

UC Berkeley

IURD Reprint Series

Title

Planners, Heal Thyselves: Planning Education, Educators, and Practitioners in the Next Century

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/85c24441>

Authors

Blakely, Edward J.

Sharp, Sumner M.

Publication Date

1993-04-01

Peer reviewed

Reprint 249

Reprinted from *APA Journal*, Spring 1993.

Planners, Heal Thyselves:
Planning Education, Educators, and
Practitioners in the Next Century

Edward J. Blakely and
Sumner M. Sharp

University of California at Berkeley
Institute of Urban and Regional Development

Planners, Heal Thyselves

Planning Education, Educators, and Practitioners in the Next Century

Edward J. Blakely and Sumner M. Sharpe

The Winter 1991 *Journal* carried an award-winning set of essays entitled "The Coming Global Metropolis." These essays, by some of the most eminent figures in American and European urban planning, provided a provocative template for planning in the next century. The authors forecasted, diagnosed, and prescribed the place of planning for the next several decades. Their message was scarcely reassuring. In his essay, Vernon predicted:

[A] large-scale movement of people from the south to the north over the decades just ahead. . . . a transfer of people mainly from Latin America to the United States and Canada; in Europe . . . from predominantly Muslim regions of the southern and eastern Mediterranean to the countries of the European Community; and in Japan, an in-movement from Korea and China (1991, 3).

Alonso's essay, in particular, and several others as well, emphasized the formation of new institutional arrangements and diversity as the cornerstones of future planning. Anthony Downs and Peter Hall warned of foundering leadership in a rapidly transforming Western industrial economy. Susskind adjourned the essays with a challenge for planning education and educators:

[P]lanning education ought to be focusing more if not most of its attention on non-American cities and cultures and the conflicts likely to arise as new waves of immigrants head for older urban areas. . . . Nor will it do for planning schools to operate under the assumption that more government regulation is always a good thing. While some planning educators have been looking at public-private partnerships . . . few have made the future role of government and improvements in the democratic

process a primary focus of their research and teaching (1991, 21).

The following essays are a partial response to these issues and other concerns raised about the planning profession. No one author or even group of authors can speak for a profession as eclectic as planning. These essays are not intended to speak for planning but to open the dialogue of planners about planning education and the conceptual framework that must underpin it. The editors commissioned these essays for presentation at the JAPA Symposium on the Future of Planning Education and Professional Practice at the 1992 Annual Conference of the American Planning Association in Washington, D.C. It took place only one week after the Los Angeles riots. The riots provided a renewed sense of urgency for the tasks at hand and the need for planners to design an educational paradigm that will respond to the nation's and the world's increasingly interdependent problems.

The essays discuss three themes: theory, practice, and education. Two papers address all of these issues and provide diversity of orientation in each area. To stimulate debate, these writings are intentionally emotive, opinionated, passionate, and visionary. Planning needs passion and vision—perhaps only planners with passion can provide the vision necessary for the world. These authors lay out a tough set of philosophical and challenging arguments that can form the basis for better planning through better-prepared planners.

In addressing planning theory, Seymour Mandelbaum and Michael Brooks offer two challenging perspectives to guide planning education and practice. Mandelbaum takes the practitioners up on their common complaint that the academy fails to educate planners for the "real world" of practice and asks us to think about the agency as educator. Brooks urges that we abandon our long-standing search for a single all-encompassing paradigm for practice and accept flexibility as a guiding principle.

The next two essays illustrate the tensions and contradictions that form the context for planning practice today. Bruce McClendon, ever the pragmatist, presents the ultimate in modernism with his client-oriented planning. His approach focuses on the recipient or client of planning and not on the concepts of planners. In contrast, Stuart Meck bases his "pragmatic" practice on the writings of Francis Fukuyama, author of *The End of History and the Last Man*. Meck argues that practice has to be grounded in something. That something is the creation of community.

The last two authors provide another set of challenges for the profession as it attempts to forge its future: They ask how it trains its aspirants. Linda Dalton and Sergio Rodriguez see the answer in who are the professionals—their gender, color, and cultural values. As stated at the outset, the world is being reshaped socially and culturally. This transformation will have a major impact on metropolitan form not only in terms of how cities are orga-

nized and who lives in them but also what they are needed for. These two essays argue that the profession must become a different mix of people to offer the emerging metropolis a different kind of planning.

A Parting Shot from the Moderators

The authors' presentation of a rich variety of ideas shows that the profession stands at an important crossroads. Down one path, planners merely assemble information for others to make decisions. Down the other, they become the forgers of a new national/international socioeconomic and geographic-based destiny.

These essays urge the latter. They also acknowledge that the world is, indeed, getting smaller. People in large nations and old alliances are seeking to separate themselves from macropolitical systems. This poses real dangers to national stability and racial harmony. They also argue that planners are not hapless nor helpless in this struggle. Planners can shape their own destiny while dealing with the problems of the world.

If planning is to shape the destiny of others, it must first shape its own profession. Planning needs a vision of itself before it embarks on fashioning visions for communities. As a profession, it must combine insight as well as technical knowledge to make a better, not a bitter tomorrow. Visionary education is one means to achieve this. Planners need to look very hard at the planning schools to see just how much vision is being forced out of the field as educators impart technique over ideas. Likewise, visionary practice is essential if we are going to be effective as change agents. Planners must face the future and offer hope too, as the world goes through unprecedented change. Planning can offer the way to the future, if it can find visions and ideals to shape that future. These may be the same or different from those visions and ideals that shaped planning's past, but we need to begin that search.

REFERENCES

- Vernon, R. et al. 1991. The Coming Global Metropolis. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 57, 1: 3-13.

Blakely is professor of city and regional planning at the University of California at Berkeley and has chaired the department. He served on the board of directors of the American Planning Association from 1988 to 1992. He is the author of *Separate Societies* (Temple University Press, 1992). Sharpe, AICP, the immediate past president of the American Institute of Certified Planners, is a partner in the Portland, Oregon, consulting firm Cogan Sharpe Cogan and was a professor of urban studies and planning at Portland State University.

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

The Field as Educator

Seymour J. Mandelbaum

Most talk of the Field and the Academy is grounded in a sense that something is terribly wrong in our relations: The crisis of planning has been created by the gap between "theory" and "practice."

I'm not so sure. A great many academics are deeply engaged in the worlds of practitioners. Indeed, I suspect at times that those worlds are too much with us: The highly constrained queries and the self-protective rhetoric of funding agencies and clients structure many of our "reports" and "service" activities; our classes and studios are often pale imitations of flawed agency practice. Were I to set out to study seriously the relations between Academy and Field to articulate a reform program with a close regard for the complexity of institutions, I would suspend my commitment to both of the polar criticisms—a broken tie or a suffocating embrace. Research would precede talk.

My intentions are, however, less than serious. I seek only to redirect a conversation toward new ground, not to specify its content in any substantial detail. When we talk in mixed company about the uneasy relations between Academy and Field and the "future of the profession," we usually focus—as if guided by a hidden hand—on our shared concern with education and the character of the next generation of planners. That is the ground of convenience; the domain in which we can work together if only we will all relax our aggressive defensiveness.

John Levy's commentary in this *Journal* (Winter 1992, 58, 1: 81-84) is a wonderful example of this genre, a paean to our common faith. Planners, he insists, "can take steps to move the profession in the direction of a more unified vision." Much of the work of change, however, "will have to come from the planning schools. . . . The place to begin is with young people coming into the field." Our ability to revive the tradition of large-scale public planning, he insists, "depends, more than anything else, on whom we draw into the profession." If it is to attract new recruits with the right stuff, planning education requires a philosophic core and a focus on strategic and long-range thinking. "If we teach only the mechanics of administration and development," he warns, "we will attract only mechanics—bright and talented and well-intentioned as they may be."

My arrow points to a different territory; not to the Academy but to the Field. Planning schools play an important role in the selection, preparation, and certification of new recruits to the profession. The imprint of the schools is, however, probably never very strong—our students are adults when they enter and they are not with us for very long—and it fades rapidly after graduation, overwhelmed by the powerful processes of socialization

into the worlds of work. Every day, in the corridors and meeting rooms of agencies and firms—in organizations, interorganizational fields, communities, politics, and “the profession”—apprentices and old hands alike learn how to plan and what it means to be a virtuous and (perhaps) even a successful planner. School lessons may be remembered warmly and a few (like amulets) may protect novices against the most pernicious forms of professional socialization. For the most part, however, the lessons open doors rather than teach practitioners to live inside the spacious house. They prepare “beginning planners,” who, as masters will testify, “have a great deal to learn.”

The educational settings in the field and their characteristic lessons are diverse, often conflicting, and certainly unequal in importance. Professionalization has deeply shaped the practices of planning and the ways we talk about them—even to evoking the phantom of a “unified vision”—but the tutelage and discipline of “the profession” in the United States are subordinate to the ways in which individual planning organizations convert strangers into members and then sustain and develop them. (The contrast with the Academy is striking: Spatially extended “invisible colleges” discipline university employers and shape the careers of the professorate, influencing hiring, promotion, salary, research funding, publication, prestige, and preferment.)

Representing the Field as the dominant educator re-frames the topic of this symposium: The future of the profession of planning will not be won or lost on the playing fields of the Academy. Established planning practices are, I suspect, remarkably resilient and will not readily be transformed by new recruits or by criticism from the Academy. If the Field needs saving—and it may not—it cannot look to the young for its salvation. New relations between Field and Academy will depend largely on the work of the larger and more influential partner and the dominant life-long educator.

What sort of educator is the Field: What sort of teachers are senior planners for the novices they employ, or for the officials, citizens, and clients with whom they interact? I suspect that none of us can answer that question with much detail or precision. We might imagine, however, ways of improving our intelligence; of understanding and assessing the performance of planners as educators.

Suppose there were a Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) for planning agencies as well as schools—probably a terrible idea but a useful conceit! What ought such a board to know before accrediting a city planning commission as a teacher of planners, clients, politicians, or citizens? Without volunteering to operationalize this system or to prepare a guide for teams of site visitors—two practitioners and one academic—I have prepared a short and deeply prejudiced list of four sets of related questions.

Learning to Be Stumped

When the agency confronts “development projects” that severely test its capacity and its knowledge, is it able

to convert itself into a seminar exploring alternative frames, relaxing and transforming constraints, fancifully articulating and assessing alternative strategies? Is it able to leave that mode and then to reenter later? Can it create new interorganizational alliances to address environmental problems that it cannot resolve in isolation? Alternatively, are great uncertainties resolved through the obscure mysteries of standard procedures, the repetition of failed policies, and the solemn assertion of the authority and wisdom of the hierarchical forms used to deal with routine problems?¹

Stunting Tutors

All but the simplest planning agencies present many faces to the world and perform many different functions. Their complex and differentiated structures provide niches in which professionals can find work that suits their personalities: here a place for those who must control their world; there for those who enjoy ambiguity and the uncertainties of interaction; here a job for a street fighter; there for a hugger. Matching is both sensible and appropriate. It can also, however, stunt both individual and agency development. Individuals find themselves in boxes from which they cannot escape without leaving the organization. Differences in personality, deeply embedded in lines of reporting and work cultures, are transformed into strategies and ideologies that no one seems to be able to control or moderate. “Does the agency,” my imaginary PAB might ask, “accommodate and even cultivate individual differences while allowing its members to mature? Is it a liberating or a stunting tutor?”²

Believing in Education

Is the agency an educator in its community? Does it wait until there is an issue at hand before listening and speaking or does it sustain a continuing forum even when there is no plan on the table or crisis banging at the door? Does the agency act as if it believed in education or does it represent everything important as fixed in advance by “interests” and intractable constraints? (You can only “dope-out” people and situations; you can’t change them.) Are “opinions” only to be announced—the hard political facts that the canny planner must learn to respect—or are conversations designed to lead to refinement and persuasion? Whether they win or lose, do citizens and public officials come away from an encounter with the agency with a fuller understanding of the matter at hand, its context, and their own responses? Are the agency’s public plans meant to be read or are they self-protective or even deceptive?

My fictive PAB might wisely observe that the public role of an agency as educator is likely to affect its inner pedagogical dynamics. If the public speech of an agency is banal and if important matters cannot even be discussed, then the external confidence game is the only

practice on the boards even inside the group of professionals. Planners are alienated from their own words: they learn—however genteelly—to lie. In contrast, the teacher is personally liberated when the students are no longer treated as uneducable or infantile.³

Learning from Experience

In the sometimes war between Field and Academy, practitioners are prone to laud the unique claims of experiential wisdom: "I was there. I did it. You couldn't learn that from a book." My imaginary PAB might sensibly observe, of course, that a planner who could only learn from direct experience would be deeply crippled. Indeed—since I can shape the sensibilities of the board in any way I like—it might even suspect that the ability to learn from one's own experience depends critically on the cultivated capacity for vicarious experience. Putting ourselves in another's shoes, we learn to detach from our own past as if we were observing a different person, living in a foreign land, inhabiting what we recognize as our own body. Individually and collectively, we grow curious about ourselves and playfully reimagine what we thought we knew securely.

A planning agency can strengthen these capacities or it can discourage them. Before it certifies an agency as an educator, the imaginary board should look closely for tell-tale signs of self-absorption: Is the teacher confident in its uniqueness, uninterested even in the critical assessment of its own past, wary of hypotheticals, suspicious of the subjunctive, and insistent on a rhetoric that is straightforward, declarative, and never ironic? (There is no annotation for this test: It is not so much bookish as experiential.)

The Principal Educator

I don't know how many agencies would be certified in a PAB (or AICP?) regime that shared my prejudices. As an observer of practices, I suspect that few would pass through the eye of the needle. I'm willing to build a small mound of suppositions on the base of that suspicion. If there were more agencies eligible for accreditation, the ties between Field and Academy would be strengthened; the dangers of a suffocating embrace reduced; the problem of educating the beginning planner outside the work site dramatically transformed.

My suspicion will, of course, hardly pass for evidence. My suppositions rest on sand. I hope, however, that the flimsy structure is robust enough to reframe our conversation so that the Field appears as the principal educator of professional planners and we mount all of our critical apparatus to ask: "How is the teacher doing?"

AUTHOR'S NOTE

I circulated a first draft of this essay among several friends. I am grateful for the comments of Ann Strong, Patsy Healey, Howell Baum, and John Forester, though

they are not, of course, implicated in my mistakes of judgment or my reading of their published work.

NOTES

1. This test is cast in the spirit of Albert O. Hirschman, *Development Projects Observed* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1967).
2. This test is grounded in my reading of Howell S. Baum, *Organizational Membership: Personal Development in the Workplace* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990).
3. Here I have merged the turn to communication among planning theoreticians and organizational analysts with the powerful echo of Melville's novel in Gerald D. Suttles, *The Man-Made City: The Land Use Confidence Game in Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

Mandelbaum joined the department of city and regional planning at the University of Pennsylvania in 1967. "Reading Old Plans," a sequel to his Summer 1990 *Journal* essay, appeared in the Winter 1993 issue of the *Journal of Policy History*.

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

A Plethora of Paradigms?

Michael P. Brooks

As Seymour Mandelbaum's essay suggests, planning both as a profession and a set of practices has been involved in a continuous search for new and better paradigms to explain, define, or otherwise provide a comprehensive rationale for our existence as a distinct profession. This search has focused on two basic issues. One has to do with the *subject matter* of planning, and has taken the form of an ongoing debate between those who would restrict our expertise to matters of land use and physical development versus those who believe that planners have legitimate roles to play in a much broader spectrum of economic, social, and other public policy matters. It is my impression that most planners today subscribe intellectually to the latter position—while finding themselves employed primarily as technicians doing physical planning. Unfortunately, not too much of this physical planning takes into consideration the changing social and international dimensions that will forge the landscape of the next century.

The other issue in our search for a defining paradigm involves the *process* dimension of planning. This is the side of planning that forms the heart of Mandelbaum's fictive Planning Accreditation Board for planning agencies. This issue has been a major preoccupation of those who think and write under the banner of planning theory. As noted in a paper I gave at the APA conference in Denver two years ago (Brooks 1990), "planning theory" is a term that strikes terror in the hearts of many planners; it conjures up images of esoteric word games played by planning educators who have little knowledge of what practicing planners actually do. In general, this is a bum rap. Properly conceived, planning theory is nothing more nor less than the vehicle through which we engage in introspection about what we do as planners. It focuses on the very nature of the planning process. It examines what distinguishes us from other fields that also deal with public policy issues, and it entails a continuous search for ways to improve our effectiveness. Far from being an irrelevant exercise in academic game playing, then, planning theory is absolutely indispensable to our sense of identity and our ongoing development.

Important as it may be, however, there is a general concern, among those who think about such matters, that the planning theory enterprise is not altogether healthy at present, that in fact we are suffering from a dearth of compelling and useful theories of the planning process. At least one major reason for that assessment, in my view, is the extent to which planning theory has been overwhelmed by our understanding of political processes. Early writings on planning characterized it as an act of visionary design or creative problem solving. Over time, however, those views have given way to theoretical formulations in which the political economy is all-pervasive, with the planner being relegated to minor walk-on roles under highly constrained conditions.

In another paper (Brooks 1991) I have traced these changes in the way we conceptualize the planning process, beginning with models that featured rational analysis as the quintessential planning act; through Charles Lindblom's (1985) immensely useful work on incrementalism, which served to correct some of our naivete about rationality; through Paul Davidoff's (1965) advocacy planning, which acknowledged the force of political processes but viewed planning as a powerful political tool; and up to more recent critical theorists, who tend to view politics as all-encompassing and assess planning as hostage to the nation's prevailing political economy. For this latter group, the planner cannot be expected to do much more than function as a watchdog, a whistle-blower, a guerrilla in the bureaucracy, or as a monitor of communication flows who guards against the dissemination of false information. While these may indeed be important roles, they focus heavily on criticism and reaction, and are a far cry from the more proactive roles of the earlier designers and rationalists.

The major point I have tried to make, in tracing these changing approaches to the planning process over time, is the notion of a historical trend line in planning theory,

in which the act of planning has gradually given way to politics as the major force at work in shaping our cities. The early rational models featured a starring role for planners and paid scant attention to politics. More recent approaches acknowledge the full force of the political economy, then search for a role for planners that is sufficiently efficacious to justify our existence as a distinct profession. This, then, is the quest for a new and better paradigm to which I referred at the outset of this essay.

Many candidates for the role of "principal planning paradigm" have been offered in response to this quest. Some writers suggest, for example, that planners should function primarily as agents of social change (e.g., Kraushaar 1988; Beauregard 1990). Others—myself included—have called for a reemergence of the visionary spirit that once enjoyed a prominent place in planning thought (Brooks 1988). Some (e.g., Susskind and Ozawa 1984) argue for the critical importance of skill in mediated negotiation. Others (e.g., Forester 1982) urge the planner to serve as the aforementioned monitor of communication flows. And still others (e.g., Benveniste 1989) argue for the mastery of political skills.

There are still writers, of course, who assert the ongoing importance of rational analysis (e.g., Black 1990). I continue to hear, on occasion, the planner's role described in terms of comprehensiveness—putting all the parts together to create a unified whole. Most recently, it has been suggested that planners should function primarily as customer service agents, as discussed by McClendon here and in an earlier *Journal* article (1991).

The list includes planners as deal makers, political-economists, and social institutional designers. There is no shortage of mandates to planners regarding the manner in which they should perform their duties. And what I have finally come to realize is that virtually all of these approaches are valid and appropriate *some* of the time, under *some* circumstances. This has led me to conclude that it is perhaps time for us to abandon our search for a single, overarching, discipline-defining paradigm. Instead we should celebrate our diversity, our flexibility—and our continued survival.

I am willing to concede, for example, that the future of planning might well be rather perilous if we were all suddenly to become the visionaries whom I greatly admire. On the other hand, I consider it critically important that *some* planners serve in this capacity, especially since no other professional group is playing this role. I recognize that every large planning organization needs its analysts, its front-counter service providers, its creative idea people, its skilled political actors and negotiators. I certainly want every such organization to work toward positive social change. Again, however, I would not be so naive as to suggest that any individual planner should be all of these things or possess all of these skills.

Perhaps it is time, in fact, to acknowledge that planning is not really a *profession* at all, in the customary sense of that word, but rather a loose confederation of shared interests and concerns. These interests and concerns, I suggest, are threefold: (1) the problems and/or devel-

opment processes occurring at one or more levels of human organization, ranging from the neighborhood scale to the global; (2) an orientation to the future, whether short run or long run; and (3) the employment of planning processes or strategies of the sort that I have been discussing. These three interests and concerns are quite broad, and they incorporate a tremendously diverse array of activities. I believe that diversity to be one of our major strengths.

Can the planning field survive without a defining paradigm? Of course; we've been doing so for decades, so why should we worry about this as we look to the future? Indeed, one could argue that our flexibility has been our primary survival mechanism. When the nation was preoccupied with its social problems in the 1960s and 1970s, we generated social planners. The economic development mentality of the 1980s produced a generation of planners who became experts in the packaging of joint public-private ventures. While many of us find the underlying values of that decade to be somewhat repugnant, there is no denying that the flexibility and adaptability of planners helped us to make it through a period characterized by considerable hostility to the historic values of planning. I hope we are now moving into an era that will feature a revival of global and local community values and concerns; only time will tell. In any event, I trust that the flexibility of the planning field will enable us to be ready for whatever may occur. I might add that this flexibility has been more characteristic of the field's practitioners than of its academics, as those in the field change their activities to meet the demands encountered in their political and economic environments.

The viewpoint I advance here may appear to be at odds with that presented in my earlier article (Brooks 1988), in which I expressed considerable concern for the future of the planning profession, and advocated the restoration of vision and creativity to positions of centrality in the profession. My concern about the relative paucity of visionary activity in current planning practice remains strong. I will concede, however, that my *other* 1988 concern—that the planning profession was in danger of being transformed in ways that might well prove dysfunctional for our society—has receded in the face of my growing conviction that we are not a profession after all. (Access to practice in the field is not rigorously controlled—many practitioners lack a planning degree, AICP membership, or both; definitions of the core knowledge and skills of planning practice are highly fluid; public understanding of the planner's role is minimal.) Once I ceased thinking of planning as a *profession*, it became less relevant to fret about its survival as such—and more fruitful to think about the characteristics of planners that have enabled us to persevere in the face of unsupportive, even hostile social, political, and economic currents. In short, my personal conclusion that planning is not a profession has been liberating for me rather than devastating. It has enabled me to understand better the current dynamics of planning practice, and perhaps even to appreciate more our accomplishments.

Finally, what are the implications of all this for planning education? The most obvious message, in my view, is that it may be time for us to reconsider, and perhaps deemphasize, the old "generalist with a specialty" model. I would argue that there is, in any event, a growing tendency toward specialization among the nation's planning schools, and I consider this a positive trend. To date, however, specialization has been viewed largely in terms of subject matter—that is, go to school X if you want to learn about land use, school Y if you are interested in transportation planning, school Z for environmental concerns. I suggest that it would also be useful to recognize and disseminate information regarding the *process* specializations that characterize our schools. Some schools are undoubtedly better than others at turning out social change agents, or rational analysts, or political actors, or skilled negotiators, or creative visionaries, or even customer service agents. It would be useful to acknowledge, nurture, and publicize special competencies in process as well as in content. The "generalist with a specialty" will probably continue as a "specialization" offered by some schools so long as there continues to be demand for such planners. My own guess, however, is that this demand will decline over the next few years.

It may well be time to call off the search for a defining paradigm. We will undoubtedly continue to develop new ones to go along with those we already have, and this is all to the good. It signals our diversity and flexibility, and thus underscores our strength as a field that continuously renews its means of providing service to our society.

REFERENCES

- Beauregard, Robert A. 1990. Bringing the City Back In. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 56, 2: 210–15.
- Benveniste, Guy. 1989. *Mastering the Politics of Planning: Crafting Credible Plans and Policies That Make a Difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Black, Alan. 1990. The Chicago Area Transportation Study: A Case Study of Rational Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 10, 1: 27–37.
- Brooks, Michael P. 1988. Four Critical Junctures in the History of the Urban Planning Profession: An Exercise in Hindsight. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54, 2: 241–48.
- . 1990. Principal Theories—Myth and Reality. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Planning Association, Denver, Colorado.
- . 1991. Planning and Political Power: Toward a Strategy for Coping. Paper presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning/European Schools of Planning Joint International Conference, Oxford, U.K.
- Davidoff, Paul. 1965. Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, 4: 331–38.
- Forester, John. 1982. Planning in the Face of Power.

- Journal of the American Planning Association* 48, 1: 67-80.
- Kraushaar, Robert. 1988. Outside the Whale: Progressive Planning and the Dilemmas of Radical Reform. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54, 1: 91-100.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1965. *The Intelligence of Democracy: Decision Making Through Mutual Adjustment*. New York: The Free Press.
- McClendon, Bruce. 1991. Customer Service: A New Philosophy Towards Effective City Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 57, 2: 205-11.
- Susskind, Lawrence, and Connie Ozawa. 1984. Mediated Negotiation in the Public Sector: The Planner as Mediator. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 4, 1: 91-100.

Brooks is professor of urban planning at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

The Paradigm of Empowerment

Bruce W. McClendon

The practice of city planning has evolved over the years from an initial emphasis on physical determinism (i.e., the City Beautiful movement), to planning for people (social reform), to planning with people (advocacy planning), and now to people planning for themselves (empowerment and self-help). Brooks outlines several of the dimensions of these concepts in his preceding essay. At each transition point there was much sound and fury as well-meaning academics and practitioners bravely glorified and defended their past failures and did their best to stop the revolution. But planning theory has evolved for the simple reason that we as a profession have simply not been able to get it right. Our effectiveness would be greatly enhanced if we would only recognize the positive aspects of change and seek to accelerate the evolutionary process.

I come to bury Caesar (all of the planning Caesars), not to praise him. My purpose in participating in this symposium is to urge the planning profession to examine and evaluate itself and then to abandon the seriously flawed theories and practices that have alienated so many planners from the very people they are trying to serve. Most traditional planning theories are increasingly in conflict with the way planning is being practiced and with the results being reported from recent academic research. For planners, the hour is late and the stakes are great. What is now needed, in the words of Judith

Innes, a professor of city and regional planning at the University of California at Berkeley, is for the profession "to develop a new way of seeing the problems and the task of planning—to make a gestalt shift to a paradigm that will provide a more satisfactory mesh with reality, a more usable set of goals for practice, and a more fruitful direction for theoretical inquiry" (1986).

Innes is not the first, nor will she be the last, to call for a fundamental transformation in the practice of planning. The simple reality is that planning based on traditional theory, principles, and practices has repeatedly failed to produce results and satisfy customers. What is needed is a new framework for practice and a new paradigm that links theory and practice to results.

Just over ten years ago, Harvey Perloff, then the longtime dean of the School of Architecture and Planning at the University of California at Los Angeles, wrote *Planning the Post-Industrial City* and offered these observations:

Much of the content and style of urban planning today reflects *departures from* unsuccessful practices in the past—particularly reliance on a relatively rigid physical master plan to guide urban development and a largely intuitive and centralized approach to its creation—rather than *movement toward* any agreed-upon new principles or practices. In part, this is a reasonable pulling away from old paradigms suggesting a sensible instinct for experimentation. However, it also reflects inadequate learning from past experience, a lag in practicing concepts that have already been well developed in theory, as well as an inadequate effort to create the new paradigms that hold promise for the future. . . . Not unexpectedly, a certain amount of confusion has accompanied the moving away from the previous dominant paradigm and the experimental search for effective new approaches to the problems of planning in our complex, troubled cities (1980).

According to *Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*, theories are not facts but rather "the analysis of a set of facts in their relationship to one another." Theories are what make it possible to transfer a large number of factual observations into a logical system of ideas that explains the real world in a coherent and understandable fashion. In science, there is no such thing as a bad theory, because if a theory fails to accommodate the facts and is not proven over time it is rejected and discarded. Perhaps Mandelbaum is correct when he searches the field for a theoretical base in observable practice.

Nineteenth-century physicists thought that space was occupied by a substance called ether, which was essential for the transmission of light waves. Michelson and Morley subsequently demonstrated that ether did not exist. Disproving this theory opened the way for Einstein to develop the theory of relativity. Unproven and unprovable theories can be dangerous if they mask our lack of un-

derstanding and discourage experimentation and progress toward future discoveries that would lead to useful knowledge. For a long time, Isaac Newton's theory of gravity worked well and was useful to the scientific community. But as our knowledge of astronomy, physics, and mathematics grew, Newton's theory was no longer accurate. New theories were developed that did a better job of explaining and predicting events and relationships. So too, must traditional planning theories be evaluated for their accuracy and usefulness and better theories developed to replace them. These theories need to be based on an open, receptive analysis of competent practitioners and effective practice.

Theories are shaped by paradigms. A paradigm is a set of beliefs, rules, or regulations that defines boundaries. Strongly held paradigms induce filtering and screening of information coming to the researcher. Paradigms affect our judgments and decisions by influencing our perceptions and the way we are able to look at reality. For example, during the disastrous accident involving the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant, the plant's managers would not accept the data and measurements coming from their instruments. The information was not consistent with their expectations, so it was ignored with disastrous consequences to the plant and subsequently to the whole nuclear power industry.

Today the planning profession is suffering from its own form of meltdown, occurring right in front of the eyes of a large number of unseeing or uncaring scholars. Inherited paradigms are filtering out incoming real-world experiences and blocking the acceptance of new information. The essays by Vernon et al., referred to earlier, illustrate this transforming yet continually ignored reality by planners. We must choose to change our paradigms if we want to see the world anew. Too many in the academic community suffer from paradigm paralysis, as the earlier essays of Mandelbaum and Brooks clearly indicate. We need new theories and paradigm flexibility. Austrian anthropologist Konrad Lorenz states in *Behind the Mirror: A Search for a Natural History of Human Knowledge* that "truth in science can be defined as the working hypothesis best suited to open the way to the next better one" (1977). If we can have truth in lending laws, surely we can have truth in planning.

What was once a gap between planning theory and practice has become a gulf that warrants immediate corrective action. Many traditional planning theories do not reflect reality and are actually impediments to effective practice and to the development of new theories capable of explaining how planning can be made more effective. Do not misunderstand what I am trying to say. I am not suggesting a reduced emphasis on research. In fact, the continued examination of the theory and practice of planning is essential if researchers are to assist practitioners in their efforts to advance the profession. What is being proposed is that scholars should be placing a higher priority on research and teaching that will improve the skills, capacities, and effectiveness of public sector planners. More courses must be developed that reflect a combination of both theory and practice. The

MRCP and other similar degrees are terminal professional degrees; the academic community's failure to address fully the practice needs of their planning students is troubling. There is just not enough evidence of a widespread conscious effort to link theory to successful practice.

Today the planning profession is at a true crossroads. Nothing less than the future of the profession may be at stake. We can continue to support the failed utopian theories and practices of the past or we can instead be paradigm busters and lead the way to a more exciting, more rewarding, and more effective profession. A few researchers and practitioners are leading the way and speaking out. They are aggressively discarding failed theories and outdated concepts and developing innovative techniques and practices that produce results. They are becoming effective—and making a difference.

Based on almost twenty-five years of experience as a practicing planner, years of inquisitive research, hundreds of interviews with planners and public officials, and a lot of reading, I have concluded that the paradigm governing traditional planning theory is not consistent with the emerging principles, strategies, and tactics being successfully used by effective city planners. I, like many other practitioners, have rejected such mainstay traditional planning theories as the comprehensive rational approach, advocacy planning, and apolitical planning. In their place I am proposing to use a pragmatic theory of planning, based "on human experience, practical activity and democratic community participation, but without the naturalistic bias and liberal pluralism incorporated in mainstream planning theories" (Hoch 1984). It is a practical theory based on the following characteristics:

- Planning is a service profession that cannot continue to ignore the frustrations, expectations, and demands of customers or the marketplace;
- Planning is part of a political process and this country is shifting from a representative democracy to a participatory, collaborative democracy;
- People must be trusted to make decisions for themselves and must be encouraged to solve their own problems and to take responsibility for their conditions;
- Face-to-face collaborative problem solving is more effective than top-down decision making; the public should be the primary arbitrator of what constitutes the public interest;
- Logical incrementalism and strategic planning are much more effective planning techniques than traditional comprehensive planning; the rational planning theory is irrational;
- The planning process is not a pure linear, sequential process, but rather a messy and often simultaneous interaction between its various steps; and finally,
- Implementation considerations do not constitute the last steps in the planning process; in fact, they are essential to each and every step along the way as planners try to help clients solve their most pressing problems.

People with problems must be empowered to solve their own problems. And this is the critical point that

Brooks fails to see when he suggests that my paradigm would have planners "function primarily as customer service agents." The term "agent," as used by Brooks, is neither a fair nor accurate description of the true role and nature of the effective planner. Effective planners do not represent or act as agents on behalf of their customer—that tends to promote dependency. Rather they work to empower and to reinforce the self-sufficiency of their customers. Successful planners are using volunteerism, self-help, and coproduction techniques to ensure that their customers are given actual authority and shared responsibility for solving these problems. These planners are empathic and caring advocates for their customers, and they are substituting passion and emotion for rationality and objectivity. Planners are helping their customers become their own planners by teaching them about networking, conflict resolution, consensus building, and the political decision-making process. Catalytic opportunities and conditions are being created so that people can act on their own environmental needs and make distinctions and choices between the experts' technical assistance and their personal judgments.

In the future, resources will be shifted from groups or classes to individuals—especially to individuals who are demonstrating initiative. Coproduction, or the joint development and delivery of products and services, will be the norm. There are already many successful joint coproduction programs and activities taking place.

An ethics of empowerment will guide the profession as it moves toward the twenty-first century. The goal will be putting people in control of their environment and their destiny. Planners will be promoting self-respect, self-reliance, and self-determination. Empowering the vision will be an exciting challenge as planners help to solve today's problems to achieve the promised vision of a better tomorrow.

REFERENCES

- Hoch, Charles. 1984. Doing Good and Being Right. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 50, 3: 335–44.
- Innes, Judith. 1986. Visible Planning Theory: An Agenda for Research and Education. *Strategic Perspectives on Planning Practice*, edited by Barry Checkoway. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Lorenz, Konrad. 1977. *Behind the Mirror: A Search for a Natural History of Human Knowledge*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Perloff, Harvey. 1980. *Planning the Post-Industrial City*. Chicago: Planners Press.

McClendon is the planning manager for Orange County, Florida, and former president of the American Planning Association. He has written extensively on planning practice, most recently *Customer Service in Local Government* (APA Books, 1992).

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

Themes from Thymos

Stuart Meck

Recently, I attended a public hearing on a proposed tree preservation ordinance in a mid-sized Midwestern university town. A city council and planning commission member, with the aid of the planning staff, had drafted a series of regulations that would have required a city-issued permit to remove any tree in the city, whether on public or private property. If a property owner cut down a tree without a permit, the city could impose draconian fines—up to \$73,000 for a sixty-four-inch-caliper tree, even if the tree were in the property owner's backyard. Although the ordinance allowed basic earthmoving for a house foundation of four thousand square feet, it required a property owner who excavated beyond that figure to replace each tree felled with another of like size.

Needless to say, the hearing became a verbal slugfest. In opposition, members of the business community—homebuilders, chamber of commerce types—and others, libertarians and citizens, outraged by this excess of regulation, stood before the council heaping invective on the proposal and predicting dire consequences to the cost of housing and the business cycle if the regulation were enacted. In support, homeowners, environmentalists, and antidevelopment types cautioned the council not to tamper with or weaken the ordinance, particularly because elections were just a few weeks away. They were angered, they said, over developers denuding the city of its landmark trees. Both groups warned, of course, there was no middle ground, no opportunity for compromise.

Hearings like this—irresistible forces confronting immovable objects—have become a fact of life in contemporary city planning, more so in the past ten to fifteen years. "We're mad as hell and we want action," the citizens tell elected officials and those who work for them. "We know *exactly* what we want and we want it *now*."

This incident is representative of the powerful and unrelenting shift in the culture of American city planning, a shift that mirrors larger changes in society (Meck 1990; 1991). By culture, I mean the pattern of beliefs and assumptions that groups (like the planning profession) adopt as they confront their external environment.

The old culture of city planning, a product of the early twentieth-century government reform movement, was above politics (hence, the independent, appointed planning commission from the "best people" of the community). It believed that physical order—especially monumental efforts—alone could beget social order and that everyone might attain a middle-class life-style. It took the long view—a twenty-year perspective. It was casual about taking action.

Today, another culture, the "New Pragmatism," is supplanting the former. It is action-oriented, emphasizes immediate effectiveness, and values the small-scale and

intimate in the everyday environment. The New Pragmatism lies at the heart of the planner's difficulty in finding a useful theorem from practice, as my colleagues McClendon and Mandelbaum argue in very different ways. The new pragmatic orientation is the product of a turbulent or dynamic political setting.

In the culture of the New Pragmatism, problems facing communities do not lend themselves to elegant and grand physical design solutions, attractively rendered, and presided over by rational, dispassionate planning commissioners and their Prufrockian advisers working with an easily malleable citizenry. Today's urban challenges require approaches that are negotiated among contentious groups who have complex and divergent views.

Francis Fukuyama, a historian and former member of the U.S. State Department's policy planning staff, offers an explanation for this change in his recently published *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992). He argues that History, "understood as a single, coherent, evolutionary process"—as opposed to a mere sequence of recorded events—has come to an end. At the terminus, he says, is "the final form of human government," liberal democracy.

Liberal democracy has gradually triumphed over authoritarian government in past decades, asserts Fukuyama, because of *thymos*, a Greek term that describes "the part of the soul that demands recognition" or "spiritedness."

He contends that "as standards of living increase, as populations become more cosmopolitan and better educated, and as society as a whole achieves a greater equality of condition, *people begin to demand not simply more wealth but recognition of their status*" (emphasis added). Because people have a thymotic pride in their self-worth, "they demand democratic governments that treat them like adults rather than children, recognizing their autonomy as free individuals."

Viewed from Fukuyama's perch, the battles of city planners and their constituents as represented by the furor over a tree preservation ordinance in a Midwest university town are a thymotic tug-of-war. Thymos leads people to want to assert themselves over other people, to lust for glory, to enact or block draconian planning schemes (Fukuyama 1992, 168–91).

On the dark side, thymos, of course, explains in part the human propensity to make wars and revolution. But, over the long term, liberal democracy ultimately suppresses that propensity. Its spread instead results in a society in which there is universal recognition of worth. We see it now in movements to confer or redefine new rights, new equalities, new dignities, for women, for homosexuals, for the disabled, and for minorities.

The quest for thymos—for honor, recognition, and esteem—explains in large measure the environment of the New Pragmatism. The turbulence that we are encountering is the result of this reinvigoration and intensification of liberal democracy, the move toward political and cultural pluralism.

Beyond this is a profound dissatisfaction with the cities,

particularly the suburban ones, that we have created since the end of World War II. No matter how thoughtfully or carefully we have planned them, no matter how many traffic engineers we have designing the road networks, our cities seem to be more congested and alienating places in which to live.

In the new suburbs, we fashion open spaces, not *public spaces*. We regulate with phenomenal zeal private activity, such as the placement of basketball hoops or the siting of local shops like videogame parlors and taverns, which could serve as gathering places (Oldenburg 1989, 203–29). Through setbacks we orient our houses toward the private domain of the rear yard. We ban sidewalks to protect or preserve "rural character." We require local streets wide enough for three or four cars side-by-side to guarantee that vehicles glide effortlessly from the principal arterial through the street hierarchy into the garage with just a flick of the automatic garage door opener. And then we wonder why we don't know our neighbor's name or why there is no street life.

A steady stream of blistering criticism from Jane Jacobs (1961) to Prince Charles (1989) to Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk (1991) tells us that we have, somehow, lost our way. We are creating *places*, but not *community*, and *the creation of community should be our polestar*.

When I speak of community, I think of people living together and sharing a set of interests. Unlike neighborhood, community implies more than just living near one another. It requires some identification of its members with the area and each other and some self-consciousness as a social entity. As its people acquire common interests, experiences, roots, and memories, a community assumes form and character (Abrams 1972, 59–60; Webber 1963).

Fukuyama stresses that the creation and nurturing of community are essential to the continuation of liberal democracy. "For democracy to work," he writes, "citizens need to develop an irrational pride in their own democratic institutions and must also develop what Tocqueville called the 'art of associating,' which rests on prideful attachment to small communities. These communities are frequently based on religion, ethnicity or other forms of recognition that fall short of the universal recognition on which the liberal state is based." By providing recognition of individuals for being special or distinctive, a community responds to basic thymotic needs. All political communities, says Fukuyama, must make use of the desire for recognition, because it provides the basis "for political virtues like courage, public spiritedness and justice." (Fukuyama 1992, xix, xxi; de Toqueville 1945).

Modern life militates against community. We rarely live where we were born and we move around a lot to meet the demands of the labor market. "Under these conditions," writes Fukuyama, "it becomes harder for people to put down roots in communities or establish permanent and lasting ties to fellow workers or neighbors. Individuals must constantly re-tool for new careers in new cities. The sense of identity provided by regionalism

and localism diminishes, and people find themselves retreating into the microscopic world of their families which they carry around with them from place to place like lawn furniture" (1992, 325). In our fascination with techniques, in our atomization of planning issues, we have forgotten or ignored community, despite a rich heritage of planning history that valued it. All too often, planners have talked a good game about the importance of community but they have few tools or political support to produce it.

The creation of community, lest we forget, is the goal of city planning, and we must gauge our success only by whether we achieve that goal, and not whether we maintain some theoretical balance between municipal revenues and costs or some artificial level of service standard that makes traffic congestion tolerable. Some concepts must guide this transformation. They cannot rest solely on contemporary practice or chance as my colleagues seem to infer. (Developing these concepts is a challenge for today's planners.)

If, through our vision and our efforts at transforming the landscape for residences, shopping, industry, schools, parks and public spaces, streets and utilities, we do manage to create community, then—as we stand here at the end of history—we will really have done something in which the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

The author thanks James M. Rubenstein, professor of geography at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, for comments on an initial draft of this commentary.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, Charles. 1972. *The Language of Cities: A Glossary of Terms*. New York: Equinox Books/Avon.
- Duany, Andres, and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk. 1991. *Towns and Town-Making Principles*, edited by Alex Krieger and William Lennertz. New York: Rizzoli.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press.
- H.R.H., The Prince of Wales. 1989. *A Vision of Britain: A Personal View of Architecture*. New York: Doubleday.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Meck, Stuart. 1990. From High-Minded Reformism to Hard-Boiled Pragmatism: American City Planning Faces the Next Century. *The Planner: Journal of the Royal Town Planning Institute* 76, 6: 11–15.
- . 1991. The Two Cultures of Planning: Toward the New Pragmatism. *Land Use Law and Zoning Digest* 43, 7: 3–7.
- Oldenburg, Ray. 1989. *The Great Good Place: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Community Centers, Beauty Parlors, General Stores, Bars, Hangouts and How They Get You Through the Day*. New York: Paragon House.
- Toqueville, Alexis de. 1945. *Democracy in America*, Vol. 2. New York: Vintage Books.
- Webber, Melvin M. 1963. Order in Diversity: Community Without Propinquity. In *Cities and Space: The Future Use of Urban Land*, edited by Lowdon Wingo, Jr. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Meck, AICP, is the assistant city manager and planning director of Oxford, Ohio, and immediate past president of the American Planning Association.
- Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

The Dilemmas of the Times

Linda C. Dalton

Planners are generally more politically liberal than their constituencies and more in tune with the transformations of the community (Catanese 1984; Henderson 1992). Further, the core of planners' professional values lies in a genuine comprehension of the intersection between such values as social equity, affordable housing, and environmental protection as they affect human existence on this planet as well as in communities (APA 1992; AICP 1990). Yet, the planning community finds itself wanting in the aftermath of the disturbances in Los Angeles in spring 1992. Somehow as a field, or in the field as Mandelbaum puts it, we have lost our way in solving the important problems of our time. We have been practitioners of making problems by using our plan-making tools for suburban exclusiveness and to promote economic investment over local concerns in the name of public-private entrepreneurship.

If the profession is to be relevant and have a future in a changing world scene, then its educational processes must be guided by a new set of principles. These principles recognize Meck's call for community and McClendon's notion of local capacity.

Directions

If planning is to become customer-based as McClendon proposes, then planning education cannot rest on the notion that planners are mere servants of current technical and political concerns. If voter initiatives undercut months of careful research and policy development, then planners must be taught patience. If planners do not surrender their notion of what is needed and right, then they will have to possess the skills to convince public planning commissions and elected officials of their responsibility

and ability to handle tough issues, and they must learn how to avoid "giving in," leaving the results of public debate to the most vocal.

Planning education must also prepare planners not to wait for federal and state policy with respect to affirmative action, housing, and even plan-making itself. In the absence of strong leadership from public officials, planning educators and practitioners need to find ways to reinforce core professional values without ignoring public preferences. Further, planning schools could assume leadership in redefining a new concept of common global community interests that do not de facto favor groups in power, but recognize and protect minority identities and interests.

Base Concepts

Planning education must give voice to new theories of urban spatial structure. Theorists such as Cooke (1988) and Soja (1989) explain the structure of postindustrial cities and regions, but planning educators lack prescriptions to make urban areas more responsive to emerging human and environmental concerns.

In addition, planning educators and planning professionals feel frustrated over their lack of control over economic forces and development patterns. Yet they employ a number of techniques—transfer of development rights, air pollution credits, transit-oriented development, inclusionary housing ordinances, impact fees, jobs-housing balance, tax-increment financing, neotraditional town planning—without knowing the cumulative impacts of such efforts. For example, San Francisco's underground regional subway system, the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), did not have the intended effect on either auto use or land use (Hall 1980). And, inclusionary housing requirements increase the cost of market-rate housing without providing affordable units (Ellickson 1981). These issues and others are a teaching and research resource for the planning schools. We need to show how planning may or may not attain desired objectives.

To this end, planning education must teach planners decision criteria to use for reviewing individual projects as well as for developing plans. Scholars could study the interactive effects of the innovative ideas listed above and address whether each technique really reinforces existing power relations or offers some opportunity for change, at least at the margin. These efforts would be interim measures. The real need is for new theories of urban and regional structure that may focus, for example, on noneconomic functions of the city (Schon 1992) and new notions of community.

Where to Start

Planning education must look to whom it prepares as well as what it communicates. If it continues to be dominated by an American white male point of view, it will fail. Along with changing demographics of the nation, the percentage of women in planning has grown steadily

to 23 percent of APA members (but they were only 12 percent of directors and tenured faculty in 1989). The representation of nonwhites has not changed substantially (Hecimovich and Butler 1984; Hecimovich 1989; ACSP 1990; Lewis 1991).

When women and minorities cannot or do not advance in the profession, the practice lacks sensitivity to multicultural and gender issues. Therefore, planning schools need to recruit and support students and young planners of different ethnic groups and women. They must track graduates to see where their careers take them. Practice must offer situations where these graduates can demonstrate effectiveness and give opportunities for advancement for promising women and minority professionals as Rodriguez argues here.

The Right People or the Right Job

Our graduates—public sector planners—commonly complain that their planning commissions, elected officials, citizens, and the media give them no respect. Studies by Baum (1987), Forester (1987), Hoch (1988), and Howe (1992) document the organizational, political, and ethical conflicts public agency planners face, especially in the regulatory arena. As planning educators, we need to prepare professionals who receive status and respect from the coequal professions of law, architecture, and engineering.

For some graduates, one way out of this status dilemma is to go into consulting; yet this option diminishes the role of the professional public agency planner. As educators we need to rebuild the notion of public planning. Evidence from California suggests that public agencies hire consultants for their more interesting advance planning work, but do not respect the consultants who do their work and then leave town (Fulton 1986; 1988). This builds a vicious cycle for the profession by downgrading what we do and who gets to do it.

The real work of planning is in the trenches. We are teaching disrespect for the customer service aspect of our work, as McClendon pointed out earlier. What other profession treats customer service at its conferences with catchy advice like "offer a difficult applicant a dish of ice cream" (California Chapter 1991)? Planning schools can incorporate customer service material in professional practice courses, but the problem is deeper. Planning schools need to teach and debate appropriate "customer service" concepts in their regulatory roles as implementors. At the same time, planning schools can reinforce nonregulatory approaches to plan implementation (Dalton 1989).

To some extent planners must be consistent in their ideals as practitioners and in the lives they lead as role models for the practice of planning. For example, planning policies in many communities call for such actions as increasing choice or equity, increasing residential densities, reducing commute times, improving air quality, and conserving resources. Yet, planners may not live in the communities where they are employed because mod-

est salaries limit their housing choices; and planners with families may prefer not to live in communities with the social problems that they are trying to address. The convergence of these issues is both philosophical and practical.

Finally, the planning education process must come to grips with the fact that much of public agency work is bureaucratic in nature, reinforcing standard work schedules and procedures. Thus, planner and planning agency behavior may contradict the very values that planners espouse and include in community plans.

Planning education can incorporate new models of behavioral changes by visible actions—incentives for carpooling, telecommuting, and using recycled paper. However, more entrenched institutions will take additional work. Here, planning educators and professionals need to work together to invent new, less bureaucratic forms of practice and to apply organizational change strategies. Yet Klosterman (1992) shows that such material is still not typically covered in planning theory courses.

Education and Identity

The profession faces two reinforcing concerns: Job ads require planning "or a related degree," and employers readily accept backgrounds in other fields for planners' jobs. At the same time, employers complain that planning schools do not adequately prepare planners for the profession (Orlick 1991).

Testing and licensing offer a way to distinguish "planners" from "pretenders." Also, during hard times licensing appears attractive as a way to control access to a limited number of job openings. However, planning is historically multidisciplinary, so it is difficult to exclude someone with an environmental affairs, economics, or geography background as unprepared. Further, Hecimovich (1989) shows that "planners" with other degrees command higher salaries.

Employers, as Meck and McClendon complain, suggest that planning schools are too theoretical, although evidence from California shows that they do distinguish between schools with different approaches (Britton 1991). Planning educators and professionals need to encourage the scholarly study of planning practice. Further, planning educators and professionals can seek ways to advance practice together. The spirit of public service needs invigoration from planning practitioners as well as educators (Cisneros 1992).

Creating the Future

The dilemmas listed above are present now and can be expected to worsen if the planning community does not address them. Communities, like the world, will become more fragmented; cities and regions will reshape themselves without planners' guidance; regulatory bureaucracy will become more entrenched; and planners will lose control of their identity. This pessimistic view

of the postmodern world calls for some responses couched in postmodern theory.¹

First and foremost, the planning community needs to discard the dualism of education (or theory) versus practice and focus on praxis. A basic flaw in some current trends is that they reinforce separation (public versus private sector employment; planners versus others) when we need consciously to integrate responsibility while recognizing the unique contribution of planning educators. Planning schools need not only encourage scholarly study of practice, as suggested above, but also must continue to involve faculty and students (especially at the doctoral level as future teachers of professionals) in practical exercises (studios, internships, community projects). In a complementary manner, practitioners must engage in the research and educational processes of planning schools and see education as a continuing process.

Other tenets of postmodern theory seem less difficult to apply to planning—especially the encouragement of plurality and difference. However, as noted above (and in Dalton 1986), if we "deconstruct" traditional planning education and practice, planners' claim to challenging existing institutions does not manifest itself effectively because planning depends on these very institutions for its existence as a field.

Thus, the most important challenges facing the planning community are to increase the effectiveness of the field by creatively synthesizing the idealism of students, research of academics, and the real demands of professional work, and to invent new forms of planning practice for the twenty-first century. To do this, planners (practitioners and educators alike) need to take ownership of the issues that planning addresses—to be willing to take risks and experiment—and to assert leadership to shape the future rather than wonder and worry about what it will bring.

NOTE

1. I have difficulty with the term postmodernism for three reasons: (1) it is reactive, rather than anticipatory and thus inappropriate for a field like planning; (2) it is both a description of the excesses of late capitalism; and (3) a basis for a radical critique (Milroy 1991). In these final comments I use concepts from the critique to address the excesses, but contend that the planning community needs to turn elsewhere for guidance into the future.

REFERENCES

- American Institute of Certified Planners. 1990. *Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. Washington, DC: AICP.
- American Planning Association. 1992. Ethical Principles in Planning. *Planning* 58, 3: 36–38.
- Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. 1990. *Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of*

- Women and Faculty of Color in Planning Education*. ACSP Update (special issue). Madison, WI: ACSP.
- Baum, H. S. 1987. *The Invisible Bureaucracy: The Unconscious in Organizational Problem Solving*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Britton, R. G. 1991. *Planning for Planning: A 1991 California Statewide Study to Help Anticipate Changes in Professional Planning and Ways in Which Universities May Better Serve*. California Polytechnic State University, City and Regional Planning Department, San Luis Obispo, California.
- California Chapter, American Planning Association. 1991. *Counter Encounters*. State Conference, American Planning Association, Sacramento, October.
- Catanese, A. J. 1984. *The Politics of Planning and Development*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cisneros, H. 1992. The Future of the Profession. Paper presented at the American Planning Association National Conference, Washington, DC, May.
- Cooke, P. 1988. The Postmodern Condition and the City. In *Power, Community and the City*, edited by Michael P. Smith. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Dalton, L. C. 1986. Why the Rational Paradigm Prevails: The Resistance of Professional Education and Practice to Alternative Forms of Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 5, 3: 147-53.
- . 1989. The Limits of Regulation: Evidence from Local Plan Implementation in California. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 55, 2: 151-68.
- Ellickson, R. C. 1981. The Irony of "Inclusionary" Zoning. *Southern California Law Review* 54, 6: 1167-1216.
- Forester, J. 1987. Planning in the Face of Conflict: Negotiation and Mediation Strategies in Local Land Use Regulation. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 53, 3: 303-14.
- Fulton, W. 1986. Burying the Hatchet. *Planning* 52, 12: 16-19.
- . 1988. To Bid or Not to Bid. *Planning* 54, 12: 15-19.
- Hall, P. G. 1980. *Great Planning Disasters*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hecimovich, J. 1989. *Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1989*. American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report No. 423, Chicago, IL.
- Hecimovich, J., and J. C. Butler. 1984. *Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1983*. American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report No. 382, Chicago, IL.
- Henderson, H. 1992. Pass on the Right. *Planning* 58, 2: 7-9.
- Hoch, C. 1988. Conflict at Large: A National Survey of Planners and Political Conflict. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8, 1: 25-34.
- Howe, E. 1992. Professional Roles and the Public Interest in Planning. *Journal of Planning Literature* 6, 3: 230-48.
- Klosterman, R. E. 1992. Planning Theory Education in the 1980s: Results of a Second Course Survey. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 11, 2: 130-40.
- Lewis, S. 1991. Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling. *Planning* 57, 7: 7-13.
- Milroy, B. M. 1991. Into Postmodern Weightlessness. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 10, 3: 181-87.
- Orlick, S. C. 1991. Assessing the Value of a Formal Planning Education. Paper presented at the Joint Congress of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning and Association of European Schools of Planning, Oxford, July.
- Schon, D. 1992. The Future of the Profession. Paper presented at the American Planning Association National Conference, Washington, DC, May.
- Soja, E. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso.
- Dalton heads the department of city and regional planning at the California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, California. She is a frequent contributor to journals on urban affairs and planning and a member of the Planning Accreditation Board.
- Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

Schools for Today, Graduates for Tomorrow

Sergio Rodriguez

This essay takes full cognizance of today's changing domestic and international transformations. In anticipating the needs of the profession, we must take into account the major changes in the world, including the demise of communism; the consequent restructuring of Europe; the emergence of the Third World, especially Asia, as an economic, and thus political, super power; and the interrelationship of global environmental problems and their effects on the United States. We must recognize the rekindled need to belong to a particular group that can give us a sense of individual identity; and understand how that will affect the planning of our neighborhoods, our cities, our urban areas, our regions, and, ultimately, our country. We must, as Anthony Downs warns, involve planning directly in the failure of elementary and secondary education to address the needs of America's changing demographic base (1991, 14). Finally, the pro-

found impacts of "Reaganism" and "Bushism," which caused a shifting of resources in planning schools toward real estate-oriented programs and away from social-related programs, have to be addressed.

Planning for Whom, How?

How relevant is planning education for the marketplace and as a conceptual model for understanding social phenomena? For a profession that argues that we are experts anticipating the concerns of the future, we, as planners, seem to lack a comprehensive needs assessment of the profession for the next few years. With approximately 120 planning programs presently belonging to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP), approximately seventy schools accredited in the United States, and 28,000 planners now in APA, we have the resources to address the relationship between the demand and supply of professionals in the planning field, and how the higher education institutions devoted to planning studies should respond.

Between 1990 and 1992, the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) undertook a survey of courses offered by twenty-five (40 percent) of the planning schools in North America. It grouped the responses into three major categories: theory, practice, and education. It found that of the total of 1,005 courses offered, 237 courses (or 24 percent) fit under the category of theory; 213 courses (or 21 percent) were practice-oriented and included design, studio, practice, "projects," and workshops; and 555 courses (or 55 percent) fell into education and covered analysis, research, methodology, introduction to planning, and systems.

We see that schools offer an equal number of courses devoted to education as those covering the theory and practice of planning combined. Although these findings are still too sketchy to arrive at any final conclusions, clearly they do show that a large number of institutions favor education and research over actual project, studio-type courses. Is this a reflection of what graduates will face in the market today? Is this what they will need in the near future? I am sure that there are probably very divergent opinions on this subject among both practitioners and academics.

I do not dispute the need to train professionals who will join the ranks of the academy or engage in research, but I believe it is also important to remember that in preparing future professionals, we have a responsibility to give them basic knowledge that will render them effective in dealing with the complexities of the real world. In addition, we have to make sure that while our graduates must be able to respond to market demand, they should not do so at the expense of some knowledge that could make them professionally complete. In recent years, we have graduates who not only have lacked basic skills in writing, graphics, and public speaking (for which we cannot put the blame solely on planning schools), but also who are incapable, without significant on-the-job

training, of understanding the physical and social structure of the same urban areas that they are trying to affect. This happens despite the fact that they are fully conversant with the latest computer training and equipment and with arcane specialized knowledge.

I have observed that throughout our educational system, not just planning programs, we lack appreciation for the common good as a desirable end derived from our Judeo-Christian tradition. It seems that for two decades we have concentrated on fulfilling the desires of the "me" generation, while ignoring the needs of others. This general deficiency is felt especially in planning programs because students often lack the discernment to see who their true clients are and to appreciate the profession's code of ethics. Lately, major catastrophes, such as AIDS and homelessness, have awakened our dormant consciences and our responsibilities toward disadvantaged groups.

Future Planning or Planning the Future

What is the future of the planning field and how should we shape it? What is the role of planning education in research, education, and professional development? What concepts are important and will be important for planning schools in the future? What processes should be used to impart professional knowledge and at what level?

We need to remind ourselves that the communities of the next century will be more diverse than today. For example, in the next twenty years African-Americans, who comprise 12.4 percent of the population in 1990, will increase to 13.7 percent; the Hispanic population, now 8.2 percent will increase to 10.9 percent; other races will increase from 4 to 5.2 percent while the non-Hispanic white population will decline as a proportion of total population. The population group under eighteen years of age is also expected to decline both numerically and proportionally from 64 million in 1990 to 62.6 million in 2010. Much of this change will be concentrated in major metropolitan areas.

Some basic tenets in planning probably will not change or should not change in the near future. Planners will continue to address the needs of the future and to deal with the management of changes in the natural and man-made environment. They will probably be expected to have the skills to define and solve problems and to identify the implications inherent in particular courses of action. This will require professionals conversant with a variety of technical skills.

Planning educators have to take new risks to become the beacons that will guide, once again, not only the profession but also the federal programs that could shape the future of this country. This is no easy task considering that planning schools, as well as institutions of higher education generally, are facing considerable financial problems. Further, educators are probably wary of the public's tendency to blame them for any future mistakes in public policies and programs, as has happened in the

past (e.g., urban renewal, public housing). But it is better to fail by trying, than to fail for not trying.

Let me offer the following observations on strengthening planning programs:

- We should maintain the concept of a core curriculum to graduate planning *generalists*. We need to develop professionals with a strong basic knowledge as generalists, while we continue to help them develop specializations responsive to the needs of an ever more complex society. The way we usually accomplish this now is at the expense of comprehensiveness and by ignoring demographic changes affecting the nation.
- We should keep in mind who the clients are for planning schools' products. With the public sector capturing one-half of our graduates for jobs in today's market, and one-third going to the private sector, we must be pragmatic about this career alternative. The core curricula should cover the theory and practice of private sector planning along with municipal and regional planning.
- We should not be overly concerned with the marketability of planning graduates, given the profession's ability to adjust to the needs of the market as has been clearly demonstrated not only during the Bush Administration, but also during the Reagan era. We have been able to adjust to the recent administrations' needs for professionals trained to enter nontraditional planning fields.
- We should fashion the curriculum in planning schools to respond better to the practice of planning. Planners, both practitioners and educators, with our unique and comprehensive way of anticipating, viewing, and affecting change can make a contribution in the final years of this century, in establishing the foundation for the century to come. This will require the collaborative effort of both practitioners and educators in creating and implementing collaborative planning curricula.
- We should tap the diversity and richness of our practitioners' experience in our planning education. Employing adjunct practitioners in our schools would compensate for the loss of university faculty expected to retire in the near future. Practitioners will allow us to emphasize "hands on" projects, and on "doing" projects, while the experience of educators could be maximized in research and education, and in the creation of new public programs that could be championed at the federal, state, and local levels.
- We should recruit and retain minority faculty in planning schools. We need to prepare students to plan for a multicultural, multiethnic America. We should use minority practitioners to solve the present shortage faced by schools in this area and to establish needed role models for students and junior faculty. We could establish a minority planner speakers bureau to serve our planning schools.
- We need to rethink the length of our planning programs and standards for granting degrees. It is time to face

the fact that many arrive at our planning schools without adequate preparation. We cannot graduate students who lack a basic ability for verbal and written communication. I am not arguing here for a three-year graduate program, but for combined undergraduate-graduate programs of five to six years that would result in a master's degree in planning. The longer time period would respond better to the basic requirements of the profession, while allowing a customized response to the students' specific needs and desires.

Above all, planning schools at the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century cannot afford to ignore the contribution that practitioners can make to improving the educational process. Is it possible to do otherwise given the economic situation faced by this country and by universities and colleges nationwide? If we expect a shortage in the near future of Ph.D.'s who will dedicate themselves to teaching and research in universities; if we know that we have and will continue to have a shortage of minority faculty to attend to our growing needs to address minority-related issues for our increasing ethnic populations; if budgets for universities are not expected to grow at the same pace as their budgetary needs; if demographics are going to continue to affect negatively the overall number of students available to go to institutions of higher education and, thus, their revenues—doesn't it make sense that we have to make changes in the way we have been using our resources in our schools? Isn't it time that we approach planning schools as we have had to approach the private and public sector, becoming more structurally flexible before we have to close our planning schools?

And what are those needs? As a body, we need to work together to anticipate and plan for the profession to be trained and ready for the future. We could possibly generate enough interest and participation in an organized series of first local, then regional, and finally national symposia of practitioners and educators addressing this issue that could place us in the driver's seat for a change. The results of these symposia could be shared by the ACSP, PAB, APA, and AICP to plan for *our* future as professionals.

If the present trend continues of practicing professionals seeking technical help from regional universities and colleges, we will have to position ourselves to develop new, or retrain existing, professionals who can lead us into the next century. We will have to change the mode of the last ten years where we basically reacted to the market needs for a particular type of professionals, for one that would place us in an anticipatory position as leaders in the solution of this country's problems, while providing the professionals needed to supply these newly created demands.

In conclusion, educators should look to practitioners to readjust their perception of the needs to be served by the planning profession; practitioners will need the educators to help them to retool themselves with new tech-

niques and knowledge borne of research and new technology. Planning research could help us continue being competitive in the solution of tomorrow's world problems, by adjusting to the technological revolution now affecting the world and by forging solutions to America's problems.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Some of the material used for this paper first appeared in a position paper titled "The Future of American Planning Education and Practice: Challenges for the 21st Century," prepared by Thomas D. Galloway, chair and dean, College of Design, Iowa State University. The author also acknowledges the contribution made to this paper by Joseph McManus, AICP.

REFERENCES

Downs, Anthony. 1991. Obstacles in the Future of U.S. Cities. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 57, 1: 13-15.

Rodriguez, AICP, is the assistant city manager and director of the department of planning, building, and zoning for the City of Miami, Florida. He is a member of the American Planning Association board of directors and vice chair of the Planning Accreditation Board.

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

niques and knowledge borne of research and new technology. Planning research could help us continue being competitive in the solution of tomorrow's world problems, by adjusting to the technological revolution now affecting the world and by forging solutions to America's problems.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Some of the material used for this paper first appeared in a position paper titled "The Future of American Planning Education and Practice: Challenges for the 21st Century," prepared by Thomas D. Galloway, chair and dean, College of Design, Iowa State University. The author also acknowledges the contribution made to this paper by Joseph McManus, AICP.

REFERENCES

Downs, Anthony. 1991. Obstacles in the Future of U.S. Cities. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 57, 1: 13-15.

Rodriguez, AICP, is the assistant city manager and director of the department of planning, building, and zoning for the City of Miami, Florida. He is a member of the American Planning Association board of directors and vice chair of the Planning Accreditation Board.

Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 59, No. 2, Spring 1993. ©American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.