as entrepreneurial networking, forging links among the organizations that might collaborate to make the most of the resources they can tap.

So the question of how to reconcile professionalism and partisanship, with which I began this reflection, seems less troubling now than in 1965, even if it is still unresolved. We no longer believe that expertise can ever be truly impartial; and the issues are different—less the deployment of Federal funds than the deployment of local resources. But Davidoff's underlying question, how can planning serve as an instrument of redistributive justice? is as urgent as ever. Examples like those I have cited suggest that it can so serve.

Other examples from Los Angeles, just as recent—such as Rebuild LA, and the downtown strategic plan—seem to repeat the characteristic faults of pretentious and largely ineffectual symbolic exercises. In planning education and research, we must pay more attention to the political, social and institutional settings in which any attempt at planning takes place, asking insistently who will carry out whatever is decided, how, when and where, and what the sanctions are against default. Once these questions are asked, the issues of authenticity and justice begin to emerge, as Paul Davidoff believed they should.

NOTES

1. Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31: 4 (1965): 331-8.
2. For the story of the Docklands Strategic Plan see Peter Marris, *Meaning and Action,* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).
3. Frances Fox Piven, "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve?" *Social Policy:* 1,1 (1970): 32-5, 37.
4. For the story of the Route 2 Cooperative see Allan Heskin, *The Struggle for Community* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991).

Peter Marris is Professor Emeritus of social planning at the University of California at Los Angeles.

The Evolution of Advocacy Planning

Pierre Clavel

For the last decade I have been thinking and writing about a set of latter-day "advocate planners," albeit evolved more narrowly, doing their work within city halls.[1] In connecting them to the tradition associated with Paul Davidoff in the 1960s and 1970s, my main observation is about how the work of the advocacy planners evolved and was a bridge from an earlier, more monolithic culture to what may now emerge as a different and more diverse one.

Perfecting Pluralism. Advocacy planning began in response to political practices that combined a superficial pluralism with the effective exclusion of the poor and minorities, and also in response to a professional culture that was monolithic in its devotion to the physical plan, the independent planning commission and a not easily accessible "public interest." An essentially assimilationist view prevailed, that cities develop toward a single model, the melting pot of ethnicities believed to produce a homogeneous "American" culture.

Davidoff's proposal was that planners could, by providing services to underrepresented groups, contribute to a more inclusive pluralism.[2] The idea was astounding—as was the effect of the emerging advocacy planning practice. Although mostly White and middle-class, the advocate planners reached out to the poor, to Blacks and Latinos. These planners were professionals and students, often affiliated with the New Left. In general they were probably a force for integration more than for separation. Moreover, Davidoff seemed to think they could both act as advocates, and be part of a more embracing planning system. He thought advocacy would lead not simply to a set of planners doing technical work at the bidding of their new clients, but to the creation of alternative ideologies, so that politics could include debate on the most fundamental issues.

Nevertheless, as much as these ideas and practices represented an advance, they were of their own time. The advocate planners sought a piece of the pie for their constituencies when the pie still seemed to be expanding. The comprehensive plan and planning commission still existed, forming the context of their work. They created opposition, but only as part of the basic system of politics and professional values that

had held from about 1945 on. There remained strong elites, a corporate agenda, and a memory at least of a certain form of order. When the advocate planners bought into these concepts they soon took criticism: for being assimilationists, integrationists, even colonizers.[3]

Transcending Pluralism. But easing assimilation was not to be the ultimate role of the advocate planners. For their experience changed them; they learned to see the differences between their own background and the cultures they made contact with. They held discussions and wrote memoranda and articles on such issues as whether they represented communities or some larger ideology; whether planning was their main function, or organization was; whether it was better to focus on problems in the inner cities, where most of the poor were, or to address problems on a larger scale; whether it was possible to work as advocates while on the payroll of city hall, foundations, or any other government agency.[4]

A view different from the original idea of advocacy planning came out of this experience. In many cases there was—in common with a more general approach in community organization throughout the 1970s—an abandonment of much of the effort to operate within a pluralist framework, in favor of simply representing communities. Some planners backed away from even this position, with the realization that "communities" often excluded the poorest residents, that organization meant providing a stage for the representation of the more affluent members and that therefore their advocacy meant introducing a counteracting representation of the least well off.[5] From all this I surmise that in the conflicts over the kinds of issues engaging advocate planners, there was not the slow development of authentic community groups, but often, rather, the quick mounting of positions that made claims to community. Nonetheless, from that process a more authentic process might emerge, and advocate planners participated in both. They became interpreters of the communities they served, and sometimes their interpretations became part of the communities' self-images.

Another development of the 1970s—not so long after the first emergence of advocate planners in the previous decade—was the establishment of "advocacy" positions actually within city government agencies, and of administrative planning for "equity" objectives in at least one major city, Cleveland. Along with later developments in cities where "progressive" majorities espoused participatory policies and redistributive goals, these changes posed new challenges to advocacy: could advocate planners serve neighborhood commu-

nity interests when they were funded by a wider constituency? Was it possible for a city government to adopt policies that went at least part way to satisfy the interests of "communities" or the "least advantaged"? That at least some success occurred along these lines raises a new question for interpreting the evolution of advocacy planning. To what extent could advocates still confine themselves to representing communities, as was more natural to their opposition roles; or could they also speak for a larger constituency now that they had a measure of representation within city governments?

A few years ago, stimulated by some of the anthropological literature, I thought the best way to interpret this evolution of advocacy planning toward government-sponsored progressive planning was to regard the advocate planners both outside and inside city governments as essentially representational in their effects.[6] Whatever their efforts to shape policy, I thought, their main contribution was their experience in bridging the profound chasms between city hall and neighborhood, dominant culture and "minority" groups, rich and poor, foundation and church basement. These divides had if anything widened since 1965, and while policies had proved ineffective, at least we had the experience of the advocates to help hold the society together and give us a basis for some growth, sometime later. What could they tell us?

First, the experience of the advocate planners suggests that it is possible for a group of professionals, members of a dominant culture, to go out to the neighborhoods and bridge the gaps between rich and poor, between the central culture and the outsiders they work for and with. In the process, and over time, the dimensions of difference became clear; the advocates found ways to dramatize difference, and bring back a sense of diversity to core institutions.

At the same time, they participated in the creation of community and community identity in the groups where they worked. For often these communities had little identity, but were in the process of either dissolution or formation. The advocate planners may have changed in the process of their work—but so did the communities.

Finally, there was the experience of success in challenging core institutions. In the planning profession this included dethroning the comprehensive plan, broadening the focus of the profession beyond physical planning, and increasing the use of alternatives to the independent planning commission. A wider challenge confronted the institutions of local politics: the pretense of pluralism, the assumption that mayors and city councils were sufficient to achieve genuine

representation. There were even occasional revelations that local economic elites did not have the ultimate answers about the production, much less the distribution, of wealth.

Thus the advocate planners and their current counterparts and interpreters provide us with an alternative view, strikingly different from the "mainstream" professional view and also different from what the advocate planner started with. This view, more recently associated with the "Rainbow" politics of people like the late Harold Washington or the 1983 mayoral candidate, Mel King, in Boston, is reflected in many citizen groups and some of the professional and academic literature; it encompasses professions, cities, and American culture in general. A critical point is that both the elite power structure and culture, and the oppositional movements at the grassroots, are changing; rather than being part of a natural order commanding the respect of long tradition, both groups are increasingly fluid and improvisational. In this view business elites, rather than acting from a long-term strategy and to serve class preservation, support upward redistribution of wealth and reject corporate liberalism out of the desperation of their own crisis.[7] Capital, rather than operating as a rational market, is "hypermobile."[8] Political systems, rather than being self-correcting, are in a state of unstable decay.[9]

The implication of this viewpoint—which I think helps us understand the role of the advocate planners— is that the varied constituencies planners now deal with are not simply distinct cultures, but are also continually forming and reforming. If this is true, there are some interesting implications. Planners in city hall may not only be the suppliers of information to autonomous groups; they also are in a position to help these groups create their own identities. If so, what undertakings are appropriate? The following seem possible:

a) Study the basic self-identifications of communities. One strength of the advocate planners was their ability to connect with the varied communities that make up the city. This was often, though not always, achieved in the process of neighborhood planning.

b) Learn the processes by which these self-identifications change. Interview key informants across social classes; determine where communities fit. Much attention is given to the way the nation changes in its self-identifications, and how we periodically recreate the social contract. Cities also create their identities, and recreate them, and in so doing, begin to speak again of social contracts. This process, now going on in many places, follows from the fact that the nation is made up of discrete communities.

c) At the same time, study the local economy through more technical processes. The advocate planners did not simply identify with and advocate for special constituencies. They also participated in more technical planning studies.

d) Look honestly at the information available from interviews showing where the community stands with regard to the technical work of planning. The plans done by advocate planners did this; as did the media work and other outreach routinely engaged in by the equity planners.

An emerging profession? But what about the wider *profession* of city planning? I think the "representational" position laid out above, postmodern in the sense that it suggests there can be no fixed position from which to tell the story, is not enough. The effort also has to be to bridge the gaps between cultures, rich and poor, Black, Latino, White and others. City planning would lose meaning if it abandoned the search for a fixed position from which to survey and prescribe for communities. As the Goodmans argued in *Communitas*, the basic reason for doing planning in a city is a concern for its heavy investments: bridges, roads, buildings that last a long time and affect livelihoods and life.[10] And David Harvey made a trenchant critique of the postmodern view:[11]

"But postmodernism ... takes matters too far ... nothing remains of any basis for reasoned action. ... Worst of all, while it opens up a radical prospect of acknowledging the authenticity of other voices, postmodernist thinking immediately shuts off those other voices from access to more universal sources of power by ghettoizing them within an opaque otherness...."

It would be a mistake to put the advocate planners too firmly in the category of "postmodern." Rather, the advocate planners, both the originals and their modern counterparts, have begun to provide us with the tools to bridge the chasms the postmodern critics describe. I will note a few of these tools.

Beginning at least in the 1970s, advocate planners (in the broad sense I have been using to describe some of the later variants) began working for city governments that shared their commitment to real pluralism. This was a big step. The advocacy movement had begun clearly outside the aegis of city hall, which held them at arm's length even when it channeled funds to

them. There were certainly doubts that anyone who worked for a city government could have genuine pluralism as a goal. But the advocates did, and the results were not all bad from the standpoint of the original concept.

Some of these planners began doing general plans with the interests of the poor and the neighborhoods explicitly represented. In doing so, however, they tried to co-opt other elements of the population as well. Cleveland's 1975 *Policy Planning Report*, while an attempt to define Cleveland's civic values in the interest of the poor, also claimed an older civic tradition. The same could be said of Chicago's strategic plan of 1984, *Chicago Works Together.*[12] A tension between the creation of central values and plans, and the legitimate creations of smaller communities is what we should seek. Davidoff himself made similar proposals.

The Chicago planners working for Harold Washington in the 1980s adopted an administrative procedure of "inclusion." Important meetings had to have not only White male, but also Black, Latino, female faces; otherwise the meeting would be postponed. Administrators sought representative faces before proceeding.

In general, latter-day advocate planners in city halls learned to respect the social movements that energized the neighborhoods: a step forward from previous bureaucratic styles that recognized mainly the institutionalized power of ward committees and city council members.

What this suggests is not just an evolution of advocacy planning, but a more diverse profession. But this suggestion is not simply "postmodern." It is both postmodern and modern. Why not simply recognize that the creation and recreation of community identity is one of the ways that communities and their planners innovate, while at the same time others remain squarely in some previous interpretation? Thus the profession develops, allowing both interpretations to co-exist, in an evolution from what either position would be alone.

NOTES

1. Pierre Clavel, *The Progressive City* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, 1986); Pierre Clavel and William Wiewel, eds., *Harold Washington and the Neighborhoods* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991); and Norman Krumholz and Pierre Clavel, *Regenerating the City: Equity Planners Tell Their Stories* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, forthcoming) are the main sources; also a number of transcribed interviews in Boston, 1992.

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

331-8; Linda Davidoff, Paul Davidoff, and Neil Newton Gold, "Suburban Action: Advocate Planning for an Open Society," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36, 1 (1970): 12-21.

3. There were many such criticisms. See Lisa R. Peattie, "Reflections on Advocacy Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 34, 2 (1968): 80-8; Frances Fox Piven, "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve?" *Social Policy* 1, 1 (1970): 32-5, 37. An extensive account is in Lily Hoffman, *The Politics of Knowledge* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989).

4. Most recently, reported in Lisa R. Peattie, "Communities and Interests in Advocacy Planning," paper presented for this panel.

5. Lisa Peattie, "Drama and Advocacy Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36, 6 (1970): 405-10.

6. James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Self-Fashioning: Conrad and Malinowski," in *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art,* edited by James Clifford (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 92-113.

7. Samuel Bowles, "The Post-Keynesian Capital-Labor Stalemate," *Socialist Review* 65 (1982), 45-72.

8. Bennett Harrison and Barry Bluestone, *The Deindustrialization of America* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

9. Ira Katznelson, "The Crisis of the Capitalist City: Urban Politics and Social Control," in *Theoretical Perspectives on Urban Politics,* edited by Willis Hawley (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1976), 214-29.

10. Paul Goodman and Percival Goodman, *Communitas: Ways of Livelihood and Means of Life* (New York: Vintage, 1960).

11. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978), 116-7.

12. The best account of the Cleveland plan is Norman Krumholz and John Forester, *Making Equity Planning Work* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989). On Chicago Works Together, see Clavel and Wiewel, *op. cit.,* and Robert Mier, *Social Justice and Local Development* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1993).

Pierre Clavel is a Professor of city and regional planning at Cornell University.