

UC Berkeley

Berkeley Planning Journal

Title

Introduction

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5pd4w1p2>

Journal

Berkeley Planning Journal, 4(1)

Author

Tyler, Stephen

Publication Date

1989

DOI

10.5070/BP34113139

Copyright Information

Copyright 1989 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

INTRODUCTION

As Eve said to Adam as they passed through the gates of Eden, "It appears that we are entering a period of transition."

Yes, we here at the *Berkeley Planning Journal* also seem to be in a perpetual state of transition. This is, one might suppose, the fate of any student publication. Unlike a "real" journal with a permanent staff, our publication is dependent upon the efforts of a group of individuals who are, despite their tendencies toward the contrary, only passing through. In his introduction to the last issue, Cliff Ellis called for successors to come forward and assume responsibility for the Journal, as each founding member slipped quietly into obscure retirement from student life.

For a while, it appeared that the Journal might disappear after publication of the last issue, as Cliff had feared. It has only been through the dedicated efforts of a large group of students (our "Editorial Collective") and the crucial encouragement of our Faculty Advisor, John Landis, that this has not happened. The job of producing this volume was shared by all these people, and the credit should be divided as well.

In the past, editorial comments in this space have focused upon a number of crucial topics for planning academics. In particular, the touted demise of public sector planning, the "problem" of excessive diversity within the field, and the need for a "restructuring" of planning theory have been put forward as essential themes for consideration. In this volume, we do not purport to deliver the definitive articles on any of these contentious topics. However, during our review of papers submitted for publication, we came to understand that despite the diversity of subjects which are considered to be within our field, there is a consistent emphasis upon the public nature of planning. Planning, with or without adjectives, addresses itself to improving the conditions of society, whether directly through the action of the public sector, or through the proper manipulation of private interests.

In our lead article, John Friedmann presents us with a cogent argument for examining the rationality of Latin American *barrio* dwellers (what Friedmann terms "existential Reason") in contrast to certain aspects of the "cognitive Reason" which underlies modern Western thought. He compares these two means of self- and societal-perception using four parameters: metaphysics, epistemology, philosophical anthropology, and the legal-political order, and shows how the characteristics of social organization and interaction in the *barrios* are related to these distinctions. As he has done so often before, Friedmann challenges the epistemological bases upon which planners operate; the

important lesson here is that planners must be sensitive to forms of logic which differ from the tradition in which they are trained.

The next three articles are empirical studies which, despite their range of subject matter and geographical setting -- from the San Francisco Bay Area to West Africa to rural Australia -- are all intended to provoke rethinking of government policies. The first of these pieces, by Pamuk and Christensen, examines the role that nonprofit developers play in the provision of low-cost housing in the Bay Area, a region considered by many to have an exemplary nonprofit housing sector. In light of government cutbacks in funding for low-cost housing over the past decade, it has become increasingly important to understand how successful nonprofit developers operate. The research by Pamuk and Christensen addresses this issue, focussing in particular on the characteristics of nonprofit development organizations, the types of projects which are undertaken in the nonprofit sector, and the continuing importance of government funding for project viability.

The article by Leitmann provides us with important insights into an energy crisis which is often overlooked by planners and policy analysts: the depletion of traditional household fuel supplies in many third-world countries. Using the example of household energy consumption in Senegal, Leitmann compares the differential impacts of rural and urban household fuel use, and assesses the environmental consequences of current and projected patterns of consumption. This is a particularly salient issue because of the continuing rapid growth of cities in Africa (and elsewhere) and the potential environmental consequences of urban resource demands in hinterland regions. The methodological issue which is central to this paper is that a proper disaggregation of consumption data by location, fuel type, and household characteristics is necessary for determining a workable strategy to offset the impending fuelwood crisis in Senegal.

The misappropriation of aggregate data is also a prevailing theme in Kelvin Willoughby's critique of Australian policies toward rural development. Through a careful examination of Australia's agricultural sector (which from the standpoint of policy has been equated with the rural sector), it is determined that there has been a major structural shift in the economy away from agriculture and that, contrary to prevailing perceptions, labor productivity in agriculture has been decreasing during the past three decades. His assessment leads the author to suggest policy responses for broadening the base of the rural economy and for promoting an alternative paradigm of "integrated rural development."

The final two articles present case studies on topics which should be of interest to both planning practitioners and academics. Each relates to the practice of planning and its role in the economy and society. The

first of these, by John Lederer, calls into question the popular notion that there is always a trade-off between equity and efficiency. The author describes the Swedish government's labor and employment programs, a set of policies which may best be described as market-based social welfare planning. Although conceived primarily as policies to lessen the negative social consequences of private-sector industrial restructuring, the Swedish model has contributed significantly to the country's continued economic growth. However, this situation is by no means perfect; Lederer describes the intensification of regional disparities within the country as a major drawback to the policy.

In the final article, Diane Scholz has compiled a number of recent case studies in the Silicon Valley area to demonstrate the effects of hazardous waste contamination on the sale of industrial properties. Rather than merely killing deals, as one might expect, the risks of hazardous waste cleanup are being handled through innovative contractual arrangements between sellers and buyers. In the absence of adequate regulatory and planning mechanisms to resolve contamination and cleanup issues, market processes have emerged to address some of the undesirable consequences. In her conclusions, the author suggests the importance of very high land values in Silicon Valley in leading to this result.

As it is the purpose of the Journal to disseminate ideas which may facilitate dialogue in what is an increasingly diverse (some might say disparate) field, we would like to put a greater emphasis upon review articles. We have included Raphael Fischler's review of John Forester's important new work, *Planning in the Face of Power*, which addresses the question of how planners ought to respond to the inherently political nature of their professional roles. This issue also includes a review of the literature in a field of considerable interest to economic development planning. Jay Stowsky presents some of the controversial ideas which have emerged on the relationship between regional culture and innovation diffusion, based on published literature in the fields of geography, economics, and regional planning. We hope to have more articles such as this in future, as the concise treatment of a specific stream of literature and the ideas it encompasses can be a worthwhile tool for opening up discussions between the various sub-disciplines within planning.

Despite the fractious nature of much of the debate over the nature of planning as a field, we here at the *Berkeley Planning Journal* maintain the belief that the more that planners know about each other's work the more commonality they will find.

Michael Leaf, for the Editorial Collective

important lesson here is that planners must be sensitive to forms of logic which differ from the tradition in which they are trained.

The next three articles are empirical studies which, despite their range of subject matter and geographical setting -- from the San Francisco Bay Area to West Africa to rural Australia -- are all intended to provoke rethinking of government policies. The first of these pieces, by Pamuk and Christensen, examines the role that nonprofit developers play in the provision of low-cost housing in the Bay Area, a region considered by many to have an exemplary nonprofit housing sector. In light of government cutbacks in funding for low-cost housing over the past decade, it has become increasingly important to understand how successful nonprofit developers operate. The research by Pamuk and Christensen addresses this issue, focussing in particular on the characteristics of nonprofit development organizations, the types of projects which are undertaken in the nonprofit sector, and the continuing importance of government funding for project viability.

The article by Leitmann provides us with important insights into an energy crisis which is often overlooked by planners and policy analysts: the depletion of traditional household fuel supplies in many third-world countries. Using the example of household energy consumption in Senegal, Leitmann compares the differential impacts of rural and urban household fuel use, and assesses the environmental consequences of current and projected patterns of consumption. This is a particularly salient issue because of the continuing rapid growth of cities in Africa (and elsewhere) and the potential environmental consequences of urban resource demands in hinterland regions. The methodological issue which is central to this paper is that a proper disaggregation of consumption data by location, fuel type, and household characteristics is necessary for determining a workable strategy to offset the impending fuelwood crisis in Senegal.

The misappropriation of aggregate data is also a prevailing theme in Kelvin Willoughby's critique of Australian policies toward rural development. Through a careful examination of Australia's agricultural sector (which from the standpoint of policy has been equated with the rural sector), it is determined that there has been a major structural shift in the economy away from agriculture and that, contrary to prevailing perceptions, labor productivity in agriculture has been decreasing during the past three decades. His assessment leads the author to suggest policy responses for broadening the base of the rural economy and for promoting an alternative paradigm of "integrated rural development."

The final two articles present case studies on topics which should be of interest to both planning practitioners and academics. Each relates to the practice of planning and its role in the economy and society. The

first of these, by John Lederer, calls into question the popular notion that there is always a trade-off between equity and efficiency. The author describes the Swedish government's labor and employment programs, a set of policies which may best be described as market-based social welfare planning. Although conceived primarily as policies to lessen the negative social consequences of private-sector industrial restructuring, the Swedish model has contributed significantly to the country's continued economic growth. However, this situation is by no means perfect; Lederer describes the intensification of regional disparities within the country as a major drawback to the policy.

In the final article, Diane Scholz has compiled a number of recent case studies in the Silicon Valley area to demonstrate the effects of hazardous waste contamination on the sale of industrial properties. Rather than merely killing deals, as one might expect, the risks of hazardous waste cleanup are being handled through innovative contractual arrangements between sellers and buyers. In the absence of adequate regulatory and planning mechanisms to resolve contamination and cleanup issues, market processes have emerged to address some of the undesirable consequences. In her conclusions, the author suggests the importance of very high land values in Silicon Valley in leading to this result.

As it is the purpose of the Journal to disseminate ideas which may facilitate dialogue in what is an increasingly diverse (some might say disparate) field, we would like to put a greater emphasis upon review articles. We have included Raphael Fischler's review of John Forester's important new work, *Planning in the Face of Power*, which addresses the question of how planners ought to respond to the inherently political nature of their professional roles. This issue also includes a review of the literature in a field of considerable interest to economic development planning. Jay Stowsky presents some of the controversial ideas which have emerged on the relationship between regional culture and innovation diffusion, based on published literature in the fields of geography, economics, and regional planning. We hope to have more articles such as this in future, as the concise treatment of a specific stream of literature and the ideas it encompasses can be a worthwhile tool for opening up discussions between the various sub-disciplines within planning.

Despite the fractious nature of much of the debate over the nature of planning as a field, we here at the *Berkeley Planning Journal* maintain the belief that the more that planners know about each other's work the more commonality they will find.

Michael Leaf, for the Editorial Collective

Notes from the Editor

The editor uses his title advisedly. In fact, the production of this issue of the Journal has only been possible thanks to a fundamental restructuring of editorial responsibilities. The last issue benefitted greatly from Cliff Ellis' personal attention to detail. With this issue, and a whole new group of people involved, our organizational style has changed from editorship-as-craft to editorship-as-management. Our success in producing it at all will, I hope, demonstrate to our colleagues the feasibility of generating a stimulating student journal without it eating up an entire term of the editor's academic life. Our student careers are interminable enough.

Most of the credit for the shape of this issue goes to the members of the Editorial Collective listed on the inside front cover of the Journal. They undertook most of the work of soliciting, reviewing, editing, proof-reading, and assembling this issue between themselves. It is a measure of their commitment and my esteem for their efforts that I can say without qualification that they each came through when they needed to. For that, I am deeply grateful.

In keeping with our effort to streamline production of the Journal, we have decided to formalize our publication cycle as a single issue per year, constituting a complete volume of the Journal. Our previous two-issue per volume publication cycle, combined with an irregular production schedule, may have been confusing for some subscribers. We feel that production and subscriptions can be simplified by moving to the format of an annual volume.

We have, with this issue, introduced a special feature in the Journal, taking a slightly different perspective on planning issues: **The Urban Fringe**. After cranking out papers throughout the academic year which address profound and substantive issues in the field, students deserve a forum for a creative, but lighter approach to planning. We present our first parody piece in the hope that it will stimulate other contributions in a lighter vein for future issues.

All in all, I am very pleased with the contents and the production process for this issue of the Journal. We have a range of interesting and well-written articles which demonstrate the importance of good analysis to local planning effort, as well as the international scope of the problems and the contributions planners can make. If this year's experience with high-quality submissions and cooperative editorial effort is any indication, there will be plenty of future issues to look forward to.

Stephen Tyler, Editor