory democracy existed in a state of equilibrium, then the task of determining what forms and amounts of the decision-making process each public interest should have to produce the best plan, would simplify planning ten-fold. However, this condition does not exist. Decision makers

and planners responsive to institutional influences, to a great extent, determine the strategy of the planning process. Only from this understanding can efforts be made to describe what factors, interactions and change must be occurring and provided to ensure that citizen participation means access to the decision-making process and the planning process.

## CHAPTER II

### VIEWING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION

The search for the inadequacies of an institution or of the total institutional framework involves reflection. This is uncongenial to the existing peoples of capitalism who take pride in calling themselves practical because they measure progress in distance travelled rather than goals attained.

Russell A. Dixon

Some of the emerging views of citizen participation today and the background of citizen participation in planning have shown the need for examining the institutional forces which mold the "public interest(s)" in the planning process. The nature of citizen participation today indicates that its growth and strong incorporation will be required in the planning function. This requirement will undoubtedly affect the distribution of political influences in the planning process. In an effort to cope with this reality, planning in general has found itself without any specific strategy towards citizen participation. This occurs even with the knowledge that in urban areas citizen participation can delay planning or support planning or even break down the "democratic" planning process by causing the existing political forces to resort to subtrafuge. The importance of this effect is clearly noted, since politics is the medium through which the influences of the power and authority of social institutions can apply pressure for their interests in the planning process.

This chapter will examine citizen participation in a role amongst these social institutions which influence the planning process, and it will indicate how dysfunctions within the social institutional structure have created a condition from which citizen

participation can emerge as a new social institution. Prior to the examination of these circumstances and conditions, it is obviously necessary to at least briefly review the institution system, since institutions do not exist in society on the same level, but arrange themselves in a structure or hierarchy.

#### Institutional Structure

The modified view presented here, for reasons of brevity, designates service institutions at the lower level of a hierarchy. These service institutions include communication and transportation; and, their purpose is to make as smooth as possible the function of higher level institutions. The institutions at the upper levels include religion, philosophy and the pure arts, which provide the broadest forms of goals and aims for society. Also, on this hierarchy of institutions are the applied arts and sciences, which are functional institutions, and the family, which is the basic or constitutive institution.

The institutions that are most relevant to the planning function are the regulative institutions, economic and government. These regulative institutions are assigned importance, since they are the institutions which are responsible for the functioning of social order. Furthermore, these institutions, to a great



extent, determine the feasibility and the scope of the planning process. These institutions also have in the past and will, undoubtedly, in the future influence the decision-making process at most phases of the planning process.

Additionally, importance is placed upon these institution, since society as a system operates in terms of institutional interaction. This interaction is not always harmonious, for there exists inter-institutional and intra-institutional conflict. When these conflicts occur, it is obvious that because of the role of institutions or their politics in the planning, the goals of planning will suffer. When conflict or dysfunction occurs either in the large social system or the system that exists on a local level, it is disruptive to planning. The reason for this is that planning must account for the allocation of interests and provide means for both arriving at and implementing a plan.

On the local level, any gaps in an institutional structure and dysfunctions of particular institutions provide obstacles in themselves. If the planning function is unsupported because of institutional conflict, dysfunction or absence of adequate institutions, then the need of a new or altered institution system arises. It is because of the nature of planning itself

that it must seek to determine whether or not the existing institutions will contribute toward the expression of a public interest in a democratic planning process.

The need and the burden to examine access to decision-making for all citizens and the proper functioning of an institutional structure to achieve the principles of planning rests heavily upon the planner. This responsibility occurs either in formulating the overall public interest for an areawide governmental body or a limited local public interest which could be incorporated into a larger public interest. When the institutional structure to achieve planning principles does not exist or has been altered due to changing functions of institutions, then the search for a proper expression of citizen interests must begin. It is a search of means to fill a lack of participation and decision-making ability. It is a search for a form of citizen participation as a social institution when changing functions of institutions do not allow participation.

As an example of this changing function, the decision-making process has been viewed as being shifted outside of communities due to the strengthening of relations between community, state and national

institutional systems.<sup>1</sup> This shift has caused "Decisions, policies and programs of local units...to be formulated in centralized offices outside the community."<sup>2</sup> The result is a changing or diminishing ability of institutions to function on the local level. This view was expressed in the opinion that "the ties between different local community units are weakened and community, defined as control by local people over the establishment, goals and policies and operations of local community units is likewise reduced."<sup>3</sup>

Emerging from this example of changing institutional function are numerous questions surrounding the task of the planning function. It should be apparent to the planner that there exists limitations and obstacles for achieving desired citizen participation through the existing system of institutions in a community. Yet, this problem should not be perceived as that of the planner only; it is a problem of the community and especially for those who are disenfranchised through the dysfunctions of the existing system of institutions. The questions that arise with respect to this dysfunction are: Upon what basis does a planner make a

---

<sup>1</sup>See Roland L. Warren, *The Community in America* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 53.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

judgment upon the effectiveness and functioning of the existing institutions and their ability to provide an adequate system for citizen participation? And, upon an analysis which indicates an unrepresentativeness of interests or dysfunction in the existing institutional structure, how can the planner make recommendations for increased participation? Also, can planning truly function when its recommendations will either be approved or disapproved by a municipal agency that might reflect the weakness of the existing institutional structures? More specifically, this last question is: Can an unrepresentative institutional system allow a democratic planning process? If the unrepresentative social institution is considered dysfunctional, then in what form must citizen participation evolve in order that a democratic planning process be upheld? Lastly, does this institutional dysfunction manifest the view that citizen participation in planning be considered a new social institution?

#### Government and Economic Institutions

Bearing these questions in mind, the economic and government institutions will be examined for their influence on the planning function. The assessment is made through analysis of the existing institution system and the politicking of interests and influences which

can lead to institutional dysfunction. These regulative institutions are viewed as having distinct importance, since they either represent or provide means by which the recognition of needs, desires, priorities and policies of a community are defined. Within the planning function, obviously, other institutions must be considered. Yet, the regulative institutions retain their importance because of their vulnerability to politics. It is in this manner that the pressure of other institutions can weaken local orientation in a community.

To provide a base for examining institutional dysfunction and planning, some definitions of the role of regulative institutions are set forth. Government institutions are the means for specifically establishing and formally maintaining social order, method, coordination and security among groups and individuals. The means operate through a system of standardized restraints and compulsions enforced by public organizations. To ensure and implement government the society has rules, regulations, laws and ordinances. It must also have an operating system of agencies to administer to both the conformity and non-conformity that enables society to operate. Clearly, with these responsibilities, government institutions must have the ability to change their procedures and regulations; since, they provide social

control in a politically organized society. In addition, "The permissiveness, as well as the final effectiveness, of almost all other institutions rests upon the support given them by the governmental institutions."<sup>4</sup>

The question of governmental support for various other institutions is severely put to a test when it is related to the economic institution. It is beyond the scope of this discussion and this author's knowledge to clearly express a position that "the business of government is business" or "government controls business" or that the "public and private sector are in an economic partnership." However, there is obviously influence by each regulative institution upon the actions of the other. The interdependence and functioning of each institution as it influences decision-making structure of a community is of prime importance to planning.

"All institutions and institutional sectors are interdependent. There is also some shifting of functions as institutions, as well as the society change, occasioned in some instances by the necessity of having a type of function carried on more efficiently. There is also a tendency for some institutions, and hence become over-dependent on these other institutions. This points to inadequate functioning in some respects, and creates the possibility of malfunctioning in both the giving and receiving institutions."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Joyce O. Hertzler, American Social Institutions (New York: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), p. 148.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 145.

The first and basic function of economic activity is to appropriate and transform the physical into goods and to convert the energies and abilities of men and services, available and usable for the satisfaction of the existent needs and contrived wants.<sup>6</sup> This functioning produces a structuring of human behavior and problems related to the production and distribution of goods and services. It also produces and expands the stature of the economic institution by a decentralization of power to local areas, while the strength of the economic institution is increased centrally. This particular aspect was cited as being due to "the growth of capitalism, coupled with ever increasing unequal distribution of wealth that has given to big enterprises the predominating power, the operations of which are too widespread to be controlled by local or even by state governments. Thus, most local bodies are now liable to be influenced more decisively by an event that has taken place on the nationwide scale, rather than by local circumstances."<sup>7</sup>

These particular remarks bring to the surface three important aspects of the institution system and structure at the local level. First, national economic power, which over-ridingly influences local decision-making,

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 260.

<sup>7</sup>H. Ito., "Self-Government, Local Finance and Democracy," Public Finance (January, 1965), p. 121.

is beyond local control or regulation is an indication of local institutional dysfunction. Secondly, the interplay between government (social order) and economic (economic order) institutions only begins to reveal the complexity and extent of their intertwined paths. Thirdly, an apparent alternative of government to excessive influence by private enterprise is for government to enter into competition with private enterprise. This can be seen in governmental operation of local gas and light power plants, waterworks systems, and convention halls at the local level; and at the national level in the Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies and quasi-public agencies.

Obviously, the complexity of the relationship between these institutions has been caused by social and economic change made to meet the demands of an expanding technology. Although the benefits of expanding technology are important to planning, its use can only be adopted in a system with functioning institutions. This is another reason why importance is attributed to the examination of the dysfunction of institutions. Furthermore, the changes wrought by technology are a cause of social change; and institutional change and social change are inseparable. "Social change affects



every existing institution and institutional sector, although not in the same degree, but depending upon the relative interest dominance or functional pertainence of the institution or sector at the moment."<sup>8</sup>

The essence of the problem of the definition or interpretation of the interplay of the roles of government and economic institutions has revealed itself in the "urban crisis." Here, the actions of these institutions are embedded in a system of political influences called the "urban political process." An evaluation of this process by Lyle C. Fitch is that "The urban political process is not directly concerned with the provisions of goods and services, except when these 'problem solving' activities can be translated into useful resources for the resolution of political conflict or its avoidance."<sup>9</sup> The blame for the problems of this political process have been made against both the economic and government institutions and to the political process itself.

The case against the economic institution is that:

"While the businessman describes the operation of the economy in terms of absolute laissez-faire concepts, he himself does not rely

---

<sup>8</sup>Hertzler, op. cit., p. 135.

<sup>9</sup>Lyle C. Fitch, "Goals for Urban America," in Urban American: Goals and Problems, Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, 90th Congress, 1st Session (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 24.

exclusively on these natural forces to preserve his position in society. Instead, he seeks to utilize the coercive authority of government to enhance his interests."<sup>10</sup>

The case against the institution of city government is that:

"Many of our urban 'problems' originate in a managerial and entrepreneurial gap between the public and private economy in a time of both intense competition and intimate complementarity between public and private goods. Not only do our cities need managers capable of articulating the public with the private economy, but one who will in this age of rapid change be alert and flexible enough to keep up with changing tastes and technology."<sup>11</sup>

The case against the political process in the city is stated simply and clearly:

"The problem of inner city politics today is to develop means by which citizen participation is meaningful to the participants and to the larger political system."<sup>12</sup>

These short and simple statements, representing cases against the economic and government institutions and the political process, are made to indicate examples of the institutional dysfunction in society. Clearly, the solution to some dysfunction lies in the alteration

---

<sup>10</sup>Marver H. Bernstein, "Political Ideas of Selected American Business Journals," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVIII (Summer, 1953), p. 260.

<sup>11</sup>Wilbur R. Thompson, "On Urban Goals and Problems," in Urban America: Goals and Problems, op. cit., p. 113.

<sup>12</sup>Harvey S. Perloff and Royce Hanson, "The Inner City and A New Urban Politics," in Urban America: Goals and Problems, op. cit., p. 164.

of some institutional roles and in making the political arena in which they operate in a more flexible and suitable forum for the democratic planning process. More citizen participation, more government programs, more business activity and social consciousness are only parts of a solution. The solution itself is the challenge to give substance to the interaction of these institutions. This interaction calls for a suitable process of participatory democracy with a generally acceptable political strategy. The ambiguous roles played by the economic and government institutions in a lopsided political process has promoted the societal forces which show the direction to the solution. This direction is the embodiment of the goals and objectives of planning in participatory democracy. This direction is the recognition of citizen participation and access to decision-making as a social institution. It is the key to the solution of vast unequal distribution of economic and political power, which has prevented the fulfillment of earnest attempts to solve community problems. It is the key to ceasing the widening of the gap between sectors of the economic and government institutions, and the concept of participatory democracy. Government must continue its programs, while states must retain their rights, cities their autonomy, and communities their identity and attachment to the city. The

economic institutions must continue to make a profit and continue the operation of a free enterprise system, but it must do so only when it considers the social and political interests of the community. "Too often American business has created some physical transformation of our living habits, usually for the better, and then walked away from all the social consequences and implications for our cities."<sup>13</sup> The honesty of judgments over government programs and business social costs require the concept of political power. So long as an unequal distribution of wealth and resources exist, the honesty of these judgments cannot occur in the system of institutions that created them. The economic deprivation that has been created "is fundamentally a political problem and power will be required to solve it."<sup>14</sup>

Whether or not a partial alteration of the existing institution structure comes about in a partnership between private enterprise and government, as proposed by former Secretary of HUD Robert C. Weaver, it is not the easiest nor the most direct approach. However, "it does harbor the possibility of ultimate efficiency and

---

<sup>13</sup>Address by Hedly Donovan, Editor-in-Chief, Time, Inc., to The Action Council for Better Cities, December 8, 1965, Washington, D. C.

<sup>14</sup>Comments by Charles E. Silberman, on a paper presented by Richard A. Cloward, Ibid.

maximum freedom. It is only with the trials and tribulations it involves if these freedoms are available to all segments of our society."<sup>15</sup> If any aspect of this approach is to succeed, it must recognize citizen participation and access to decision-making as a new social institution. The recognition is found in the existing institution system and has been stated that "if there is anything to change it must be some institutions in the majority community that continue to disenfranchise the minority."<sup>16</sup>

#### Citizen Participation Institutionalized

It is not a purpose of this Thesis to continue to charge planning and social institutions with a failure to recognize the need for citizen participation. However, both planning and social institutions must recognize the dysfunction that does exist. They must also recognize the effective granting of charter, by the federal government, which institutionalizes citizen participation and access to decision-making. Citizen participation received its charter and institutionalization in the federal anti-poverty, urban renewal and Model Cities programs. The establishment of the participation of the poor in anti-poverty programs has withstood the

---

<sup>15</sup>Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Comments by Charles E. Silberman, op. cit.

assault on the federal government by the "Mayors across the nation (who) charged the federal government with financing an attack on city hall and undermining local influence and authority."<sup>17</sup> It also withstood the lack of funding and support caused by the United States involvement in the war in Southeast Asia. Citizen participation retained its accepted position because of the need for participation and the inability of citizens to participate through existing institutions. This need was cited by the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy:

"The community action programs must basically change these existing organizations by building into the program real representation for the poor. This bill calls for 'maximum feasible participation' of the residents. This means the involvement of the poor in planning and implementing programs; giving them a real voice in their institutions."<sup>18</sup>

The role of citizen participation in urban renewal planning has been viewed as more than an acceptable working arrangement, although on the local planning level much of the program has been lost. Yet, it was seen that the "ideological importance of a citizen role in planning has been institutionalized by making citizen participation a part of the workable program

---

<sup>17</sup>Lillian Rubin, "Maximum Feasible Participation," Poverty and Human Resources Abstracts, Nov.-Dec., 1967, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan. p. 5.

<sup>18</sup>Comments by Senator Robert F. Kennedy during the Congressional Hearings for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Public Law 222, H.R. 2711-2729, p. 305.

which is required by the federal government as a pre-requisite for urban renewal funds."<sup>19</sup>

Furthermore, the formulation and acceptance of the role of citizen participation and access to decision-making in the Model Cities program was greatly influenced by the lack of strength imposed in attempting to gain acceptance of citizen participation by other local institutions in the anti-poverty and urban renewal programs. The remarks of H. Ralph Taylor, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in May, 1967, were attributed to the learning process of how local institutions could circumvent the objectives of participation in the planning process. He said, "Somehow it seemed easier to set up competing institutions than to make existing institutions work together more effectively."<sup>20</sup>

The overall justification for recognizing citizen participation as a social institution is that it has been established that the federal government is committed to a policy that "...stresses local initiative and local

---

<sup>19</sup>David C. Ranney, Planning and Politics in the Metropolis (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969), p. 155.

<sup>20</sup>Daniel P. Moynihan, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1969), p. 185.

solutions to local problems."<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, the need for a new social institution exists as long as "those with power to authorize and implement major modifications in existing public and private institutional policies and practices have tended to constrain the pressures for change, if not resist them outright."<sup>22</sup>

#### Promotion of Citizen Participation by Existing Institutions

To keep sight upon how the forces within a rhetoric bound political process and institutional system with numerous dysfunctions promotes the recognition of citizen participation and access to decision-making as a social institution, attention is called to the manner in which social institutions are created. Social institutions are generally created four ways: (1) with a specific purpose; (2) as a spontaneous reaction to circumstances and conditions imposed by other institutions; (3) a combination of a latent purpose, activated by less extreme conditions imposed by other institutions; and (4) institutions are created within the compulsion of force where revolution or social strife is occurring in an active state.

---

<sup>21</sup>Comments from Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to the Business and Urban Affairs Conference, Washington, D. C., May, 1966.

<sup>22</sup>Warner Bloomberg, Jr., and Henry J. Schmandt, (ed.), Power, Poverty and Urban Policy (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1968), p. 251.



The mechanisms of the economic institutions which are dysfunctional in its interactions with other institutions and itself are first seen in the power it has amassed. This power promotes economic constraints upon various sectors of the public, which the economic institutions are neither inclined to nor able to rectify. In terms familiar to the planning function, the land use problems of most beneficial uses for land, industrial or residential are handicapped by the power and wealth of industries to obtain the choice land compared to the ability of city government to actively pursue planned housing. The interpretation of needs for transportation and urban activity systems are greatly influenced by a public interest which promotes employment and an increased tax base. Yet, the hidden costs to the individual taxpayer of such policies have never been fully accounted for in terms of long-range accounts. The inability to cope with industrial economic power is due to its respective strength in the local community's economy. As stated by Alinsky, "In our present economy it is self-evident that the larger industries have combined to where for all intents and purposes it may be said that they largely control within their own respective fields the economy of America. This organized economic power of industry has been increasingly directed toward

the achieving of political power for its own ends."<sup>23</sup>

The self-interest perpetuated by industries in their ability to achieving power has been adopted as a strong, implicit principle of labor unions. The one time rivals of the interests of industrial and commercial economic institutions now are poised to use their united political impact upon city government for the preservation of the interests of their membership which does not reflect itself in the numbers of persons accounted for in the formulation of a public interest. Nor does the economic status of these memberships convey the most urgent social needs achievable within the scope of the planning function. "Organized labor, through its nationwide industrial and craft unions, most of them now consolidated in the AFL-CIO, exercise power over labor for labor and over all economic operations and conditions affecting labor far in excess of the proportion (approximately 25 percent) of its members in the total labor force."<sup>24</sup> In the more expressive words of Saul Alinsky, "As labor unions have become strong, wealthy, fat and respectable, they have behaved more and more like organized business."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Saul D. Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), p. 34.

<sup>24</sup>Hertzler, op. cit., p. 287.

<sup>25</sup>Alinsky, op. cit., p. 38.

The economic institutions of the industrial category or labor unions and many others, banking, insurance, commercial and agriculture being social institutions and their trade associations, Chambers of Commerce and interlocking directorates are partially contrived agencies and are never perfect. However, as a social institution, they exercise some type of social control. On the local level, these institutions place a limitation upon the planning function. "As products of the past, they are always in considerable measure geared to the past, and, therefore, never in full accord with the requirements of the present."<sup>26</sup> Whenever new functions or services are added to an institution, "accumulation of the new with retention of the old is more likely to take place than the discard of obsolete units and substitution of modernized units."<sup>27</sup>

The ambiguous role played by the institutions of government towards the economic institutions at the local level is also seen in a few examples of mutual self-interest between them. When a local municipal government wants to promote a new industry, it is empowered to grant a tax-exemption. When a local school board wants to build a new school, it looks

---

<sup>26</sup>Hertzler, op. cit., p. 135.

<sup>27</sup>F. Stuart Chapin, Contemporary American Institutions (New York: Harpur and Brothers Publications, 1935), p. 56.

toward business to purchase a portion of the bonds. In an attempt to keep the competition honest for business, government will carry out an inspection function.

Where government has been given the ultimate authority to exercise regulation over institutions to provide adequate social control, this role through legislation and enforcement has, in many cases, not fulfilled its intentions. Lane presents the thesis that the attitude of business toward regulation can be traced as hostility that is gradually replaced by acceptance and eventually overt preference.<sup>28</sup> The reason for this modification of attitude is that "substantial evidence can be marshalled to indicate that the promises of regulatory statutes to distribute benefits to relatively broad and diverse interests do not materialize."<sup>29</sup> Regulation and effectiveness of control are the determinants which, when manipulated through the political process, constitute the forces which are defining or influencing the public interest of the planning function.

Short of actual conflict, the operation of various institutions, especially the older and more massive ones

---

<sup>28</sup>Robert E. Lane, "Law and Opinion in the Business Community," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVIII (Summer, 1953), pp. 239-257.

<sup>29</sup>Harmon Zeigler, Interest Groups in American Society (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 118.

in a complex society, may reveal a web of contradictions and cross-purposes not intended and sometimes not even recognized. The situation among the major departments of our federal government is a common case in point. When there is multiplicity of institutional responsibility, a struggle results. These struggles "not only impair the functioning of the particular institutions in which they occur, but also the entire community or society of which they are critical functional agents."<sup>30</sup>

For emphasis in viewing the forces which have directed the emergence of citizen participation as a social institution, attention is focused upon the operation of city government. Two of the most consequential problems in the larger urban cities are those of representation of elected officials and the transfer of functions of city government to independent agencies. Where dysfunction occurs in either of these operations, the representativeness of city government is hindered and can result in varying degrees of a breakdown in the decision-making process. The formulation of the public interest is directly vulnerable to these sectors of the institution of government, since they are responsible for articulation of values and implementation of policies in the planning function. When the roles of

---

<sup>30</sup>Hertzler, op. cit., p. 146.

these sectors are impaired due to various manipulations of the political process, then a vacuum is created for the renewal of citizen participation in the decision-making process. The occurrence of these two institutional dysfunctions is recorded in fact that since 1946 many city councils have moved away from district representation to a system of election at large. This arrangement exists in Detroit, Columbus, Boston, San Francisco and elsewhere. The error of this type of reform was that it isolated various local areas in the city without specific representation and, consequently, without continuing political party organization. Although this does not intend to imply that the existing political organization was efficient nor representative, it did exist as an institutional sector for use, even if it was by the larger political process. The ceasation of a party organization "deprived these areas of their territorial advantage under a prevailing system of pressure politics. Where councils are elected at large, campaigning is principally directed to the middle class."<sup>31</sup> Consequently, there is very little public service in some neighborhoods; and, usually, these same areas are

---

<sup>31</sup>Milton Kotler, "Two Essays on the Neighborhood Corporation," in Urban America: Goals and Problems, op. cit., p. 190.

already in need of a greater share of public services.

"As political demand and frustration grows in these neighborhoods, there is no local continuing party organization to structure this demand and negotiate its claim."<sup>32</sup>

The planning function cannot rely on the existing institutions and political process to articulate the priorities of the needs of these areas. However, the recognition of citizen participation and access to decision-making presents a strategy to planning for the formulation of the public interest. This, at the same time, promotes citizen participation as a social institution to fill a vacuum in the political process with a means for representing a territorial organization in the decision-making process.

The second aspect of municipal government which has imposed a form of institutional dysfunction upon local areas is that of independent agencies for government management. There are obvious advantages to a system of independent agencies; one, in fact, is the removal of some of the decision-making process from the worst influence of the political process. However, the shortcomings of this specific point is more significant for the planning function and those who are not participating in the formulation of the public interest.

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 191.

The reasons are two-fold. First, the independent agencies represent governmental functions which are further than ever beyond the reach of the residents, but have yet remained within the sphere of political influence by the strongest elements in the political process. This occurs through appointments and appropriations of funds. Second, where the planning function attempts to promote a comprehensive approach to problem solving, independent agencies can either play a policy-making role or functional role of a government in its existing form. This further promotes an inability to achieve democratic planning, due to existing dysfunctions in the political process.

"Urban governments have not yet digested these new (urban development and renewal) responsibilities, which tend to be lodged in newly created authorities and special agencies, such as housing and redevelopment authorities. Thus, the new functions have tended to remain outside the mainstream of planning and decision-making; although, intrinsically they are as important to community welfare and as imbedded in community politics as are old line functions."<sup>33</sup>

When municipal government in either its daily operation or in its planning function is confronted with an

---

<sup>33</sup>Lyle C. Fitch, op. cit., p. 29.



expressed interest by a sector of the populace or an interest group, its first task in response must be to determine the political character of the demand. In other words, what is the expression or potential expression of its political power? Not until the access to the decision-making process is expanded for various sectors of the community in the formulation of the public interest will planning achieve its position in the operation of urban institutional systems. Without the access to decision-making being opened to allow for participatory democracy in planning, plans will remain wrapped in rhetoric and always have the effect of being handed down. The very size of our urban milieu has demanded the recognition of citizen participation and access to decision-making to protect the self-esteem of the individual. If citizen participation is not recognized in its role as a newly re-emerged social institution, there will continue to be adequate development of some institutional sectors, of some institutions, and of some institutional components. Only, this will be at the cost of belated development of other institutions and the overall cost of unrealized human development in a system that guarantees the right to this development. The general effect of these factors is to eventually promote inefficiency and disorganization in all

institutions. The result from this is a planning function where values are uncertain and norms that are supposed to regulate are no longer effective. There will be a relative lack of internal equilibrium and consistency in our urban systems and amongst the constituent parts. Consequently, as long as the existing social institutions operate in varying degrees of dysfunction and ignore the forces that have promoted the re-emergence of citizen participation and access to decision-making, planning will fail. It will fail in defining a public interest that is founded upon the best development of objectives, goals, priorities, wants, needs and means within the framework of participatory democracy.

### CHAPTER III

#### REQUIREMENTS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION

In one form or another all of the major domestic problems facing you (Mr. Nixon) derive from the erosion of the authority of the institutions of American society.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan

The examination of citizen participation in Chapter II has shown how the need to recognize citizen participation as a social institution has been prompted by forms of existing institutional dysfunctions. It also indicates how citizen participation has been effectively established as a social institution through the chartering effect of various programs by the institution of government. The discussion of citizen participation continues as a search for a planning strategy to utilize the process of citizen participation and to achieve a plan relevant to the public interest. The discussion also seeks to establish the practicality of planning, not limited by its technical competence but by a strategy of feasibility in a decision-making process, which is constrained, manipulated and often made ineffective by a closed and unresponsive urban political process.

In pursuing the examination of citizen participation further, this chapter will more specifically describe a working framework for citizen participation in terms of components of a social institution. These components or properties will then be discussed in a manner relative to suggested definitional descriptions of planning variables, such as influence, power, decision and policy-making. The importance of this will be seen as the process

of citizen participation occurs within the structure of the political process which activates these variables.

#### A Framework of Citizen Participation In Planning

To remain consistent with institutional framework previously established and to briefly, but significantly, examine the properties or elements of a social institution, only the four most obvious elements will be discussed. These elements are organization, personnel, procedure and equipment. This grouping of elements is for the purpose of describing an institutional framework, the central purpose or function does not appear as an element per se. That there is one, of course, goes without saying, but the primary purpose of the as such is to function as an institution. The motivation for the purpose of the institution of citizen participation in the planning function is to establish the means to approach the solving of problems -- problems which in the past did not exist or cannot presently be solved. In manifesting this motivation, society or a level of it "erects institutions to deal with the compromises which arise from the necessity of having to go on pending a solution. Such institutions with their implied acceptances gradually take the place of the unsolved problems, establishing what they have adopted in place of a solution, and so the problem itself is made to

disappear, or at least appear to have been settled."<sup>1</sup>

### Purpose

What this immediately points to is that citizen participation recognized as a social institution and organized with the elements of a social institution is not seen as the panacea of the planning function in terms of formulations of the "public interests" in all of its goals, objectives and policies. However, it is the means of approaching the unsolved problems in a manner dictated and motivated by the interaction and dysfunction of the remainder of the institutional system. This primary purpose is the means for aiding citizens "to achieve their ends with as little intrusion on the part of the institution itself as possible."<sup>2</sup> Planning is the process which all the institutions contribute to and maintain, but without all the users it remains an unobjective process where people are planned for or without. Planning is the process with people -- a difficult process to say the least.

### Organization

The discussion of the elements of a citizen participation as a social institution begins with the organization. The organization of an institution consists in

---

<sup>1</sup>James K. Fiebleman, The Institutions of Society (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1962), p. 178.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 179.

the way or manner in which a group of persons act together within their prescribed rules of behavior and are enabled to work toward a central purpose. From this point of view it is "a kind of social group with an organization consisting of reasons."<sup>3</sup> This description is immediately compared with some task force and advisory types of citizen participation previously utilized in the planning function. The procedures and central purpose of these types of participation groups have been "handed down," and they are included in the "process," rather than having the planning process serve the people. For citizen participation to be recognized as a social institution, it cannot simply be in the form of an independent group of citizens demanding a share of the action. The organization of citizen participation as an institution would not exist were there no reason to pull its elements together. The reason here is the aim of the institution itself, that is the institution in some way must serve the society of which it is to re-emerge as an integral part.

#### Personnel

The personnel of citizen participation as an institution are those persons who participate in some way which affects them. The personnel of a citizen

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 159.

participation group possess certain relations among themselves which they feel as members of a structure which has stability and, hence, a reliability beyond their own lives and powers. This description tends to indicate why loose knit informal groups cannot be viewed as citizen participation and a social institution. The distinction between social groups and social institutions, as to which should be deemed citizen participation in planning, is made by the property objectivity. Citizen participation as a social institution is a group aim objectified with the aid of some material means of expression, and objectification occurs with legal establishment.

### Procedures

The procedures of citizen participation as an institution are the ways in which it carries out the operations called for by its main function -- participation. Thus, procedure is the way of both performing, publicizing and symbolizing the main function of citizen participation. The procedures adopted by citizen participation should provide for three distinct effects upon the participants. First, the following of established procedures will absorb an individual participant into a social framework. Institutional procedures are social; and, when an individual goes through the prescribed motions, he is, in effect, incorporating the stamp of group approval.



Secondly, an important result of procedures often consists in an evolution of an established way of thinking. What this will basically achieve is the ability to find consensus with group values. Finally, the procedures of citizen participation will place an individual in a situation of confrontation, as a member of a group which arrived at a position followed for a rational consequence -- action.

#### Equipment

The last of the institutional elements to be discussed is equipment. "Equipment is the substance of an institution."<sup>4</sup> The obvious equipment required by citizen participation are those material facets which promote the cause of participation. The equipment will also, as a matter of course, have additional implications. The easiest way to describe this phenomenon is to think about the implications of citizen participation headquarters, a telephone and a mimeograph machine. These are definite means of communication, both within the institution, and they promote its cause among other institutions. Symbolically, the strength of these few pieces of equipment is vast; since, it represents a way in which "they" can get in touch with "us;" a place where "we" can meet; and a means to inform the rest of society.

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 146.

## Citizen Participation In the Development of Planning Strategy

Briefly, what these elements of citizen participation as a social institution seek to form is a citizen effort that will partake in planning; and, is viewed as having:

Its efforts to participate in all stages of the planning process as its main purpose and a form of charter;

A resident and recognizable membership;

Defined or developing roles for the membership through which the goals, value and priority of the organization are expressed;

A viable spatial, territorial or jurisdictional aspect; and

Other aspects, such as equipment or property.

The formation of citizen participation with these elements gives the planner the potential actors, structure and ability to influence the planning function to a consideration of a public interest. The provisions for access to decision-making now are beginning to form. The existing sources of influence, power, decision and policy-making, which lead to legally binding public policy in the form of an adopted plan, may adjust or crush the developing social institution of citizen participation. These sources may also place the "blame for any unpopular decision...to the planner which will unite any resulting hostilities toward the politician."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ranney, op. cit., p. 136.

What the planner is going to be contending with is a generation and management of conflict - either actual or potential.

Therefore, the focus is now turned to the arena in which citizen participation will emerge, the quasi-public and political arena; where the political process is the medium of institutional interaction and the outcome of the planning process is due to the power to influence. The manner and form of citizen participation as it emerges can be seen as Means and Ends, Process and Conflict or Structure and Power. All can hold a justifiable attitude or image of the participants. The reasoning for each expression is dealt with separately.

#### Means and Ends

If the ends of the participation effort is to gain the inclusion of the value system and goals of a local area into the planning process; or, if the ends of the participation is the fulfillment of a planning process demanded by citizens of an area to avoid the imposition of the traditional unitary planning effort upon the residents, then, the means must reflect and strengthen a rational planning program with a substantial portion of the planning time involved spent on what might be called "participation in participation," rather than planning. Simplified, it appears that citizen participation in the planning process will be fully developed

by a planner, either because of the need to achieve the desired ends of a sector of the public interest or that it represents the only available means to achieve a project representative of the public interest. For either reason, the method and the form of citizen participation in the planning process must be consistent in its utilization of available means to achieve the desired ends.

#### Process and Conflict

There have been cities where for a variety of reasons participation in a planning for citizens was in the form of the ritual of attending meetings, being talked at, proceeding to make "decisions" where authority to make "decisions" or "policy" was unclear and not binding in any way. Only because of the strength of the existing political process in these cities did these forms become a norm for planning. The objective of the officials in entrenched positions was maintaining the attitude that participation is "engineering the consent of the governed." In these cities, "more emphasis is placed on the public relations of participation - the number of people attending meetings, the amount of paper distributed, publicity in mass media - than the substance and effect of the dialogue

between public officials, planners and citizens."<sup>6</sup> This strategy of city officials has in the past won out even to the extent that some persons may have achieved membership on a "policy-making board," but unable to articulate ideas then, for lack of technical knowledge and being outnumbered by representatives of organized interests, these members of citizen groups seem to have become uneasy about their "victory."

#### Structure and Power

The establishment of a participation effort, although it may only consist of representatives from a selected area in a policy or advisory capacity, must develop strong governing objectives, procedures and methods. This is required in order for it to function effectively with all governmental agencies and institutions, from which proposals come or jurisdictions held that will effect the planning effort. Beyond ability to participate, the interaction between government and citizens in planning must not be ambiguous. Any lack of clarity renders participation irrelevant in terms of the citizen's responsibilities toward the authority of government and government toward the "rights" of citizens. "Experience suggests that these ambiguities

---

<sup>6</sup>U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Technical Assistance Bulletin No. 3: Citizen Participation in Model Cities (Washington, D. C.: HUD, December, 1968), p. 14.

underlie the demands of many neighborhood residents and group 'control' of the planning process."<sup>7</sup> It is the existence of citizen participation amongst institutions and the influences and power wielded in the political process that demands that citizen participation have its role and authority known and accepted. Without such an established position, it cannot be expected that other institutions will account for the presence and interests of citizen participation, nor can it be expected that the participatory function would be willing to account for the interests of other institutions.

The brief discussion of the attitudes and images associated with citizen participation begins to reveal why, each and every element of an institution must be established in citizen participation. The views of the establishment of citizen participation with access to decision-making described as Means and Ends, Process and Conflict, Structure and Power are fully realized in the down to earth political interpretation of planning politics. The creation of the basic condition for citizen participation as a social institution; the inability of existing institutions to broaden their membership, will continue to exist, if the planning function fails to utilize citizen participation to

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

achieve an up-to-date planning process, with the comprehensiveness and rationality of its technical competence.

As the planning function utilizes citizen participation as a social institution, it will provide more depth to goals and objectives which must be subject to consensus of interests and power of influence. This depth will continue to draw resisters of a comprehensive planning away from compartmentalizing planning into physical, economic and social components. Instead, the improved capacities of planning to forecast probable consequences and assessed payoffs of recommended economic or physical policies will be strengthened by a broader judgment of how it will affect the daily living patterns of the residents. The increased ability of planning to gain feedback and recommendations in devising meaningful alternative plans will undoubtedly approach greater compatibility in objectives. The promotion of interaction between citizen participation and vested interests, combined with political influences, will also promote the differing positions on issues to take a greater stance of practicality, and greater benefit over the political expediency. The ability of the planning function to develop acceptable policies will broaden the potential for compromise, negotiating and bargaining with the effect that benefits of holding a

position will come under a greater public scrutiny and evaluation. In turn, the emphasis on the complexities of development will be better understood by the public at large. When a final plan is developed, it will reflect a greater reconciliation of diverse interests and can more readily gain supported public approval. The implementation of such a plan can only be easier, since it will have been based upon the concept of political practicality in the public arena and not narrow political expediency. To follow this course, is rational and action oriented. Yet, the ability of citizen participation to succeed in providing access to decision-making hinges on the power of influence, authority, and resources, which it can muster. With these strengths, it can meet the established institutional powers and their resources at each phase of the planning process.

#### Power and Authority In Its Relationship To Planning Strategy

The important task now is to evaluate the kinds of power of influences, authority and resources citizen participation requires, and to understand how acceptance of citizen participation as a social institution provides a foundation for these powers. Then finally, how to establish the working framework of citizen participation to achieve its position as a social institution.



However, in order to accomplish this, the evaluation of power, influence and resources of citizen participation must be understood relative to those possessed by existing institutions and their use in political policy-making.

The critical question of evaluating this aspect of citizen participation can only be answered when its role is seen as a form of citizen power in planning. Thus, at hand is the question of ability and power of planners and the planning process. It is the development and redistribution of various forms of power to influence policy, strategies, priorities and decisions for those citizens who at present are not included in participation and who do not have access to decision-making that is at the center of participation. It is a strategy by which all citizens will be able to rejoin the policy-making functions in determining among other things how information is shared, goals and policies set, tax resources allocated, programs are operated, and benefits are parcelled out. It is, also, a strategy for planners and the planning process when the "Lack power, 'the ability to control external and internal environments and/or to counteract the consequence of imperfect control' for there it needs to win cooperation to achieve the process and to do this the distribution of influences may have to

be altered or fragmented power may have to be collected and harnessed."<sup>8</sup> For it is "Within the structure of institution responsibility (that) the planner attempts to articulate values, priorities and programs."<sup>9</sup>

When the expression "power" is discussed in planning, it is seen as a power to influence in the planning process, and not an external force per se. The citizen power to influence is an exertion of authority to promote interests in the form of participation, and this authority is based upon the ultimate consent of the participants. The exercise of authority in this sense is the promotion of a strategy, but not "to imply that citizen participation is a single, undifferentiated and overriding strategy. It is more accurate to speak of several strategies of citizen participation, defined in terms of given objectives."<sup>10</sup> Thus, the power to influence, the authority to promote interests and the strategies are the means of achieving participation.

To begin with the ability to influence citizen participation occurs where there is a process of

---

<sup>8</sup>Martin Rein, "Social Planning: The Search for Legitimacy," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969), p. 233.

<sup>9</sup>Marshall Kaplan, "Advocacy and the Urban Poor," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (March, 1969), p. 97.

<sup>10</sup>Edmund M. Burke, "Citizen Participation Strategies," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXIV (September, 1968), p. 288.

community decision-making. The form that the process takes as it affects planning has been summarized and discussed by Lawrence Mann in terms of various power model concepts.<sup>11</sup> Belief in any one particular one of these power models is not the crux of recognition of the ability of citizen participation to influence.

#### Planning Strategy for Citizen Participation

Inappropriately for planning, all of its concerns do not always begin with the start of a planning effort. Institutions and their ability to influence are already existing; patterns of community decision-making are already in existence and past planning policies to some extent still exist in both the minds of municipal officials and in approved public documents.

The beginning of a planning effort is the most difficult time for the promotion of citizen participation as it is recognized here as a social institution. At this point, there is the greatest amount of reliance upon the planner, who in the past when conventional "planning" functions were performed was not in control or in any position to direct the process. Not that any single decision-making entity that could be said to have "planned" was in central control of the process.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Lawrence D. Mann, "Studies in Community Decision-Making," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXX (February, 1964), p. 58-65.

<sup>12</sup>See Roland L. Warren, "Model Cities First Round: Politics, Planning and Participation," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969), p. 245-252.

The planning process and its functions are performed in an essentially political process. With this handicap, the planner attempting a viable program of citizen participation is promoting a program of institutional reform which has an implicitly limited appeal; and, its first results are relatively remote, roundabout and intangible.

Nevertheless, this is the time in a municipal initiative for a planning effort, whether it be a total comprehensive effort or a planning project such as urban renewal, at which the effort for citizen participation and access to decision-making must begin. It must begin when the potential of citizen participation will not be an issue opposed by other institutions and organized interests. Not later, when these interests can and will become fully activated by particular issues in program and policy decision of the planning effort, since they might affect their main purpose or interest. It is a time when everyone is for citizen participation.

The "power" requirements of citizen participation at this time are least; it needs only to obtain a non-cooptable, non-manipulated working position on the first decisive decision-making body established for the articulation of the public interest. The management of this

position will require less in the way of exposure of the planner from then on, since the planner could obviously run the risk of being called a tribunal of the people. The power now required of citizen participation is the power of stimulation. This is the activation of the main purpose of citizen participation as a social institution; it is the purpose of participating.

The first interest of participation will be to prevent its first position from becoming final, since from this point, citizen participation will endeavor to strengthen its position. Next, it will further promote recognition of itself amongst the community, and as a non-threatening force of the interests of other institutions. Thirdly, it must bring into the public arena the first issues of the planning process, that of the establishment of goals. The success of these immediate steps will be noted in the ability of the planning process to become the public and political issue it realistically is.

Furthermore, the ability of citizen participation to operate with or against community decision-making, its ability to blunt proposals of planning policy not in the interest of the whole community and to counter these proposals with other constructive proposal and efforts, and the ability to prevent a coopted or sidetracked public interest rests upon the "power" of citizen participation

to remain active. For this to occur, the elements of social institutions must be brought to their full potential before issues which are the purposes and main function of other institutions are brought into the quasi-public political arena.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE OBJECTIVES AND AIMS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Power to the people.

Rap Brown

Probably the most troublesome area of citizen participation which has not yet been discussed is that of objectives, aims and strategy. This area is difficult to discuss, because it begins to examine citizen participation internally; and, as this occurs, the implications of the objectives and aims of citizen participation that reach to planning programs, bureaucracy, public interests and rights of individuals become apparent. Since citizen participation is seen as a social institution, the objectives and aims are embodied within the structure of the institution. However, since citizen participation is also viewed in terms of planning and, therefore, in a process of decisions and compromise, these same objectives and aims take on the significant effect of also being viewed as elements of strategy.

The discussion in this chapter places citizen participation in the position of attempting to operationalize its objectives and aims as strategy; both for the members of the citizen participation effort itself and as an influence of the planning process. In addition, this chapter will relate citizen participation to a number of achievement elements, which are seen as crucial factors in the structuring of a citizen participation organization in that they link participants to the aims and objectives.



To briefly review what was established earlier, the primary function or purpose of citizen participation as a social institution is the ability to participate. This is seen in the components of a social institution which provide the means for individuals to participate and the means for citizen participation to function in an institutional system. The goal of citizen participation in this form is in its ability to partake in the planning process, which assumes the inherent ability to influence decisions. This requires the incorporation of citizen participation into the decision-making process of planning. Without the access to the decision-making process citizen participation cannot be considered as partaking in the planning process.

#### Objectives of Citizen Participation

Accordingly, the most important objectives in the establishment of a citizen participation effort are:

1. To strengthen and reinforce the planning process and planning programs.
2. To re-establish the best concept of the public interest.
3. To ensure a lasting responsiveness of the existing institutional structure.

In the consideration of the first objective of citizen participation, which is to strengthen and reinforce the planning process and programs, the emphasis of this

objective should be seen as feasible action. A sound planning program requires a "planning process directed towards functional priorities, a modest planning period and precisely defined, achievable products."<sup>1</sup> Citizen participation offers an impetus to the planning process to gain this direction. Only the resolution of the direction of the planning process by the inclusion of all value systems and evaluation of priorities and alternatives, not just an increase in the number of organizations or interests, will facilitate action. The planning process and programs are strengthened because, by participation, a better understanding of the total process is achieved by all interests. The process and programs are also strengthened, since the plan or program is itself a document which has the broadest support and, thereby, increases the importance of its implementation. In the same context, inclusion of all interests in the planning process represents the most practical achievement of political feasibility of a plan, once it has been brought into the public arena.

The second objective which is to re-establish the best concept of the public interest, is obviously closely related to the first objective, in that the benefits derived from a sound planning process can only be applied

---

<sup>1</sup>Kaplan, op. cit., p. 97.

to those interests considered in the evaluation of the public interest. Since the "Determinations of what serves the public interest, in a society containing many diverse interest groups, are almost always of a highly contentious nature,"<sup>2</sup> the consideration of the public interest is cited as a separate and most important objective. The emphasis is also placed on this objective because the attainment of the public interest must be carried on as a means of evaluating and providing feedback to the planning process. Since the formulation of the public interest in the past has essentially been a competitive political struggle for the enhancement of domain and accomplishment of goal-oriented objectives of major competitive interests, there is no reason not to expect a resurgence of these efforts during the total planning period and plan implementation.

The third objective which was cited was that of ensuring a lasting responsiveness of the existing institutional structure. This objective is merely a statement that expresses the success of citizen participation as a social institution. As an institution partaking in the planning process, citizen participation will grow in accordance with the responsibilities it assumes, and it must also survive to assume these responsibilities. Given this process, citizen participation will be taken

---

<sup>2</sup>Davidoff, op. cit., p. 332.

further into the arena of institutional competition. In that situation, "it is clear that if any one institution grows it must then do so at the expense of the others."<sup>3</sup> In addition, the planning process is a continuous process, and citizen participation must remain active and established to ensure that there always exists a pluralism of values in the process and that none becomes so prominent that it is able to suppress another.

#### Aims of Citizen Participation

The objectives on a broad scale set the tone for the strategy of citizen participation. However, the label of objective, strategy or strategy objective should not lead away from the main consideration that the objectives represent the over-riding achievements to be made by citizen participation. Moreover, within these areas are also found the aims of citizen participation as a social institution. Here the aims are seen as a further statement of accomplishments to be expected. They are seen as being representative of the specific responsibilities of a social institution toward the persons represented by a citizen participation effort.

---

<sup>3</sup>Fieblemen, op. cit., p. 189.

The aims as such are:

1. Providing the communication of new ideas from persons previously excluded from the planning process.
2. Correction of existing and future policies which are influenced by the best intentions of bureaucrats which have not always been definable, predictable, consistent, workable or realistic.
3. The strengthening of the rights of all persons to have a voice in the planning that affects them.

The importance of the first aim, which is to provide the communication of new ideas from persons previously excluded from the planning process, is a key to effective citizen involvement. This aim is cited as being a key to effective citizen participation, because channels of communication are the means for citizens "to convert local aspirations into highly visible, creditable projects that affect the public and private resource stream."<sup>4</sup> In addition, where past planning has failed by proposing complex, involved approaches to a problem, time should be allowed to consider simple but uncomplicated approaches proposed by persons affected by a problem area. This is not to exclude a planner's or anyone else's approach for solution, but it strives to establish a better view and consequences of alternatives

---

<sup>4</sup>Kaplan, op. cit., p. 98.

offered. This aim also promotes pressure upon the organization itself to "help develop skills in bargaining and negotiation, gathering of evidence, use of rules of the game, organization and use of professional and non-professional help."<sup>5</sup>

The second aim which is the correction of existing and future policies which are influenced by the best intentions of bureaucrats which have not always been definable, predictable, consistent, workable or realistic. Stated simply, it is to bring things together. This aim represents a response to the increasing bureaucratization and complexity of administering of public policy. While it in no way proposes a total revamping of the administrative structure, the aim recognizes that while some proposals in the development of a planning document may reflect a marginal commitment by one or more local departments, these proposals will at least provide residents opportunities for dialogue along with a frame of reference with agencies responsible for public policy. The same agencies may also utilize this frame or reference towards rethinking their policies and priorities with respect to knowledge brought to the planning effort by citizens. Furthermore, this aim is also directed toward the federal effort in planning

---

<sup>5</sup>Perloff and Hanson, op. cit., p. 165.

programs. It is described as reaching into communities in "multiple ways through an unbelievable array of departments and agencies, each assigned categorical tasks impossible to achieve without a broader framework of reference. It is not only that the right hand does not always know what the left hand is doing. It is a serious question whether they have any common connection."<sup>6</sup>

The final aim cited was the strengthening of the rights of all persons to have a voice in the planning that affects them. This aim obviously does not propose that every citizen be personally consulted for every decision to be made in the planning process, but they should be able to find out quickly "what's up," "what's going on" and be able to make their opinion known. "The ritualistic and highly manipulative public hearings that were possible in the early days of urban development have become politically infeasible..."<sup>7</sup> Those persons that persisted at the time to express their interest were either frustrated, channeled to make "unproductive and peripheral decisions" and basically learned that

---

<sup>6</sup>Homer C. Wadsworth, "Goals and Social Planning," in Urban America: Goals and Problems, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>7</sup>Langley Carleton Deyes, Jr., The Rehabilitation Planning Game: A Study in the Diversity of Neighborhood (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1969), p. 7.

efforts at "participation are not an efficacious expenditure of time, or that his views did not matter."<sup>8</sup> The aim of citizen participation is to change. Public information shall be made public, access to influence will exist and procedures to participate shall be adequate -- before the "bulldozers arrive."

#### Secondary Consequences of the Objectives and Aims

The aims that have been thus far considered are similar to the objectives in that they are seen as most important and not inclusive. However, as elements of strategy, they must also be examined for their possible secondary achievements, consequences or implications. The two areas which are appearing to become activated, as a result of management and fulfillment of these aims and objectives, are decentralization and the development of political power. These two possible secondary effects are probably most important to the existing policy makers, because they are both laden with the potential of diminishing the effective authority of the existing influence structure.

#### Decentralization and Community Power

To avoid the dilemma of being totally misunderstood the following definition is presented as being consistent with the framework established thus far for citizen

---

<sup>8</sup>Perloff and Hanson, op. cit., p. 163.



participation as an access to the decision-making process of planning. Decentralization means "a pattern of organization in which decisions are made at the local level rather than centrally, but these decisions can be made by the agents of the central authority without the participation of the local community."<sup>9</sup> This definition as it applies to citizen participation clearly refutes the argument that all that is meant by citizen participation is the decentralization of the planning process. As it has been pointed out numerous times, this was the form that citizen participation was given in past planning efforts. Those efforts (call them manipulation, cooptation or engineering consent) were basically forms of non-participation when compared to the framework that depicts citizen participation as a social institution. When schemes of citizen participation are offered under the guise of decentralization, it is the exemplification of the "critical difference between going through the empty ritual of participation and having the real power needed to affect the outcome of the process."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Nathan Glazer, "For White and Black, Community Control Is the Issue," The New York Times Magazine, April 27, 1969, p. 36.

<sup>10</sup>Sherry R. Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969), p. 216.

When decisions are made on a local level, for example, and then compromised or refined at a city-wide level, this represents a failure at the local level in terms of strategy, resources or power; but it is a legitimate consequence of position in the decision-making process. The honest of "community control" over decentralization is the sharing of power, rather than a so called engineered responsibility of power. In this case, "community control" means "a pattern of organization in which the local community has power over decisions."<sup>11</sup> Comparing the two, it is seen that it is possible to have decentralization without any community control, although you cannot have community control without some substantial measure of decentralization.

#### Development of Political Power

What probably strikes fear into the non-understanding opponents of community control is that it is presumed to mean total community control. That concept would be better described as secession. Nevertheless, political policy makers do have a right to fear a diminishing of their power, if they have in the past defined the scope, priorities and decisions of planning that affected areas which were involuntarily subject to the political

---

<sup>11</sup>Glazer, op. cit., p. 37.

control of decision-makers. Citizen participation is community control of the decisions to be made in the planning process which reflect the desires of the local residents. Once these desires are articulated they compete with other interests towards achieving primary importance in the planning process. At this point, if the interests pressed forward by citizen participation are not at least negotiated or compromised then there has not been access to the decision-making process, because "every decision is a compromise."<sup>12</sup> If this is not the result, then citizen participation in the very least could be expected to move toward the development of political power quickly, belligerently and with a sense of disregard for friendship and polite social intercourse. However, where there is access to decision-making there should be moderate, constructive and progressive movement toward development of political power.

The progression of citizen participation in the planning toward political development would receive its stimulus through motivation and effectiveness.

---

<sup>12</sup>Comment from informal discussion with Thomas H. Haga, Director-Coordinator of the Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission, March 3, 1970.

Although the stake of citizens in planning is not necessarily material, nor a direct service, it reveals itself in the outcome of the planning process as an improvement of the living environment. Even in specific situations, it is difficult to accurately assess human motivation, but "in general terms, people become politically involved in a planning question when they feel they have a stake in the matter."<sup>13</sup> As a result of participation, citizens and emerging or existing leaders will "increase their effectiveness in influencing policy through training in the language of politics and methods of decision-making."<sup>14</sup> Citizens with motivation and effectiveness will overcome the existing trends of reacting to proposed agency planning programs and propose their own appropriate goals, actions and programs. Moreover, if planning continues to over-emphasize the physical planning concept, then this will organize citizen efforts toward government, political systems and decision-makers to bypass planning altogether. The reasonable course of further citizen participation efforts should then be toward the political institutions of the community. Since participation in planning will

---

<sup>13</sup>Ranney, op. cit., Planning and Politics in the Metropolis, p. 114.

<sup>14</sup>Perloff and Hanson, op. cit., p. 165.

have shown that the ultimate focus of decisions that are binding on the total community are exercised with political power through government institutions.

#### Achievement Elements of the Objectives and Aims

At this point it is not deemed practical nor enlightening to attempt to discuss the previously cited aims and objectives of citizen participation as they were reflected in planning advisory committees, task forces and so called community councils. The simple reason is that the goal or primary purpose of these forms of "participation" in planning were not suited to a demand for participation and access to decision-making. The difference between policy-making and cooptation and the difference between decentralization and community control are the pragmatic differences between citizen participation as a social institution in today's planning process and citizen participation in land use planning. Today then, the demand for participation and access to decision-making is being given its best chance of being met by three forms of efforts. These are the Model Cities Program, Neighborhood Corporation and Citizen Planning Boards. Before pursuing a discussion into these forms of citizen participation efforts, it would be beneficial to describe some of the more pragmatic aspects that would be required of

these efforts in order to fulfill the requirements of the defined objectives and aims. These "nitty-gritty" aspects will then be further discussed in Chapter V with the three forms of participation.

The practical and difficult aspects, or "achievement elements," of the citizen participation effort are listed in an order that is consistent with the goals, objectives and aims that have been previously stated. They are also seen as more readily relating individuals to a planning effort in terms of the responsibility of efforts that are dependent upon the planner. In addition, many of the elements that were outlined earlier as components of a social institution are reaffirmed, since they emphasize the developing relationship between citizens and planning.

#### ACHIEVEMENT ELEMENTS

Type of governing unit	---Goals or Primary Function
Choosing of representatives	
Past participation	
Ability to participate	---Objectives
Distrust	
Cooperation	
Decision and Policy Areas	
Defining of Decision and Policy	---Aims
Lack of information	
Technical assistance	
Others	

The first group of achievement elements - type of governing unit, choosing of representatives, past

participation, and ability to participate - are seen as primary to the goal or primary purpose, because they are basic to the establishment and continuation of participation. The type of governing unit and method of representation are critical because of their linkage between the planning area and residents. Whereas a single homogenous grouping of persons would tend to arise where an issue is prompted or led by an ethnic or fraternal organization, the concern of a heterogeneous grouping of local residents is more apt to arise when planning issues or programs designate area and affected areas of a community. The critical condition at this point is the coordination of a citizen unit that responds to the pending planning issue or program at large. The particular form of representation, therefore, is not the most important factor. It is the manifestation of a stable and representative form of governing unit; one that provides an inward movement of the consolidation of ideas and an outward expression of expansion. Moreover, the governing unit and representation therein must be centered around the ability to "manage" an area, since it will be directly involved with diverse interests and priorities in a specific area and the transference of these issues in a negotiable position to issues of a citywide scale. The achievement elements of past

participation and ability to participate strongly lend themselves to the leadership, support and identification of the participation effort. Past participation in other citizen participation efforts is one of the greatest unequalizing efforts amongst all persons. Past participation along with education is the greatest potential obstacle and the best motivating device for prompting individual participation and the development of leadership within the organization. Manipulation of any of these elements could generate a setback for participation when utilized by a selected group. The development of group dynamics could obviously create impasses, but the stress of individual interest being at stake is the best lever to avoid bottlenecks.

The second group of achievement elements - distrust, cooperation, decision and policy areas - are seen as being parallel to the objectives; whereas, they are of primary consequence to the development of strategy. The element of distrust is the suspicion and alienation that residents of local areas know from having been previously excluded from the planning process. Or, suspicion and alienation might have arisen as a result of previous attempts of participation which were either manipulated or led to a misconception of the ability of past programs to deliver on the promises made. The strength



of representativeness should provide a means to alleviate the distrust.

The cooperational achievement element or a measure of it will undoubtedly influence the development of the strategy, because it will represent a commitment of working with some existing channels of communication. It should also point the way towards a recognition of the organization's willingness or refusal to articulate some of the local public interests which are seen in existing policies administered by agencies or those thought to be responsible for their administration. With knowledge of the political and legal strengths and weaknesses of agency responsibility towards a planning program, the element of cooperation will find itself able to produce more cooperation by continuing to bring issues and interests to the center of all efforts and to the public arena.

The third element of the group - decision and policy areas - will probably provide the greatest influence on the framework of strategy. The first step toward the development of strategy will come about by the organization's position of what decision and policy areas are of concern to it, and how it will reveal their recognizable public interest. This should develop both alignment with other interests and the needed organizational requirements to adequately

approach involvement in the decision and policy-making process. Secondly, this step will begin to define the scope of the problem area or emphasis, and the delineation of the decision and policy areas. The organization's definitions should implicitly contain indications where possible solutions to problem areas lie or are perceived to lie. This achievement element, in addition to providing the key to the recognition of the complexity of policy and decision development, will also show the interdependency of one decision area based upon the consequences of policies in a second area. As an important step in the development of strategy, the seeking of a decision and policy area by the participation effort will require political units, agencies, and decision and policy making units to declare and define the extent of their responsibilities. The stimulus for these revelations is bound to the exposure of the decision-making process into the public arena.

The third group of achievement elements - the defining of decision and policy, information and technical assistance - are closely related to the aims of the participation effort, since they dominate the ability to respond positively towards the personal satisfaction of partaking in a planning effort. The

achievement element of defining decisions and policies is vital to the aim of participation, because it represents an articulation of citizen and community values in the planning effort. There certainly exists a difference between the decision of two alternatives compared to the decision of choosing to study any number of alternatives as an approach to a problem. The ability to become immersed in semantics looms over any discussion of decision and policy; but in terms of a citizen participation process, the lines of communications and responsibilities must be clearly definable to overcome all possible suspicions of cooptation and manipulation. As an example of the importance attributed to this aspect, the planning effort definitions must indicate that if a policy is developed for a citizen participation effort to make a decision, such as to follow policy "A," as an example, does this mean that they will be required to make decisions upon alternatives that might arise in pursuit of this policy? Is the concept of decision-making only limited to a decision upon alternatives suggested by the citizen participation effort? Is the ultimate form of decision-making the power of approving or vetoing appropriation of funds to pursue a policy, decision or choice of alternatives? These kinds of questions will always

arise for clarification and could conceivably be asked in a hundred different ways. The fulfillment of this achievement element then appears to rest on the ability of the citizen participation effort to define what is meant by a decision and pursue the position of being able to make this choice effective. What is also necessarily sought here is not a knowledge or ability to occupy organization chart boxes, but the clarification of the ability of box A to influence decisions of box B, etc. The effect of this cannot be passed over for the planner either, since it is entirely possible for the planner to become coopted or manipulated by the decision-making process, citizens and politicians, alike. However, what appears as a significantly critical determining factor in this relationship is the ability to adequately provide understandable technical knowledge and assistance to all interests concerned. It will then be easier to discern where a decision or policy is made upon an objective evaluation and where it will be made upon a value judgment. The time and place in the planning process where these judgments and evaluations must be reconciled will be heavily influenced by the planner. This will be in his ability to deliver the technical assistance and expertise in a manner where all potential decision-makers have achieved a relative equalization

because of their ability to predict the development consequences of a policy or decision.

Reflecting the thought that every decision is a compromise, every structure of a citizen participation effort should also represent a compromise. To this end, it must be recorded that the formation of objectives and aims, which develop strategy of a citizen participation effort, must not be rigid. They must be feasible and flexible. In addition, they must be adaptable to the diverse elements within the participation process itself, as well as being durable enough to withstand the consequences of involvement in the decision-making process in the community.

## CHAPTER V

### IMPEDIMENTS TO CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, AND EVALUATION OF SELECTED PROGRAMS

The implicit assumption of a homogeneity of values, needs and objectives in a ghetto community is as invalid as is a like assumption with respect to any other neighborhood or community within the city.

Michael P. Brooks and  
Michael A. Stegman

In examining citizen participation thus far, it was not the intent to prepare a blueprint for citizen participation which could be carried from community to community by a planner. Instead, what has been presented are warranted steps which must obviously be taken by the planning function in activating a planning process where a form of institutional dysfunction exists. In addition to the numerous strategies that have to be developed for citizen participation in its "encounters" with decision makers, and the political and planning process, there will exist other internal and external impediments to a participation effort. This chapter will examine what are seen as the more prevalent impediments to citizen participation and then discuss some existing programs and types of citizen efforts which are the most responsive to the framework of citizen participation as a social institution. The programs to be discussed are the Model Cities Program, Neighborhood Corporations and Citizen Planning Boards. In this chapter the discussion retains the approach of seeking rational and decisive action by planners in efforts, as opposed to the doctrine that "where power has come to be shared it was taken by the citizens, not given by the city."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Arnstein, op. cit., p. 222.

### Impediments

The more prevalent impediments of the application of citizen participation efforts have been grouped into six areas, as follows:

1. Motivation-Cause
2. Leadership-Participation-Past Activities
3. Representativeness-Constituency
4. Purpose-Interest-Perpetuation
5. Political Education
6. Technical Assistance

### Motivation-Cause

The recent attempts being undertaken to re-open channels for communication between local areas and central government has resulted in residents of local areas being placed in a dilemma of not really being able to describe what they can expect in the way of municipal response to their problems. Part of this inability is because "Very few services provided by cities for their residents are placed or administered in the neighborhood, limiting interplay between citizens and their acceptance."<sup>2</sup> This dilemma, combined with the need for social "adjustment," presents a credibility gap as to what possible accomplishments could be gained by citizen participation in planning. The overcoming of this municipal credibility gap and explanations or "education" of the potential effect of planning programs

---

<sup>2</sup>Perloff and Hanson, op. cit., p. 164.



for local residents is seen as one of the first impediments with which the planning function is presented. The difficulties of this task places great pressure on the abilities of planners to create their own credibility and provide a recognizable potential in planning, especially in the area of visible participation in planning and change due to the process of planning. This task will probably require the planner to utilize those persons who have a generally favorable image in the local area in gaining a first step toward the acceptability of planning to citizens, if he intends to decrease the "disparity between the need to change social institutions and programs of individual and neighborhood improvement (which) threaten to stalemate most of the programs."<sup>3</sup>

#### Leadership-Participation-Past Activities

It should be expected that some of the leadership of the participation effort that occurs in planning is, in a sense, a reaction, response or continuation of individuals or groups to some past form of participation; i.e., civil rights, anti-poverty programs, or urban renewal. One oddly hopeful note of this past participation is that "having been so grossly affronted, some

---

<sup>3</sup>Walter W. Stafford and Joyce Ladner, "Comprehensive Planning and Racism," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969), p. 71.

citizens have learned the Mickey Mouse game and now they know how to play. As a result of this knowledge, they are demanding genuine levels of participation."<sup>4</sup> Planning can, perhaps, provide the fulfillment of these demands; but, because of the nature of past citizen participation efforts or involvement in programs, planning may find itself in conflict with the ways and means developed in past participation efforts. Citizen participation in planning is assumed to remain distant from mass demonstrations and job training, although there could obviously or inevitably be a need for either at some time during the planning process. How the participation responds to planning and how planning responds to participation will rely heavily on the leadership of the participation effort. In turn, how this leadership will rely on positive physical participation and/or a sharing of benefits and personal indications of participation will quickly be answered only in the actual process of participation. Where leaders work, some sort of "tribute" must also be paid. These leaders, as well as any other individuals who become involved in planning, should be expected to have a stake in the outcome of the planning process. The impediment of this aspect of participation would

---

<sup>4</sup>Arnstein, op. cit., p. 218.

be the possible misapplication of pressure tactics too early in the planning process when possibilities for negotiation and bargaining and participation in decision-making have not been allowed their "proper" development. Part of this development is in both responding to, and restraining from opposing politically initiated strategy. Also, and more importantly, is the developing of strategy which makes other interests respond to the aims and objectives of those in the participation effort. The strength of participation with respect to this impediment is in the overall enhancement of strategy through strong leadership.

#### Representativeness-Constituency

The impediment to the citizen participation effort with respect to representativeness is the delineation of a constituency and ensuring the "rights" of the represented. The delineation of areas for representation and form of the organization will, hopefully, be created to consider not only possible physical boundaries of planning areas, but factors which are of particular interest to special groupings of citizens in the organization, such as the elderly and the youthful. As was mentioned earlier, the form and the structure of the organization should be of the choosing of the residents. The responsibility of the planner



in helping to bring about such a structure would be to elicit strong support within the community for educational and organizational activities. This is, in a sense, the promotion of politicking on a small scale, but this is an essential first step in participatory democracy. The benefit of this activity is to ensure a publicizing of the rights and responsibilities of those who are going to assume leadership roles in the organization and the interests of the residents who belong to the organization. The difficulty of achieving representativeness has been noted in some recent efforts of citizen participation in the model cities program. It was acknowledged by citizens who held elections "that they had only made a start toward achieving representativeness, that reaching it is a developmental process that will require continuing effort and commitment, that known methods to ensure that representatives accountable to their constituency need to be incorporated, and that new methods of accountability need to be devised."<sup>5</sup>

#### Purpose-Interest-Perpetuation

In the strongest sense of the word, the keeping of purpose of participation is participation itself,

---

<sup>5</sup>Citizen Participation in Model Cities, op. cit., p. 7.



and the interest of this participation occurs only with progressive and visable results. The ability of the planning function to provide at least some sort of tangential form of result is what appears as the impediment to this facet of participation. The ability of the participation effort to extend activism to all members continually, and to provide them with this visable form of result, is participation's greatest impediment. Whether this result is the advancement of funds or a change in public policy of a municipal agency, it provides an indication by which to gauge the progress of the participation effort. In fact, the framework of citizen participation presents a relationship which if "restricted to the planning phase it will be of little value."<sup>6</sup> The residents view participation as "action and not as an organization (that) has only its goals, its idealized purpose, to sustain interest and create satisfactions."<sup>7</sup> It is difficult to maintain interest in idealized goals over a long period of time and planning to some members of the participation effort may be viewed as an eternity. Where planning fails to maintain a level of possible achievement, it could surely be possible for

---

<sup>6</sup>Perloff and Hanson, op. cit., p. 166.

<sup>7</sup>Burke, op. cit., p. 292.

"the leader of the organization...to depend upon exhortations or the manufacturing of crisis to recharge interest."<sup>8</sup>

#### Political-Education

One of the greatest impediments to planning and participation in the political context is knowledge. The ability to secure this knowledge is almost seen as trial by fire. This knowledge is sought in three phases: the knowledge of the distribution of stakes and resources of groups and their interests relative to the planning issue; how these resources will be utilized in the development of a strategy; and the prediction of political consequences with the proposal of various planning policies. The task of gaining this knowledge is not new to planning and, therefore, it should not be difficult to transfer this experience to citizen participation. The difference between the utilization of this knowledge by planners and citizen participation is that planning oversees and must conduct any possible alliances of resources in the utmost of discretion so as not to permanently effect its bargaining and negotiating position. A citizen participation effort, on the other hand, must fully exploit this knowledge in its development of strategy. In narrowing down this impediment, there are two crucial factors. First,

---

<sup>8</sup>Burke, Ibid., p. 293.



participation must account for its own resources to avoid overplaying its hand; and, secondly, "at any point in time there will always be potentially influential...(interests)...on hand who are not using all of their political resources."<sup>9</sup> Thus, the stakes in the outcome of the planning issue or the conflicts of strategy will partially determine how much of these resources will be brought into play.

#### Technical Assistance

The difficulty of this impediment is drawn from two different types of technical assistance; one is when the citizen organization maintains their own technical staff, and the other is the use of technical personnel provided by the municipality for the citizens' use. Under the latter condition, with the assumption that there is not a complete employment control directed by the citizens over the planner and staff, the most disconcerting element can be the element of distrust. When this distrust exists, it is a restriction of technical assistance, not by anyone's intention or fault, but as a result of past experiences of citizens or just their utmost desire to have their own staff.

When a citizen group can maintain its own planner or staff, they must also be utilized and to "analyze

---

<sup>9</sup>Ranney, op. cit., p. 117.

community systems in order to locate decision centers, identify representatives of community sentiment groups, and suggest individuals who can contribute knowledge and information."<sup>10</sup> in addition to providing the full gamut of other technical assistance. In providing this technical assistance, the staff must realize that proposals offered will always be viewed by others who do not have the same perspective nor intimacy with the problems. Moreover, when the citizen participation organization endorses and proposes a policy, they should always look toward a point of convergence of policies as they are affected in and by the decision-making process. In essence, technical assistance to citizen participation is new and it can be overplayed. "A strategy that relies upon the power of knowledge has...limitations...for it can also conflict with other strategies of change. Research requires a degree of autonomy if it is to follow a problem, not yielding to political expediency and feasibility. But, the ruthless pursuit of a problem without regard to the question of implementation may lead to a solution that, while it is rational, it is not politically relevant."<sup>11</sup>

These then are the impediments which are seen as offering the greatest obstacles to citizen participation and planning, but the obvious impediment which has not

---

<sup>10</sup>Burke, op. cit., p. 293.

<sup>11</sup>Martin Rein, op. cit., p. 233.

been discussed is that of financial resources and support for the participation effort. This aspect has its greatest relevance in the discussion of the various particular forms of citizen participation efforts. This is also the same consideration of citizen participation which has the potential to arouse political controversy and was previously discussed as a possible secondary effect of the citizen participation efforts.

#### Evaluation of Selected Programs

In the ensuing examination of the selected forms of participation, none of the forms (Model Cities, Neighborhood Corporation or Citizen Planning Boards) is individually seen as completely fulfilling the framework established for implementing citizen participation as a social institution. Instead, what is pointed out by the examination is various "abilities" of each structure of participation, which when combined provides the closest existing working structures of citizen participation while fulfilling the requirements of a social institution and means for access to the decision-making process.

#### Model Cities Program

The first consideration that must be given to the examination of some of the elements of the Model Cities Program is that none of the programs are complete,

and much of the evaluation that has been performed is, in essence, only that of the organization and planning phases. The Model Cities Administration's CDA Letter No. 3 (October 30, 1967) on citizen participation interpreted the original act's provision for "widespread citizen participation in the program" to mean that the city government must be sure "that whatever organization is adopted provides the means for the model neighborhood's citizens to participate in policy making, planning and the execution of all programs elements." and "require that the plan spell out just how such participation and involvement were to be carried out."<sup>12</sup> This particular aspect, which provides for the beginning acceptance of citizen participation as a social institution, has been circumvented by the strategies of municipal government and the inability of the federal agency to keep close tabs on the various programs. Nonetheless, "Neighborhood power and a measure of control, envisioned neither by HUD nor by cities, gradually began to slip under a number of negotiating tables."<sup>13</sup> The most likable aspect of this program with respect to initiation of

---

<sup>12</sup>Roland L. Warren, op. cit., p. 248.

<sup>13</sup>Hans B. Spiegel and Stephen D. Mitterenthal, Neighborhood Power and Control: Implications for Urban Planning (New York: Institute of Urban Environment, Columbia University, School of Architecture, 1968), p. 62.



citizen participation was the ability of planners to initially suggest "interm" or organizational frameworks for participation in the program. This occurred because most applications for Model Cities funding was performed by municipal planning departments. This event in itself allowed for further expansion and organization activities in a community, especially in the formation of an organizational structure which promoted indigenous community leadership and procedures.

In terms of the six impediments to implement citizen participation as a social institution, much of the impediments of motivation, representativeness, and leadership were overcome if the program wasn't initially coopted by the municipal government. In fact, although a body or agency of the municipal government must have final authority for the acceptance of federal funds (required by federal statute) the federal government has sought to view the program as a partnership between city government and the residents of the model neighborhood. The perpetuation of interest in the program is a consideration that is presently going through a crucial period, since most of the planning phases of the programs are drawing to a close. The time between the end of this phase and any further visible results will depend upon the particular program adopted in

each city.

Yet, in broad terms the political stature of the Model Cities Program can be considered successful by the measured attempt by the Nixon administration to disband the program, which failed, and a question that was asked at a Harvard conference for businessmen. The question was, "If the Demonstration Cities Program reaches meaningful proportions, does the influx of federal funds to local officials and agencies mean a weakening of the relative position of business and its ability to influence the future of the city?"<sup>14</sup> Even with the original awareness of some of the potential of the program, Model Cities has in a very short time definitely enlivened and caused some adjustment in the political process in some cities.

Additionally, "while the overall model cities rationale called for designing program specifically suited to attack problems identified in the original planning grant applications, there is little indication that this process took precedence over the competitive interplay of interests and objectives of different groups and organizations."<sup>15</sup> But, within this interplay

---

<sup>14</sup>David C. Birch, The Businessman and the City (Boston: Harvard University, 1967), p. 56.

<sup>15</sup>Warren, op. cit., p. 217.

was the interests of citizens in the model neighborhood, and it also remains a fact that the programs are not yet into the implementation stage.

In the area of technical assistance, there existed a number of instances where steps were taken to allow the citizen effort to hire its own planners for technical assistance. Yet, due to the intensity of the interplay of interests, much of the expertise has been sidelined in the jousting for positions of decision-making and development of early strategy.

Overall, the Model Cities Program probably allows the greatest latitude for the development of the components of a social institution within its framework for citizen participation than any other planning assistance program. It, also, as previously mentioned, recognizes the participation effort as an institution; and, the Model Cities citizen participation role has been upheld in the Federal Appeals Court.

"The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit ruled, in a three-judge opinion filed Tuesday, that George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, had violated the Model Cities Act of 1966 last year when he ordered a "drastically reduced" role for citizens of the demonstration area in carrying out a program for this city.

"The ruling found that Philadelphia had also erred in agreeing to the change without consulting citizens' groups.



"The case was the first court test of the Nixon policy to reach the Federal appellate courts. The Johnson Administration originated the program to demonstrate how city governments and citizens groups could share control of Federal funds to benefit pockets of urban blight and poverty. Last year Mr. Romney shifted the lion's share of control to city halls.

#### "Court Actions Taken

"Citizens groups that had been instrumental in formulating Model Cities plans in several cities went to court. The North City Area-Wide Council of Philadelphia led the way last August. It sought an injunction against implementation of Philadelphia's revised plan for renewal of a North Side slum on the ground that the plan disregarded the Model Cities Program's requirement for 'widespread citizen participation.'

"Federal District Judge John M. Davis dismissed the complaint. This week the Court of Appeals reversed him, holding that citizen involvement 'was drastically reduced by the unilateral actions of the city and H.U.D.' The Government has not indicated whether it will appeal to the Supreme Court.

"The Area-Wide Council was formed three years ago by a unanimous vote of 456 persons representing numerous community organizations in the 90 percent black neighborhood that was to be aided. The council worked nearly two years with the city to plan Philadelphia's \$25.1 million Model Cities program.

#### "\$3.3-Million Sought

"When the city asked for \$3.3-million to get the program under way, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare said Philadelphia was relying too heavily on the council in permitting it to control non-profit corporations to be set up to



carry out housing, health, education and other aspects of the program.

"The city revised its application, substantially reducing the role of the citizens group, and Philadelphia was awarded the money. Little has been done with it, because the council declined to participate under H.U.D.'s terms and went to court instead with a class action in behalf of all 217,000 residents of the target area.

"The appeals court agreed that the city's application and the H.U.D. grant were illegal, citing the requirement of 'wide-spread citizen participation' as a 'central and novel feature' of the Model Cities Act.

"Last year Mr. Romney said it would be his policy to continue to require 'adequate' citizen participation but that 'the final authority' in each city would rest with mayors and their appointed administrators.

"The appeals court noted that, prior to H.U.D.'s objections last year, Philadelphia's plan sought to 'provide Model Cities residents with an opportunity to participate fully in city decisions affecting this area and to assume some control over their own economic resources.'

"The ruling noted that the council did not seek a veto over city and H.U.D. proposals, only 'the right to be consulted and to participate in the planning and carrying out of the program.'

"The judges pointed out that the Model Cities Act directs H.U.D. to 'emphasize local initiative' by residents in both planning and implementation."<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Donald Janson, "Plan for Philadelphia is Ruled A Violation of Model Cities Act," New York Times, July 19, 1970.

However, it appears that the over-riding image of it being a long but limited program still provides an undermining effect on its potential strength to fully develop as a social institution. This factor could also be partly attributed to the continuing requirement that the participation effort look over its shoulder to both the federal and city government for funds, while within the overall framework of municipal approval. The one exception to this financial constraint is the development of Neighborhood Corporations similar to the result of citizen efforts in a number of Model Cities programs. Nevertheless, one of the more substantial gains of Model Cities has been to direct participation efforts away from manipulative, informing and consulting types of citizen efforts. These are the efforts established under conditions where citizens "lack the power to ensure that their views will be heeded by the powerful. When participation is restricted to these levels, there is no follow-through, no muscle, hence, no assurance of changing the status quo."<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, under the influence of drawing away from the "rubber stamp" image of citizen participation, citizen participation in the Model Cities Program still

---

<sup>17</sup>Arnstein, op. cit., p. 217.

remains somewhat suspended in its ability to more than partially have access to the decision-making process. However, the advantages of the program, which were briefly outlined, when combined with some of the elements of Neighborhood Corporations and Citizen Planning Boards, does raise the potential for citizen participation to more fully develop as a social institution and, therefore, gain access to the decision-making process.

#### Neighborhood Corporations

The development of the Neighborhood Corporation from the impetus of the Model Cities Program, and as a separate suggested form of local authority, presents a stronger governing and economic unit than what is provided for in the intentions of the original Model Cities Act. When the structure of the Neighborhood Corporation is taken as part of the Model Cities Program, it is seen as a means of gaining strength over the actions of strategy for citizen which can be prevented in the future by the withholding of funds by the municipal government. This ability is arrived at by the Neighborhood Corporation in its independent legal authority to sign contracts for technical assistance and services, hire and fire employees and to raise some of its own financial support. These three particular aspects relate to the development of the institutional standing of citizen participation in relation to

authority vested in the organization to operationalize its procedures; functions of personnel and expansion of organization. This strength of the Neighborhood Corporation provides the greatest ability of a citizen participation effort to remove the onus of the label of a federal program. In addition, it provides a greater means of access to the decision-making process by its ability to contract for social services in the neighborhood. This leverage is developed, since it brings the citizen participation effort into a closer working relationship with municipal agencies and private institutions providing social services. From this position, the Neighborhood Corporation can take part in negotiating the framework of all the social services and participation programs in the community, since they are directly related to planning and are inter-dependent throughout the community. Clearly, this linkage to the planning process and decision-making is not in direct accordance with past citizen participation efforts in planning. However, it does directly relate the needs of participation that were noted as impediments earlier. These were, namely, those of expanding the strategy of citizen participation and maintaining a level of interest by promotion of visible participation efforts.

The notion of Neighborhood Corporations has also been proposed by some as a "needed and legitimate form" of local government. Under this proposition, the Neighborhood Corporation is seen as "the territorial organization of local authority which can relate people to city government. This relationship is implicitly achieved when Neighborhood Corporation and its self-governing authority is included into the system of government. Territory is more than merely an efficient principle of group formation and common interest."<sup>18</sup> It further goes on to counter some immediate reactions that "city government, in the course of transfer of authority to the neighborhoods, will seek clear lines of responsibility and accountability..." In addition, the success of this transfer "lies in its ability to cooperatively relate to city government and politics."

But, even with the more limited form of Neighborhood Corporation, adjustments in the structures of federal, state and municipal relations would have to be made in the operation of federal grant-in-aid programs. "One of the sharpest political questions concerning the transfer of authority to local Neighborhood Corporations will be the degree of direct relationship between the

---

<sup>18</sup>Kotler, op. cit., p. 185.





federal and neighborhood levels."<sup>19</sup> But, these same operations of grant-in-aid programs, which are often directly supporting planning programs, are also being contracted to Model Cities Neighborhood Corporations. The leap for these same types of Neighborhood Corporations to receive grant-in-aid funds for planning is not as great as it once appeared, and steps to allowing smaller local areas the responsibility of decision-making in planning which contributes to the plan of a larger central area are also being enacted. An example of efforts to achieve this, although still unfinished and very political, is the creation of Citizen Planning Boards in the great City of New York.

#### Citizen Planning Boards

Under a 1961 revision to the Charter of the City of New York, a provision was made for creating sixty-two community districts and the appointment of planning boards in each district. Although these planning boards do not come anywhere near the citizen participation efforts previously discussed, its importance is in the extension of government and political influence to neighborhoods for the purpose of "advising and influencing" the planning and budget of the central

---

<sup>19</sup>Kolter, Ibid., p. 181.

government. The role of the planning boards have been expanded since 1961 from nine members serving under each councilman to a present maximum of fifty members per board. The board's powers have also increased to that of having paid staff, and having the city departments with planning or projects affecting a district, to "refer matters" to them. In addition, the community boards will now hold local hearings, conduct investigations and make their own plan recommendations, before final public hearings are held by the city planning commission.<sup>20</sup>

The main thrust of these planning boards is in the recognition that the neighborhood has the right to influence planning that is aimed at affecting them, while promoted by the central government agency. Yet, accounts of the development of these boards presents them as a political plumb. The New York Times, on March 11, 1970, cites that "control over the complex of neighborhood links to the central government that is being formed is thought by many politicians to be a matter of immense importance." It goes on to say that "Mayor Lindsay, through his urban task forces, has created what his

---

<sup>20</sup>"Local Planning Boards May Get Greater Roles," New York Times, May 14, 1969.

people call an apparatus to respond to neighborhood needs. His political opponents call the apparatus a latter-day version of the old Tammany Hall clubhouse network."

Even with the view that this framework is political, the acknowledgement of this important linkage of neighborhoods to central government in planning should be noted. Furthermore, the possibilities of the potential of citizen participation are greatly enhanced if certain elements of the Model Cities Program and Neighborhood Corporations are given the recognition of Citizen Planning Boards. When taken together, the elements of organization and representativeness in the Model Cities Program, the strength for independence fostered by Neighborhood Corporations, and the acknowledged place of neighborhood interests in central government planning provide most elements for the recognition of citizen participation as a social institution. Finally, and just as important, is the fact that all these elements are portions of existing programs, which when combined can provide access to the decision-making process.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING OUTLOOK

Citizen participation is part  
of our democratic heritage,  
often proclaimed as a means to  
perfect the democratic process.

Edmund M. Burke

From a presentation of divergent views of citizen participation and a review of past planning involvement with the grass-roots level of participation, the conflicts and problems surrounding access to decision-making for citizens in today's planning process evidenced themselves in three main areas. First, there is both an overall and specific breakdown or dysfunction of the social institutions which contribute to the decision-making process. Second, there are existing patterns of influence which tend to exclude groups of citizens from aiding in the determination of the public interest in planning. Finally, there is an apparent lack of planning strategy for planners to use in their attempts to activate citizen participation.

In acknowledgement of these problem areas, this examination of citizen participation was directed towards finding a solution and strategy for providing access to the decision-making in planning. In seeking a solution, emphasis was placed upon the ability of the planning process to promote the recognition of citizen participation. Within the examination of strategy, emphasis was placed upon the initiation and utilization of citizen participation. This was done for the purpose of making planning more relevant to citizens, while it serves as a process of

planned socio-physical change. Hence, this Thesis has focused on citizen participation in planning: a new social institution.

From the onset, the examination of citizen participation in recognition of the methods of established social institutions encountered "politics." Politics is viewed as the medium through which the influences of the power and authority of social institutions have been applied in the formation of the public interest in the planning process. A dysfunction of social institutions was revealed in the breakdown of interaction between the regulative and economic institutions and citizens, and was attributed to politics. Thus, "politics" plays a large part in the determination of the public interest, since it lies between citizens and planning and social institutions. This dysfunction of social institutions also prompts the emergence of citizen participation as a social institution.

Another view of this dysfunction is the institutional isolation of citizens from the planning process. This is the inability of social institutions to expand and accept citizen participation. This dysfunction has obviously placed an unprecedented demand upon municipal government, which is charged with the legal responsibility of planning.

Indications are that planning, under this demand and influence of social institutions, will fail to develop the best public interest for the entire municipality, unless access to the decision-making process is provided for citizen participation. With the development of access to decision-making as a priority, planning could then proceed to develop the best plan based upon goals, objectives and strategy derived in a framework of participatory democracy.

However, the dysfunctions that exist which promote citizen participation also indicate dysfunctions in many areas related to planning. The few examples which are most important are those related to financial lending policies, housing programs, school systems, political parties and employment. With any eventual change in planning with citizen participation, much of its relevancy will be seen in its encounters with these areas of dysfunctions. Thus, citizen participation as a social institution will be a catalyst for more institutional reform and social change.

In the examination of the requirements of a planning strategy, which would provide inclusion of citizen participation in the decision-making process, various components of a social institution were sought for definition as they applied to citizen participation. The components examined were Purpose

or Main Function, Organization, Personnel, Procedures and Equipment. As drawn from the examination, Purpose or Main Function is directed for the citizens to achieve their ends with as little intrusion on the part of the institution itself as possible. It is also this purpose which separates planning as an "unobjective" process where people are planned for or without, as opposed to planning as a process with people.

The Organization of citizen participation was shown to be the method by which participation serves the society and its institutions for a smooth and more strict adherence to its purpose. This organization is also the structure of a social organization for which the planner adapts strategy and can rely on to be more representative than the other institutional interests that seek to influence the determination of a public interest.

The Personnel of the participation effort was viewed as the stability and depth which separates a loose knit informal group from participation as a social institution. The reliance upon this component by the planner promotes a planning strategy by which participation will be effective throughout the planning process and to completion of specific programs within the process.



The Procedures of the citizen participation effort are those features which provide a social institution with the ability to find consensus with group values. Moreover, it defines for participation a position and strategy developed for a rational consequence-action and adoption of plans. The encouraged feasibility for the planning process of this consequence only enhances its desirability.

When the initial organization efforts for these components are suitably affected, they provide the planner with potential actors, structure and ability to influence the process of decision-making in planning. From this potential, the planner can engage in the determination of a public interest through a process where citizen participation can begin to contribute and compete with the influence of other social institutions. As this potential leads to a further development of strategy, it could be viewed as a means and ends, process and conflict, or structure and power, as it becomes incorporated in the planning process. In the discussion of these possible views of participation, the resultant involvement of each view brought into focus the possibility that the utilization of participation will undoubtedly bring more pressure to bear on the political interpretation of planning policies.

Yet, any development of planning strategy with citizen participation still places a great amount of reliance upon the individual professional planner. This occurs while the professional planner is employed "in the service" of an establishment agency, and who could be considered a handicapped actor in municipal governing. This handicap becomes increased for the planner, who in attempting to promote a viable program of citizen participation is promoting a program of institutional reform which has an implicitly limited appeal. At best, its first results will be relatively remote, roundabout and intangible. An added burden for the planner is to introduce citizen participation into the planning process with a timeliness so as not to be opposed by other interests. The strategy of this introduction is that the "power" requirements of citizen participation are least when they are unopposed by other interests. It appears that the more subtle the planner makes the introduction of participation, then greater is the opportunity for participation to obtain a non-cooptable, non-manipulative working position. Only this type of position can contribute to the articulation of the public interest. Then, after this type of introduction, citizen participation would



strive to gain resources. At this same time, the planner should be revealing himself at a minimum for the participation effort, but increase his internal activity and support for participation as a member of the establishment's agency in the planning process. Whether the planner's role is viewed in part or total, adjustments in professional attitudes will have to be made. Planners can no longer repudiate the mandate to innovate or promote planned change. Awareness of social implications of planning and the need for sound planning policy demands that planning no longer considers its "mission" as providing only a forum to help others reach agreement for that mission is still -- maintaining the status quo.

In the further development of citizen participation as a social institution, the objectives which were established set on a broad scale the strategy of citizen participation in relation to the planning process. When these objectives are taken individually, they provide for a strengthening of the planning process, a re-establishment of public interest, and the assurance of a responsiveness of the existing institutional structure. The public interest and institutional structure are both within the realm of responsibility of the planner in the development of a plan, and are

affirmed in these objectives. These objectives also recognized the limits of the planner's expression of a plan. There is no reason to believe these limits will be altered, and these objectives express the strategy of participation for strengthening the position of the planner to keep these responsibilities.

It is especially important to note that much of citizen participation will involve short-range policy planning. Since this will require decisions upon existing policies or development of new policies, it will usually produce immediate results with more readily identifiable political stakes in the outcome.

The aims that were established are an expression of the strategy of citizens to citizen participation. The aims taken individually provide for communication from persons previously excluded from the planning process; a method for individuals to approach bureaucracy; and the strengthening of individual rights in relationship to planning that is intended to affect them. Communication, rights and breaking down of bureaucracy are the responsibility of the participation effort. The burden of assurance and responsibility for the scope of these aims can be said to be a function of government. No doubt it still is, but

the lack of activity in providing these assurances and responsibilities has only impressed these aims further on citizen participation efforts.

In the pursuit of the fulfillment of these objectives and aims, the ability of the planner to remain unimplicated in opposition to his employer is made vulnerable by the possible secondary consequences of the objectives and aims. What appear as the two most prominent potential secondary consequences of participation is the issue of community control or decentralization, and the development of political structure. It is noted that for citizen participation, community control means that the decisions to be made in the planning process which affects the local residents are to be made by the local residents. They are to be developed and weighed against all alternatives in keeping with the asserted goals of the local community. Once these decisions have been made, they then compete with other interests in the development of any plan which might incorporate the local community into a larger area. Decentralization is held to be that process by which the central government agency makes decisions at the local level without local participation.

The other possible secondary consequence, the development of political structure, could become a

result of effective participation. It is apparent that citizens and emerging or existing leaders will increase their effectiveness through participation in the language of politics and methods of decision-making. The reasonable course of further citizen participation efforts could then be toward the established political institutions of the community. The reason for this is that effective participation should indicate that the ultimate focus of many decisions that are binding on the total community are those that are exercised through the use of political power.

In an effort to expand the investigation into an area of some practical and difficult aspects of a working relationship between a planner and the organization of citizen participation, the organization was viewed as a process that could be broken down into achievement elements. These elements were seen as measuring points or building blocks in the development of a participation effort as it relates to the responsibilities imposed upon the planner. In addition, the day-to-day working relationship was examined with a view toward the achievement of the objectives and aims of participation.

The first group of achievement elements - type of governing unit, choosing of representatives, past





participation and ability to participate - were stated as being directly related to the primary purpose of participation. This was stated, since they are all basic to the establishment and continuation of a participation effort in its earliest stages. The ability of the professional planner to work for the cause of the people, not simply with the people, could directly provide the success of the initiation of the participation effort.

The second group of achievement elements - distrust, cooperation, decision and policy areas - were seen as being directly parallel to the objective of participation. This view was held, since these elements are indicators of local community attitudes toward the development of a participation strategy. The planner is presented here with the delicately balanced task of prompting open communication between the participation effort and political units, governmental agencies, and decision and policy bodies. The purpose of this communication is for these participants to define and clarify the extent of their responsibilities and desires to engage in an open planning process.

The third group of achievement elements - the defining of decision and policy, information, and



technical assistance - were those aspects of the participation effort which indicate the ability of citizens to respond positively, once engaged in the planning process. The importance of the development and delivery of the process to citizens in a manner which fulfills these achievement elements is found in their anticipated results. These results will, hopefully, lead to a relative equalization of contributions and evaluations of the planning process, because they represent a stage where all participating interests are brought closer in their ability to predict the consequences of the adoption of a particular policy or decision.

The planner, in striving to obtain the fulfillment of all these achievement elements, is developing planning strategy dependent upon a realistic amount of feasibility and flexibility. Moreover, this strategy, once functioning within the process, should be durable enough to withstand the consequences of involvement in the overall community decision-making process, since it is based upon the solution of practical citizen participation-planner difficulties.

Aside from the numerous encounters of resistance that citizen participation will have in the decision-making process, it will also have to contend with various internal impediments. Although these impediments

are cited as being internal to the participation effort, the success for overcoming them is directly linked to a planner's initiation of participation. The more prevalent impediments were grouped into six areas:

1. Motivation-Cause
2. Leadership-Participation-Past Activities
3. Representativeness-Constituency
4. Purpose-Interest-Perpetuation
5. Political Education
6. Technical Assistance

The satisfactory application of solutions to these impediments will rely heavily on a planner's professional abilities, attitudes and both education and experience. This view is held because the dilemmas that these impediments can create, for example, are credibility and leadership development. Here, the planner could be faced with problems and conflicts created by past planning efforts. The reliance on a planner's education and background as resources could be a measure of his ability to respond to newly created awareness of rights of the represented. Moreover, while responding to these possible impediments, the planner will probably find himself continually having to recharge the interest of participation in the planning process. Finally, the planner's professional ability and stature will have to be utilized by promoting the diverging views and interests of participants toward

points of convergence within the planning process and in a manner that doesn't forsake its political relevancy. In each aspect of this reliance, the planner, with his increased responsibilities, must be conscious of his work style, perceived client, and the auspicious under which he works.

To provide for the examination of a practical application of citizen participation in terms of political relevance and financial constraints, selected programs of participation were reviewed. Each of these programs (Model Cities, Neighborhood Corporations, and Citizen Planning Boards) were seen as partially fulfilling the framework established for implementing citizen participation as a social institution. Moreover, it was indicated that when various aspects of each program were combined, the planning process is presented with existing participation efforts which partially fulfill the basic requirements of a social institution and access to the decision-making process.

More specifically, the Model Cities program allows latitude for the development of components of a social institution within its overall framework. The program also has a potential for causing adjustment in the political alignment of a city. In addition, the program has a potential for funding

to initially secure a participation effort.

The development of Neighborhood Corporations from the impetus of the Model Cities program has provided some participation authority to operationalize many of its procedures, functions of personnel and expansion of organization. The leverage that this authorization provides relieves some strategy development by the planner, since it brings the participation effort in a closer working relationship with municipal agencies and private institutions.

The accomplishment that was noted in the development of Citizen Planning Boards is that it was a recognition that neighborhoods have a right to influence planning on a central level that will effectively influence the neighborhood. This recognition came about, formally, as the extension of government and political influence to neighborhoods for the purpose of advising and influencing the planning and budgetary process of the central municipal government.

Lastly, in looking to tomorrow, how any application of Citizen Participation: A New Social Institution could be effectuated will depend upon the patience and dedication of citizens, the abilities of the professional planner to assume a flexible attitude toward change and a sober response on behalf of the existing social institutions. Whether or not citizens and



planners will be able to fulfill their roles will depend upon the unpredictable human attitudes and responses in any given local community. The only apparent predictable provision for the success of this entire outlook of citizen participation, planning and participatory democracy is that the time is right.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alinsky, Saul. Reveille for Radicals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Altshuler, Sean. The City Planning Process. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1965.
- Banfield, Edward. The Un-heavenly City. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.
- Bellush, Jewell and Murray Hacshnecht, (eds.). Urban Renewal: People, Politics and Planning. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1967.
- Birch, David. The Businessman and the City. Boston: Harvard University, 1967.
- Bloomberg, Warner, Jr., and Henry J. Schmandt, (eds.). Power, Poverty and Urban Policy. San Francisco: Sage Publications, Inc., 1968.
- Clark, Kenneth. Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Reform. New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1965.
- Chapin, Stuart. Contemporary American Institutions. New York: Harper Brothers, 1935.
- Deyes, Langley C., Jr. The Rehabilitation Planning Game: A Study in the Diversity of Neighborhood. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1969.
- Dixon, Russell. Economic Institutions and Cultural Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1941.
- Feibleman, James. The Institutions of Society. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1962.
- Frieden, Bernard J., and Robert Morris, (eds.). Urban Planning and Social Policy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.
- Gans, Herbert. People and Plans: Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.
- Goodman, William I., and Eric C. Freund, (eds.). Principles and Practice of Urban Planning. Washington, D. C.: International City Manager's Association, 1968.

- Harrington, Michael. The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: Pequin Books, 1962.
- Hertzler, Joyce. American Social Institutions. New York: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961.
- Lindbloom, Carl G., and Morton Farrah, (eds.), Revised Edition. The Citizen's Guide to Urban Renewal. Trenton: Chandler-Davis Publishing Company, 1968.
- Marris, Peter and Martin Rein. Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.
- Meyerson, Martin and Edward C. Banfield. Politics, Planning and the Public Interest. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.
- Moynihan, Daniel. Maximum Feasible Misunderstandings. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1969.
- Morris, Robert and Robert H. Binstock. Feasible Planning for Social Change. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Nelson, Lowry, Charles E. Ramsey, and Codie Verner. Community Structure and Change. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1960,
- Rabinovitz, Racine. City Politics and Planning. New York: Atherton Press, Inc., 1969.
- Ranney, David. Planning and Politics in the Metropolis. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.
- Rossi, Peter and Robert Dentber. The Politics of Urban Renewal. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
- Sozokin, Pitrum. Society, Culture and Personality. New York: Cooper Square Publishing Co., 1962.
- Spiegel, Hans and Stephen D. Miententhal. Neighborhood Power and Control: Implications for Urban Planning. New York: Institute for Urban Environment, Columbia University, 1968.
- Walker, Robert. The Planning Function in Urban Government. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

- Warren, Roland. The Community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.
- Weinberg, Kiron. "Social-Action Systems and Social Problem," in Rose, Arnold, (eds.), Human Behavior and Social Process. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
- Wilcox, Walter. "The Congressional Poll and Non-Poll," in Dreyer, Edward C., and Walter A. Rosenbaum, (eds.), Political Opinion and Electoral Behavior: Essays and Studies. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1966.
- Wood, Robert. Suburbia: Its People and Their Politics. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958.
- Zeigler, Harmon. Interests Groups in American Society. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.

#### Periodicals

- Arnstein, Cherry H., "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969). 216-224.
- Bernstein, Marver H., "Political Ideas of Selected American Business Journals," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVIII (Summer, 1953). 258-267.
- Burke, Edmund H., "Citizen Participation Strategies," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXIV (September, 1968). 287-294.
- Burke, Edmund H., "Citizen Participation in Renewal." The Journal of Housing, XXIII (January, 1966). 18-21.
- Davidoff, Paul, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXI (November, 1965). 331-338.
- Kaplan, Marshall, "Advocacy and the Urban Poor," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXI (March, 1969). 96-104.
- Lane, Robert E., "Law and Opinion in the Business Community," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVIII (Summer, 1953). 239-247.

Mann, Lawrence D., "Studies in Community Decision-Making," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXX (February, 1964). 58-65.

Perloff, Harvey, "New Directions in Social Planning," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXI (November, 1965). 297-303.

Rein, Martin, "Social Planning: The Search for Legitimacy," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969). 233-244.

Stafford, Walter W. and Joyce Ladner, "Comprehensive Planning and Racism," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969). 245-252.

Warren, Roland L., "Model Cities First Round: Politics, Planning and Participation," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXXV (July, 1969). 245-252.

Webber, Melvin M., "Comprehensive Planning and Social Responsibility," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXIX (November, 1963). 232-241.

Wilson, James O., "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal," Journal of American Institute of Planners, XXIX (November, 1963). 242-249.

#### Governmental Documents

U.S. Congress, House, Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee, Urban America: Goals and Problems. 90th Congress, 1st Session.

U.S. Congress, House, Title I, Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (as amended), Public Law 754, 89th Congress, H.R. 3301.

U.S. Congress, House, Title I, Housing Act of 1949 (as amended, Section 101), Public Law 171, 81st Congress, H.R. 1450.

U.S. Congress, House, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (as amended), Public Law 222, H.R. 2711-2729.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Technical Bulletin No. 3: Citizen Participation in Model Cities. Washington, D. C. (December, 1968).

Massachusetts, Department of Commerce, Housing Association of Metropolitan Boston, Inc., Housing and House Finance Agency, Urban Renewal Administration Branch, Community Organization for Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal, Boston (1957).

Newspaper Articles

New York Times, March 11, 1970 and May 14, 1970.

Village Voice, July 17, 1969.

New York Times, July 19, 1970.

NOV 20 1970

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293102766858