

Wit, Style, and Substance

How Planners Shape Public Participation

Jana Carp

Abstract

This article compares the participatory methods and attitudes of four very different planners for whom public participation is central to practice. The comparison is based on Lefebvre's theory of the production of space and so emphasizes the decisiveness of material outcomes in gauging the depth and effectiveness of participatory processes. The featured planners are public art experts, which lends the study an air of freedom of expression while remaining well within the planning realms of central area enhancement, community development, and professional commitment to realizing the public interest.

Keywords: *planning practice; production of space; public art; public participation*

Jana Carp is an adjunct assistant professor in the Department of Geography and Planning at Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina.

When you allow people the opportunity to talk about themselves, they end up caring not only about the project but becoming reinvested in the park. You have to make a connection on the level of the individual and their lives, what they care about, their families.

—Nancy Angeles

We start by asking people how they feel about the space, then how they want to feel in the space. How can we take responsibility and ownership of presenting, of encouraging, a different experience in this place?

—Ed Ives

It's family oriented, it's public education, and it's bringing culture down to a public level. It's pretty much a . . . what the hell's the word I want, something that comes from the heart . . . altruistic.

—Jim Boriemann

Oh sure, we know we're steering them in a particular direction. I call it caressing, not steering. . . . We have to educate them.

—Chuck Childress

“Public participation” in planning implies an active relationship between planners and planning subjects. It is central to planners' work from several standpoints—state and federal requirements, professional ethics, management of controversy—and this article shows how planners represent a variety of attitudes, concepts, and tools that, in effect, shape the participatory character of planning subjects. Involving the public is both bane and boon for planning. Public participation costs time and attention; to the extent that it introduces political and interpersonal complexities into decisions, it compromises planners' autonomy and efficiency. Although there is some evidence that broad participation may result in better plans, limited participation simplifies planning, allowing experienced political actors who represent powerful stakeholder groups to directly concentrate their influence on collective decision making (Dahl 1956; Putnam 1976; Aronowitz 1993; Burby 2003). Yet the reasons for involving the public go beyond the expediency of functional rationality and tie into the foundation

Journal of Planning Education and Research 23:242-254
DOI: 10.1177/0739456X03261283
© 2004 Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

of democratic governance: the practice of democratic skills and civic engagement in matters of public interest sustains our capacity for self-government (Mannheim 1949, 53; Jacobs [1961] 1993; Walker 1966; Pateman 1970; Barber 1984; Evans and Boyte 1986; Berry, Portnoy, and Thomson 1993; West 1993; Baum 1998; Loeb 1999; Shutkin 2000). The four planners who appear in this article—each working on public art projects—represent four positions in respect to appropriate depth of public involvement in planning and exemplify strategies used to manage public participation accordingly. In each situation, the intensity of planning subjects' role varies according to the worth that the planner places on their potential contributions: the planners who expect participants to be inadequate use participatory strategies that limit their opportunity to contribute, and the planners who believe participants to be competent use participatory strategies that deepen their responsibility for the project. At the same time, each planner believes that public participation is essential to his or her work and provides expertly for public engagement in planning.

Concerns about public participation appear consistently within the academic study of planning, from both normative and empirical vantage points. One of the difficulties that scholars must face is that planners relate to publics in ways that are complex, multivocal, and unevenly representative, not only in their intentionally participatory strategies but also throughout their mundane routines. These relations are somewhat incomprehensible since they involve multiple types and interpretations of data, various personalities and individual talents and interests, multiple and conflicting values and priorities, inequities of power and access to information, and constant circumstantial changes—from local to global. It makes for a “messy” planning situation, as well as a challenge for study (Baum 1996, 129; see also Saarikoski 2002; Sandercock 1998; Haraway 1996).

Sherry Arnstein (1969) shows how many meanings—both misleading and valid—can fall under the term “public participation.” Her observations and critique include both planners and planning participants, as she points to the mutual obligations and responsibilities that all planning partners undertake when involved in programs structured to allow citizen self-determination. Donald Schön (1982) also represents planning participants when he uses the transcript of a planner's conversation with a developer to uncover a pattern of misunderstandings and assumptions that contributes to suboptimal results in the built environment. Communicative planning theory, with its focus on verbal and text-based communication, further contributes to the study of public participation by delving into the significance of planners' behaviors and choices for planning participants and subjects (Forester 1996; Healey 1996; Innes 1995; see also Fainstein 2000; Beauregard 1998).

Recent epistemological examinations on treating diversity in planning practice can broaden planners' awareness of social justice issues in their planning contexts (Saarikoski 2002; Umemoto 2001). As visioning, community-based Geographic Information Systems, asset-based community development methods, and visual preference surveys receive wider use, we will benefit from critical perspectives on the relations between the planner and the planned-for that support the ongoing development of planners' participatory techniques as well as the results of planning processes that employ these collaborative means (Margerum 2002).

An additional approach to the relation of planners and planning subjects that has not been well developed in application to planning practice is based on theories of the social production of space (Lefebvre 1991; Madanipour 1996; Soja 1996; Liggett and Perry 1995; Gottdiener 1985). Lefebvre's theoretical framework is particularly useful because it does not separate mental cogitations about “place” from the actual nature of places as mental/physical experiences, simultaneously conceptual and embodied. This approach claims that everyone, regardless of circumstance, continuously “produces space” in socially and spatially interactive processes. Thus, it focuses on planners' agency as set within the broader concern of their relation to planning subjects. Furthermore, this approach holds that the only significant indication of self-determination is the participants' capacity to change the physical conditions of their collective existence on their own terms.¹ As Lefebvre (1991) writes,

Ideas, representations or values which do not succeed in making their mark on space, and thus generating (or producing) an appropriate morphology, will lose all pith and become mere signs, resolve themselves into abstract descriptions, or mutate into fantasies. (pp. 416-17)

As this article shows, planners' participatory strategies limit or deepen participants' roles in deciding physical changes, and planners use space effectively, if more or less deliberately, in support of these strategies. After describing the modes of practice of the four public art planners I interviewed, I compare their participatory strategies according to a framework grounded in Lefebvre's production of space theory and offer a preliminary set of criteria meant to distinguish participatory practices that significantly affect relevant physical outcomes from those that do not.

Public art planning is a particularly rich discipline for exploring the nexus between planning practice, public participation, and place. As in other planning disciplines, public art planning routinely includes advocating for and spending public funds, collaborating with various municipal and state departments and agencies, conforming to regulations, playing various roles in public approval processes, acting on

professional expertise in design and site negotiations, weighing alternative project concepts, and managing controversy over social issues that become attached to the project and played out in that context. In addition, public art (as both a planning process and a constructed object) has the same high visibility and broad accountability to embody the public interest as other planning disciplines. The field of public art comprises both established, legal procedures (municipal and state public art programs, “percent-for-art” set-aside programs) and nongovernment initiatives in which public art planners experiment with planning processes. The active debate within the professional art world about the nature of the public—Is the silent “audience” appreciative or apathetic? Is the vocal “community” actively engaged or ignorantly reactionary?—means that public art planners habitually articulate and defend their positions on how they conceptualize planning subjects.² Furthermore, arts professionals (and thus public art planners) are generally interested in the sensory, subjective, irrational, and affective dimensions of art, which allows for easy discussion of the qualitative and communicative aspects of their practice. These qualities—beauty, truth, prudence, freedom—are not just private opinions but explicitly debated professional concerns for collective experience.

At the same time, public art planning is not commensurate with urban planning. Obvious differences include public art’s smaller scope and scale, especially in terms of land, resources, competing demands, and social and economic impacts. Public art planners work with a much lower assignment of risk and, arguably, benefit as well. Yet these limitations present a unique opportunity: public art planning shares issues, conditions, and procedures in common with urban planning, and its comparatively low-risk, low-cost, low-impact, small-scale, simple interventions allow a greater breadth of creative experimentation. The contemporary art world is well known for its insistence on freedom of expression (sometimes known as “artistic license”); the salience of this position is heightened when such freedom literally takes place in a public venue, appropriating public space to make a plainly symbolic statement. Because public artists and planners work for a realized public benefit within the civic sphere, they deal directly with controversy over community and civic identity, individual rights, professional privilege, and public good. Public art projects situate these significant issues within a relatively circumscribed context.

► The Framework for Comparison

For this study, I visited four planners’ offices and project sites, talking informally with them about many aspects of their practices and listening to their stories. As a basis for

comparison, I focused on three specific dimensions of planning practice that elucidate the interconnection between the planners and their planning subjects. These three dimensions are taken directly from Henri Lefebvre’s (1991) conceptual triad of the “moments” of the social production of space: spatial practice or perceived space, representations of space or conceived space, and representational space or lived space.³ I have interpreted the elements of Lefebvre’s conceptual triad and described them below as (1) presence at the project site (perceived space), (2) the control of creative initiative (conceived space), and (3) questioning whose subjectivity matters (lived space).

Presence at the Project Site

Many planners work primarily in the office, on the phone, and in meeting rooms. Perhaps they rely on windshield surveys to get a better idea of the planning site than allowed by site plans, statistics, and 3-D and visualization software. There is not always time or inclination to make numerous or in-depth site visits, yet site-specific information derived from direct experience of the site and its social and spatial context cannot be conveyed by other means. The planner’s time and attention spent at the project site—with and without stakeholders—helps shape the identification of factors (e.g., problems, innovative ideas, alternatives and modifications, risks) to be considered during planning, as well as her or his judgment of the significance of those factors. In any case, planners take various positions on the utility of site-specific information gained by direct experience, commonly valuing more the information gained through their own experience of the site than the information held by planning subjects as “users” or “the community.” Three questions identify differences in practice: (1) To what extent does the planner actively plan on-site? (2) Does the planner believe that planning subjects have site-specific information that is significant for the project’s success? and (3) Does the planner feel that planning subjects’ habitual presence at the project site entitles them to participate in decision making about the concept and implementation of the project?

The Control of Creative Initiative

Planners frame their work using concepts that describe places as in need of and open to improvement. They employ these concepts—familiar to trained experts but not to the general public—throughout the planning process, for example, using maps, quantities, figures, models of structures and systems, legal histories, design and research methods,

compilations of evidence, persuasive arguments, phone calls to or from political “heavies,” and so on. Yet these professional concepts are not the only ideas operating in a planning context. Just about anyone who is aware of the area being planned has ideas about, for example, what the place is like, who is responsible for it, and what should and should not occur there. Conventional planning privileges the professional’s concepts and tools over the ideas or concepts of planning subjects. Many times, official planning participants expect that the ideas that are finally implemented make sense to them but not to planning subjects. Some planning practices, however, encourage planning subjects to contribute their own ideas, concerns, and energy to the planning process, and the most ambitious of these practices require nonplanners to take some initiative in the creative development of the plan. So, the framework for discerning the relation between planner and planning subjects locates the creative initiative for the plan or project—exclusively within the professional planning realm, primarily among the public participants, or in some sort of balance between them—and examines planners’ habitually employed concepts and techniques to understand what opportunities they afford for planning subjects’ productive agency.

Whose Subjectivity Matters

The subjectivity of planning practice refers to the tacit, symbolic, and intangible qualities of planners’ direct experiences in the activity of planning. All four planners alluded in their interviews to experiences of these inarticulate, involuntary aspects of practice. In some instances, they had a particularly significant sense of a project site; in others, events in a certain planning process had special meaning. In addition to revealing what subjective meanings their projects have for themselves, the planners also described their understandings of the meaning that these projects have for planning subjects. However, while each planner intends to both respond to and elicit certain responses from planning subjects, not all their participatory strategies involve confirmation of these responses. For this analysis, then, the four planners’ practices are distinguished by whether the planner feels that she or he is able to adequately comprehend the tacit, subjective experiences of planning subjects with or without substantial face-to-face interaction.

In the next section, I briefly relate the scope of four planners’ current activities and describe their participatory strategies in the context of their routine practices. The three categories of analysis explained above are inherent, not explicit, in these descriptions. I return to the specific categories in the

following section with an application of the analytical framework that compares the planning practices described below.

► The Wit, Style, and Substance of Four Public Art Planners’ Practices

The four planners are noted professionals in a U.S. city with a vibrant and diverse arts sector. They are all public art planners, but they employ four different planning practices in terms of scale, constituency, resources, political clout, and method. Each planning practice conveys the sincerity and humor of the planner’s wit, reflects his or her personal style, and substantiates the ideas and interventions that the planner recognizes as significant prospects within the profusion of opportunities streaming through the city.

Chuck Childress: Educating a Lagging Public⁴

Chuck Childress is the director of the city’s prestigious public art program, a “museum without walls.” He administers the Percent-for-Art Program, which commissions or purchases artwork for the public areas in or around municipal buildings.⁵ This task includes chairing the Project Advisory Panel meetings in which the art or artist is selected prior to formal approval by the standing Public Art Committee. Childress also manages special projects: planning the city’s numerous temporary public art exhibits, negotiating donations of art to the city, assisting neighborhood and civic groups who want public art, and advocating for public art to be included in every one of the city’s development projects. He navigates between two contradictory responsibilities. On one hand, he must maintain the professional quality of the collection, ensuring that acquisitions are current with elite art trends. On the other hand, because the collection is public, he must involve the broader population in the selection of works. Childress names a variety of forms as “public involvement”: making public art physically accessible and prominently sited, educating the participants of project advisory panels, consulting ethnic communities about proposed monuments representing their cultures, publishing brochures that explain public artworks, and representing public sensibilities when working with commissioned artists.

Childress works primarily with private funders, urban designers, city agencies and politicians, leaders of civic organizations, and arts experts. His office is situated in a civic building downtown, a central location for many of his meetings. Although he has visited almost every public art venue in the city, planning subjects almost never visit his office; he usually

receives comments by mail. Childress colorfully describes planning subjects as hypothetical individuals who move in categorical patterns: commuters filing in and out of train stations, workers arranging lunchtime meetings in plazas, tourists looking for directions, and travelers striding through airports.

All public art program projects take place on city property: buildings, parks, and streetscapes. It is important to plan as if these public spaces are not “owned” by those who traverse them; rather, city government is responsible to keep these spaces accessible to everyone and appropriated by no one in particular. Childress thinks of planning subjects as moving in masses through a mazelike urban environment in which public art provides a needed stimulus, saying,

It’s psychologically proven that lab rats living in sterile environments live shorter, eat less, and are less sexually active, and less happy, and die earlier you know, and all the things, than rats in a stimulating environment. And I think [public art] helps stimulate our environment. It doesn’t even engage people, coming out of the train. But they *know* it’s there. And maybe once a year or once every so often they catch it. Or one day you catch that piece of artwork you never saw before and it grabs you and it just like pops two synapses in your brain. And you might say, “Yuk!” but you said *something*. And it increased the quality of your life just that little bit. Even if you had to duck it, you know.

Site selection for projects favors gathering spaces, where public art can heighten quality of life in routine movement patterns as place markers and directional signs, unexpected sensations of sight or sound, cultural pride, historical education, even bemusement.

When public artworks are proposed by specific communities, Childress consults city council representatives and representatives of ethnic groups to gain an impression of the potential response. He has learned that city-sponsored artwork about vexed social conditions and sensitive political events can trigger allegations of inequitable treatment. He has high hopes for his new idea, “a monument to the native, the aboriginal, American,” that would be erected in a central downtown park location.

Especially with our Mexican, or Spanish-speaking, populations growing, I don’t think it would be bad to get a monument up ahead, a sense of pride, to their cultures, rather than coming in as piecemeal. We’re discussing a larger picture. Because otherwise, you know, you have to have a monument to every little historic revolutionary from all these countries.

He visualizes the monument as large enough to “create a real dialogue” with existing monumental statues among the civic buildings downtown.

Childress uses his professional discretion to influence the selection of public art on behalf of future public appreciation.

He explains the public’s resistance to contemporary art as “the public lag”:

You have to figure that most of the public is pretty well settled now into the early twentieth century. They can take Monet, they can take Renoir. And a nice vivisection, a good slice of them, can take Pop Art. Ab Ex [abstract expressionism] is still a little too scary. The public lag just slowly moves forward. The public’s maybe starting to get the early parts of Conceptualism.

Childress’s favorite opportunity to “educate the public” arises in the project advisory panels, which include arts nonexperts. He shows them slides of contemporary artworks, explaining to them why “stained glass and unicorns and farm landscapes aren’t what they want.” At the same time, he tries to play down the significance of their selection for the prestige of the city’s art collection:

We approach [Percent-for-Art projects] like we’re Joe Public buying a piece of artwork for over the couch. You know—“We’ve got this much money and we’re going to put something here. So what do you want to put?”

The panel members to whom he addresses this question include the project architect, a representative of the city department whose building is involved, two arts experts selected by the Public Art Committee, and two members of the community being served by the public building. They meet three times: an orientation in Childress’s building, a site visit, and then back to the city department to select the artwork by looking at slides. A specific charge of the community representatives is to inform the panel about the people and community whom the building is to serve. However, Childress describes a number of competing viewpoints:

The artists on the panel, the art people, want to push the envelope a little bit, and the community wants stained glass windows and unicorns, and the architect is really pissed that you’re putting *anything* in his or her building because *this* is an artwork unto itself. . . . And the librarian says, “You mean I can’t put posters there?” Or, “That’s where the Xerox machine was going to go.” So you get all these people with their own agendas, and then they all have to come to some terms with spending this budget.

The building manager (such as librarian, aviation agency representative, or police administrator) and project architect are responsible for selecting artwork that will “activate” or “quiet” the public environments according to the intended function of the space. All panel members are encouraged to come to Childress’s office to view a registry of thousands of approved submissions by public artists, but in most cases staff or expert volunteers pull slides from the registry that they think are suitable for the panel to choose from.

Much of Childress's practice involves comparing what the artwork "actually means" with how it is likely to be understood by the public. The problems that provoke negative reactions, says Childress, are problems of the people who react rather than having to do with the artwork itself, so he is not responsible to address their complaints.

Some of those people would be angry at anything. But the pieces are all safe. They've hardly ever complained about an issue with the piece; it's an issue with themselves.

"Safety" is a significant term in Childress's practice. In ensuring public art as politically safe, he addresses the accountability of the program to the perceived preferences of the public regardless of their art education. In ensuring public art as physically safe, he upholds the public art program's responsibility to prevent harm to the public. In ensuring public art as a safe economic investment, he fulfills the program's responsibility to conduct advantageous financial dealings in expanding the city's art collection.

It is intriguing that the concept of "safe" represents the public art program in terms that are antithetical to the professional art world, which is represented as *avant-garde*, controversial, provocative, and so forth. Childress acknowledged this antagonism in designing an outdoor exhibit that included hyperrealistic sculptures that are typically popular among the general public but detested by arts elites. He bucked the discrimination of the professional art world to "give the public what they want" and notes the successful outcome: even though his office received an unusually high number of letters objecting to the "banality" of the sculptures, almost all of the pieces were sold during the exhibit period.

Childress clearly relishes his job. He enjoys balancing along a fine line between accommodating public sensibilities and exhibiting his art world expertise. Without mentioning specific instances, Childress declares that visitors to the city are impressed with the quality and sheer quantity of the city's public art collection and that commuters and city residents are profoundly attached to many public artworks because they become familiar landmarks, whether or not they are liked. He believes that exposing the public to contemporary public art enhances mundane public life by symbolizing cultural connections between ethnicities, experiencing a sense of place, commemorating famous residents and historic regional events, enjoying beautification of the urban environment, pondering concerns of contemporary civilization as represented by famous artists, and so forth. The limitations of the public—inadequate arts education, the "public lag," the irrational projection of individual issues onto art objects, the necessity of safety—define his role as an expert art educator. He finds his

work both creatively rewarding for himself and intrinsically valuable in terms of a general public welfare.

Jim Boriemann: Elevating Public Life

Jim Boriemann runs a small nonprofit organization that produces an annual international outdoor sculpture exhibit in a lively family entertainment/convention complex in the city. His work has been wildly successful: in three years, the exhibit has grown from a weeklong display of three sculptures by local artists to a six-month display of almost two hundred sculptures from around the world, placed along adjacent city streets as well as at the original site. The exhibit is increasingly supported by grants from business corporations, in-kind contributions, and appearances by government officials, and the site is provided at no cost by the public-private authority that runs the complex. For Boriemann, evidence of successful "public involvement" is based on the remarkable annual growth of the exhibit in three areas: (1) more visitors to the entertainment complex; (2) more sculptures both proposed and exhibited every year, more of the participating sculptures exhibited at secondary shows in the area, and more sculptures purchased during the show; and (3) increased financial support, volunteer contributions, and press coverage.

Boriemann thinks of the people for whom he plans the outdoor sculpture gallery mainly in terms of their presence at the entertainment complex, which exposes them to the outdoor sculpture exhibition. He believes that each of these persons has a serendipitous opportunity to enter the world of contemporary sculpture through contact with the physical objects on display.

It's family oriented, it's public education, and it's bringing culture down to a public level. My feeling is that our primary focus is that of education. Yeah, it's about the exposure of sculpture to the society, but it is elevating. . . . I don't want to say "working-class people," but . . . a mother says to her children, "Let's go to the art museum!" and you can just see these kids turn rigid. . . . But the stuff that's being done right now, sure you can touch it. Give them an understanding of where it's come from. What is our society telling the artist that impels them to make something that looks like this.

Boriemann's presence at the exhibit site does not provide many opportunities for interaction with the audience, although the sight of a group of people gathered around a sculpture has stayed with him for more than a year because, to him, they were an intergenerational family and thus signify the exhibition's mainstream appeal. He is on-site to install sculptures, for the opening celebration, for occasional visits during the exhibit to check on the condition of the sculptures, and to

meet with the managers of the complex as needed. Most of his planning activity occurs in his home/office/studio building, and he works mainly with professional sculptors and art critics, commercial galleries, materials suppliers, wealthy patrons, and the corporate offices of potential donors.

Boriemann plans the outdoor exhibit using the model of an art gallery show. The selection process allows Boriemann to avoid problems in the show before it is set up. He publishes a call for proposals, inviting any sculptor to submit a design proposal (maquette). The maquettes are assembled in an art gallery, and he hires an arts expert to help him make selections. Other sculptors, internationally recognized, are invited personally to exhibit whatever they like. Boriemann describes this project design as remarkably inclusive in terms of the professional standing of sculptors and open in terms of content and form. However, he accepts certain potentially controversial sculptures and rejects others.

It's a real dicey situation. We have two penises coming up in this show. I don't want to redo the whole First Amendment deal. But I can rationalize that as being an educational tool. No pun intended. Where families, mothers, can say to their children, you know, "that's a penis." But in terms of the other kind of content, where you're trying to make some kind of statement about abortion, animal rights, you know, those are things that can be eliminated or weeded out in this kind of maquette show.

Boriemann makes sure to invite to the maquette show the site managers, city officials, and the corporate funders on whom the exhibit relies, and if they attend, he points out to them the design proposals that could become controversial in case they want to remove them from the exhibit.

Boriemann describes the exhibit as a commercial product whose size and professional reputation provide specific economic benefits: it strengthens the prestige of the city (and the entertainment/convention complex) as a culturally rich and desirable destination for tourism and business, and it provides an exhibition venue that supports the sculptors' career development and may lead to sales. However, the primary concept of the project is to "bring art to the people." He expects that most of the audience is deprived of art in their daily lives because they will have chosen the entertainment complex as their destination. He trusts that his project improves their lives by "elevating" their cultural experience. Because he believes that the sculptures will evoke significant and unique thoughts in anyone who encounters them with an open mind, and that they will instigate dialogue about important social issues, he relates that merely seeing that people at the complex stop and look at the sculptures is "absolutely rewarding."

Nancy Angeles: Activating Communities

Nancy Angeles was selected by the board of a public art organization to design and plan their annual program. Angeles wanted to use public art to "activate" city parks as more intensively used public spaces whose history would be newly appreciated by the "park community" of people living or working in the vicinity.

I think we are losing public spaces as we suburbanize, and make malls, and a lot of the architecture of urban spaces is shifting to situations where space is becoming privatized. . . . And I just really appreciate and marvel at the park system that we have in this city. . . . The park system is a huge institution on one hand, but on the other hand it's really a community-based structure, because each one—although it functions within this huge bureaucracy—each one has its own constituency of people who live nearby, and walk their dogs there, and *use* it.

With the cooperation of the park district, she selected centrally located parks with staff interested in the program. Next, she invited four public artists who agreed to involve the park community in their work to make site visits and allowed them to choose the park in which they would work. Then, because she had learned in a previous project that "it is a really naive idea to think that artists can just go out and work with communities," Angeles approached neighborhood organizations local to each park and pulled together project committees—residents, park district staff, and arts experts—to represent the park to the artist. This was not a simple task:

Some of the parks, the successful parks, have already activated the community. But some of the other parks we worked in, it was almost invisible, not there. And so some of the projects became more about trying to identify and make visible, and activate, that community. So all four of them functioned in completely different ways. Even though my intention was to start with something predefined, when you really start looking at a micro-level, it's not like that.

In fact, the largest portion of Angeles's planning activity involved encouraging, structuring, and managing the participation of the project committees, on-site and in program-wide roundtables held throughout the development of the projects.

Though they maintained a small downtown office, Angeles and her staff, who had recently been trained in group facilitation, held all meetings on-site rather than centralizing their activity in one location. Angeles also visited community-level organizations and businesses, park district offices, and resource providers to coordinate services and resolve problems. Angeles's program design—a pattern of committee meetings, roundtable discussions, tours, and "public days"—required program participants to engage in site visits with the

artists, to meet face to face for collective decision making, to read about and listen to presentations on park and public art history, to find opportunities in the vicinity of the park to listen to and tell about diverse personal experiences associated with the park, and to publicize the project. Angeles expected this level of involvement of all participants, no matter their rank or role, including program staff, the artists, the park district staff, the participating arts experts and sponsoring board members and staff, and the local representatives on each project committee. There were two events that Angeles required the project committees to design on their own: first, the “public days” prior to the construction of the artworks, when the projects were introduced to the park communities; and second, the program’s opening events for which the project committee members organized music, food, and performers from their neighborhoods.

For the program to work as Angeles envisioned, the artists needed to get site-specific information directly from local representatives, and the projects needed to be woven into the social space of the park community through the members of the project committees. Also, being community representatives offered planning subjects the opportunity to question the artist’s concept. This opportunity helped surface any controversy about the appropriateness of the artist’s intervention. Angeles did not guarantee success: the project at one park was aborted due to a clash between the artist and community representatives. Even so, that park’s project committee continued to attend the roundtable discussions after the project was abandoned because

they were just interested. It was a very involved and intelligent conversation that we had in B— Park. There was nothing superficial or facile about it at all. It was a really valuable thing I think for everyone. I think it made people [on the other committees] more conscious that they did have a say in it, actually. And that they were making a conscious decision to support these projects.

Angeles describes the collapse of the project as a very positive event for the park community, which was vexed by a mismatch between nonresident park visitors who were attracted to the park’s amenities and the surrounding neighborhood residents who were struggling with redevelopment and displacement.

Empowering planning subjects to refuse the project was one challenge; another was dealing with their unfamiliarity with creative process, which Angeles began to understand as due to lack of training and experience.

Even though we had drawings, and slides of other work, and did everything we could think of to try to make this real for people before it happened, I was really amazed that when it finally happened they really were shocked. They had no

idea. It was like no matter how much information they had, how much participation, how many attempts we made to help visualize it, they *still* walked into [the exhibit at a park] and said, “Oh! *This* is what you meant!” And I never knew that.

Angeles attributes part of the demise of the aborted project to this inability to visualize the completed work, but the telling point was that the artist (X) did not involve the neighborhood early on.

It wasn’t that [artist X’s] idea was more fascist or anything. For example, [another artist] completely controlled the way that piece looked. But the way it was organized allowed people in earlier, and somehow they were not offended by what he did with what they gave him. . . . All four projects did have the possibility of participation by the community, but in [artist X’s] project, the participation didn’t come until much later. [Artist X] had a really great idea for community participation and it would have been a wonderful thing. But it didn’t come until much later, and we were never able to get to that point.

Because her goal was to empower committee participants both to more actively critique the projects and to contribute their own ideas, Angeles does not consider the outcome of this particular project as a failure, even though she disagreed with the committee’s decision. And because the park district had already approved the project and expected it would proceed with or without the project committee’s agreement, she found herself defending their decision to the park supervisor.

Angeles described her experience of the program in much the same terms as her impression of other participants’ experiences: that it was an important learning experience containing both success and failure.

I know more. How to run a meeting, how to get people involved. It was really difficult. I think people, in most cases, assumed that [the sponsoring organization] was in charge, and that they were there to just approve what we were doing already. And that wasn’t really what we wanted. And so, making that change, shifting that attitude to a more kind of participatory process is really difficult. And in some cases it didn’t ever quite work.

She expressed her hope that the projects were meaningful for the larger park communities but made no claims. In describing what she had heard and observed in terms of committee members’ experiences of the projects and the parks, she explicitly avoided interpreting others’ experiences and emphasized that her comments were subjective. That she witnessed program participants discovering both differences and commonalities with each other and learning about their social and spatial connections within and around the parks was her confirmation that participatory public art can make these connections palpable.

Ed Ives: Community Collaboration

Ed Ives directs a multiracial, multiethnic, intergenerational, artist-run collaborative (CAC). They sustain a thirty-year tradition of community-oriented public art that creates indoor and outdoor murals and mosaics and designs public spaces in schools, youth centers, parks, churches, transit stations, cultural centers, and pedestrian malls in the city. Virtually all of their artwork takes shape in concert with nonartists who live or work adjacent to the project site, and 90 percent of the collaborative's projects are sponsored by local community organizations, primarily but not only in disadvantaged and multicultural neighborhoods. The images, ideas, and issues represented in the public art emerge from discussions and site visits with the nonartist participants about how things are and how they would like things to be at the project site.

The artists work almost exclusively on-site and in neighborhood institutions to collaborate with participants on design as well as implementation of the artwork. CAC artwork affirms that participants belong to the place and recognizes the complexity of participants' current experiences. It also invariably depicts participants' imagined futures in that place. Ives holds that such experience can only be accurately expressed by the participants themselves, in "their" space, and as full participants rather than consultants. To this end, CAC requires that project cosponsors provide a site, a level of funding appropriate to the project and the resources within the community, an approval process that includes a public forum for comment on the project, and volunteers to work on the project itself. The knowledges and experiences of the volunteer participants form the content of the public artwork in concert with the artist team's expertise. The planning of the artwork includes "expressing and moving beyond" social conflicts that are place specific, such as gentrification, intercultural conflicts in schools, racial and socioeconomic ghettoization, and economic and ecological history, and identifying an ethnically specific presence in public places.

Ives stressed the organizational and collective aspects of the group in describing their practice, rather than relating his individual experiences. A senior artists group assigns artist teams to projects, deliberating about individual combinations in terms of aesthetics, ethnic or cultural connections, and fair distribution of work opportunities, and always with an eye toward training younger members in the community arts tradition. This training includes artistic and technical skills of course but also how to facilitate a collective creative process and how to participate in critical evaluation.

The important thing is how we listen. The potential success of a project has to do with my ability to hear what their issues are, where are the tension points, the flashpoints, the dis-

sension. . . . The community-oriented process is based on how the artist approaches the project with questions. And how the artist listens.

The artists do not arrive on-site with proposals but bring their expertise in directing a transformative, open-ended process, as well as their technical skills and aesthetic sensibilities.

We start by asking people how they feel about the space, then how they *want* to feel in the space. This is pre-art—what's the human condition? How can we take responsibility and ownership of presenting, of encouraging, a different experience in this place?

The artists look for both divergence and commonality within the experiences and ideas of participants. Significant differences become elements within the final design of the public artwork as well as in the deliberations of the participants. It is a demanding process: participants tell their experiences, they listen to each other, they draw together, they look at images and symbols together and discuss them, and they write about what they think and imagine what they want.

CAC artists also organize and facilitate wider community participation through meetings held in the project's vicinity. Because projects are usually initiated by the cosponsoring group, project sites are already significant for group members, and artists attempt to broaden the context of each project in terms of the issues and concerns represented by the cosponsor. While the cosponsor makes the neighborhood contacts, the artists are trained to think critically about community representation at the project table and to extend representation without personally confronting the cosponsor. To this end, they may ask the group to identify missing stakeholders as various community issues are discussed, facilitate changes in meeting times, and suggest that dependent care be provided. The artists also encourage rotating meeting sites to avoid the appearance of one group's co-opting the project or bearing disproportional responsibility for it.

Broad representation means that the collective process of producing imagery for community-based public art is rarely a smooth one. For example, Ives related the story of a CAC mural that was painted at a public park undergoing redevelopment in a gentrifying neighborhood. Planning meetings revealed that the new park design had obliterated a favorite hangout for local teenagers. The artists wanted the teens to depict their loss in the mural, but another participant with significant financial investment in the area wanted very much for the mural to show everyone happy with the park. The issue was hotly contested, and ultimately the unhappy teens were represented in the mural. Ives used this example to critique

utopian images of a diverse society that functions well together, when society *isn't* like that. Our work has to have enough accuracy that people look at it and say, "This is

right.” It shows complexity of experience—they say, “This is close enough to our experience,” so even if they didn’t participate directly, they “own” it.

Although Ives understood that the teenagers’ experience of both the park’s redevelopment and their threatened exclusion from the mural was analogous to their parents’ losing their homes to gentrification, he seemed less concerned about taking sides than affirming the verity of differences in place. Throughout the interviews, he referred often to the metaphor of renovation as recursive: “What can we do *now* and what can we do *after that* to make it a more participatory space?”

As well as collaborative process, CAC artists are personally concerned with the professional quality of the artwork itself: skills and techniques, creative problem solving, diverse aesthetic directions and artistic influences, and art historical traditions. Project designs are characteristic of the lead artist or the artist team. Artists rework participants’ drawings and images, imagine the overall design of the public artwork, and make other aesthetic decisions according to their professional expertise. At the same time, they retain what Ives calls “aesthetic room to negotiate” and the willingness to change their concepts in response to criticism of participants and even passersby who contribute their own ideas.

Artists have an ego and they need to have their ego work in public, but they’ve got to sublimate it to a creative process where people bring up ideas and have a say in what the artist is doing. The community artist is not a prima donna. You can’t have what you want just because you want it, even if it’s right. The work is really dialogical; if we can’t convince them now, the dialogue will continue.

Ives also related stories of non-CAC projects that were insufficiently guided by art or design experts. The planning of these projects was “open to the community but not well facilitated, so the participants got exactly what they wanted.” The problem, explained Ives, is with design: a chaotic layout or unbuildable design must be modified or abandoned during fabrication.

Ives did not specifically describe his own experience of directing CAC, except for referring to how much work there was to do. It was clear that he enjoyed telling me about the organization, and his advocacy of the community-based public art tradition came across strongly. He described both problems and accomplishments as group problems and group accomplishments that had particular examples best represented by the actual participants, and he often suggested that I speak directly with that artist to “find out what happened.” Ives’s evidence of the planning subjects’ satisfaction with CAC projects included increased activity at the site, absence of litter and vandalism, cosponsors’ recommendations of CAC to other organizations, and cosponsors approaching CAC with ideas for subsequent projects.

► Conclusions: Comparing Participatory Strategies in Practice

To compare the four planners’ practices, I have categorized them according to the depth of participation offered to planning subjects through the planner’s participatory strategy. The planners would not necessarily organize their practices in this way since public participation is a sincere concern for each of them, but I use the three aspects of the production of space explained previously to justify my distinctions: where they do their work, where the creative initiative for the project is located, and the manner in which they play off their own subjectivity toward planning sites against that of their planning subjects. The planners fall into pairs. Childress and Boriemann use participatory strategies that limit planning subjects’ impact on material outcomes, and Angeles and Ives use participatory strategies that tend to enhance it.

Childress and Boriemann significantly limit the complexity of working directly with planning subjects. First, they do not conduct planning at the project site. They separate where decisions are made from where the project is implemented. They perceive no need to uncover or confirm particular information about who uses the project site, how, and why. Second, they develop the project in consultation with the site owner or manager, designing a representation of the site’s character and the project’s purpose that reflects exclusively authoritarian needs. Any nonprofessional (“public”) input is unsolicited, and if it contradicts the project’s stated purpose, it is considered irrelevant and uninformed. Third, they believe that the project possesses an immutable meaning that places it in the public interest, whether or not the public is aware of it. This “higher” meaning for the project is capable of assimilating all public response that may occur on implementation of the project.

In contrast, Angeles and Ives structure multiple opportunities for direct and creative interaction with the diverse people affected by their planning activity. First, the project sites are considered social space that is lived and valued by particular people whose place-specific knowledges and experiences are necessary to include substantially in planning. Because not everybody is either interested in or able to participate in the planning of a project, planners depend on community representatives to take part, including acting as links between the project and the wider social space that they inhabit. Furthermore, the planning decisions are made deliberatively in local community institutions. Second, the planners begin their projects without a complete idea of what shape they will take because they expect the contributions of the participants to transform the project concept as it develops. While Angeles’s and Ives’s practices differ considerably in how they

incorporate planning subjects' contributions, both planners rely on the direct substance of participation: stories, questions, focused listening, personal images, logistics, photographs, networking, histories, planting, painting, tile making, cleanup, dependent care provision, phone work, and creative initiative. Third, the planners expected and were intrigued by the diversity of concepts, meanings, and experiences that were evoked in the process of project development and that were articulated by participants. Both planning practices depend on planning subjects' support; "no" is an acceptable and respected answer, at least after group deliberation. Also, the planners' evidence of a successful project includes planning subjects' own affirmation of the project's productivity.

Angeles and Ives describe participatory strategies that lay responsibility on the participants for the development and the outcome of the project, looking to increase the participatory capacity of planning subjects. Childress and Boriemann have a more instrumental conception of planning, motivated by the belief that planning is best provided by themselves as neutral yet benevolent experts who are stewards of a rational public interest (Friedmann 1987, 97; Baum 1996, 128; Beauregard 1998, 93). However, these two planners are not in the least disinterested or uncaring. They express strong feelings for the social significance of their work, as well as for their technical expertise. They believe deeply that their work is improving the quality of life for everyone in the city, without bias. They have well-developed concepts of who the beneficiaries are and particular stories that support these concepts. They explain dissenting responses to their work as misinformation and misunderstanding that can be remedied, and they make substantial attempts to educate the public. They are aware of the uncertainty that pervades their projects, and thus they rely on their networks of like-minded people and supportive organizations: certain department of transportation project managers; an animated librarian here, an enthusiastic elementary school teacher there; a generous union local; donations of money and equipment; or a full-spread article in a travel magazine. And they have fun, a good amount of the time. They interpret these facets of their experience as support for what they do, widespread agreement on its significance, and proof of its social benefit.

All four planners show similar feelings of commitment, satisfaction, frustration, and enthusiasm. The significant difference between the two pairs that has implications for public participation lies in how their participatory strategies structure interaction with planning subjects who think differently from the planner. Childress and Boriemann suppress the feelings of others that are different from their own while privileging interaction with like-minded people who become empathetic partners. Angeles and Ives invite a working relationship with the

feelings of all those with whom they are planning and maintain a more practical and profound sense of diversity in public life. They understand it as complex, but the complexity is rich, not enervating. They experience it as factional—full of imbalance, divisiveness, and contention—so sitting down to address conflicts together is a necessary component of the actual situation. They share the substance of planning and decision making with public participants, and this sharing is creative, not debilitating. While their projects take on dimensions and meanings that were unpredictable when the planning process began, the results (at least as represented by the planners) are productive at all the levels of social interaction that were planned into the process: connecting people and place and people with each other, deepening a sense of local belonging and ownership, and contributing to the urban environment both beauty and a public monument to common good, in an expression that emerged from the social and spatial interaction of particular people, in a particular place and time. The ambiguity and creative unpredictability of their professional experiences are a significant indication that in their practices, participation changes the material conditions of participants' collective existence on their own terms.

This research indicates a direction that is promising for further exploration of planning in relation to planning subjects. Each dimension of practice—presence at the project site, the location of creative initiative, and the signifying power of subjectivities—is woven through the stories that the planners told about what they do, what projects were like, and what it all means. From these stories, four points emerge that identify the characteristics of participatory planning strategies that enhance participants' self-determination:

- They are place particular. Every planning site is an already existing social space that has particular socio-spatial characteristics that inspire and constrain its possibilities for intervention. These characteristics include the experience of who/what is routinely present at the project site, various ideas or concepts for improvement, and diverse subjective experiences. Appropriate knowledge of these characteristics for planning is infused with local experience as well as intellectual concepts contributed by planning experts.
- They require an extended, face-to-face relationship between the planner and representatives of the planned-for. This relationship is characterized by mutual responsibility and social learning and takes place within the spatial practices of the planned-for. It requires that the planner listen, facilitate group interaction, recognize and encourage the articulation of inexpert concepts based on particular knowledges and experiences, and share leadership of the planning process, and it requires that the participants attend, share, listen, initiate creative contributions, and identify and mediate problems.
- They particularize the relationship between knowledge and action. The place-specific knowledge of the planning

subjects is fundamental to the development of the plan, as is the professional planning knowledge of the expert planner/leader. In addition, “knowledge” is diverse, conflicted, tacit, and imbued with personal experience; the planned-for are agents along with the planners. Ideas and experiences must be shared, listened to, and deliberated in a collective process of constructing shared knowledge particular to the planning situation. The plan represents this knowledge (social learning) as intersubjectively defining an appropriate collective action.

- Participatory strategies precede, include, and are subsequent to design. The first participatory phase focuses on deciding how the project design will be created in relation to the social space of the site. The second phase involves creating the project design in relation to its implementation. The third phase involves planning the technical implementation of the project, followed by an implementation process that is responsive to public reaction, and, finally, postimplementation evaluation of the entire process. While creative interaction must take place between planner and participants, creative initiative by the planning subjects is more likely to result in local accountability for the project.

These points begin to articulate an approach to planning that attends constructively and creatively to the relation between planning experts and the people for whom they plan. Each point, as well as the list itself, begs further definition and critical development in relation to existing literature on participatory planning. The approach I have taken here is circumscribed by the necessarily small scale and intimate manner of “data” gathering and analysis. The lack of clear differentiation between the three Lefebvrian categories of analysis employed can be a challenge in itself. However, there are planning and design practices congruent with this approach that offer material for critical reflection as well as inspiration (e.g., Schneekloth and Shibley 1995; Wells 2002; Al-Khodmany 1999).

When planning participants of diverse social and cultural standpoints—for example, ethnic backgrounds, desire for shared housing, commitment to appropriate technologies and sustainable development, neighborhood preservation, and assets-based community development—engage effectively in envisioning and problem solving in design, their particular knowledges and experiences may extend beyond the imagination of trained planners and designers. Problematic? Of course, but the benefits of sustaining the participatory capacity of the civic sphere may outweigh the costs of time and money. Effective citizen self-determination within our socioeconomically and culturally diverse society may challenge the gatekeeping of creative initiative in place making, now located almost exclusively within the planning and design professions, to become more inclusive. This would likely diversify the concept of good city form (Csikszentmihalyi 1996; R. Carp 1994; J. Carp 1999a; Isaac and Kissmann 1998; Al-Khodmany 1999;

Schneekloth and Shibley 1995; Holston 1995; Hemmens, Hoch, and Carp 1996; Talen and Ellis 2002). Because participatory techniques such as visioning and visual preference surveying rely on preselected, conventional options and are limited to visual sensibilities, and because they often involve reproducing the social relations of power in determining community character, the critical appraisal of planner-subject relation that this article suggests could provide opportunities to broaden and deepen civic deliberation concerning the character of future development (Nelessen 1994; Burby 2003; Holston 1995; Carp 1999a).

► Notes

1. Of course, this includes the capacity for participants to defend their space from being changed; for a cautionary tale concerning San Diego’s rezoned Chinatown, see Baum (1996, 130). See also Hemmens, Hoch, and Carp (1996); Holston (1995); and Carp (1994).

2. The “professional art world” refers to professional artists, educators, suppliers, galleries and private collectors and dealers, private and public museums, funding agencies, and policy makers at all levels of government. Increasingly, it is an international domain.

3. For a discussion of method, see Carp (1999b).

4. All material in the following section comes from personal interviews with the author. Names of individuals and organizations have been changed to protect their anonymity.

5. There are at least two hundred such programs in the United States, just at the level of local government. They are modeled after the federal Art-in-Architecture Program of the General Services Administration and have the broad intent to enhance the quality of public life in a city.

► References

- Al-Khodmany, Kheir. 1999. Combining artistry and technology in participatory community planning. *Berkeley Planning Journal* 13:28-36.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* (July):216-24.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1993. Is a democracy possible? The decline of the public in the American debate. In *The phantom public sphere*, edited by Bruce Robbins, 75-92. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1984. *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Baum, Howell. 1996. Why the rational paradigm persists: Tales from the field. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15 (2): 127-35.
- . 1998. Ethical behavior is extraordinary behavior; it’s the same as all other behavior: A case study in community planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 64 (4): 411-23.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1998. Writing the planner. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18:93-101.

- Berry, Jeffrey M., Kent E. Portnoy, and Ken Thomson. 1993. *The rebirth of urban democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Burby, Raymond J. 2003. Making plans that matter: Citizen involvement and government action. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69 (1): 33-49.
- Carp, Jana. 1999a. "The key to the treasure": Locating creativity in planning contexts. Paper presented to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Chicago.
- . 1999b. The peopling of public space: Interpreting Lefebvre's production of space theory for planning practice. PhD diss., University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Carp, Richard, ed. 1994. *saber es poder/interventions*. Los Angeles: ADOBE-LA.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihalyi. 1996. *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1956. *A preface to democratic theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Evans, Sara M., and Harry C. Boyte. 1986. *Free spaces: The sources of democratic change in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Fainstein, Susan S. 2000. New directions in planning theory. *Urban Affairs Review* 35 (4): 451-78.
- Forester, John. 1996. Argument, power and passion in planning practice. In *Explorations in planning theory*, edited by Seymour Mandelbaum, Luigi Mazza, and Robert Burchell, 241-62. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.
- Friedmann, John. 1987. *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gottdiener, Mark. 1985. *The social production of urban space*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Haraway, Donna. 1996. Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. In *Human geography: An essential anthology*, edited by John Agnew, David N. Livingstone, and Alisdair Rogers, 108-28. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Healey, Patsy. 1996. The communicative work of development plans. In *Explorations in planning theory*, edited by Seymour Mandelbaum, Luigi Mazza, and Robert Burchell, 263-88. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.
- Hemmens, George C., Charles Hoch, and Jana Carp, eds. 1996. *Under one roof: Issues and innovations in shared housing*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Holston, James. 1995. Spaces of insurgent citizenship. *Planning Theory* 13:30-50.
- Innes, Judith. 1995. Planning theory's emerging paradigm: Communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14 (3): 183-89.
- Isaac, Claudia B., and Susanne Kissmann. 1998. The Albuquerque community planning program: Contradictions in planning for community identity. Paper presented to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Pasadena, CA.
- Jacobs, Jane. [1961] 1993. *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The production of space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Liggett, Helen, and David C. Perry, eds. 1995. *Spatial practices: Critical explorations in social/spatial theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Loeb, Paul Rogat. 1999. *Soul of a citizen: Living with conviction in a cynical time*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Madanipour, Ali. 1996. Urban design and the dilemmas of space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14:331-55.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1949. *Man and society in an age of reconstruction*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Margerum, Richard D. 2002. Collaborative planning: Building consensus and building a distinct model for practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21 (3): 237-53.
- Nelessen, Anton Clarence. 1994. *Views for a new American dream: Process, principles and an ordinance to plan and design small communities*. Chicago: Planners Press.
- Pateman, Carole. 1970. *Participation and democratic theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1976. Introduction. In *The comparative study of political elites*, 2-19. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Saarikoski, Heli. 2002. Naturalized epistemology and dilemmas of planning practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22 (1): 3-14.
- Sandercock, Leonie, ed. 1998. *Making the invisible visible*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Schneekloth, Lynda H., and Robert G. Shibley. 1995. *Placemaking: The art and practice of building communities*. New York: John Wiley.
- Schön, Donald A. 1982. Some of what a planner knows. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48:351-64.
- Shutkin, William A. 2000. *The land that could be: Civic environmentalism and democracy in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Soja, Edward W. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Talen, Emily, and Cliff Ellis. 2002. Beyond relativism: Reclaiming the search for good city form. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22 (1): 36-49.
- Umemoto, Karen. 2001. Walking in another's shoes: Epistemological challenges in participatory planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21 (1): 17-31.
- Walker, Jack L. 1966. A critique of the elitist theory of democracy. *American Political Science Review* 60:285-95.
- Wells, Valerie. 2002. Mississippi milestones. *Planning* 68 (8): 24-27.
- West, Cornel. 1993. *Race matters*. Boston: Beacon.