About one-third of all panels of the 1993 APA convention in Chicago dealt with questions of how practitioners could address social equity issues in their day-to-day work.

What of the planning schools? What can they do to celebrate Paul Davidoff's unique contribution and take cognizance of the substantial amount of equity or advocacy planning now underway in many cities? We have four suggestions.[3]

1. Professional planning schools, in collaboration with practitioners, should develop the practical and methodological side of equity planning. As long as curricula and professional journals feature mainstream methodology while bringing in equity planners for inspirational lectures, the interests of the growth coalition will be secure. It is time for the center of the profession and its academics to seriously study and codify the ways in which equity planners actually get things done.
2. The professional school and university libraries should put more effort into tracking the equity planners' experiences. They should collect stories and histories, but also documents, analyses of method and practice, new legislation and administrative procedures.
3. Professional schools should put more emphasis on interaction with practice, particularly through the mounting of outreach efforts and through courses that put students in direct contact with the work of the equity planners. This is a logical function for professional schools but one that is underrealized, perhaps because of administrative pressure for "scholarship." We think the best professional schools are those that balance scholarship with practice, more or less evenly. And we think that balance should occur within individual careers, not simply by hiring a token practitioner or two, or a few token theorists. We advocate opportunities to broaden academic careers; that has happened in a few, but too few cases. We believe it would be extraordinarily useful for academics to take positions in city government for a time, not only to get a leg up on the complex problems of implementation, but to begin measuring their success, not in number of papers produced, but in actual improvements in the lives of needy city residents.
4. Planning professionals and planning schools should take the lead in creating and publicizing indicators of distribution—of wealth, income, municipal services, and health outcomes—and other information that provides a baseline accounting of the state of "equity" in our cities and nation. The idea of a "public balance sheet," put forward by David Smith and publicized by the Conference on Alternative State and Local Policies a decade ago, is one example of what we are talking about.

For those of us who are trying to create greater equity and social justice, Paul Davidoff's 1965 article continues to provide a crucial spark.

NOTES

1. Norman Krumholz, and Pierre Clavel, *Reinventing Cities: Equity Planners Tell Their Stories* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, forthcoming).
2. Lisa Peattie suggested this possibility in her article "Reflections on Advocacy Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 34, 2 (1968): 80–8.
3. These recommendations were prepared jointly with Professor Pierre Clavel.

Norman Krumholz is a Professor of urban planning at Cleveland State University. He is the former director of the Cleveland City Planning Commission and past president of the American Planning Association.

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 60, No. 2, Spring 1994.

Communities and Interests in Advocacy Planning

Lisa R. Peattie

When Paul Davidoff put forward the concept of "advocacy planning" in his influential article of 1965,[1] he proposed it as a way in which planning could enter a world of conflicting interests and values, not in the guise of value-free practice that would subsume them—the Planning Commission model, but as a frankly partisan endeavor.

Experiments arose and discussion ensued, most of the latter about the compatibility of the technical approach and the political agenda. Davidoff's conceptualization and the activities to which it gave rise were variously criticized from both right and left.

The advocates were accused of being excessively obstructive and failing either to offer "positive alterna-

tives"[2] or to address the "nuts and bolts" problems of making the metropolitan environment work.[3] Advocacy planning was criticized as oversimplifying: Advocates were said to conceive of "the community" as having a single interest, rather than as comprising within itself diverse and often conflicting interests; to underestimate the role of political power, as compared to rational analysis, in decisionmaking; and to overlook the advocate planner's own role as formulator and generator of issues.[4] Radical critics saw advocacy planning as making "misleading and incongruent assumptions regarding the political economy within which advocacy must be made operational,"[5] and as diverting their clients "from the types of political action by which the poor are most likely to be effective."[6]

Partly in response to these issues, client-centered advocacy was then supplemented by another concept, "radical planning"[7] or "ideological advocacy," in which the advocate represented his own point of view rather than that of a client.[8]

For this discussion, I should like to propose that the struggle we experienced between interest representation and movement politics was not and is not an issue only for planning, but rather is a central, unresolved, and probably unresolvable issue for our whole polity.

This theme Gordon Wood identifies as central, in his recent and fascinating book on *The Radicalism of the American Revolution.* Wood starts his story with an 18th-century culture in which the role of the disinterested societal manager, played in the advocacy-planning story by the Commission and its technocrats, was played by the class of landed gentry. The gentry were seen as the appropriate rulers of society not only because they were educated, but because they did not have to work for a living. According to the classical republican tradition, "[p]ublic virtue was the sacrifice of private desires and interests for the public interest. . . . " For many this disinterested leadership could be located only among the landed gentry, whose income from the rents of tenants came to them, as Adam Smith said, without their exertion or direct involvement in the interests of the marketplace.[9]

The Revolutionary period, Wood tells us, was a period that so transformed this system of ideas that, reading of it now, it seems as foreign as some exotic tribal culture. The revolutionaries "had no desire to overturn one class and replace it with another. . . . What the Whig radicals desired was to destroy all the remaining traditional ties of monarchical society."[10] But the process gave their descendents a different sort of society and new political ideas. The gentry no longer appeared as disinterested, but simply as a class of people with capital. Ordinary people came to participate in politics. Interest group politics was legitimated. That was democracy.

Wood, however, sees the costs of that. The Founding Fathers, he tells us, were in fact quite distressed at what they had wrought. We may brush aside their unease as that of gentry who saw they had opened the political domain to the unlettered, but there were other serious issues at stake that we have not resolved yet. The definition of the "general interest" was taken away from a rich elite: well and good. But how is an alternative sense of general interest, of shared community, to arise?

Isn't it this issue that animated those discussions of advocacy planning? We in Urban Planning Aid, like the Whigs of the 18th Century, insisted that the Planning Commission's presentation of the general interest was a screen for the class interests of property owners and their political allies. Planning inevitably was partisan; the only road to follow was to see that all interested parties had proper representation.

But then we found ourselves picking and choosing among interests. We saw there were some interests that we would never represent. We saw that we were looking for interests congenial to our outlook; behind our interest-group politics was a vision of the beloved community.

Urban Planning Aid, the particular advocacy planning group with which I was involved, struggled with these issues in endless discussions and memoranda. We moved farther and farther away from the original advocate model (responding to client needs) towards proactive social movement. In a memorandum of 1967 I argued (successfully, as I remember) that "UPA must adopt the more frankly partisan tack of building representation for people previously unrepresented . . . and we would look . . . for organizations which seem likely to progress in this direction. . . . UPA has never said it was out to represent everybody; that's Ed Logue's line."[11] Three years later, another memorandum argues for

> " . . . very serious need of developing our own sense of positive alternatives, our understanding of what the institutions would be of the good society."[12]

Looking back at all this now, I see that what was at stake was not only the grounding and specification of a new kind of practice on the intersection between planning and politics, but some even deeper issues, issues that have been with us for a long time and that we are not likely to resolve today or perhaps ever. They concern the relationship between interest-group politics and the politics of community.

Think of President Clinton at his Inauguration,

going into his clinch with Maya Angelou and then stepping down into the sea of interests. What can the variant practices of planning teach us about interest and community?

I am not sure what planners ought to do about this issue. But I do have the feeling that in the old advocacy-planning days we retained a bit too much of the professional's desire to move things to a higher level. Our "common good" visions tended to take the forms of a progressive transportation system, a more egalitarian social system—desirable goals in themselves, but perhaps the goal-setting did not embody the healthiest process.

As usual, Jane Jacobs has something incisive to say about this. "Self-appointed exponents of the common good have done an awful lot to ruin the notion of the common good," she says. Perhaps we, too, sometimes began to drift into the complacent way of thinking that Jacobs identifies with Robert Moses and his favorite saying, "You can't make an omelet without breaking eggs." Jacobs worries about "two words as generalized and as abstract as [common good], which can be corrupted so easily, and turned against the common good.... But people understand when you say 'the neighborhood good.' That is not so abstract. 'The good of the city,' that gets a little more abstract, and you can 'justify' a few more eggs broken, usually wrongly. And the bigger and more abstract the subject of this 'good' gets, the more easy it is to make it a grindstone for somebody's axe."[13]

It would be a pity for reformist planners to get so involved in life at the grassroots as to lose sight of larger and longer-term issues and consequences. But it would be helpful, I think, to spend more time on streets and front steps trying to grasp daily life. It would be helpful to try to translate our rather economist language into forms of speech that sound like renderings of experience. I believe that in this way we would come to see more clearly what we, and the cities, are about. I rather doubt that we would ever come to a universally satisfactory definition of the common good, but we might in the process improve our common life.

NOTES

1. Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, 4 (1965): 331–8.
2. Roger Starr, "Advocates or Adversaries," in *Planning 1968* (Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1968).
3. Langley C. Keyes Jr., and Edward Teitcher, "Limitations of Advocacy Planning: A View from the Establishment," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36, 4 (1978): 225–6.
4. Lisa R. Peattie, "Reflections on Advocacy Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 34, 2 (1968): 80–8.
5. Donald F. Mazziotti, "Advocacy Planning—Toward the Development of Theory and Strategy," Exchange Bibliography No. 241 (Monticello, Illinois Council for Planning Librarians, 1971).
6. Frances Fox Piven, "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve?" *Social Policy* 1,1 (1978): 32–5, 37.
7. Lisa R. Peattie, ibid.
8. Linda Davidoff, Paul Davidoff, and Neil Newton Cold, "Suburban Action: Advocate Planning for an Open Society," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36, 1 (1970): 12–21.
9. Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 106.
10. Ibid., 212.
11. Lisa R. Peattie, "What Should UPA Consider to be Adequate Citizen Representation?" memorandum, March 21, 1967.
12. Lisa R. Peattie, "Fellow UPA-ers," memorandum, April 13, 1970.
13. "Jane Jacobs's Response to Patrick Byrne's Presentation," in *Ethics in Making a Living: The Jane Jacobs Conference,* edited by Fred Lawrence (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989), 187.

Lisa R. Peattie is Professor Emerita of urban studies and planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 60, No. 2, Spring 1994.

Bridging Interests and Community: Advocacy Planning and the Challenges of Deliberative Democracy

John Forester

Lisa Peattie poses central questions about advocacy planning when she asks about the tensions between narrower "interests" and broader notions of "community."[1] Planners have to deal with Lisa's ques-