

The following short essay is clipped from Paul Davidoff's article entitled "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." Please read it and answer the following questions in Chinese. (I would also like to remind you to take a note of the footnotes.)

1. Please describe the different opinions between Davidoff and Harris, Dahl & Lindblom. (20%)
2. Does Davidoff believe that planners can be value neutral when they make their plans? Do you agree with his argument? Why? (Can you relate your answers to the research of epistemology?) (50%)
3. Why Davidoff would like to use the word of "inclusion" to substitute for "exclusion"? Can you explain it? (20%)
4. Do you have any critiques to this article? (10%)

The prospect for future planning is that of a practice which openly invites political and social values to be examined and debated. Acceptance of this position means rejection of prescriptions for planning which would have the planner act solely as a technician. It has been argued that technical studies to enlarge the information available to decision-makers must take precedence over statements of goals and ideals:

We have suggested that, at least in part, the city planner is better advised to start from research into the functional aspects of cities than from his own estimation of the values which he is attempting to maximize. This suggestion springs from a conviction that at this juncture the implications of many planning decisions are poorly understood, and that no certain means are at hand by which values can be measured, ranked, and translated into the design of a metropolitan system.¹

While acknowledging the need for humility and openness in the adoption of social goals, this statement amounts to an attempt to eliminate, or sharply reduce, the unique contribution planning can make: understanding the functional aspects of the city and recommending appropriate future action to improve the urban condition.

Another argument that attempts to reduce the importance of attitudes and values in planning and other policy sciences is that the major public questions are themselves matters of choices between technical methods of solution. Dahl and Lindblom put forth this position at the beginning of their important textbook, *Politics, Economics, and Welfare*.²

In economic organization and reform, the "great issues" are no longer the great issues, if they ever were. It has become increasingly difficult for thoughtful men to find meaningful alternatives posed in the traditional choices between socialism and capitalism, planning and the free market, regulation and laissez faire, for they find their actual choices neither so simple nor so grand. Not so simple, because economic organization poses knotty problems that can only be solved by painstaking attention to technical details-how else, for example, can inflation be controlled? Nor so grand, because, at least in the Western world, most people neither can nor wish to experiment with the whole pattern of socio-economic organization to attain goals more easily won. If for example, taxation will serve the purpose, why "abolish the wages system" to ameliorate income inequality?

These words were written in the early 1950s and express the spirit of that decade more than that of the 1960s. They suggest that the major battles have been fought. But the "great issues" in economic organization, those revolving around the central issue of the nature of distributive justice, have yet to be settled. The world is still in turmoil over the way in which the resources of nations are to be distributed. The justice of the present social allocation of wealth, knowledge, skill, and other social goods is clearly in debate. Solutions to questions about the share of wealth and other social commodities that should go to different classes cannot be technically derived; they must arise from social attitudes.

Appropriate planning action cannot be prescribed from a position of value neutrality, for prescriptions are based on desired objectives. One conclusion drawn from this assertion is that "values are inescapable elements of any rational decision-making process"³ and that values held by the planner should be made clear. The implications of that conclusion for planning have been described elsewhere and will not be considered in this article.⁴ Here I will say that the planner should do more than explicate the values underlying his prescriptions for courses of action; he should affirm them; he should be an advocate for what he deems proper.

Determinations of what serves the public interest, in a society containing many diverse interest groups, are almost always of a highly contentious nature. In performing its role of prescribing courses of action leading to future desired states, the planning profession must engage itself thoroughly and openly in the contention surrounding political determination. Moreover, planners should be able to engage in the political process as advocates of the interests both of government and of such

other groups, organizations, or individuals who are concerned with proposing policies for the future development of the community.

The recommendation that city planners represent and plead the plans of many interest groups is founded upon the need to establish an effective urban democracy, one in which citizens may be able to play an active role in the process of deciding public policy. Appropriate policy in a democracy is determined through a process of political debate. The right course of action is always a matter of choice, never of fact. In a bureaucratic age great care must be taken that choices remain in the area of public view and participation.

Urban politics, in an era of increasing government activity in planning and welfare, must balance the demands for ever-increasing central bureaucratic control against the demands for increased concern for the unique requirements of local, specialized interests. The welfare of all and the welfare of minorities are both deserving of support; planning must be so structured and so practiced as to account for this unavoidable bifurcation of the public interest...

If the planning process is to encourage democratic urban government then it must operate so as to include rather than exclude citizens from participating in the process. "Inclusion" means not only permitting the citizen to be heard. It also means that he be able to become well informed about the underlying reasons for planning proposals, and be able to respond to them in the technical language of professional planners.

Footnotes:

1. Britton Harris, "Plan or projection", *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol. XXVI (November 1960), pp. 265-72.
2. Robert Dahl and Charles Lindblom, *Politics, Economics, and Welfare*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953, p. 3.
3. Paul Davidoff and Thomas Reiner, "A choice theory of planing", *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol. XXVIII (May 1962), pp. 103-15.
4. *Ibid.*

考試科目	不動地權理論	系組	所別	地政	考試時間	6月27日上午 星期二
------	--------	----	----	----	------	----------------

- 一、試從「獨占競爭」與「新古典經濟」論「都市地價理論」的差異性。(25分)
- 二、「土地增值稅課徵」與「土地使用變更課徵」理論基礎為何？並論對土地利用影響效果？(25分)
- 三、試論「照價收買」與「土地儲備」差異，兩者在政策上應如何建構？(25分)
- 四、公告地價與公告現值是否應該合而為一，又和市價之間關聯為何？試論述之。(25分)

考試科目	土地經濟分析	系組	所別	地政系	考試時間	月	日	上午	下午
						星期		下	

- 一、 我國即將加入 WTO，試分析加入 WTO 以後對台灣地區農地價格之影響。 (25分)
- 二、 請分析新政府三三三政策中有關首次購屋貸款利息補貼之政策對不動產市場及整體經濟之影響。 (25分)
- 三、 最近各項重大開發案件，當地政府及居民均要求回饋，請問您對此事件之看法，並分析回饋對當地居民、消費者、開發者以及整體經濟之影響。 (25分)
- 四、 九二一大地震後，有人認為政府應概括承受損失，您認為新政府對地震毀損之住宅應採取何種策略，可使受災戶及整體經濟之衝擊達到最小。 (25分)