# Transportation Rationality Kritik – Hoya-Spartan Scholars – 2012

## Lesson Plan and Opening Materials

### Lesson Plan

#### The lesson plans that have been released up-to-this point by Hoya-Spartan have emphasized speech set-ups and mini-debating. While we encourage use of this file for that kind of mini-debating, we had a different kind of lesson plan in mind.

#### Steps in this lesson plan include:

* **Introduction to the basic concept(s).** This file contains a background explanation of this (slightly-confusing) kritik that can be used in a small-group lecture to briefly introduce the students to the basic themes of this kritik. A small introduction to these concepts prior to releasing the file to the class might make sense.
* **Have the students read the shell in class** (independently, during lab time)… or, in the alternative, have them read the entire \*negative\* file overnight. Ask them not to “read” in the abstract, but – instead – ask them to create two lists as they read:
  + A list of at least five terms that they do not understand
  + A list of four things that they may say if Affirmative against this kritik (other than “perm”). Try to have them focus-in on weaknesses in the Neg’s evidence, un-underlines portions of the evidence that might help the Aff, or logical areas of weakness in the Kritik.
  + Please note that if you release to them the section of “Aff answers”, they’ll might parrot-back the Aff answers in lieu of conjuring-up analytic Aff answers to the Kritik.
* **Use the student generated lists to spark an in-class discussion** of terminology and of the areas of Aff weakness.
* **Also included is a list of “Items that one could use to steer the conversation”.** Lean on this if the student-lists aren’t enough to carry the conversation.
* **In my experience, lesson plans of this sort reveal very quickly that (many) students are struggling with both universal K terminology** (i.e. “what is epistemology ?..”) **and particular K concepts** (i.e. “who is Habermas and how do his writing apply to this particular K ?...”)
* **One pitfall and tip** – in most summer labs, there are some kids that are quite familiar with K terms/concepts and others that are not at all familiar. There’s a real risk that group conversations can be dominated by the K-familiar crowd – which can actually increase insecurities. An alternative option is to collect the “five questions” or the “four arguments” as homework – and to divide into smaller groups…. Another option is to read from their questions – as a conversation about “what is epistemology ?” is probably more-needed than even the K-familiar students would acknowledge.
* **Lastly, this conversation can hopefully serve as a bridge into additional research and tips for broader research strategy.** I have included a page of “ideas for future research”. If you find a student in the lab that especially would like to research critical arguments, they can use some of those citations (and the associated tips). It is reasonable to ask that a student cut 20-30 additional cards specific to this Kritik based on that citation sheet alone.

### Background explanation for this Kritik

#### Because this particular kritik draws upon themes that were not commonly debated on the space or military presence topics, some of the terms discussed might be a touch confusing.

#### Hopefully, this section can clear some things up.

#### While students might be familiar with critical literature debating economic models (i.e. capitalism v. Marxism) or models for security studies (i.e. realism v. various IR criticisms) this Kritik draws from a literature that debates models for public planning.

#### While the words are often big and weird, it is actually fairly straightforward. Suppose you were planning a class project, or even a transportation project. As you planned the project, how would you interact with other folks that cared about the project (“stakeholders”) ?. Better put, what model would you use ?...

#### If your class project involved a public debate, would you select yourself – as one of the best debaters in the class – to participate ?... or, would you consult the entire class and let the class come-up with their own ideas for the debate topic, for the speech times, for how to select the debaters, etc ?...

#### If you were building or re-building a mass transit project in your city, where would you locate new bus stops ?... where should one lay-down rail lines ?... where is it too dangerous to lay down rail (because of construction safety or fear of crime) ?... where would new construction be too disruptive to business ?... what if people disagree over the answers to these questions ?...

#### The kritik argues that there are two basic models for how to proceed as a planner – the *instrumental rationality model* (turning to expertise and having decisions made “from the top-down” by government, by objective science, and by transportation experts) or *communicative rationality model* (turning to the public, turning to interested business, and various “stakeholders” and using their ideas to help shape the project).

#### This card explains the distinction between instrumental rationality model (this is what the Neg is accusing the Aff of defending) and communicative rationality model (what the Neg defends with their alternative):

LANGMYHR ‘1

(TORE LANGMYHR – County Municipality of Sør-Trøndelag, N-7004 Trondheim, Norway – – Transportation 28: 207–210, 2001 – via EBSCO database)

Several classification schemes have been proposed for rationality types (e.g., Diesing 1962; Breheny & Hooper 1985; Sager 1994). Here, the main distinction will be drawn between instrumental and communicative rationality. Instrumental rationality focuses on goal achievement efficiency. The planners’ legitimacy rests upon the need for correction of market production. An efficient production of material goods (including environmental qualities) demands that planners act as “visible hands”, providing information, correcting for externalities and securing the provision of public goods. The synoptic planning paradigm (Banfield 1959) displays planning as production in its purest form. Consciously or unconsciously, this planning paradigm seems to have played a dominant role in the field of transport planning. This orientation implies a conception of the planner as an expert on how to reach politically decided goals in the most efficient manner. Even though the “optimal plan” concept has been revised through the realisation of bounds on informational capacity (cf. Herbert Simon’s [1957] “bounded rationality”), and the intermingling of ends and means (cf. Charles Lindblom’s [1959] “disjointed incrementalism”), the goal achievement rationale for planning still has wide impact. While a strong case can be made for holding on to an instrumental (means ends) type of rationality, there are equally strong arguments to broaden this perspective. In the field of planning theory, types of non-instrumental rationality have attracted much interest. The most clear-cut outlining of noninstrumental rationality is found in the concept of communicative rationality (Habermas 1984, 1987). Here, the focus is on human interaction and communication, with the “ideal speech situation”, unhindered by power relations, as a yardstick. The planners’ legitimacy rests upon the need to minimise communicative distortions, thereby counteracting illegitimate social inequalities. Furthermore, enhancing solidarity, community building and commitments to common tasks are included in the planning rationale. Communicative rationality explicitly acknowledges the potential intrinsic value of the planning process. Hence, citizen participation, friendly small talk, time consuming persuasion and even types of conflict may enhance planning rationality, and not merely represent obstacles to efficiency. Communicative planning theory is outlined in Sager (1994), and explicitly coupled to planning practice in Forester’s (1989) critical pragmatism. In bounded form, communicative rationality may be crippled by more or less institutionalised power structures into forms of misinformation and manipulation. In assessments of communicative rationality, it is pertinent to focus on the sources of misinformation, as well as the fairness of both the policy process and the outcome. (Have all interested parties been able to state their views, and received proper attention?)

#### Still confused ?... don’t be afraid to keep reading through the file – it starts to make a little more sense… Ask your lab leaders if you have questions…

### Items that one could use to steer the conversation

**More basic questions:**

* What is “top-down” versus “bottom-up” ?..
* What is direct democracy ?... how does it differ from the plan ?... how does it differ from representative democracy ?...
* What is “social justice” ?...
* What is deontology ?... what is the strategic utility of the social justice/ moral imperative argument ?...
* What is epistemology ?...
* What is meant by “rigged game” ?...
* What is utopianism ?...
* What is pragmatism ?...

**Questions that might generate more discussion:**

* Why does direct democracy cause delays in action ?...
* Your local community hosts a town hall meeting on whether to add a new bus stop in a certain part of town ?... why are meetings of this sort usually poorly attended ?...
* The same proposed bus stop is designed to stop in front of a section of town that has a Best Buy and a specific grocery store… who shows-up to the meeting to oppose that bus stop ?....
* Why might the communicative model (participatory-guided democracy) help certain elites get their agenda ?...

**More advanced questions**:

* Why does the Aff have to defend instrumental rationality ?.... answers to this question could begin to bleed into slightly-advanced discussions of perm theory, namely:
  + Does the Aff need to defend certainty ?...
  + Does the Aff need to defend immediacy ?...
  + Do perms have topicality burdens ?...
  + Does the Aff have to defend normal means ?...
* Who is Habermas ?...
* Habermas writes many things – more than this lesson plan or Kritik could cover. But, the most relevant tenet of Habermas for this particular K relates to “the ideal speech setting”. Habermas’ faith in the communicative model rests on this “ideal speech setting” (you can pretty quickly look-up stuff on Habermas’ four tenets for “ideal speech’). The Aff answers to the Neg’s communicative model alternative rest on the following question:

“is ideal speech attainable ?... or just utopian ?..”

### Areas for future research

**A can’t miss article for additional Aff answers is:**

* “Deconstructing communicative rationality: a critique of Habermasian collaborative planning” – by M Tewdwr-Jones, P Allmendinger -- Environment and Planning - Part A (1998), Volume: 30, Issue: 11, Publisher: PION LTD, Pages: 1975-1989

**One things that you want to do when researching is to look at the footnotes of particularly strong articles.** Especially look for the footnotes that correspond to the best parts of the best cards. For instance if you strongest card has footnote (25) next to it, go and get the book/article for footnote 25.

Once I found the Willson articles (much of the Neg K is from that article), I noticed the following promising footnotes:

* Alexander Ernest (2000) Rationality revisited: Planning paradigms in a post-postmodernist perspective. Journal of Planning Education and Research 19: 242–256.
* Friedmann J (1987) Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action. Princeton,

NJ: Princeton University Press.

**Another tip is to be sure if that really good author has written any other articles on the same subject.** Willson has at least one other (strong) article – here’s the citation:

* “Does Discussion Enhance Rationality? Communicative Rationality in Transportation Planning.” (2003) Journal of the American Planning Association. 69: 354 - 367 (with Marianne Payne and Ellen Smith).
* Everything he’s ever written is indexed in his CV (link below):

http://www.csupomona.edu/~rwwillson/rwwillsonvitae.pdf

**Keep in mind that the new Willson citation above will also have footnotes** – **and that those footnotes, in turn, could generate even more citations.** I have not cut the new Willson citation, but these are some footnotes that looked good to me. This is not an exhaustive list – I encourage you to glance through all of Willson’s footnotes:

* Forester, J. (1989). Planning in the face of power. Berkeley: University

of California Press.

* Forester, J. (1999a). The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory

planning processes. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

* Healey, P. (1999). Institutional analysis, communicative planning,

and shaping places. Journal of Planning Education and Research, 19, 111–121.

* Habermas, J. (1984). The theory of communicative action, Volume 1.

Reason and the rationalization of society. (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

* Habermas, J. (1987). The theory of communicative action, Volume 2. Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason. (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

**For those that are kind of into the Kritik, you’ll notice that much of the communicative rationality model is based on the work of Habermas. A lot is written about Habermas and the communicative model – that is certainly an area for a bunch of future Aff and Neg research.**

## 1NC Shell

### Next off – Transportation Rationality

#### Links

#### The Aff’s approach to transportation planning sticks with conventional models and processes – that boost *instrumental*, not *communicative*, rationality.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

The paper opens by reviewing and critiquing the instrumental rationality model that is the espoused planning theory of the profession. It then examines changes in the social context for transportation planning activities. The theoretical basis for communicative rationality is then presented. This definition is used to sketch the general outlines of a new form of transportation planning based on the concept of communicative rationality. Discussions of transportation planning processes in general and a case study of a particular transportation planning issue (parking policy for fixed rail transit) are used to illustrate the general features of a communicative approach and how they differ from conventional practices. The paper concludes with an assessment of the promise of communicative rationality for transportation planning, arguing that communicative rationality can form a new transportation planning paradigm that addresses the problems of the coming decades in an innovative way. The orthodoxy of transportation planning process: Instrumental rationality and objectivity The predominant method of transportation planning is instrumental rationality, a process of optimizing means (plans and programs) according to identified ends (goals). Instrumental rationality requires that the desired ends of a unitary decision-maker can be known. It assumes that efficient means can be identified using algorithm-like methods. Instrumental rationality bases reason on logic and scientific empiricism. It maintains that what we know is based on what we can observe in a neutral and dispassionate manner. Furthermore, it assumes that urban and transportation systems operate in mechanistic, predictable ways – that immutable laws about travel behavior can be discovered and used for prediction. Finally, instrumental rationality assumes that the actors in a planning process are autonomous individuals who refine their knowledge against universal principles, and that planning roles can be divided into various analysis, evaluation and decision-making tasks. In this model, planning activities focus on analytic issues such as modeling and forecasting, impact analysis and economic evaluation.

#### Policy acting without prior, deep public dialogue is steeped in instrumental rationality. Plan and perm shatter social justice and true democracy.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Purpose of planning. The purpose of transportation planning continues to be to develop strategies for connecting people and goods with destinations. However, transportation planning is not divorced from larger issues such as the development of human potential, social justice, environmental improvement or aesthetic appreciation. Its purposes broaden from the primary task of designing and selecting programs to enhancing the deliberative capability of decision making bodies and the public, and promoting learning about transportation phenomenon. Transportation planning also provides a way for the public to reflect on broader social issues, such as the relationship of travel choices to the environment and social equity. Transportation planning is a creative activity that adds meaning to people’s lives as well as helping them link origins and destinations. It is intended to increase the capacity for reasoned deliberation and democratic decisionmaking. Whereas the larger project of instrumental rationality could be described as increasing rationality, social progress and individual freedom, the larger project of communicative rationality is to enhance the quality of community and political dialogue in support of democracy, creating a transportation planning process that fully addresses both means and ends and links transportation issues to broader social concerns. The effects of this approach are greater attention to ends (goals), better integration of means and ends, new forms of participation and learning, and enhanced democratic capacity. Because of the educational function of planning, planning documents and presentations do more than document technical analysis – they engage the public in thinking about fundamental questions, explore images, ideals and values, and open up the process to creative participation. Public participation is seen as a part of an ongoing learning process, not an episodic event prior to the adoption of a new plan. Example: The parking planning effort has multiple purposes: 1) to design and implement parking policies; 2) to promote learning about the ridership, fiscal, environmental and social equity goals of the agency; and 3) to build a deliberative capacity among decision-makers and community stakeholders for addressing other strategic transit issues. The planning process helps decision-makers, stakeholders and the public learn about how transit agency goals are realized in specific policies and informs the broader goals of the transportation agency and society. For example, one board member may see free surface parking as the impediment to economically feasible transit-oriented development while another might see it as a basic right of a commuter. The planning process helps them explain their perspectives, search for common ground and agree to tradeoffs. Similarly, discussion about the distributional consequences of alternative parking charges may lead to discussion of broader station access strategies, or even a discourse that redefines the mission of the organization. The parking issue is a way of developing the strategic plan of the organization and can be a catalyst for broader public debate about transportation pricing, transportation equity and the environment. Planning process. As shown in Figure 2, communicative transportation planning does not involve a linear progression from ends to means. Instead, it is an iterative process that transforms the decision environment and the participants themselves. Participants simultaneously consider means and ends. Communicative transportation planning emphasizes listening, conveying, interpreting, mediating and bridge-building between stakeholders – encouraging them to ease their commitment to pre-existing positions and to share interests and goals. It is open to and influences the larger context of societal values, public opinion, institutions and stakeholders. Consequently, communicative planning itself may develop or modify the planning process. Finally, communicative transportation planning encourages a continuous critique about the planning process and its effects. It draws attention to that process rather than using a cookbook-like set of procedural steps for planning.7 Accordingly, communicative rationality involves experimental approaches because developing the planning process is an explicit part of the planning activity.

#### The alternative to *instrumental and scientific rationality* is *communicative rationality*. It unlocks solvency.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

For planning, however, gridlock is not gridlock until we have defined it as a problem and decided to do something to address it. Transportation plans depend on what gridlock means, and establishing meaning is an inherently social and linguistically based process. The way that transportation planners use language – understanding certain ideas and values and excluding others, hearing some things and not hearing others, and defining roles for themselves, their organizations, decision makers and the public – shapes knowledge, public participation, problem definition, process design and negotiation, and the outcome of planning. The perspective offered in this paper is that language profoundly shapes our view of the world. The paper critically examines the formal scientific rationality that dominates the field and uses insights from planning practice, social theory and philosophy to explore the promise of communicative rationality as a new paradigm for transportation planning – one in which language and communicative processes form the basis for rational planning. Innovative forms of transportation planning based on theories of communicative rationality hold the promise of solving some of our most difficult transportation planning problems. The global aim of communicative rationality is to create a rational basis for constructing ends and means in a democratic society, by enriching public and political discourse. Communicative rationality focuses on interactive processes rather than the deliberative process of a single actor, emphasizing the design of planning processes, participation and learning, and a reconciliation of different ways of understanding planning opportunities. It reorients planning from a form of scientific, instrumental rationality to a form of reason based on consensual discussion.1

#### Implications

#### First – Solvency is try-or-die for us – conventional paradigm can no longer succeed.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

The “problem” of transportation planning increasingly requires a communicative rationality approach. The terrain of transportation planning has shifted from engineering problems (in which behavior following mechanistic and immutable laws) to travel behavior questions beyond the scope of current conditions. The terrain has shifted from building new highways to managing travel behavior and services. This shift in emphasis makes language and discourse more important because they underpin the roots of the behavioral phenomena that are of interest. When transportation planning considers issues such as ridesharing, car-sharing, telecommuting, or vehicle choice, the linguistically formed meanings people assign to their actions are powerful policy levers. A shift from instrumental rationality to communicative rationality is the key to addressing these new issues. Conventional transportation planning is not sufficiently creative to address current problems. Instrumental rationality tends to be a reductive process that narrows possibilities rather than expanding them. When there are unreconciled problem frames in the background there is little learning, redefinition of problem frames, or opportunity to discover new approaches. Although technological innovations and research eventually find their way into trans-portation planning, there is sameness in the way of understanding the problem and the type of solutions that are considered. When, for example, is the last time a regional transportation plan developed a truly new idea? There is real urgency to finding new solutions to transportation problems, yet transportation plans rarely produce them. Many regional transportation plans include projects and behavioral assumptions that are unlikely to be realized. They may produce the necessary conformity findings, but many are deficient in terms of helping their regions develop innovative policies and make tough choices. When this occurs, transportation planning starts to move out of the hands of public agencies, as private innovations produce “work-arounds” such as telecommunication replacement of travel, and employers and residents vote with their feet by leaving regions that cannot manage their growth and transportation systems. Communicative distortions impede effective transportation planning. Communicative distortions create serious problems for the transportation planning process. The ideal of instrumental rationality breaks down when the participants in planning refuse to follow its structure. Decision-makers resist processes that separate means from ends, the public resists restricted problem frames, and planners often play limited technical roles. Modelers lack credibility if their conceptual framework does not include the dynamics of public perception and decision-making. Communicative rationality may help transportation planners understand and resolve the dichotomous way that they often think about the rational and political dimensions of their work.

#### Second – Aff’s rationalist approach is epistemologically flawed. Their harm and solvency claims are rigged-games.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

The theory of knowledge, or epistemology, that is implied by instrumental rationality is scientific objectivism. Drawing from the natural sciences, engineering and certain of the social sciences, this view assumes that objective facts can be known and that the analyst is able to observe a system without participating in it or effecting it. Furthermore, it is assumed that facts can be separated from subjective information and abstracted from complex social settings. Data analysis and modeling results provide the primary information upon which alternatives are evaluated, information such as level of service, air quality conditions or cost effectiveness. Objectivist epistemology and instrumental rationality method go hand-in-hand – if one element cannot be supported it is difficult to justify the other. Some aspects of the practice of transportation planning are well suited to the traditional focus described above. Many transportation conditions are quantifiable and certain aspects of travel behavior are quite predictable (e.g., traveler route selection). Most plans involve complex technical aspects that are suited to a scientific approach. If there is a social consensus about ends and the range of alternatives is within an aspect of travel behavior that is predictable, then the traditional model has much to recommend it. Indeed, the efficiency with which people and goods are moved in developed countries is a testament to the efficiency of these methods. Criticisms of the conventional model It is not new to observe that the practice of transportation planning does not follow the classic instrumental rationality model. It important to review those criticisms, however, because they illustrate the possibilities for communicative rationality. Conventional transportation planning practice reflects a tension between the espoused theory just described and a theory-in-use of strategic rationality. By strategic rationality, I mean a form of rationality that is oriented toward achieving political action. One of the realities of practice is that transportation planners are frequently not able to achieve a consensus concerning the ends of planning. The multiple stakeholders to transportation planning often have different goals and objectives; in recent decades the range of goals for transportation have widened significantly. Instead of acting as advisors to a rational actor decision-maker who is functioning in a closed system, transportation planners find competing interest groups in an organizationally defined and differentially empowered setting. Instead of well-defined problems, they find multiple, perhaps ideologically defined problems. Instead of perfect information and analytic certainty, they find contested, ideological information and models that are stretched to represent complex behavioral realities. The transportation planner’s challenge is to reconcile the espoused theory with these conditions to find practical wisdom and a process that will lead to decision-making and plan adoption. The conventional model is not helpful in this regard. Furthermore, transportation scholarship has abandoned the issue except for offering postmortem on failed processes. The claims for objectivity in data and models that underpin instrumental rationality have been challenged from numerous standpoints. Quantification draws attention to some things and hides other things, such as equity issues or qualitative considerations. For example, studies of travel patterns by gender reveal differences formerly hidden in aggregate data. Wachs (1985) points out that models are also manipulated to produce predetermined outcomes. More broadly, Throgmorton (1993) argues that analytic techniques do not present an objective truth, but instead act as figures of speech and argument. In other words, a survey instrument or model does not exist disconnected from speech in a place and time. Surveys and models have an audience, they respond to what came before, they construct the roles of planners and others and they are built on language concepts. Finally, Harvey (1985) suggests that transportation models must respond to the fact that “values are invoked and mediated through the process, rather than resolved at an early stage” (pp. 458). When models ignore this reality, as they often do, their results become less relevant to decision making. Yet model results and analytic data are often presented as “findings” rather than a form of discourse.3 Many observers of transportation planning recognize that political and institutional aspects in transportation are ignored by the conventional approach (Wachs 1985). Reviewing planning theories that bear on transportation planning, Meyer and Miller (1984) advocate decision-centered transportation planning and identify a broad range of influences on the planning process, including rational comprehensive planning, incrementalist planning, advocacy planning, policy planning, and strategic planning. They argue for an approach that will help decision-makers reach good decisions rather than focus exclusively on the “right” answer. The literature contains many accounts of how little rational planning has to do with actual decision-making (for example, see Altschuler 1979, Wachs 1995, Richmond 1998). Stakeholders, institutions and decision-makers usually know the alternatives they prefer and may seek to structure analysis to rationalize their preferences. Figure 1 shows these groups as direct influences on the evaluation of alternatives even though that is classically the domain of the planner/analyst. In short, political processes rarely “hold still” for the rigid and time-consuming methods of conventional rational planning.

#### Without more-direct democracy, extinction is inevitable. Only the alt can spillover and ensure transition

Gare ‘3

Arran, Swinburne University social sciences professor, Swinburne University, Melbourne, Australia, Ph.D. from Murdoch University, "Beyond Social Democracy? Beyond Social Democracy?" Democracy and Nature, 9(3), Nov 2003, via EBSCO database

In the new order, the state’s role, along with a range of new institutional structures ranging from the local to the international level, is exclusively to create the stable framework for the efficient functioning of the market. Although this phase extends the market into the Third World, power is concentrated as never before with the elites of the core zones. Civil society has dissolved almost completely, people have been brutalized, and politics and democracy rendered superfluous. Only a small minority of the world population, mostly in a few affluent regions in North America, Western Europe and East Asia are benefiting from these developments. And the consequence of the internationalization of the market economy and the concentration of economic power it engenders, is ‘an ecological crisis that threatens to develop into an eco-catastrophe, the destruction of the countryside, the creation of monstrous mega-cities and the uprooting of local communities and cultures’ (p. 116). Fotopoulos argues that with liberalized commodity and capital markets, the internationalization of the market economy with an over-riding commitment to economic growth, it is impossible to regulate the market to control its destructive imperatives. Any country that attempts to do so (for instance Sweden), will lose its international competitiveness (p. 86ff). Market efficiency in an internationalized economy and social control of the market are irreconcilable. This argument provides the background for the defence of inclusive democracy. Going beyond efforts to democratize industrial production and focusing on the community rather than merely the economy, the project of inclusive democracy encompasses the political, economic, social and ecological realms; that is, any area of human activity where decisions can be taken collectively and democratically. Democracy is defined as the ‘institutional framework that aims at the equal distribution of political, economic and social power. . . in other words, as the system which aims at the effective elimination of the domination of human beings over human being’ (p. 206f). Ecological democracy is defined as the institutional framework that aims to reintegrate humans and nature. The original example of genuine democracy (although it was confined to a small proportion of the total population) is taken to be ancient Athens of Pericles. The liberal ‘democracies’ of the modern world, social democratic models and Marxist socialism that reduce politics to the scientific management of production, are dismissed as various forms of oligarchy. Fotopoulos traces the history of these social forms, claiming them to be perversions of the democratic ideal. Fotopoulos offers an historical, social and economic analysis of ancient Greek democracy to show what true democracy is and the conditions for its success. The basis of democracy must be the choice of people for individual and collective autonomy. Political decisions should be made by citizens collectively in community assemblies, not through representatives. Positions to which authority is delegated should be filled by lot on a rotation basis. All residents in a particular geographical area should be directly involved in decision-taking processes and should be educated to enable them to do so. Political rights should be accompanied by social and economic rights and, to ensure this, productive resources should be owned by the demos (the people). In one of the most important sections of the book, Fotopoulos provides a detailed model of a production and distribution system simulating and gaining the benefits of a market economy while avoiding the destructive effects of real markets. This involves a combination of democratic planning and a voucher system, securing the satisfaction of basic needs for everyone while enabling individuals to maintain their sovereignty as consumers. Satisfaction of basic needs involving more than one community should be coordinated through a confederal plan formulated in regional and confederal assemblies made up of delegates. Fotopoulos shows how such a system could be made workable economically and politically. The point of offering such a model is not to prescribe how people should organize themselves but to demonstrate that direct democracy is feasible. Fotopoulos argues we do not have to wait for the conditions for inclusive democracies to evolve. They can be created at almost any time, although it is easier at some times rather than others. Fotopoulos argues that to escape the destructive imperatives and brutalizing effects of the present order, ‘The immediate objective should. . . be the creation, frombelow, of “popular bases of political and economic power”, that is, the establishment of local and public realms of direct and economic democracy which, at some stage, will confederate in order to create the conditions for the establishment of a new society’ (p. 284). This struggle must be undertaken simultaneously at the political, economic, social and cultural levels. The final part of the book is devoted to the philosophical justification of inclusive democracy. Essentially, Fotopoulos develops Castoriadis’ arguments that the core of democracy is autonomy—the freedom of people to be self-instituting, that is, to be able to put into question and transform their existing institutions and their dominant social paradigm (beliefs, ideas and values).1 Any philosophy that denies the possibility of such autonomy is criticised. In particular, Fotopoulos attacks those who see democracy as the outcome of something other than the free choice of people, whether this be the truths of religion, the laws of nature, the cunning of reason or the evolution of society. The question then is whether people are prepared to struggle for democracy now, given that their failure to do so not only means accepting their subjugation and brutalization, but also the destruction of the ecological conditions of their existence.

#### Independently, Social justice should be the debate’s top priority – it’s an obligation.

Nieutvenhuis ‘10

Prof Jan Nieutvenhuis, Dept of Education Management and Policy Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria, Acta Academica 2011: 43(1) – available at: http://up-za.academia.edu/JanNieuwenhuis/Papers/882363/Social\_justice\_in\_education\_today

Accept the geo-historical context of the struggle as something that must be reconciled with attempts to create social justice. This implies that the state must work with communities to repair damaged solidarities by reconciling autonomy and interdependence (Giddens 1991)- This also implies the abolishment of structural forms of oppression that restrict peoples' access to resources and opportunities for developing and exercising their capacities or capabilities for living a decent human life (Young 2002). In doing so care must be taken not to create new forms of exclusion that will, in turn, create new forms of social injustice. Similarly, it must ensure fairness in terms of rewards. One cannot reward state officials with considerable bonuses when they are failing to deliver the social services intended to create a just society. Justice is done when each member of an organisation receives a reward equivalent to the contribution s/he makes (Rawls 1971, Miller 1999). This also applies to education. One cannot reward a child if no contribution was forthcoming. For example, One cannot promote a child to the next grade automatically if s/he did not participate in the educational process on an equal basis with others. A theory of social justice in education is essential. Brighouse (2002: 181) states that until recently there was no theory of justice in education and that one cannot simply read a theory off from Rawls, Young, Giddens, or any other author. This article critically reviewed a number of theories that could inform such a theory of social justice in education. It argued that social justice is an ideal — a vision that must become a way of life that permeates all aspects of being human. For this reason it cannot be legislated or achieved by means of international conventions or declarations — albeit important instruments to promote social justice; social justice must be lived. It requires that every citizen must take the responsibility to protect, advance and promote the values, principles and ideals of social justice. The road to achieving this is, however, obstructed by geo-historical and scarcity challenges confronting developing countries. These challenges and their negative impact on achieving social justice in education must be addressed in an ordered and well-structured manner without creating new forms of social injustice. As long as poverty, unemployment and high levels of violence exist, there cannot be social justice. This is the real challenge and it is a journey on which all developing countries and their people must embark. In Long walk to freedom Nelson Mandela (1994a: 751) asserts: Some say that (the liberation of the oppressed and the oppressor) has now been achieved. But I know that that is not the case. The truth is that we are not yet free: we have merely achieved the freedom to be free, the right not to be oppressed. We have not taken the final step of our journey, but the first step on a longer and even more difficult road. For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others.

## Alt Solvency Section

### Alt solvency wall – 2NC-1NR

#### The alt solves. Extend our 1NC Willson cards – they prove the alt of “communicative rationality can solve some even the most difficult transportation problems”

#### And – even if the Alt is imperfect, the Aff can’t solve at all. Willson says that the Aff’s model of instrumental rationality can *no longer* succeed.

#### ( ) By gaining even a little acceptance, the alt will radically re-shape transportation planning.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Alexander (2000) argues that there are many forms of rationality – communicative, instrumental, strategic, and so on – and that the real question is appropriately matching the form of rationality to the planning circumstance. This paper takes a different approach, anticipating a paradigm shift that will radically change the basis of knowing and the process for making transportation planning decisions. Kuhn (1970) explains that such shifts only occur when contradictions in the predominant paradigm become great and a new, more useful paradigm is compelling. The reader is invited to consider his or her own practice to conclude whether the preconditions for a paradigm shift in transportation planning are present and whether communicative rationality will be the new transportation planning paradigm.

#### ( ) Alt solves the Aff – and, even it does not, the process results in creative remedies to transportation policy.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Planning process. As shown in Figure 2, communicative transportation planning does not involve a linear progression from ends to means. Instead, it is an iterative process that transforms the decision environment and the participants themselves. Participants simultaneously consider means and ends. Communicative transportation planning emphasizes listening, conveying, interpreting, mediating and bridge-building between stakeholders – encouraging them to ease their commitment to pre-existing positions and to share interests and goals. It is open to and influences the larger context of societal values, public opinion, institutions and stakeholders. Consequently, communicative planning itself may develop or modify the planning process. Finally, communicative transportation planning encourages a continuous critique about the planning process and its effects. It draws attention to that process rather than using a cookbook-like set of procedural steps for planning.7 Accordingly, communicative rationality involves experimental approaches because developing the planning process is an explicit part of the planning activity.

### A-to “Alt not work within State”, or “Alt is not pragmatic”

#### ( ) Our alt does not forego the State – it just engages it differently

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Role of the planner. Communicative rationality requires that transportation planners function as communicative and technical experts who design and implement collaborative transportation planning processes. The main focus is helping decision-makers, stakeholders and the public learn about the dimensions of transportation problems from one another and developing plans in a collaborative manner. But transportation planners are not just facilitators – they articulate economic, social and technical knowledge and represent values that might be neglected by other participants, such as social justice or the interest of future generations. Transportation planners are attentive to the way in which language frames the possibilities for action, helping planning participants discover how information and metaphor to shape perceptions, preferences and policy choices.5 They seek arrangements with decision-making bodies that give them the latitude to develop processes that promote inclusive and fair discussion. They seek to reduce communicative distortions brought about by unequal access to information, the influence of special interests, or the restrictive nature of an engineering problem frame. Their work counteracts false claims and the disguising of value issues as technical issues. Planners articulate their own value positions as participants in the planning process, but disclose the basis for the claim (e.g., technical or moral).

#### ( ) The Alt considers the role of language and thus improves political action

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Transportation planners draw attention to how language defines problems and solutions. For example, they seek to understand speech acts more fully, distinguishing different forms of speech in their interpretation of dialogue and their own speech. Statements may assert that an expressed proposition is true, direct another person to act (in the form of questions or commands), commit the speaker to a future course of action, express a psychological state, or declare action. If the participants to a discussion are engaging in different forms of speech acts without awareness, they may well talk past one another. Communicative transportation planners create awareness about speech, seeking to help participants understand one another. In designing participatory activities, planners encourage sincerity of expression and examination of the legitimacy with which claims are made, and in the process, enrich the quality of political claims.

#### ( ) The alt enriches and improves conventional politics

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Transportation planners draw attention to how language defines problems and solutions. For example, they seek to understand speech acts more fully, distinguishing different forms of speech in their interpretation of dialogue and their own speech. Statements may assert that an expressed proposition is true, direct another person to act (in the form of questions or commands), commit the speaker to a future course of action, express a psychological state, or declare action. If the participants to a discussion are engaging in different forms of speech acts without awareness, they may well talk past one another. Communicative transportation planners create awareness about speech, seeking to help participants understand one another. In designing participatory activities, planners encourage sincerity of expression and examination of the legitimacy with which claims are made, and in the process, enrich the quality of political claims.

### Alt can change Legislation and the State

#### ( ) Alt can change legislation. At a minimum, it can influence it.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

The transportation problems of major metropolitan areas provide a strong impetus for improved transportation planning. Furthermore, enabling legislation in North American and Europe emphasizes a more adaptable and open transportation planning process. But ultimately, it is the discomfort that planners, politicians and the public feel with status quo transportation planning that suggests that change is coming. The profession should proactively examine its planning processes, reevaluate its planning methods, experiment with alternatives, and build capacity for new approaches. How can this change occur? Regional transportation organizations can lead the way, supported by Federal and state programs that recognize the value of communicative planning. New forms of professional education should address listening skills, writing and speaking for diverse, non-technical audiences, mediation and consensus building processes, qualitative research methods and social theory. Researchers and practitioners need to develop and document new processes for transportation planning, conduct case studies of best practices and further develop models based on theory and field experience (see Anson and Willis 1993). Finally, theorists need to help resolve the challenges that new models encounter in practice. When an espoused theory (instrumental rationality) and a theory-in-use are at odds, it creates a baffling set of discourses for decision-makers and the public. The resulting confusion harms the planning process. Transportation research and practice communities should come together to develop transportation planning processes that are suited to the problems and the societal context of the coming decades. We must be able to recognize dysfunctional transportation planning processes when they occur and have the courage and initiative to develop new approaches. The world has changed – the problems are different, the institutions are different, and the values are different. Language is not a mirror, but the very basis for planning. This new recognition challenges us to integrate theory and practice and develop new processes for transportation planning. Communicative rationality offers a promising place to start.

### A-to “Alt won’t solve – public is apathetic”

#### ( ) Public apathy args are wrong – public is only apathetic because they’re disengaged. Our alt changes the basis of their apathy.

Klein ‘10

Internally quoting Stanford professor James Fishkin – Joe Klein is TIME's political columnist and author of six books, most recently Politics Lost. His weekly TIME column, "In the Arena," covers national and international affairs. In 2004 he won the National Headliner Award for best magazine column. Time Magazine – How Can a Democracy Solve Tough Problems? – Sept 2nd – http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2015790,00.html#ixzz1xcLhwzfw

"The public is very smart if you give it a chance," says Fishkin, 62, who has been conducting experiments in what he calls "deliberative democracy" for nearly 20 years now. "If people think their voice actually matters, they'll do the hard work, really study their briefing books, ask the experts smart questions and then make tough decisions. When they hear the experts disagreeing, they're forced to think for themselves. About 70% change their minds in the process." Fishkin has done this on several continents and in many countries, including the U.S. In Texas, he ran a deliberative-democracy process for a consortium of utilities, from 1996 to 2007, which gradually transformed the state from last to first in the use of wind power. "Over that time, the percentage of people — and these were stakeholders, utility customers — willing to pay more for wind went from 54% to 84%," he says. (He also ran a "National Issues Convention" for public television in 1996.) (See the best viral campaign ads of 2010.) Given all the noise afflicting the country, this might be a productive moment for deliberative democracy. "It works best when you have hard choices," Fishkin says. "Despite what you see and read, this is not a nation of extremists. What you see on TV, and in most polling, is an impersonation of public opinion. The actual public isn't really like that, especially when it is given something more than sound bites and distorted political messaging. If you give people real choices and real consequences, they will make real decisions."

### A-to “Alt = delay”

#### ( ) Alt is pragmatic and faster than top-down policies that cause litigation.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

I maintain that communicative rationality is a desirable and practical approach to transportation planning. Communicative rationality can help transportation planning move beyond its objectivist roots to a broader epistemological base. It can support innovative approaches to transportation problems and help planners move forward from seemingly intractable conflicts. While perhaps requiring more time in its initial stages, it can move more quickly than conventional planning if it avoids decades-long, litigious controversies. Communicative rationality can enhance the quality of deliberation and support consensus-based decisions. It can help decision-makers find a way out of intractable conflicts that might endanger their political careers.

### Transportation and the single-issue of the Alt can spillover

#### ( ) There is an internal link between rationality, transportation, and social justice. Engaging the public would spillover.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Purpose of planning. The purpose of transportation planning continues to be to develop strategies for connecting people and goods with destinations. However, transportation planning is not divorced from larger issues such as the development of human potential, social justice, environmental improvement or aesthetic appreciation. Its purposes broaden from the primary task of designing and selecting programs to enhancing the deliberative capability of decision making bodies and the public, and promoting learning about transportation phenomenon. Transportation planning also provides a way for the public to reflect on broader social issues, such as the relationship of travel choices to the environment and social equity. Transportation planning is a creative activity that adds meaning to people’s lives as well as helping them link origins and destinations. It is intended to increase the capacity for reasoned deliberation and democratic decisionmaking. Whereas the larger project of instrumental rationality could be described as increasing rationality, social progress and individual freedom, the larger project of communicative rationality is to enhance the quality of community and political dialogue in support of democracy, creating a transportation planning process that fully addresses both means and ends and links transportation issues to broader social concerns. The effects of this approach are greater attention to ends (goals), better integration of means and ends, new forms of participation and learning, and enhanced democratic capacity.

### A-to “no mechanism to carry out the alt”

#### ( ) Mechanisms presently exist to carry-out communicative participation

Lupia ‘4

(et al, Arthur – Assistant Prof at the University of Michigan – “Direct Democracy: A New Approach to old Questions” – via google scholar)

For better or worse, the institutions of direct democracy—initiative and referendum— have become an integral part of American democracy. At present, more than half of the states and cities in the United States provide for the initiative and referendum, and upwards of 70 percent of the population lives in a state or city where direct democracy is available (Matsusaka, 2004). These institutions have been a part of American government for more than 100 years now, making them older than universal women's suffrage and direct election of U.S. senators, and there is reason to believe that they will become increasingly important in the future. No state with the initiative or referendum has ever chosen to do away with the procedure, and states without the procedures are gradually adopting them (at a rate of about one state per decade since the end of World War II).

### A-to “Alt gets manipulated by stakeholders”

#### ( ) Alt won’t get high-jacked by stakeholders – the Aff underestimates the public.

Talisse ‘5

(Robert B. Talisse, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Vanderbilt. 2005. Democracy After Liberalism: Pragmatism and Deliberative Politics)

A pragmatic deliberativism can steer clear of both the liberal hyperindividualism that makes community impossible and the antiliberal commu-nitarianism that makes community oppressive; the pragmatist view, hence, can generate a plausible conception of democratic citizenship. The pragmatic deliberativist view does this by emphasizing that citizens are neither encumbered selves helplessly ensconced within fixed historical or moral traditions and communities, nor atomic and autonomous agents of ex ni-hilo self-creation. We rather are, for better or worse, sharers in a common social-political world and the joint inheritors of political institutions, historical traditions, ideas, principles, conflicts, and problems. This social-political world is dynamic and fluctuating, it requires that we respond to it —indifference, nonparticipation, and self-absorption are responses. The pragmatist maintains with the antiliberals that democratic self-government requires a sense of community and shared purpose among citizens; it accordingly rejects the liberal aspiration to a neutral politics and accepts the antiliberal claim that the state must play a formative role in the lives of citizens. Yet the pragmatist also affirms, with the liberals, the need for individual protections against majority tyranny and oppression\*

### Our alt avoids Reps K’s

#### ( ) Our Reps K’s are a net benefit – our alt avoids divisive framing

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Problem-framing. A communicative rationality model frames problems differently than the conventional model. Rather than assume that problems can be defined and bounded in a single frame, communicative planners place greater emphasis on acknowledging different problem frames and mediating between frames. A problem frame is a construct that organizes one’s understanding of problems, their causes and the effectiveness of alternative responses.8 Although the existence of different problem frames suggest that participants to planning do not agree on the criteria by which one might judge a rational decision, communicative rationality provides a basis for examining and seeking redefinition of problem frames. In doing so, the planning process becomes more realistic and transparent, albeit potentially more complicated. In fact, the acknowledgment of different problem frames can be an effective strategy for depersonalizing conflict. Decision-makers may discourage planners from identifying problem frames if that process sharpens conflict or empowers opposing groups. Recognizing this reality, communicative planners seek appropriate ways to facilitate understanding of alternative frames, alter pre-existing problem frames, and/or discover new ways that respond to multiple frames. The idea is not pure relativism, where all frames have equal value, but to establish a rational process where some frames hold greater weight on the basis of a better argument. A better argument will not emerge if exclusion, unequal power and varying access to information and expertise exist among stakeholders. Therefore, communicative transportation planners take advantage of opportunities to counteract distortions of communication along the lines suggested by Forester (1989). A planner might indicate how a way of defining a problem might exclude consideration of an important issue or an unexpressed interest that is influencing the plan’s direction. Furthermore, planners draw attention to how language and discourse is used to construct, modify and reconcile these problem frames. Because the planner is not separate from the planning process, s/he also discovers how her or his own frames guide perception and thinking about solutions.

## A-to Perm

### A-to Perm “do both”

#### First – Communicative model demands the public be able to modify and completely revise. That’s our Willson ev from the shell. This is more than a typical “sever certainty arg” – the communicative model must listen to voices that want inaction. The alt can’t co-exist without the Aff severing its very design.

#### Severance is a voter – makes Aff a moving target and means neg could never win.

#### Perm just makes no sense – a top-down and bottom-up, opened-ended approach can’t logically con-exist in this instance.

#### Irrespective of severance, the perm will fail in practice. We’ve tried “doing both” and found that only abandoning instrumental rationality can work.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Unresolved tension between instrumental rationality and politics produces poor plans, cynical planners, frustrated politicians, and a mistrustful public. At the same time, however, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) ask for regions to prepare more substantive and participatory transportation plans. Transportation plans are supposed to mean something; more local discretion is offered on how funds are spent and there are more requirements for public participation, consistency with other policy initiatives and financial feasibility. The problems with instrumental rationality are not unique to transportation planning – they stem from changes in the larger social context for planning. The changes, in turn, touch on the most basic questions in philosophy and social theory. Instrumental rationality and objectivism are part of traditional notions of modernism and progress, yet these foundational elements have been transformed. Starting in the 1950s, critiques of scientific social science emerged in sociology and planning (see Guhathakurta (1999) for an overview). Yet in practice and research, transportation planning has followed a schizophrenic path – acknowledging problems in instrumental rationality but continuing to employ it in research, practice and teaching.

#### Our episodic event disad – our second Willson card from the shell says that the communicative model won’t solve social justice or democracy if it turns into an “routine event” that fails to genuinely engage public opinion.

#### Rubber-stamping disad – perm insists on action without genuine community dialogue. This proves addiction to instrumental rationality. It will fail and ignore social justice.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Left out in the tension between conventional planning and politics is the public. Although there have been growing requirements for participation, it is generally participation with a small ‘p’. Members of the public are rarely engaged in a substantive dialogue about transportation. Instead, their input is usually sought after the problem has been defined, after analysis has been completed and after alternative projects have been designed. Participation processes are highly constrained – often the public is presented with a narrow problem definition and asked to comment on small variations of similar alternatives. Consequences The result of the split between the traditional transportation planning paradigm and politics is an increasingly dysfunctional planning process. Borrowing from Dryzek’s (1993) characterization of the instrumental rationality model as “clean, calculating, and homogenizing” (p. 214) we can see that such a model is not a good fit with the setting of most transportation planning. In highly congested regions, private sector-led transportation planning often steps in to fill the void left by dysfunctional public transportation planning, either by taking on planning functions or by providing substitutes for travel. In either case, public objectives related to social equity, community development or environmental policy receive less emphasis.

### A-to “perm – do the Alt”

#### Perm severs for three reasons:

#### First – Communicative model demands the public be able to modify and completely revise. That’s our Willson ev from the shell. This is more than a typical “sever certainty arg” – the communicative model must listen to voices that want inaction. The alt can’t co-exist without the Aff severing its very design.

#### Second – Aff must defend certainty, or it severs topicality burdens:

#### Resolved means “unconditional”

American Heritage, 9

(American Heritage Dictionary, 4th Edition "resolved," 2009, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/Resolved)

re•solve (rĭ-zŏlv') v. tr. 1. To make a firm decision about.

#### “Should” means Aff can’t sever certainty

Compact Oxford English Dictionary ‘5

(http://www.askoxford.com/concise\_oed/should?view=uk)

should • modal verb (3rd sing. should) 1 used to indicate obligation, duty, or correctness.

#### And, they sever normal means – which is instrumental rationality

LANGMYHR ‘1

(TORE LANGMYHR – County Municipality of Sør-Trøndelag, N-7004 Trondheim, Norway – – Transportation 28: 207–210, 2001 – via EBSCO database)

Several classification schemes have been proposed for rationality types (e.g., Diesing 1962; Breheny & Hooper 1985; Sager 1994). Here, the main distinction will be drawn between instrumental and communicative rationality. Instrumental rationality focuses on goal achievement efficiency. The planners’ legitimacy rests upon the need for correction of market production. An efficient production of material goods (including environmental qualities) demands that planners act as “visible hands”, providing information, correcting for externalities and securing the provision of public goods. The synoptic planning paradigm (Banfield 1959) displays planning as production in its purest form. Consciously or unconsciously, this planning paradigm seems to have played a dominant role in the field of transport planning. This orientation implies a conception of the planner as an expert on how to reach politically decided goals in the most efficient manner. Even though the “optimal plan” concept has been revised through the realisation of bounds on informational capacity (cf. Herbert Simon’s [1957] “bounded rationality”), and the intermingling of ends and means (cf. Charles Lindblom’s [1959] “disjointed incrementalism”), the goal achievement rationale for planning still has wide impact.

#### Severance is a voter – makes Aff a moving target and means neg could never win.

## Additional Neg cards

### All-purpose good card to read in 2NC-1NR

#### ( ) No Aff solvency, social justice disad, and alt works – In transportation, conventional policy rationality fails and boosts violence – better to start with our alt.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

The problems with instrumental rationality are not unique to transportation planning – they stem from changes in the larger social context for planning. The changes, in turn, touch on the most basic questions in philosophy and social theory. Instrumental rationality and objectivism are part of traditional notions of modernism and progress, yet these foundational elements have been transformed. Starting in the 1950s, critiques of scientific social science emerged in sociology and planning (see Guhathakurta (1999) for an overview). Yet in practice and research, transportation planning has followed a schizophrenic path – acknowledging problems in instrumental rationality but continuing to employ it in research, practice and teaching. In the recent years, social theorists use the term postmodernism to describe changes that undermine traditional modernist notions, including instrumental rationality and objectivism. Stated simply, postmodernism recognizes that there is not longer a single organizing narrative around which a plan can optimize (e.g., a consensus notion of what constitutes progress). Without such an organizing narrative, a plan cannot optimize means with respect to ends, and many assumptions of rational transportation planning come apart.4 Milroy’s (1991) four observations about the implications of postmodernism for planning are used here to discuss the context for transportation planning. First, a postmodern perspective questions conventional beliefs and seeks to understand the power relations beneath them. The changing notions about the appropriateness of mobility as a transportation planning goal are an example of this. Mobility (taken here to mean vehicle throughput) was once assumed to be the general aim of transportation planning, but now there are competing ideas about such goals (e.g., mobility versus accessibility, and recently, restricting travel opportunity). Transportation planning rarely optimizes around a single goal; it usually balances multiple, often contradictory goals. In addition, more is understood about who benefits and who loses from differing goals definitions, so terms and ideas that were formerly uncontroversial become contested. Second, a postmodernism perspective challenges the notion of universals as bases of truth. Mobility enhancement used to be associated with a general notion of progress. Just as old postcards show factories billowing smoke as a sign of economic prosperity, the freedom to live and work where one chooses was a cornerstone of American land use and transportation policy. Although that freedom is still sought, the question of progress is now contested, not consensual. In the realm of project evaluation criteria, the cost/benefit calculus of economic evaluation is not offered as the sole decision criterion as it might have been in the past. Third, a postmodernism perspective asserts that a clear delineation between subjective and objective is not possible. There is, for example, recognition that objective analysis leaves out forms of knowing important to understanding travel behavior and making policy choices, such as qualitative factors, aethestics and morals. For example, Talvitie (1997) challenges the economic theory that underlies transportation models by introducing psychoanalytic understandings of travel behavior, aspects outside the realm of traditional notions of objectivity. He calls for examination of the “dark” side of transportation behavior instead of focusing solely on utility maximization. And finally, a postmodernism perspective is said to value plurality and difference. Recent research shows how transportation systems function differently for women, people of color, children, the elderly, the disabled, the poor and other groups. As we begin to recognize the perspectives and claims of a more diverse society, a type of planning that is “clean, calculating and homogenizing” seems a poor fit with the likely planning and decision-making environment.

### Neg Epistemology Extensions

#### ( ) Communicative Rationality uses a different epistemology and is driven by prior public participation

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

What is the theory of communicative rationality? This section provides an overview that is further developed for transportation planning in the rest of the paper. As previously mentioned, communicative rationality is concerned with creating a rational basis for constructing ends and means in a democratic society – an approach that integrates scientific and interpretive/social learning approaches. A precise definition of communicative rationality is elusive because it is a theory “in action” that can result in different formulations depending on the circumstances of a planning problem. In practice, however, communicative rationality has clearly distinguishing features – a focus on discourse, interpretation and design of deliberative processes. It is distinguished by its attention to participation and learning, particularly through the reconciliation of different problem frames. The communicative rationality perspective enriches public and political discourse by reorienting planning to a form of reason based on consensual discussion (the theorists call it “intersubjective communication”). The basis for knowledge (or epistemology) and method of planning shifts from a predominantly analytical basis to a communicative basis. Communicative rationality integrates traditional notions of science with communicative rationality’s critical social theory origins. The communicative model argues that reason derives from a communicative practice that is specific to people, time and place. It maintains that reason is a process that creates both means and ends and constitutes both subject and object. Yet communicative rationality is not relativism or purely an individual interpretive activity. Knowledge is derived through discourse in which the participants proceed according to consensual principles of validity and communication, in which they seek a rational basis for unifying dualisms such as subject and object, knowledge and practice, and so on. It is the communicative process, then, that is the universal. The communicative model assumes that consensual understanding is sought and can be approached.

### A-to “Social Justice shouldn’t be top priority”/ utilitarianism

#### Even if we shouldn’t always have deontology, social justice must be the top priority in transportation policy. This *requires* a shift from instrumental rationality.

Kumar ‘9

Ashok Kumar, is Professor and Head of the Department of Physical Planning at the School

of Planning and Architecture, New Delhi. He researched at the University of Liverpool,

England, U.K. for his doctoral degree, which he received in 1992. Institute of Town Planners, India Journal 6 - 4, 68 - 72, October - December 2009 – http://itpi.org.in/pdfs/oct6\_09.pdf

In this paper, the author argues that transport planning has become highly sciencitized discipline. Sciencitization of transport planning practice, among others, have led to two main consequences for society and economy. One, sciencitization of transport planning has led it to achieving the ends of technical rationality that is transport planning practitioners firmly believe that technical robustness of their proposals and projects remain their primary task, and moral goals such as transport equity are mere social irritants. Second, excessive emphasis on technical rationality has created a condition whereby problem formulation and reformulation has become detached from societal needs, particularly those of the majority urban poor. The paper ends by suggesting that moral principles such as equity and by implication social justice must remain at the heart of transport planning practice and education, if this important specialization has to make any significant contribution to the most important exercise of nation building. Transport planning is an integral part of town and country planning. It is the only land use, which has the capacity to provide links between other land uses physically. Whatever may be the level of technological advances aimed at reducing the need to travel (globalization of work and work processes, working from home within a city, studying in a virtual university, internet based entertainment), place remains important. As long as locale remains vital for human civilization to function and flourish, transport planning will continue to occupy high place on the table of town and country planning. In this specific sense, transport planning is the only land use which could thus afford meaning to other land uses because without physical links through road networks, it is not possible to reasonably enjoy activity systems located in the form of other land uses. Whether we meet people for specific purpose or get together on a social occasion, the significance of transport planning could not be overlooked because in order to make every trip affordable, comfortable, enjoyable and sustainable (less time and energy consuming), someone must do a good job at transport planning. Most of the efforts in transport planning are made to achieve efficiency by use of scientific or instrumental rationality. Instrumental reasoning implies complete reliance on scientific methods of analysis and examination and proposed action premised on such reasoning. Thinking, conceiving, planning and implementing planning projects through instrumental reason is acceptable provided it does not become an end in itself. Transport planners are known for their technical prowess as most of the practitioners of transport planning generally have engineering background. In this paper, I make the argument that transport planning is highly sciencitized discipline. Sciencitization of transport planning practice, among others, have led to two main consequences for society and economy. One, sciencitization of transport planning has led it to achieving the ends of technical rationality that is transport planning practitioners firmly believe that technical robustness of their proposals and projects remain their primary task, and moral goals such as transport equity are mere social irritants. As I will try to demonstrate below in briefly, engineering content dominates the essence of both transport planning practice as well as education. Second, excessive emphasis on technical rationality has created a condition whereby problem formulation and reformulation has become detached from societal needs, particularly those of the majority urban poor. I intend to close my discussion in this paper by suggesting that moral principles such as equity and by implication social justice must become the nerve center of transport planning practice and education, if this important specialization has to make any significant contribution to the most important exercise of nation building. Improving one or two intersections or roundabouts could never achieve these moral ends.

## Aff Answers start here

### Wilson indicts and – he’s wrong and his models are wrong

#### ( ) Willson’s transportation paradigm will fail and can’t explain change.

TALVITIE ‘1

(Antti Talvitie, Professor at Aalto University School of Science and Technology and formerly with the World Bank – “Comment on Richard Willson’s paper: Assessing communicative rationality as a transportation planning paradigm” – Transportation 28: 207–210, 2001 – via EBSCO database)

Willson addresses in his paper a wide range of planning issues: better communication, honesty, re-education of planners, public participation, planning process, and so on, and aims at creating a new paradigm for transport planning. The paper has much content to recommend it to planners, decisionmakers and the public. Dr. Willson deserves credit – as does Transportation – for bringing up these issues. Dr. Willson is also right in pointing out that technical expertise and methods that have been built over the past 30 years continue to be needed. Is Prof. Willson’s case for Communicative Rationality as the new paradigm for transport planning valid? I am not persuaded. I agree with many elements of his argument enumerated above, but not the paradigm. If it is not the right paradigm, what is? I argue below that analysis and emotional communication are. This is puzzling when talking is involved in both, and a prominent econometrist friend once complained to me that “these planners like to talk rather than analyze the problems.” Willson’s core inspiration is Habermas’ concept of communicative rationality. Habermas crafted communicative rationality as postmodernist method to counter the instrumental rationality of industrial revolution. Two constructs, lifeworld and system, are central to his argument. Lifeworld comprises the social life with symbolic meanings – religion, self-concepts, social norms, stories, art – and form the cultural basis for communication, social interaction, consensus and conflict resolution. System is the material knowledge in society, such as agriculture or engineering. Prior to the modern era system and lifeworld had an experiential relation. Symbolically, Habermas argued, in the good old days people related to each other in human ways – Oktoberfest brought people together to celebrate the hard work of harvest. Industrial revolution uncoupled system and lifeworld, mechanized harvest and commercialized Oktoberfest. Other than issues of money, there is now little human satisfaction in either. For Willson communicative rationality is an expansion of knowledge-based logical thinking to counter similar uncoupling as Habermas observed in society. He contends that knowledge and thinking – the traditional means of interpretation – are insufficient instruments. Rational communication, argumentation and debate, as distinct from knowledge and thinking, will lead to experiences of understanding and consensus, and will help construct, rationally, ends and means for a democratic society. It does this that by interpersonal discourse and interpretation of “facts” which, through public participation, result in social learning and consensus for change – ultimately, in desirable actions. Further, rational communication enriches public and political discourse, and integrates “traditional notions of science and communicative rationality’s critical social theory origins” (Willson, p. 12). Does rational communication facilitate or cause desirable change? Evidence answers in the negative. When rational communication is a factor in change, it occurs toward the end of a process when the battle has already been won. That is the problem with Willson’s paradigm. It does not answer what makes changes happen, in planning or in peoples’ lives, or in peoples themselves.

### Neg Link and Impact claims too sweeping

#### ( ) Burden shift – they need to specifically prove that we’re the dangerous kind of planning and power.

Mohammadi ‘10

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – p. 33-34

Jurgen Habermas's theory of communicative action has been basis of communicative planning theory. Communicative planning concentrates on bottom-up approach and real citizen participation in decision-making. Both of the two 'bottom-up' and 'top-down\* planning approaches have been faced with certain limits and potentials. While top-down planning emphasizes on governmental authority, bottom-up planning pays particular attention to local communities as main actors in planning process. Similar to many other theories, communicative planning theory has also been widely criticized. These critiques can be divided into three main categories—theoretical critiques, critiques in practice, and critiques regarding the relations between power and planning—among which, I believe that critiques concerned with power is more important due to strong and mutual relations between power and planning and their mutual effects on each other. It is clear that power 'can’ mislead, corrupt or limit planning rationality in practice, but it only 'can’. The question is that under which condition? In fact, it should be mentioned that there are different forms of power and rationality which appear within different political and institutional situations. There are conditions under which rational critiques of existent and dominant power is possible. Moreover, we should distinguish the power which detriments people from the power which may help people and leads to educate them.

#### ( ) instrumental rationality is not categorically bad – perm is best option.

Mohammadi ‘10

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – Page 23-25

It seems that at least part of reasons to formation of theory of communicative rationality refers to this "difference\* and 'language relativity\*. This theory helps consensus among individuals and group members and Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger's critique of the theory regarding difference and language relativity has no strong logic. On the contrary, using the critics' reasons, the bases of Habermas's theory will be supported and reinforced. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) in another critique of the theory stated: "there is the question raised by Rorty regarding instrumental rationality—the bogeyman of communicative rationality. Is it all bad? Of course not." They referred to the benefits of modernism and instrumental rationality and asked: "Although we must not forget that not everyone has benefited from this in equal measures and huge disparities exist, can we really say that instrumental rationality has (I) been crucial to people's 'voice', and (2) made a significant detrimental difference to their ability to express that voice when other avenues are open to them ? We think not. I believe that Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger are right when they stated that in scientific and instrumental rationality, the situation was not too bad to hear the people's voice and there were no other methods open to them, but the important question is that do the opponents of communicative planning and rationality theories deny the whole scientific and instrumental rationality'1 And do they question all the aspects of scientific rationality and introduce it as a bogeyman'1 According to the writings of opponents of communicative rationality, the answer is 'No'. At least I do not think so. In most writings about communicative rationality and planning, the opponents have clearly mentioned the scientific and instrumental rationality is a way that should help the communicative planning. Where Healey (1993) describing essential components of communicative theory stated: "Planning is an interactive and interpretive process, focusing on "deciding and acting" within a range of specialized allocative and authoritative systems but drawing on the multi-dimensionality of "life-worlds" or "practical sense," rather than a single formalized dimention (for example, urban morphology- or scientific rationalism). Formal techniques of analysis and design in planning processes are but one form of discourse. Planning processes should be enriched by discussion of moral dilemmas and aesthetic experience, using a range of presentational tonus, from telling stones to aesthetic illustrations or experiences. Therefore, it can be seen that the opponents of communicative theory' have not rejected and denied the whole scientific and instrumental rationality.

### A-to “Social Justice Comes First”

#### Social justice impact not 1st – consequentialism’s always a better option

**Issac, ‘2**

(Jeffery, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Dissent, Vol. 49 No. 2, Spring)

Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intentions does not ensure the achievement of what one intends**.** Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally comprised parties may seem like the right thing, but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness, it is often a form of complicity in injustice**.** This is why, from the standpoint of politics-as opposed to religion-pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits **this** judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

### A-to Neg’s Epsitemology args

#### ( ) Communicative rationality will fail and is more epistemological flawed – it ignores pragmatic realities.

Flyvbjerg ‘2

(et al, Bent Flyvbjerg is founding chair of the Geography Program at Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning – In Philip Allmendinger and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, eds., Planning Futures: New Directions for

Planning Theory. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, pp. 44-62. Also available at: http://flyvbjerg.plan.aau.dk/DarkSide2.pdf)

For students of power, communication is more typically characterised by non-rational rhetoric and maintenance of interests than by freedom from domination and consensus-seeking. In rhetoric, ‘validity’ is established via the mode of communication--e.g., eloquence, hidden control, rationalisation, charisma, using dependency relations between participants--rather than through rational arguments concerning the matter at hand. Seen from this perspective Habermas (1987, 297-8) seems overly naive and idealistic when he contrasts ‘successful’ with ‘distorted’ utterance in human conversation, because success in rhetoric is associated precisely with distortion. Whether the communicative or the rhetorical position is ‘correct’ is not important here. What is decisive, rather, is that a non-idealistic point of departure for planning theory must take account of the fact that both positions are possible, and even simultaneously possible. In an empirical scientific context, something to which Habermas otherwise takes great pains to define himself, the question of communicative rationality versus rhetoric must therefore remain open. The question must be settled by concrete examination of the case at hand. The researcher must ask how communication takes place, and how politics, planning and democracy operate. Is communication characterised by consensus-seeking and absence of power? Or is communication the exercise of power and rhetoric? How do consensus-seeking and rhetoric, freedom from domination and exercise of power, eventually come together in individual acts of communication? The basic question being raised here is whether one can meaningfully distinguish rationality and power from each other in communication and whether rationality can be viewed in isolation from power, as does Habermas. To assume an answer to this question a priori is just as invalid as presuming that one can ultimately answer the biblical question of whether humans are basically good or basically evil. And to assume either position ex ante, to universalise it and build a theory upon it, as Habermas does, makes for problematic philosophy and speculative social science. This is one reason we have to be cautious when using the theory of communicative rationality to understand and act in relation to planning.

#### ( ) Epistemology 1st wrong – Act in face of uncertainty or forever study things that can never get fully flushed-out.

Cochran ‘99

Molly Cochran Assistant Professor of International Affairs @ Georgia Institute for Technology, Normative Theory in International Relations. 1999, Page 272

To conclude this chapter, while modernist and postmodernist debates continue, while we are still unsure as to what we can legitimately identify as a feminist ethical/political concern, while we still are unclear about the relationship between discourse and experience, it is particularly important for feminists that we proceed with analysis of both the material (institutional and structural) as well as the discursive. This holds not only for feminists, but for all theorists oriented towards the goal of extending further moral inclusion in the present social sciences climate of epistemological uncertainty. Important ethical/political concerns hang in the balance. We cannot afford to wait for the meta-theoretical questions to be conclusively answered. Those answers may be unavailable. Nor can we wait for a credible vision of an alternative institutional order to appear before an emancipatory agenda can be kicked into gear. Nor do we have before us a chicken and egg question of which comes first: sorting out the metatheoretical issues or working out which practices contribute to a credible institutional vision. The two questions can and should be pursued together, and can be via moral imagination. Imagination can help us think beyond discursive and material conditions which limit us, by pushing the boundaries of those limitations in thought and examining what yields. In this respect, I believe international ethics as pragmatic critique can be a useful ally to feminist and normative theorists generally.

#### ( ) Epistemic imperfection doesn’t mean Aff is entirely wrong – should still act with even partial knowledge.

Cowen ‘4

(Tyler, Professor of Economics – George Mason University, “The Epistemic Problem Does Not Refute Consequentialism”, 11-2, http://www.gmu.edu/jbc/Tyler/Epistemic2.pdf, p. 14-15)

The epistemic critique relies heavily on a complete lack of information about initial circumstances. This is not a plausible general assumption, although it may sometimes be true. The critique may give the impression of relying more heavily on a more plausible assumption, namely a high variance for the probability distribution of our estimates concerning the future. But simply increasing the level of variance or uncertainty does not add much force to the epistemic argument. To see this more clearly, consider another case of a high upfront benefit. Assume that the United States has been hit with a bioterror attack and one million children have contracted smallpox. We also have two new experimental remedies, both of which offer some chance of curing smallpox and restoring the children to perfect health. If we know for sure which remedy works, obviously we should apply that remedy. But imagine now that we are uncertain as to which remedy works. The uncertainty is so extreme that each remedy may cure somewhere between three hundred thousand and six hundred thousand children. Nonetheless we have a slight idea that one remedy is better than the other. That is, one remedy is slightly more likely to cure more children, with no other apparent offsetting negative effects or considerations. Despite the greater uncertainty, we still have the intuition that we should try to save as many children as possible. We should apply the remedy that is more likely to cure more children. We do not say: “We are now so uncertain about what will happen. We should pursue some goal other than trying to cure as many children as possible.” Nor would we cite greater uncertainty about longer-run events as an argument against curing the children. We have a definite good in the present (more cured children), balanced against a radical remixing of the future on both sides of the equation. The definite upfront good still stands firm. Alternatively, let us assume that our broader future suddenly became less predictable (perhaps genetic engineering is invented, which creates new and difficult-to-forecast possibilities). That still would not diminish the force of our reason for saving more children. The variance of forecast becomes larger on both sides of the equation – whether we save the children or not – and the value of the upfront lives remains. A higher variance of forecast might increase the required size of the upfront benefit (to overcome the Principle of Roughness), but it would not refute the relevance of consequences more generally. We could increase the uncertainty more, but consequentialism still will not appear counterintuitive. The remedies, rather than curing somewhere in the range of three to six hundred thousand children, might cure in the broader range of zero to all one million of the children. By all classical statistical standards, this new cure scenario involves more uncertainty than the previous case, such as by having a higher variance of possible outcomes. Yet this higher uncertainty lends little support for the view that curing the children becomes less important. We still have an imperative to apply the remedy that appears best, and is expected the cure the greater number of children. This example may appear excessively simple, but it points our attention to the non-generality of the epistemic critique. The critique appears strongest only when we have absolutely no idea about the future; this is a special rather than a general case. Simply boosting the degree of background generic uncertainty should not stop us from pursuing large upfront benefits of obvious importance.

### Alt offense – stakeholder manipulation disad

#### ( ) Social Justice Turn – participation will boost majoritarian interest

Mohammadi ‘10

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – Page 23-25

2.4.1. Theoretical Critiques Susan Fainstein (2000) believes that: "The communicative theorists make the role of the planner the central element of discussion. Both the context in which planners work and the outcome of planning fade from view. Unlike the rational modelers, the communicative theorists have found a subject, but like them, they lack an object. Whereas in legal theory the object of analysis is the relationship between the legal system and society and in medical theory the concern is with the human body, in communicative planning theory the spotlight is on the planner. Instead of asking what is to be done about cities and regions, communicative planners typically ask what planners should be doing, and the answer is that they should be good (i.e., tell the truth, not be pushy about their own judgments)." Moreover. Fainstein states communicative theorists avoid dealing with the question "what to do when open processes produce unjust results." She believes that the communicative planning theorists have not answered this question yet. It should be acknowledged that Patsy Healey (1997) in 'collaborative planning; shaping places in fragmented societies' tried to answer this question. Using the term 'right of appeal' in a collaborative exercise, Healey stated that individual stakeholders who feel aggrieved by decisions taken against their own—even minority—desires would be affordable an opportunity to be heard at a later time. Henley's answer to the above mentioned question by Fainstein. surprised the other critics—Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger. Referring to the 'right of appeal\* in a collaborative exercise. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger stated "to enact any right of appeal is to suggest that the agreed view developed from the discourse arena could be overturned in favor of other more pertinem considerations expressed by stakeholders either later in the process or by stakeholders who decided not to participate in the original collaborative exercises." They continued "We have been surprised, therefore, to read in Healey's latest work (1997) of the recognition of the need for an appeals arbitration process within a collaborative technique, as a form of "backstop formal arrangement" (page 330) when breakdown in agreement occurs" (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger, 1998). As Healey (1993) stated in this theory, planning is being considered as a democratic enterprise aiming at promoting social justice and environmental sustainability. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1993) criticized this view on planning and stated it should itself contain clear prejudices towards a certain view or set of values. They added "To accept Habermas's work there has to be a corresponding 'world view' of values. At a crude level, communicative rationality is about undistorted communication, openness and a lack of oppression." But this assumption also contains prejudice Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger believe that participatory democracy, upon which communicative planning depends, can not be considered 'without any problem', and is not a value acceptable for everyone, even the proponents of the theory acknowledged its limits and problems emphasizing on local rather than national concerns. He asked what happens when the two meet? Moreover, the assumption that 'citizen involvement in democratic processes brings more participation' is also open to the question. Held (1987) wrote it is at least questionable whether participation by itself leads to desirable and consistent political outcomes, while there can be possible tensions between individual liberty, distributional questions—social justice— and democratic decisions.

#### ( ) Alt causes delay, isn’t pragmatic, and fails by propping self-interest

Willson ‘1

(Internally quoting Friedmann to support his claims – John Friedmann is an Honorary Professor in the School of Community and Regional Planning at University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, and Professor Emeritus in the School of Public Policy and Social Research at UCLA. His achievements have been internationally recognized. In 2006, he was the first recipient of the UN-Habitat Lecture Award "for his outstanding and sustained contribution to research, thinking and practice in the field of Human Settlements." Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

Transportation planning practitioners might envisage that communicative rationality would result in time consuming, unrepresentative and expensive planning processes that will not move beyond expressions of individuals’ self interest. Transportation planners may shudder at the thought of “opening up” transportation planning, thinking that the only way to move policy forward is to control discourse enough so that a working consensus can be created. Transportation planning, by virtue of the large capital investment and impact on land value, attracts powerful interests who seek to manipulate communication to their advantage. Without the authority achieved by claiming scientific expertise, transportation planners may be unable to resist projects that are ill-conceived or wasteful but nonetheless linguistically appealing (e.g., when a nostalgia for rail transit supports a light rail project that is not cost effective). For many transportation planners, science is more important than words in counteracting special interest lobbying. Critics of communicative rationality might also challenge the notions advanced for ideal discourse. For example, sincerity is at odds with conventional technocratic behavior (e.g., since planners claim objectivity, sincerity is irrelevant). As has been said, planners are sometimes directed to be inaccurate. Such critics might even argue that transportation planners should distort language in a strategic manner. First, communicative distortions are a source of power in an environment where the planner’s influence is sometimes outweighed by special interests. Second, more subtly, if the only way a reasonable consensus for action can be achieved is by watering down and mystifying policy language, distorted communicative practices may in fact allow progress to be achieved. Finally, is it too much to ask to expect practitioners to not manipulate information and language to gain advantage for their organizations and themselves? Friedmann (1987) criticizes communicative action as being disconnected from action and power. His comment that communicative action is “the ideal of a graduate seminar” suggests that it is too idealistic for the reality of interests, power relationships and politics. Practicing transportation planners may also ask if they can actually guide the communicative processes that swirl around planning.

#### ( ) Alt never solves and reifies the worst of the squo. They give cover to deceptive stakeholders.

Mohammadi ‘10

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – p. 28=29

Based on their statements, an actor within a communicative planning discourse, can intentionally use strategies and tactics to reach his or her desired aims. It is possible that a participant tends to act teleologically, despite acceptation of an open, honest, and trustworthy discursive style of argumentation. There is also possibility of an occurrence of normatively regulated action within the communicative discourse arena. When members of a group (for example, members of an environmental lobbying group, paid employees or shareholders of a property development company, or professional planning representatives of a local planning auriiority) participate in a communicative planning discourse, maybe have common values and shared agendas to ensure their viewpoints affect the negotiation and support their clients' interests, despite of their signing up of honesty and trustworthiness in the debate. Moreover, occurrence of dramaturgical action is not impossible in an arena of collaborative planning discourse. As Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger stated, "Individual stakeholders within the discourse arena might attempt to constitute a particular image of the self in presenting viewpoints, either to evoke an acceptable image to the audience, or to present a completely false position to minimize argumentation and debate." They added, despite of Forester's work (1989), this point has been absent in Healey's works. Here, the participants may employ deceiving ways to reach desired outcomes. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger believe that communicative planning is founded on the rationale that "individuals will decide 'morally', and that negotiative processes within collaborative discourse arenas are founded on truth, openness, honesty, legitimacy, and integrity. It fails to include the possibility' that individuals can deliberately obfuscate the facts and judgments for their own benefits, and for the benefit of their own arguments." That is to say, the idea that "the individuals change their behavior and personality as soon as they take part in a communicative planning process" is an Utopian and unrealistic expectation in practice. As it has been previously mentioned, John Forester (1989) discussed this point systematically, but Habermas and communicative planning theorists have not paid enough and appropriate attention to this point. The familiar NIMBYism"1 that has been referred by Fainstein (2000). confirms this problem. This famous English idiom in planning literature denotes that participants in communicative discourses try to achieve the most amounts of benefits and bear the least amounts of costs to reach consensus in communicative planning processes. They usually agree with the projects and decisions which impose them the least costs. NIMBYism, despite the expectation of the planners, appears mostly in small municipalities. Referring to the above mentioned problems, Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) concluded that a really successful process of communicative planning is impossible as long as power and political action are the dominant factors. In other words, in a severe political field like planning, reaching to consensus is completely Utopian and unrealistic. There are always winners and losers and it can hardly be imagined all participants behave neutrally and impartially and relinquish their own interests and political positions forever.

#### ( ) Alt won’t boost democracy – not everyone can participate and stakeholders will jack democratic ethic.

Mohammadi ‘10

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – Page 27

Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) criticized other aspects of the communicative planning theory in practice. They question, above all, some assumptions of the theory. They believe: "The assumption that all stakeholders within the communicative discourse arena are striving for enhanced democracy for communities is a value judgment and one that does not hold water; the stakeholders present within the arena of discourse will possess different aims and values and professional agendas There is also difficulty in questioning how far values are held in common, and what assumptions can be made about this. The ethic assumes that all those who present themselves into the discourse arena would share the same desire to make sense together. This assumption does not relate to the nature of the human psyche: why should consensus among all those attending be regarded as a positive attribute when clearly different agendas and different objectives form the very essence of the planning argumentation process?" Citing a sentence from John Forester (1989) "making sense together while living differently"; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger stated "It does not suggest that the purpose of communicative planning is to ensure that everyone agrees, or that everyone will accept a shared understanding of multifarious position on the same contentious issue". Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger added communicative rationality assumes that all sections of the community *can* participate in the process of collaborative planning discourse, however, this theory has not enough answers to the questions like how should this be achieved? How the stakeholders can be identified and by whom?

### Alt defense – too utopian, can’t tackle real power

#### ( ) The Alt will fail – it falsely wishes away power and inflates its solvency.

Mohammadi ‘10

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – p. 30-31

The critics of communicative planning disagree with the above argument, as Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) wrote; "The distribution of power between individual stakeholders is recognized, but communicative rationalists suggest that, by building up trust and confidence across these fissures in interpersonal relations, new relations of collaboration and trust ... [will] shift power bases (Healey, 1997, page 263). To say that this is optimistic would be an understatement. The theorists are advocating a redesigning of institutions to foster collaborative social learning processes; they are arguing for the replacement of existing power structures with inclusionary argumentative governance, and this is the weakness of the theory. The planning theorists, even Habernias himself, argue for communicative rationality to foster an alternative to existing power structures. By simply changing the institutional framework of governance, it is argued that a more open discursive style of governance can develop. This, however, displays little regard for individual perception and motivation. It tackles only the institutional aspect of power structures, and denies the existence of power inherent within the individual.'"

#### ( ) Alt alone won’t solve – consensus alone is too weak. Perm is a better option.

Mohammadi ‘10

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – p. 31

Susan Fainsicin (2000) in a viewpoint similar to the views of Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger criticizes Healey's statement that "people have not constant and unchangeable interests, so it is possible to reach mutual interests with consensus and negotiation." Fainstein believes that the problem of 'different perceptions of interest" can not be solved 'only’ within discussion and view exchanges. Essential changes in 'different perceptions of interest' require restructuration which, in turn, follows usually a crisis or a social movement It is beyond negotiation and consensus among interest groups and stakeholders. Fainstein continued; "Marx and Engels (1947), in their critique of the Hegelians, asserted that the world was changed through struggle, not the force of ideas. They did not mean, as they are often misinterpreted, that economic structures automatically determine outcomes and that human agency is helpless to affect them. But they did mean that words will not prevail if unsupported by a social force carrying with it a treat of disruption. To put this in another way “the power of words depends on the power of speakers." Bent Flyvbjerg is one of the main critics of communicative planning theory, especially in the scope of relations between planning and power. In 'rationality and power\* (1993). Flyvbjerg discussed the relations between power and rationality—emphasizing on communicative planning. In this book. Flyvbjerg examined the planning project of redesigning Aalborg's' central area. Aalborg's central area plan was provided based on the best rational principles and methods and enjoyed wide citizen participation. But during the process of approval and execution, most of the plan's rational aspects were weakened and the plan's best ideas and intentions were distorted and maimed (Yiftachel. 2001). Flyvbjerg (1998) concluded that rationality is under influence of power and even determined by power, and not by enlightenment ideals of reasons, democracy, and public utility. Flyvbjerg added when we understand the power, we find out that we can not count on 'rationality-based democracy' alone to solve our problems. Based on Flyvbjerg's argument, Yiftachel (2001) stated that: "if, as Flyvbjerg shows, 'rationality is determined by power', and if Nietzche's 'will to power' and Foucault's 'rationality' as rationalization' are core behavioural principles of many planners and decision-makers, then we may need to reconceptualize (that is, retheorize) planning as a "double-edged sword'." However, in a moderate statement, he added: "one can still appreciate and advocate the power of rationality', democracy, education, science, state neutrality', professionalism and planning, but conduct a probing examination of the impact and consequences of the institutions which bear these ideals as their public trademark."

#### ( ) Communicative planning alt fails – won’t tackle power.

Flyvbjerg ‘2

(et al, Bent Flyvbjerg is founding chair of the Geography Program at Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning – In Philip Allmendinger and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, eds., Planning Futures: New Directions for

Planning Theory. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, pp. 44-62. Also available at: http://flyvbjerg.plan.aau.dk/DarkSide2.pdf)

The position we are attempting to establish is that communicative planning theory fails to capture the role of power in planning. As a result, it is a theory which is weak in its capacity to help us understand what happens in the real world; and weak in serving as a basis for effective action and change. Because of these weaknesses, we believe that this approach to theory building is highly problematic for planning.

#### ( ) Communicative rationality Alt too utopian – no version can succeed.

Flyvbjerg ‘2

(et al, Bent Flyvbjerg is founding chair of the Geography Program at Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning – In Philip Allmendinger and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, eds., Planning Futures: New Directions for

Planning Theory. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, pp. 44-62. Also available at: http://flyvbjerg.plan.aau.dk/DarkSide2.pdf)

Habermas’s definitions of discourse ethics and communicative rationality, and their procedural requirements (Habermas 1979, 1983, 1985, 1990) are based on a procedural as opposed to substantive rationality: ‘Discourse ethics ... establishes a procedure based on presuppositions and designed to guarantee the impartiality of the process of judging’ (Habermas 1990, 122). Habermas is a universalistic, ‘top-down’ moralist as concerns process: the rules for correct process are normatively given in advance, in the form of the requirements for the ideal speech situation. Conversely, as regards content, Habermas is a ‘bottom-up’ situationalist: what is right and true in a given communicative process is determined solely by the participants in that process. Habermas operates within a perspective of law and sovereignty which contrasts with that of Foucault (1980a, 87-8) who finds this conception of power ‘by no means adequate.’ Foucault (1980a, 82,90) says about his own ‘analytics of power’ that it ‘can be constituted only if it frees itself completely from [this] representation of power that I would term...‘juridico-discursive’...a certain image of power-law, of power-sovereignty.’ It is in this connection that Foucault (1980a, 89) made his famous argument to ‘cut off the head of the king’ in political analysis and replace it by a decentred understanding of power. For Habermas the head of the king is still very much on, in the sense that sovereignty is a prerequisite for the regulation of power by law. The basic weakness of Habermas’s project is its lack of agreement between ideal and reality, between intentions and their implementation, and is rooted in an insufficient conception of power. Habermas himself observes that discourse cannot by itself insure that the conditions for discourse ethics and democracy are met. But discourse about discourse ethics is all Habermas has to offer. This is the fundamental political dilemma in Habermas’s thinking: he describes to us the utopia of communicative rationality but not how to get there. Habermas (1990, 209) himself mentions lack of ‘crucial institutions,’ lack of ‘crucial socialisation’ and ‘poverty, abuse, and degradation’ as barriers to discursive decision making. But he has little to say about the relations of power that create these barriers and how power may be changed in order to begin the kinds of institutional and educational change, improvements in welfare, and enforcement of basic human rights that could help lower the barriers. In short, Habermas lacks the kind of concrete understanding of relations of power that is needed for political change. Habermas (1987, 322) tells us he is aware that his theory of communicative action opens him to criticism as an idealist: ‘It is not so simple to counter the suspicion that with the concept of action oriented to validity claims, the idealism of a pure, nonsituated reason slips in again.’ We would argue further that not only is it difficult to counter this suspicion, it is impossible. And this impossibility constitutes a fundamental problem in Habermas’s work.

### Alt defense – delay

#### ( ) Alt causes delay and can’t overcome power. That causes burnout, turning the whole communicative method.

Mohammadi ‘10
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Theories do not always appear in practice as theorists expect. That is the case especially in sciences which are more related to the human being—of course, planning is one of them. In other words, some components of a theory will be seriously challenged in practice and the created insufficiencies welcome the critics. There are some practical insufficiencies in communicative planning theory and the opponents of the theory are sometimes disable facing with some of the problems, shortages and insufficiencies, despite of their answering to many of the questions and ambiguities. It is clear that based on essence of communicative planning, to which citizens and stakeholders involvement is central, the process is not easy to realize. The difficulties of the process include many of issues and subjects, but I will focus on the important ones. 'The gap between theory' and action is one of these problems. Fainstein (2000) referring to this problem stated that the participants in planning process have no 'real power' and if they have real power, however, agreement by participants to a document does not necessarily mean that anything will happen. To support her claims, she relied on providing and executing of two plans in South Africa1" and stated that according to her studies, both of these plans have been failed. Regarding the above critique, an important point should be mentioned that the opponents of communicative planning theory especially John Forester (2001) have frequently warned that success or failure of one or more plans in a certain time and place should not be easily generalized to the whole theory, rather it should be mentioned that, this method because of some reasons, has been successful or failed in a certain time and place. This point will be discussed more in following pages. Moreover, Fainstein's claim referring to "the participants in planning process have no real power', may not allow us to deny the theory, but leads us to improve the participatory methods, and to give 'real power\* to the participants in planning process. Fainstein believes "agreement by participants to a document does not necessarily mean that anything will happen". This refers not only to the need for improvement and reform of methods and institutions, but also to the "power structure' which will be discussed separately in the following section.\_ Fainstein (2000) relying to the provided plans in South Africa, criticized the communicative planning theory in practice. She stated that another practical problem of communicative planning is "the lengthy time required for such participatory processes, leading to burnout among citizen participants and disillusion as nothing ever seems to get accomplished. Cynical South Africans referred to the various policy forums as "talking shops'." Although communicative planning is a time-consuming process, it should be paid appropriate attention in two points: first, by passing time, and by practicing participatory method, the needed time would be decreased. The second point is that although the participatory process is time-consuming, but if this process leads to easier acceptation and execution of the plan by citizens who have benefits there, and do not obstruct for the plans' execution, the needed time to the whole process of planning can be somewhat decreased. It is also the case when the number of frequent revisions decreased due to drawing citizens' agreement—however, it should be acknowledged that the needed time for the participatory process is more than non-participatory one.

#### ( ) Alt won’t solve social justice and will increase delay – history proves.
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The other critique refers to the framing alternatives and the quality of participants. Fainstein (2000) expressed during communicative planning, sometimes, the planners have no direct intervention to present alternatives and only facilitate the process. They would intervene when they have been asked. In these cases—South Africa—only in neighborhoods in which middle-class professionals live, they have reached creative solutions. She wrote that "another issue arises from the difficulties involved in framing alternatives when planners desist from agenda setting. Thus, for example, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the city established a neighborhood planning process whereby residents formulated five-year plans for their neighborhoods and were allocated fairly substantial sums of money to spend. Planners assigned to facilitate the process were committed to a nondireciive role and therefore only proposed actions when asked. The result was that some neighborhoods reached active solutions, especially when participants were middle-class professionals, but others floundered in attempting to rank priorities and to come up with specific projects, sometimes taking as many as three years to determine a vague and hard-to-implement plan "

### Alt defense – won’t solve democracy

#### ( ) Alt won’t solve democracy or public participation
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Democratic behavior of planners is another issue of critique in the domain of communicative planning model. Allmendinger (1996) and Tewdwr-Jones (1996) claimed that recent researches in some of the countries showed the planners have no obligation to act democratically. Even in a country like Great Britain, planners doubt in 'social justice', and do not believe that planners are responsible for such an issue. And more interesting, some planners have little tendency to involve citizens in planning process, because it decreases potentially planners' professional independence and treats their professional judgment. Planners can participate, they can even promote mutual understandings in discourses, but simultaneously, they are not ready to abandon completely their beliefs and professional values and change their values on the benefit of other stakeholders and interest groups. Moreover, participants in this process have primary knowledge and expectations from both process and outcome. Communicative planning is not able to guarantee that the primary knowledge of the participants can completely be reformed, replaced, or abandoned on the benefit of more appropriate viewpoints.

### Alt defense – won’t spillover

#### ( ) No spillover – even if they resolve one issue, it won’t spill to the whole planning process.
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John Forester (1996) and Patsy Healey (1997) claimed that to proceed a communicative planning process only a minimum degree of commitment, trust, and confidence is required On the other hand, Twedwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) believe that consensus can be successful among stakeholders but only on a particular strategy', particular issue, and in a particular day. It does not mean that the same stakeholders and interest groups can reach consensus on the other strategy or issue in the future. Moreover, it is not realistic to expect that the individual who posses a divergent opinion from the consensus, after discourse, would easily abandon his or her opinion on the benefit of the consensus building and does not lobby by other means to achieve desired outcomes.

#### ( ) Alt doesn’t trickle-up – planners don’t listen to communicative theorists.

Willson ‘1

(Richard Willson is a professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Transportation 28: 1–31, 2001 – http://www.uvm.edu/~transctr/pdf/willson\_article.pdf)

To properly explore these questions, the transportation field needs an intense dialogue about planning processes and a willingness to look at how transportation planning really works. This effort has been hampered by the fact that transportation planners and planning theorists generally ignore one another. Communicative rationality has not been reviewed in transportation journals; planning theory research seldom links to transportation planning. Furthermore, theory articles are often presented in language that is difficult to understand and disconnected from practice. In taking up these questions, therefore, I am seeking to foster a conversation between transportation planners and planning theorists, one that will improve the quality of transportation planning and add rigor to planning theory.

### Alt defense – public won’t participate

#### ( ) Communicative rationality won’t solve in the context of transportation policy – people won’t participate

Svensson ‘8

(Dr. Jakob Svensson, Department of Communication Studies, Lund University, 25108 Helsingborg, Sweden – Communication, Culture & CritiqueVolume 1, Issue 2, Article first published online: 29 JUL 2008 – available via Wiley database)

The old conflict between instrumental and communicative rationality is thus embodied under these new circumstances. As I have discussed elsewhere (see Svensson, 2008), the Municipality of Helsingborg sought to avoid a more instrumental rational discourse of calculating and self-interested citizens in favor of a deliberative discourse based in Habermas’ (1996) notion of communicative rationality. In this article, I focus on citizens’ motivations for participating in the activities organized by the Civic Committees. And the issue of motivation exposes some problems with communicative rationality. My conclusion is that addressing the citizenry as communicative will not solve the problem of civic disinterest toward traditional politics. Neither the communicative nor the instrumental account of rationality fully grasp why citizens participate or not. Communicative rationality fails to address the increasing problem of civic apathy toward representative democracy, whereas instrumental rationality does not provide a sufficient understanding of new forms of political participation that are emerging in late modernity. Therefore, I argue that we need a new analytical tool for understanding citizens’ motivations for participating in municipal communicative spaces, expressive rationality—an analytical tool that is able to address both emergent late modern political practices as well as civic withdrawal from the parliamentary arena. I begin this article by briefly presenting the Civic Committees, their practices, and my studies of those. I then continue to further outline the perceived crisis of representative democracy in late modernity. In order to explain the current rise of deliberative participatory practices within representative democracy, I will contrast instrumental with communicative accounts of rationality. After having addressed the issue of motivation, I will end the article by introducing expressive rationality. Civic committees The Municipal Council in Helsingborg decided in 2002 to renew its municipal organization with five Civic Committees, covering different parts of the municipality, beginning in 2003. This comes due to the fact that certain municipal officials, especially being inspired by local municipal participatory projects and ideas of deliberation and social capital, allied themselves with the dominant Social Democratic Party and managed to gain a majority in the Municipal Council. The Civic Committees in Helsingborg were an initiative to improve and transform representative democracy by recognizing the value of conversation, stimulating civic participation between elections and promoting a comprehensive view on issues within the municipality (The Strategy Document, 2003). A Civic Committee consisted of 14 politicians. These politicians also had commissions in Branch Committees.1 The Civic Committees should especially look into issues of ethnic integration, collect the inhabitants’ viewpoints, and produce local development programs. Their main task was to cover different geographic areas and supply knowledge to the Branch Committees. The Branch Committees, covering different sectors,2 were established by the Municipal Council and should prepare decisions before the council assembled. The Civic Committees’ task was to provide useful data to the Branch Committees so they could make better decisions, considering citizens’ needs and experiences more effectively. In order to support the Civic Committees, the Municipal Council had set up an office, The Department for Sustainable Development, responsible for developing the committees’ practices. Each committee has one handling officer tied to it as well as a coordinator from the department. The Civic Committees organized different kinds of activities out in the neighborhoods. Their practices changed and developed constantly as they gained experience from early messy meetings. Neighborhood walks,3 workshops for the future, and meetings with specific interest organizations (Islamic groups, youth centers, neighborhood associations, etc.) are examples of activities that were organized. Public meetings, open for inhabitants in geographically defined neighborhoods, were the most common activity during the period I followed the committees. The alleged purpose of these meetings was to create a constructive and respectful dialogue between politicians and inhabitants (The Strategy Document, 2003). Problematic issues and concerns for the future development of the neighborhood were to be defined and discussed. These conversations together with a statistical survey, sent out in the neighborhood, formed the basis of a local development program. The Civic Committee always returned to the neighborhood in order to present and discuss how the municipality worked with the issues and concerns that had been put on the agenda. The inhabitants were also encouraged to actively participate both independently and together with different municipal organizations. Invitations to public meetings and activities were both posted as ads in the newspaper and as posters in the actual neighborhood where the meeting would take place. Invitations were also sent out by mail, often together with other information brochures from the municipality. When the committee beforehand knew that a specific issue would be discussed, they would invite experts to the meetings, often municipal officials, such as the city architect, if new buildings were planned in the neighborhood (for a more detailed discussion on the Civic Committees’ organization and practices, see Svensson, 2008). This article comes out of a larger research project in which I have studied the Civic Committees since February 2004. The main part of the empirical data gathering took place during 2005 when I especially followed two committees in different parts of Helsingborg.4 My studies are ethnographic in character, partly because the research project is sponsored by the municipality5 and partly because I had no background in municipal or organizational research.6 Like early anthropologists arriving at unknown and exotic islands, I found myself in the municipal corridors asking myself the fundamental question what was going on and why. In this way, the research is both empirically driven and theoretically inspired. Citizenship and identity became focal points early on, especially the discursive construction of citizenship in the Civic Committees’ communicative practices. I argue from an empirical base of 81 different activities observed7 and 24 in-depth interviews8 with politicians (5), municipal officials (10), and inhabitants participating in the activities organized by the Civic Committees (9). I have also studied 212 documents connected to the committees’ practices. In this article, my aim is to understand citizens’ motivations for participating in the activities organized in Helsingborg. For doing this, I draw especially on interviews with inhabitants and on observations of the committees’ activities in the different neighborhoods of the municipality. Documents concerning the Civic Committees’ advertising have also been illuminating. Revitalizing representative democracy Why were the Civic Committees established in the first place? Western society is currently witnessing a civic withdrawal away from formal politics, away from larger collective identities, and community sensibilities (Boggs, 2000; Tho¨rn, 2002). In Sweden, electoral participation has diminished from over 90% in 1976 to 80% in the latest national elections 2006. When it comes to faith in politicians and confidence in political parties, the citizens are becoming increasingly skeptical (Olsson, 2006; Peterson et al., 1989). This decreasing participation in elections and membership dropout in political parties have launched a debate about a growing civic apathy toward traditional politics. At the same time political activities outside the Parliament are increasing, such as signing petitions, protesting, and creating new communities and associations (Beck, 1995; Bennett & Entman, 2001; Dahlgren, 2001; Peterson et al., 1989). Giddens (1991) explains this transition by underlining processes of reflexivity and individualization in late modernity. The collective and traditional comes second when politics becomes a part of the individual identity formation project (ibid). It is not my intention to discuss this process in great detail here. But it is crucial for my purposes to stress the increasing prominence of identity and individualization in this transition toward nonparliamentary forms of civic participation (see Bauman, 2001; Beck, 1995; Bennett & Entman, 2001; Dahlgren, 2001; Giddens, 1991). This civic retreat from formal politics is often discussed as a legitimacy crisis for representative democracy. This crisis concerns politicians (Government bill, 2001), administrators (The Swedish State Official Report Series [SOU], 2000), and academics (Carter & Stokes, 1998). The struggle to get more citizens engaged in traditional politics has thus begun (van Gunsteren, 1998). Different forums where inhabitants are expected to engage civically in politics are created. Deliberative ideals of free and unrestrained discussion have often underpinned the creation of these forums. Deliberative democracy contributes above all to a theory of legitimate collective decision making (Cohen, 1989). In order for a decision to be legitimate, it has to be discussed among all those who will be affected by the decision (Elster, 1998). These discussions should be free from coercion, deception, strategizing, and manipulation. Individual and collective positions are subject to change in deliberations because selfinterests should be put aside and people should be willing to be convinced by the better argument (Jodal, 2003). Persuasion through reason is a central feature of deliberative democracy (Forst, 2001). When applied within a representative democratic setting, deliberation tends to be equated to open and free dialogue between equals. We are currently witnessing a deliberative turn within parliamentary institutions. For example, The deliberative democracy handbook discusses a number of deliberative experiments from mainly the United States (Gastil & Levine, 2005a). Deliberative participatory projects have also been conducted in such diverse parts of the world as China9 (He & Leib, 2006), Australia10 (Niemeyer, 2004), Brazil11 (Vera-Zavala, 2003), and Turkey12 (Kanra, 2004). Deliberative democratic ideas, underlining civic discussion and dialogue, have also reached Sweden. The democracy report (SOU, 2000, p. 23) and the following Government bill (2001, p. 27) recommend a ‘‘participatory democracy with deliberative qualities.’’13 The Swedish Government wanted to attend to problems of civic apathy toward traditional parliamentary politics (Government bill, 2001). Therefore, new organizational models have emerged during the past few years within public administration—organizational models that should better consider citizens’ needs and experiences (Government letter, 2003; SOU, 2000, 2001). Examples include local referendums, civic offices, civic panels, and citizen proposals (ibid). The purpose of these models is to ensure a developed civic dialogue, which is supposed to both improve municipal administration and increase civic participation within the municipal setting (Benson Consulting, 2006; Government bill, 2001; SOU, 2000, 2001). Deliberation and dialogue is thus presented as a solution to a range of different problems that the state and municipalities are dealing with (see the Government Bill, 2001; SOU, 2000). Dialogue is emphasized both as the means to reorient the citizens back to the representative institutions and as an end in itself (SOU, 2000; The Strategy Document, 2003). The focus on conversation both as a means and as an end in official documents is inspired by deliberative democracy. In Helsingborg, it was within the Civic Committees that this dialogue was intended to be produced.14 When I observed and interviewed municipal officials and politicians in Helsingborg, getting participants to talk was of prime importance to them. One example I am going to use throughout this article is a meeting in an upper middle–class neighborhood the Civic Committee had worked with for a couple of months. From earlier activities in the neighborhood, the committee knew beforehand that the school in the local park was going to be a main topic. This was because there was a conflict between the old people living in the park, annoyed by the traffic the school attracted, and the parents concerned about their children’s safety going back and forth to school. Other issues that had been put on the agenda prior to this meeting were public transport, traffic, the possibility of a small neighborhood center with a convenience store, and the refuse collection, which some inhabitants said was random and that the garbage truck did not take considerable caution given the high amount of children in the neighborhood. The Civic Committee organized the activity so that participants should engage in discussions with each other. Smaller roundtables were placed around the premises,15 and municipal officials and politicians working particularly with the issues on the agenda16 were stationed at different tables. The activity attracted approximately 70 inhabitants. Discussions and arguments were taking place, for example, about the traffic in front of the local school. These animated debates pleased the committees’ officials and politicians so much that afterward, in other municipal context, they underlined how many involved citizens had taken part in the activity and how ‘‘good’’ the dialogue had been.

### Alt overemphasizes process

#### ( ) Alt over-emphasizes process at the expense of outcomes. Case is a huge disad.
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Focusing on the process instead of outcomes has also been challenged by Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger. They stated that the theory of communicative planning and rationality emphasizes on the process instead of the outcomes. They believe that participation of citizens, stakeholders and interest groups in planning process is acceptable and reasonable, but it is unacceptable to focus only on the planning process as the final aim without reaching the outcomes. The participants would like to be aware of final decisions and outcomes, otherwise we will have only talking shops. They relied on the experience from South Africa and added the studies in South Africa show that the organizers of communicative planning have been faced several problems because of strong emphasis on the process and lack of attention to the outcomes and practical processes (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger, 1998). Although the communicative planning theorists do not discuss only the planning process, and the outcome of the planning has also been discussed by them, however, like Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger I believe that the opponents of the communicative planning have not paid enough and sufficient attention—at least until the present—to the planning outcomes.

### A-to “perm do the alt = severs”

#### First – perms have no T burdens. If they did, the Aff would always lose on extra-T because every perm acts beyond the topic.

#### ( ) “Resolved” doesn’t sever certainty

Merriam Webster ‘9

(http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolved)

# Main Entry: 1re•solve # Pronunciation: \ri-ˈzälv, -ˈzȯlv also -ˈzäv or -ˈzȯv\ # Function: verb # Inflected Form(s): re•solved; re•solv•ing 1 : to become separated into component parts; also : to become reduced by dissolving or analysis 2 : to form a resolution : determine 3 : consult, deliberate

#### ( ) “Should” doesn’t mean rigid certainty

Encarta ‘5

Encarta World English Dictionary 2005 (http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861735294)

Should: expressing conditions or consequences: used to express the conditionality of an occurrence and suggest it is not a given, or to indicate the consequence of something that might happen ( used in conditional clauses )