PROVISIONAL AND PRECAUTIONARY POLITICS AS FOUNDATION FOR PLURALITY PARTICIPATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT – A POLITICAL CULTURE THAT INCORPORATES THE "WISDOM OF THE CROWDS" WITHIN A SOLIDLY UNITED PLANNING AND PARTICIPATION PROCESS.

Hannes Rockenbauch [1], Walter L. Schönwandt [2]

[1]Institute for the foundations of planning, university of Stuttgart, rockenbauch@igp.uni-stuttgart.de
[2]Institute for the foundations of planning, university of Stuttgart,schoenwandt@igp.uni-stuttgart.de

Keywords: planning, politics, participation

Cooperation and participation have today become regular components of planning processes. Processes that take the ideas and concerns of citizens into account are recognised as more suitable and are therefore more easily accepted. The protests against the infrastructure project "Stuttgart 21", however, have demonstrated that the so-called "communicative turn" in planning theory has failed to install a planning and policy-making process on a level playing field with the citizens.
What is missing is an approach which brings the actors jointly to the table. In real life practice, politics, public administrations, and citizens are often parallel worlds with their own general rules and rituals, and with little mutual understanding. The concept of Provisional and Precautionary Politics can provide the stimulus to change the culture of local planning and policy-making processes. This kind of politics means a radical break with the rational planning model, which assumes that everything can be planned. By contrast, it aims at a common and mandatory process of open-ended knowledge generation, in terms of a body of experience and feedback. Provisional and Precautionary Politics is based on the assumption that in a changing world and due to human fallibility, knowledge and actions can only be preliminary. Therefore, it is important to preserve maximum scope for future action. According to this proposition, the "wisdom of the crowds" helps in solving complex social problems, while, in turn, planning and politics can help the "wisdom of the crowds" to achieve common action.

1. Introduction

Already in the seventies and eighties, the academic discourse on planning had departed from a planning culture that still perceived the planner as having a "God the Father" type role and saw the world as being predictable by planning. The fantasies of omnipotence of a rational understanding of planning were set against the so-called "wicked problems" (cf. H. Rittel, 1973, p. 20). Owing to their quality of being socio-culturally constructed, these "wicked problems" led to the derivation of the demand for greater citizen communication, culminating in the so-called "Communicative Turn". Suddenly, the citizens became the focus and efforts were undertaken to ensure their participation in planning, which had until then mostly remained a sovereign affair. In the meanwhile, a broadly differentiated collection of formats for participation has developed. However, in political and administrative practice, the classic representative division of labour all too often still holds sway, following the motto: "Politics and planning decide, and the citizen must live with it." The fact that this outdated conception of planning is still deeply ingrained in Germany was last demonstrated by the controversies over the infrastructure and real estate project *Stuttgart 21*. By the autumn of 2010 at the latest, when the images of the police operation in Stuttgart's palace garden flashed around the world, the calls for better citizen participation in politics and planning in Germany became so loud that the search for new forms of participation and cooperation gathered renewed momentum everywhere. The Green Party-Social Democratic state government, in the meanwhile, even has a state councillor for civil society and since 2013, the University of Stuttgart has been offering a new master's course, "Planning and Participation", for studying citizen participation, while municipalities and administration departments are increasingly experimenting with various formats of participation. (cf. Selle, 2013, p. 337). However, parallel to these efforts, an old debate resurfaced between those who wholeheartedly proclaimed a new "culture of being heard" (cf. coalition agreement of the Green Party-

Social Democratic state government of Baden-Wuerttemberg, p. 1) and those who tirelessly warn against ungovernability and the decline of Germany as a business location on account of the attacks on representative democracy by enraged citizens (cf. Kurbjuweit, 2010, p. 26). In the light of such statements, the question arises whether things have really changed since the events of Stuttgart 21. Is it not true that soap-box oratories pay lip service to the "culture of being heard", but that in everyday life, the effects of participatory projects on the actual practice on the ground turn out to be rather modest? If this is true, why then is it so difficult to actually progress with "plurality participation in urban development"?

It should be noted that in the current debates over concepts of participation, a central aspect is often missed out, namely that the success of participation significantly depends on the decision-making processes in which it is embedded. This means that for participation to work, one has to particularly take a fresh look at processes in politics and planning. The search for ever new participation procedures seems to remain less expedient as long as the actual causes lie in the democratic deficit within the routines and processes of planning and politics themselves. The basic proposition of this paper is as follows: **Without fundamental changes in the decision-making processes in politics and planning, participation will, at best, remain little more than a well-meaning spectacle of participation, while the opportunity to fundamentally improve planning and political decisions in urban development by means of plurality participation is lost.** As long as politics and planning on the one hand, and plurality participation on the other, stand against each other in parallel worlds of sorts, as is the case today, many efforts go in vain in spite of planned communication. This is not only because the interfaces and time schedules of participatory processes don't fit to the processes in politics and administration, but also because according to the classical understanding of representative democracy, the field of politics and administration is not prepared to hand over decision-making authority. Frustration and conflicts then seem inevitable for both sides. Indeed, the problem faced during Stuttgart 21 was not a lack of participation but that the existing participation remained ineffective because citizen demands failed to flow into the planning. Already in 1997, open citizen participation was invited for the future city quarter. After three months of intensive work by the citizens, the city council adopted the framework prepared by the administration without any major changes – hardly surprising since the city council had decided on the main planning parameters in a basic agreement already in 1995 (cf. Süddeutsche-Online, 2011). In 2012, the Deutsche Bahn AG and the state of Baden-Wuerttemberg held the so-called "Filder dialogue" on a section of Stuttgart 21. However, the dialogue did not result in adhering to the route variant preferred by the citizens, but to that from which the Deutsche Bahn AG would have profited the most (cf. STZ-Online, 2012). It is not for nothing that, in numerous debates, Stuttgart 21 is cited as a dissuasive example for how politics and planning should not be conducted.

If one follows the above-mentioned proposition, the usual viewing framework shifts away from the search for new participation procedures and towards the specific practice of politics, administration, and planning. Hence, when we ask ourselves how participation, politics, and planning can come together in future, the answer can only lie in a mutual process of change. On the one hand, participation procedures should be better integrated into political and planning processes, and on the other, the organisational and methodical foundations within future political and planning processes to make plurality participation work must first be created. This includes that the specific changes in the decision-making of politics and planning don't function without a transformation in the culture of politics and planning. What is being seen as constituting this culture, is the proposition that the search for answers to the question of "how we want to live and produce in future" can only be a joint search by politics, planning, and citizens. On this basis and under the term of "provisional politics and planning", this text intends to develop preliminary approaches for the construction of a new understanding of politics and planning as processes of joint learning with the citizens.
At the start of this paper, the most important terms used and the intellectual approach are clarified. In the second stage, an own approach for "provisional politics and planning" is developed, taking Christoph Hubig's deliberations on provisional ethics as a starting point. In the third stage, the consequences of the basic proposition that it is the field of politics and planning processes in particular

which must change are taken up. In the conclusion, the most important insights are summarized and the further research needs stated.

It is to be pointed out that whenever there is general talk of politics and planning, it always refers to the sphere of municipal politics and planning in Baden-Wuerttemberg.

2. Provisional politics and planning as cooperative knowledge-generating process

For a better comprehension of this paper, it seems useful to briefly address the author's understanding of politics and planning.

2.1. What is understood by politics and planning

The understanding of politics and planning which is taken as a basis here is oriented towards Benjamin Barber's definition.
"the need for politics arises when some *action* of *public* consequence becomes *necessary* and when men must thus make a *public choice* that is *reasonable* in the face of *conflict* despite the *absence of an independent ground* of judgment." (Barber, 1984, p. 122).
According to Benjamin Barber, politics always has to do with taking action or not taking action, whereby politics, in his view, "only" refers to the publicly relevant realm of taking action for which people are obliged to come to public decisions without having any "independent ground" to refer to as basis for decision-making. Barber describes politics as a negotiation process which is supposed to produce reasonable decisions in spite of differing views and disagreements. (cf. Barber, 1994, p. 106ff). This view of politics as being a negotiation process which, despite a recognised pluralism of values and a given uncertainty regarding the future, is condemned to come to "reasonable" decisions, connects with Christoph Hubig's theoretical deliberations on smartness which are discussed later. Since the discussion on different perceptions of democracy is not the main subject of this work, it may just briefly be mentioned here that Barber's conception of "strong democracy" most closely matches an understanding of democracy as "provisional politics and planning". In both approaches, citizen participation and participation in planning and politics serve as a kind of political epistemology which makes possible – albeit not in all cases but where it matters – citizen self-government. (cf. Barber, 1994, p. 146)

If one agrees with Horst Rittel's proposition that planning is an integral part of politics (cf. Rittel, 1992, p. 35), Barber's definition can be transferred almost one-to-one to the planning process in urban development. Especially when it comes to questions of urban development, it is considered necessary to arrive at reasonable decisions despite different views on one and the same problem. For example, to a traffic planner, a car parking space represents an entity that can be compulsorily determined from the legal framework according to precisely defined regulations. For a retailer, a car parking space may, proverbially speaking, be a locational advantage. For a pedestrian who is obliged to squeeze himself between parking cars, it is a traffic hindrance, and for a child it represents an area which could have been better used for a playground or for a tree to climb. To be able to come to a publicly useful and balanced decision under precisely these kinds of differing viewpoints and interests, is the planning-related challenge and - in keeping with the approach chosen here - simultaneously politics-related challenge of planning. Barber's definition, however, also allows another analogy. In planning, just as in politics, absolute truths don't lend themselves for use as independent justification. This perspective on planning and politics breaks with the view that there allegedly exist absolute truths that form the basis for decisions that permit no alternative and a "take-it-or-leave-it" manner of politics of any kind. However, it also breaks with the planners' understanding of themselves as experts with a "God the Father" type of role in developing cities.

Based on an understanding that views politics and planning as a negotiation process which despite differing perceptions and disagreements is supposed to lead to reasonable decisions, the proposition is

made here that there can be no sound decision-making foundation for complex urban development processes without "plurality participation". Why is this so?

2.2. Dealing with uncertainty and insecurity

In contrast to routine tasks such as the issuing of a building permit, the problems of urban development are usually complex. This means, for example, that these questions depend upon a variety of factors which are probably not all known, but are often dependent on each other and have their own unforeseeable dynamics (cf. Schönwandt, 2013, p. 22).
This situation is aggravated by the circumstance that the penetration depth of human decision-making vis-à-vis global ecosystems, for instance, has increased owing to the advancing dynamics of "techno-economic superstructures" (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 134). This, however, also leads to growing uncertainty regarding the effects of such human interventions. Politicians and planners whose plans and decisions are oriented towards future action are thus confronted with considerable challenges. In a constantly changing world, one may ask what is at all certain except the certainty that nothing is certain?
To avoid ending up in fatalism, planners and politicians depend on enlarging the knowledge base of their decisions for which they require the knowledge of the citizens. Klaus Selle (2013, p. 353) justifies plurality participation vis-à-vis the experts with the observation that there isn't just "knowledge" but that planning and politics requires various forms of knowledge. As such, planners are especially needed where "explanatory knowledge" or "instrumental knowledge" is needed, i.e. knowledge of how things are related to each other in the world, and of how to act. The citizens, in turn, are to be called upon when it's about the knowledge of "what is" and of "what ought to be". According to Klaus Selle, planners and citizens are simply experts in different fields, as the case may be, though all their knowledge and views are indispensable for successful planning.
To jointly learn from this communication, it is necessary to place political and planning decisions under the condition of human fallibility, since knowledge and the world are constantly changing and only a small part of the world and of knowledge is open to individual human beings (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 129). Instead of making the individual knowledge-bearer the starting point of decisions, plurality participation in political decision-making is required, as Aristotle had already demanded. "[...] Since there exists a plurality of persons, each one of them may possess a part of the virtue and wisdom, and the entirety, in coming together, may become like a single person with many feet, hands, and senses." (Free translation from German, Aristoteles, Politik 1281b 5-10).

If the goal is to base political and planning decisions on the knowledge of real societal and social relationships, then plurality participation is indispensable. It represents the only possibility to integrate the day-to-day world and thoughts of the concerned and participating persons into the decisions. Moreover, politicians and planners usually don't have to (and in purely physical terms, can't) live with the planning effects which they have caused. More often than not, this leads to a lack of experience on their part, though an "experience-rich capacity for judgement" is necessary for assessing their own decisions. In order to improve political and planning decisions, politicians and planners thus depend on the experiences and the local knowledge of multitudes or pluralities on a feedback level (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 129).

The „wisdom of pluralities" can thus serve as a pool of experience and a feedback level of politics and planning with a view to solving complex problems.

2.3. The wisdom-related ethical consequence of value pluralism

The understanding of societal and social relationships such as the question "how do we want to live in future?" is an exceedingly normative process. This means that such an understanding is a negotiation process about what should at all be perceived as a relevant problem or a desirable goal. Assuming that every value requires higher-level recognition by the decision-making subject, value pluralism and hence value conflict are bound to emerge in an increasingly pluralistic world (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 137). Final justifiability for public decisions is lacking. As mentioned above, Horst Rittel calls these socially constructed problems "wicked problems" because there supposedly is no scientific solution-finding

routine for them as there is for the "benign problems" of, say, the engineering and natural sciences. At first, there usually is disagreement over what is and what ought to be, urgently requiring any form of decision-making on how to act in future.

However, in the light of these conflicts and uncertainty, how can balanced planning and decision-making processes be possible? Ever since the philosophers of the world have attempted to find justification instances for human actions, there have, in turn, been disputes over precisely these instances. In principle, even the most diverse approaches are all based on the attempt to derive from higher-level rules justifications for dealing with value conflicts. Broadly speaking, one can distinguish here between utilitarian, discourse-ethical and smartness-related ethical approaches (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 119). In most cases, deliberative democracy theories which can be included in the group of discourse-ethical approaches, and following Jürgen Habermas, for example, are cited for justifying "plurality participation". The approach attempted here to describe principles for a culture of provisional politics and planning also draws on particular smartness-related philosophical deliberations which Christoph Hubig has developed as "provisional morals", based on Aristotle and René Descartes. These theoretical deliberations represent a pragmatic approach for processes in planning and politics. In contrast to discourse-ethical approaches, real negotiation processes are less burdened by strong entry preconditions such as the demand for a domination-free discourse or the demand for consent of all concerned persons as justification instance.

At this point, it should be noted that Christoph Hubig (2007) developed his provisional morals as an ethics of technology and not as an aid for politics and planning. Nonetheless, his basic ideas which are meant to help come to reasonable decisions in the face of "dynamic situations of uncertainty" and existing value conflicts, are very interesting for the similarly complex decision-making situations in planning and politics.
From Hubig's deliberations (2007, p. 119ff.) and going beyond "plurality participation", the following requirements of provisional politics and planning can be derived:

1. Provisional politics and planning is problem-oriented and situation-specific.
2. Provisional politics and planning makes sure that individual decisions and actions are conducive to the strategic goal of a good life for the community (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 128).
3. Provisional politics and planning includes human fallibility, especially under dynamically changing conditions, in its plans (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 130).
4. Provisional politics and planning orients all decisions towards the goal of preserving the conditions for action.
5. Provisional politics and planning takes provisional decisions.

2.4. What does provisional mean?

The term "provisional politics and planning" has been deliberately chosen to be provocative to make clear the break with the terms relating to politics and planning prevalent in Germany today. In this context, "provisional" should by no means be confused with "arbitrary" or "weak". Here, "provisional" signifies an approach that allows to react flexibly to changing circumstances and to learn from human errors. "Provisional" should, as such, be understood in its threefold meaning of being foresighted, protective, and reversible. This makes provisional politics and planning an approach that delivers error-friendly and, hence, robust decisions.

In his deliberations, Christoph Hubig refers to the image of "tent morality", which René Descartes had developed already in the seventeenth century. For Descartes, in the time of change in which he lived, there was no moral foundation anymore. He spoke of there being no fixed house of morals anymore (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 133). As a reaction to the loss of a secure assessment instance, Descartes developed his thoughts on provisional tent morality as transit morality. In this image, the tent becomes the symbol for at least providing a minimum measure of protection and comfort for the journey to a new, yet-to-be-found solid house of morals. Christoph Hubig takes up this tent notion and transfers it to our present time to derive a canon of features from it with which particular options for action can be

marked as preferable. In doing so, Hubig concretises Descartes' approach for a tent morality by developing assessment criteria from the image of the flexible and easily transportable tent. Flexibility, adaptability, reparability, error-friendliness, and optimisation ability, but also the possibility for easy revision, represent some of these criteria. A tent should, however, should also have the ability to be carried on many shoulders, which brings Hubig to the issue of diversity and participation. It is striking that these criteria also include the main criteria for sustainability (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 136).

The limits which provisional politics and planning defines for future decisions and actions assume special significance here. These limits result from the basic smartness-related ethical demand for preserving the conditions for action. To retain the possibility to learn from errors and to be able to deal with changing circumstances, provisional politics and planning takes into account, in every decision, the goal of preserving the ability for action and the possibilities for action, for future action. As such, all actions which question the subject of action (or its ability for action as self-determined being) should be avoided, just like actions that endanger future scopes of action (possibilities for action). Hubig distinguishes between the option values and the bequest values. The option values, like the sustainability criteria of renewability and diversity, for example, aim to keep open future scopes of action. Bequest values aim to preserve social structures such as education and upbringing, etc., as well as corresponding organisations and institutions. According to this, bequest values are basic conditions which are necessary for the formation of autonomous subjects and their value competence (cf. Hubig, 2007, p. 142).

This self-limitation not just allows joint learning processes but also allows the sphere of politics and planning to admit that it doesn't always know the one solution that's right for all. On the contrary, provisional politics and planning aims to make planning and politics permanently negotiable anew by preserving the scopes and conditions for future decisions. Once planning and politics are permanently negotiable anew on account of plurality participation, it can be ensured that the wisdom of the plurality not only represents an additional feedback level, but in fact turns into a strategic control level in an iterative optimisation process. Moreover, once politicians and planners accept this understanding of provisional politics and planning, a new dynamics in politics and planning can emerge. As such, political confrontations over what constitutes "the only correct decision" would relax, since the retention of smartness-related ethical limits will permit to tentatively commit oneself to a particular course of action (and perhaps also risk an experiment) and then, if necessary and under plurality participation, to continually readjust or, if need be, even revise the decision in favour of another variant. Under the conditions of provisional politics and planning, disagreements revolving around the question of "how we want to live in future?" are not decided once and for all, but form important resources to optimise and correct provisionally taken decisions. By means of the concept of provisional politics and planning an understanding of planning and politics becomes possible that practices plurality participation as a joint learning and knowledge-generation process.

3. Plurality participation in urban development

Following the rather theoretical deliberations on an approach for a new understanding of politics and planning, as described above, the next chapter is about the practical difficulties of plurality participation in urban development. At the beginning of this chapter, the main terms such as "plurality participation" and "urban development and urban planning" are briefly determined in more detail.

3.1. Urban development and urban planning

In this context, urban development, following Klaus Selle, is viewed as a joint effort by entirely different actors (cf. Selle, 2013, p. 13). The actors can roughly be divided into three supersets: market actors, state or municipal actors, and a group of citizens who belong to civil society in all their diversity. Cities develop in an interplay of these three sets of actors. Urban development, in turn, can be described in more detail by means of an arbitrarily differentiable range of characteristics. The different actors all contribute in their own way to the constructional-spatial, social, ecological,

economic, and cultural development of cities (cf. Selle, 2013, p. 77). As such, urban planning is viewed as the attempt to steer the diverse urban development processes which are taking place anyway in the direction of strategic goals for the public good. In doing so, urban planning is not restricted to constructional-spatial uses only (comprising areas and facilities), but endeavours to influence the social make-up and institutions by creating organisations and guiding attitudes (cf. Jung, 2008, p. 28ff)

3.2. Participation

Numerous actors are involved in all these diverse processes. This text specifically focuses on the participation of inhabitants as actors of civil society in the field of urban development. Inhabitants participate in urban development in diverse ways. Citizens can, by their own actions, participate directly in urban development, for example for the cause of neighbourhood gardens, building owners' associations, and much more. They can also, however, participate with others in the form of collaborations and co-operations such as housing or energy associations (this type of participation is only briefly outlined here; in any case, it represents the area where civil society actors become new market actors). Finally, they can participate in opinion-making by means of protests and campaigns, and in decision-making of local democracy by means of elections and referendums (cf. Selle, 2013, p. 60).
Participation, in this context, is understood as a broader concept, similar to the participation of citizens in decision-making processes initiated by politics and planning. From this understanding of participation, it becomes clear that what is needed is more than a mere "culture of being heard", but rather a culture of "joint effort".

3.3. Practical prerequisites for plurality participation in urban development

In his polemic interjection, *Stop participating*, Klaus Selle (Selle, 2013, p. 337ff) concludes that "never before has there been so much participation". However, true cooperation on an equal footing with the citizens is hardly evident in everyday administrative and political practice. Traditional understandings of roles, as well as a deep-seated distrust of the citizen as troublemaker and the alleged necessity to stay "among themselves" and "not go public" means that participation is often futile. A lack of support for participation within politics and administration certainly also is an important aspect. Just as decisive, however, is the situation that participation and politics today are still separate worlds. As a rule, the classical representative division of labour holds sway here too: The planner plans, the moderator/mediator facilitates participation, and the politician decides. Thanks to this division of labour, even well-constituted, methodically mature, and comprehensive participation processes are doomed to failure, as they are usually poorly or not at all integrated into the "parallel universes" of municipal politics and planning (cf. Klaus Selle, 2013, p. 372), or encounter deficits of democracy there (see below).

Conceiving of politics, planning, and participation as belonging together, not only right from the start, but in actual practice too, is a conception that faces considerable unsolved challenges today due to the constitution of planning and political processes in Baden-Wuerttemberg, which is unfriendly to the citizen. In the following section, some of these challenges are briefly discussed.

3.3.1. Inadequate transparency and impossible control

In the political practice of municipal politics in Germany, citizens today still stand in front of closed doors. The legal possibilities for citizens to demand transparency and information on political decisions usually fail due to an inadequate legal basis, including a lack of municipal statutes on freedom of information. In addition, in municipal practice, basically almost every issue undergoes preliminary discussion in non-public committees. The tendency towards confidentiality increases to the extent that municipalities privatise their organisational units of city administration and their public services, or at the very least, organise them on a market basis. Conversely, market players often gain direct access to decision-makers' backrooms (cf. Lobbycontrol, 2013, p. 9). In this way, secrets of

trade and competition lead to non-transparent procedures. Frequently, however, transparency fails simply because of the required human and technical resources in the municipalities. As such, documents of meetings, for example, often only reach committees at the expiry of the minimum period, while protocols usually take longer than prescribed.
Need for change: The creation of the legal prerequisites for ensuring transparency of municipal freedom of information statutes, as well as the personnel-related and financial means for transparency must be ensured by the municipalities. Existing information gaps otherwise make it impossible for the citizen to trace or control political decisions, let alone to intervene in advance and at an early stage, or even to contribute new arguments for decision-making. Moreover, a self-conscious use of direct democracy rights such as a referendum is significantly hampered.

3.3.2. Inadequate formal procedures

In municipal practice in particular, where planning projects directly concern citizens, the formal participation procedures are inadequate. Municipal codes, such as in Baden-Wuerttemberg, exclude direct-democratic decisions on the budget statutes of municipalities as well as on urban land-use planning. An amendment of the municipal code of Baden-Wuerttemberg, planned for this year (2015), is envisaged to at least make the decision on development plans referendum-capable. Whether this will give an actual impetus to participation remains to be seen. Experience has shown that formal "participation at an early stage", provided for by the building code with regard to the preparation of urban land-use plans, often proves futile. This has a very simple cause: At the time of "participation at an early stage", the consequences of plan change, and with it, the citizens' own concern, are inestimable for the citizen. From the point onwards when it becomes clear "what actually it is that's coming", which results in growing citizen concern, most of the fundamental decisions have already been taken. The leeway of citizens then usually approaches insignificance. Citizens are left with the means to "object and suggest" and the thankless role of being commentators of an evaluation process which, according to municipal code of Baden-Wuerttemberg, can only be decided upon by the municipal council. The planned amendment of the municipal code will not change this procedure in any fundamental way. Participation prior to or during decision-making assumes the presence of an activated citizenry which, at such an early stage, only appears likely in exceptional situations.
Need for change: Though correct, it is insufficient that drawing up of development plans should now become referendum-capable. Citizen participation should also become possible when goals are turned into concrete resolutions.

The formal procedures are inadequate not only in terms of the specification of the type and extent of future development by means of a development plan. As we have seen, many suggestions by citizens go far beyond the steering possibilities of classic urban development instruments. For example, the demand for lower prices in local transport lies outside the sphere of statements and regulatory possibilities which can be decided by a plan (cf. Selle, 2014, p. 29). However, even taking a municipal transport company as an example, citizens in Baden-Wuerttemberg lack an obligatory option to oblige the municipality - by means of a referendum - to lower fares and, in a countermove, to increase a tax to finance it, for example. Just as in the case of statute resolutions of land-use and development plans, direct citizen participation is not permitted by municipal code in Baden-Wuerttemberg for the preparation of a municipal budget. Due to this, there is a lack of formal instruments to decide on obligatory financing through participation processes. Hence, no matter how well participation procedures are constituted, the ideas of citizens, in most cases, finally depend on implementation by the municipal council. When other priorities are pursued in a cash-strapped financial situation, or a municipal council is simply voted out, there may well be a lack of funds for measures which are, per se, welcomed by all.
Need for change: The formal instruments of participation in decision-making should be expanded in the municipal codes of the federal states. In particular, it is a matter of formally guaranteeing participation in statute resolutions of land-use and development plans, as well as in city budget preparation. Only in such a manner can emancipatory budgets such as in Porto Alegre also become possible in Germany or in Baden-Wuerttemberg.

The expansion of formal instruments places higher demands at the implementation level of municipal administration, which not only pertains to the above-mentioned demand for greater transparency.

3.3.3. Administrative organisation doesn't fit to the aspirations of participation.

In many cases, it is simply the internal routines and rites of administration which make it so difficult for participation to connect. Participation processes mean additional administrative burden for which there usually isn't any staff, money, and time in the departments. If, in addition, the participation processes are looked after by external professionals, it can easily happen that subsequently simply no one in the administrative departments (which are usually organized in sectors) feels responsible for the implementation of the "unsolicited" outcomes. The result is a kind of diffusion of responsibility. The numerous ideas of citizens disappear in the „depths of municipal administration" (Selle, 2014, p. 29). Should there, indeed, be somebody to take responsibility, specific agreements often remain valid only until the next change of head officials or department heads.

However, even before outcomes and agreements begin to be implemented, it quickly becomes apparent that administration departments, which today are mostly organized according to hierarchies and sectors, reach their limits when confronted by citizen participation. Even where citizen participation and a given municipality happen to be dealing with the same problem, their way of working mostly differs fundamentally. In participation processes - as would seem natural - discussions take place based on a problem definition. The ideas and preferences of citizens thus emerge in a thematic and spatial context and are derived from the given problem definition. While all discussants in participation processes (excepting certain work phases) take part in a discussion, municipalities work in a much more specialized manner and in specific departments on account of their organisational form. In cities, such as in the state capital Stuttgart, municipalities usually are complex administrative units with several political departments, which are divided into administrative offices, which, in turn, are structured into divisions. Except for necessary project meetings, divisions working on the same problem do so in parallel, however, each with a specific professional orientation. These sector-wise competencies thus, for example, lead to a laborious coordination routine, so that every responsible person touched by a specific problem is actually involved, and legally watertight procedures finally ensue. Freely adapting from Garry D. Brewer, one could, as such, conclude that "participation knows of problems, while municipalities know of departments".

Apart from the different professional departments, the different hierarchy levels of administration departments must also, however, be involved, and the different political committees heard, until a political decision can be reached. This usually laborious coordination procedure not only takes time, but also leads to successive changes and coordination processes during its passage through the various offices, and thereby leads to constantly changing drafts of one and the same resolution proposal. As such, it is difficult to ensure that citizens' patience doesn't wear thin, since being active on a voluntary basis means that the citizens lack the time to check and comprehend constant changes.
Furthermore, the different competencies and authorities in administration can also be used to always delegate responsibility to precisely that department or person which/who happens to be absent. Justified citizen concerns often prove futile when the key responsible person is absent.
Need for change: The planning and decision-making processes in administration must be newly organised according to the principle of "gathering everyone around the table". The appropriate demand to follow this maxim in participation processes not only applies to concerned citizens, but also - and particularly so - to the authorities and responsible persons in administration. For these processes, the necessary staff-related, financial and temporal resources should be made available.

3.3.4. The numerous informal procedures don't fit to the structures of the established routine of politics and therefore often remain non-binding advisory procedures.

Following a brief problem outline, many participation processes begin with a brainstorming on or other creative methods applicable to the ideas and aspirations of citizens. In most cases, however,

there is no time to direct a structured negotiation process on the usually divergent aspirations and wishes. As such, participation only serves to collect ideas and, if necessary, criticism. The actual negotiation process on what should bindingly be implemented in the light of usually scarce resources is left to the municipality and the politicians. This division of labour corresponds to the common perception of parliamentary democracy where parliamentary processes are merely supplemented by citizen participation. This is the principle according to which most of the municipal participatory budgets currently function, including the participatory budget in Stuttgart. The decision-makers in administration and politics are, in such cases, left with almost nothing else but to simply pick out from this "motley bunch of flowers" what would anyway have fitted to their concept. In Stuttgart, the municipal council is presented with a citizen wish list containing over 100 suggestions on the budget discussions. Such procedures have little in common with participation processes.

Since informal procedures, for a start, take up discussions from the perspective of the issue at hand or the problem faced by (and wishes of) the citizens, it is difficult to ensure at the beginning whether ideas can at all be realised via the municipal-politics level. The different political competencies in a federal Germany, and the different regulation possibilities derived from them as restrictions of municipal politics and planning, at first understandably play no role in the participation process. However, if such a reflection is missed until the end of the participation procedure, "inappropriate" results of participation may correspondingly often be present.

Besides the fact that many citizen demands can, indeed, not be decided upon at the municipal level alone, suggestions of participants often depend on the initiative of private actors for their implementation. This presents a difficulty for many politicians, as often the political will to intervene by steering the organisation or the behaviour of private actors is lacking. It becomes particularly complicated when powerful market players such as large investors or employers in the city are negatively impacted by the implementation of participation. Thus, till now and in spite of a delinquency procedure of the EU, no traffic-restricting measures are being taken to reduce air pollution in Stuttgart. The argument usually goes that the city is an important automobile industry location and must therefore also consider its interests. According to the Stuttgart action plan, *Nachhaltig Mobil* ("Sustainably Mobile"), "it's not about the question as to whether one is for or against cars, but about how well-networked mobility can be set up and organised in our city. This is also and precisely in the interest of our automobile industry." (cf. Aktionsplan, 2014).
Need for change: Even if this democracy deficit on a municipal level cannot be cured by a procedure or by local politics, it is at least the task of the participation procedure to carry out mutual qualification as well as joint consideration and prioritisation. For these comprehensive processes, the necessary time and money must be planned right from the start. If this is not the case, the ideas of the citizens often don't really fit well into the political arena. They are not or only partially taken up, which, in turn, leads to frustration on the part of the citizens since all efforts have been futile.

4. Conclusion

Understanding politics and planning as provisional precautionary, plurality participation becomes a necessity for arriving at wise and balanced decisions. While retaining smartness-related ethical limits which aim at maintaining future possibilities and abilities of action, politics and planning as a joint learning process comprising politics, planning, and citizens becomes possible. Provisional politics and planning allows to flexibly react to dynamically changing local and global conditions by taking into consideration the changeability of every decision.

The shift of the prevailing examination framework, away from the search for new participation procedures and towards current processes in politics and planning, delivers concrete insights on the changes required to make plurality participation successful. These changes range from obligatory rights such as municipal freedom of information statutes and

more resources for transparency to the expansion of direct democracy rights, so that urban land-use planning and municipal budget statutes become referendum-capable to the point where concrete organisational and methodical changes are made which permit plurality participation in political and planning processes.

It must be the goal of further deliberations to concretise the thoughts outlined here, in order to develop a more concrete understanding for a provisional politics and planning, as well as more concrete suggestions for plurality participation, following the maxim of bringing "everyone to the table". In practice it will surely be impossible to have everyone always negotiate everything around one table, as it were. More likely, it will be a question of scheduling the phases of task distributions by targeted links ("everyone to the table") and improved interfaces (transparency) in such a way that joint cooperative problem resolution between politics, planning, and citizens becomes possible.

In conclusion, it remains to be mentioned that provisional politics and planning can only function if the possibilities and abilities for participation are available to the plurality. Without the associated guaranteed participation in education and social prosperity, and without sufficient time, plurality participation in urban development remains an empty promise, or rapidly assumes a skewed social and exclusive position.

5. References

- Aristoteles. 1995: Politik. Philosophische Schriften 4; Hamburg: Meiner
- Barber, B. 1984: Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for A New Age; Berkeley: University of California Press
- Barber, B. 1994: Starke Demokratie. Über die Teilhabe am Politischen; Hamburg: Rotbuch Verlag
- Horst W.J. Rittel, 1973: Dilemmas in einer allgemeinen Theorie der Planung; original version in Policy Sciences 4, p. 155-169; here in Planen Entwerfen Design: Ausgewählte Schriften zu Theorie und Methodik; Stuttgart; Berlin; Cologne: Kohlhammer, 1992
- Hubig, C. 2007: Die Kunst des Möglichen II, Ethik der Technik als provisorische Moral; Bielefeld: transcript Verlag
- Jung, W. 2008: Instrumente räumlicher Planung. Systematisierung und Wirkung auf die Regimes und Budgets der Adressaten; Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac
- Kurbjuweit, D. 2010: Der Wutbürger - Stuttgart 21 und Sarrazin-Debatte: Warum die Deutschen so viel protestieren; in: Spiegel; issue 24/2010; 26-27
- Lobby Control 2013: Lobbyreport 2013; Cologne: Lobbycontrol
- Schönwandt, W.; Voermanek, K.; Utz, J.; Grunau, J.; Hemberger, C. 2013: Komplexe Probleme lösen. Ein Handbuch; Berlin: Jovis Verlag
- Selle, K. 2013: Über Bürgerbeteiligung hinaus, Stadtentwicklung als Gemeinschaftsaufgabe?; Detmold: Dorothea Rohn
- Selle, K. 2014; Particitainment; in: der architekt; 2014, 2; 27-33
- Koalitionsvertrag der rot-grünen Landesregierung 2011: Der Wechsel beginnt; Stuttgart
- STZ-Online 2012: http://www.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inhalt.filderdialog-der-kampf-um-die-deutungshoheit.9b4eeaed-237d-4474-b0fe-b4a6e51b590e.html 12.05.2015 10:11
- Süddeutsche-Online 2011: http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/umstrittenes-bahnprojekt-stuttgart-und-der-unheilbare-mangel-1.1013415-4 12.05.2015 11:08

- Aktionsplan Nachhaltig Mobil 2014: http://www.stuttgart.de/nachhaltig-mobil 12.05.2015 11:30