

PUBLIC PLANNING AND TERRITORIAL DYNAMICS

Rodrigo Luppi dos Passos (PMSA)
Sidney Jard da Silva (UFABC)

ABSTRACT

Many scholars and managers consider public planning a key factor for the effectiveness of governments. A number of planning theories states that it might be limited to technicians, who would develop it according to scientific methods, without the influence of society. The present paper aims to understand and demonstrate the role that territorial dynamics, conflicts, and institutions plays with public planning. Therefore, this article is an analysis of in what manners planning theories were influenced by the trinomial equation "territorial dynamics, conflicts, and institutions", and how these theories approach it in their ideas. In order to observe these relationships in practice, it is described the manner how a practice of public planning, specifically the public planning of cities in Brazil during the 1990s, was based on the Global City theory and directly influenced by the territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions, thus establishing a coalition among government, real estate market, and financial sector for the production and acquisition of a new economic and spatial pattern that favored the interests of these sectors, but put the interests of other social groups aside. It was concluded that public planning is not a specific activity, but a process not to be analyzed, formulated or implemented without considering the role that territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions plays with it.

Keywords: *Public Planning, Territorial Dynamics, Conflicts, Institutions*

INTRODUCTION

This article aims to analyze in what manners territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions relate and affect public planning, which can also be called government planning. More specifically, this paper intends to demonstrate how conflicts that emerge from the territorial dynamics reverberate for the institutions and the public planning.

In order to assess this influence, it is analyzed the history of planning theories and, finally, made an analysis of how territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions were related to strategic planning practices of Brazilian cities throughout the 1990s.

The concept of territorial dynamics stems from the viewpoint that considers a territory not as a static configuration, but a complex and dynamic reality. Thus, territorial dynamics are the physical, cultural, social, and economical dynamics of a particular and local context (GEHNLEN and RIELLA, 2004).

The concept of territorial dynamics is herein used in order to address urban planning practices in Brazil. However, when conceptualizing the formation of the State and the planning theories because they are not referenced analysis in a territory, we separate the concept of territorial dynamics and discuss social and economical dynamics, especially.

The concept of conflicts can be understood as disputes involving social groups which arise when a social group has ownership relations and practices, usage and significance of the available resources in territories that reach other groups, threatening their reproduction strategies in that territory (ACSELRAD, 2004).

In turn, the concept of institution herein used is seen as broad, ranging from the formal structures and power rules, which manage individual action and coordinate collective choices, to the informal rules, such as routines, customs, symbols and cultures, also manage individual actions, and coordinate collective choices. The institution is therefore a structuring political actor who acts in different ways in society (HALL and TAYLOR, 1996).

The concept of institution herein used is broad and ranges from formal power structures and rules, which manage individual action and coordinate collective choices, to informal rules such as routines, habits, symbols and cultures, which also manage individual actions and coordinate collective choices. The institution is therefore a structuring political player who acts in different ways in society (HALL and TAYLOR, 1996).

Although we understand the concept of institution is wide, our focus is the state institution, since it takes a direct relation with the planning theories. The historical institutionalism is an important factor for the article because it is based mainly on the analysis of historical facts as a factor of influence in the institutions. In addition, historical institutionalism recognizes that institutions work as a way of regulating conflicts inherent to the development of the different interests and power asymmetry (THÉRET, 2003), that is, it understands institutions as a phenomenon directly related to the conflicts that emerge from territorial dynamics, which is the focus when performing public planning.

The relationship of territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions is a basis for analyzing public planning, which is a factor that many academics and managers deal as essential to the effectiveness or otherwise of government policies. This importance lies in the fact that plans organize the actions of governments and "refer to decisions on the routes to be followed by action and measures necessary to adoption it, to follow the implementation, to control, to evaluate and to redefine action "(OLIVEIRA, 2006, p. 13)1.

Due to the importance of the planning process for the effectiveness of government policies, as well as the need for a comprehensive analysis, this article strives for understanding and demonstrating that territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions are intrinsically related to the planning theory, and in what manner they influenced urban planning practices in Brazil.

The article is divided into three parts: the first part defines what is planning; the second one is a historical analysis of planning theories, and finally, it addresses strategic planning practices of Brazilian cities throughout the 1990s.

CONCEPT OF PLANNING

Definitions of planning relate with future, decision, rationality, and strategy. In Mitzberg (2000) it is found some of them: to plan means to think about the future; to control the future. Planning means decision-making; is a formal procedure to produce an articulated result in the form of an integrated decision system.

The reference of concept that "to plan means to think about the future" lies in Bolan and Sawyer. Nevertheless, Newman and Mitzberg question this definition for its simplicity, since almost every work is performed towards the future, even when informally and minutes before it is done (MITZBERG, 2000).

In turn, the concept that "to plan is to control the future" is based on Ackoff (1970) and Ozbekhan (1969). The central idea is not just to think about the future, but act on it, make it happen, as stated in Oliveira: "The idea of has arisen in order to try to somehow control the future with plans we call documents" (OLIVEIRA, 2006, p. 282). Another concept states that "planning means decision-making" (NUTT, 1992); and to decide, choose and select alternatives synthesizes the ideas presented in this concept. However, Mitzberg believes that the whole decision-making process linked to an action is directed to the future, which makes the nuances of this concept of little use in order to explain what planning is (MITZBERG, 2000).

A more complex concept about planning, related especially to organizations, is that "planning is a formal procedure to produce an articulated result in the form of an integrated decision system". The theoretical framework of this concept is in Mitzberg, to whom featuring planning is a "formalization and systematization of the phenomenon which the plan is intended to be implemented" (MITZBERG, 2000, p. 26).

The concept of systematization proposed by Mitzberg is different from the other concepts, especially if we analyze public planning specifically, since public administration may follow formal and legal processes. John Friedmann converges with the latter concept when he states that planning presupposes a scientific method. For him, planning is the "idea that science-based knowledge about society can indeed be applied to improve it" (FRIEDMANN, 2006, p. 58) 2.

The concept of planning as a strategy was recognized until the mid-twentieth century only because of its military purposes. From then on, however, the term was increasingly used in the private sector, whose milestone was in 1946, when Ford Company hired veterans of World War II who worked on the statistical control of the Air Force of the United States (US). The term involves the adjustment related to long-term problems methods (NOVAIS, 2010).

1 By highlighting the impact of planning on society, Milton Santos believes that "the list of causes of underdevelopment and poverty in the Third World may not be complete before they give due emphasis to the importance of the role of planning" (SANTOS 2006, p. 37).

2 Weber, in turn, brings the bias of rationality, in which planning is "a systematic and rational method to conduct of life, in order to overcome the natural status, release all men from irrational instincts, and subtract them to the supremacy of the planned will" (WEBER, 2004, p. 100).

Since then, the concept of planning as a strategy has widely grown in the private sector, becoming hegemonic both in the public sector, when Robert Macnamara, former president of the Ford Company, became Secretary of Defense of the USA and applied planning concepts. Mintzberg says that strategy:

Is formulated to direct energies in a certain direction; momentum is, therefore, not only the inevitable result but the desired one. And the more clearly the strategy is articulated, the more deeply embedded it becomes, in both the habits of the organization and the minds of this people (MINTZBERG, 1994, p. 175).

More recently, planning concepts covering most of what the other concepts advocated have emerged. Matus, for example, states that:

Planning means thinking before acting; thinking systematically, methodically, explaining each of the possibilities and analyzing their respective advantages; it means proposing goals. It is to project for the future, because the actions of today have not been effective or ineffective, depending on what may happen tomorrow, and it cannot happen. Planning is a tool to think about and create the future because it contributes to a way of seeing that extends beyond the path curves and reaches the borders of virgin lands not yet trodden and conquered by men. This broad view works as support of daily decisions: feet down in the present, and eyes towards the future. Therefore, it is a vital tool. Whether we know how to plan or we condemn ourselves to improvisation (...) In short, planning is the attempt to enable the intention that men have to govern themselves and the future: to impose the power of human reason to the circumstances (MATUS, 1996, p. 12)

Del Tonni also provides a wide conception of planning:

Therefore, planning process relates to a set of theoretical principles, methodological procedures and group techniques that can be applied to any kind of social organization that requires an objective and chases a change of scenario in the future. Planning is not just decisions about the future, but it questions especially about the future of our decisions. To plan (and simulate) the future amplifies the assessment of the present by changing its conditions, which promotes a desirable and possible future. (DEL Tonni apud ENAP, 2009. p. 22)

In order to conclude our understanding of planning, Costa calls it prospects:

Planning consists of multiple perspectives, namely: a teleological perspective, that is, goal-oriented knowledge and practice oriented; its policy perspective, in the sense that the planning process refers to decision-making and the choice between alternatives (between means and ends); its holistic dimension, while the various elements of social reality should be covered by the plan; and its historical dimension, understood as the planning process. (COSTA, 2008, p. 100)

This more complete understanding of planning was developed throughout history, along with planning practices and theories. Even so, there is still no general agreement on what planning is, indeed. It is accepted as basic consensus that it is a mediation process of applying knowledge, that is, something between theory and practice.

However, as above seen, the concepts encompass much more than a consensus and, depending on the concept used, some practices can also be considered as "planning". Friedmann (1987), for instance, ignores the urban planning experiences of the nineteenth century, because, for him, they do not fit into what he considers "scientific planning".

There is a dialogue about "what is planning" with "what is planning theories", that is, how planning was designed, implemented, and in what manners it was influenced by ideological models in social context. Next section, we will analyze developed planning theories and their relations with the territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions.

PLANNING THEORIES

It is paramount to understand the dynamics, conflicts, and institutions that influenced the planning theories, because "planning is a method of producing changes in the trend course of events. When applied in society, it is influenced by guiding ideas and limited by the development conditions of this society" (THEIS and VARGAS, 2009, p. 5).

The history of ideas about planning is conveyed by the prism of several theories. It is not separated from the concept of planning and, therefore, there are disagreements about the time when planning practices began to be performed. Usually, the first half of the nineteenth century is designate as the beginning of the so-called planning theory. However, we found remnants of theories dating back from ancient Greece, although still embryonic.

Greek theorists Plato and Aristotle formulated planning theories. "Plato discusses the spatial configuration of an ideal city for social life, initiating a tradition of thinkers whose object of investigation for excellence is the city itself." (LINHARES, 2007, p. 18).

Aristotle also discusses "Polis" organization from "Policy", whose aim was to promote that the best way of life would lead men to happiness. Based on Aristotle's work, Lucas Linhares inferred that he "does anything other than planning, even without using this term" (LINHARES, 2007, p. 19).

According to Linhares, Aristotle brings scientific evidence aimed at thinking of city.

Aristotle seeks to apply his logical and analytical method to assess the components of a city, its social, economic, space reality (...) he makes spatial, urban planning to bring forward the ideal disposition of the entire social body in the city, recognizing that social processes are embedded in the spatial plan and, in addition, the city space influences the social structure (LINHARES, 2007, p. 20).

Linhares innovated when credited Aristotle and Plato the origin of the idea that scientific knowledge can indeed be applied in a plan to improve society. For other researchers, however, the beginning of planning ideas and practices were in the early nineteenth century in Europe. According to Vargas and Theis, his beginning presents three distinct sources:

the development of urban planning as a manner of trying to solve problems resulting from the growth of industrial cities, driven by the Industrial Revolution; the arising of social planning and the increasing intervention of professionals and the state in society, in the name of the promotion of the well-being of the population; and the invention of the modern economy, which solidified with the institutionalization of the market and the formulation of the classical political economy. (VARGAS and THEIS, 2009, p. 6)

In turn, John Friedmann recognizes the beginning of the planning in the nineteenth century, but says the embryo of this idea is from the eighteenth century by Jeremy Bentham, who advocated that "any valid idea had to be practical, and treated with mathematical rigidity the consequences of the action" (Friedmann, 2006, p. 69). Bentham's ideas inspired other two authors who Friedmann considers intellectual mentors of the scientific planning of the twentieth century: Sant-Simon and Comte.

For Friedmann, Sant-Simon considered planning a neutral, value-free system, "based on scientific conceptualization and empirical research, and through which he could predict what kind of institutions and processes the emerging industrial society would require" (FRIEDMANN, 1987, p. 70). In this view, Sant-Simon showed that planning was influenced by territorial dynamics, relating to the creation of institutions that the industrial society would require.

Comte was a disciple of Sant-Simon, and he argued that the society is able to change the destiny when developing conditions to predict future results of actions taken in the present. Comte believed that the development of every plan necessarily covered two aspects:

One, theoretical or spiritual, aims at developing the leading conception of the plan - that is to say, the new principle destined to coordinate social relations - and at forming the system of general ideas, fitted to guide society. The other, practical or time, decide upon the distribution of authority and the combination of administrative institutions best adapted to the spirit of the system already determined by the intellectual labors (COMTE, 1822 *apud* LENZER, 1975, p. 19).

Once again, it is emphasized the important role of institutions to the planning process, more precisely its aspect of governance, distribution/establishment of better-adapted authorities to manage emerging dynamics and conflicts. According to August Comte (COMTE, 1822 *apud* LENZER, 1975, p. 19), it is created a paradigm of scientific planning, which we may call the key idea of the planning theory beginning; the scientization to predict and control the future.

From the mid-twentieth century, there was what researchers call the explosion in planning theories and methods (FRIEDMANN, 1987) (ALLMENDINGER, 2001).

The First World War, from 1914 to 1918, also influenced the design of planning by showing "possibilities of central planning and, in a decade, the Soviet Union (USSR) had launched its first Five-Year Plan" (FRIEDMANN, 2006, p. 79).

Russia was "the first country to use planning in a more comprehensively manner. In the period of the revolution, especially between 1917 and 1930, there were not planning experiences in social level" (THEIS and VARGAS, 2009).

The USSR took the planning system to the center of the state and prioritized economic planning. It aimed to economic development, which was the "agenda" of the USSR after the Tsarist era. Nikolai Kondratiev founded in 1920 the Moscow Conjunction Institute, the first scientific foundation in the social and economic area in Soviet Russia.

The overall economic strategy was to industrialize the country so that it reached and surpassed the most developed countries as soon as possible. Since the beginning of the age of the plans in 1928, the emphasis has been in the industry (...). In one hand, Soviet planners have used centralized commands, as well as a central distribution of capital goods, strategic raw materials and other market mechanisms, prices of intermediate and final products to guide workers according to the planned objectives, to encourage or discourage the use of certain inputs, and to distribute commodities (VILLELA, 1964, p. 12).

It is paramount the role of the institution and the State as a dominant player in the Soviet planning. The territory dynamics were the cause of the conflicts that formed the Russian Revolution, and planning had as an objective to the change these dynamics. "The major debate focused on social change of alternatives: the conversion from a semi-feudal society into a socialist one could be directed and limited by market prices? Or, conversely, should be conducted by planning?" (THEIS and VARGAS, 2009).

Besides this socialist experiment, especially from the industrial segment, capitalism also made use of planning, as Theis and Vargas explain: "it has turned everyone and everything into commodities, and the industrial capitalist economy made this planning-supported reasoning basis (business, economic, and governmental) became more solid, rigid and instrumental" (THEIS and VARGAS, 2009, p. 8).

Escobar argues that planning played an important role in industrial capitalism. According to him, "Planning redefines social and economic life according to some criteria of rationality, efficiency and morality aligned with History and with the needs of capitalism and industrial society" (ESCOBAR, 2000, p. 214).

The crisis of 1929 gave rise to the Keynesian theory as an instrument of solid intervention of the State, and American New Deal was considered an economic planning tool (FRIEDMANN, 1987). At that time, the basics of business planning, or scientific management, were also strengthened by Taylorism and Fordism theory, which would subsequently inspire for some planning schools. In this context, "society and development experts groups are to unanimously accept planning experiments because they legitimate development actions" (THEIS and VARGAS, 2009).

The 1950s and 1960s witnessed an explosion of planning theories. According to Friedmann, "scientific planning had finally emerged. Against the nervous tide of global events, the triumph of technical reason proclaimed itself" (FRIEDMANN, 2006, p. 82). More than individual contributions, theories and practices in trends or planning schools start to group, Allmendinger call it "planning theory typologies".

Faludi based his approach on the distinction between substantive and procedural theory. In Faludi's typology procedures, or means, were to be the business of planning and planners. Consequently, planning theory was dominated by the systems and rational approaches both of which emphasized process above substance. (ALLMENDINGER, 2001, p.79).

Not only Faludi (1987), but a whole school of planning in the 1960s and 1970s was based on this distinction between the theory of substantive planning and the theory of procedural planning.

The school of substantive planning focuses on the phenomenon to which planning process is applied - economic development, regional planning, health, education, etc.

Procedural theory informs the planning based on processes, methods and techniques, steps and courses of action, regardless of the context, the territory of the phenomenon, the problem or even the set of knowledge applied. (THEIS and VARGAS, 2009, p.9).

According to Allmendinger, “Substantive–procedural distinction remained a popular typology with which to approach and understand planning theory.” (ALLMENDINGER, 2001, p. 82). In the 1970s, there was predominance of this distinction and of the procedural planning theory. Based on econometrics and classical economics, this school planning sought in mathematical models the anchor of the whole process, as stated by Linhares.

Finally, planning peremptorily took on the character of an economy-biased scientific enterprise. As regards to the economic aspects of planning - major field of political action in capitalist societies -, the hegemonic rules were dictated by a liberal trend which incorporated the principles of the classical theories of authors such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo, filling them with positive rationality rising in social sciences in the nineteenth century. The economic concept of efficiency, which contained the optimization of Pareto, would be the guidance of decisions to be taken by the planning authorities (LINHARES, 2009, p. 23).

Predominant until the 1970s, the theory of procedural planning was inspired by the positivist theory, which credits to meritocracy, which the State adopted from the private segment, the responsibility and exclusivity to draw scientific plans. The dynamics that this theory dealt with would not be derived from subjectivities, but from natural laws that align with the ideas of David Ricardo and Adam Smith. When object of planning, the emerging conflicts should be solved by applying mathematical and scientific methods, based on the concept of economic efficiency.

According to Theis and Vargas, “the policies to ‘plan’ a crisis scenario or to overcome conflicts by means of planning began with the analysis of the economic process development.” (VARGAS and THEIS, 2009, p. 5).

By the late 1970s, a number of authors began to confront Faludi’s typology and to pay more attention to issues such as social practices, regulations, behavior, language, and social groups. This paradigm shift has generated fragmentation and pluralization of typologies.

The fragmentation of theory has been labeled the ‘paradigm breakdown’ (Hudson, 1979) or ‘theoretical pluralism’ (Healey et al., 1979: 5) and has been characterized in subsequent years by the exploration and development of new avenues of theoretical thinking and reflection. The different positions were outlined by a number of studies (e.g. Friedmann, 1987; Healey et al., 1979; Underwood, 1980) and seen either as a development of or an opposition to Faludi’s substantive–procedural typology. Healey et al.’s (1979) map of the theoretical positions in planning theory in the 1970s, for example, defined the new and emerging positions by reference to procedural planning theory. Thus, social planning and advocacy planning are portrayed as a development of procedural (ALLMENDINGER, 2001, p. 81)

This trend, which converges several schools, was named “pluralist theories” by Allmendinger (2001). In the 1980s, these theories began to separately describe in different ways the Planning Theories. Hudson (1979), for instance, identified five approaches: “synoptic, incremental, transactive, advocacy, and radical planning. Each approach can render a reasonable solo performance in good hands but further possibilities can be created by the use of each theory in conjunction with others” (ALLMENDINGER, 2001, p. 25).

Taylor (*apud* ALLMENDINGER, 2001), in turn, replaced the dualism of Faludi (1987) with another one that differentiated the theories between empirically based social theories and philosophical questions based on ideologies and normativity. Cooke (1983) also believed that the distinction between “substantive and procedure” was false. “In place of the dualism, Cooke posited three types of planning theory and spatial relations: theories of the development process, theories of the planning process and theories of the state” (ALLMENDINGER, 2001, p. 27).

In 1987, John Friedmann published *Planning in the Public Domain*, which is now a reference book in discussions about planning. For the author, there are four traditions of planning schools: Policy Analysis, Social Reform, Social Learning, and Social Mobilization (FRIEDMANN, 1987).

The intellectual trend of Social Reform focuses on institutional changes necessary to the process of “societal guidance” in the State, with guidance to society. The concern is to institutionalize and increase the efficiency of

state-owned shares. There is the defense of State intervention, representative democracy, and social justice. The three core areas are economic growth, full employment, and income redistribution. The authors of this trend believe that ordinary people should not be involved in planning of actions.

This is the essence of this chain, also based on positivism, technicality, scientific nature, and partitioning. The Social Reform holds that the planner must be skilled in predicting the future, provided by mechanistic models of "social physics" (LINHARES, 2007; FRIEDMANN, 1987).

The differences between Social Reform and Policy Analysis, as we see below, lies in attention to the role of institutions, more specifically the State, and an attempt mediation of collective interests with the interests that guide the planning process. ³

The intellectual trend Policy Analysis is in line with part of the Social Reform ideas. According to Linhares (2007), also, it is a theory derived from Social Reform. Similar ideas come from the positivist inspiration resulting from the clear distinction between those who plan and who is the object of planning. Friedmann says that: "State would plan, the economy would produce, and working people would concentrate on their private agendas: raising families, enriching themselves, and consuming whatever came tumbling out from the cornucopia" (FRIEDMANN, 1987, p. 8).

The difference is in the lack of attention to the State and the mediation of possible conflicts involving the collective interests with the interests of the planning orientation. This trend focuses mainly on the organizational planning process.

According to Friedmann (2006), the ideal model of planning for the authors of this trend should have 7 stages:

- 1 – Development of Goals and Objectives
- 2 - Identification and Development of the major alternatives to achieve the goals
- 3 - Prediction of the main sets of consequences that are expected in the adoption of each of these alternatives
- 4 - Evaluation of the consequences in relation to the desired goals
- 5 - Decision based on information provided in the previous steps
- 6 - Implementation of the decision by using appropriate institutions
- 7 - Feedback of results

For Friedman, the Policy Analysis is particularly focused on phases 2, 3 and 4. The planners, who would also be statisticians, mathematicians or engineers, would use the simulation of situations as a basis for the phases. Both the school of Policy Analysis and Social Reform are inserted within the positivist theories and, in general, they see the dynamics, conflicts and institutions as positivist theories.

The Social Learning trend understands that theories are not flawless, and focuses its analysis in overcoming the contradiction between theory and practice. There is an obvious influence of John Dewey's pragmatism, who points out the "learn by doing" and the Marxist philosophy when it says that the question is not to analyze, but to change the world (FRIEDMANN, 2006).

At this point, the Social Learning is substantially different from the other two trends and from the positivism of Sant-Simon and Comte. In this sense, it was believed that knowledge comes from experience and is validated in practice. Its focus, then, is to find ways to facilitate the dialogue between planners and other social players, non-hierarchical forms of relationship, and how to motivate people to participate in these processes (FRIEDMANN, 2006).

The territorial dynamics and conflicts are no longer problems that could hinder the progress of scientific planning, but became a fundamental object and a planning motivator.

Another trend that moves away from positivism is the Social Mobilization. In its case, planning is essentially political, without the primacy of science. The message is clearly directed to "the lower ones". At this point,

³ In this manner, Linhares (2007, p. 29) argues: "It is clear that the design planning embodied in social reform, which brings up the idea of social rationality, guard itself some purposes to constrain the operation of market forces. However, its fundamental system of societal guidance is intended primarily to the maintenance of the capitalist social order, where the guarantee of individual rights gained prominence, although this discourse is often spoken on behalf of the community."

planning would be a confrontation policy that emphasizes the conflict needed to transform existing power relations and create one that is not based on labor exploitation.

The two first trend plans (social reform and policy analysis) were hegemonically imposed in the urban and industrial modern capitalism (LINHARES, 2007, p. 34).

After Friedmann, who became a paradigm, all other authors use him as reference on the development of new types. Allmendinger criticizes previously formulated typologies because "there can be the development of different trunks without branches, that is, without considering the interactions, disputes and imports between thinkers of different lines" (NOVAIS, 2010, p. 42).

Allmendinger (2001) states that the focus should not be the genealogy of ideas, because it is not a linear time development as assumed by Friedmann, but "regions (niches) whose areas sometimes overlap, and where different theories can be grouped (...) the emergence of theories assumes meta-theories intervention and the influence of space and social, political and economic contexts" (NOVAIS, 2010, p. 24).

According to Allmendinger (2001), the decades of 1990 and 2000 provided other typologies that are still developing, such as the neoliberal perspective and rational choice, new pragmatism, collaborative planning and post-positivism, among other types and approaches. Carlos Matus (MATUS, 1996) is another author who is fundamental to the planning theory and can be considered a member of the collaborative planning approach. He developed a planning method that has been widely used since the 1990s: the Situational Strategic Planning (SEP).

Matus makes a simpler division in planning schools. According to him, there are the traditional planning and the strategic planning, or normative model and strategic model (MATUS, 1996). The traditional planning makes use of deterministic, economist and technocratic bias, as above mentioned. A player designs and directs the planning; the others are simple economic agents with predictable reactions. The traditional planning aims to predict the future and thus determine it. However, also according to the author, this model fails not only for a matter of methodology, but because their goals are incompatible with society.

The limitations to manage the system do not come from a shortage or lack of control of variables and resources as absolute deficiency. It stems from the fact that what I don't have or don't control are owned or are under the control of another. If I do not win, the other wins. If I lose popular support, another one will win popular support. One thing that is ungovernable to me, considering my skills and my goals, can be governable to another, considering their capabilities and objectives. In this model and conflict or shared power, only a few actions are behaviors, and other actions, the main ones, are strategic actions based on strategic judgment. In this case, the theory (...) is absolutely insufficient to provide a basis for planning. (MATUS, 1996 p. 54)

For Matus (MATUS, 1996), overcoming this normative model should be based on a situational strategic model, that is, do not try to control the future, but foresee the possible surprises and prepare for them. Thus, the planning aims to outline paths into the future, and not predict it.

The planning model presented by Matus is situational, since its starting point is the understanding and involvement of all stakeholders in the process and its possible changes. In other words, planning is situational because it takes into account the reality, situations, territorial dynamics, and conflicts that emerge from them. It is clear that planning changes according to these variables, and therefore, it is necessary to take them into account and be based on them, as Matus reports:

The system is semi-controlled in case all the players are creative strategists who cooperate and engage in conflicts with the limited resources that the result of the game distributes in every moment of its endless development. (MATUS, 1996, p. 30).

In a more or less intense way, this is the main difference between positivist and post-positivist theory. Much of the post-positivist theories, especially the collaborative planning ones, are not intended to eliminate conflicts and do not see it as a problem to planning, but start from them to develop the planning. These theories do not comprehend territorial dynamics and conflicts only as variables "to be planned", but as structural variables of any planning process.

"GLOBAL CITY" AND STRATEGIC PLANNING OF CITIES

As a practical example of how territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions affect public planning, we analyze urban planning practices in Brazil in the 1990s, especially plans based on the theory of "global cities".

Novais states that since the 1990s there is the emergence of strategic planning for urban practices.

In the early 1990s, strategic planning of cities became a reference to urban practices. (...) The emergence of a strategic planning of cities was not isolated, but followed the intense process of circulation models (...) whose main one was a planning model based on the dominance of competitive policies in local governments (NOVAIS, 2010, p. 22).

This model is the Global City theory, and one of its theoretical columns is found in Sassen (1996). Its shaft idea is a scenario in which cities compete to attract capital. Urban planning should therefore be grounded on the idea of promoting competitiveness, that is, policies that can provide comparative advantages to attract transnational corporations and international flows of financial capital (NOVAIS, 2010; WHITAKER, 2004).

Maricato reports that "in the urbanism field, there were many who were carried away by the piper's song of the "strategic plans" inspired by the urban marketing and cultural interventions characteristics of the "city of entertainment"(MARICATO, 2003, p. 161). Whitaker agrees with that theory. For him, the strategic urban planning has become especially useful for the purposes of the Global City theory, and was applied in a number of cities such as Paris, New York, London, Atlanta, Bilbao, Lisbon, and Barcelona. It was aimed at changing the infrastructure of the cities into attraction poles of the great global capital and transnational corporations especially in the service sector. To achieve these macro goals, strategic planning of cities should consider actions aimed at providing the cities with convention centers, modern airports, quality hotels, cultural events, and safety (WHITAKER, 2004).

Brazilian and Latin American cities have adopted this model, as Whitaker shows:

Supported by the masterminds of Barcelona's strategic planning, which coincidentally became international consultants, in the last decade many Latin American mayors embraced the adventure of the "Global City" by applying to host the Olympic Games, as in the case of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, offering to host branches of great museums such as the Guggenheim and the Cidade da Música in Rio, fostering large urban operations focused on the interests of real estate investors in the third sector (...) as the famous Puerto Madero, in Buenos Aires. (WHITAKER, 2004, p. 6)

But what are the influences of territorial dynamics, conflicts, and institutions in strategic planning practices of cities included in the Global City theory?

The role of the global economy is paramount in this process. According to Novais, with globalization there was "a social and economic restructuring process on a world scale, made possible by technological innovations in communication, information and transport. (...) Economy is worldwide, in a context of hegemony of financial capital and increased competition." (NOVAIS, 2010, p. 23).

These changes were shown in different manners and dimensions. In the economic dimension, they meant the "integration of financial markets, the reorganization of the company, the spreading of industrial activity related to the new international social division of labor, and the growth of world trade" (NOVAIS, 2010, p. 23). These dynamics have forced some changes in the capitalism of Brazilian cities based on the objectives of the above mentioned Global Cities.

As for the theories of the Global City, these changes are natural, as expressed in Whitaker:

Global city theories argue that the new dynamics of flexibility and deregulation of the economy, increase in international capital flows, and strengthening of the service economy over the Fordist-Taylorist industrial activity, would be forcing cities to adapt to a new demand for buildings, services and equipment that meet the requirements of a new and modern economic sector, which Sassen called "service sector". (WHITAKER, 2004, p.8)

However, this view does not take into account the dynamic emergence of new conflicts between social groups, and the options of adaptability presented by the Global City theory favor certain groups. (MARICATO 2003)

Whitaker states that the implementation of the global city theory in Brazil, more precisely in the state of São Paulo, cannot be automatically done because these conflicts are not similar to a conflict in Barcelona, for example:

The transposition of this theoretical framework (Global City) to the reality of the state of São Paulo cannot be automatically done, since the nature of the main urban conflict

in the city of São Paulo is not in dispute between asset value and exchange value, but more in a class struggle between accepted citizens and outcasts from the formal city. It is a structural character dispute that transcends intra-urban conflicts between owners and tenants, focusing on a much deeper social rupture between citizens and outcasts. (...) More than global, the dynamics which guide the production of São Paulo city are the representation of the most archaic patronage, that is, when dominant private sectors appropriate from public sectors for the sake of their own interests. (WHITAKER, 2004, p.9)

Thus, the strategic planning of cities based on the Global City theory emerges from a conflict and is directly in favor of one side of urban violence, which Whitaker named "archaic oligarchies working in the real estate market."

Each of these groups works with the State in order to enforce their interests, always claiming that each of it is the best region to represent the Global City connected to the globalized capital. In this process, the excluded outskirts in need of public investment in infrastructure remain dramatically without receiving attention even when the situation requires a complete change of priorities of these investments, almost ceasing flows to the most privileged areas (...) To the real estate market, inserted within the social group of "ruling classes", the participation in the effort to build the image of a Global City seems natural because it represents the mobilization around investment opportunities and profitability in a recessive scenario. When the model of the Global City favors the dominant classes, it is because it favors essentially, as we see as follows, archaic oligarchies working in the real estate market. (WHITAKER, 2004, p.10).

The option of governments for a certain type of policy is favorable to the real estate market and other social groups that Whitaker and Maricato call "dominant". Thus, the state is allied to certain social groups in conflicts that emerged from the territorial dynamics.

Whitaker states about a coalition between institutions and social groups in favor of certain interests that emerge from the dynamics.

The idea of a coalition between the real estate elites and the Government in order to promote the growth of the city in vectors that interest them has indisputable parallels in the dynamics of production of the São Paulo area, when it obviously comes to the construction of the formal city, and not to the forgotten outskirts. Historically, there is a significant favoring southwest vector in the implementation of public investment in urban infrastructure, favoring the elites in their movement throughout the city, and promoting an important real estate and land appreciation, whose profitability is obviously appropriate to these same elites (...). Opening avenues and tunnels of questionable utility, modernization of railway lines and stations, road links between business districts or between these neighborhoods and the airport are some of the examples of how to channel public investments that surreptitiously boost to sell the omnipotent image of "São Paulo Global City", allowing the construction of hotels, "smart buildings" and other tertiary huge projects which benefit only themselves and archaic groups of local real estate investors. (WHITAKER, 2004, p. 11)

Whitaker (2004), Novais (2010), and Maricato (2003) demonstrate that territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions were related to public planning, in this case, strategic planning cities. For them, this process was influenced by territorial dynamics, based on the Global City theory, and generated conflicts in Brazilian cities where the public institutions acted according to the dominant city social groups such the real estate market, contractors, and the financial sector.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Public planning is crucial and can increase government capacity. However, planning is not a binary relationship in which the success or the failure of a government is determined by whether there is a schedule or not.

As many used to believe or still do, planning is not a panacea for social problems. It is an instrument of dispute involving institutions and social groups so they appropriate the best of bonuses or reduce the burden caused by territorial dynamics.

Therefore, public planning cannot be analyzed when separated from conceptions about the state, or without taking into account the conflicts over social hegemony. Thus, when looking at public planning, it is necessary to consider a process, and not only a specific activity.

By analyzing this process of formulation and implementation of a public planning, one must first understand the territorial dynamics present in the process, conflicts and institutions involved, since they are the foundational components of the process.

Territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions are intrinsically linked to public planning, because they were fundamental to the establishment of the institution of public planning – the State – because they shaped the planning theories, or because they directly cause and influence the implementation planning, as previously seen in the strategic planning of cities.

In this manner, in order to understand the public planning, it is essential to understand what the territorial dynamics presented in the process and in what manners this planning is related to them, that is, is it a change of planning, maintenance or enhancement of certain dynamics?

Furthermore, it is important to understand which conflicts the planning is dealing with. Which groups are in conflict? How these groups relate to the institutions? What are the goals of the groups and their relationships? What is the purpose of planning and what motivated it?

These and other questions constitute a framework of analysis necessary to understand the complexity of the planning processes. In a nutshell, understanding a planning process is to understand the society where we live and the territorial dynamics, conflicts and institutions that are part of it.

REFERENCES

- ACKOFF, Russell L.A. *Concept of Corporate Planning*. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- ACSELRAD, Henri. *Environmentalism and environmental conflicts in Brazil*. In: *Conference Social Movements in the South, 2002*, Cambridge: Kennedy school of Government, Harvard University, 2002.
- _____. *Justiça ambiental – ação coletiva e estratégias argumentativas*. In: ACSELRAD, Henri; HERCULANO, Selene; PÁDUA, José Augusto (org.) *Justiça ambiental e cidadania*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume dumará, 2004.
- ALLMENDINGER, Philipi. *Planning in Postmodern Times*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- COSTA, Marco Aurélio. *Democracia urbana: para uma crítica do planejamento territorial no Brasil*. 2008. v.1. (Doutorado em Planejamento Urbano e Regional) – Instituto de Pesquisa e Planejamento Urbano e Regional, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro.
- DEL TONI, Jackson. *Em busca do Planejamento Governamental do SEC XXI*. In ENAP. *Reflexões para Ibero América: Planejamento Estratégico*. Brasília, 2009. v.1, pp. 21-36.
- ESCOBAR, Arturo. In: SACHS, Wolfgang. *Dicionário do desenvolvimento: guia para o conhecimento como poder*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000.
- FALUDI, Andreas. *A Decision Centred View of Environmental Planning*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1987.
- FRIEDMANN, John. *Planning in the public domain: from knowledge to action*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University, 1987.
- _____. *Dois Séculos de Planejamento: Uma visão geral*. In GIACOMONI, James e PAGNUSSAT, José Luiz. *Planejamento e Orçamento governamental*. Brasília: ENAP, 2 v. 2006.
- GEHLEN, Ivaldo; RIELLA, Alberto. *Dinâmicas territoriais e desenvolvimento sustentável*. *Sociologias*, Porto Alegre, n. 11, 2004, pp. 26-26.
- HALL, Peter e TAYLOR, Rosemary. *As três versões do neo-institucionalismo*, in *Lua Nova Revista de Cultura e Política*, nº 58, 2003. pp. 193-223.
- LENZER, Gertrud. *August Comte and positivismo: The essential writings*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1975.
- LINHARES, Lucas. *As idéias fora do lugar e o lugar fora das idéias: o (sub)desenvolvimento sócio-econômico-espacial no Brasil e as possibilidades contemporâneas do seu planejamento*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2007.
- MARICATO, Ermínia. *Planejamento urbano no Brasil: As idéias fora do lugar e o lugar fora das idéias*. In ARANTES, Otilia B., MARICATO, Ermínia e VAINER, Carlos. *O Pensamento Único das Cidades: desmanchando consensos*, Petrópolis: Ed. Vozes, Coleção Zero à Esquerda, 2000.
- MATUS, Carlos. *Adeus Senhor Presidente: Governantes governados*. Brasília: Fundap, 1996.
- MITZBERG, Henry. *Ascensão e queda do Planejamento Estratégico*. Rio de Janeiro: Bookman 2000.
- NOVAIS, Pedro. *Uma estratégia chamada “planejamento estratégico”: deslocamentos espaciais e a atribuição de sentidos na terapia do planejamento urbano*. Rio de Janeiro: Letras. 2010.

- OLIVEIRA, José Antônio Puppim de. Desafios do planejamento em políticas públicas: diferentes visões e práticas. *Rev. Adm. Pública*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 40, n. 2, 2006.
- OZBEKHAN, Hasan. Toward a General Theory of Planning. In E. Jantsch, *Perspectives of Planning*. Paris: OECD, pp. 47-155, 1969.
- NUTT, Paul C. Formulation tactics and the success of organizational decision-making. *Decision Sciences*, Hoboken, n. 23, pp. 519-540, 1992.
- RIBEIRO, Renato. *Democracia versus República: a questão do desejo nas lutas sociais*. In: BIGNOTTO. N. (Org.). *Pensar a República*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2000.
- SANTOS, Milton. *O Brasil: território e sociedade no início do século XXI*. 9. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2006.
- SASSEN, Saskia. *The Global city*. Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 1994.
- SAWYER, George C. *Corporate Planning as a Creative Process*. Planning Executives Institute, Oxford, 1983.
- THÉRET, Bruno. *As instituições entre as estruturas e as ações* - in *Lua Nova Revista de Cultura e Política*, n 58, pp. 226-254, 2003.
- VARGAS, Diego Boelhke e THEIS, Ivo Marcos. A evolução recente do planejamento na américa latina: lições para santa catarina? In: *III Encontro de Economia Catarinense*. Blumenau, 2009.
- VILLELA, Annibal. Os Métodos de Planejamento na URSS. *Revista Brasileira de Economia*. v. 18, n.4, pp. 7-110. 1964.
- WEBER, Max. *A Ética Protestante e o Espírito do Capitalismo*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2004.
- WHITAKER, João. O mito da cidade-global: o papel da ideologia na produção do espaço terciário em São Paulo. São Paulo: *Revista Pós-FAUUSP*, 2004.
- YIFTACHEL, Oren. Towards a New Typology of Urban Planning Theories ,*Environment and Planning: Planning and Design*, 1989.