Bagh-e Nazar باغ نظر

Bagh-e Nazar, 16(76), 23-34 /Oct. 2019
DOI: 10.22034/bagh.2019.100892.3261

Persian translation of this paper entitled:
فرایند تهیهٔ برنامه‌های توسعهٔ شهری و تبیین انواع مغالطه در زمان پاسخگویی به افکار عمومی
نمونهٔ موردی: کارگاه‌های ایسنا در نقد طرح جامع تهران
is also published in this issue of journal.

Process of Preparing Urban Development Plans and Explaining Types of False Reasoning in Responding to Public Opinions

Case Study: ISNA Workshops in Review of Tehran Comprehensive Plan

Mohammadsaleh Shokouhibidhendi*[1]

1. Assistant Professor, Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Iran.

Received: 13/10/2017 ; revised: 07/05/2018 ; accepted: 08/05/2018 ; available online: 23/09/2019

Abstract

Problem statement: This article has been prepared according to the publication of the book "Review of the Comprehensive Plan of Tehran 2007". Today, it has been about ten years since the Comprehensive Plan of Tehran (TCP) was approved. A review of the efforts of a number of university professors while preparing this plan, supported by a group of experts and led to hold workshops at the Iran Student News Agency (ISNA), is a good example for evaluating the position of expert opinions in the process of developing urban development projects in Iran. The present article focuses on the "Responsiveness" of the planners of the Tehran Comprehensive Plan (consultants and employers) answering the criticism to this plan. So, it has been tried to show how different types of false reasoning can be identified and explained in these answers. Exposing this false reasoning of the planners against critiques can probably more responsibility for future planners to improve their products or answer to criticisms.

Objective: The purpose of this article is to explain the types of false reasoning when providers of Tehran Comprehensive Plan answer to critics.

Method of Research: The research method in this study is the discourse analysis method. Accordingly, the discussions of nine ISNA workshops have been reviewed, and in particular the responses of the suppliers to the Tehran Comprehensive Plan have been analyzed. It has been tried to categorize the answers according to a framework derived from the Schopenhauer's book, entitled The Art of Being Right.

Conclusion: The study findings show that there are three general categories of responses to criticisms. The first category of responses, while admitting some criticisms, points out that since these criticisms have already been addressed to previous projects, they cannot be modified in this plan (TCP can merely continue the current procedure of planning). The second category of responses, instead of responding to the critique, attempts to accuse critics with vague statements. The third category also offers criticism: a tempting proposition that silences the critic! The common point in all three ways is that there is no attempt to eliminate defects or respond to criticisms.

Keywords: *Responsiveness, False reasoning, Tehran Comprehensive Plan*.

* shokouhi@iust.ac.ir ، +0989125470608

Introduction

The issues of responsibility and transparency in the recent urban planning literature have been emphasized by many theorists. In particular, by proposing paradigms such as urban governance, the importance of responsibility in the urban planning and management process has become more and more evident. In strategic plans, due to the emphasis on public participation, it is necessary for plan providers to the response reviews and critiques. Producers of Tehran Comprehensive Plan have also been obliged to respond to criticism in the process of preparing their plans.

While preparing Tehran Comprehensive Plan, the ISNA news agency hosted a series of workshops in which a number of university professors criticized the process of preparing and the content of the comprehensive plan of Tehran. The detailed text of these topics has been documented in a book entitled "A review on the Tehran comprehensive plan 2007". From the behalf of the planners who were providing the plan, as well as the employer organization of that, some people came to some sessions of these workshops to answer some critics. This paper tries to sort out the types of arguments in responding to critics by reviewing some of the responses raised by the plan's providers (including the consultant and employer). The hypothesis of this paper is that the providers of the comprehensive plan of Tehran, instead of responding to critics or accepting errors and trying to correct them, generally have attempted to false reasoning.

Literature Review

• The concept of responsibility and its importance in urban management

In the current theoretical literature, accountability is considered as one of the criteria for evaluation of appropriate governance in a city (Parhizkar & Kazemian, 2005, 32). This concept is counted as a criterion for appropriate urban governance evaluation, along with the other four criteria (effectiveness, procedural justice, sustainability, equilibrium), (Hendriks, 2013, 553). Governments are responsible for meeting the needs and wants of the citizens (Panday, 2017, 58). Not only governmental institutions, but also public organizations such as municipalities and private sector such as consultant engineers are also responsible toward citizens and stakeholders (Taghvai & Tajdar, 2009, 53). Therefore, city managers and their consultants are required to be responsible toward citizens and critics with their clear performance representation.

Accountability increases the possibility of citizens' participation in the urban governance process (UN-Habitat, 2017). The criteria for responsibility and accountability is how the officials and decision makers are accountable to citizens (Taghvai & Tajdar, 2009, 54). Therefore, if a good urban governance is considered as a system, accountability of managers is the input and effectiveness and efficacy will be the output (Van den Dool , Hendricks, Gianoli, & Schaap, 2015, 169). Accordingly, the first step to good urban governance is possibly the managers' accountability.

• Kinds of false reasoning in responsibility

While criticism provides opportunity for city managers to identify and resolve weak points (Pierre, 2011, 38), the lack of transparency and accountability to critics are considered as the main features in urban management in Iran (Taghvai & Tajdar, 2009, 47). However, resistance to criticism through kinds of fallacy deprives managers of this opportunities. The question is why and how urban managers can evade responsibility and accountability?

If urban managers break the rules or ignore legally-legislated principles and regulations, they are obliged to improvise a way in order to evade criticism or to use fallacy in accountability to critics. Yet, how is it possible that fallacy exonerates the offender, or criticized, manager from public opinion? Arthur Schopenhauer- the well-known German philosopher in 19th century in his peerless book named "The Art of Being Right" presents 38 stratagems to show how a wrong person can show up his opponent in a debate, or at least avoid drooping (Schopenhauer, 2006). Fig.1 outlines Schopenhauer's strategies in the content of

1. The Extension (Dana's Law)	20. Draw Conclusions Yourself
2. The Homonymy	21. Meet Him With a Counter-Argument as Bad as His
3. Generalize Your Opponent's Specific Statements	22. Petitio principii
4. Conceal Your Game	23. Make Him Exaggerate His Statement
5. False Propositions	24. State a False Syllogism
6. Postulate What Has to Be Proved	25. Find One Instance to the Contrary
7. Yield Admissions Through Questions	26. Turn the Tables
8. Make Your Opponent Angry	27. Anger Indicates a Weak Point
9. Questions in Detouring Order	28. Persuade the Audience, Not the Opponent
10. Take Advantage of the Nay-Sayer	29. Diversion
11. Generalize Admissions of Specific Cases	30. Appeal to Authority Rather Than Reason
12. Choose Metaphors Favorable to Your Proposition	31. This Is Beyond Me
13. Agree to Reject the Counter-Proposition	32. Put His Thesis into Some Odious Category
14. Claim Victory Despite Defeat	33. It Applies in Theory, but Not in Practice
15. Use Seemingly Absurd Propositions	34. Don't Let Him Off the Hook
16. Arguments Ad Hominem	35. Will Is More Effective Than Insight
17. Defense Through Subtle Distinction	36. Bewilder Your opponent by Mere Bombast
18. Interrupt, Break, Divert the Dispute	37. A Faulty Proof Refutes His Whole Position
19. Generalize the Matter, Then Argue Against it	38. Become Personal, Insulting, Rude (argumentum ad personam)

Fig. 1. A list of 38 offered strategies by Schopenhauer for fallacy in debates. Source: Schopenhauer, 2006.

his book.

In the following, it is discussed whether the producers of comprehensive plans utilize such strategies in their debate with critics, and if yes, which of the strategies are used.

Methodology

The method of the present study is based on discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a method used for reviewing passages and texts including conflicted viewpoints. Discourse analysis is referred to as identification of the relationship between sentences and viewing the whole outcome made out of these relationships. Based on this definition, discourse analysis, unlike traditional linguistic analyses, does not deal with grammatical and lexical elements concluding the sentence as the most general basis for explanation of meaning, i.e. context of the text, rather it focuses on outer-factors of the text including positional, cultural, social, etc., contexts (Hatami & Jabbarnejad, 2008). Hence, with respect to the issues around Comprehensive Plan, discourse analysis can be a useful method. Therefore, the content of three ISNA Workshops in which proponents of Tehran Comprehensive Plan attended is investigated and their accountability method is analyzed comparing the 38 strategies indicated by Schopenhauer.

As a strategic-structural plan for development and construction of Tehran, Tehran Comprehensive Plan was legislated by Iran City Planning and Architecture Supreme Council in November 26, 2007, and Tehran's Mayor delivered it to deputies and region mayors in April of 2008 (Qalibaf, 2008). As with the production of the Plan, several critics including university professors and professionals of city planning and architecture criticized the procedure and content of studies for the Plan. The criticisms were discussed in workshops held and

hosted by ISNA News Agency. Among the critics of the Plan were Seyed Amir Mansouri (academic staff of Tehran University), Naser Barati (academic staff of Imam Khomeini International University), Sharif Motavvaf (academic staff of Shahid Beheshti University), Seyed Abdolhadi Daneshpour, Mostafa Behzadfar, and Esmail Shi'e (academic staffs of Iran University of Science and Technology). The content of the workshops were then compiled in a book named "Criticism and Investigation of Tehran Comprehensive Plan" by Seyed Amir Mansouri (Mansouri, 2016).

Out of the nine meetings held, in three meetings (the first one on July 11, the second one on July 24, and the fifth one on December 10, 2006), a number of producers and employers of the plan attended to answer critics' questions. One of the main officials was Majid Ghamami who attended the first workshop. He was one of the influential experts in the process of plan production; however, he was not able to take the responsibility for all of the issues discussed about the plan. The second workshop included more criticisms with the presence of Masud Shafiq, managing director of BoomSazgan Paidar company; however, he was not able to respond all the questions and issues, as he responded some of the questions precisely with "I have no idea!" (Shafiq, second workshop). In the fifth session, Jalil Habibolahian, Tehran mayor deputy and chief manager of comprehensive and detailed plans production organization attended the workshop as the principal of Plan. Examining the responses of these three men to the questions posed by critics in first, second and fifth workshops can contribute to the support or rejection of the hypothesis of the study. Since the attenders have not discussed as the proponents of the Plan in the other workshops, the present study solely focuses on the three aforementioned workshops. In the following, the criticisms to the Comprehensive Plan are summarized and categorized and the responses of officials are then reviewed.

Findings: Discourse Analysis of the Comprehensive Plan Criticism Workshops

• Criticism of Tehran Comprehensive Plan

- First Category: Criticism of the Plan procedure

A. Consultant selection process: some critical remarks have been made about the process of consultant selection. For example, Mansouri indicates that "In Tehran Plan, 29 consultants are selected. Reviewing the process, we find out that the selection of the consultants is based on the idea of one person, and the selection criteria are not clear. We haven't established an organization in which the vote of one person is determiner of all issues. Such situations indicate that the so-called organization was not an organization in practice, it was just a person" (Mansouri, First Workshop). Moreover, Mansouri addresses Masud Shafiq, "You can't pass the buck to Eng. Habibolahian and Ghamami, ignoring the question of how and from where BoomSazgan Company appeared. The question is always asked. You enjoyed a rent for which you should be accountable" (Mansouri, Second Workshop). On the other hand, Mansouri indicates that "eight consultants have been selected, each of which taking the responsibilities such as traffic, environmental studies, etc., and a chief consultant has been responsible for city planning issues, while the organizational link of the chief city planning consultant and other consultants is blurred. The city planning consultant is referred to as the chief consultant, whereas the responsibility is declared after all other consultants. Is the chief consultant able to be responsible for defending the transportation organization reports? Such coordination has no meaning" (Mansouri, first workshop).

B. Role and position of the plan producer organization: In September, 2003, an agreement between Ministry of Roads and Urban Development and Tehran Municipality has been signed for the first time in order to establish an institute for Tehran urban development plans production[1]. This institute became the main principal of the Plan.

With respect to the past experiences (the previous comprehensive plan of Tehran prepared by ATEK consultant engineers which was illegally put away by the mayor of Tehran with this declaration that the plan has not provided in a participatory way), the institute was meant to provide opportunities for the synergy of the Municipality and the Ministry for production of the Plan. The institute wasn't legally well-founded. Hence, in the first half of 2006, efforts were initiated by representatives of Ministry and Municipality to legislate laws for establishment of a permanent institute for the investigation, planning and management of urban development plans (Andalib, 2009, 31-32). In the ISNA workshops, there were several issues mentioned around the performance of Tehran institue. For example, Barati declared, "The institute was of importance. If the institute had had its main role, we wouldn't have needed such Plan with respect to the gradual correction of the Plan. The decision was to change the attitude of resolving urban problems through solely one document. The organization was meant to replace this attitude with the one that indicated planning is a progressive process, not only compiling a document. I believe that this was a historical opportunity that became lost" (Barati, First Workshop).

C. Participation and transparency: Several remarks made by critics included the issues of lack of participation and transparency in the Plan. For example, Mansouri, Barati and Motavvaf declared, "Eng. Ghamami had to explain these issues in university for students. I think the Plan is compiled baselessly and we shouldn't have ignored public. We should frankly assert that the procedure taken by you in the organization is unilateral, non-participative, and against institutionalization. The idea of hiring a consultant and leaving the issues out to be done by him is absolutely unilateral" (Mansouri, first workshop). Moreover, it was indicated that "Nowadays, there is no methodology that ignores public. In the current method of the Plan, the public is of least importance, representing one of the largest deficiency of the Plan (alongside the other shortcomings). The provider of the plan should be responsible in this regard" (Barati, second workshop). On the other hand, it was also declared, "How and where is public participation included and defined in the Plan? The Plan is cutting any link with upper plans, since when the principal is satisfied, the need to do so is not taken into account" (Motavvaf, second workshop).

- Second Category: Criticism of Plan Content

D. Lack of clear approach: One of the criticisms posed on the Plan was the fact that "Eng. Ghamami provided a simple linear process in which the main sections had been ignored and the planning step was quickly reached. The process lacked perspectives, main objectives, summary of facilities and limitations, polling stakeholders and influential people, and summary of upper and related studies. After a short period of initiation of the plan preparation process, a description document of the needed studies was provided which was a collage! This collage was including almost everything! However, the document didn't have any role in the real process of the Plan preparation" (Mansouri, second workshop).

E. Lack of clear methodology: A number of criticisms referred to the lack of academic method in the Plan. For example, Barati indicated, "A crystal-clear issue is that the compilation of perspectives is primary to the compilation of the plan. However, the studies of other sections of the Plan have been started before perspective studies. It seems that a number of various ideas are utilized in the Plan. The Plan is not based on "Type 12 Service Description". Moreover, the Plan is not structural-strategic, as its name implies." (Barati, second workshop). Barati's statements indicate that in his viewpoint, this kind of methodology (or in his words: a blended method) would not be useful. In other words, the document cannot be simultaneously comprehensive, strategic, and structural, while it is not congruous with any of these manners of planning. Seyed Abdolhadi Daneshpur is for this viewpoit, declaring: "The question here is that when the issues of sprightliness, activity, cohesion, and life level promotion is raised and considered as objectives and perspectives, how they are fulfilled? It would

be discussed that what mechanisms are utilized for achieving such objectives" (Daneshpur, second workshop). He further indicated, "The process of determining methodology cannot be set through time. Doesn't methodology implies the fact that we must proceed forward, and not outward? A comprehensive plan should be dealt with out of improvisation. Every report and research, in order to be academic, should include a clear methodology" (Daneshpur, second workshop). Seyed Amir Mansouri discusses the same issue more precisely addressing Masud Shafiq. When Shafiq stated that "The methodology will be announced after we finish the work", Mansouri replied, "If you knew the meaning of methodology, you wouldn't precisely state that you are going to achieve it while always asking your methodology. You called critics as demagogues; however, what you yourself just declared is demagogic" (Mansouri, second workshop).

• Responses to the Criticisms

- First Category: Justification of Weaknesses with respect to the Similar Criticisms in Former Plans

Among the responses in order to defend the comprehensive plan, the most honorable ones have been stated by Majid Ghamami. Accepting the weak points, he related them to the incumbent structures and believed that the Plan had to be produced in spite of the pre-known weaknesses. Some of his statements in the First Workshop are as follows:

"I think that the mentioned critiques does not merely limited to this specific project, but all of the projects with a cost of billions are like this. I would not say that many issues should be shrunk. I myself have lots of criticisms toward the Plan; however, I believe we are living in a historical period and a social condition in which we are to proceed forward gradually using the current facilities and conditions.

"We cannot be instantly turn into people having a thirty-year background in participation, public issues, democracy, and law. Such change and development takes time. The people acting in the field are the former ones. Do you consider me as not having criticisms? I criticize all issues along with Mr. Mansouri. I pose several criticisms and moreover, I might have more criticisms since I have been mostly involved. I also believe in institutionalization. Yet, I believe that we are heading toward having a plan after 28 years of lacking having none, using all we have got in this procedure. Facing many difficulties, we have gathered a number of engineers and doctors, and now it is declared that a very few of people are compiled. The number of experts was far more than before. All people were involved. The consultants declared that we have 400 to 500 experts most of which are university professors, including Dr. Golkar and Dr. Bahraini. Of course, a number of the people involved are not academics. Moreover, which universities are compared by you? The universities are having a closed loop and made up with connections. What I want to say is that all things are the same. As for the participation of public, is it an easy job? Public are participated in the current Plan as they are in other plans and sections of the society. To the amount that public participate in other sections, the same is applied here as well. We would perform better if we could, but this is all we can do. It is not wise to declare that the Plan is null and void since public are not given the chance to participate" (Ghamami, first workshop).

- Second Category: Accusing Critics through Ambiguous Statements

The second type of accountability toward critics can be investigated in the statements of Masud Shafiq and some statements of Jalil Habibolahian. Using the 36th strategy of The Art of Being Right as stated by Schopenhauer, Shafiq have utilized ambiguous and complex phrases and expressions. Using expressions such as "politize" (politicized), "militarism", "Irani-Plan", "demagogic", "social contract", "new strategic-structural paradigm" indicates a special discourse Shafiq utilizes to get his own way. Interestingly, it is not important in this method to use the words in their correct way, the complexity of the sentence structure is rather important. Another method applied by Shafiq is accusing the critics, as Schopenhauer states, "Make your opponent angry,

since when he is, he lost his distinguishing power and does not understand what is good for him. In order to make him angry, you should be repeatedly unfair to him, or use fallacy, or be generally rude" (Schopenhauer, 2006, 47). For example, calling critics who discuss participation as "demagogues" is another approach to make the opponent angry. Moreover, the producers of Plan discuss personal aspects in their statements, as Schopenhauer states, "Whenever you see the opponent is near to overcome, and you are almost beaten, use the last stratagem. Make the issue personal" (*ibid.*,117). During the workshops, accusing critics of conducting critical studies not for correcting, but for being promoted to a better academic status, e.g. doctor or full professor, is a strategy to utilize personal aspects in discussions. Similar to this method applied by Shafiq was accountability approach and method of Jalil Habibolahian in Fifth Workshop. In the following, some fallacy methods applied by him are presented:

"Regarding the questions about the BoomSazgan as a new company and the reason for selecting this company as the chief consultant of the Plan despite other companies with good background, I don't have any answer. In the following, when the issue of selecting consultant without related expertise and background raises, he continues: I'm not enough qualified to answer some of your questions. The other questions are those that can be answered by ordinary citizens, Justice Ministry, or Intelligence Ministry. (Shafiq, second workshop).

"We have reached an "Iranian-Plan" that should be discussed through the time. Answering the criticism of lack of theory and methodology, he continues: Names such as Master Plan, Structure Plan, Action Plan, and Strategic Plan are all just a joke! Which global experience in a social environment has commenced via a hypothesis and why we should do so? The doctrines are even achieved in procedure. A greengrocer applies a method when starting his job, and so does the Plan. Yet, the plan is unwritten and compiled in procedure. The plan is then transferred to university for eliciting doctrine and methodology. A person with the experience of research in practice might be able to elicit the methodology, and it is not my expertise to do so".

"As for the method, it should have been written at first. We didn't know. Actually, the way implies you which way to go! Shall we be concerned before initiation for which way to go? The Comprehensive Plan have not had a method; however, we have known what we are to do. Due to time restrictions and politico-social issues, the Plan hasn't yet been shaped well. Let's discuss evidences. Lying, bluffing, illogical philosophies must be kept aside, and the mistakes in our social contract document should be empirically discussed. In reply to the criticisms of Dr. Motavvaf and Dr. Mansouri (regarding lack of public participation), it can be asserted that if the issue is not politicized, which have been a fruitful approach in only a proportion of the world, most of the issue follows the militarism of battle, such as what happened in Latin America and what happened in the East in rural and urban battles for the poor.

"It's good to discuss participation. What to discuss matters. Show us an example which is done and is attractive. It should be indicated that a bad law is better than lacking a law. What declared on behalf of Habibolahian and others is the fact that we should have something firstly, and then it can be improved by "social participation", which I have no idea what it is and you should explain its meaning".

(In reply to the criticism of cutting the link between the Plan and upper documents) "We are well-aware of this field. We have new software and hardware systems which give us the chance to compile materials and issues together as they adjust thousands of maps. We even compiled the Iran's Development Document, aka 1400 Document (2021); however, we would have been distracted if we had written the analyses".

"In the present work, we assumed that we should take the last comprehensive plan and its pattern along with Type 12 Document. The reason was the fact that the principal in charge used to assume them. We then figured out that the conscience of the society have professionally proposed a new strategic-structural paradigm which we have taken into account. The Plan inquired us to provide an outline such as the one favored by those who have studied strategic-structural planning as land use outline. Our discussion

is not fit with land use, but zoning. We discussed that we have both use and zoning, and the result of our documents entail zoning as well. We changed six groups in order to achieve the zoning outline, and commanded the regions to work as well. We have notified the issue publicly. We were commanded to take out the notifications; however, many people were cooperating within four or five months. The rest of the work, including setting objectives and eliciting objectives and perspectives are all trivial issues".

The nature of all the issues just discussed is environmental. The ecologic document of the City was handed to us just a week ago. We were not waiting, and we didn't have to wait! We were to make a consistent city which was made consistent by a network. We were afraid of proposing this idea, because we were mocked! We couldn't tell the public and all people what a network city was. Therefore, we tried to use an understandable language to tell them that we want a city which is neat and having facilities. We had an objective by which the population of Region #22 wouldn't increase. Tehran Comprehensive Plan proceeds forward in a problem-oriented basis, aiming at accountability as the main issue. Repining the criticisms posed by the audience in the meeting, it should be noted that we, as elites, should concord.

Demagogic treats should be left out and we should clearly declare what public means. We are tricking people and public. Populism is one of the most dangerous issues and when people and public are looked upon this viewpoint, we face fascism. Addressing Dr. Motavvaf: As for the Plan being located on a fault, or as for the density of population, who knows more? The people of Naziabad [a quarter in Tehran] or you" (Shafiq, second workshop).

"I consider these issues to be out of personal taste and interests and I do not include any explanation for them. We should discuss what is sought after all the reasoning here. Let's consider that all the objectives and plan are wrong. So what?! Our purpose was not converting the Plan into a thesis in order to get Ph.D. In our idea, all these issues are trivial. I don't consider them to be helpful and contributive. They might look highly academic; however, we do not discuss Tehran academically. It is crystal clear that we have to confront chaos in Tehran and avoid circular letters and mono-solutions. Some people might be after doing a thesis for Ph.D. program or being promoted to full professor through all these issues, which is all OK, yet, we were not doing this. We were to prescribe in order to save the City out of the inconsistency. I would not discuss the how-ness and the procedure of the Plan so far, since I believe it to be aimless and trivial (Habibolahian, fifth workshop).

- Third Category: Deceiving Participating Propositions for the Critics

The last, and the least honorable strategy of being un-accountable is deceiving the critics in order to keep them silent, which is not even included in the list recommended by Schopenhauer. In this approach, the critics are required to submit a proposal in order to take the responsibility of resolving the weaknesses of the Plan. Accordingly, it is aimed at changing their position as critic (or lawyer of public in Friedman's idea) to a part of the work, or a principal. In the following, a number of such techniques from the third workshop are presented.

"The issue is still in process. I suggest that the critics take action and communicate their viewpoints so that we discuss them in the final report, on the condition that they are not after spoiling the Plan! It might be discussed that why the consultant has ignored a given action. Your contribution as the critic is well-paid! Isn't it the issue of money? Don't act this way. There has been a will, love, brevity, or madness, nothing else!"

"I am grateful to the audience attending the meeting. I ask you to, following the same course, write down the objectives and hand them to me. Tell me to remove a given objective, and replace the other. You are authorized to do anything to me if I wouldn't follow! If it is problematic, solve it! If we have to pay for that, we would! We pay it from the resources of consultant, and not ours! In a nutshell, we have lots of thing to do together. This procedure is a permanent procedural one, and an endless one. Believe, we are not opposed to each other fighting!"

"We are forced and imposed from different sources. We only have a God, and Mr. Chamran. We sometimes grieve, speak our hearts, in order to be pacified. I have nobody! I'm alone! No one in the municipality is accompanying me. Not only not accompanied, but also I'm set up, since they didn't understand me! Since I used to understand the issues and proceed forward sooner, I was always in trouble! I will be understood in five years!" (Habibolahian, fifth workshop).

Discussion

As noticed, three ways of responsibility were used by proponents of the Plan. The first method of accountability, in spite of being honorable, does not account for the fact that the Plan was a proper opportunity to make a different plan with respect to the former ones. However, the nature of the action, i.e. production of an urban development plan for Tehran is a promising step for law abiding. Specifically, production and legislation of an urban development plan, in a city such as Tehran which was ruled without special plans before the new ones, is a promising step in the way of justice. Nonetheless, with respect to the multiplicity of stakeholders and influential groups in Tehran, when the possibility of compilation and legislation of an urban development plan appears and the expert remarks are noted, altogether in exceptional conditions, a notable opportunity would be lost if the plan is not sufficiently logical and accountable to the needs of citizens. In this respect, Barati indicated, "We now notice that the Plan is questioned by experts, and I regret that many of the issues we discussed are neglected due to the centralized management system. In my idea, urban planning is a field for criticism. Society can only build a city when its cultural issues and the way academics, professionals and specialists are treated is resolved. Eng. Ghamami's saying regarding improvising the Plan due to time constraints is unacceptable. The planning is like a surgery. We cannot dissect the body of the operated person and leave it out saying we don't have time" (Barati, first workshop).

The second method is the clumsiest type of defending a plan including not hearing the criticisms and accusing critics of improper attributes. In this method, the most questioned person is the proponent. During the workshops, the critics discussing lack of participation had been labeled as "demagogues", and critics discussing the lack of academic methodology were labeled as "following Ph.D. program thesis". Such accountability is the last alternative to evade in Schopenhauer's classification. In this type, the questions are usually left unanswered using expressions such as "I have no idea", "I'm not in the position to answer some of your questions", "I consider these issues to be out of personal taste and interests and I do not include any explanation for them", "I would not discuss the how-ness and the procedure of the Plan so far". In such expressions, the speaker is more after silencing the critic than correcting his own path. Therefore, he would not provide answers for the questions.

The third method is the most improper and immoral type of accountability. In this method, there is a pre-conception stating that any criticism is out of the fact that personal interests and benefits of the critic is not fulfilled. Therefore, critics are invited to enter the other part through recommending projects. If the proposition is accepted by critics, it's an abject failure. On the one hand, the professional nobleness is lost, and on the other hand, the recommender would publicly promulgate that the criticisms were out of benefit seeking. Nonetheless, the critics of the Plan at the time didn't accept such propositions based on the evidence provided by the book named "Criticisms and Investigations of 2007 Comprehensive Plan", compiled ten years after the workshops.

Conclusion

As noticed, several criticisms were discussed regarding the process and content of the Plan. However, the proponents of the Plan were accountable through various methods. The findings of the study indicate that the methods were generally accompanied with a number of fallacy types. The following table compares the three type of accountabilities along with their related fallacy as indicated by Schopenhauer (Table 1).

Table 1. The comparison of the approaches in answering critiques on Tehran Comprehensive Plan. Source: author.

	Overall Attribute	The Most Prominent Proponent	Some Key Remarks	The Most Important Presuppositions	Type of Fallacy
First Category	Justifying weaknesses with respect to the similar criticisms in the former projects	Majid Ghamami	- I think that the mentioned critiques does not merely limited to this specific project, but all of the projects with a cost of billions are like this. - The people acting in the field are the former ones. - The number of experts was far more than before.	What matters is that Tehran is having a plan. Better plans can't be expected up until all cultural, social and economic structures are not well-made.	This method contains the least possible amount of fallacy,yet it ignores the fact that improvement should be initiated somewhere ultimately. Postulate What Has to Be Proved
Second Category	Effort to accuse critics using ambiguous statements	Masud Shafiq	- Let's discuss evidences. Lying, bluffing, illogical philosophies must be kept aside. - it can be asserted that if the issue is not politicized, which have been a fruitful approach in only a proportion of the world, most of the issue follows the militarism of battle, such as what happened in Latin America and what happened in the East in rural and urban battles for the poor. - Demagogic treats should be left out and we should clearly declare what public means. We are tricking people and public. - Our purpose was not converting the Plan into a thesis in order to get Ph.D.	Through overstatement, the person can be bewildered, since it is assumed that the speech contains meaning. Insulting, and agonizing the person can deviate the person off the logic path.	"Bewilder Your opponent". "Make Your Opponent Angry". "Become Personal, Insulting, Rude".
		Jalil Habibolahian	- In our idea, all these issues are trivial. Some people might be after doing a thesis for Ph.D. program or being promoted to full professor through all these issues, which is all OK.		
Third Category	Deceiving proposition of participation to critics	Jalil Habibolahian	- I suggest that the critics take action and communicate their viewpoints so that we discuss them in the final report, on the condition that they are not after spoiling the Plan! It might be discussed that why the consultant has ignored a given action. Your contribution as the critic is well-paid! Isn't it the issue of money?	Critics criticize for the feeling of jealousy toward the consultant, or they are after getting benefits. Money matters.	Personalize the subject and create temptations for critics through a financial proposal.

The common attribute in all the methods is the lack of efforts to correct the plan or answer the criticisms. In order to avoid replacing true accountability with false and illogical verbiage, recommendations can be made. The present study recommends revelation of fallacious types of accountability for the public opinion and professional communities. Future studies

can discuss how graduated people can be led to accurate, out-of-fallacy statements of problems, methods and strategies through correction of architecture and urban planning educational system. The sentence stated by Ghamami, "which universities are compared by you?" indicates evidence for essential correction of educational system. Moreover, future studies can focus on strategies for provision of legal and managerial opportunities for meritocracy in the process of project and plan submissions. As noticed in the study, a notable portion of the criticisms had been related to the procedure of the Plan and especially the process of consultant selection.

Endnote

1. The institute performed under different names (in different periods), such as Tehran Urban Development Production Management and Planning Institute (Boomsazegan, 2006), Tehran Urban Development Plan Production Institute (Farivar Sadri, 2009), Tehran Detailed and Comprehensive Plans Producer Institute (Mansouri, 2009), Permanent Institute for Study and Production of Tehran urban Development Plans, and Tehran Urban Development Planning Institute (Andalib, 2009). The common entities in these names are " Institute" and "Tehran". Tehran Institute, aka "Tehran Urban Development Planning Institute was approved by the supreme council of the institute (including housing & Urban Development Minister, Tehran Mayor, and Tehran's City Council Chief Member through an official letter of association (Supreme Council of the Institute, 2009). Ultimately, the institute was disestablished in 2010. The institute can be considered as APUR, i.e. Paris Urban Development Gallery, in Tehran (Shokuhibidhendi, 2014).

Reference List

• Andalib, A. (2009). Nahad-e barnamerizi-ye tosee-ye shahri-ye tehran: gozashte, hall va ayande [Urban Development Planning Institute of Tehran: Past, Present and Future]. *Manzar,* (1), 25-33.

• Boomsazegan Paidar, Consulting Engineers. (2006). *Tarh-e rahbordi-sakhtari-ye tosee-ye shahr-e tehran: tarh-e jame-e tehran, kholase gozaresh-e nahaei-ye tarh [Strategic-Structural Development Plan of the City of Tehran: Tehran Comprehensive Plan, Summary of Project, Final Report* (First Edition). Tehran: The Institute of Management and Planning Urban Development Plans in Tehran.

• Frivar Sadri, B. (2009). Morori bar jariyan-e barnamerizi-ye shahri-ye Tehran [A Review of Urban Planning Process in Tehran, *Manzar*, (1), 34-37.

• Hatami, A. & Jabbarnejhad, S. (2008). Tahlil-e gofteman be masabe-ye yek ravesh tahghigh dar olom-e ensani [Discourse Analysis as a Research Method in the Humanities]. *National Social Sciences Congress.* Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies.

• Hendriks, F. (2013). Understanding Good Urban Governance: Essentials, Shifts, and Values, Urban affairs review. *Urban Affairs Review*, 50(4), 553-576.

• Mansouri, S. A. (2009). Dars-ha-yi az gozaresh-e APUR darbare-ye tarh-e jame-e jadid-e Tehran [Lessons from the APUR Report on the New Tehran Comprehensive Plan]. *Manzar*, (1), 77-80.

• Mansouri, S. A. (2016). *Naghd va barresi-ye tarh-e Jam-e Tehran, 2007 [Review of the Comprehensive Plan of Tehran 2007]*. Tehran: Nazar Research Center Publications.

• Parhizkar, A. & Kazemian, Gh. (2005). Rouykard-e Hokmravayi-e shahri va zarourat-e an dar mantagheye kalanshahri-ye Tehran [Urban Governance Approach and its necessity in Tehran metropolitan area]. *Journal of Economic Research*, (16), 29-49.

• Panday, P. K. (2017). *Performing Urban Governance in Bangladesh: The city corporation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

• Pierre, J. (2011). *The Politics of Urban Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

• Qalibaf, M. B. (2008). Letter No. 8717803/8710 dated 20/4/2008, by the mayor of Tehran.

• Schopenhauer, A. (2006). The art of always being right: thirty eight ways to win when you are defeated (E. Sabeti,Trans.). Tehran: Qoqnoos.

• Shokouhibidhendi, M. S. (2014). *Evaluation of Spatial Justice in Urban Development Plans, Cases of Study: Strategic-Structural Development Plan of Tehran (Tehran Comprehensive Plan) and Plan d'Aménagement et de Développement Durable (PADD) of Paris*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis in Urban Planning. College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran, Iran.

• Taghvai, A. A. & Tajdar, R. (2009). Dramadi bar hokmravaei-ye khoub-e shahri dar rouykard-e tahlili [An Introduction to Good Urban Governance in An Analytical Approach]. *Urban Management Quarterly*, (23), 45-58.

• The Supreme Council of the Institute. (2009). the Statute of the Tehran Urban Development Planning Institue, approved on 25/4/2009.

• UN-Habitat (2017). *Global Campaign on Urban Governance: Principles*. Retrived from http://mirror.unhabitat.org/content.asp?typeid=19&catid=25&cid=2097

•Van den Dool, L., Hendricks, F., Gianoli, A. & Schaap, L. (2015). *The Quest for Good Urban Governance: Theoretical References and International Practices*. Springer.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Shokouhibidhendi, M. S. (2019). Process of Preparing Urban Development Plans and Explaining Types of False Reasoning in Responding to Public Opinions, Case Study: ISNA Workshops in Review of Tehran Comprehensive Plan. Bagh-e Nazar, 16(76), 23-34.

DOI: 10.22034/bagh.2019.100892.3261
URL: http://www.bagh-sj.com/article_93431_en.html