

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Forstwesen = Swiss forestry journal = Journal forestier suisse
Herausgeber: Schweizerischer Forstverein
Band: 157 (2006)
Heft: 10

Artikel: Participatory process as a tool to resolve conflict
Autor: Mitchell-Banks, Paul
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1098012>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 11.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Participatory process as a tool to resolve conflict

PAUL MITCHELL-BANKS

Keywords: Conflict resolution; participation. FDK 624

There have been a very large number of papers written about the theory of Participatory Planning, and the area remains one of great interest and relevance – especially given the increasing complexity of projects that stems from both the scale and scope of many planning exercises but also the increased understanding of the sociological, environmental and economic impacts of planning processes and final decisions. The intention of this paper is to take a more practical focus on participatory planning and how to try and ensure that the process is an effective one. Actual participatory planning processes of varying degrees of success are examined and lessons from these and other processes are discussed.

Planning – a growing history of complexity of theory and practice

Campbell and Fainstein argue that planning history is a very difficult subject to define and explain. They provide four reasons behind this challenge. First, many of the fundamental questions regarding planning belong to a much broader inquiry concerning the role of the state in social and spatial transformation. Consequently, planning theory appears to overlap with theory in all the social science disciplines, and it becomes hard to limit its scope or to stake out a turf specific to planning. Second, the boundary between planners and professionals (such as real estate developers, architects, city council members) is not mutually exclusive; planners don't just plan, and nonplanners also plan. Third, the field of planning is divided into those who define it according to its object (land-use patterns of the build and natural environments) and those who do so by its method (the process of decision making). Finally, many fields are defined by a specific set of methodologies. Yet planning commonly borrows the diverse methodologies from many different fields, and so its theoretical base cannot easily be drawn from its tools for analysis. Taken together, this considerable disagreement over the scope and function of planning and the problems of defining who is actually a planner obscure the delineation of an appropriate body of theory. Whereas most scholars can agree on what constitutes the economy and the polity – and thus what is economic or political or political theory – they differ as to the content of planning theory (CAMPBELL & FAINSTEIN 1996, 2).

Where the planning is conducted can also increase the complexity of the process and it can be argued that of all the resource based industries, it is forestry that is the most complicated to operate and manage (MITCHELL-BANKS 1994). Some of the challenges faced in forestry planning include: long time frames, future uncertainty, economics, social needs/desires, problems and symptoms, governance, technology, climate, knowledge, resources for management, resources considered, accuracy in measurement, accuracy in evaluation, carrying capacity, cumulative impacts, complexity, equity, and power and authority (MITCHELL-BANKS 1999). Changes in scientific knowledge, economic and technological change, and evolving social values further complicate the issue (DRUSHKA 1992). Our ecological understanding of forests continues to grow, and there is an increasing appreciation that forests are interconnected

webs which focus on inter-sustenance and not just the production of a single element, and trees play only one structural role within a fully functioning forest (HAMMOND 1992). Together these considerations lead to forestry being very challenging to plan on a sustainable basis.

The advent of participatory planning

Planning in any kind of a formal sense began to occur at the end of the 19th century with roots in several movements such as the Garden City, City Beautiful and a number of public health reforms (CAMPBELL & FAINSTEIN 1996, MITCHELL-BANKS 1999) and has gone through a continuing series of evolutionary phases in an attempt to more effectively address the growing challenges of planning. During this period, planning has passed through a period of institutionalisation, professionalism and self-recognition of the planning profession and after the Second World War there was a growing emphasis on more concrete issues such as what planning techniques to employ and what alternative institutional structures could be employed in achieving society's objectives (KLOSTERMAN 1985, MITCHELL-BANKS 1999).

Perhaps the most important and influential of all planning approaches has been the concept of Comprehensive Planning, which is an attempt to coordinate the entire spectrum of multiple development and regulatory initiatives underway throughout a region or city, but this required not only a high level of knowledge but also the technological capability of using it. Comprehensive Planning essentially failed for two reasons: 1) the level of knowledge, analysis, and organisational co-ordination was impossibly complex; and 2) it presumed a common or homogeneous public interest when in reality it only addressed the concerns of the powerful and influential while ignoring the poor and weak (CAMPBELL & FAINSTEIN 1996, MITCHELL-BANKS 1999).

This failure to address the concerns of the entire spectrum of impacted people led to a recognition of the need to more effectively capture their concerns and input into the planning process, and this led to the advent of participatory planning, in which stakeholders – people with a vested interest in the planning issue – take part in the planning process. This participatory process can take a number of forms with participation ranging from one extreme of simply commenting on a plan to another extreme with the participants participating throughout the process and even at times having decision making power. Of note, is that while the application of participatory planning as an application of participatory democracy theory is widely advocated, it has not received the close examination required to see what works and what does not (MOOTE *et al.* 1997, HOLMES & SCOONES 1999) and real participation is often elusive (EVERSOLE 2003).

What makes a good public participation process is a fundamental question that needs to be asked on an ongoing basis, and perhaps the perspective of the public is one of the most effective methods of helping establish what constitutes a successful participatory planning process. The public can have a number of perspectives on what makes a good participatory

process, and this is well expressed in the following: It is now widely accepted that members of the public should be involved in environmental decision-making. This has inspired many to search for principles that characterise good public participation processes. In this paper we report on a study that identifies discourses about what defines a good process... One perspective emphasises that a good process acquires and maintains popular legitimacy. A second sees a good process as one that facilitates an ideological discussion. A third focuses on the fairness of the process. A fourth perspective conceptualises participatory processes as a power struggle – in this instance a power play between local landowning interests and outsiders. A fifth perspective highlights the need for leadership and compromise. Dramatic differences among these views suggest an important challenge for those responsible for designing and carrying out public participation processes. Conflicts may emerge about process designs because people disagree about what is good in specific contexts (WEBLER *et al.* 2001).

Planning tradeoffs and conflict

Conflicts or disputes are an inherent part of planning and can occur both while the planning effort is underway arising from the process followed, the alternatives chosen for examination and the final decision making (MITCHELL-BANKS 1999). A great deal of the planning conflict centres around the tradeoffs that are ubiquitous and frequent in their appearance, as the Pareto optimal solution exists in neither the real world of economics nor that of planning. Conflict, if properly managed, can inform and assist the planning process to capture the concerns of the stakeholders and can contribute to a more effective planning outcome, especially if the planning process is seen to be logical, and has the essential elements of being traceable (well documented), accountable (decision makers are clearly identified) and reproducible (the entire planning process can be reviewed effectively at a later date; MITCHELL-BANKS 1994).

Successful participatory planning processes

Four participatory planning processes will be briefly reviewed to demonstrate effective techniques and some of the lessons that have been learnt from them. These planning processes are all from Canada, and the author was directly involved in the first three of them, they are as follows:

1. Muskwa-Kechika Management Area (M-KMA);
2. Weyerhaeuser Nicola Bands Cooperative Working Agreement;
3. Islands Community Stability Initiative;
4. Gwaii Haanas National Heritage Park Reserve.

The Muskwa-Kechika Management Area encompasses 63 000 square kilometres of Northern British Columbia in Canada and includes the Northern Rocky Mountains and a large part of the Great Plain (the northern prairies). It is the location of some of the most biologically rich habitat in the northern hemisphere, and is world famous for its wildlife and wilderness values – being one of the largest unroaded areas in North America south of 60 degrees latitude. It is also the site of some very important economic values, particularly extensive oil and gas deposits, boreal forests and mineral deposits (LAND USE COORDINATION OFFICE 1997). The Muskwa-Kechika Management Area results from three separate Land and Resource

Management Planning Processes (LRMPs – all with a very high degree of public participation) essentially setting aside a common area of the three planning regions that was deemed to be especially important. These were multi-year public participatory processes that were led by trained facilitators, in which government staff and members of the public (stakeholders) jointly planned out the areas and then submitted the recommended plans to the government for approval. The Fort Nelson and Fort St. John LRMPs occurred first and received unanimous support from all stakeholders; in the Mackenzie LRMP the mining representative participated in the process and at the very end refused to sign off on the plan. Specifically however, it was a 1997 Order-in-Council (where cabinet – government ministers – approves a decision without going to the legislature) that established the Muskwa-Kechika Management Plan (GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA 1997).

The things that worked, and continue to work well for the M-KMA participatory process, particularly given the challenges presented by balancing wilderness and wildlife with economic development, are the following:

- The effective involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in three large scale participatory planning processes that successfully addressed the initial planning area needs but also established the Muskwa-Kechika Management Area that received special legislation and planning requirements to maintain wilderness and wildlife values while promoting economic development.
- The establishment of the Muskwa-Kechika Program Manager who «championed» the M-KMA initiative and acts as a facilitator between the Muskwa-Kechika Advisory Board (public stakeholders) and government staff.
- The establishment of the Muskwa-Kechika Advisory Board, composed of over 20 stakeholders from First Nations (indigenous people), industry and other stakeholders to provide advice and comment to the government staff on management and planning issues and who make recommendations on the annual Muskwa-Kechika Trust Fund expenditures.
- The establishment of the Muskwa-Kechika Trust Fund that annually targets up to Canadian \$ 3 million to a number of planning and management requirements within the M-KMA.

The Weyerhaeuser Nicola Bands Cooperative Working Agreement was signed in 1992 between Weyerhaeuser Canada Limited (a very large forestry company) and five First Nations (indigenous communities) in south-central British Columbia. The intent of this Cooperative Working Agreement was to improve communications and cooperation between the parties, address and resolve any conflicts before they arose, and promote economic development and employment for the First Nations that would be mutually beneficial for both Weyerhaeuser Canada as well as the communities. The agreement resulted from extensive discussion between the communities and the forestry company and the recognised need to establish a formal agreement and protocol. This was a very well worded agreement with two dispute resolution processes (one to initially address disputes that involved Indian Chiefs and company executives), and if that failed, then a formal commercial arbitration process (neither one of which was used). The success behind this public participatory process can be linked to the following:

- Formal recognition of the rights and concerns of the various parties;
- A mutual desire to establish an effective, efficient and robust agreement;
- A commitment from all parties to honour the Cooperative Agreement and to work constructively with each other;

- Extensive and ongoing communication between the parties with designated representatives to participate
- A great deal of relationship building and trust development, as well as a concerted attempt to get mutual community understanding and support of the issues was emphasised. This led to non-native communities and native communities understanding to a greater degree what the issues and needs were of each other;
- Excellent agenda setting and documentation of all meetings and agreements;
- The strong role of key Weyerhaeuser executive staff who were committed to the Cooperative Working Agreement;
- The strong role of one Indian Chief, David Walkem, who was an exceptional leader and with an MBA and banking experience as well as a professional forester designation, who served as the leader and champion of the Native side;
- The strong role of the Forest Planner (the author) with a background in science, business, planning, forestry and banking, whose job was to focus on the implementation of the Cooperative Agreement. This was a role that at times acted as a go-between or broker between the native and industry interests.

The Cooperative Working Agreement led to the successful creation of a number of native forestry worker positions and cooperation on new and innovative methods of forestry planning. The agreement also addressed indigenous rights, cultural conflict and issue management centred on forestry, with all parties benefiting. The agreement remained strong until Weyerhaeuser commenced to pull out of the area due to strategic restructuring, at which time the agreement effectively fell into stasis.

The Islands Community Stability Initiative (ICSI) arose from frustration in six communities on the Queen Charlotte Islands (located off the northern coast of British Columbia) with the lack of influence they had with large-scale forestry practices and the perceived rapid deforestation occurring on the archipelago – with most of the jobs held by flown in workers and virtually all of the logs being processed in remote (off islands) locations. The six communities involved decided that the only way to bring about change was to work closely together and established ICSI to present a united front in dealing with the provincial government and the forest companies involved. Extensive meetings were held with representatives from each community, some of these meetings were public and the more sensitive ones were held in camera. Outside assistance was obtained, and the author was hired by one of the Non Governmental Organisations to come to the islands for an extended period and to act as a resource person and facilitator in both a private and «behind the scene» fashion to the process.

In the end, «The Islands Community Stability Initiative Declaration» was signed by all six communities and presented to the provincial government. This ICSI Declaration led to a new approach by the provincial government in dealing with the communities and was acknowledged by the forestry companies as being a significant development. The success behind this public participatory process can be linked to the following:

- Strong commitment in terms of people and time from community representatives to find a common solution and to try to avoid the previous inter-community conflict;
- A strong sense of purpose to act and not just talk, and a commitment to being civil in dealing between communities in seeking mutually acceptable solutions;
- Setting aside issues that could not be addressed in the near future (such as unresolved First Nation Land Claims and fo-

cusssing on the immediate term while agreeing to deal with longer term issues later;

- The creative use of both direct and indirect action – at one time a blockade was arranged to stop one of the large timber barges from leaving the islands with thousands of cubic metres of logs on it. This very public act of civil disobedience emphasised that the communities were fed up with the situation;
- Using resources from both on and off the islands (such as trained facilitators, journalists who wrote key articles about the issue, and the author who did background research, networking, facilitation) to help raise the issues, address the challenges and try to find solutions.

The Gwaii Haanas National Heritage Park Reserve and Haida Heritage Site results from a very unique agreement signed in 1993 between The Government of Canada and The Haida Nation (the indigenous nation that claim the Queen Charlotte Islands (what they call «Haida Gwaii»). These islands located off the north coast of British Columbia are «Canada's Galapagos» with unique flora, fauna and geology found nowhere else in Canada – with some suggestions that the islands may have crossed over the Pacific and not originate from the same area as the rest of Canada.

The Queen Charlottes have been the home to the Haida Nation for some thousands of years and subjected to a long history of extensive logging and habitat loss. This was the location of some of the fiercest environmental activism in Canadian history with a history of blockades, protests, even gunfire. The history is colourful to say the least. In 1974, the dispute over the future of South Moresby Island began with the advent of logging plans and a public proposal to protect the «South Moresby Wilderness Area». In 1985, the Haida Nation designated the area a «Haida Heritage Site». Logging continued in the area in the face of legal and political controversy until July of 1987, when Canada and British Columbia signed the South Moresby Memorandum of Understanding. One year later, the South Moresby Agreement was signed, providing Canada's designation of a «National Park Reserve».

While negotiations between Canada and the Haida Nation progressed, temporary measures were put in place to facilitate co-operative management. In January of 1993, the Gwaii Haanas Agreement was signed. The agreement expresses respect for both Canadian and Haida interests and designations, and includes a mutual commitment to the protection of Gwaii Haanas.

The history of Gwaii Haanas provides a model of a respectful relationship between human beings and the earth, a place where people can now learn about a way of life where humans are a part of nature, and where they can experience Haida culture and respect sacred and spiritual values. Traditional activities continue to take place here as part of the living and evolving culture of the Haida.¹

The outcome of the dispute and future solution was sealed with a cross-country «environmental issue awareness» tour that started on the east coast of Canada and when it hit Toronto, the most populated area of Canada, the public opinion swung strongly behind finding a solution and the Federal Government committed to action.

The success behind this public participatory process can be linked to the following:

- Commitment on the part of the activists both in the Haida and environmental communities to work together for a common end;

¹ Parks Canada 2005: Website: http://www.pc.gc.ca/pn-np/bc/gwaiihaanas/natcul/natcul1_E.asp (October 3, 2006).

- The incredibly creative manner in which the issues were raised to a very high level of public awareness that led demands from the public for a solution;
- A political recognition (albeit delayed) that a solution had to be found that met the needs of the Haida people and addressed the environmental protection of the area;
- The recognition that Gwaii Haanas was truly a unique area and that perhaps a unique solution had to be devised;
- The commitment of politicians (again late but driven by tremendous national support) to do «something different» and to resolve the issue immediately;
- The willingness to use short term or interim solutions to stop additional environmental impacts and longer term interim solutions pending the settlement of land claims.

Failures in participatory planning

There have also been a number of failures in participatory planning. Failures have resulted from pursuing an inappropriate scale and scope to planning challenges, inadequate or inappropriate management approaches, failing to generate relationships and trust as well as poorly managed processes. Only two examples are cited here due to space constraints in the paper,

1. CORE (Commission on Resources and Environment) Planning in British Columbia, Canada.
2. USDA Forest Service Planning but with a creative approach to solutions after a long history of conflict in the Camino Real Ranger District.

The CORE and its attendant legislation essentially addressed coordinated land use planning for a first time in British Columbia, and resulted from the highly critical Forest Resources Commission (often called the Peel Commission) that came out with 108 recommendations in 1991 (FOREST RESOURCES COMMISSION 1991). Coordinated land use planning had largely been non-existent to this time in the province and the Forest Resources Commission was the fifth to be held that addressed the perceived inadequacy of forestry management and the growing decline of the forests. Given that forests dominate the landscape, not only the need to have effective forestry management but also having coordinated land use planning and management was finally acknowledged formally (MITCHELL-BANKS 1998).

This led to a rapid effort on the BC Government to commence coordinated land use planning, and arguably the three CORE planning processes were failures (though there were some valuable lessons learnt – and the eventual establishment of Land and Resource Management Plans) with all three failing to reach consensus with all the participants – resulting in the final plans being controversial and imposed by the Provincial Government. The failures behind these participatory planning processes stem from a number of factors, including but not limited to:

- Being too ambitious in terms of the scale and scope of the planning areas – the author was part of a team conducting socio-economic research for an area encompassing thousands of square kilometres – and this was just one part of the CORE Planning area, with very different issues and challenges from the other areas.
- Targeting highly controversial planning areas while still effectively learning and often devising the planning methods.
- Not having established the required degree of trust and respect amongst the various stakeholders involved – there was outright animosity, mistrust and at times destructive

conflict between a number of participants in the processes.

- The government not being entirely clear about the process (understandable given the new nature of the planning approach) and this resulting in some uncertainty behind the processes that was successfully exploited by stakeholders, particularly from industry.
- Inadequate facilitation for some of the processes and not having adequate time, resources or patience to work through some of the more trying issues.

Much of state dominated forestry planning has been a failure with a «top down» and often technocratic/autocratic approach often leading to single-issue solutions that do not fully address the sustainable issues and leave many stakeholders angry and frustrated – and in some cases violent. An interesting case occurred in the Camino Real Ranger District in the United States where a creative approach was taken to try to turn around the long history of animosity between the USDA Forest Service and the local residents: Using skills in personal communication and listening, Crockett Dumas, former District Ranger on the Carson National Forest's Camino Real Ranger District was able to build trust in a divisive community and develop innovative programs that avoided being paralyzed by appeals and litigation. This model of adaptive leadership has earned Dumas national recognition and awards.

In the late 1980's and early 90's, Dumas arrived at a forest in which environmentalists were concerned about declining forest health and local communities were frustrated by strict permitting regulations for fuelwood gathering and the lack of local employment opportunities. The forest's policy of large volume timber sales ignored the interests of both the environmentalists and the local communities and the district had lost touch with those whom it was supposed to serve.

Dumas initiated what became known as «Horseback Diplomacy» by which he and his staff rode on horseback to people's homes to talk with them one on one and listen to their concerns with forest management. Visiting the 32 rural communities surrounding the forest, the Forest Service staff learned how people relied on the forest for fuel and construction materials and that the location and timing of permits caused difficulty. The district changed their permitting policies and reconfigured timber sales to help small, local businesses. By directly engaging the community, listening and learning to community concerns, and then involving the community in policy making, Dumas was able to open channels of communication and build the trust needed to reduce conflict on the Camino Real District. Horseback Diplomacy provided the Forest Service with a means to establish relationships, identify real issues, and form the foundation of collaborative decision-making (SIRMON *et al.* 2002).

How to sabotage participatory planning

Participatory planning can be sabotaged through ignorance of the process. Unfortunately, understanding the participatory process can also assist someone in deliberately sabotaging the process. Good planners have to aware of some of the warning signs of a participatory process running off the tracks, and a short list of some «alarm ringers» are provided below:

- «I know something you don't know.» Failure to provide information, whether of proven value or not, can lead to suboptimal decision making and can effectively kill any trust that has developed between parties.

- «Didn't I tell you?» or «I would never have said that!» This «forgetfulness» or recanting of statements can to some extent be addressed through effective documentation. Constant verification of mutual understanding/agreement also helps.
- «Whoops I forgot.» Sometimes this does happen, particularly in complex situations with lots of data and variables, but this has to be examined – at times subjectively – with regard to the potential «intent» of the one(s) forgetting.
- «Under new management» or «I have to check with my boss.» A change in an authority or power figure can effectively take you right back to the beginning, obtaining sign off on stages of an extended planning process can address this.
- «Rule maker rule breaker.» Rules have to be agreed to up front, or at most, changed with complete agreement from all parties – otherwise the trust evaporates quickly.
- «I've changed my mind.» At times this is understandable given new data or knowledge – but often this is also a strategy to pull out if a participant does not get exactly what they want and are not willing to compromise – again staged agreements can assist here.
- «I will never change my mind.» If serious, this is a non-starter, so don't waste too much time after some initial exploration of the issues satisfying yourself that you truly understand the perspective of the intransigent person – and there are no alternatives that are acceptable to the process. Sometimes mind change though...
- «Remote control.» This is at times necessary as decision makers can not be ubiquitous – constant documentation to verify that approval from the remote parties is necessary. Failure to do this can lead to people acting as potential foils to the process.
- «I quit.» It is always important to find what brings this «ultimate» rejection about, at times it is just frustration that can be alleviated by explanation or creative alternatives, at other times – the party really means it, and then it is time to reassess and constrain the damage from losing that participant.
- Understanding the participants and their challenges, and take great care to be aware of who has power and whether they also have authority. Much of this is about relationships that have to be determined, understood and accommodated for.
- Know, honour and respect – trust comes in time. Absolutely critical for effective participatory planning, «common sense that is uncommonly rare».
- Focusing on the participatory planning process without becoming process bound. Too much time focussing on procedure can kill any momentum and pending agreements.
- Focusing on outcome without skipping the process. The obverse of above, but finding the balance between the two is the heart of a good participatory process.
- Symptoms and problems. Make certain that you understand the differences. At times symptoms have to be alleviated to give «breathing space» to solve the problems, but remember that symptoms result from problems and do not go away without the former being dealt with effectively.
- Get out of the room! Get out, see the area in question, go to the homes and businesses of people, and visit the areas that they are concerned about. Experience the issues and be open to experiencing or discovering potential solutions.
- Good food, good coffee, good setting (location of the planning meetings). Failure to have all three leads to cranky participation and a process that runs low on energy.
- Retain a healthy sense of madness. Remember that life is a challenge, and that sometimes running a participatory process is like trying to herd a bunch of cats.

Participatory planning «musts»

Participatory planning has some fundamental aspects to maximise its chances of success. A good planner understands that planning is ideally a logical way to approach a challenge but does not guarantee a successful outcome, so keep the following in mind:

- Understanding planning limitations is important to maintain expectations and effort.
- Embracing participation and conflict can lead to a better understanding of the situation and ideally identify ways out of the source of the conflict itself.
- Understanding the scale and scope of the challenges and opportunities, be realistic. Remember that neither you as the planner, nor the stakeholders, are super heroes.
- Levelling the playing field and facilitating equal access. This will encourage participants to want to engage and will assist them in fully participating and contributing. I have witnessed dramatic progress from these people coming forward.
- Ensuring participants are committed to the objectives, understand the process, are committed to the process and have «standing» (legitimate standing as a representative) and accurately represent their constituency, failure to do so may lead to false understanding of the true needs and concerns of the community supposedly represented.

Summary

The very nature of participatory processes raises the issues (and sources of conflict) more effectively – and a key aspect of successful participatory process is to openly acknowledge and embrace the source of the disputes and then focus on finding acceptable tradeoffs that have to be made. Common sense, trust, respect, patience, really focussing on understanding the needs, concerns and limits of all participants all go a long way to facilitating positive outcomes. A process that is transparent in nature and which embraces a philosophy of being traceable, accountable and reproducible is also key.

Résumé

Le processus de participation comme moyen de résolution des conflits

Le processus de participation permet de mieux faire ressortir les problèmes (et les causes des conflits). Pour être garant de succès, il doit reconnaître et accepter ouvertement les causes des conflits, puis finalement se concentrer sur une solution consensuelle. Le bon sens, la confiance, le respect, la patience et le fait d'admettre les besoins, exigences et restrictions de l'ensemble des participants sont des atouts qui facilitent le déroulement du processus et conduisent dans l'ensemble à des résultats positifs. Il importe également que le processus soit transparent, ouvert, logique, responsable et reproductible.

Traduction: CLAUDE GASSMANN

Zusammenfassung

Mitwirkungsprozess als Konfliktlösungsmittel

Im Kern wirklicher Mitwirkung werden die Probleme (und Ursachen der Konflikte) effektiver angesprochen, und ein Haupt-

aspekt eines gelingenden Mitwirkungsprozesses liegt darin, die Ursachen der Streitigkeiten offen anzuerkennen und anzunehmen und sich anschliessend auf eine einvernehmliche Lösung zu konzentrieren. Gesunder Menschenverstand, Vertrauen, Respekt, Geduld und ein sich wirklich auf die Bedürfnisse, Anliegen und Beschränkungen aller Teilnehmer Einlassen, erleichtern den Prozess und führen insgesamt zu positiven Ergebnissen. Ein Prozess der transparent, offen nachvollziehbar, verantwortungsvoll und reproduzierbar gestaltet wird, ist ebenfalls entscheidend.

Übersetzung: MARGRIT IRNIGER

Bibliography

- CAMPBELL, S.; FAINSTEIN, S.S. (eds.) 1996: Readings in Planning Theory. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford.
- DRUSHKA, K. 1992: Working in the Woods. A History of Logging on the West Coast. Harbour Publishing, Madeira Park, BC.
- EVERSOLE, R. 2003: Managing the Pitfalls of Participatory Development: Some Insight from Australia: World Development 31, 5: 781–795.
- FOREST RESOURCES COMMISSION 1991: The Future of Our Forests. Executive Summary. Forest Resources Commission, Victoria.
- HAMMOND, H. 1992: Seeing the Forest among the Trees. Polestar Book Publishers, Vancouver.
- HOLMES, T.; SCOONES, I. 1999: Participatory Environmental Policy Processes: Experiences from North and South. In: IDS Working Paper 113, <http://www.ids.ac.uk> (October 5, 2006).
- KLOSTERMAN, R.E. 1985: Arguments for and Against Planning. In: Town Planning Review 56, 1: 5–20.
- LAND USE COORDINATION OFFICE 1997: Fort Nelson Land and Resource Management Plan. Government of British Columbia, Victoria, BC.
- GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA 1997: Muskwa-Kechika Management Plan. Province of British Columbia, Victoria, BC.
- MITCHELL-BANKS, P.J. 1994: Conflict and Cooperation in Small Scale and Community Forestry. In: Proceedings of the IUFRO Symposium, Small Scale Forestry, Krakow, Poland, August 28-September 3, 1994.
- MITCHELL-BANKS, P.J. 1998: Five Forest Commissions in British Columbia and Their Legacy on Forestry and Forest History in the Province of British Columbia. Presented at the IUFRO International Conference on History and Forest Resources at Florence Italy, May 18–23, 1998.
- MITCHELL-BANKS, P.J. 1999: Tenure Arrangements for Facilitating Community Forestry in British Columbia. PhD Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- MOOTE, M.A.; MCCLARAN, M.P.; CHICKERING, D.K. 1997: Research: Theory in Practice: Applying Participatory Democracy Theory to Public Land Planning. Environmental Management 21, 6: 877–889.
- SIRMON, J.; RANA, N.; KOSTISHACK, P. 2002: «Learning While Doing:» A Model for Working in Collaboration and Through Partnerships. Report to the USDA Forest Service on Phase II of the Partnership Development Program. Pinchot Institute for Conservation, Washington DC.
- WEBLER, T.; TULER, S.; KRUEGER, B. 2001: What is a Good Public Participation Process? Five Perspectives from the Public. Environmental Management 27, 3: 435–450.

Author

Dr. PAUL MITCHELL-BANKS, Senior Researcher,
Moreforskning Volda, P.O. Box 325, Volda, NO 6101, Norway.