PUBLIC RELATIONS AS A TOOL

OF THE URBAN PLANNER

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of Graduate Studies

University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of City Planning

---

by

Charles William Hodgson

October 1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Urban governments, over the years, have become increasingly
aware of the economic and social costs resulting from the haphazard
physical development of their communities. In order to correct the
situation, many have attempted to apply a rational approach, commonly
referred to as the urban planning process, to their city's development
and redevelopment. As part of this approach they have created urban
planning departments within their administrations and staffed them with
urban planners.

The success of these departments, however, has not been parti-
cularly encouraging. They have produced great quantities of plans and
documents but few of them have ever been implemented. The politicians,
and particularly the planners, have been castigated for their failures
by such authors as Rachel Carson[1] and Jane Jacobs[2] as well as some pro-
fessional planners.[3] Professor John Reps, in a speech delivered in 1967,
appraised the success of city planning departments as follows:[4]

---

[1] See Rachel Carson, Silent Spring (Greenwich, Conn: Fawcett
Publications, Inc., 1962).

[2] See Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities
(New York: Vintage Books, 1961).

[3] See Melvin R. Levin, "Planners and Metropolitan Planning,"
Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2
(March 1967), pp 78-89.

[4] Throughout this thesis, 'urban planning', 'city planning'
and 'town planning' are considered to be synonomous.

> Nowhere in this country can one find a major sector
> of an important city which in the present era has been
> developed as planned. It is not a case of an occasional
> departure from an officially adopted plan. It is not
> even a situation where a majority of cities do not grow
> as planned. It is, rather, a record of complete and
> consistent failure. There is obviously something wrong
> with a planning system which never works as we say it
> should. We (planners) are being dishonest with ourselves
> and our clients - the community at large - when we think,
> talk, or write otherwise. [5]

There have been many reasons advanced attempting to explain this failure of urban planning. The planners have complained that the politicians pay only lip-service to their expertise. The politicians on the other hand, have often criticized the work of their planning departments as 'ivory tower' and politically impractical.

Blame has also been placed on the general public because of their apathy toward urban planning and municipal administration generally. Most citizens who come in contact with their urban planning departments do so only when they are directly affected by some action of the department and that action, from the point of view of the citizen, has often been negative in nature. The result has been that the citizen has often had an unfavorable impression of planners and the concept of urban planning.

---

[5] Carl Feiss, "Taking Stock: A Resume of Planning Accomplishments in the United States," in Environment and Change, ed. by William R. Ewald, Jr. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968), p. 218, quoting Professor John Reps' address to the National Planning Conference of the American Society of Planning Officials, Houston, Texas, April 3, 1967.

The failure of urban planning has also been attributed to the planners' disregard for, or a lack of understanding of, the values of their clients - the citizens of the community. Low-income public housing residents have consistently complained that the developments imposed on them have destroyed their communities in many respects rather than improved them.[6] They have complained that the planners have used their middle-class values in creating public housing rather than considering the goals and aspirations of the future residents.

These, and many other commonly held reasons for the failure of city planning, have a common element - the lack of understanding of one group for another. The planners in the planning departments, the politicians on the urban councils and the public affected by the planning all seem to misunderstand what the other groups desire and are attempting to achieve. Successful urban planning, like most successful government activities, requires that the non-political public servants, the politicians and the citizens align the goals which they are attempting to approach so they can work for the benefit of all concerned.

One activity which is employed by many private organizations and groups in an attempt to relate themselves to others is public relations. A prime objective of this activity is to harmonize the goals of the organization or group with those of others in order to benefit all concerned.

---

[6] Jacobs, op. cit., Chapter 20.

It is the opinion of the author that use of public relations as a tool of the urban planner has been underutilized and/or misunderstood by most people in the profession. This thesis will attempt to show that public relations is a valid and useful tool of the urban planner and to illustrate some of the situations in which it was, or could have been, used by an urban planner.

CHAPTER II

URBAN PLANNING AND THE URBAN PLANNER

It follows from the commonly accepted definition of a planner

as one who does planning that an urban planner is one who does urban

planning. This definition of an urban planner, however, is too general

for the purpose of this thesis. In order to arrive at a more precise

definition of an urban planner and the nature of his work, it is

necessary to refine the concept of planning and that particular aspect

of it known as urban planning.

Planning has become a commonplace term in the language of the

twentieth century. It is part of our daily conversation, a major

topic at many meetings and an integral component of contemporary

decision-making. The term, however, is not always understood. This

results from the fact that planning as a concept and practice is still

in a dynamic state of defining itself.

Numerous people have attempted to define or describe planning.

Dahl and Lindblom viewed it in a general way as, "... an attempt at

rationally calculated action to achieve a goal."[7] Simon, Smithberg

and Thompson were more specific when they suggested planning to be,

---

[7] Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindblom, Politics, Economics,
and Welfare (New York: Harper, 1953), p. 20.

> "... that activity that concerns itself with proposals
> for the future, with the evaluation of alternative
> proposals, and the methods by which these proposals
> may be achieved. Planning is rational, adaptive
> thought applied to the future and to matters over
> which the planners, or the administrative organizations
> with which they are associated, have some degree of
> control." [8]

Although no definitions of planning have ever been universally accepted, most tend to agree that planning, in essence, is a rational process or method which is applied in an attempt to approach some goal or goals. The process or method is commonly referred to as the 'planning process' and the act of carrying it out as 'planning'.

The words planning and planning process, due to their general meaning, are often coupled with a modifier to clarify their meaning; the modifier usually indicates the nature of the goal or goals to be approached. Thus, such terms as economic planning, social planning, military planning and urban planning are commonly used to describe types of planning whose goals, respectively, are economic, social, military and urban in nature. Urban planning, then, in a very general sense, is that term used to denote the application of the planning process toward the achievement of goals which are urban in nature.

The term urban planning, like the other types of planning, has been more precisely described or defined in numerous ways. The Chicago Plan Commission suggested that it was,

> "... the well-considered correlation of those
> immediate and long-range needs, purposes, and

---

[8] Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithberg and Victor A. Thompson, Public Administration (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp 423-424.

desires of the people which have been found
suitable, feasible, and capable of expression
in physical terms, presented as a guide to assist
achievement of beneficial objectives through co-
ordinated action. ... planning provides the basic
framework for directing the development of the
urban area and prescribes interpretations to facili-
tate its realization." 9

Hans Blumenfeld proposed that urban planning is an activity

which,

"... consists in designing and re-designing a set
of plans aimed at creating an adequate framework
for the anticipated or hoped-for social life of the
community which will live, work, and move. It has
been and is primarily concerned with the allocation
of space. The questions it attempts to decide are:
where and how? Where will and should activities be
located, what amounts and kind of space do they need,
and how is the required space to be built or modified?" 10

Again, no definition has ever been universally accepted. Similar

to the definitions of planning, however, those of urban planning

generally agree that the goal of urban planning is to provide the best

physical environment possible to act as the framework in which the

social, economic, religious and other activities of an urban area

can take place.

These two definitions of urban planning include many, although

not all, of the aspects and functions of the urban planning process.

One of these is particularly salient to this thesis' concept of an

---

9 Gerald Breese and Dorothy E. Whiteman, An Approach to Urban
Planning (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), pp 5-6, quoting
the 1945 Annual Report of the Chicago Plan Commission.

10 Hans Blumenfeld, "Contemporary Planning Systems - A Hope for
City Planning," in Planning 1968: Selected Papers from the ASPO National
Planning Conference (Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials,
1968), pp 121-122.

urban planner - that the expression of the goals of urban planning
is physical in nature.

Theorists and academics, as well as others, have also used the
term "urban planning" to indicate any planning whose ultimate goal is
to optimize the welfare of the community's citizens. In the broader
sense, they have included educational planning, social planning,
transportation planning and economic planning as well as several other
types. The majority of people actively involved in these activities,
however, do not generally refer to them as urban planning but rather
as education, social work, transportation engineering, economics or
administration.[11] People who do consider their work to be urban planning
are usually concerned primarily with the physical environment as it
relates to these other activities.

Although the authority for directing the physical development
of an urban area generally lies with the urban government, there are
other interests and jurisdictions involved. For example, the federal
and provincial governments own properties in the various towns and
cities and also have programs of financial aid for urban development
and re-development, and private land developers have certain rights
and jurisdictions over their land holdings. In some instances, they
employ urban planning to enhance and protect their particular interests.

---

[11] Jack Meltzer discusses the various planning activities in
which the people involved associate themselves with professional planning
societies and with other types of professional bodies, in his paper
"Manpower Needs for Planning for the Next Fifty Years" in Environment
and Policy, ed. by William R. Ewald, Jr. (Bloomington: Indiana University
Press, 1968), pp 241-257.

For the purposes of this thesis, however, urban planning will be considered to be the activity as carried out by an urban government.

The urban planning process has been subdivided into steps or phases in a variety of ways.[12] For the purposes of this thesis, four "linear but also cyclical"[13] phases will be considered: (1) The philosophy and structure, (2) The formulation of goals, (3) The formulation of means and, (4) The implementation of the means. Throughout these phases, the element of re-evaluation is an important input. Therefore, it will be discussed separately.

Philosophy and Structure

The philosophy of urban planning is based on the assumption that the physical nature of the community can be improved. The improvement, however, requires two conditions. First, there must be a rational, co-ordinated program of action and, second, there must be some authority with the power and resources to implement it. The program of action is the urban planning process and the responsibility for carrying it out has fallen on the shoulders of the urban governments.

---

[12] For various groupings of the elements of the urban planning process, see Hugh H. Pomeroy, "The Planning Process and Public participation" in An Approach to Urban Planning, ed. by Gerald Breese and Dorothy E. Whiteman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), pp 9-37; Michael Chevalier, A Strategy of Interest-Based Planning (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1968); Robert C. Young, "Goals and Goal-Setting," JAIP, Vol. XXXII, No. 2 (March 1966); and David Popenoe, "Community Development and Community Planning," JAIP, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4 (July 1967).

[13] This description of the phases is used by Britton Harris in "The Limits of Science and Humanism," JAIP, Vol. XXXIII, No. 5 (September 1967) to indicate that although the phases are generally sequential, what evolves from one often affects a prior phase and, consequently, it must then be re-evaluated.

Like all government activities, urban planning must be consistent with the philosophy of the government under which it operates. All governments, democratic or otherwise, depend on the philosophy that they have the support of the people they govern. No government, in any form, can long exist if those governed actively oppose it.

> Government by force has often been successful over relatively brief periods of history, but an analysis of past despotisms indicates that one of two situations has always existed: Either the people who were governed by force did not in fact actively oppose their rulers; or over a period of time there occurred riot and revolution, bloodshed and treachery, until finally the government fell. [14]

But democratic government goes one step further in its philosophy. Democratic government exists for the express purpose of attaining the [15] democratic ideal which is, as Lincoln defined it, 'government of the people, by the people, for the people.' Inherent in this ideal is that the citizens must not only support their government but also actively participate in the formulation of its goals and policies. In the modern context, their participation, other than the election of their representatives, is primarily in the form of expressing their opinions on various issues to their representatives - the decision-makers - since it is clearly impractical for each citizen to exercise direct personal participation in ruling. "The slogan, 'Let the majority [16] rule,' implies let the opinion of the majority rule."

---

[14] Marbury Bladen Ogle, Jr., *Public Opinion and Political Dynamics* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1950), p. 2.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

In carrying out urban planning, the political bodies of urban governments have not always been as closely involved as most are today. Several decades ago, it was considered best to separate the planning function from urban politics.[17] As a result, independent, non-political commissions were created to consider urban planning matters. Some engaged experts in urban development as full-time advisors but, much too often, they operated without any expert advice. This approach usually proved futile because the commissions lacked an adequate understanding of most problems and had very limited power to implement urban planning proposals. In the 1940's the trend changed. Based on the premise that implementation was the prerogative of the politicians, urban planning departments tended to become more closely linked to the decision-making body and were staffed by full-time experts rather than depending on lay volunteers. These experts, known as 'urban planners', are the group of people with which this thesis is primarily concerned.

Today, urban planners are usually people with an undergraduate degree in a specific discipline such as architecture, engineering, economics, political science or sociology and graduate training in the application of that discipline to urban development and re-development. When employed by urban governments, they often function as part of a team. As part of that team, they are responsible for certain specific

---

[17] For a history of the organizational aspects of urban planning, see Francine F. Rabinovitz and J. Stanley Pottinger, "Organization for Local Planning: The Attitudes of Directors," JAIP, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1 (January 1967).

duties such as long-range planning or current operations. This thesis
is concerned with all the various activities of all members of the team
and therefore, when it refers to a function or activity of 'the urban
planner,' it is referring to one carried out by one or more members of
the team; that is, the urban planner is a personification of the urban
planning department.

The people involved in the urban planning process may be divided
into three categories according to their function. First, there are
the citizens of the urban area who must desire, or at least condone,
the carrying out of the process by their elected representatives.
When an urban government decides to initiate or continue an urban planning
program, they do so on the assumption that it is something the com-
munity desires. Should the citizens object to the concept of urban
planning, the amount of government resources spent on it or the limi-
tations which its proposals might place on their personal freedom,
they have the power to discontinue or modify it through an election.

Assuming that they do condone it, then they are responsible for
a second function: formulating and articulating their goals, values
and aspirations. Since the objective of the process is to provide the
best physical environment possible in which the various activities of
the citizens can take place, only the citizens can reveal what those
values are and evaluate whether or not a particular environment is
good or bad.

The second category is the politicians - the decision-makers -
whose function is to interpret the goals, values and opinions of the

citizens, make the final decisions on all matters, integrate the urban

planning process into the other activities of government and, in

general, manage the entire process.

The third category is the one with which this thesis is pri-

marily concerned - the urban planner. The function of the urban

planner is that of technical expert and advisor to the politician; he

is employed by the political body to advise them on the technical

aspects of how to approach this 'best physical environment.' The

urban planner's function is to answer the question 'how' and not 'what'.

It is not his prerogative to dictate to the citizens of the community

what mode of transportation they should use; it is his function,

however, to advise them how the system they choose can best be facili-

tated in the physical environment and the implications it has, or may

have, for the other activities in the community.

Each of these groups or categories has an integral part to play

in the urban planning process. Each must participate in the process

if it is to be successful. The participation of each group also

enhances the degree to which it is able to achieve its own objectives.

Formulation of Goals

Perhaps one of the most decisive steps in the urban planning

process, within the commonly accepted philosophy and organizational

structure, is to formulate specific goals. Goal-setting has not always

been as significant an element in the urban planning process as it is

at present. "Regrettably, much planning has been accomplished by

planners who have worked toward goals that were more a part of their

creed than the result of their rational inquiry."[18] However, Young points out that the trend is changing. He suggests that in urban planning the formulation of goals is equally as important as the design of the means to achieve them. He states that today we are "beginning to see the emergence of methodical goal-setting in some of the multi-level planning operations that have been initiated in the last few years."[19]

A goal, as defined by Webster's Dictionary, is "the end toward which a design trends: aim; purposes."[20] It is particularly important to note in this definition the term 'trends'.

> A goal provides the traveller a direction not a
> location. In this sense, a goal is an ideal ...
> it is a value to be sought after, not an object
> to be achieved. Like Galahad's quest for the
> Holy Grail it is the pursuit of the goal that
> ennobles us not its attainment.[21]

By their nature, however, goals are dichotomous in that they are generally both means and ends depending on the point of view. For example, a goal may be to provide park and recreational areas for the community. From a broader point of view, however, this goal may be only one means of approaching a larger goal such as to provide a more amenable living environment. Virtually all goals formulated in the urban planning process are means as well as ends.

---

[18] Young, op. cit., p. 77.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Webster's Dictionary (5th ed. 1946).

[21] Young, op. cit., p. 78.

The traditional distinction between the political and ad-
ministrative parts of government has been that the politicians are the
formulators of the goals and the policies which express them while the
administrative section is limited to the execution of the policies.
In reality, this division of function does not operate in modern govern-
ment. Simon, Smithberg and Thompson point out that the administrative
body of local government "by no means confines itself to the 'neutral'
carrying out of whatever well-defined goals the legislature may desire
to lay down. Instead it ... is intimately involved in the very process
of goal formulation and goal evaluation." They also emphasize that
"Among administrative agencies, none are more deeply involved in goal
formulation than are planning bodies; and particularly those planning
bodies that are engaged in long-range planning."[22] It should be em-
phasized, however, that this does not mean that the urban planner
formulates the goals; it implies that since goals and means are so
interdependent, that the expertise which the planner possesses with
respect to the formulation of means is an essential input to the
formulation of the goals and the formulation of goals is a necessary
input to the formulation of means.

From the point of view of the urban planner, the formulation of
goals requires three distinct steps: a) the establishment of the peri-
meter of concern, b) the examination of alternatives and, c) the final
establishment of goals.[23] The perimeter of concern is that area over

---

[22] Simon, Smithberg and Thompson, op. cit., p. 429.

[23] Young, op. cit., p. 82.

which urban planning has legally defined jurisdiction as well as that area of concern which will be affected by urban planning activities. This, of course, varies from one situation to the next. Since urban planning, as previously stated, is concerned with the physical environment as related to the activities which take place in it, all activities which contribute to the welfare of the citizens must be of concern to it. For example, land-use zoning comes under the jurisdiction of urban planning. But activity in this area will also have an effect on the economic and social nature of the community. To the extent that land-use zoning affects these aspects of urban life, they are also the concern of urban planning and the urban planner.

The perimeter of concern also includes those factors which affect activities within the legally defined jurisdiction of urban planning. For example, urban renewal is usally defined as a responsibility of urban planning but factors such as, say, municipal engineering, public finance and higher level government grants must be considered in dealing with such an issue. Thus, they also become a concern of the urban planner.

If the formulation and evaluation of alternative urban planning goals is to be consistent with the democratic ideal, the values and opinions of the urban citizens must constitute the primary input into the activity. A goal approved by the decision-making body or assumed by the planner which is in serious conflict with a large portion of the citizens' values and opinions is a breach of the democratic ideal and often creates a serious obstacle to the success of other goals.

The urban planner must therefore develop some effective mechanism for
evaluating the citizens' values and aspirations.

It is impractical, however, to determine the values and opinions
of each member of the general public on each and every issue.[24] Therefore,
the individuals who compose the general public may be grouped into units
or entities called 'specific publics'. These publics are defined as,
"... any group which will admit in any way that its members have the
same interests, or that its members belong together - or could probably
belong together under the proper circumstances."[25] Within the general
public there are literally an infinite number of publics and individuals
are frequently members of several which may have conflicting opinions
on an issue. From the urban planner's point of view, however, these
publics may be used to synthesize the various opinions on an urban
planning issue.

There are, however, many difficulties in dealing with these
publics. On any given issue, numerous publics will be identifiable to
a certain extent but in most cases the identity will only be a sub-
jective generalization. This is primarily due to the fact that
individuals are members of more than one public and their opinions
on the issue change as their role changes. Publics are also difficult
to deal with because they are continually in a state of flux with
respect to their membership and their opinions. Society is dynamic
and so are its individuals and their associations.

---

[24] The term 'general public' refers to the group of all people
represented by an urban government.

[25] Ogle, op. cit., p. 44.

Because people have different interests, values and opinions, there are bound to be conflicts between the various publics on what the goals of urban planning should be. However, these conflicts between the publics usually arise not because their goals are antagonistic to each other but because the groups differ on the values they assign to different goals. Not all goals can assume equal importance in urban planning and therefore a hierarchy of goals must be established. It is usually the level at which a goal fits into the overall hierarchy of goals that is the cause of conflict.

For example,

> ... health, wealth, leisure and honor ... are all
> on the same hierarchical level in that it is not
> necessary to go through one to achieve the other.
> However, because they draw on the same resources -
> time, energy and ability - they act as constraints
> on each other. Because of the constraint relation-
> ship the comparative value assigned to goals assumes
> importance. [26]

In terms of the hierarchy of goals,

> ... everyone in a community, for instance, is for
> better schools and lower taxes but anyone who is
> politically knowledgeable in his community could
> make a division of those political activists who
> are for the best schools without endangering the
> tax situation and those who are for the lowest
> tax rate possible without endangering the school
> system. Even with only two elements in this
> construction the conditions for a bitter fight
> are present and obvious. [27]

Reading the general public's values is also complicated by the fact that what people express publicly and what they feel privately

---

[26] Young, op. cit., p. 80.

[27] Ibid., p. 81.

(which is how they vote) are often different. John Marston points out
that,

> We often incorrectly assume that the opinions of a
> public are simply the sum total of the opinions of
> the individuals comprising that public ... It has
> often been observed that in an interacting crowd
> individuals tend to shed their personal inhibitions,
> to respond to the crowd and to appeals which would
> scarcely move them or would even repel them if they
> were considered in solitude. [28]

Despite these difficulties in reading the general and specific
publics' values and opinions, it is an integral part of the urban
planning process and the degree to which the urban planner is able to
fulfill this function will directly affect his success.

Other inputs must also be considered in formulating and
evaluating urban planning goals. Urban planning goals cannot be
isolated from the formulation of goals by other urban government de-
partments since urban planning is only one segment of the total planning
process for the urban community. It would be irrational for urban
planning to establish a goal of a strong central core while trans-
portation planning was aimed toward the decentralization of the major
traffic generators. If urban planning is to be rational, its goals
must be consistent with, and complementary to, the goals established
by other planning processes in the community. The ultimate goal of
all the various planning functions is not likely to be in dispute; it
is those lesser goals which are also means that are often in conflict.

---

[28] John E. Marston, The Nature of Public Relations (New York:
McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1963), p. 34.

All the various goals, as suggested by the various publics, must be evaluated by the decision-making body. The evaluation must be based on the information received from all the inputs and the goals placed in a hierarchy. This hierarchy of goals, if the inputs have been correctly interpreted, will provide the guidance for creating a physical environment in which the activities of the urban citizens can best occur.

Formulation of Means

Means and goals are closely related and, as previously stated, are often one and the same depending on the point of view. Goals were described as something to work toward rather than to be achieved. "In this sense, a goal is an ideal and should be expressed in abstract terms."[29] Means, on the other hand, may be considered to be more concrete in nature. In the urban planning process, the means tend to indicate 'how' whereas the goals indicate 'what'. It is in this phase that the urban planner makes his major contribution.

The formulation of goals is dependent more on the values and desires of the general public than on more technical considerations such as the legality of jurisdiction, financial implications, sequence of events and the technological capabilities of the society. In contrast, the means are more concerned with these technical realities and their inherent purposes tend to be implicit rather than explicit. The formulation of means usually requires a high level of technical expertise, an input which the urban planner is expected to provide. It must be realized, however, that means, despite the fact that they

---

[29] Young, op. cit., p. 78.

tend to be concrete and technical in nature, and the values and opinions

of the general public, are not mutually exclusive. There are often

several means of approaching the same goal and the choice of which one,

or ones, to pursue is dependent upon the values and opinions of the

general public within the limits established by technical feasibility.

The formulation of means is, in essence, a continuation of the

formulation of goals. However, the extension is not so much one of

sorting values and opinions as a basis of further activity (formulating

goals) but one of formulating alternatives first and then submitting

them to the various publics for scrutiny. The formulation of means is

usually carried out in three steps.

The first step is carried out by the urban planner in con-

sultation with other experts, primarily those officials of the other

government departments and other levels of government. The urban

planner seeks as many alternative means of approaching each goal as

possible and, after eliminating the obviously inappropriate ones,

subjects them to the criticisms of the experts in the departments of

finance, traffic planning, public works, recreation and so on.

For example, a goal may be to increase the quantity of park land

in the central core of the city. There are several means of doing this

such as expanding certain existing facilities, creating several new

parks or creating one very large park. The urban planner examines each

of these and every other possibility and then eliminates those which

his expertise indicates are highly impractical from his technical point

of view. The remaining alternatives are then discussed with the other

experts to assess the effect of each proposal on the goals and activities
of their departments. The traffic planning department may indicate
that alternative 'A' would conflict with their proposed freeway and any
change in the location of the freeway would increase its cost by at
least 50 per cent. Or he may point out that alternative 'B' would be
limited in its access. The finance department, on the other hand, may
indicate that their present goal is to cut expenditures and if proposal
'C' were to be implemented in the next fiscal year, it would mean that
a school construction would have to be postponed for one or two years.

Knowing the technical implications and limitations of each pro-
posal or alternative and their interrelationships with the means and
goals of the other government activities, the urban planner narrows
the number of alternative means for the various goals. He then submits
them to the various publics for their consideration.

It is in this activity that the greatest amount of conflict
between the various publics is likely to occur because means tend to
affect individuals more directly than do goals. It is usually not too
difficult to get a large number of people to agree that a freeway should
be built across the city but actually locating it and dealing with the
people whose property must be expropriated, is not so easy.

Inherent in this activity of submitting the alternatives to the
various publics is the resolution of the conflicts to the greatest
possible extent. This is usually done by compromise with the urban
planner playing the role of mediator.

Based on the values and opinions of the various publics on the
alternatives, the urban planner chooses those which are most acceptable

to the publics and presents them, in a formal document or plan, to the
decision-makers. Usually, the decision-makers will question, on the
basis of their personal values and political expertise, the proposals
which the urban planner has submitted. However, through discussion
with the urban planner, they may achieve a position of knowledge to
make a rational selection of what they consider to be the best alter-
natives.

Implementation

Once the goals and means have been established, the implementation
is generally a matter of administering them. This implementation,
however, depends on the participation and support of both the government
(its agencies and departments) and the various publics whose good will
is of essence. It is often the function of the urban planner to secure
and co-ordinate the efforts of these groups within the framework
provided by the goals and means.

There is usually little difficulty in acquiring government
participation since it is the agency which has initiated and carried
out the urban planning process to this point and its role in implementation
is usually well defined in the plan. The urban government's role is
usually one of commitment; that is, the government has committed itself
in the plan to carrying out certain programs as its part in approaching
the goals.

The second element is public participation. This element has
often been lacking in urban planning projects and has been blamed for
many failures. In our democratic society and free-enterprise system,

public participation is achieved through incentive rather than force. We do not force a land developer to develop his subdivision in a particular place or in a particular way but rather provide incentives such as adequate access routes, tax incentives and public facilities which make the goal of the private developer (profit) compatible with the goal of the government (maximization of the welfare of the urban dwellers). Ideally, we do not force homeowners in deteriorated areas of our communities to rehabilitate their homes but rather encourage them to do so by providing incentives such as, for example, low-interest loans. These incentives are supported by proving to the people that through this action they can increase the value of their property, gain self-esteem, improve their living conditions and, in general, move closer to their own personal goals. At the same time, they are also helping to increase the overall welfare of the community.

Public participation in implementation is dependent on the goals of individuals and specific publics being consistent with those established through the urban planning process. Therefore, the groundwork for successful implementation is established in the earlier phases of the urban planning process. If the goals and means have been formulated such that they reflect the true values and opinions of the various publics, implementation will be almost automatic.

Re-Evaluation

Permeating all these phases of urban planning is the process of constant re-evaluation. Urban planning is a complex operation in that it involves an almost infinite number of variables or inputs. Because

of this complexity, some inputs are bound to be mis-evaluated in their importance to, or effect on, the overall operation. Therefore, each input and each decision based on it, from the initial philosophical assumptions to implementation, must be constantly re-evaluated to ensure that its significance to the urban planning operation has been properly assessed.

The element of time, over which the urban planning process takes place, permits not only some of the mis-evaluations to be recognized but also allows changes to occur in many of the inputs to the process. For example, a population projection for an urban area can suddenly be rendered obsolete by an unforeseen resource discovery. This element of time also permits drastic changes in the economic condition of a community as well as its social patterns.

Time is a most significant element in every phase of the urban planning process and constant re-evaluation minimizes its negative effects. When re-evaluation brings a new or altered input into the system at any particular phase, all other phases must also be re-evaluated to assess the impact of the new input. It is this constant re-evaluation process which gives the urban planning process its cyclical characteristic within its generally linear nature.

Summary

Urban planning is a process whose goal is to provide the best physical environment possible to act as a framework in which the various activities of the residents of an urban area can take place. It involves the participation, in varying degrees, of all the

residents of the area as well as some outsiders. One of the more important people involved is the urban planner whose primary function is to provide the technical expertise on how to approach the goals of the community.

In order to carry out his functions, he has numerous tools at his disposal. One of these is public relations which, in the past, has often been underrated and underutilized.

CHAPTER III

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The rise of vast industrial complexes with their inherent specialization of labor, the trend toward extensive urbanization and the advent of rapid and massive communication and transportation systems have produced a world in which one can no longer live in isolation. Individuals and groups are highly dependent upon one another for their existence and the behaviour of one virtually always affects that of others. Yet all people are different and their ideas, attitudes and opinions are sometimes in conflict. This interdependency and the conflict which is inherent in it, has resulted in groups and individuals being concerned with the opinions and behaviour of others and, inevitably, in one attempting to influence another.

The importance of considering the interests of others is recognized by most groups and individuals today.

> There can be no escape in today's world from the grinding wheels of public attitudes. .... This is the era of 'The Public Be Pleased'. No individual, no institution, can long prosper without public support or, at least, without public suffrance. ... Satisfying the public interest to the mutual advantage of all parties in conflict is a prerequisite to profitable public relationships. The basic problem is to adjust the institution to the climate of social change in a way that will serve both the public and private interests insofar as this is possible.[30]

---

[30] Scott Cutlip and Allen Center, *Effective Public Relations* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 8.

This concern for other groups and the attempt to adjust to, and influence, them, is only a means to approaching some other goal. In general, people do not attempt to influence others simply for the sake of doing so; they do it because they wish to influence an individual's or group's behaviour for a particular reason. A large corporation does not spend time and money trying to improve its employees' opinion of the firm because it wants to be liked; it does so in order to increase the corporation's profits through an increase in the productivity of each employee. Similarly, a politician attempts to influence the voters' opinions toward himself primarily to gain their support at election time.

Every institution has some ultimate goal toward which it is working. [31] In order to approach this goal, a second or lower level of goals ('sub-goals' or 'means goals') are established which are expected to lead to the higher level goal. In turn, for each of these second level goals, a third level is established and the process continues until a hierarchy of goals exists. [32]

For example, a private business usually has an ultimate goal of making the largest possible profit. In order to approach this, the

---

[31] The term 'institution' will refer, throughout the remainder of this thesis, to any business, government, society or other group which may be carrying out a public relations activity. The purpose in using the term is to distinguish the entity which carries out the public relations activity from those with which it is dealing.

[32] In the context of the public relations process, the term 'goals' will refer both to the ultimate goal of the institution and to all those lower-level goals and means which are part of the activity designed to approach the ultimate goal.

business establishes goals for each of the factors which may influence
or affect it such as the level of production, efficiency of distribution,
size of market area and level of sales. In turn, for each of these
goals, another level of goals is established for each of its component
factors and so on.

The degree of success in approaching each of the goals in the
hierarchy is ultimately dependent upon the behaviour, in the most
general sense, of various publics involved in it.[33] In order to approach
the goal of increased sales, for example, the behaviour of both the
sales staff and the consumer public must be considered. The behaviour
of these publics is the overt manifestation of their interests, ideas
and opinions and if they can be directed, so can their behaviour.
Therefore, if an institution can accurately determine the feelings of
those publics which affect the approachment of its goals, it can attempt
to adjust those feelings (and thus their behaviour) and its own goals
in such a way that the two become compatible. The conscious efforts
of institutions to relate their goals to the feelings of their publics
in such a way has led to the relatively new activity known as public
relations.

The origins of public relations go back to antiquity when the
activity was primarily intuitive rather than rational. However, the
methods, organization and degree of effort exerted today are relatively

---

[33] See Chapter II, p. 17 for definitions of 'public' or 'general
public' and 'publics' or 'specific publics'.

new. The public relations process is now normally applied by large

businesses, governments and other sizable groups and institutions

although some smaller bodies and individuals use it on a reduced scale.

In the modern context, public relations has been defined in

many ways. By far the most frequently quoted and accepted definition

was formulated by Public Relations News:

> Public relations is the management function which
> evaluates public attitudes, identifies the policies
> and procedures of an individual or an organization
> with the public interest, and executes a program
> of action to earn public understanding and acceptance.[35]

As stated in this definition, public relations is a management

function. The success of any institution is highly dependent on the

actions of its management - the decision-making body - which sets the

goals. Public relations is a means of relating the interests of the

salient publics to the goals of the institution in such a manner that

the goals may be more fully approached. Thus, public relations must

be intimately related to the decision-making body.

Although the decision-makers themselves do not carry out each

and every activity in the public relations process, they must be

constantly aware of its activities and the information it provides.

---

[34] The history and development of what is now referred to as
public relations is presented by Cutlip and Center, op. cit., Chapters
2 and 3; and Edward L. Bernays, Public Relations (Norman, Oklahoma:
University of Oklahoma Press, 1952), Chapters 3-13.

[35] Marston, op. cit., p. 5, quoting Public Relations News 1947.
The same quote with the same reference appears in Cutlip and Center,
op. cit., p. 5; Bertrand R. Canfield, Public Relations - Principles,
Cases and Problems (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1964),
p. 4; and David Finn, Public Relations and Management (New York:
Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1960), p. 1.

If the public relations process operates independently of the decision-making process, the two functions may come in conflict. Public relations, to be an effective means of helping to approach an institution's goals, must be related to the decision-makers in such a way that there is an immediate and effective communication link between them.

The definition of public relations stated above identifies, either explicitly or implicitly, the four steps in the process:

(1) Research   - the determination and evaluation of public attitudes and opinions;

(2) Planning   - the formulation of ways and means of dealing with these attitudes and opinions;

(3) Action   - communication with the publics involved in an attempt to bring the attitudes and opinions of all groups concerned into harmony;

(4) Evaluation - an assessment of the effectiveness of the activity.

These steps, similar to the phases of the urban planning process, have a cyclical characteristic within their predominantly linear nature.

Research

The function of research, the starting point of the public relations process, is to establish the existing situation with respect to those factors which may affect the relationship between the opinions of the various publics and the goals of the institution. Such factors include the goals of the institution and their interrelationships, the nature of the publics which may influence the various goals and the interrelationships between each of the publics and each of the goals. Of course, the research is not carried out by the management

personally but by an individual or group directly responsible to them.
Although the bulk of the research is done at the beginning of the pro-
cess, it is not a 'one shot' effort but rather a continuing function
and the 'existing situation' refers to that point in time at which the
research is being done.

Before an institution can relate its goals to the feelings of
the various publics, it must first establish clearly its own goals
and the policies and programs which are designed to approach them.
This includes an analysis of such elements as the resources of the
institution, its organizational structure, the priority ranking of
the various goals in the hierarchy and the interrelationships amongst
them. Without a full understanding of itself, an institution will have
difficulty in relating itself to its publics.

Once the institution 'knows itself', it can begin to attempt to
determine those publics, and their ideas, attitudes and opinions, which
may be pertinent to the various goals of the institution. As it was
pointed out in Chapter II, publics are not always easily identifiable
nor their nature determined due to their dynamic nature. However, they
must be researched as thoroughly as possible. This characteristic of
instability means that the publics must be constantly researched in
order to keep current as accurate an analysis as possible.

Despite the fact that many publics are difficult to identify
and research, there are usually some which are fairly obvious both in
identity and opinion. Often, these are the most important. For
example, in an urban renewal project, those who actually live in the
area of proposed renewal form one public and those in the surrounding

area form another. Those within the area are easily discernible and
it is they who are most concerned with the goals of the project. That
public composed of the residents of the 'surrounding area', however,
is not so readily delineated and its involvement is probably less
significant.

The number of publics which influence the goals of an institution
is usually very great and not all can be researched with equal effort.
A choice must therefore be made as to which are the most important and
a more concentrated effort must be applied to them. Researching the
publics is therefore divided into two phases. The first involves an
overview of as many different publics as is reasonably practical and
the second is a concentrated effort on those which are most significant.

Several methods are used to provide an overview of a large number
of publics. They are usually informal methods such as personal contacts,
analysis of the institution's incoming mail, reports of people in the
field, monitering the mass media and the statements of recognized
leaders. These types of research are most valuable in that they provide
a general knowledge of a large number of publics in a relatively short
period of time. However, they have weaknesses in that they are neither
objective (much of the information is hearsay) nor representative.
But a competent user of these devices who understands their weaknesses
can derive sufficient information from them to provide an adequate
overview.

From the overview, specific publics will appear to be more
significant than others to the approachment of the institution's goals.
These more salient publics are then subjected to more accurate and

reliable methods of research to determine more precisely their attitudes and opinions, how they relate to the institution and to the other publics, and how significant their support is to the institution.

Two common research methods are the mail questionnaire and depth interviews. The method selected is dependent on both the type of information desired and the nature of the publics. The mail questionnaire has the advantage of deriving a large range of information from a large number of publics, or individuals within publics, while depth interviews provide a wide range of latitude in responding and, therefore, more refined information. In many instances, a combination of the two is employed.

Once this more refined data is collected by the researcher, it is organized and analyzed to provide management with a clearer understanding of the existing situation. This data and its analysis provide the basis for the remainder of the public relations process. First, it provides the institution with a fresh review of its hierarchy of goals, their interrelationships and the resources available to approach them. Some members of an institution, particularly the decision-makers, sometimes become narrow-minded and parochial in their approach to some problems. The information derived from research permits the decision-makers to be somewhat more objective, and therefore more successful, in their decision-making. As Cutlip and Center point out, "more wrong decisions are made on mistaken hunches of what the public thinks than on willful disregard of public opinion."[36]

---

[36] Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 96.

Second, the results of the analysis with respect to the publics are important. They reveal the nature of each public in terms of its opinions, its leadership and its composition. It points out the inter-relationships amongst the various publics including their points of conflict and concurrence. The analysis also relates each public to specific goals of the institution and determine its impact on the approachment of them. It must be remembered that this impact is not simply a matter of the number of members in the public, but also a function of other aspects of its nature.[37]

Third, the analysis of the research data indicates the points of conflict between the existing policies of the institution and their salient publics as well as issues over which problems may arise. It is these existing and potential problems around which an effective public relations program is designed.

Besides the information derived for these primary concerns, other benefits often accrue to the institution. The knowledge of the various publics permits an increase in the effectiveness of the institution's outbound communications. Communications from an institution are directed toward specific individuals or publics and by knowing their nature, the institution can choose the best medium of communication and suit the message to the intended receiver.

------

[37] In our society, characterized by the specialization of labor and a high level of technology, a very small public in terms of its number of members can exert a tremendous impact on a much larger institution. For example, individuals who have objected to the expropriation of their property have been able to delay major re-development projects for extended periods of time.

In carrying out the research, most methods require that information be transmitted from the various publics to the institution. In this activity, the primary function of the institution (its researcher) is to listen and, at the appropriate time, ask pertinent questions. By so doing, communication links are established between the various publics and the institution which can, as the process goes on, be tailored to each specific public.

In order to research the publics, certain preconceived notions of what information is desired are established. However, there is often other information derived which is outside what was considered to be the area of concern. This 'intelligence' can often be used to deal with potential problems before they develop. "Too often problems are allowed to define themselves in the form of a crisis."[38] It is an advantage to the institution to avoid a conflict rather than resolve it after it arises.

The research step provides the basis for the remainder of the process. If the research is inadequate or inaccurate, it is unlikely that the public relations program based on it will be successful.

Planning

The second step in the process is the laying of plans. Planning, as used in this context, refers to the application of the planning process in an attempt to approach the goal of a public relations program.

_____

[38] Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 98.

Once the existing situation is defined and comprehended, a decision

must be made on how to improve it. The planning step is very critical

in that effective plans become effective programs, and ineffective

plans become ineffective programs, when they reach the action phase.

Poor planning, especially in times of crisis, often produces negative

results.

Planning a public relations program begins with the goals of

the institution and takes two directions simultaneously. One is

concerned with the overall, long-range program to assist the in-

stitution in approaching its entire hierarchy of goals and is defined

by the institution's ultimate goal. It is preventive in nature and

its purpose is to maintain continuous cordial relationships with the

various publics by precluding any misunderstanding. The second

direction is short-range and deals with specific projects to resolve

existing conflicts and problems. It is remedial in nature and arises

in response to specific conflicts. In modern public relations planning,

the emphasis is on the long-range program. "In the past there has been

too much remedial public relations, too much occasion for it, and too

little preventive. Quite often a matter calling for remedial action

provides the spark that touches off positive planning for the future."[39]

Planning a long-range program involves several phases. Since

the institution's primary goal defines the direction of the program,

it must be explicitly defined. Also, the other high-level goals provide

the framework and should also be stated clearly. If these goals are

---

[39] Ibid., p. 112.

not explicitly stated, "public relations is ... in danger of ... selling

a grab-bag package without having any clear idea of what the merchandise

is."[40] These goals should be presented to all the salient publics. "This

is equivalent to saying to the public: 'We should like to serve you and

we offer you the following contract which we think would be fair to all

concerned and mutually profitable.' The statements of policy, made

publicly, are hostages for performance."[41] These goals should also be

known and understood within the institution. It invites support and

collaboration from all hands. Also, in expressing the position of the

organization, the position of officials is also often clarified.

From the data collected and its subsequent analysis, action may

be taken in two different directions. Keeping in mind that the objective

of public relations is to bring the opinions of the various publics

into harmony with the goals of the institution, either the goals may

be altered to suit the public's opinion or the publics can be persuaded

to change their opinions. These two forms of action are dichotomous

and most action occurs somewhere in between.

On any given issue, it generally requires less effort on the

part of the institution to alter its goal to conform to the opinion of

a public. Therefore, the institution should consider this type of

action first. In some instances it may be that the goal in question

may be replaced by another which would be more acceptable to that

public and, at the same time, have little or no effect on the institution's

---

[40] Ibid., p. 113.

[41] Ibid., quoting Conger Reynolds, "And What is Your Public
Relations Platform?" Public Relations Journal, Vol. II (October 1955).

ultimate goal. On the other hand, the goal may be very important and the second type of action would be necessary.

If the second type of action is required, then a program must be devised to influence the opinion of the public in such a way that their resultant behaviour will be supportive to the approachment of the institution's goals. In public relations the influence is attempted through persuasion and "persuasion, in the sense of offering cogent reasons for belief, can be achieved only by communication."[42] Thus, planning the means of influencing the salient publics is planning a program of communication.

No matter what course of action is decided upon, whether it is adjusting the institution to the publics, the publics to the institution or somewhere in between, two conditions must be present if public relations is to be operative. First, meaningful alternatives must exist. The assumption in public relations is that before any action takes place, the institution and one or more of its publics have differing goals or opinions. If the position of each of the groups is fixed and there is no alternative position which would bring the two groups closer together, then public relations cannot be operative.

For example, an urban government may decide to build a freeway which requires a particular piece of land from which the owner does not wish to move. If the government is unwilling to change the site of the road and the property owner is unwilling to vacate under any

---

[42] Marston, op. cit., p. 15.

conditions, the public relations involving the two is inoperative.
However, as is most often the case, the property owner is convinced
that in the long run, what is good for the majority of the community
will be good for him and that the compensation he receives will fulfill
his objective of having a residence. In this situation, the position
of the property owner is brought into closer harmony with that of the
government and public relations has been operative.

In any situation there are elements or factors which foreclose
various alternatives. For example, downtown businessmen may wish to
intensify the activity in the core area of their city while conser-
vationists oppose any increase in vehicular traffic due to its causing
increased air pollution. These two goals tend to be in conflict but
could be resolved by the construction of an underground rapid-transit
system. But it would not, in most cases, be a meaningful alternative
since the cost would be too great. Thus, economics or resources,
foreclose the alternative as a meaningful one.

The second condition necessary for public relations to become
operative is the existence of communication. Communication, the inter-
change of thoughts or opinions, is the backbone of all effective public
[43]
relations programs because no matter how virtuous an institution's
actions are, they will have little impact on the various publics unless
they are known. However, communications vary in their degree of
effectiveness. In today's world of massive communication, people are
constantly bombarded with messages and,

---

[43] Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 125.

... they pay little attention to most of them unless
they are of considerable personal interest; and this
usually means that the message must, in some way,
recall or reinforce the experiences or goals of the
recipients. ... Mere volume of communication is no
longer the sole prerequisite to success. In today's
great flow of communications, in fact, only a few of
the great organizations can hope to beat down in-
difference by sheer massive assault. Aim is becoming
increasingly important. [44]

In order to 'aim' communications most effectively, certain

principles of communications must be followed. The list of principles

is extensive and is constantly being added to by social scientists. [45]

In planning a public relations program, these principles must be con-

sidered if the communication is to be effective.

Once the various goals and publics have been defined and the

communication planned, the public relations program is structured in

terms of priorities and timing. Certain goals and certain publics will

be allotted varying degrees of attention and the timing and sequence

of the various communications will be established. The result is a

comprehensive, planned program of action.

The short-range projects are planned in a similar way only they

are less comprehensive in nature. However, no matter how specialized

they are, they must be consistent with the goals of the long-range

program. The planning of short-range projects begins with the frame-

work provided by the specific conflict or problem to be resolved. A

---

[44] Marston, op. cit., p. 245.

[45] The principles of effective public relations communications
are beyond the scope of this thesis. For a comprehensive discussion
of fifteen of the more important ones, see Marston, op. cit., Chapter
12. An outline of these principles is provided in Appendix I.

certain goal, or goals, of the institution is in conflict with one or more publics and a specific project is planned to deal with it. Once the conflict is resolved, that public and goal become the concern of the long-range program.

Action

The action step involves the implementation of the planned program of action - the actual communication with the various publics. If an effective program has been planned, then the action step is simply the carrying out of that program.

The program, however, is not a static entity and, due to the lapse of time between the first research and the actual communication, modifications and adjustments are likely to be required. Modifications at this or any other point in the process, necessitate a back-tracking to each of the previous steps. It is this type of activity that gives the public relations process its cyclical character.

Evaluation

The final step in the public relations process is to seek, through objective research, an evaluation of the program and projects. It is carried out in primarily the same way and with basically the same tools as the first step in the process. Thus, it logically leads back to it. The evaluation of a public relations program often functions as the research step in a new or revised program.

Research for the purposes of evaluation differs from the original research in that its ultimate purpose is not to determine

the existing situation (although it is one of the purposes), but to determine how and why the situation has changed from what it was before the public relations program began to what it is at present.

The collection of data for evaluation is primarily the same as for the research step; it is in the analysis of the data that the effectiveness of the program comes to light. It is by knowing the situation before the program began, the program designed to alter the situation and the situation after the program has been implemented that an analysis of the effectiveness of the program can be made.

The evaluation begins soon after the action step has begun and they are carried out concurrently. Often, the evaluation will identify weaknesses and misdirections in the program and adjustments can be made immediately. Again, this activity is another example of the cyclical character of the public relations process.

Summary

Public relations is a process designed to integrate the opinions and behaviour of certain publics with the goals of an institution in such a way that the goals may be more fully approached. The integration is accomplished by the institution in one of three ways: either by altering the goals to suit the publics, altering the ideas and attitudes (the basis of opinions and behaviour) of the publics to suit the goals or a combination of the two. It is a management function in the sense that management must be intimately involved in each of the four steps in the process even though its members do not personally carry out all the activities.

The public relations process is a tool which is used by many institutions in an attempt to approach a variety of different goals. In most instances, a specific group of individuals are hired by management to carry out most of the activities in the process. However, within an institution, certain individuals and departments whose primary responsibility is not public relations per se can utilize the process as a tool to help them fulfill their primary functions. The urban planner is one of these individuals, par excellence.

CHAPTER IV

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND THE URBAN PLANNER

From a theoretical point of view, the urban planning process
is applied by the politicians to approach a goal desired by the
people whom they represent. In order to approach that goal, the
urban planning process attempts to answer two questions: (1) What
physical environment will best suit the various activities of the
citizens? and, (2) How can that environment be achieved? As pointed
out in Chapter II, the answer to the first question is the re-
sponsibility of the citizens and the answer to the second, in large
part, is the function of the urban planner.

The answers to these two questions, however, are interdependent;
one cannot be answered without considering the other. If the urban
planner is to apply his technical expertise toward certain goals, he
must know what those goals are and if the citizens of the community
are to formulate their goals, they must be aware not only of all the
alternative goals, but also of the means available to approach them
and the implications of each.

From the point of view of the urban planner, then, the ful-
fillment of his professional function of providing the politicians
with the best advice possible on how to approach the 'best possible
environment,' is dependent on how well the citizens perform their
function. Therefore, it is part of his responsibility to assist
them in any way he can to formulate their goals.

There are two ways in which the urban planner can aid the
community in formulating its goals. First, if the goals articulated
by the citizens are to be their true goals, they must evolve from a
public that is informed - a public which is aware of the various
alternatives and their implications. Obviously, very few members of
the community have the time, interest or resources to research the
pertinent information in order to become informed.

> The fact is that the human being seems to have a
> limited capacity. Most of us simply do not have
> sufficient curiosity and intellectual equipment
> to be interested in everything, or even a wide
> range of things, nor energy to be able to devote
> ourselves to a variety of interests. If we manage
> to sustain an active interest in one or two fields
> beyond our vocation, that usually requires all the
> curiosity, brains and energy that we can muster. [46]

But the urban planner, by virtue of his training, experience
and access to a variety of resources is aware and informed of the
existing situation, the alternative goals and means that are available
and the probable implications of each. Thus, he is in a position to
provide the community with a good deal of knowledge which is relevant
to the formulation of their true goals.

The carrying out of this 'informing' activity by the urban
planner raises two questions: (1) What is an informed public? and, (2)
Is it possible for the urban planner to communicate this information
without wittingly or unwittingly contaminating it with his own personal
values? Whether a public is informed or not is a relative and

---

[46] E.A. Levin, "The Planner, The Council and the Citizens'
Organization," Community Planning Review, Vol. XII, No. 2, p. 16.

subjective evaluation. From the urban planner's point of view, that point, if there is one, at which a public may be considered to be informed is irrelevant. What the urban planner is concerned with is the assumption that the better informed the public, and politicians, are, the more able they are to fulfill their functions in the urban planning process and, consequently, he is able to fulfill his. His function is not to evaluate whether or not the public is informed but rather to make available to them whatever knowledge he possesses to permit them to become better informed.

The answer to the second question is, of course, no. Being human, the urban planner cannot communicate, without being influenced by his own personal bias. But he can make every reasonable effort to reduce it to a minimum and has a professional responsibility to do so.

The second manner in which the urban planner can assist the community in formulating its goals is by encouraging all members of the community to actively participate. In a democratic society, a high value is placed on citizen participation in government policy-making and goal-setting on the assumption that the greater the number who do, the better the system will operate. This value is evidenced by the fact that people are strongly encouraged to vote at each election. Since urban planning is a government activity which is directly involved in goal-setting and policy-making, the same value applies, i.e., the greater the number of people who actively participate in fulfilling their responsibility in the urban planning process, the more effective the process will be. Therefore, the urban planner must actively

encourage the citizens of the community to participate.

It is evident from this discussion that the function of the urban planner is highly interrelated with the activities of the other groups and individuals involved in the process and the success he achieves in fulfilling his function is dependent upon how well his activities are aligned with theirs. The tool at the disposal of the urban planner to carry out this co-ordination is public relations.

As previously stated, the urban planner's activities varies from one situation to the next and it is therefore impossible to delineate precisely how and when public relations should be utilized by an urban planner. Each must evaluate his own specific circumstances and create a public relations program which is tailor-made to his requirements.

Following are three case studies which are analyzed from the point of view of public relations. In each case, the urban planner operated in a unique environment and each had a different approach to public relations.

The first two cases - Passaic and Montclair - are analyzed together since they are primarily concerned with the relationship between the political body and the planner while the third - Metropolitan Winnipeg - is more involved with the 'planner-public' relationship.

Case I: Passaic, New Jersey

Passaic was a declining textile manufacturing city whose economic base had been somewhat bolstered in recent years by several new industries. Its population of 54,000 included a large number of blue collar workers (23,000) and over half the population was either foreign born or the children of immigrants. In addition, nearly 10 per cent were either Negro or Puerto Rican.

The potential divisiveness inherent in the ethnic structure was accentuated by the city's form of government - a nonpartisan commission - which reduced the possibility of social differences crossing party divisions and thereby moderating political conflict. The political power, however, had not always been as fragmented. Over the previous century, the city had moved from oligarchy to pluralism. The leadership had begun in the hands of powerful industrialists and moved through the middle class to politicians of primarily working-class backgrounds. The leadership of the Board of Commissioners was divided amongst five, equally powerful Commissioners, each of whom headed a separate department and was supported by a definite following based on ethnicity and patronage.

The fragmented nature of Passaic's politics had affected the ability of the city to deal effectively with urban development problems as well as many other issues. Co-ordination and co-operation had been

---

[47] This case study is condensed from a case study in Francine F. Rabinovitz's City Politics and Planning (New York: Atherton Press, 1969), pp 24, 73-77 and 104-107.

severely limited by a decision-making body in which each member
was competing with the others for power and prestige. Primarily as
a result of this system, most proposals for change had become public
conflicts and, consequently, it had been virtually impossible to gain
any policy commitment for the city's re-development.

The limited planning that had been done in Passaic had been
under the direction of a Planning Commission appointed by the Board of
Commissioners. Composed of lay members, except for one from the Board
of Commissioners, it was primarily an advisory body similar to the
Citizen's Advisory Committee on Reassessment and the Passaic Parking
Authority which were also involved in some specific aspects of planning.

In 1954, the Federal Government made funds available to cities
(for urban renewal, urban re-development and public housing) under the
Urban Planning Assistance Program and the Housing Act. These grants,
however, were conditional on the cities formulating comprehensive
metropolitan plans. Passaic, encouraged by the Federal incentive,
decided to take advantage of the funds and hired an urban planner as
technical advisor.

Many urban planners had become aware that in many instances
master plans prepared for communities interested only in gaining access
to Federal funds had proposed only minor alterations to existing land-
use patterns and/or had been relegated to the status of obscure documents
on a dusty shelf. This had tended to be particularly true of cities
like Passaic where any consensus on action and innovation would have
been difficult to achieve. This had occurred primarily because urban
planners often thought, rightly or wrongly, that master plans which

proposed radical innovations would be subject to the wrath of the
interests tied to the status quo and thus the position of the plan,
and possibly the planner, may have been endangered.

Passaic's planner did not follow this established strategy.
He immediately pointed out, upon taking office, that the city's original
master plan was 40 years old and required major revisions. He con-
vinced both the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners
that a new master plan, which would be financed by Federal funds, should
be formulated. Facing squarely the city's most serious problems, he
believed that some people would have to be antagonized. "It is wrong
to think that people will be frightened into opposition if our plans
are ambitious and bold. A plan that fails to stir the imagination
will fail to light a fire of civic enthusiasm. It will fail to re-
kindle Passaic's future."[48]

The planner approached the formulation of the master plan by
dividing it into phases or studies. As each phase was completed, it
was presented to the Planning Commission and published in the local
paper in order that everyone could understand the reasoning behind
the proposals. It was a well organized public relations program and
kept the master plan in the public eye. As a result, a member of the
Board of Commissioners organized a co-ordinating committee to guide
the plan through the various formal agencies of the city, including
the Board of Commissioners. This committee, known as the Joint Agencies

---

[48] Master Plan Report Number One (February 22, 1955) as quoted in
Rabinovitz, op. cit., p. 99.

Committee, included representatives of various civic bodies and the planner and was chaired by the Commissioner.

Upon completion of the plan, invitations to public meetings on the plan were given to numerous groups and individuals. When the meetings were held most of the members of the Planning Commission were present but the planner did most of the explaining and answering of questions.

The approach resulted in immediate gains in that the meetings were well attended and did not provoke any serious conflicts. Also, the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners were impressed by the planner's proposals since they allotted additional money for the preparation of a zoning ordinance to complement the master plan.

When public hearings took place on the zoning ordinance, however, some serious opposition arose. Due to the likelihood of conflict, the Planning Commission withdrew its support of the zoning ordinance. The planner, however, did not. The newspaper supported the planner by alleging that changes in the proposed zoning ordinances were being made despite the planner's objections. Encouraged by the newspaper's and planner's stand, a citizens committee organized to support them. The group was large and vociferous and their show of opposition to the Planning Commission's negative attitude resulted in the Board of Commissioners deciding to accept the expert's advice. Shortly there-after, the master plan, including the zoning ordinances, was officially adopted by them.

The master plan did not solve all of Passaic's re-development problems. When the planner was hired, there already existed a Public

Housing Authority which had operated freely. It had already received approval for two major housing projects as a matter of routine. Following the adoption of the master plan, a third project was initiated. The site chosen for this housing project was ideal from the point of view of the Authority and the Board of Commissioners since it was in one of the most dilapidated areas of the city and its residents, primarily new Negro immigrants, were unlikely to generate an organized protest.

Without the knowledge of the planner, the Planning Commission approved the site chosen by the Public Housing Authority. However, the master plan and zoning ordinance called for the area to be converted to light industrial use. The members of the Planning Commission had overlooked this technicality and, even if they had not, the members would probably have ignored the two documents rather than become involved in a conflict with the Authority. The planner was not to be intimidated by the older body and, based on his conviction that the master plan was correct and should not be indiscriminantly altered, he challenged the Public Housing Authority.

The planner faced a difficult task. He could not base his challenge simply on the grounds that his option was better than the Housing Authority's. The Planning Commission was wary of public conflict and to change their original decision would be embarrassing. The planner was also faced with the general apathy of the public, the inertia of the Public Housing Authority and the question of legality in interfering.

The planner began by exercising his legitimate right to evaluate

the project. The time required to make the evaluation also afforded

him an opportunity to mobilize support for the impending conflict.

The planner presented his case to the Planning Commission in a speech

at one of their meetings and to the public in a column in the local

paper. He also arranged private conferences with those members of the

Commission who supported the Public Housing Authority's position.

Realizing that support from the general public would also be

required, he appealed to the civic groups which had supported him in

the preparation and acceptance of the master plan and zoning ordinance.

He approached the League of Women Voters on the basis that the master

plan was being indiscriminantly violated; the Chamber of Commerce and

the industrialists on the fact that the site proposed by the Public

Housing Authority could be re-developed for industrial use, thereby

increasing the city's tax revenue; and the Board of Education on the

grounds that the site was in an area where schools were already over-

burdened. The planner also received support from the city's conservatives

who took the opportunity to voice their opposition to public housing in

general and the residents of the proposed site who were responding to

a personal threat.

As the planner's support increased, the Board of Commissioners

squirmed in their predicament. On one hand, they did not wish to

castigate the Public Housing Authority and the Planning Commission

---

[49]The terms of the New Jersey Redevelopment Agencies Act of 1949
give local planning boards the power to evaluate re-development sites
to see that they are in accord with the local master plan.

while on the other they could not ignore the increasingly more vocal

segment of the community opposed to the site selection. The Board of

Commissioners received an opportunity to save face when a court ruling,

in a suit initiated by the Chamber of Commerce, stated that although

the city had agreed to the site and the project, it did not necessarily

constitute grounds for the zoning change required to allow residential

construction in the industrial zone.

When the Board of Commissioners met to consider the zoning

adjustment, over 700 people attended the meeting. Proponents of both

points of view were represented and presented their cases. The anti-

project group was well-organized and convincing and the Board of

Commissioners subsequently rejected the application for adjustment.

Case II: Montclair, New Jersey[50]

The community of Montclair had been established as a rail-

commuter town in the late 19th century and had since become a suburb

in the New York megalopolis. It was a well-to-do community with more

than 40 per cent of its 43,000 residents having an income of more than

$10,000 per year in 1964. In addition to the large segment of higher

income families, nearly a quarter of the population was non-white.

Racial conflict, however, had been virtually non-existent primarily

because the Negro population, composed mainly of long-term residents

---

[50] This case study is condensed from Rabinovitz, op. cit.,
pp 49-53 and 60-69.

rather than newcomers, had been indoctrinated to, and accepted, their
social place in the community.

The city had a nonpartisan commission form of government.
Election campaigns had usually been staid affairs ever since a public
fight in 1934 resulted in the establishment, by a number of prominent
citizens, of an ad hoc group known as the Montclair Community Committee.
This group had since selected a slate of candidates for each Town
Commission election and, although an odd one of their choices had been
defeated, they had consistently held a majority of seats on the Town
Commission.

The strength of the Montclair Community Committee and its
control of the Town Commission created a ruling elite. Besides con-
trolling the decision-making process, the group had also been successful
in avoiding any serious public conflict over the decisions it did make.
They had accomplished this by following a path of minimum citizen
resistance and settling potential conflicts behind the scenes.

This strategy of decision-making had been illustrated by the
M.C.C.'s settlement of what had appeared to be the beginning of a
serious racial problem. In a recent election, a Negro dentist had
been runner-up in the M.C.C.'s slate which had subsequently been
elected. When one of the Commissioners resigned, the Negro was not
appointed to take his place. There had been, at this time, increasing
Negro militancy against de facto school segregation and it had become
clear that further failure to provide Negro representation would
increase the probability of community wide conflict. The M.C.C. had
recognized this impending trouble and, therefore, for the following

election had selected, at unrecorded meetings, a slate of candidates which included a Negro minister. That year, Montclair elected its first Negro Commissioner. The elite had yielded to the pressure for Negro rights but without a serious public confrontation and within the channels of established community relations.

Urban planning in Montclair was administerd by a Planning Commission, appointed by the Town Commission, and a planning director which it selected. The Planning Commission gave the planner extensive formal powers and he served not only the Planning Commission but was also a staff member of the Traffic Committee and secretary of the Board of Adjustment.

Despite what appeared to be a position of extensive influence, the planner occupied a technician's role. He unquestioningly accepted the goals submitted by his superiors who were of the opinion that the goal of planning in Montclair was to maintain it as a high-income, single-family residential suburb. The planner did his part in approaching this goal by providing the technical means to secure the holding operation.

The role of the planner in Montclair is best illustrated by the city's venture in urban renewal. Re-development in the city was first suggested by a M.C.C. sponsored Commissioner but there were few interests that were concerned with fostering renewal, except the building industry and the banks, since there were no groups which would derive direct monetary benefits. However, the Town Commission, always concerned with Montclair's physical appearance, requested the planner to study and report on the extent and location of deteriorated areas.

The Redevelopment Agency, appointed by the Town Commission, made its decisions on urban renewal not on the basis of the extent and location of deteriorated areas but on a project that fostered its image as defender of the character of the town without leading to conflict. Consequently, the $3\frac{1}{2}$ acre site it selected was not within the area designated in the planner's report to the Town Commission. It was a site which minimized the chances of public conflict. It assuaged the fears of the non-white community since it affected only existing housing units owned by whites; it provided the least relocation problem of any alternative sites and two-thirds of it had already been cleared by a private developer. What opposition did exist was minimal. The Negro community mildly opposed it because it did not benefit them even though nearly half the dwelling units occupied by them were in blighted areas according to the planner's report. Also, there was some slight opposition by a right-wing group which was hostile toward any Federal intervention in local affairs. (Urban renewal would be financed, to a large extent, by Federal funds.)

State law required that the Planning Commission investigate and hold public hearings to determine whether blight actually existed in the area chosen for urban renewal and whether the re-development plans were consistent with the city's master plan. Hearings were held in Montclair and the Negro and right-wing group used the opportunity to voice their protests. But the Planning Commission was clearly unsympathetic to their viewpoint. Predictably, the Commission declared the area blighted despite the fact that the dilapitated

buildings had been removed from the site by this time. Also, they

adjudged the land to be improperly used in terms of its potential

value even though a developer had just assembled and cleared the land.

The planner identified his position in the decision-making process

when he issued his statement on the proceedings: "the decision is

certainly not up to the planning department."[51]

Analysis of Passaic and Montclair

The public relations program carried out by Passaic's planner

was influenced by numerous factors which defined the environment in

which he operated. His own concept of the role of the urban planner

as more than just a technical advisor to the decision-makers gave rise

to the necessity of his attempting to inform others. He felt that

planning which was not implemented was not planning at all; therefore,

he felt responsible for convincing the decision-makers that the

planning concepts they approved (the development plan and zoning

ordinance) must be implemented and not indiscriminantly altered.

The political nature of the community lended itself to public

relations on the part of the planner. The Board of Commissioners

had in the past been unable to agree on, or had not been concerned

with, a policy of urban development and re-development and the apathy

of the public permitted them to ignore it. When the Federal Housing

Act of 1954 was passed by Congress and they realized that they re-

quired at least a minimal amount of urban planning in order to qualify

---

[51] _Ibid._, p. 53.

for the federal funds, the urban planner was in a position to exert a good deal of influence on the direction which the planning would take. Thus, despite the formal administrative hierarchy which tended to limit the planner to a strictly advisory role, he became, informally, a central figure in the decision-making process.

The planner in Montclair operated in a much different political environment. He was confronted with a united, somewhat dictatorial decision-making body which had, as one of its primary objectives, the avoidance of public conflict. When this body was forced into urban planning, for the same reason as Passaic, their approach was to accept the planner's professional advice only insofar as it did not create any public conflict. When public conflict appeared imminent, the politicians yielded to the line of least resistance.

The decision-making process in Passaic influenced the groups toward which the planner directed his public relations. The planner realized that the decision-making body - the Board of Commissioners - must be convinced of the value of planning for without their approval, any attempt to inform the general public would only create more conflict and indecision and his own position would be in jeopardy. But the approval of the public was also important because of the unstable nature of the Board of Commissioners. Past experience in Passaic indicated that the Commissioners had had trouble gaining a solid consensus on many policy matters but if public support for their decision to adhere to sound planning principles was in evidence, the Board would be less likely to succumb to special interest groups.

As a result, the urban planner cultivated his relationships with the politicians and the various specific publics and it yielded the desired result when opposition arose to the proposed zoning ordinance.

The public relations program of Passaic's planner was also influenced by the timeliness of his appointment. He took office when urban re-development was becoming fashionable and a necessity as evidenced by the Federal Government's interest in it. Passaic had had virtually no urban planning prior to this time and the thought of 'free' Federal money created a good deal of interest in the issue. Also, the fact that the Federal Government required cities to formulate a master plan as a condition for a grant enhanced the status of planning and the professional planner.

Timing was also important in that the planner came to office at a time when the public was somewhat dissatisfied with the inability of the Board of Commissioners to exert strong leadership. The public's attitude toward urban planning had not yet been firmly established since they had not been exposed to any great amount of it but they did think that it might benefit the city. The planner, therefore, had an opportunity to show them the value of urban planning without first having to overcome a negative attitude.

If Passaic's planner had elected to serve only in a purely advisory capacity and made no attempt to relate the objectives of the planning department to those of the politicians and the various publics, the city's venture in planning would probably have been ineffective. The zoning ordinance would probably have been indiscriminantly altered both before its formal approval by the Board of

Commissioners and after. In the first instance, the Board of
Commissioners would have created the changes and in the second, the
Public Housing Authority's wishes would have prevailed. In Montclair,
where the planner made no attempt at public relations, the Redevelopment
Agency was able to adjust the zoning ordinance even though the action
was contrary to sound planning principles and the welfare of the
community.

Montclair's planner did not establish a public relations
program primarily because of three factors. First, the political
nature of the community was such that the decision-making body con-
trolled a good deal of power and tended to be more closed to the
influence of their administrators and advisors than was Passaic's
Board of Commissioners. The closely-knit elite made the policy
decisions and expected their planner to provide only technical advice
on how to implement their policies. Therefore, the planner was
limited in any attempt he might make to influence the politicians,
let alone the public, since the elite were adverse to such a strategy
of planning.

The second factor was the Town Commission's general philosophy
of choosing the path of least public resistance in order to avoid
conflict. Such a philosophy relegated sound planning principles to
a secondary influence on their decision-making. If it came to a
choice between a policy based on rational thought and research, but
accompanied by some conflict and one which would minimize conflict,
the second choice would be preferred. This was evidenced by the
Public Housing Authority's site selection prevailing over what

appeared to be the more rational choice.

The third, and possibly the most important, factor was the planner's concept of his own role. The fact that he conceived urban planners as strictly technical advisors with no feeling for the political environment in which they operate precluded any attempt on his part to influence either the politicians, other government departments and agencies (the Public Housing Authority) or the public. Thus, he had no reason to employ public relations as one of his tools.

Case III: Metropolitan Winnipeg

Greater Winnipeg is an urban area containing all or part of twelve municipalities and having a population of about 500,000. Each municipality was governed by its own local council until 1960 when a metropolitan level of government was superimposed. This level of government has been responsible for certain specific services which require inter-municipal co-ordination.

A central metropolitan authority was first suggested for Greater Winnipeg in 1953 by a Provincial Municipal Committee which was studying the organization of municipalities in Manitoba. As a result of the findings of this Committee, it became the subject of an extensive four-year examination by a commission established by the Provincial Government and known as The Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission. The Commission was established because the governing of the area was split among the various councils, each with its own interests and its own objectives. As a result, Greater Winnipeg faced major difficulties in the provision of certain services which were of metropolitan wide

concern. One of the main problems was confusion and conflict in the

overall planning of the development of the area and in the administration

of zoning by-laws.

In 1959, the Commission published its report and unanimously

recommended the immediate formation of a metropolitan level of govern-

ment. Although the Commission's primary issue of concern was the type

of governmental structure, it did make specific reference to urban

planning.

> The need for one overall planning authority is so
> evident that little comment is necessary. It is
> the intent of the Commission, however, that the
> central authority has jurisdiction and authority
> to enforce its plans, and that these shall not
> be subject to change by local council or by
> referendum. [52]

The Provincial Government was quick to act on the Commission's

report. Bill 62, an Act to establish the Metropolitan Corporation

of Greater Winnipeg, was introduced at the 1960 session of the

Manitoba Legislature. After thorough examination and public hearings

the Act was approved almost unanimously by the Provincial Legislature

in March, 1960.

The significance of the planning function in the new 'Metro' [53]

government was emphasized by the Premier of the Province of Manitoba

who commented in the Legislature that,

---

[52] Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission, Report and
Recommendations (Winnipeg, Manitoba: Queen's Printer, Province of
Manitoba, 1959), p. 268.

[53] 'Metro' is a term commonly used to identify the Metropolitan
Corporation of Greater Winnipeg.

The key to the major portion of the services to come
under metropolitan jurisdiction is to be found in
the central planning function. The Council is charged
with the preparation, revision and adoption of a
development plan for the whole of this metropolitan
area and is established as the sole authority in that
field. The adoption of an overall development plan
must, of course, include long-term planning with
respect to major roads and bridges, traffic control,
transit, sewer and water functions, the establishment
of major parks and garbage disposal.

An orderly and economic expansion in any one of the
above fields can be successfully achieved only if it
is integrated and fitted into the whole picture of
the future development of the whole area. Any in-
dividual development in any one of these fields, if
carried on separately and without due regard to other
requirements will lead only to unnecessary expenditure
of public funds which cannot be recouped at a later
date when that particular service is fitted into the
overall program. [54]

This statement by the Premier indicated the necessity of the

urban planning body to co-ordinate numerous activities and thus, the

necessity of effective communication with the various bodies re-

sponsible for them. [55] However, neither the Act nor the organizational

structure of Metro were conducive to the urban planning objectives

as stated by the Premier. The Act did not give Metro complete

authority in the fields of roads, sewer and water and garbage disposal

nor in several other areas relevant to urban planning. Within Metro

---

[54] Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, Debates and Proceedings
(February 17, 1960).

[55] Statutes of Manitoba, 1960, The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act,
Bill No. 62, CAP. 40, "An Act to establish the Metropolitan Corporation
of Greater Winnipeg and to provide for the Exercise by the Corporation
of Certain Powers and Authority," Province of Manitoba (May 26, 1960).

itself, rather than urban planning being the co-ordinative activity

in the administrative structure, it became the responsibility of the

Planning Division which was but one of a total of seven divisions.

Each division, including Planning, was equal in its jurisdiction and

responsibilities within the formal structure.

Although the planner (Planning Division) was given a wide range

of tasks, by far the most important was the preparation of the Metro-

politan Development Plan. This activity was specifically set out in

the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act in that, "... the metropolitan council

shall ... as soon as it is practicable, cause to be prepared and

approved and by by-law established, a plan."[56] This plan was to be,

> ... a statement of policy of the metropolitan council
> set out in a text, in maps, or illustrations, or in
> any form of them, designed to secure and promote the
> orderly growth and economic development in the metro-
> politan area ... in the manner most advantageous to,
> and that will best promote those amenities that are
> essential to, or desirable for, the well being of
> the inhabitants thereof.[57]

The planner began work early in 1961 and by November presented

his first progress report to Council. The report gave a brief des-

cription of what the urban planning process involved but, for the

most part, was a technical description of the organization or a "...

'plan for the plan'."[58] The report was printed in a booklet form and

---

[56] Ibid., Part IV, Sec. 97(1), p. 78.

[57] Ibid., Part IV, Sec. 77(1)(c), p. 77.

[58] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, First Annual Report, 1961 (Winnipeg: 1962), p. 2.

made available to the public as well as being reported in the local

newspapers. However, no formal attempt was made to determine public

reaction to the proposed activity.

During the following two years, the planner discussed his work

with a consulting committee composed of representatives of the muni-

cipal councils and school authorities in the metropolitan area. By

the fall of 1963, a preliminary development plan had been completed

and in September the Draft Development Plan was released.[59]

The Plan was primarily a physical plan in that it dealt almost

exclusively with the proposed use of land in the Greater Winnipeg area

despite its statement that, "The basic purpose of the Plan is to

establish policies and objectives for urban growth."[60] The major element

of the document was a map of future land uses entitled "Metropolitan

Winnipeg Development Plan." Its function was to indicate what use

general areas of land could be put to in the future. In no way was

it intended to restrict what use was presently to be made of specific

properties.

The public, however, did not understand the purpose or intent

of the map. Many who studied it thought that their properties would

immediately be adversely affected by its implementation. In September,

a public hearing was held and the only submission which was not critical

of the Plan was that of an urban planning consultant speaking as a

---

[59] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning
Division, Draft Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg (September 3,
1963).

[60] Ibid., p. 45.

private citizen.[61]

The planner attempted to clarify the misunderstanding by publicly
stating that, "The Development Plan itself is binding on the Metro-
politan Corporation while the zoning and building by-laws will be
binding on the community."[62]

In February of the following year, the Cumming Commission
published its report on the operations of the Metropolitan Corporation
of Greater Winnipeg.[63] In its report, it recommended that,

> ... the expression 'metropolitan development plan' be defined
> so as to make it clear that it is to be a statement of
> land development policy and not in itself a legal restriction[64]
> upon the use of lands or buildings in the metropolitan area.

The statement reinforced that made by the planner but it appears to
have had little or no effect on the public's concept of the Plan.

In the following few months, the Draft Development Plan was
slightly revised and released as the 'Development Plan, Metropolitan
Winnipeg.'[65] Included in the new Plan was the statement: "These policies
and objectives will guide and influence the actions of the Corporation."[66]

---

[61] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Transcript of
Special Committee of Council Re: By-Law No. 705, Winnipeg (September
8, 1964). (Mimeographed.)

[62] Winnipeg Tribune (December 24, 1963).

[63] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg Review Commission,
Report, (Winnipeg, Manitoba: Queen's Printer, Province of Manitoba, 1964).
The Commission is commonly referred to as the 'Cumming Commission' after
its chairman, L.R. Cumming.

[64] Ibid., p. 23.

[65] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning Division,
Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg (July 4, 1964).

[66] Ibid., p. 55.

The Plan received its first reading by Council almost immediately
as the first step in its official acceptance. The second step, public
hearings, were also held and were characterized by violent opposition
to the land use changes that appeared to exist on the map in the Plan.
From the hearings, it was obvious that the planner had not conveyed
to the public that the map did not place any legal restrictions on
properties in the community. As a result of the opposition, the Plan
never reached the Council for second reading but was returned to the
Planning Division for revision and a new approach.

During the following two years, the Plan was changed from a
'physical plan' to a 'policy plan'. In essence, the concepts expressed
in the original plan changed very little other than incorporating some
of the suggestions from the public hearings. What did change signi-
ficantly was the format of the document. On the very first page of
the new plan, known as the 'Development Plan 1966', the planner out-
lined the concept of what the Plan was and what it hoped to achieve.

> The Plan is defined as a 'Statement of Policy of the
> Metropolitan Council'; therefore it is the 'Statement
> of Objectives and Policies' as set out in the following
> section A2 that forms the operative part of the Plan.
> The balance of the document is explanatory. It provides
> the basis for the Statement of Objectives and Policies
> and indicates the anticipated effect of their im-
> plementation. This explanatory material which consists
> of text, maps and illustrations must be used as part of
> the Plan and is essential to the proper understanding
> of the Statement of Objectives and Policies.
>
> The Plan's prime function is to act as the means by
> which the Corporation may confirm existing policies
> and initiate new policies relative to urban growth,
> and through subsequent amendments can modify or

supercede these policies in light of changing cir-
cumstances or additional experience and understanding.[67]

Almost immediately after its release, a group of five urban
planning experts from various parts of North America were brought
together to evaluate this draft of the Development Plan. Their
reaction was favorable and on October 13, 1966, the Council gave
first reading on the Plan. Again, public hearings were held, twelve
in all, to hear 49 submissions from various local governments, pro-
fessional organizations and other groups and individuals. The
hearings took three months and ended in April, 1967.

During the following summer, amendments were made to the Plan
on the basis of the public hearing submissions and each group or
individual which had made a submission received an explanation by mail
on what action had been taken with respect to their representations.

The 'Metropolitan Development Plan', the amended version of
'Development Plan 1966', was given second reading by Council in
November 1967 and was forwarded to the Minister of Urban Development
and Municipal Affairs for approval, as required in the Metropolitan
Winnipeg Act. The Minister approved the Plan in April 1968 and it
received its third and final reading on April 11, 1968.

Analysis of Metropolitan Winnipeg

The degree of success achieved by Metro's planner does not
appear to be as great as it might have been with respect to the

---

[67] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning
Division, Development Plan, 1966 (July 15, 1966), p. 1.

Metropolitan Development Plan. There is little doubt that it has injected some co-ordination and orderliness into the metropolitan area's development but there still appears, from the point of view of many groups and individuals, to be a mystic element in the urban planning process. This lack of understanding, or misunderstanding, has created an apprehensive attitude toward the Plan and the planner.

Metro has had two planning directors since its inception in 1960. Mr. G. Rich was the first director and when he resigned in 1967, he was succeeded by the Corporation's present director, Mr. E.A. Levin. Although fully qualified technically, these planners may not have made full use of public relations. As stated in the Act, the planner was to prepare a plan which would "secure and promote the orderly growth and economic development in the metropolitan area."[68] The environment in which the urban planner found himself, however, was not particularly conducive to such an objective.

In particular, the environment posed three barriers to the success of the planner and the urban planning process. First, the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg lacked complete authority over many services related to urban planning. Despite the recommendations of the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission, the member municipalities retained jurisdiction in such matters as housing and urban renewal, local sanitary sewage and water supply, storm drainage, education and garbage collection. The local municipalities

---

[68] The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, op. cit., Part IV, Sec. 77(1), p. 77.

also retained the power to issue debentures and plan their own capital
works programs. Therefore, they had control over many of the services
which were crucial to planning the future physical environment and
thus, in essence, cancelled Metro's power to have the "sole responsi-
bility for and authority and jurisdiction over the planning and
development of the Metropolitan Area."[69] As a result, neither the planner
nor the Metropolitan Council was in a position to challenge the muni-
cipalities on many planning matters. The authority of the urban planner
to implement his proposals was severely restricted and depended more
on the voluntary support of the constituent municipalities than on
any powers granted the Corporation and its planner by the Metropolitan
Winnipeg Act.

Second, in order to secure the co-operation of the various
municipalities and the public, their parochial attitudes had to be
reduced and a spirit of common enterprise created with respect to
urban planning. Parochialism was inherent in the history of the
Greater Winnipeg area. The municipalities had always been autonomous
units and, for the most part, were relatively small and intimate.
Citizens were often personally acquainted with their elected repre-
sentatives and could appear at Council meetings to voice their views
without feeling overpowered by a large impersonal machine.

Prior to the formation of Metro, there had been little inter-
municipal co-operation since there were few services which could not

---

[69] Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, op. cit., Part IV, Sec. 78(1),
p. 77.

adequately be supplied by the individual local governments. In urban

planning, a 'Metropolitan Planning Commission' had existed since 1949.

Established under the Metropolitan Planning Act,[70] it was a body composed

of representatives from any municipality which wished to join. However,

it was strictly an advisory commission and left the authority of

decision-making and implementation to the member municipalities.

When the Provincial Government imposed the new level of govern-

ment on the Greater Winnipeg area, there was a good deal of opposition

to it. Many groups and individuals saw it as an institution that

would infringe upon their freedom to decide on local issues, that

would remove them even further from the decision-making process and

would mean an increase in taxes. Many were still thinking in terms of

their rural heritage where people tended to be independent and the

specialization of function was uncommon. Metro and urban planning on

an area-wide basis were viewed by many as unnecessary or, at least,

with apprehension. In order for the planner and urban planning to

proceed efficiently, this attitude had to be modified.

Third, the slot in the organizational structure of Metro

assigned to urban planning was not what the Greater Winnipeg

Investigating Commission and the Premier had suggested it should be.

Both had indicated that it should be the central co-ordinating function

of Metro but it became the responsibility of the Planning Division which

was but one of seven divisions, each with equal status. Therefore,

in order to co-ordinate the various elements relevant to urban planning,

---

[70] Statutes of Manitoba, 1949, Metropolitan Planning Act, C. 40.

the planner had to rely on the voluntary co-operation of the other divisions.

These three factors did not seem to influence the planner's approach to the urban planning process and as a result, the Development Plan took eight years to complete and its value as an urban planning vehicle is still questionable.

Throughout the formulation of the Plan there were several instances where public relations on the part of the planner was noticeably lacking. In 1961, the planner presented his first progress report to Council and in it he outlined what the urban planning process was and, in his particular project, the "'plan for the plan'."[71] Although the document was printed in booklet form and made available to the public, it was intended for Council and, therefore, written to fulfill that function. Being somewhat technical in nature and containing professional jargon, the booklet was found by most laymen to be either difficult or impossible to understand or, after looking at the first few paragraphs, too difficult to bother attempting to understand. Also, the booklet was made available only to those who requested it; there was no attempt on the part of the planner to get the public to understand what it was doing, or proposed to do, and the public continued to be uninformed about, and apathetic or apprehensive toward, urban planning in the metropolitan area.

---

[71] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, First Annual Report, 1961, op. cit., p. 2.

Between 1961 and 1963, when the "Draft Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg" was made public, the planner did discuss urban planning and the proposals in the Plan with a consultative committee composed of representatives of the various municipalities. However, the discussions proved to be unfruitful since shortly after the Plan became public, several of the municipalities, all of whom had been represented on the consultative committee, were critical of the contents of the document and in doing so, exhibited a high degree of misunderstanding of its intent. Of particular concern was the map which was assumed to be the essence of the document rather than its intended role of an explanation.

In the following few months, before the "Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg" was published, and presented to Council for first reading, the planner made a public statement in an attempt to clarify the misunderstanding and the Cumming Commission, recognizing the lack of communication, publicly attempted to place the Plan in its proper perspective. But it was too late and too superficial. At the public hearings which followed, both the public and the municipalities were hyper-critical of the document in their briefs, often because they misunderstood the document and its intent. As a result of the opposition, the Plan was returned to the planner who, over the following two years, revised the Plan.

A comparison of the "Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg" and its successor, the "Development Plan: 1966" reveals little difference in their essence. What did differ significantly, however,

was the format of the documents and the explanation contained in the preface of the latter. The planner referred to the new version as a 'policy plan' rather than the old 'physical plan', i.e.,

> ... it is the 'Statement of Objectives and Policies' as set out in the following section A2 that forms the operative part of the Plan. The balance of the document is explanatory. [72]

The public hearings on the Plan did not indicate the same degree of misunderstanding as to the intent of the document but they did reveal that the municipalities were still thinking in a parochial manner. They also indicated that there was some confusion on the part of the planner as to the exact nature of the document he had just prepared. In a press release, the planner stated that the Plan was "binding on the Metropolitan Corporation"[73] while at the hearings it was pointed out that the document stated that it was to "... guide and influence the actions of the Corporation."[74]

In addition to the new confusion as to the intent of the Plan, the public hearings also indicated that many people were still having trouble understanding the content of the Plan. The feelings of many citizens filing briefs was summarized in the City of Winnipeg's submission:

---

[72] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning Division, Development Plan: 1966, op. cit., p. 1.

[73] Winnipeg Tribune (December 24, 1963).

[74] Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning Division, Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg, op. cit., p. 55.

The Development Plan is intended to serve as a guide
to future development and is also intended to promote
orderly growth. In order to fulfill these objectives
it must be capable of ready interpretation by the area
Municipalities, private investors, and the community
at large. In its present form the proposed Plan will
serve only as a guide to the Metropolitan Corporation
... and therefore will not fulfill the intended purpose
of a general development plan. [75]

In addition to the specific cases mentioned above, the entire

exercise lent itself to a strong program of public relations. From

the very beginning some effort should have been made to explain fully

what a development plan is, what its purposes are, and what effort

it would have on the individual's freedom to be 'master over his own

land.' This could have been done through the mass media, the mass

distribution of small booklets or circulars and by a more intensive

effort on the part of the planner to meet with specific interest

groups such as the municipal councils, business groups and local

community associations. In each case, however, some vehicle to permit

the various publics to comment and make suggestions would have to have

been provided. Certainly, public hearings permitted the various groups

and individuals to express their goals, values and desires but their

timing was too late to permit their maximum effectiveness.

There were two minor attempts at public relations made by the

planner but they were too little, too late and too short-range to have

any significant effect on the Development Plan. After the public

---

[75] Brief submitted by the City of Winnipeg from Transcript of
Public Hearing Representations Against, or in Respect of, the
Metropolitan Development Plan before the Committee on Planning Public
Hearings: No. 9, (March 1, 1967), p. 15.

hearings, each group or individual which submitted a brief received a letter from the planner explaining what action had been taken on the suggestions included in their submissions. The second effort involved an audio-visual explanation of the Plan which was made available after the release of the "Development Plan: 1966." During the period prior to the document's public hearings, eighteen local groups received the presentation but there is no indication that it was modified to suit the various audiences, i.e., the same presentation was made to the Labor Council as to the Winnipeg Real Estate Board. A similar program was launched following the adoption of the Plan in 1968.

Other than these specific efforts on the part of the planner, the public hearings required by law and the odd pieces of explanation appearing in Metro's general publications, no serious attempt to inform, or be informed by, the public appears to have been made. As a result, neither the urban planner nor the Development Plan were as successful as they could have been.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The use of public relations by urban planners to help them fulfill their urban planning function has not always been recognized as a valid tool. Even today, many people, including urban planners, view public relations as a 'gimmick' for promoting a selfish interest. As such, they object to its use by governments and their agencies since they feel it conflicts with the democratic ideal of governments being the reflectors of ideas and opinions, not the creators of them.

However, the notion of public relations is inherently democratic. In a despotism, there is no need for public relations since there are no meaningful alternatives to deal with. Public relations is neither a 'gimmick' nor a selfish act; it is a rational process by which the goals of an individual or institution are aligned with those of other individuals and publics to obtain a mutual benefit. It is this type of activity that is the essence of democracy.

The urban planning process involves the participation of numerous groups and individuals and the success it achieves is dependent, in large measure, on the extent to which the activities of the participants are integrated into a common effort. Since public relations is that activity which attempts to align and co-ordinate the various goals of two or more entities, it is an essential part of the urban planning process.

Public relations is of particular importance to the urban

planner. In his professional capacity of providing the technical

expertise required by the community in order to approach its goals,

it is essential that he have a clear understanding of what those goals

are and that he not confuse them with his own personal ones or those

of a vocal minority. An effective public relations program will help

the urban planner avoid misunderstanding the true desires of the

community at large and help keep him abreast of its constantly changing

values.

Not only is the urban planner dependent upon the others in-

volved in the process, they are dependent upon him. Most people

involved in the process have neither the time, interest nor resources

to research for themselves the facts salient to their making informed

evaluations and decisions. Therefore, they must rely on the urban

planner, whose training, experience and access to resources, permit

him to become aware of the various alternatives and their implications.

The analysis of the three case studies presented in Chapter IV

reveals two facts concerning the utilization of public relations by

urban planners. First, it indicates that the failure of the planners

in Montclair and Winnipeg to satisfactorily determine the true desires

and aspirations of the citizens of their respective communities and

to permit them, as well as the politicians, to carry on being con-

sistently misinformed, reduced their effectiveness in fulfilling

their professional functions as well as limiting the success of the

urban planning process as a whole. Second, it illustrated how such

factors as the political nature of a community, the nature of its

decision-making process, the general philosophy of a local council or

the political history of an urban area might influence the manner in

which a planner approaches his responsibilities which in turn affects

the use he may make of the public relations process.

This thesis has attempted to show that public relations is a

valid and useful tool of the urban planner and to illustrate a few of

the situations in which it was, or could have been, used by an urban

planner. What this thesis did not attempt to do was to delineate

precisely how and when public relations should be utilized in any

given circumstance the urban planner may face. It has become obvious

to the author that this would be an impossible task since any urban

planner at any point in any project is faced with a unique set of

circumstances and the elements which define that circumstance are the

criteria on which a unique public relations program must be based.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Altshuler, Alan A. The City Planning Process. Ithica, N.Y.: Cornell
        University Press, 1965.

Bernays, Edward L. Public Relations. Norman, Oklahoma: University
        of Oklahoma Press, 1952.

Breese, Gerald and Whiteman, Dorothy E., ed. An Approach to Urban
        Planning. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Canfield, Bertrand R. Public Relations - Principles, Cases, and
        Problems. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1964.

Carson, Rachel. Silent Spring. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications,
        Inc., 1962.

Cutlip, Scott and Center, Allen. Effective Public Relations.
        Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1958.

Dahl, Robert A. and Lindblom, Charles E. Politics, Economics, and
        Welfare. New York: Harper, 1953.

Feiss, Carl. "Taking Stock: A Resume of Planning Accomplishments in
        the United States." Environment and Change. Edited by
        William R. Ewald, Jr. Scarborough, Ontario: Fitzhenry and
        Whiteside, Ltd., 1968.

Finn, David. Public Relations and Management. New York: Reinhold
        Publishing Corp., 1960.

Harlow, Rex F. and Black, Marvin M. Practical Public Relations. New
        York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Huxley, Julian. TVA - Adventure in Planning. London: The Architectural
        Press, 1943.

Jacobs, Jane. The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York:
        Vintage Books, 1961.

Kelley, Stanley, Jr. Public Relations and Political Power. Baltimore:
        The John Hopkins Press, 1956.

Lerbinger, Otto and Sullivan, Albert J., ed. Information, Influence,
        and Communication. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Marston, John E. The Nature of Public Relations. New York: McGraw-
    Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

Meltzer, Jack. "Manpower Needs for Planning for the Next Fifty Years."
    Environment and Policy. Edited by William R. Ewald, Jr.
    Scarborough, Ontario: Fitzhenry and Whiteside Ltd., 1968.

Ogle, Marbury Bladen. Public Opinion and Political Dynamics. Boston:
    Houghton Mifflin Co., 1950.

Plunkett, Thomas J. Urban Canada and Its Government: A Study of
    Municipal Organization. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1968.

Rabinovitz, Francine F. City Politics and Planning. New York:
    Atherton Press, 1969.

Simon, Herbert A.; Smithberg, Donald W. and Thompson, Victor A. Public
    Administration. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962.

Theobald, Robert. "Planning With People." Environment and Change.
    Edited by William R. Ewald, Jr. Scarborough, Ontario:
    Fitzhenry and Whiteside Ltd., 1968.

Articles in Journals or Magazines

Altshuler, Alan. "The Goals of Comprehensive Planning. Journal of
    the American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXXI, No. 3 (August,
    1965), 186-194.

Bair, Fred, Jr. "Public Relations in Planning: Who, What, How." ASPO
    Newsletter, Vol. XXXIV, No. 11 (December, 1968), 143.

Burke, Edmund M. "Citizen Participation Strategies." Journal of the
    American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXXIV, No. 5 (September,
    1968), 287-294.

Dakin, John. "The Background Ideas of Planning." Plan, Vol. II, No. 3,
    (1961), 96-107.

Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." Journal of the
    American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXXI, No. 4 (November,
    1965), 331-337.

Davidoff, Paul and Reiner, Thomas A. "A Choice Theory of Planning."
    Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXVIII,
    No. 2 (May, 1962), 103-115.

Friedman, John. "A Response to Altshuler: Comprehensive Planning as
        a Process." Journal of the American Institute of Planners,
        Vol. XXXI, No. 3 (August, 1965), 195-197.

Harris, Britton. "The Limits of Science and Humanism." J.A.I.P., Vol.
        XXXIII, No. 5 (September 1967), 203-7.

Levin, Earl A. "The Planner, The Council and The Citizens' Organization."
        Community Planning Review, Vol. XII, No. 2, 203-207.

Levin, Melvin R. "Planners and Metropolitan Planning." Journal of
        the American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2 (March
        1967), 78-90.

Popenoe, David. "Community Development and Community Planning." J.A.I.P.,
        Vol. XXXIII, No. 4 (July 1967), 187-191.

Petersen, William. "On Some Meanings of 'Planning'." Journal of the
        American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXXII, No. 3 (May 1966),
        130-142.

Rabinovitz, Francine F., and Pottinger, Stanley J. "Organization For
        Local Planning: The Attitudes of Directors." J.A.I.P., Vol.
        XXXIII, No. 1 (January 1967), 91-97.

Seeley, John R. "What is Planning? Definition and Strategy." J.A.I.P.,
        Vol. XXVIII, No. 2 (May 1962), 91-97.

"Who Are the Planners?" Official Architecture and Planning, Vol. XXXI,
        No. 12 (December 1968), 1543.

Young, Robert C. "Goals and Goal-Setting." J.A.I.P., Vol. XXXII, No. 2
        (March 1966), 118-123.

Public Documents

Manitoba. Statutes of Manitoba, Metropolitan Planning Act, Chapter 40,
        1949.

Manitoba. Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission, Report and
        Recommendations, 1959.

Manitoba. Statutes of Manitoba, The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, Chapter
        40, 1960.

Manitoba. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg Review Commission,
        Report, 1964.

Winnipeg. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, First Annual Report, 1961, 1962.

Winnipeg. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning Division, Draft Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg (September 1963).

Winnipeg. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning Division, Development Plan, Metropolitan Winnipeg (July 1964).

Winnipeg. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Transcript of Special Committee of Council Re: By-Law No. 705 (September 1964).

Winnipeg. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning Division, Development Plan, 1966 (July 1966).

Winnipeg. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Transcript of Public Hearing: Representations Against, or in Respect of, the Metropolitan Development Plan, 1967.

Winnipeg. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Planning Division, The Metropolitan Development Plan (April 1968).

Other

Blumenfeld, Hans. "Contemporary Planning Systems - A Hope For City Planning." Planning 1968: Selected Papers From The American Society of Planning Officials National Planning Conference. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1968, 116-135.

Chevalier, Michel. "A Strategy of Interest-Based Planning." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1968.

Winnipeg Free Press.

Winnipeg Tribune.

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF FIFTEEN PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

1. Humanize - identify in terms of people if possible.

2. Suit the message and means of communication to the audience.

3. Speak the receiver's language.

4. Be timely.

5. Use two-way communication.

6. Dramatize communication.

7. Reach your own people first.

8. Face the facts - even when it is hard to do so.

9. Perform a needed public service.

10. Stress positive benefits.

11. Repeat if necessary.

12. Overcome refusal to pay attention.

13. Concentrate upon leaders of opinion.

14. Precondition the audience to your viewpoint.

15. Keep all communications in harmony.

---

[76] Marston, op. cit., p. 288.