

## **AESOP Paper**

### **PLANNING FOR THE 3rd MILLENNIUM: FROM KNOWLEDGE TO ACTION**

*Proceedings of the 1997 Joint AESOP–ISoCaRP Seminar*

16–20 April 1997, Ascona – Switzerland

Association of European Schools of Planning

International Society of City and Regional Planners

May 1997

Published and printed at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

## **Preface**

By the end of 1995, contacts between representatives of the Executive Councils of ISoCaRP and AESOP led to the idea that it might be fruitful for both organisations to engage in joint activities concerning the development of planning in Europe.

ISoCaRP, being primarily an organisation of professional planners, was most interested in the challenges that planning in Europe would face in the coming decades, and in how the profession could and should prepare for them. AESOP, as an organisation of academics engaged in planning education, also had Europe on the agenda and was trying to address questions of how to adjust education to meet Europe's needs.

What better idea than to organise a joint seminar on topics such as Europe, planning education, planning practice and research?

Both councils welcomed the idea of such a seminar to advance thinking on these issues and to enhance mutual understanding between members of both organisations: planning practice and planning education would meet. Moreover, whereas both organisations already had their large annual conferences, a smaller seminar devoted to one theme in depth was expected to be very fruitful.

A joint working group was formed, chaired by Eric Wirén (who also chaired the seminar). The group enthusiastically prepared the central theme and all necessary arrangements. Being close to the turn of the century, the theme soon became *Planning for the Third Millennium: From Knowledge to Action*, expressing the need to look ahead and prepare for Europe's spatial future. It was decided to hold the seminar at Monte Verità – “the mountain of truth” – in Ascona, Switzerland.

This AESOP Paper contains the first proceedings of the seminar, especially with a view to reporting at the 11th annual AESOP Congress held in Nijmegen, The Netherlands, which addressed a similar theme: *Planning Knowledge for the European Market*. These first proceedings of the seminar were distributed among participants.

Alongside a general synopsis, a more detailed record of the purpose and structure of the seminar and some additional information, the volume contains:

- the full text of most keynote speeches and reflections,
- reports on several other contributions,

- reports on the workshops and general discussions.

We feel that this complete set is not only valuable but compulsory reading for anyone interested in planning, planning research and planning education. It provides ample stimulus to pursue these topics with renewed enthusiasm. Europe is waiting out there!

**The rapporteurs:**

Willem Buunk

Goran Cars

Marco Kerstens

Hans Mastop

Nijmegen, May 1997

**Contents**

1. **Synopsis** – p. 3  
*Rapporteur: Hans Mastop*
2. **Theme and Structure** – p. 9
3. **Opening Session** – p. 11  
*Chair: Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP]*
  1. Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP] – *Knowledge for Interaction in Space and Time* – p. 11
  2. Marcel Bazin [AESOP] – *Higher Education and Planning Professions at the Crossroads* – p. 13
  3. Manuel da Costa Lobo [ISoCaRP] – *Sharing Responsibilities* – p. 17
  4. Haluk Alatan [ISoCaRP] – *For Mutual Benefit: New Approaches for Collaboration between Practice and Academia* – p. 26
  5. Jacob Maurer [ISoCaRP] – *Advanced Studies in Spatial Development* – p. 28
4. **Workshops** – p. 33
  1. Workshop I – *Research and Education* – p. 33  
*Chairs: Werner Schramm [ISoCaRP], Vesselina Troeva [AESOP]*
    - Introductions: Werner Schramm, Vesselina Troeva
    - Discussions: Marco Kerstens, *Rapporteur*
  2. Workshop II – *Education and Practice* – p. 36  
*Chairs: Taner Oc [AESOP], Stefano Wagner [ISoCaRP]*
    - Introductions: Taner Oc, Stefano Wagner

- Discussions: Goran Cars, *Rapporteur*
3. Workshop III – *Practice and Research* – p. 40  
*Chairs: Max van den Berg [ISoCaRP], Alex Fubini [AESOP]*
    - Introductions: Max van den Berg, Alex Fubini
    - Discussions: Willem Buunk, *Rapporteur*
5. **Closing Session** – p. 45  
*Chair: Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP]*
    1. Main Themes of the Workshops – p. 45  
*Rapporteur: Hans Mastop*
    2. Expectations and Reflections – p. 46
      - Peter Hall
      - Derek Lyddon
    3. General Discussion – p. 50  
*Rapporteur: Hans Mastop*
    4. Closing Statement – Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP] – *Education, Research and Planning Made Simple* – p. 51

## **Appendices** – p. 55

1. List of Participants – p. 55
2. About AESOP/ISoCaRP – p. 57

## **1. Synopsis**

*Rapporteur: Hans Mastop*

How is one to assess the outcomes of a four-day seminar, held on a mountain (“the mountain of truth”) in the southern part of Switzerland, where some 70 people from all over the world came together to talk, eat, drink, walk (some of them two or four times a day up and down that same mountain) and, above all, to discuss the practice of, the research on, and the education for “that thing called planning” (to borrow from Johnny Cash)?

First and foremost, by stressing that planning is a “men’s world” (to borrow – and slightly but significantly differ – from another American singer), meaning that planning is done by, done for, undergone, assessed and discussed by people, and that, consequently, those who make a living out of it have the moral obligation to share experiences: agonies, successes and failures, expectations, dreams.

Second, without even taking the slightest breath: such sharing of experiences is difficult, needs to be organised, and yet is not organised often enough.

Planning is a basic – some say everyday – human activity. But as soon as “science”, “craft”, “art”, “research for”, “education for”, “purpose”, or “legitimation” come into the discussion, then the trouble starts. Those who make a living out of it and/or see it as a vocation, do so with a multitude of frames of reference in their minds. These reflect all the different influences one can think of in terms of education, politico-institutional context, social and cultural settings, specific planning experience, and so on. Every planner and every academic who studies planning seems to tell his or her own story. And when they join together, they are bound for a collision of completely different views and misinterpretations of each other’s positions, intentions, approaches, and so on.

This happened in Ascona too. And yet, the seminar was exactly meant to make a fresh start with overcoming these problems, since the only way to do so is to seek exposure and to discuss one’s differences.

The seminar was prepared and organised as a joint ISoCaRP–AESOP event. Two organisations representing the world of planning practice on the one hand, and the world of planning education and research on the other. Two organisations that saw the need for mutual exposure. Two organisations that felt they had an obligation to encourage their members to think ahead about the planning issues that would confront us in the next millennium.

The plenary opening session set the tone. Chaired by Eric Wirén, representatives of both ISoCaRP and AESOP gave their views on the triangulation between planning practice, education and research.

For Eric Wirén, the basic challenges of planning in the third millennium are not those of the distant future but our present worries about that future. He stressed that education, research and planning practice are all witnessing fundamental changes:

- education: from teaching to learning
- research: from knowing to understanding
- planning: from an act of mastering to continuous serving

In his view, the future will see much more competition between planning schools. Students will be more mobile than at present and will choose the best schools to get the best education. Schools, in turn, will want to attract the best students. Thus, planning education – next to basic training – should be much more attuned to the market of individual students. Modern means of communication will play a decisive role in serving that market.

Marcel Bazin stressed the diversity in planning: in terms of policies and practices, in terms of professional status and organisation of planners, and in terms of education itself. In his view, these differences are an asset, not a problem. The planning community must learn to live with and exploit these differences, as planning itself – as a basic human activity – will always be necessary, whatever face it may take in the future.

As far as education is concerned, for Bazin the basic qualities of future planners might include:

- the capacity for selecting and organising information
- a sense of complexity
- sensitivity to cultural and social diversity
- ability to manage conflicts
- and above all: creativity (based, of course, on technical expertise)

## 2. Theme and Structure

Coming closer to the third millennium, one often wonders: “*What is coming?*” Nobody has the answer. But that should not prevent discussions on things that might be coming. This is especially true for planners; they have to look ahead.

Thinking about the future of planning, one realises that there are at least two worlds: that of practice and that of the academic planning world. Up to now, these worlds have often been “dynamically conservative” in their respective positioning. Time and again it has proven difficult to (re)define each other’s roles and positions.

The seminar was meant as a new effort to overcome these difficulties. It was set up as a collaborative exercise between representatives of ISoCaRP and AESOP. The theme of the seminar was to start discussions on what might become the future *European Planning Agenda*, by considering and trying to define the interconnections between planning practice, planning research and planning education.

So both planning practitioners and planning academics were invited to Monte Verità (“the mountain of truth”) in Ascona, Switzerland: not to find definitive solutions, but to try to identify the right questions regarding the future of planning in Europe – and especially planning education in Europe. Just finding the right questions would be good enough for a start.

The seminar was designed to allow in-depth discussions on the interactive relationships between education, practice and research: what these are like, and what they should be like. Next to an introductory plenary session and a closing general discussion, these in-depth discussions took place in workshops, each dealing with one of the relations:

- education and research,
- education and practice,
- research and practice.

Since the participants of the seminar were recruited from the ISoCaRP and AESOP networks, three mixed groups were formed. Each group subsequently passed through each of the three workshops, thus enabling group cohesion and ongoing discussions on all three types of relations.

The dual chairs of the workshops were tasked not only with introducing their themes three times over to different groups, but also with giving a general report of the findings of all three groups.

---

### 3. Opening Session

Chair: Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP]

#### 3.1 Eric Wirén

##### Knowledge for Interaction in Space and Time

I cannot think of a more suitable place for our seminar than Monte Verità, the mountain of truth. It makes me think of one of my favourite books when I was young: Hermann Hesse's *Das Glasperlenspiel*.

This area could be *Kastalia*, the region where the sophisticated game society had its headquarters, protected from the trivial world, from journalistic vulgarity and from the devastating inflation and corruption of spiritual values. Kastalia was the home of a noble international hierarchy of scientists, artists and philosophers where the *Magister Ludi*, the supreme conductor of the game, was Joseph Knecht (notice the name).

The society was not isolated; it was an international organisation. The game itself became a means of communication, a language for spirituality. In the schools for the young elite, everybody dreamt of a career in the game hierarchy. For them, *Magister Ludi* was next to God. The deepest insight of the culture was in the relationships between teacher and student, between the individual and the collective, between master and servant. Authority meant nothing but goodwill, helpfulness and deepest affection.

Once a year, the *Magister Ludi* conducted the performance of a sophisticated game where music, poetry and other arts, mathematics, astronomy and other sciences were the ingredients for spiritual refreshment and profound inner reflection. At the very top of his career and fame, Joseph Knecht woke up from this dream life of perfect harmony, left the perfect society and went down to the people in the valley to become an ordinary teacher – no longer as master but as a learning servant.

It was, and still is, a thought-provoking story of a future époque of disintegration. It tells us that even the noblest mind has to face reality. It is necessary to fight for the cultural heritage of values, but it cannot be done through any cults for an elite only. Knowledge cannot by itself be considered spiritual and eternal; on the contrary, it is fragile and perishable, and most of it will soon be forgotten. The pearls of the game, however fantastically they once have been used, will one day turn into what they really are: pearls of glass, and nothing more.

It is not only the sense of place that brings *Das Glasperlenspiel* back to my mind, but also the theme of our seminar. The turn of the century has a remarkable effect on the mind: it is like opening the doors to something new. There is, in fact, nothing that contradicts the idea that we are facing a totally different culture within maybe ten years.

My advice to the workshops is to keep an eye on the expectations as expressed by Peter Hall and Derek Lyddon, and also to consider what the keynote speakers have to say. They are indeed presenting a few challenges.

*(dalje slede njegovi argumenti o obrazovanju, istraživanju i praksi – ostavila sam kao uvod, a u sledećem koraku ćemo detaljno završiti ceo Wirénov govor)*

## 3.2 Marcel Bazin

### Higher Education and Planning Professions at the Crossroads

Being an organisation of planning schools, AESOP is basically concerned with the advancement of planning education throughout Europe. But this objective cannot be achieved without strong links with practitioners and their organisations, and that is why we are all together in this seminar.

In fact, AESOP has already undertaken a dialectic reflection upon the curricula in planning – i.e., the *offer* we put on the “European education market” as planning schools – confronted with the *demand*, in the formulation of which professional organisations such as ISoCaRP (as well as ECTP) play an outstanding role. Our hope is that this seminar will be an important stage in that process.

### The Present: A Threefold Diversity

This reflection is based upon the acknowledgement of a threefold diversity:

- diversity in planning policies and practices,
- diversity in the professional status and level of organisation of planners, and
- diversity in planning education itself, from state to state, and even from school to school.

---

#### 1. Diversity in Planning Policies and Practices

The word *planning* itself is understood and implemented in various ways, with extensive differences in scale and content. It includes the rigid communist *planifikatsia* as well as the most gentle forms of incentive measures intended to improve the spatial distribution of industry; wide views over broad trans-border areas such as the Alpine regions where we are now, as well as micro-projects in a small rural area or in an urban neighbourhood; global perspectives aiming at sustainable development as well as specialised projects in housing, tourism or transport; ready-made urban design projects as well as gradual processes in advocacy planning.

However, all that is planning, since it organises the spatial regulation of human societies. And all those aspects, or most of them, coexist in the same country.

The most meaningful differences are bound to the decisional level(s) involved in planning, which are related to the structure of political power. In spite of their maximal ideological distance, Thatcherian Britain and Brezhnevian Russia both suffered from a highly centralised structure, very far from that of federal Germany or Switzerland, whereas Latin countries like France, Italy and Spain experienced deep changes towards decentralised forms of power during the last decades.

The *Compendium* recently elaborated by DG XVI now gives a comprehensive picture of this diversity. We had hoped to have it presented here, and regret that Philippe Doucet and his colleagues from DG

XVI are too busy preparing the inter-ministerial meeting in Noordwijk about the organisational scheme of European space to be able to bring us their experience.

---

## 2. Diversity of Planners

Such different ways of practising planning mean various ways of being a planner. You can work as a civil servant – either in state administrations or in offices linked to local authorities – as an employee in an associative structure such as town planning agencies (*Agences d'Urbanisme*) or natural parks (*Parcs Naturels Régionaux* and *Parcs Nationaux*) in France, in a social housing company or in a private consulting company, or be the head of such a private company, or finally be an independent self-employed person.

Students' associations, or former students' associations connected to our planning schools, could produce comprehensive pictures of the jobs exercised by our graduates. These vary greatly from one country to another, and even from one school to another according to its main disciplinary pattern and its regional and national network of partners.

In fact, there is often a gap between the professional destiny of our graduates and the actual map of the planning professions in most countries – probably with the exception of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, where planning education has been functioning from the beginning. Elsewhere, most planning schools are relatively young, and a great number of actually working planners have another educational background – generally architecture, sometimes engineering or social sciences.

Another important issue is the legal definition and status of planners, which varies greatly throughout Europe. The strictest definition seems to be observed in the Netherlands, where the title of town planner is protected by official registration, whereas planners are grouped in the Association of Dutch Town Planners (BNS), though fewer than half of registered town planners are actually members of BNS.

The United Kingdom does not protect the title by registration, but recognition through membership of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) – itself bound to the recognition of curricula by RTPI – gives a key to employment in planning almost as effective as official registration.

In Germany, access to the title of planner (more precisely *Stadtplaner* or *Regionalplaner*) derives directly from obtaining a degree in planning, though architects may also be granted this title in some *Länder* by the Department of Urban Planning of the Regional Chamber of Architects.

In Italy, architects have the monopoly of planning: any kind of plan, from the national scale to the communal scale, has to be signed by a registered architect. This has led the new *Società Italiana degli Urbanisti* to undertake a wide action in order to change this situation.

In France, there is no official definition of the profession, which is actually practised by people with various educational backgrounds: architects, graduates from planning schools, engineers. The new *Conseil Français des Urbanistes* has begun working actively to initiate a “qualification” process leading to a professional label of “qualified planner.”

These few examples show that maintaining, or changing, the status of planners depends upon their forms and level of organisation at the national scale – and over this, the action of international bodies such as ISOCaRP and ECTP plays a very important role.

### 3. Diversity in Planning Education

Planning education itself shows extreme diversity, not only from one country to another, but often between schools of the same country. The new edition of the *AESOP Directory of Planning Schools*, published in 1990 thanks to Tadeusz Marszał's efforts, gives a good idea of this diversity, since it included a more detailed presentation of the curricula.

Three main formulas can be distinguished within the jungle of curricula:

1. **Continuous curriculum** fully devoted to planning, from undergraduate to graduate and to postgraduate levels (although these three words do not cover the same realities in all countries).
2. **Specialisation curriculum** in planning, generally at the postgraduate level, following an undergraduate disciplinary programme supportive to planning (geography, architecture, social sciences, law, economics, etc.).
3. **Integration of a specialisation in planning** within a curriculum basically devoted to another field: architecture, geography, engineering.

The first formula is predominant in the UK, Germany, Norway or the Netherlands. The "French model" gives the greatest weight to the second formula, which is also the case in Portugal, Poland or Israel. The third model is often found in Eastern European countries, while Italy stands at the border between the second and the third formulas.

Anyway, this rough distinction is quite insufficient to give a precise account of the diversity in curricula. Other very important differentiation factors are the forms of linkage between education and profession: participation of practitioners in courses, placement periods, case studies and workshops; and the contribution of research to planning education, now illustrated by Ingrid Lundahl's report *Doctoral Studies between Academy and Profession*.

---

### 4. Diversity: A Source of Weakness or of Richness?

One could stare at that utmost diversity and think it makes the situation rather desperate – something like an enormous jigsaw puzzle, the pieces of which will never fit together. Against this despondent attitude, one might also choose a combative and normative attitude: diversity is our enemy, we have to build an efficient "European bulldozer" that will crush the differences and level everything into an ideal European planning system and corresponding educational pattern.

In my view, this idea is neither realistic nor desirable. In fact, AESOP's aim is not to level diversity, but to analyse it through its richness, to facilitate mutual information, to pick out interesting experiments from various countries and evaluate their transferability, and finally to contribute to organising that diversity.

---

## 1. Is There Any Future for Planning?

If we decided to have this seminar together, it is of course because we are all convinced that the answer is “Yes”, as all the keynote speeches have also shown. Naturally, no one would expect another answer from us, and our conviction might just be a reflex for survival – the manifestation of our “dynamic conservatism”: planning is useful because we are the planners, the people supposed to practise planning or to teach it to younger generations. Declaring that planning is condemned to death would be the equivalent of committing professional suicide.

But couldn't a new Cassandra once again sing the refrain of “No future”? Doesn't the trend towards mondialisation and liberalisation make planning a prehistoric activity, the last struggle against triumphant economic forces? As you can guess, I am intimately convinced of the exact opposite of that assessment. I do not insist upon it here, since our meeting is rooted in the conviction that planning will still be necessary to ensure the articulation between economic efficiency and socio-spatial justice. Recent human disasters remind us of the necessity of a spatial regulation of society.

---

## 2. What Will Be the New Patterns of Planning Activity in the Beginning of the Next Millennium?

Thus, planning is a necessity – but what kind of planning? Isn't there a permanent temptation to think that we are the ones who know, and to go on perfecting models of planning (and of course methods of teaching that planning) that are already outdated, such as the physical planning of the 1960s, implemented in a period of industrial and demographic growth?

As we know, things have changed. We can try to update the contents and methods of our planning education to present-day situations, and then think “*We've got the solution*” and use our respective organisations in a defensive orientation – but this is the best way to guarantee failure in the very near future.

So, how must we face this uncertain future? The last decades have taught us to be modest with regard to prediction, since extrapolated trends were suddenly cut off by unforeseen events such as the 1974 oil crisis or the 1989–90 collapse of communist states. This modesty must also be applied to ourselves and the future of planning. Only one thing is 100% certain: nobody entering the profession of planner will do the same job all along his or her professional life. (And more and more planners – indeed the majority of our students, at least in France – belong to the feminine half of humankind.)

We can point out a number of factors that will change the nature and methods of planning practice. The difficulty will be to estimate their respective, and probably rapidly shifting, weight. A very likely tendency towards globalisation will embrace both the economic and the ecological spheres. Decisions taken quite far away from here will have a deep impact on our lives, which should lead to an increasing consciousness of worldwide solidarity.

What place can Europe take in such processes – and what Europe? Will the deepening of the European Union within its present boundaries, through the implementation of the Euro as a common monetary unit, play against its broadening to Eastern and South-eastern Europe? How far will

regionalisation and decentralisation processes go, and what remnants of power will stay in the hands of national states? This redistribution of power will at the same time define the most significant spatial levels for planning policies, and eventually result in new types of conflicts between these different levels.

At the same time, what kinds of new tools will new technologies in information and telecommunication bring to planners – as well as to their partners, the political and economic decision-makers, and to all the citizens of an “Internetted World”?

---

### 3. How Can Planning Education Take These New Evolutions into Account?

Although our students are eagerly demanding technical recipes for present-day practice, we must let them know that such recipes may quickly become outdated. We must instead insist on giving them, as a priority, what has been defined by the AESOP Working Group on Planning Education as the *core of planning education*:

- theoretical and practical knowledge of the need and conditions of planning interventions,
- preparation, implementation and evaluation of such interventions, and
- practical skills needed to engage in planning activities.

This requires acquiring knowledge in many different fields, developing practical competence through regular exposure to and interaction with planning practice, and never forgetting the ethical dimension of planning. In my view, these principles will remain valid in the future, although their application will need to be adapted.

We have to think now, in our workshops, about the competencies and skills that will keep their value in a changing world. They might be the following:

- **Capacity to select and organise information.** An ever more abundant amount of data will be available through various media: written literature (scientific books and articles as well as reports and projects), graphic, cartographic and photographic documents, electronic databases, etc. Technical knowledge of new information-providing devices will have to be constantly updated, but the basic capacity of analysing data critically, classifying them, selecting the most significant ones, and associating them into bundles and networks will always be indispensable.
- **Sense of complexity.** Planners will be confronted with increasingly intricate situations. Understanding such situations will require, rather than an analytic approach that breaks them into pieces, a systemic approach that appreciates the multiple and reciprocal interactions likely to modify the whole system. Jakob Maurer will illustrate this with examples of how planners must manage complexity.
- **Sensitivity to cultural and social diversity.** An increasingly important component of the above-mentioned complexity. Even today, one of the poorest results of planning programmes concerns the difficulty of “reducing the social split” and managing a multicultural society.

- **Ability to manage conflicts.** In a socially confused environment, one of the main tasks of planners will be to act as mediators between political leaders and economic forces, or between decision-makers of all kinds and “ordinary” citizens. Playing this mediator role requires some training, but is impossible without at least a minimal innate endowment.
- **Creativity.** This will remain one of the basic qualities expected of a planner. In this respect, planning is akin to cooking: in both cases, the good technician applying a recipe scrupulously will lack the “spice” of creativity. On the contrary, a planner showing high creativity today will be able to apply it tomorrow to still unknown problems.

You may object that creativity is an innate endowment which has nothing to do with higher education. Nevertheless, we can do two things as educators:

1. try to select students who show this creativity, and warn them of its necessity if they do not want to be merely second-class executors; and
2. put as many opportunities as possible on their educational path to use and develop this creativity.

Our programme is now to explore these more difficult but fruitful ways of facing tomorrow’s uncertainties.

### 3.3 Manuel da Costa Lobo

#### Sharing Responsibilities

---

##### I. Development of Co-operation: From Education to Practice

1. **Territorial planning** for growth, protection and regeneration – to favour humanised space development – is a way (through science, art and will) of sharing space and resources, having in view short, medium, long and very long-term horizons. There is no way to formulate criteria for these purposes if two postulates are not accepted as natural human impulses that cannot and ought not to be demonstrated:
  - Humanised space development / Respect of nature
  - Solidarity among human beings
2. This path can only be found through **transdisciplinarity**, based on a lot of:
  - Scientific knowledge
  - Experience
  - Contemplation / Intuition
  - Meditation / Introspection
  - Communication

3. Before being a science and an art, before being a professional activity, territorial planning is a question of **ethics**, where humankind faces the need for co-operation through understanding not only itself but also its surroundings, in order to draw objectives that take into account all human dimensions and all natural laws, grasping even the unknown.
4. In a world that claims to be more and more global, divisions appear: between North and South, between East and West, between countries, between religious denominations, between regions and ethnic groups. Humanity is beginning to understand that there are proper levels to face different issues.
  - **Global issues** must bring all humanity together.
  - **Specific problems of specific spaces** need the proper place for debate and for an adequate decision-making process.

Thus, a municipality within a region must have its own space of competence, but some problems require links between municipalities and regional resolution. The same holds between small communities and their shared space, through associations; and even between a citizen and their community. For community issues, citizens must act through a democratic process as a unit – but each one has the right to preserve individual freedom, privacy and decision-making capacity.

Even within each individual we feel the need for coherent behaviour, but our ego also faces conflicting impulses of body and mind. It is not always easy to remain coherent with one's own personality. This brings about the big issue of fragmented versus global decisions. **Fractal theories, multilevel administration, decision-making systems, optimising co-operation, iterative and monitoring methods** are among the tools for planning renewal and research.

5. Debates such as globalisation vs. localisation lose their meaning if life is proclaimed the most wonderful good. Life asks for movement, not flatness – for waves and scintillation. It is therefore not a question of global *or* local, but of a permanent movement between the two. The right question is not *to be or not to be*, but to debate the **amplitude and frequency of dynamics**.
6. In reality, the knowledge of different people, scientists and professionals is very often partial, lacking comprehensiveness. Each group tends to build its own “castle of knowledge” with thick walls all around. **Comprehensive approaches**, on the contrary, require opening these narrow-minded groups so that common understanding can gradually be built. Good interchange of ideas can develop community life, stimulate creativity and enrich relations among people and regions.

---

## II. Leadership and Participation

7. So many interests, understandings, personal views and conflicting wills call for leadership – but also for participation within democratic grounds.
  - **Strategy + tactics** on one side,

- **Flexibility + coherence** on the other,

can provide the tools for sound planning.

Leadership on education, leadership on research, leadership on professional behaviour, leadership on development implementation, leadership among leaders – all this brings the need for a **network of leaders**, articulated to foster progress and a civilised integration of citizens and communities, without interfering with local specifics and identities.

The complexity of partners, leaders and privileged links is such that an effective network requires iterative steps and partial organisations until a general structure can be offered for detailed development.

---

### III. Professionals and Tools

8. Within the profession, some feel called to become “**masters**”, offering all their knowledge to others and creating more know-how and theories. Others will be strict professionals, fighting in the market for jobs, networking, developing teams and competing – and therefore less inclined to share their knowledge.

#### Professional Master vs. Market Professional

9. Tools for practical planning include:
  - Observation capacities
  - Awareness of issues
  - Information / measurement / projections
  - Scenario building
  - Dialogue development
  - Decision-making and sharing of responsibilities
  - Creativity / “third solutions”
  - Evaluation methods and assessments
  - Managing systems
  - Implementation through administration, organisation and resource mobilisation
  - Mediation

---

### IV. Legitimation and Effectiveness of Planning

10. Legitimation and effectiveness of planning require:

- Territorial comprehensiveness (no “spatial holes”)
- Permanence of planning activity (no time gaps)
- Participation and partnership integration
- Timely resolutions (agile management and decision-making)
- Monitoring and comprehensive strategies
- Flexibility through participatory systems and adaptive norms
- Professional excellence, open to alternative evaluation and co-operation
- Respect for local and minority groups
- Provision of meeting opportunities and tools for synergetic developments
- Administrative division for territorial planning with associative approaches
- Coordination levels that respect local autonomy and subsidiarity

The subsidiarity principle means placing decision powers at the lowest appropriate level according to capacity and economic scale, but also allows for the **suppletory principle**: the immediate intervention of higher administrative levels when lower levels cannot meet legitimate needs.

The issue of legitimisation does not depend on some of these items but on all of them. Planning is like a container for water: the lack of any of these items is like a hole in the container – it will not serve its purpose.

---

## V. Shared Responsibility

11. Due to the complexity of the systems in which urbanists perform their professional activities, their interventions are always measured through results – where they nevertheless bear only shared responsibility.

Very often there are expertise gaps. The only way for urbanists to act is to **fill the gaps**. The team may lack a historian, sociologist, landscape architect, transport engineer, surveyor, mediator, etc. The urbanist must cover these gaps with their own capacities, in order to respond properly to human, geographic and technological issues.

Improvisation requires:

- capacity for study,
- creativity,
- psychological strength,
- openness to dialogue,

- goodwill.

Once again, the analogy with water: **town planners must be like water in concrete-making – filling all the empty spaces among pebbles, sand and cement.**

### **FILLING THE GAPS**

13. A key problem for all planning steps is the threshold issue. Many development policies lie on the device of growing, of increasing urban centres, of getting more population, of spending more resources. Although, all these are ingredients for unsustainability, threatening our own future or the one of next generations. Limitations have a moral value but human beings act as if they are unable to accept limits, always ambitioning some extra improvements, power or ownership, irrespective to accumulated richness. Another style of life and thinking is urgently needed.

### **Threshold – Rupture – Low**

14. It seems that some light is showing the way to human kind but false promising ways now and then are very often being taken... finally bringing humans back to the very first start. It seems that round circles are being followed by unwise people or by researchers looking for other alternatives... without finding them. From time to time it seems that objectives become clearer as much as modesty comes back to science. Nature is the only source for human thinking and is combining complexity/variety with unity and comprehensiveness. These are the two poles for human kind to locate a scheme of behaviour and of self-respect within practical actions and theoretical design.

### **Forgetting Nature Laws – Back to the Starting Point**

15. Both participation and co-ordination, both subsidiarity and complementarity, both economy of scale and scale of economy lead us to an administration structure through a hierarchical system of levels, where capacities and powers can be provided and shared in order to get better administrative results. The bureaucratic principle of hierarchical administration brings a high level of time and cost consuming handling of applications, going up and down to get a final decision (A). The principle of directing issues immediately to their level of resolution, avoiding other administrative levels, seems to be a good one (B). Public administration practice has to change for that purpose but also has to offer a balanced gradatory system of different levels to allow the choosing of the adequate level for final decision according to the problem. These gradatory system can better answer to democratic participation not only directly but also indirectly through each level involvement on the decision making at the immediate level of power.

### **Optimal Resolution – Gap Level**

(A) – NO      (B) – YES

16. Recent political movements underline the need of competitiveness as the only way for surviving. Education and training prepare citizens to compete one another. Industrial enterprises have to compete. Countries offer incentives to societies to restructure their activities in order they can compete. Cities are now developing a policy for competing among themselves.

Competition tends to get wild and inhuman. Co-operation, at the other extreme of policy making, seems to be obsolete. Co-operation is misunderstood as something like paternalism, communism, incapacity. If co-operation within society and within nations does not find a positive connotation and a practical sense, then there is no way to go out from a forceful wild competition where moral values mean nothing and where opportunities for human kind development/improvement of life conditions will be lost.

**O-O-O-O-O**

17. Planning is a risky activity, because it is strongly systemic (causing many side-effects) and because there are many actors that interfere in its development, with conflicting objectives and/or different strategies that can destroy each other. Actors in each department of ministries have a sectoral view. Actors in municipalities, the elected members or even the staff members are not able to co-ordinate their interventions in the cities. Private investors follow a different philosophy of gains. Credit agents and banks influence the trends, as the credit is always selective and has its own policy and strategy. Pressure groups like societies, scientific research centres, mass media, trade unions, political partners and others also add complexity to the system. If some group of co-ordinators succeed on having a rational strategy there is still a risk of treason.

#### **Systemic – Planning Side Effects > Strategy – Activity Impacts (uncertain)**

18. Social exclusion and poverty brings a special frame for planners' action, where barefoot planners... or interpreter-planners, or bridge-professionals can be key persons for democratic positive aid to almost helpless social groups. The main strategy must be to get a somewhat intense living together between town-planner and local communities until identity of objectives and feelings can be attained.

#### **Interpreter-Planners**

19. Urban environment qualification and urban ecosystemic balance is also an achievement to get: where streets cleaning and litter removal and recycling is one of the most backward sectors of urban technology. Sustainability also has to do with construction ecosystem: duration and pathology of structures, conservation methods, drainage and underground infrastructure ecosystems, urban biology. It happens that some local powers are investing on new urban structures and forgetting their ancient ones at a rate that means growing of useless urban fabric, without proper conservation/rehabilitation.

#### **URBAN/REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT CONSERVATION**

20. On education it is important that planners will get a solid scientific approach to phenomena understanding and judgement, creativity capacity and extensive experience dealing with design, materials and people. All this means working both in office and on the ground. The way to obtain that performance is to get academic knowledge and professional practice on different levels, that means permanent education, obtained through university periodic learning, maybe every 10 to 12 years and intermediate periods of practice, dealing with different aspects of planning issues.

## **PERMANENT EDUCATION**

Cities happenings, participation and legal/administrative frames. City fractals. Citizens training to live within freedom & solidarity towards qualified environment.

### **III. RESEARCH FIELDS TO FOLLOW AND TOOLS TO USE**

Research for urban and regional planning can develop through several fields and using many scientific tools, behind researching on research being done and looking for innovation on the tools themselves. Some of the roads to research can be:

1. Studies on human perception, experimental research, monitored practice of intuition and human sentiments exploring.
2. Studies on social behaviour, through inquiries and statistical treatment of findings, going back to former accumulated knowledge and historic research.
3. Projection of trends and forecasts (linking trends to political will and human behaviour) – the sliding horizons and the control of happenings previously decided.
4. Adaptation of functions and forms to urban and regional phenomena.
5. Calculation of rigor and sensibility of measurements and methods/models.
6. Fractal and catastrophe theory.
7. Evaluation methods and epistemology. Multi-criteria analysis and decision aid systems, selecting alternatives.
8. Analogue models like gravity, rank-size, surface tensions, etc., playing with functions and discrete values following objectives and nature of issues.
9. Iconic models.
10. Aesthetics of numbers, forms and comprehensive answers to issues, accepting geometric principles like order, symmetry, filling in, continuity, balanced distribution, etc. Modelling of number of settlements, at different scales.
11. Cybernetics and human creativity, innovating capacity, interface between man and computers – generation of alternatives. Developing of discovering capacities.
12. Automatic calculation, automatic drawing and geographic representation of phenomena.
13. Thresholds and stock management.
14. Devices for economic recovery and development incentives.
15. Participation models and administrative structuring, indicators and conditioning – inertia, friction, interests, general laws of administration staff behaviour (Parkinson's law, Peter's principle).
16. Techniques for field surveys and monitoring.

17. Economy of scale studies. Offer-demand balance and connecting devices and mitigations.
  18. Cultural identity and complementarities – synergies.
  19. Sustainability and environmental studies and assessments.
  20. System of rules and discretionary principles – rationality and pathologies. Deviations and mitigations within administrative strategies.
- 

#### **IV. FORE RUNNERS**

If forerunners are to be trusted and successful they must behave with determination and modesty. If they go very fast then they will become very far from others and the pulling effect will disappear.

When alternatives are presented it will be wise to go slower and to divide efforts on more than one research field (see figure next page).

Being near to real life happenings, “forerunners” can go back now and then and maintain a feedback wise system, being sure that their voice is heard and their advice followed or at least debated within a fair, human dialogue. As a matter of fact, running at the head of the group is more risky and many times a wrong path can be taken. The healthier attitude is to be prepared to explore alternative paths and to come back whenever necessary.

Maybe the forerunners will open many fields of research but the second range runners, taking advantage of the bad or good experiences of those, eventually be the own that applied planning activity will need to support new trends and to get advice.

Besides understanding ecological claims and laws of nature and getting policies on those grounds, planning researches must spend more time with people in order to understand their problems, their behaviour, this way to dialogue, their psychological reactions as individuals and as groups. Planning can be called as a paternalistic activity by those that don’t understand what it is – a professional advice at the right moment, at the right place – and by those hypocrite that misunderstand freedom as abandon of many people to “their freedom” (having no conditions to overcome their own difficulties to survive or to get a habitat or to promote their education and dignity).

The necessary links between planners and people/authorities means the right of reporting to the people and the access to mass media instruments.

---

#### **(B) the wrong path → right path to explore**

---

#### **SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- *Les objets Fractals*, Benoit Mandelbrot, 1989
- *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*, Benoit Mandelbrot, 1982

- *The Science of Fractal Images*, Peitgen, H.O. and Saupe, D., 1988
- *Models Mathématiques de la Morphogenèse*, Thom, René, 1980
- *Land Resource Economics*, Barlowe, R., 1978
- *Hysteresis and Catastrophe Theory: Empirical Identification in Transportation Modelling*, Blase, J.H., 1979
- *Land Policy in Planning*, Lichfield, N. and Darin-Drabkin, 1980
- *Políticas de Solos no Planeamento Municipal*, Paulo V.D. Correia, 1993
- *Facility Location with Spatiality – Interactive Travel Behaviour*, Erlenkotter, D. and G. Leonardi, 1984
- *Urban and Regional Planning*, McLoughlin, 1969
- *L'aide Multicritère à la Décision*, Philippe Vincke, 1989
- *A Systems View of Planning*, Chadwick, G., 1978
- *Normas Urbanísticas*, Vol. I–III, Manuel Leal da Costa Lobo and altri, 1990, 1991, 1993
- *Loteamentos Ilegais*, Associação dos Municípios do Distrito de Setúbal, 1983
- *Une Approche Systémique des Systèmes d'Information du Territoire et de Leur Intégrité*, Chevallier, J.J.
- *Geographic Information Systems: GIS Primer*, M. Kevany
- *A Multi-Dimensional Motivations Model for Decision Making*, L. Valadares Tavares, 1996
- *Provedor do Ambiente e Qualidade de Vida Urbana – Uma Experiência Inédita*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1996
- *On the Optimal Management of Project Risk*, L. Valadares Tavares and J. Antunes Ferreira, 1996
- *The Strategic Development of Human Resources*, L. Valadares Tavares, 1994
- *Turn of the Century, Survival of the Compact City, Revival of Public Transport*, 1995
- *Thoughts of Future of the Multi Criteria Field: Basic Convictions and Outline for a General Methodology*, C.A. Bana e Costa
- *The XXIst Century Planning. The Way of Freedom*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1995
- *Town-Planning Elementary Metrics, Reference Table*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1985
- *General Overview of the MACBETH Approach*, C.A. Bana e Costa, Jean-Claude Vansnick, 1995
- *O Que Não Tem Sido Dito Sobre a Clandestinidade*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1988

- *Normas de Construção das Cidades – O Sistema Estratégico-Estocástico*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1988
- *As Opções Implícitas na Natureza dos Regulamentos dos Planos de Urbanização e na Natureza do Planeamento, Visando Controlar e Influenciar o Desenvolvimento Urbanístico*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1989
- *How to Get Greater Urban Cohesion in Big Cities*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1996
- *Vale de Mithagos: Indicadores Sociais para a Urbanização de um Loteamento Clandestino do Concelho do Seixal*, Pereira Neto & Rocha Trindade, M.B., 1975
- *Planning as a Dialogue: The Portuguese Experience*, Henriques, J.M.
- *The State of Spatial Planning in Europe*, Healey, P. and Piccinato, G., 1995
- *Neighbourhood Regeneration: An International Evolution*, Alterman, R. and Cars, G., 1991
- *Regionalização e Participação – Conceitos Básicos da Gestão do Território*, Manuel da Costa Lobo, 1996

- **3.4 Halik Alatan**

- **FOR MUTUAL BENEFIT: NEW APPROACHES FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN PRACTICE AND ACADEMIA**

- During the preparatory stages of the Monte Verità Seminar, the theme that I was asked to deliver a speech on was defined in broad terms as *theory and practice*. This was later specified to read as *For Mutual Benefit: New Approaches for Collaboration between Practice and Academia*.

- **Theory – Academia – Practice**

Whether it be theory and practice or academia and practice, we are talking about a line extending from theory to practice. If the path stretching between the two extreme ends is the method, we need to think and work out alternative paths. What we are here referring to is, in general, the theory, practice, reality and education of planning. It is certainly possible to deal with these fields individually. Each may have overlapping or contradictory features in relation to the other. Nevertheless, they should be considered as integral parts of an entity. We must always bear in mind that theory also has a practice whereas practice is based on theory. Particularly in the field of planning, which is a simulation of life itself, neither practice nor theory can offer realistic, sustained and lasting solutions.

- It can be claimed that theory constitutes the first step in planning. However, in the context of practice, which directly corresponds to reality, theory will be subject to continuous review and revision as soon as implementation takes place. As a matter of fact, theory should closely relate to reality.
- As an organisation of professional planners, ISoCaRP has always accorded due importance to both planning practice and planning education and training. The Young Planners' Workshops organised during the last six years, concurrent with the Congresses of ISoCaRP, are a clear indication of its faith in continuous training in planning.
- In brief, we can state that practice and theory coexist in all phases and scales of planning with varying relative weight of significance attached to each at different times.

- 
- - **1980 Tunisia – Planning and Education**

Another example is the 1980 ISoCaRP Congress in Tunisia. The theme of this Congress, organised in co-operation with UNESCO, was *Planning and Education*. Besides the theoretical issues discussed, examples of the experiences of different countries presented to the Congress by the participants have shed light on the practical aspects of planning education. One conclusion, inter alia, derived from the deliberations in the Congress, emphasised the importance of continuous development, review and reorganisation of planning education and planning curriculum.
  - The Tunisian Congress drew attention to the gap between developed and developing countries in terms of the quality of education, and underscored the need for endeavours that would help to remove these discrepancies. Furthermore, these gaps exist not only among countries but also within individual countries. Unfortunately, no great success has yet been recorded to date towards the rectification of this situation. On the contrary, the issues put forward in the Tunisian Congress are still present, awaiting to be solved – which implies that there are a lot of things to be done to improve planning education.

- 
- - **New Approaches for Collaboration?**

*New Approaches for Collaboration between Practice and Academia* is a pretentious title. Especially suggesting new solutions towards the 3rd millennium surpasses the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, there is not much reason to hold us back from conveying our experiences which we had accumulated in the past decade and making some suggestions derived from them.
  - My personal opinion is that, at the threshold of the turn of the century, our starting point would be the globalisation and localisation trends experienced in the world. We have to give due consideration to the way in which the world and planning – which is the topic of our present debates – are affected by the economic, social and technological globalisation. In this context, at our annual Congress to be held in Japan, I believe, we shall have the opportunity to exchange views and develop new approaches related to *planning of an uncertain future*.
  - The interaction and interrelationship of academia and practice, or in other words, education and implementation, can be better tackled once the potential problems and issues in the period ahead are accurately identified.
  - First, we must acknowledge that in a global world, the planners whom we train will work not only in their own countries and even in their own continents but all over the world, and therefore that they need to be acquainted with the problems of those countries so as to be capable of working in the future in collaboration with their colleagues there in search for solutions to these problems. This is to say that we shall have to know and teach the issues of concern to other countries as well as to our own. The transfer of technology and know-how can be facilitated in this way.
  - Planning is an art of collaboration. Interdisciplinary co-operation is essential in planning. The planner must be acquainted with other disciplines in order to be able to make use of them. However, prompted also by the rapid technological advancements, disciplines multiply, fragment, broaden in scope, sometimes overlapping with each other. The main issue is, through taking into consideration practice and implementation, determining the optimum combination and extent of the information related to these disciplines that will be included in the planning education. I am fully aware that there is no single recipe available on the subject. Besides the revisions and modifications introduced from time to time, the existing programs of the same

university, we also observe different approaches in different universities. For instance, while one university emphasises design aspects in its curriculum, the other may choose to attach more weight to social and economic analyses in planning. I believe that this is only natural and that it is neither practical nor desirable for all universities offering planning courses to pursue the same programme.

- 
- **A Few Remarks**

With a view to creating a favourable medium for increased dialogue between planners and professionals of other disciplines, it would also be helpful if the latter were also informed on planning through short-term courses and workshops. The planner on the other hand should know when and where to take the lead as a decision maker and to stay a step behind other disciplines as appropriate.
  - An important implication of this is the need for the incorporation of communication skills development and conflict resolution capacity development in planning curriculum. This component should be underlined so as to make the student recognise its significance in practice.
  - Especially in developing countries, the divergence between academia and practice leaves us with a dilemma. While emphasis on practical issues in the education system has its advantages, it may lead to an undesirable situation where the young student's creative capacity is suppressed and his/her pure innovative ideas – though utopian they may be – are challenged by the sheer facts which are not usually so appealing. Nevertheless, the planner should not in any case be isolated from the society or any segments of the population and must be familiar with their problems. This will enable him/her to determine to which direction and to what extent he/she would deepen his/her studies.
  - The relationship between the administrative system of the country and planning and planning education is effective within a spectrum ranging from the autonomy of universities to that of local authorities and other institutions. Particularly in developing countries, the central authority sometimes imposes restrictions on the actions of universities and local authorities. This issue should not be overlooked in planning and its education which are closely related to politics.
  - An important factor fostering the relationship between academia and practice involves the preparation by the universities of projects commissioned by public authorities and municipalities.
  - Also, as it is customary in some disciplines, the graduate could be asked to practise his/her profession for a couple of years before applying for post-graduate studies. This might confer beneficial results for all parties involved (academia, practice, the student).
  - Both AESOP and ISoCaRP should launch programmes which facilitate and promote the exchange of students and experts among countries.

- 
- **Conclusion**

Since planning aims at ideas and opinions concerning the regulation of the future and their implementation, to have doubts about the future of planning is having doubts about the future. As there will always be a future, so will be the planning. Unless the planner is optimistic about the future, how can he/she work for a better, nice and more liveable future?
  - We have all experienced periods or moments of despair in our life-time. Perhaps we are passing through such a stage as far as planning is concerned. Maybe we are at the junction of crossroads. During the Second United Nations Conference on Human

Settlements it was emphasised that the Conference was not an end in itself, but would pave the way for a new approach based on partnership among all relevant actors towards solving human settlements problems.

- The Conference underscored that local level was the most appropriate level for the implementation of the recommendations of the Habitat Agenda. The preparation of local Habitat Agendas with the participation of local NGOs, local authorities and other partners will serve this purpose.
- The NGOs which for the first time so widely participated in a UN Conference, are effectively acquiring new functions in democratic regimes in recent years. The importance of NGOs increased with the changing role of the National State under the phenomenon of globalisation. They will play a major role in the formulation of “local habitats”. The planner will take his/her place within different NGOs acting as a mediator, identifying problems and proposing solutions particularly in relation to the physical space.
- This new public sphere has not yet been sufficiently defined. In a sense, different NGOs determine their fields of action. This field can either be a physical unit (neighbourhood, municipalities, water basin zones) or relate to a particular issue. The society is in a process of social, economic and administrative change. While previously talking about the decentralisation of the functions of central government, we are now discussing the decentralisation of local authorities.
- The claims of local NGOs and local communities on their own environments, or briefly on planning, will facilitate in a way the superposition of theory and practice, academia and practice. The planner will need to be equipped with new capacities to work efficiently in this new medium. These include fields such as negotiation, communication and even psychology. The incorporation of these subjects in the planning curricula will enable the planner to more easily communicate with other people and institutions in executing higher profession.

### **3.5 Jakob Maurer**

#### **ADVANCED STUDIES IN SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Challenges for the 3rd Millennium: What can be learned from the shortcomings and prot’ of today. Are there front-runners that can show the way?

#### **MORE COMPLEX PROBLEMS**

Decisive decisions have to be taken increasingly in situations characterised by a great number of involved actors, interweaving agencies and enterprises, a broad range of possible actions and of high uncertainties, disturbed communication and co-operation, significant organisational difficulties and weakening influence of public bodies. At the same time, the number and the variety of demands and the speed of change is growing. But still, as a rule, the time span is great between decisions and effects on spatial developments.

Derived from the empirical psychology, the theory of systems and experiences based on front-runners, there are strong indicators showing how to handle and manage complex problems. It seems advisable to distinguish, in a first approach, between two main approaches, namely:

1. to construct a fairly illusionary normative, empirical and logical structure of the whole complex, deduct formal and methodical routines and then to operate on this bases, or

2. to conceive the complex as a black box and to approach it step by step, using continually quick experiments of different kinds in thinking (Gedankenexperimente), in the planning work and in operations.

According to the present evidence – 2. – would be much more successful, but the majority of the people – including professionals like planners and top managers – seem to choose in fact – 1. –, inspite of divergent statements. There seem to be similarities to quite a number of study programs in planning which are based on a deduction of their elements from a seemingly unambiguous general definition of planning tasks.

Main reasons to choose – 1. – could be:

- the concentration on formal rules and routines, and
- an education based on a great number of separate units of knowledge and not on the learning of processes which would mean to start with vague questions and learn by trying to define and to solve the problem (by the way, this is the classical method of academic studies according to Humboldt, one of the main founders of modern universities around 1800).

To guide advanced studies towards – 2. – is a difficult task. It is not enough to proceed on the present way to use planning projects, to introduce a bit more of simulations and group-discussions, to hear more about complex problems and to increase special knowledge elements.

### **PRECURSORY PLANNING TASKS**

The investigation of precursory planning tasks produces insights in the future of possibly important functions of planners, the required knowledge and abilities, and the chances of planners. Regarding the practically unlimited number of interesting subjects for planning studies, it is decisive to use the scarce resources of time, money and learning capacity very effectively. At the end, there is no other way then to test, in the real world, which knowledge and abilities are really valuable. In a time of rapid change, it is dangerous to look first at the usual practice; it is compelling to concentrate on precursory processes.

This could be an important field of international co-operation, namely to compare and to discuss precursory complex planning tasks with the intention to analyse the actual and possible role of planners and their contributions.

Significant functions of planners are e.g.:

- to detect problems between the usually great number of different chains of actions and presumable deviations from the desired goals of the total outcome,
- to formulate relevant questions and programs for specialists and to use and to communicate the answers, and
- to uncover, concerning the specific task, his own missing knowledge and abilities, and to learn on the job.

The following hints on some planning tasks, which I think are precursors, are based on personal experiences as a planner in executive function (except for the new Alps crossing railways). In all these

tasks, the above mentioned characteristics of complex planning tasks have been relevant, and I am observing, that this kind of tasks is becoming increasingly dominant, also for apparently limited jobs. For more information about the mentioned examples see the footnotes.

- The planning and construction of a new urban landscape crossing the city of Vienna.<sup>2</sup>
- Traffic planning and city renewal in the „Gürtelbereich“ of Vienna.<sup>3</sup>
- Co-ordination and Management of development projects along the Main river in Frankfurt.<sup>4</sup>
- Impulses for the development of the greater region of Zürich.<sup>5</sup>
- The new Alps crossing railways.<sup>6</sup>
- The control of the traffic planning and management concerning the world exhibition Hannover 2000.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Maurer, Jakob; Freisitzer, Kurt u.a. Das Wiener Modell – Erfahrungen mit innovativer Stadtplanung, Compress-Verlag, Wien 1985

<sup>3</sup> Maurer, Jakob u.a. (Projektorganisation Gürtel Wien) Neue Wege für Wien, Gürtel, Süd- und Westeinfahrt, Entwicklungsprogramm. Abschlussbericht der Projektleitung, Projektorganisation Gürtel, Wien, 1988

<sup>4</sup> Maurer, Jakob (Vorsitzender des Consiliums Frankfurt a.M.), Entwicklung des Stadtraumes Main. Die Zukunft des Städtischen. Abschlussbericht des Consiliums 1990–1992, Stadt Frankfurt a.M. 1992

<sup>5</sup> Maurer, J.; Müller G.; Heller M.; von Rotz R. u.a., IZU, Interessengemeinschaft Zürcher Unternehmen, Projekt „impulse für die Entwicklung des Raumes Zürich“, Kurzbeschreibung, Interessengemeinschaft Zürcher Unternehmen, Zürich 1993, Prospekt „impulse für die Entwicklung des Raumes Zürich“. Informationen aus einer Studie der Professur für Methodik der Raumplanung am Institut für Orts-, Regional- und Landesplanung der ETH Zürich und der Interessengemeinschaft Zürcher Unternehmen. IZU, Zürich, 1993

<sup>6</sup> Botschaft über Bau und Finanzierung der Infrastruktur des öffentlichen Verkehrs von 1996

<sup>7</sup> This task has not been finished yet.

I am convinced, that in many decisions concerning spatial developments, major mistakes are reality. Consequences are e.g. negative impacts on the environment and excessive costs. In vari[ous cases] the planning profession is used as a scapegoat for such failures and – surprisingly – it does not reveal the real causes of the mistakes in the way modern media demand.

## **CONSEQUENCES FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN SPATIAL DEVELOPMENTS**

In the future, it will still be necessary to educate planners for the traditional planning work, according to the special legal and spatial circumstances of specific countries and regions. Planning schools used to do that.

But if planners are unable to fulfil important functions in solving complex problems concerning spatial developments, then planning as a profession will become weaker as it is already now. European planning schools could take a lead in promoting planning by strengthening the top sector of studies and at the same time, by using these studies to open new opportunities for planners.

**The following domains of education should be considered:**

### **Knowledge**

- Specialised knowledge (not of particular interest for advanced studies in planning)
- Communication knowledge (passive knowledge)
- Planning knowledge (including planning organisation and management)

### **Abilities**

- To communicate and to co-operate in an interdisciplinary environment.
- To design „Gestalten“ of space, organisations and time sequences relevant for complex decision situations as a mean of orientation.
- To detect one's missing knowledge and abilities concerning the given task and to learn on the job.
- To detect and to formulate tasks for specialists and to understand, to combine and communicate the results and to put them into effect.
- To act as a agent for communication and moderation towards inside and outside.
- To develop „leading thoughts“ (leitende Gedanken) or strategies (ability to think strategically) and combine – following a strategy – different procedures and met[ho]ds according to the ever changing circumstances (operational or tactical ability).
- To manage difficult planning tasks.

### **Opportunities**

- To compare knowledge and abilities with students of other countries and universities.
- To get deep insights in the reality of handling complex problems.
- To be involved in important processes concerning the management of complex problems.
- To be introduced and to get acquainted with leading professionals from the praxis and academic world, representing different disciplines, countries, universities and organisations, and to become a partner in discourses.

### **Points to be considered**

I shall concentrate only on a few points, which seem to me of main importance for an international co-operation.

1. The spectrum of knowledge and data, which could be of importance in relation to complex problems, is becoming wider and wider. There is practically no end in enumerating all the subjects. It is [simply] impossible to have, in great detail, knowledge in such an ever broadening field, or to have a complete overview about the persons and sources which could be of help.

Planners have a tradition to co-operate across boundaries. But there are limits, I think that no planning school alone has the staff and the information resources to master this task. The same is true for the teaching materials. So it could be valuable for every colleague and every school to become a knot in a network for advanced studies in spatial development. A kind of international teaching staff, with connections to special sectors and information resources, might be formed.

An even more difficult problem is to get students involved effectively in the handling and managing of complex planning problems in reality. Advanced studies require such an element. Examples of general fields of complex problems could be:

- The handling of spatial developments by the EU commission and the involved regions concerning e.g.: the Alpine Regions, the Northern Range, the Mediterranean Coasts and its hinterland, the spatial effects of traffic and agricultural policies;
- the investigation of the possible spatial effects of the new Alps-crossing traffic lines in combination with the port policies in the north and the south of Europe with the purpose to advise the stricken regions;
- the co-operation with the world exhibition 2000 in Hannover, concerning the „Themenpark“ which, together with special programs, should define and demonstrate the main problems and chances of mankind in the coming millennium;
- the co-operation of the countries bordering the Baltic sea;
- the co-operation with the „Territorial groups“ of the OECD in Paris, e.g. concerning the spatial development of urban regions;
- the policy of multinationals concerning spatial aspects, e.g. ABB (Asea Brown Bovery), Mercedes, Nestle, international banks.

Of course specific projects have to concentrate on limited issues; but they should be embedded in the whole complex.

It needs intensive work to prepare the base for such ambitious projects. It is very difficult to persuade main actors to participate and to inform about ongoing, not yet published processes. It is a laborious task to organise a sequence of projects and seminars within a certain field. For all this, it is necessary to care for good relations to main actors. Obviously, it would be advisable, to choose only few general fields for a period of several years. This is practically impossible for one planning school alone. But it could be done by an international network. Because of the combined knowledge of such a network, it could also be of advantage for main actors.

## **NEXT STEPS**

The following points seem to be of importance:

- Is there enough interest to investigate further the possibility of such an ambitious project and to fight for a top position of spatial planning (in a wide sense as handling and managing complex problems of spatial developments)?

- If yes, is there a limited group of colleagues from universities and praxis to prepare and to organise a first attempt?
- If yes, the following points could be important:
  - No new formal unit, at least for the start.
  - Construction of a functioning network using information technology.
  - Investigation of different precursory processes and formulation of preliminary conclusions concerning important knowledge and abilities for executive functions in solving complex problems of spatial development.
  - Design of a test program for advanced studies based on international co-operation and existing formal structures.
  - Discussion within and between AESOP and IGSRP in combination with a program for a Europe-wide promotion of the importance of spatial development and planning.
  - Setting up a test project together with the promotion program.

#### **4 WORKSHOPS**

##### **1 WORKSHOP I – RESEARCH AND EDUCATION**

chairs: Werner Schramm [ISoCaRP], Vesselina Troeva [AESOP]

##### **INTRODUCTION**

###### **Werner Schramm**

I would like to bring in research experience from two key areas:

- connection between human resources and regional development
- the concept of sustainable settlement development against the background of the Rio and Habitat processes

longterm          Rio

trends            agenda 21

human resources    international    Habitat 2

regional development    processing

##### **WORKSHOP**

sustainable regional

development          research &

training

ANY

regional            urban networks

planning      planning      networking

### **Vesselina Troeva**

Research has always been an essential part of higher education. Research achievements are evidence for the university prestige and guarantee the quality of education. Universities offer the best and most logical environment for research. This applies to the planning education, which has its roots in the fundamental and applied research. As an element of education the latter increase their share and scope as we go from undergraduate to postgraduate programmes and from urban design to regional planning levels. Successful realisation of the planning professionals depends on the acquired scientific knowledge and research methods and tools.

At the end of the 2nd millennium we are facing the growing competition among planning schools and participants in planning research and practice – architects, economists, sociologists, geographers and engineers. Academics still look for answers to some of the basic questions in planning education: What type of education – a broad based universal undergraduate level or profile specialisation at graduate level? How the emerging new technologies will influence the planning education? Is there a future for a common core or the curriculum will be ever changing and dynamic? What is better for planning students – distance learning in isolation and more personal freedom or networking in groups. There is not a single answer to these questions. They depend on the traditions, culture, history, economic development, social and physical environment, the tasks which have to be solved by the future specialists.

### **Integration between education and research**

It is clear today that there is a continuous growth of research at different educational levels. That is an increase of research oriented planning programmes at the expense of design oriented ones. Attractive artistic and highly intellectual figure of the architect-urbanists will be soon a history. Future planning professionals will need deeper knowledge in fundamental and applied science in order to participate in both interdisciplinary and specialised research, to conduct complex analysis and elaborate development strategies.

The discussion on the relations between planning education and research might be concerned around three major issues:

- main research topics which have an impact on the education;
- research on planning education; and
- the education of the researchers.

The first issue is connected to the political, economic, social and environmental changes and problems which will need solutions through the competencies, knowledge and skills of the planning professionals. Among these topics are the following:

- fragmentation and polarisation in society and the equal opportunities myth;
- conservation and change throughout the built environment;
- sustainability – from professional jargon to a way of thinking;

- new technologies reshaping our environment;
- urban management and planning policy – money, power and control;
- the new spatial pattern of the global economy;
- diversity of community culture;
- virtual planning.

Our task is to find out how these topics will shape the future planning curriculum, what are European and global perspectives to which planning education and research should respond.

The second issue raises itself a number of discussion questions. These are two contradictory opinions about the role and scope of the research on planning education. Having in mind that one of its aims is to investigate the national needs of professionals in different areas, a lot of colleagues argue should be left to the free competition of the labour market. Participants in the planning education research have to be not only academics but also representatives of the professional organisations, politicians and higher education authorities. The only fact that a joint seminar on planning education has been organised proves the need for more profound research on planning education processes, contents and links with other professional areas. Such research should be based on national reports and will give a realistic picture of the educational trends.

The third issue aims at investigating the growing demand for knowledge and the need for continuous education for professional planners and researchers in the field of planning for a very dynamic environment. This is a new type of higher level education which requires higher standards, methods of teaching and learning. How and where could we close the circle research–education–research? Or it is a continuous process of learning thorough practice and research?

As a result of the Workshop we have to formulate the areas for better integration between education and research, topics for further discussions, problems seeking urgent research solutions and recommendations for the academics, working on the curriculum for the 3 millennium planning generations. These generations should manage the conflicts and changes, the political and economic restructuring of a patchwork Europe.

---

## **DISCUSSION**

rapporteur: Marco Kerstens

### **Introduction**

This first workshop of the ISoCaRP – AESOP Conference ‘Planning for the third millennium’ dedicated to the relation between planning research and education. Discussing this relation proved to be a difficult task. Most of the discussions did not advance beyond the stage of expressing ideas and looking for common grounds. Undoubtedly, the different backgrounds of the participants played an important role in this. Some practitioners apparently felt uncomfortable discussing a topic they feel they have little knowledge about: education. This may be the reason why the major part of the sessions was dedicated to the topic of research. Within these discussions about research most

attention was given to expressing the demand for research. In this, an interesting distinction was revealed, that can be described as 'research on planning' versus 'research for planning'.

As with research, most of the discussion about education focused on the demand for education. The issues addressed can be summarised in the questions: who, what, and how do we need to teach? The second and third question (what and how do we teach planners) not only concern education per se, but also the relationship between education and research. In the discussion about this relationship, a distinction similar to the one in the discussions about the demand for research became apparent, the heart of the matter being: do we train planners to do research or not?

The following sections of this report do not represent a summary of the consecutive sessions of this workshop. Rather, they are a description of the discussion that took place in all three sessions. This report will show that, though differences between educators and professionals, between countries, and between disciplines exist, interesting similarities can be distinguished, that provide a basis for joint action by AESOP and ISoCaRP.

### **Research on planning versus research for planning**

When discussing the demand for planning research, two kinds of research crystallised. The first kind of research is undertaken to learn more about planning, especially the planning process. Topics include planning history, planning systems, and planning itself (evaluation of effects of planning). Generally speaking, the realm of this kind of research is the academic world. The object of the second kind of research is to provide planners with the (technical) information they need to perform their daily tasks in planning practice. This distinction in thinking about planning research seems to be affected by geographical and disciplinary rather than professional (practitioner/educator) backgrounds. On the one hand, participants from north-western Europe, where many planners are trained in the tradition of the social and policy sciences, expressed the need for researching fundamental, academic problems. People from eastern and, to a lesser extent, southern Europe, where most planners have technical backgrounds, raised more practical questions, concerning ad hoc problems planning practice is facing every day. Most people that held this latter view, argued that this research into place, folk, and work is done better by other disciplines. In their view, this makes planning an application of other disciplines, rather than a discipline of its own.

A specific topic that was put forward by participants from eastern European countries concerns the legitimisation of planning. There, planning has a negative connotation to the public, which identifies planning with the old political regimes. Planners feel they have to defend planning, a role they are not used to perform. Therefore, planners in these countries need to learn about communicating with local communities and the media. Interestingly, planning in western Europe also faces problems of what can be called 'institutional rearrangements'. Planners find themselves working in new situations, in which they need to co-operate with many different actors, ranging from public and private corporate bodies to individual citizens. These developments led participants to feel a need for conceptualising and theorising about networking and organising.

### **Education for planning: training generalists or specialists?**

When discussing the topic of planning education, participants argued that education is not only classroom teaching. They not only spoke about training young people to become planners, but they also stressed the importance of continuously educating all different kinds of actors involved in the

planning process, not only professional planners, but also citizens and politicians. Education is a much broader concept than university teaching alone.

At first, there seemed to exist agreement upon the contents of planning education in the different sessions. The participants agreed that the planning process deserves much attention in planning education. Planners need to be taught how to work together and communicate with other actors in the planning process, that will have different professional backgrounds, levels of knowledge, personal characteristics, etc. The personal qualities openness and creativity, were named as crucial elements for being a good planner. For being able to work with other people, planners need to be able and willing to listen to others and come up with creative solutions. Sadly (for planning education), these qualities are very hard to teach.

However, when this topic was explored a little further, an important difference in point of views surfaced. On the one hand, a point of view could be distinguished in which managing the planning process is the primary task of a planner. On the other hand, people argued that planners, first and foremost, need to be trained in technical skills that help them to (re)construct the built and natural environment. Communicative skills are important to perform this task, but they are only a means. So, like geographers, economists, and sociologists. Here, a clear parallel with the distinction discussed in the previous section can be drawn.

Ways of teaching planners (and other people involved in Planning) were only touched upon. There seemed to be agreement though that interactive and interdisciplinary group work is a preferable way to teach them to work together with an open view. Information Technology means...

All participants agreed that education should, wherever possible, be based on research. Unfortunately, practical limitations concerning time and money often make it impossible to realise this ideal. An example of this is the British situation. Here, there are three types of funding, provided by the government, research councils, and the European Union. When applying for research ... procedures.

## **Conclusion**

The sessions dealing with Research and Education revealed an interesting distinction in stand points caused by different answers to the fundamental questions: What is planning? What do planners do? The distinction can be expressed using many different adjectives, like practical versus academic, specialist versus generalist, ad hoc versus fundamental. Institutional (re)arrangements appear to be the most influential variable in this. Interestingly, when examined more closely, the different views also have a common ground, namely the importance of communication. Different institutional (re)arrangements around Europe ask for both practical skills (techniques of mediating, organising, etc.) and academic knowledge (conceptualising and theorising). This commonality provides a basis for joint action by AESOP and ISoCaRP in the fields of research and education.

## **2 WORKSHOP II – EDUCATION AND PRACTICE**

chairs: Taner Oc [AESOP], Stefano Wagner [ISoCaRP]

### **INTRODUCTION**

## **Taner Oc**

Planning practice in Europe has been undergoing significant changes over the past decade. Modernist traditions of planning are challenged by environmental (green) concerns, by different interest groups and by technological changes. The concept of unitary public interest is no longer currency, and neither are long-term plans. Is planning education responding to these changes? Are the European universities equipped to effectively manage the change in natural and built environment in the 21st century? Is planning education still dominated by outmoded attitudes and hence losing its place to other environmental professions? What is the need of the profession for Information Technology and does education provide the graduates with adequate IT skills?

These are some of the questions a survey of international planners and educators aimed to answer. Analysis of the results of the questionnaire will be presented for discussion at the seminar. The findings of the survey, and the ensuing discussion, will enable us to understand the emerging needs of the profession and the role played by the education institutions. Continuing professional development is a new challenge for both the practitioners and the educators.

## **Stefano Wagner**

### **WHAT IS COMING – Changing perceptions of planning activities**

The ORL Institute organised in February 1996 the seminar “World-wide processes and their influence on the European space”, meant to provide a reflection moment on changing rules in European planning. Supported by ISOCaRP, the seminar gave cause also, with the speeches of invited guests on the first day, for some discussion on “what is or could come”.

What especially resulted out of the seminar is a quite diversified image of planners and planning activity. Planners as communication managers, close to policy-makers but also “pirate and spies”, these were the speakers’ professional experiences. This should allow us to identify some main patterns of change:

- **The loss of Time and Space (the “world city hypothesis”)**  
Some main pillars that have constantly signed the professional activity of (physical) planners, like administrative boundaries and timetables, are more and more losing importance in spatial development matters. Technological and cultural changes have widely been responsible also for the reduction in importance of territorial authorities in pursuing territorial planning goals. The acceleration of decision processes in spatial development could be one main influence factor. Public decision-making, and therefore traditional planning practice, is overrun by other, mainly private, actors.
- **From Projects to Processes**  
Layouts and physical quality elements are often reduced to technical aspects inside decision processes where complexity is one main characteristic. Projects, as traditional result of town planning, can be realised only with wide organisational capacities. Managing processes, with core capacities in communication and organisation, will become in the future main tasks for planners. But instruments for these non-physical products are often linked with other professional sectors and quality-control mechanisms have still to be developed in this field.

- **New Demands and new Skills**

Some of the last ISoCaRP congresses have dealt with changing demand for planning activities (Prague 1994) and new skills (Sydney 1995). Somehow these aspects have to flow in the discussion of Monte Verita in order to provide guiding ideas on future planning education.

## **NEW NEEDS FOR PLANNING EDUCATION?**

- **Access to knowledge networks – inter-regional and culturally differentiated**

Planning is deeply rooted in the specific cultural framework of each European region, depending on historical backgrounds and identities. This leads to different institutional appreciation and differentiated awareness of mechanisms of spatial development. But specific tasks on regional level are often linked to European processes. This means that planners have to have a capacity to understand also phenomena out of their cultural background, being at the same time capable to lead them back to regional specifics.

- **Basic education (for physical planning) vs. specialised education (in spatial development management)**

It is of no doubt that the gap between the needs of traditional physical and town planning education and the education to cope with the new rules in spatial development will grow in future. But new demands do not necessarily just substitute old ones. Therefore, it is probably worth to debate which different models of planning education can achieve best the different aims of planning practice, distinguishing between (traditional) physical planning and new demands in spatial development management.

- **Process and problem oriented education**

It is probably worth to deeply debate on Monte Verita if academia (as place of knowledge) is today still close enough to practice (as field of action). The educational translation process from (theoretical) knowledge to (practical) action could result a determining key for future education (basic and permanent).

Planning has no laboratories as other scientific branches know: where are the future planning laboratories integrating planning theory and research into action?

## **A EUROPEAN PLANNING CENTRE?**

Out of the above considerations, it could be that planners who should handle future over-regional tasks in the European development frame will need some different focus in their education curricula. Early access to wide networks of professionals, with implementation of communication (technical and cultural nature), could become central for some of the future professionals.

The basic idea of a European Planning Centre could be debated in Monte Verità and more precisely on:

- European planning tasks
- Education networks for project development
- Flows of information vs. flows of persons (teachers and students)

- Planning schools
  - Basic education and research on own experience and background
  - European Planning Centre practical project semester recognised in the education curricula of different European schools
  - Functioning co-ordination on a network basis
  - Modern communication tools (no permanent infrastructure)
  - Ever changing staff (coming from different involved schools)
  - External projects (commissioned)
- 

## DISCUSSION

**rapporteur: Goran Cars**

### Questionnaire

The University of Nottingham conducted a questionnaire covering AESOP and ISoCaRP members. The respondents were asked to consider the important core knowledge, skills and values components for the planning profession. There were 104 responses to the questionnaire (60 from ISoCaRP and 44 from AESOP). Some of the main findings are summarised below.

**Priorities.** When it comes to priorities in planning education, the assessments of both practitioners and educators coincide to a large extent. For most of the questions the top priorities were identified by both groups of respondents.

**New issues.** The respondents thought that new issues and components must be given high priority as they are emerging in planning. Among these, for example, are strategic thinking, negotiation, mediation, management skills, and European and trans-national planning.

Educators were inclined to critically assess their work. For nearly all questions and aspects, their assessment was that educational performance was of good quality. The practitioners' assessment of educational quality was mixed. For some issues the assessment was good; for other issues the assessment was that educational performance was poor. It is worth noting that there is a significant difference between the educational components that practitioners consider being of satisfactory or poor quality.

Education about traditional and basic skills such as the ability to read maps and plans, knowledge about administrative and government structures, graphic communication, history and the development of planning, and practical skills in plan development, were considered by practitioners to be of good quality. However, for new components emerging in planning the assessment was that the education was as yet of poor quality.

A conclusion that might be drawn, based on the practitioners' assessments, is that planning education is out of date. Rather than educating planners for the third millennium, schools educate

planners for a professional role that to a large extent is old-fashioned. The professional skills given to planning students are to some extent obsolete. Even more alarming is that what society regards as the urgent professional needs are not being addressed in planning education.

---

### **A new role for planning and planners**

The discussion in the workshop took its starting point from the structural changes that have taken place in Europe during the previous decade, and how they have impacted on planning education and planning. Some features of the changes that are characteristic for European countries are:

- An emergence of new actors on the planning arena: i.e. business, organised interest groups and the general public are, to an increasing extent, demanding a role in the process that previously was dominated by public sector actors.
- Constrained public resources versus needs: i.e. for investments in infrastructure and services. To an increasing extent, public budget constraints have made new ways of financing infrastructure and services necessary.
- A changing labour market for planners: Various European countries report increases in private practice and decreases in public employment.
- A changing geographical perspective in planning: Previously planning issues, to a large extent, were local and had at best minor impact on adjacent municipalities and the surrounding region. This does not hold true anymore. Most municipal plans usually have a considerable impact on conditions outside their borders. At the same time, the explicit demands for regional and international plans are increasing.
- A changing ideological perspective on planning. This ideological change was summarised by participants as a change from “regulation” to plans being “enabling”. Until the 1980s, planning was to a large extent a responsibility for public sector actors, and the outcome was a plan to regulate future development. Today, rather than regulating growth, the role of planning is to enable development. Rather than the plan as a document, focus has shifted to planning as a process.
- A new perspective of the general public: Traditionally citizens were objects and clients for various services provided by planning. A new perspective has developed in which citizens are seen as actors and consumers. The challenge is for planning to take this analogy of change and to develop planning methods that provide options for the affected citizens.

---

### **Shortcomings in planning**

In the workshop discussions it was considered that planning education had responded poorly to these structural changes. A consequence of this lack of adaptation to new realities is that it has contributed to a tarnished reputation of planning and planners.

In the discussion two observations were highlighted by the practitioners:

- a) there is an increasing need for planning; and
- b) planners are not always seen as the most appropriate professionals to deal with these issues.

The increased need for planning was illustrated by the rapid emergence of projects with regional and international impacts. In addition the increased complexity and interrelation between various key issues were mentioned as a new feature of planning. Today's planning has to respond to increasing levels of complexity, and decisions at the local level can substantially impact on regional and national levels, and vice versa. At the same time, there is an increased awareness of the interdependence between development in various sectors of society. Finally, the number of actors in the planning arena has increased. Neighbourhood groups, private corporations, and organised interest groups are demanding the right to be active partners with substantial roles to influence the outcome of the process.

In order to meet these demands the role of, and methods for, planning must be reconsidered. Planning has to give up the ambition to determine and regulate urban development. Based on the ambition to achieve sustainable development from economic, social and environmental perspectives, the role of planning must be to enable rather than to regulate.

There are various reasons that can explain the scepticism that practitioners have with respect to the competence of planning students. Planning education does not address urgent and new issues on the planning agenda in an efficient way. Nor are the planning students provided adequately with the problem-solving skills required.

This calls for a rethinking and the restructuring of planning education. The following aspects should, according to the workshop, be considered in this work.

### **Practical versus analytical skills**

The first issue that was raised concerned the need for modernising planning education. A typical task – “plan making” – was used as an example to illustrate the changes that were considered necessary. It was demonstrated that plan making in various countries was seen as an activity focused on the product, the plan itself. Subsequently, planning education has placed a priority on practical skills. This restricted perspective on planning has led to a reduction of the planners' role in the planning process.

Several participants experienced a situation characterised by professionals from other disciplines (i.e. geography, economics, sociology, accounting) shaping the content and format of the plan. The roles of planners have been reduced to practical work, making a plan according to decisions already taken, based on the professional expertise of non-planners.

In reformulating planning education, the traditional perspective in education must be widened. The “product perspective” is not sufficient. The role of planning education must include the process of preparing, negotiating and implementing the plan. This calls for new skills. In order to increase the competitiveness and status of planners, planning education must recognise the necessity to improve analytical and problem-solving skills. It is essential to develop the planners' ability and skills in impact assessment, scenario techniques, analytical elaborations, and in dealing with changing values and preference structures.

### **3 WORKSHOP III – PRACTICE AND RESEARCH**

chairs: Max van den Berg [ISoCaRP], Alex Fubini [AESOP]

## INTRODUCTION

### Max van den Berg

In the 20th century planning has been directed mostly to quantitative growth, to urban development, to space consumption and to a righteous division of space. Spatial planning contributed to social goals like emancipation of the working class and improving social organisation and order. Spatial planning facilitated economic developments. The industrial development evolved and was partly replaced by service and knowledge industries. Increase of mobility was most striking. Rail transport was over-thrown by the use of cars. Traditional street patterns got the burden of cars.

The used planning methods were functional for extensions and process planning was developed for renewal. Now a more strategic and inter-actional planning method is arising to cope with global developments. There is a shift from quantity to quality, from economy to ecology. Political ideologies **[illegible in scan]**. For the next decades planning practice has to change fundamentally and has to be directed to quality of life, quality of space and place, and sustainability.

In either case practice has to improve the quality of planning action. From planners is expected that they are able to reduce uncertainties, deal with dynamic changes, improve efficiency and effectiveness of planning processes, improve management. Practice needs less policy preparations and more execution (implementation).

Expected tendencies in society related to space are: unforeseen migration; increasing pluriformity; diverging lifestyles; individual identity; disappearing and rearranging social organisations; new interest groups will arise and will distinguish themselves. Space consumption will continue to grow, place and space will diversify. The private domain will segment socially and economically. Changing public domain needs permanent redefinition.

- Production and assembling is globalised and will be foot-loose;
- Transportation and distribution of goods, people and information will be very complex and sophisticated;
- Production of information and knowledge develops everywhere.

Production and markets need a lot of space. The demand on space seems endless. Production and work patterns are dispersing and concentrating. No general patterns show up. Dynamic changes, flexibility and pulsing seems the message. Practice topics, issues and themes are (political): facilitating economic development; quality of life; quality of place and space; sustainability; accessibility.

Scale enlargement related to mobility-improvement is definite. The object of planning shifts from town to region.

Translated to spatial scales it means:

- **On European scale:** competition between urban regions;

- **On regional scale:** strengthening cohesion and structure, sophisticated regional infrastructure; quality of the countryside; the significance of agriculture; nature-development and outdoor recreation.
- **On urban scale:** improvement of quality of space; improvement of facilities and amenities; health and security; the development of public domain.

Will the developments go to urban concentration, bundling, or dispersion (sprawl)? to growth or stabilisation of growth? or will they go to uniformity or differentiation? And how to deal with: resource management, stock management and flow management? with social mobility and dynamic change? with the relation between long term and short term; and with reduction of negative effects on environment.

“All” we need is new conceptions, new instruments, new planning practice and new attitudes.

I see four kinds of support research might contribute to help to improve planning action today and for the future:

1. to be critical on planning actions now by analysing empirical;
2. to improve planning methods, management and processes by participating in planning-teams;
3. to participate in inventing new concepts;
4. to contemplate and rethink basic meanings, sense and definitions on space, structure, use, time etc. Are planners and researchers able to develop a new typology on spatial values? The meaning of place and space, of the object of planning, of time – past and future – will change dramatically in the 3rd millennium. Secure our existence by acting now for later.

Planners have always promised progress and a sunny future. Let’s not make too many promises, but give excellent knowledge and superior interaction between education, research and practice.

---

### **Alex Fubini**

Strong government intervention, and can therefore be considered a rather unusual kind of planning activity.

### **Planning and Market: a better understanding of the relationship in research and practice**

Property is a managed market which could survive without direct and indirect government control, planning being the main tool. Land-use control – prevalently carried out with traditional techniques – underlies each and every planning policy. However, theory appears to have underestimated this feature of local planning and the traditional model has been disregarded by research within academia.

Land-use control is not the only way to measure territorial change. In fact such changes are the outcome of practice entailing a greater interaction among a number of legislative, spatial, economic and institutional features. It is also the result of the interaction between planning trends and the

market, the latter not referring exclusively to the property market. Urban markets and urban plans are but two sides of the same coin.

In spite of the above statements being self-evident there is no match between the importance of these relationships and their place in theory: this is one of the key issues we have deal with when studying the relationship between practice and theory. The situation can be described as follows:

- theory and research remain enclosed in a sector-specific and in separate academic spheres;
- practice tends to progressively adjust to the developments on a case-by-case approach, without rethinking the situation;
- universities are caught between a general approach – polytechnic if you like – theory- and method-oriented, and a more professionally-oriented approach.

In the 80s, planning difficulties and reorientation meant that the professional nature of education began to be questioned.

Focusing on the relationship between market and planning is a meaningful choice in itself, because of the importance the relationship holds, but also, and above all, because this approach enables us to highlight how physical change interacts with the range of social, economic and cultural phenomena which are the prime cause of spatial transformation. In the course of this workshop, I hope we shall be able to shed some light on these issues.

#### **How can research and practice interact?**

One question is: to what extent can research generate the knowledge required to develop more reliable and consistent planning techniques and procedures, and if it can to what extent can they improve on the traditional results? Another question concerns the professional world: how can it best stimulate the academic research world, so that problems and events can be addressed by theory? How can tools be developed to keep abreast with the faster and faster changes in the social and territorial contexts planning policies have to be applied to?

#### **Research within academia (complementary to Max van den Berg's suggestions)**

Planning and research are mutually dependent: their relationships are decisive for the quality of planning expertise and action in society.

If we take a look at our universities and schools, we will find one research area which is relatively homogenous, that is to say which is comparable, and that is the area of the PhDs. The question then is: are PhD courses able to produce 'socially meaningful research', that is to say research that can be used to improve planning practice – that is technical expertise in the framework of a social process? If so, to what extent is this true?

When analysing their finished products, i.e. theses, we can ask ourselves whether they represent a satisfactory result in terms of the scientific content. Do they also represent a starting point for the practical use of such knowledge?

Currently the transfer of knowledge from research to the professional world is anything but easy or obvious. One wonders to what extent research tends to develop in subject areas far from a planner's daily issues, and whether this trait is inherent to the nature of research itself. This dilemma has not

been addressed in the two-pronged approach which currently can be seen in the PhD courses of the European Planning Schools:

1. the traditional model focused on the scientific development of the discipline (research work for a doctorate is not conceived as training in research but as a contribution to the enhancement of scientific knowledge);
2. according to the professional model, a Doctorate is not only intended for a scientific career but also as a means to develop knowledge relevant to non-university careers. Is it possible to conceive Doctoral Degrees as widely applied research and development, oriented to the solution of problems related to practice?

### **For discussion**

I have raised a short list of issues this workshop can address, leaving it to the participants to decide which specific features are worth discussing in depth and detail. I hope this workshop will open new inroads to further finalise and more fruitfully orient university research projects so as to match the needs of practice within the market. Likewise, we hope professionals will pinpoint areas of interest for research to universities.

---

## **DISCUSSION**

rapporteur: Willem Buunk

### **Introduction**

This third workshop was dedicated to the relation between planning practice and academic planning research. In all three sessions of the third workshop an attempt is made to make the participants clearly play the role either of practitioner or of researcher in the discussion. A first observation that can be made is that many of the participants have difficulty choosing between the distinct sides of the range of planning professions. This can be considered to be exemplary for many of the participants of the ISOCaRP/AESOP conference. Many participants either have a long-standing career as a practitioner and find themselves now in a teaching and researching position. Many of the academics find themselves after a long-standing career in research and teaching in planning-schools participating in planning action, e.g. in an advisory role. By asking the participants of the workshop to represent one of the two distinctly different types of planning professions, it appeared possible to put the participants face to face as two groups so that some clear statements could be derived out of the discussions.

In the first session, the attempt was aimed at finding out of the participants what they feel is a top-priority for the future activities of either planning practice or planning research. The second session was concentrated more on the research products, building on what the outcomes of the first session. Practitioners were asked what research products they recently have been using and what issues they would like to have researched. Researchers were asked what their latest research work included and whether they thought that to be of use to practitioners.

### **Two different worlds**

The outcomes of these two sessions were presented in the third session, after which a discussion was

set out along the lines of these outcomes. The issues in this discussion mostly concerned the co-operation between the researchers and the planners and their common task. Besides this, the question of what the context of planning will be was discussed and the contribution planning can make.

From the three sessions comes a twofold picture, due to the distinction between what can be called 'two different worlds' of planners. The world of practitioners is a changing world. In this world a planner takes in a new position in changed and ever-changing arenas. And as one of the participants remarks: top-priority is planning for people, not stones. There are direct influences on planning action. Planning is complex because people and communities are different. Although practitioners in their professional situation apparently have adapted themselves in their way of working to a new role in the decision-making process, they do express the need for new planning concepts. Practitioners are keen on the need for evaluation of new methods and case-studies of best practices. Practitioners hope to be presented with new information tools and examples of good solutions in comparable situations. Practitioners stress the maintained importance of the core technical task of planning, thereby formulating as main themes mobility, urban infrastructure and sustainable urbanism.

'Planning for people, not stones' also points at the complexity of today's planning practice, in the sense that new scales for planning have emerged. Most practitioners do acknowledge this, but like to stress the prolonged importance of the regional and local level as the most suitable tiers for planning. Future challenges are in the definition of appropriate action at the appropriate level.

Criticism on the own achievements of practitioners concern the lack of attention for ex post evaluation. Due to this, a learning loop in planning practice is missing, which seems more than ever necessary. There is an underestimation of the possible use of practical knowledge for practitioners amongst each other.

Academics see themselves confronted with the situation that an estimated figure of some 90% of academic research is not used, or at least not directly applicable. Academic focus in research is determined by the research situation, in the sense that researchers have to rely on comparative research and case-study research aimed at logical and argumentative testing of hypotheses. Practitioners would rather prefer practical examples from best-case-studies, which would ask for historical testing of hypotheses. The dynamic of research determined by the scientific-methodological impetus leads to an agenda containing research issues for planning and research on planning. Most academics acknowledge that the result, like much of the research published in the Carfax journals, which is publicly funded research, may not be directly applicable. Yet, researchers stress that universities do programme research according to the needs of society. It is hard enough as it is to gain insight in the ever more complex society, as one of the participants, head of a planning-school, said.

Planning researchers can experience the practical use of their theoretical ideas by participating in planning action. But in general, the possibilities for experiments in planning are limited. Directly funded research and commissioned research is mostly undertaken by practitioners like consultants. Many academics stress that undertaking such research is a possibility, but that difficulties easily occur in upholding academic standards while dealing with the commissioning authorities.

The issues researchers focus on are partly differing from what practitioners propose. Amongst other issues, academics stress the importance of research in what was called the communication problem,

related to the effect of planning. Research into this is related to other disciplines, like sociology. In connection to this, attention should be given to learning processes, the use of the Internet in decision-making mentioned by Japanese colleagues and the disappearance of planning in the public domain in Britain, leaving the planner in an affluent changing position with different, e.g. private, actors.

### **Education can't do it all!**

The debate between practitioners and researchers not only brought forward differences in view between the two planning worlds. As one of the participants said, the perceived lack of common language cannot be a real problem. There certainly seems to be much common understanding of new challenges for planning. In a changing and complex society there is a need for new approaches in practical planning action and in research. New approaches should include both knowledge and skills on the role of planning and planners in the political process and in decision-making processes. This means that some understanding of the differences of problems both groups of planners are confronted with and the differences in their dynamic and driving forces.

The role of education as an intermediate is acknowledged between knowledge and action. The third working group focused on other mechanisms for interaction like the participation of academics in planning action or the taking on of commissioned research. There are several possibilities to bridge the perceived or existing gaps between the work of planning action and planning research. Above all, a more intensive co-operation and communication between practitioners and academics is desirable in order to make serious efforts in setting a joint agenda for research.

### **Conclusions**

Considering the wishes expressed by practitioners and academics, the report of the third working group can be concluded with the following recommendations:

- there is need for more communication about, interaction between and participation in the work of the two groups of planners;
- the specific and changed roles and positions that both practitioners and academics have within their own working environment should be defined;
- both academics and practitioners should make their needs and questions more explicit and negotiate them;
- the relation between the practitioners and planners should be explored and stimulated by negotiating their agendas.

## **5 CLOSING SESSION**

chair: Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP]

### **1 MAIN THEMES OF THE WORKSHOPS**

rapporteur: Hans Mastop

The chair decided the reports of the workshops should be given in the sequence III, I and II in order to stress that planning practice is — or rather should be — at the beginning and at the end of the cycle practice – research – education – practice (see also the closing statement of the seminar).

Reporting on the main themes of **Workshop III: Practice and Research**, Willem Buunk [AESOP] stressed that, first of all and in spite of all efforts to prove otherwise, practitioners and researchers still speak their own language, use their own vocabulary and have their own frame of reference. Practitioners have to work in a changing world and have to find new solutions to pressing problems. They are in constant need for new concepts — both for local and regional planning problems; they explicitly pleaded for ex post evaluation studies — did we do a good job? — and all felt that it was difficult to come to some kind of learning process — learning from experience in successive projects: a clear demand for the documentation and dissemination of practical knowledge.

For researchers/academics, however, the applicability of their research findings is still a point of great concern. Planning always deals with unique situations. Research more often than not is based on a case-study-like approach: both for financial reasons — planning research is not really high on the agendas of financing institutions — and for reasons that have to do with the need to understand why planning goes the way it does: this calls for “in-depth” analysis. So generalisation and transferability of research findings from one situation to the other, which actually is what is done when contributing to “practical knowledge”, is by no means easy. Next to that, for academics their research is by no means always unilaterally directed to improve practice — much academic research is done to understand practice. Academic planning research thus has its own agenda and the assessment of much of that research is done by academic standards, to which one has to attune more and more. Planning as an academic discipline then has at least two frames of reference: practice and academia.

Nonetheless, both practitioners and researchers felt that there were common grounds to improve mutual understanding and to enhance mutual benefit:

- research should always be directed to understand and clarify the political backcloth of any process of planning and the differences in institutional contexts: such research can contribute to the transferability of planning solutions and approaches;
- research should pay much more attention to the time–space constraints of modern societies in general and special groups in that society in particular; planners in their turn should be more receptive to these time–space constraints: solutions may not always be found in ordering space — ordering time more often than not proves very fruitful;
- given the need for co-operation between practitioners and researchers, their relation is best seen as a LAT relation: living apart together, each has its own individual job to do — but at regular intervals they join to do things together: e.g. commissioned research, participation of researchers in real-life planning situations, developing a joint agenda for public funding of research, seminars (like this).

Reporting on the main themes of **Workshop I: Research and Education**, Vesselina Troeva [AESOP] stressed that all participants felt that both research and education should be geared to the development of new kinds of knowledge and skills, especially concerning communication in planning processes and management of projects. As far as communication is concerned the planner-

professional is seen as a mediator; (s)he has to mediate between national, regional and local planning issues and stakeholders, between the various parties concerned in any planning problem, between the various target groups and constituencies — in which case special attention was asked for generation-specific issues. As far as management is concerned new skills and knowledge are needed for questions like: how do we deal with risk, with chances, with conflict, with time and human, natural, financial and intellectual resources. This plea for new skills and knowledge implicitly indicates that “off-the-shelf” knowledge and approaches more often than not do not give suitable answers. Situation-specific networking was seen as a promising — and perhaps the only — solution to overcome these difficulties. Planning, as well as research and education, should be geared to facilitate some kind of continuous education of all participants in the process — politicians, planners, business/developers — and the public in general. Especially in countries with a less well-developed (democratic) planning tradition planning has a kind of emancipating task.

As far as specific research topics were concerned, the discussions revealed that quite a lot of the participants to the workshops pleaded for case histories and planning evaluation and impact studies (to learn from the past), research on the intricacies of planning processes as such (what is actually happening when we are planning?), the possible impact and promises of new technologies and the development of some common language (or languages) for all those involved in planning processes. Last but not least attention was asked for how to approach, assess and go about with that difficult, multi-interpretable and contingent concept of “Quality of life” which should be at the heart of any planning endeavour.

Reporting on the main themes of **Workshop II: Education and Practice**, Taner Oc’s [AESOP] first and foremost finding was that both the workshop sessions and the questionnaire research amongst representatives of ISoCaRP (the practitioners) and AESOP (the educators) once again had revealed how many differences and difficulties there are in the appreciation of each other’s position and in actually knowing what “the other” does. Yet, some conclusions came out:

- education will no longer be adequate if based on the idea of task-related training, i.e. training for a specific kind of job, for specific routines; the practice of planning is much more differentiated than e.g. the specifications of the RTP1 let us believe; instead education above all should develop the analytical skills of the would-be planners and their openness, eagerness and abilities to reflect and act on societal questions;
- there seems to be no consensus on the question whether planning education does have or should have a common core; the same holds for the question whether or not planning education should develop specialised training and thus foster diversity;
- there was consensus however on the fact that educators will more and more have to serve different groups of consumers and that more and more their students will work outside government and outside routine-like jobs; the idea of “a fixed core” of planning education then, however understandable with an eye to accreditation matters, might in due time lead to inertia;
- it was commonly felt that project- and practice-based training is of the utmost importance of any planning education and that, luckily, most schools are more and more aware of this, i.e. introduced these into their curricula;

- as far as substantive issues are concerned, i.e. special fields of knowledge and training that need more attention, both practice and academia felt that the sustainability question ranks number 1 on the agenda; both parties felt that all planners should be more receptive to issues related to sustainability when and wherever these present themselves and scrutinise our systems and paradigms on the question whether or not these are adequate to deal with these issues.

## **Peter Hall**

### **Pre-seminar expectations**

The following points seem to me the central set of dilemmas from which the conference has to start.

1. Planning at the start of the 3rd Millennium has to deal with a completely different world from the one in which many of the basic ways of thought of the profession were grounded, 50 and more years ago:
    1. A service-based, information-based economy in which material flows are no longer paramount.
    2. A globalised economy in which traditional local advantages disappear.
    3. Consequently, a free-flow competitive world in which image and place marketing become increasingly vital.
    4. A society increasingly polarised between a relatively prosperous information-processing middle class (the “symbolic analysts”) and a permanently unemployed underclass, with all the social and political tensions that this implies.
    5. A partial rejection of the welfare state model established after World War II, notably for housing, but with an unclear notion of what is to take its place.
  2. There is a similar set of new challenges in the field of intellectual discourse:
    1. Academic education has specifically identified and analysed many of the above trends, but with an increasing tendency to highly abstract formulations derived from philosophical discourse and from the humanities, which appear to have very little relevance to the world of practical decision-making.
    2. The collapse of the state socialist system of Eastern Europe has left many left-wing thinkers without a coherent system of beliefs or values; there is a strong sense of an intellectual vacuum in the relationship between knowledge and action.
    3. There is evidence that the intellectual “revolution of the right”, so marked in the UK and the USA in the 1980s, has run its course.
    4. The “Rhineland Model” of capitalism, exemplified in different ways by France and Germany, is equally undergoing huge strains in the recession of the 1990s, exacerbated by the competition to meet the Maastricht convergence criteria.
-

## Reflections

(rapporteur: Hans Mastop)

Peter Hall stressed that with a view to research it is necessary to differentiate between **contextual research** – which is more or less relevant to all disciplines, not just planning – and **research on the planning process itself**. The latter is practised too little (Friend & Jessop's book was a good example).

Next to that, one has to differentiate between **basic research** (set by the disciplines) and **applied research** (commonly commissioned and done by consultants; often superficial). Crossing these, one gets:

	Basic	Applied
Contextual	very often only vaguely relevant	

### Process (role of planning)

Basic contextual research must be made applicable and be more focused on the planning process.

Much research also has an Anglo-Saxon bias. Relevant research is done in e.g. German and French and other language-speaking countries too. More exchange of research findings is necessary.

But above all, a constant review is necessary of:

- what is/has proven to be successful research?
- which outcomes are questionable?
- what is bare nonsense or pure hunch?

Next to that, one always has to be aware of **policy hypes**, e.g. cultural urban regeneration or the present sustainability hype.

---

### Education concerning the use of research should train a planner:

- how to acquire relevant knowledge and how to use it;
- how to assimilate various forms and bodies of knowledge;
- how to develop skills to judge the usefulness of available knowledge;
- and above all: to understand the role and influence of the politico-institutional context of planning.

### Education concerning practice should train a planner:

- to relate to a variety of actors – (s)he works for the public in general: one should learn how to engage these in thinking on spatial developments of society (e.g. by gaming/simulation, role-playing);

- the ability to make forecasts and judge these critically – planning means thinking ahead; one should not accept superficial “solutions” – there aren’t any;
- to be aware of buzz-words – the main concerns in Western Europe do not change that rapidly as some will make us believe; there is much more continuity.

## Derek Lyddon

### Pre-seminar expectations

I have been asked to provide a brief note on my ‘expectations’ for the seminar. I note that we have been invited not to search for solutions but to identify the right questions and to redefine future roles.

In the first place, I hope, in discussing the relationship between the three roles of plan making, research for planning, and teaching of planning we can observe the Geddesian principles of:

- sympathy for the other roles and approaches;
- synergy with them, combining our energies.

The history of the evolution of the ‘planning-team’ is very revealing. He reminds us that originally there was *the Principal* (the politician, entrepreneur or client) who was the author of ‘the grand design’ and final decision maker (exercising the art of governing, meaning to steer), while the planner was the author of the spatial answer to that ‘design’ (or client requirement as we might now say).

Each of these two figures, however, finds himself more and more surrounded by a growing number of specialised experts – first assistants, later advisers, finally collaborators. He concludes:

“When dreaming of a present day ideal planning team I would like to see a clear distinction between workers in time (sociologists, etc.), workers in space (geographers, ecologists, engineers), and finally the physical planner as the creator of the definite form. All members of such an ideal team should have a full understanding of the importance and the essence of each other’s contribution.”

It would be interesting if some participants had read an update of this ‘role review’ in a paper on the link between research and urban design by Heide & Wijnbelt of Utrecht University in *Urban Design* (Vol. 1, No. 1, Carfax). They suggest that instead of regarding designers as practitioners who are supplied with knowledge by researchers, it is possible to see design as the study of potential or desirable futures, thus putting the two on a more equal footing.

On education questions, Johnson-Marshall in Tunis suggested that there should be an obligation on all planners to collaborate with an educational organisation, and he called for “Planning Centres” for education, research and practice to be set up – noting that in some cases it may be necessary for them to be outside the normal institutional system.

My expectations for the Seminar are therefore that we can come to some understanding of the past evolution of roles, and see how these need to be adjusted to future requirements.

On identifying the right questions, I hope the following might help discussion:

- The Principal sets out an answer but does not know what questions will arise.
  - The Designer finds the answer to a question that nobody knew existed.
  - The Researcher answers a question which nobody thought could be asked.
  - The Teacher reformulates any question so that an answer can be given.
  - The Planner finds the right question by testing alternative answers.
- 

## Reflections

A story is told of civil servants from all government departments who were gathered in a seminar like this. They were asked: “*What is it you do when you are planning that is different from what you do every day?*” They went away and discussed this in workshops in great detail for two days. When they came back they said that after great arguments they had found the answer:

“When we are planning we are being long and deep.

Long – in looking far ahead in time, into an uncertain future; there will be hostages to fortune, we will be wrong. We don’t like that.

Deep – concerned with all levels of society; interfering in other people’s business; we don’t like that.”

I tell this story because I wonder whether we have discussed enough the *clients of planning*, or indeed recognised the *unpopularity of planning*. It is only noticed when it goes wrong; when it works it goes unnoticed as the natural order, the market working – it would have happened anyway.

It is right to suggest that we have three types of client:

- those who commission and pay us;
- those who act on our plans – the developer;
- those who suffer or benefit from our plans – the citizens.

We serve the living, the dead and those yet to be born.

As I mentioned in my “expectations”, Sam van Embden used the term *principal*, the governor who steers the project; the workshops considered the representative of those who are being planned, and the customer and consumer of the environment. Did we hear enough about those “clients” who participate in research and education?

Clearly there are the “clients” who are the initiators of practice, but should they be more involved in evaluating the results and recording them; passing on experience? Should clients be more involved in education – did we hear about developers talking to students, client-based learning? What are the clients’ research requirements? Should they be better represented on research requirements committees – to avoid the charge that research for planning is too self-indulgent (what the researcher can get published rather than what the client needs)?

Beyond this, the discussion more than met the “expectations” which I set out in the Preliminary Proceedings:

- sympathy between the three roles was clearly evident;
- synergy was emerging between science of analysis, dedication of teaching and profession of practice;
- synthesis was discussed as the essential spatial craft which can be learnt, researched and practised.

What emerged strongly was the importance, for all three, of learning from experience or mistakes, by recording relevant examples of plan making and development or conservation of resources; project summaries; case studies; distillation and dissemination of good practice – available on the Web, accessible to all.

These “exemplars” should be in Jakob Maurer’s *Black Box*:

- for education to learn from practice;
- for research for analysis and review;
- for practice to benefit from success;
- and for all three to reduce uncertainty.

All the introductory papers mentioned this issue of uncertainty; things are going to be more uncertain as we move into the next century. Again, as Van Embden said some time ago: “*The future is not what it used to be.*” Planning is making arrangements for the future (a basic human activity), but if the future is certain, there is no need for planning. So uncertainty is the very lifeblood of planning. Given uncertainty, we need a plan so that we have something to alter or adjust.

Do we need therefore to be more skilled in analysing the types of uncertainty? The attached list (see next page) was drawn up by ISOCaRP in 1989, after 25 years of conferences and scanning the reviews in our *International Manual of Planning Practice*. We need to bring it up to date and contributions would be welcome.

Another way is to be more aware of the possible responses to the future:

- predict and prepare: the role of government at all levels;
- make it happen: the role of industry and commerce;
- wait and see: the fate of the citizen.

Overlaid on this are three types of uncertainty:

- in the working environment we need more information;
- in values we need clearer objectives;
- in related decisions we need more co-ordination.

The seminar as a whole was stimulating with well-organised workshops and will lead me to “reflect” for a long time. In the meantime I offer the following:

- what are you trying to do and how will you know when you have done it?
- think the unthinkable but wear a blue suit and tie when presenting the results (and don't have grappa for lunch);
- and (thanks again to Van Embden) we have to learn to plan as if we were not planning. This is more a question of mental attitude than method; more of wisdom than knowledge.

---

**Table: 25 years of towns and cities – a summary of some of the changes**

(from ISoCaRP, November 1989)

- *From* garden city → *To* inner city
- *From* expansion of new development → *To* conservation and renewal
- *From* population and employment increase → *To* stability, changes in social structure and our understanding of the future of work
- *From* simplistic notion of planning as enlarged architecture → *To* understanding of the city as a social and economic system
- *From* creating and controlling whole environments → *To* accepting diversity and “the happy accident”
- *From* the “end state” master plan → *To* flexible policy plan
- *From* “top-down” planning → *To* encouraging self-help initiatives
- *From* planning product according to design rules → *To* planning process as the result of participation
- *From* control by “plot ratio” → *To* urban impact analysis
- *From* separation of land uses for health reasons → *To* a mixture of uses for social diversity
- *From* confidence in the computer and quantitative methods → *To* mistrust of model-based planning
- *From* quantitative methods → *To* qualitative concerns
- *From* the planner as the only discipline involved in planning → *To* corporate view and product from a wide range of disciplines
- *From* the pursuit of exciting but simplistic new images → *To* the discovery of order in existing diversity
- *From* industrial technology → *To* electronic technology

- *From cheap energy → To expensive energy*
- *From central systems → To quest for decentralisation*
- *From consensus and agreed definitions → To roles of experts questioned*
- *From municipality provides services → To municipality acts as civic entrepreneur*
- *From urban governance: worst first → To municipal marketing: invest in success*

### • **3 GENERAL DISCUSSION**

#### • **rapporteur: Hans Mastop**

- For most, if not all participants, the seminar proved to be a very stimulating and fruitful event of exchange of ideas and experience. The seminar also proved to be very successful in creating new and refreshing existing networks between individuals to maintain this exchange and even to join forces to work on specific topics. The art and craft of networking then, and how to go about in fostering it, was central to the final discussions.
- First of all it was felt that networking entails both the individual and the institutional. At the individual level confidence and mutual trust are primordial to any kind of co-operation, and notwithstanding the differences, personal networks between those working in practice, research and education always exist. These personal networks then are the backbone for any network on the institutional level. The latter always will know elements of compromise and negotiation. Building personal networks next to arranging new meetings between institutional networks, preferably on more specific topics, might be the way to go ahead.
- As information is central to any kind of network, the idea to use modern IT for developing a basic network for international contacts between ISoCaRP and AESOP members and individuals to promote the exchange of ideas, to react on these and possibly to join forces to work on specific projects was raised (again) and met with support.
- Especially with respect to the co-operation in terms of education, AESOP has already applied for EU funds to engage in a network for improving planning education (exchange of staff, students and joint seminars), especially with a view to international cross-border issues in Europe and possible consequences for the curricula of the participating planning schools. In this respect it was felt that the question of curriculum development, i.e. how to structure learning processes, was felt of the utmost importance for further investigation.
- For instance, the UK has a rather general model, based on the idea of a “standard” government planner. Switzerland has the model of specialised planning courses, whereas the USA normally has the so-called “Hightower model”: general + specialised training. Basic questions then are: What kind of different models do the various countries/schools use, i.e. what are the frames of reference for the planners in those countries/of those schools? What are the differences, common elements and especially the “hidden concepts”, “institutional arrangements” and contingencies? As education plays a vital role in framing the minds of our future planners, the planning community – both practitioners, researchers and educators – should be much more aware of how they frame these minds and with what.
- And then again, such investigations should definitely not be confined to the well-known planning countries, i.e. countries with a vested and well-developed tradition. For tradition is in danger of inertia. Whereas the world is in constant change, some of

the audience felt that planners sometimes are reluctant to adapt to the huge changes that take place in the global society. Somehow, they still seem to feel as if the model of the “western world” is applicable to all sorts of planning and social circumstances. But it is quite clear that planners in western Europe and “modern” countries might learn from colleagues elsewhere. Especially “self-help” experiments which are now being re-invented there, due to the fact that government is changing its role, were seen as cases in point (e.g. urban development projects, community development).

- A general plea for further events like the seminar, for a possible joint “world congress” in 2000 and for the detailing of practical steps to promote the co-operation between the representatives of ISoCaRP and AESOP – of which the seminar had proven to be such a fruitful starting point – was the natural and generally supported closing point of the discussions.
- **4 CLOSING STATEMENT – EDUCATION, RESEARCH AND PLANNING MADE SIMPLE**
- **Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP]**
- Everything has already been said. The privilege of the chair: I will take my time. Every planning is a case with a context. I choose the story of my own life, as it is familiar to me. It is story-telling time. I shall also pay a visit to the old Greeks before I return to the seminar. Finally, I shall present “the truth of the mountain.” Please relax, this is going to take some time. If you fall asleep you will be brutally woken up by the truth.
- **The Island Game** – School did not completely kill my creativity, even if we were only allowed to put questions that already had an answer.
- **University studies** – The idea seemed to be that knowledge was produced by research and could be used in practice. But none of my teachers was a researcher, they were all practitioners. But research was the noble art.
- After examination I started two things: a private studio and an experimental theatre. One to make money and one to spend it.
- I became the director of a research institute. I was free to choose subject and as I was wondering how cars could cause traffic problems and not people, I started a large investigation. In Uppsala every 5th person was questioned. The result showed that people behaved very rationally and that gravity theories and engineer modelling was all madness. The rational behaviour could be well understood by economic sense. But that was understood by research.
- Then I was asked to take a chair in urban planning at my former school. In my first lecture I told the students about my Island Game. They asked: “*Is that what you are going to teach us – to play?*”  
“No,” I answered, “*you shall all meet reality and work among the people and for them.*”
- Disaster! We came close to reality, but it was all theatre, with roles and a script and a stage. I had to rethink.
- The students wanted to do case studies. I said: “*No, no story-telling, no uniqueness, in research there has to be theories, hypotheses and thick books in foreign languages.*”
- I believe many of you recognise this. It was a dilemma. The one who helped me to sort it out was Bent Flyvbjerg, a Danish researcher from Aalborg. He told me about the old Greeks.
- From Socrates science has inherited the idea that theories are explicit, which means they are not based upon interpretations or intuition; they are abstract, meaning that there is no need for concrete examples; and finally that they are universal, that is valid

at any time and place. They are independent of context and the charm of this ideal is the ability to make precise predictions.

- This ideal has gained a lot of success in natural science and caused a lot of problems for the social sciences. The problems have to do with the context. If a theory has to be independent of context, then there cannot be such things as social theories or planning theories.
- Here Aristotle is willing to help. He talks about three different intellectual virtues which he calls *episteme*, *techne* and *phronesis*.

## Continuation of 4 CLOSING STATEMENT – EDUCATION, RESEARCH AND PLANNING MADE SIMPLE

### Eric Wirén [ISoCaRP]

*Episteme* (epistemology) – Theoretical knowledge is just one of the intellectual virtues, representing the fixed, that cannot be otherwise.

The second virtue – *techne* – means both art and craft; a productive state that is truly reasoned. It means practical knowledge oriented towards production in a goals-and-means rationality. It brings about something that was not before. So if *episteme* is fixed, *techne* is variable.

A third virtue was *phronesis*, which is based upon practical rationality. It is pragmatic and dependent on context, experienced ethics – you may call it wisdom. *Phronesis* concerns “actions with regards to things that are good and bad for men.” The point of departure is an analysis of values and their implication for action. Aristotle says: “We consider that this quality belongs to those who understand the management of households or states.”

For informatics, architecture and planning, and for social sciences, *techne* and *phronesis* are the basic virtues, not *episteme*. According to Aristotle it makes a difference whether one studies man or things. Social sciences and natural sciences have their strengths and weaknesses along fundamentally different dimensions and cannot be compared on the single dimension of theoretical knowledge.

An applied ethics inspired by *phronesis* should focus on values by means of simple value-rational questions like: Where are we going? Is it desirable? What ought to be done? Who gains and who loses? By virtue of which mechanisms of power? What are the possibilities for changing existing power relations, if desirable?

Research should focus on practical activity and practical knowledge in daily life situations. Practical rationality can be considered more fundamental as an object of study than discourse and theory. So research should focus on case studies and on context, since practices can only be understood in the proper context. Researchers should take their points of departure in *how* questions rather than in *why* questions, in *Verstehen* rather than in *Erklären*.

No practical philosophy can be adequate for our time unless it confronts the analysis of power and how that power operates in our everyday lives. One task is to make the world-at-risk less risky to live in.

As for the seminar, it is only natural that we all drew different conclusions. Some will stress the research approach, some the planners' view and others the education and the students. I believe it is right to say that we all came here ready to agree, that planning research and analytical studies should go alongside planning practice while constantly drawing on it. Similarly, these findings from research and practice should be continuously fed into education and training in the real world. Only then the planning profession can build up a collective memory which reflects a true learning process and may lead to real progress over time.

This was in fact the reason why this seminar was arranged in the first place. Research was given a leading position. Workshop I dealt with research and education; Workshop II dealt with education and practice; and Workshop III dealt with practice and research. As you have noticed I changed this order for the presentation of results: practice was in the beginning as well as in the end. This is in fact a very meaningful result of the seminar, as well as it creates new problems.

The problem I want to point out is the idea of planning as a problem-solving activity. Here we have to make up our mind. And this is the moment of truth. In Lewis Carroll's wonderful poem *The Hunting of the Snark* the Bellman says that some sentence has to be said three times before it can be true, but if this happens, then it is true. Many sentences have been repeated more than three times here, so in fact truth is all around us.

But according to Douglas & Wildavsky's cross table knowledge and consensus must be regarded to differentiate how society can manage risks.

---

#### **Knowledge – Consensus table (Douglas & Wildavsky):**

- High knowledge + high consensus → technical solutions
- High knowledge + low consensus → practical solutions (needs negotiation)
- Low knowledge + high consensus → ignorance solutions
- Low knowledge + low consensus → research needed

---

Now when we add ability we get a three-dimensional problem. And as we can easily see, rational planning approaches are only the tip of the iceberg.

“The Ice-berg Verità.”

---

#### **Finally, words of gratitude.**

Thanks to all you participants of the seminar. Special thanks to Judy van Hemert who made it all work; to Stefano Wagner, the driving force; to Jakob Maurer for offering the network; to Peter Hall and Derek Lyddon for the external examination; and a personal thank to Gerd Albers for coming. He wrote to me and asked for permission to come; my answer was: “You please come; we need young people, whatever their age.”

Congratulations ISOCaRP and AESOP and many happy returns of the seminar.

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix 1 – List of participants**

Farabi-galipedede Sok. 1/3, Cankaya-Ankara, Turkey  
Mr. Halil Alatan

Prof. em. Dr. Gerd Albers  
St. Jakobstrasse 9, 82110 Germering, Germany

Dipl. Arch Benedetto Antonini  
Divisione Del Territorio, Stabile Amministrativo, 6500 Bellinzona, Switzerland

NLH Agricultural University of Norway, Dept. of Land Use and Landscape Planning, P.O. Box 5029,  
1432 Aas, Norway

Mr. Alessandro Balducci  
Politecnico di Milano, Via Bonardi 3, 20133 Milano, Italy

Mr. Carlos Bana e Costa  
Technical University of Lisbon; IST/Cesur; Av. Rovisco Pais, 1000 Lisbon, Portugal

26, rue Hippolyte Maindron, 75014 Paris, France

IATEUR, 57bis rue P. Taittinger, 51096 Reims CEDEX, France

Prof. Ir. Max van den Berg  
Apoliolaan 77a, 1077 AJ Amsterdam, Netherlands

Prof. Mariolina Besio  
Salita Pollaiuoli 15/5, 16123 Genova, Italy

Mr. Vittorio Borachia  
Politecnico di Milano, Via Bonardi 3, 20133 Milano, Italy

University of Lausanne, IRI, BFSH 2, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Mr. Laurent Bridel

Mr. Willem Buunk  
University of Nijmegen, Faculty of Policy Sciences, P.O. Box 9108, 6500 HK Nijmegen, Netherlands

Mr. Goran Cars  
Royal Institute of Technology, Dept. of Regional Planning, 10044 Stockholm, Sweden

The Royal Town Planning Institute, 26 Portland Place, London W1N 4BE, UK

83-6 Esq. Av. M. Bombarda, 1000 Lisboa, Portugal

Plan & Design, Palomar 11, Fuente del Fresno / San Sebastian de las Reyes, Madrid 28708, Spain

Ms. Marta Davidova  
See Schmeidler, Czech Rep.

Prof. em. Serge Domicelj  
Domicelj Consultants Pty Ltd, 401/102 Alfred Street, Milsons Point NSW 2061, Australia

Politecnico & Universita di Torino, Dipt. Inter. Territorio

Mr. Sigmund Asmervik  
Mr. Hari Baral  
Mr. Marcel Bazin  
Ms. Margaret Catran  
Prof. Manuel L. da Costa Lobo  
Prof. Adriana Dal Cin

Mr. Alex Fubini  
Viale Mattioli 39, 10125 Torino, Italy

Dr. Yehoyahin Gur  
P.O. Box 68, 84100 Beer-Sheva, Israel

Mr. Peter Hall  
12 Queen Road, London W5251, UK  
Director CREUE, Dept. of Town & Country Planning, Claremont Tower, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU,  
UK

Mr. Ernst Heer  
ORL-Institute ETH, Hönggerberg, CH-8093 Zürich, Switzerland

Ms. Marilyn Higgins  
School of Planning & Housing, Edinburgh College of Art, 79 the Grassmarket, Edinburgh EH1 2HJ,  
Scotland, UK

Department of Geography, Breniken 2, 5035 Bergen-Sandviken, Norway

Ir. Peter Jonquiére  
Oranjelaan 10, 2635 JL Den Hoorn, Netherlands

Mr. Ib Jorgensen  
Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning, Aalborg, Denmark

University of Nijmegen, Faculty of Policy Sciences, P.O. Box 8108, 6500 HK Nijmegen, Netherlands

Dipl.-Ing. Monika Klingele  
Gotachstrasse 34, 8003 Zürich, Switzerland

Prof. Yoshinobu Kumata  
Kurata Laboratory, Dept. of Soc. Eng, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1 Okayama, Meguro-Ku,  
Tokyo 152, Japan

Via Amedeo Modigliani, 36, 95125 Catania, Italy

Patrick Geddes Centre for Planning Studies, 20 Chambers Street, Edinburgh EH1 1JZ, UK

Ms. Margarida da Lobo Howell

Quinta da Arrabida, Casais da Serra, 2925 Azeitao, Portugal

Ms. Ingrid Lundahl

Dept. of Infrastructure and Planning, Royal Institute of Technology, 10044 Stockholm, Sweden

Dr. Derek Lyddon

31 Blackford Road, Edinburgh EH5 2DT, UK

Dr. Karel Maier

Mikulova 1571, Praha 4, 14900, Czech Rep.

Prof. Patsy Healey

Mr. Arild Holt-Jensen

Mr. Marco Kerstens

Dr.-Ing. Paolo La Greca

Ms. Sofia Leonardama

Mr. Tadeusz Markowski

Mr. Tadeusz Marszal

Prof. Hans Mastop

Mr. Thomas R. Matta

Prof. Dr. Jakob Maurer

Mr. Craig Minor

Dipl.-Kfm. Jurg Müller

Prof. Alain Motte

Ms. Rosemarie Müller-Holz

Drs. Pipo Nicola

Arch. Maria Niemczyk

Ms. Kristina Nilsson

Dr. Taner Oc

Prof. Marinella Ottolenghi

Mr. Antonio Pais Antunes

Mr. Paulo Pinho

Arch. Ida Provenzano

Ms. Dina Rachevsky

Prof. Peter Robinson

Mr. Artur Rosa Pires

Prof. Angelo Rossi

PhDr. Karel Schmeidler

Mr. Karl Otto Schmid

Ms. Ursula Schmidt

Mr. Andreas Schneider

Dr. Bernd Scholl

Prof. Dr. Werner Schramm  
Prof. Heinz Schwarzbach  
Dr. Rolf Signer  
Prof. em. Dr. Erika Spiegel  
Mr. Hari Srinivas  
Mr. Lennart Tonell  
Ms. Vesselina Troeva  
Ing. Stefano Wagner  
Prof. Erik Wirén  
Mr. Bogdan Wyporek  
University of Lodz/Dept of City & Regional Management, Revoluji 1805 no.41, 90-214 Lodz, Poland

---

## **Appendix 2 – About AESOP and ISoCaRP**

### **ABOUT AESOP**

The Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP) was established in 1987. The aim of the organisation is to articulate a European dimension within planning education as part of the process of institutional co-operation and integration within Europe, also keeping in mind the prospect of increasing professional mobility within Europe. The ambition is to foster and enrich higher education in planning across Europe by mutual support, including facilitating dialogue, exchange visits and spread of information, and to defend the cause of expanding and enhancing higher education in planning.

The key event of AESOP is the annual congress which brings together the broad spectrum of the work of member schools. It incorporates presentations and discussions of papers on planning, planning-related and planning-education subjects. Congresses also include local study visits, business meetings and meetings of special interest groups.

In addition to the traditional congress, annual AESOP Seminars are organised. The Seminars have a clearly delineated theme, and are modelled on an informal workshop style. The seminars focus in-depth on a topic, are limited in size, and are relevant to AESOP's concerns with developing understanding and education in the planning field within Europe.

The AESOP Newsletter is published twice per year and contains information about member schools, working groups, office-bearers and other representatives. It also provides news of our corporate activities. Information about AESOP is also given in AESOP News Items which are distributed via e-mail.

For additional information about AESOP, contact:

The Secretary General – Goran Cars  
Royal Institute of Technology  
Department of Infrastructure and Planning  
10044 Stockholm, Sweden  
Tel: +46 8 790 7938  
Fax: +46 8 790 6761

Web: <http://regplan.kth.se/aesop>

E-mail: cars@infra.kth.se

---

### **ABOUT ISoCaRP**

The International Society of City and Regional Planners is a global association of professional planners. It was founded in 1965 with the objective of bringing together recognised and highly qualified individual planners in an international network.

ISoCaRP is a Non-Governmental Organisation officially recognised by the UN, UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

The objectives of ISoCaRP include the improvement of planning practice through the creation of a platform for the exchange between planners from different countries, promotion of the planning profession in all its aspects, promoting planning research, improvement of planning education and training, and increasing information, awareness and advice, particularly on major planning issues.

The key event of ISoCaRP is the annual congress dealing with a topical international planning theme.

In addition ISoCaRP is involved in the following activities:

- seminars, conferences, exhibitions and study tours
- publication of congress & seminar reports and case studies
- workshops and competitions especially for young planners
- publication of up-to-date comparative material on planning policies, methods, legislation in every country
- representation at major international events concerned with planning
- evaluation of development and trends in planning practice

For additional information about ISoCaRP, contact:

The Secretariat – Judy van Hemert

Mauritskade 23

2514 HD The Hague, The Netherlands

Tel: +31 70 3462654

Fax: +31 70 361 7909

Homepage: <http://www.soc.titech.ac.jp/isocarp>

E-mail: isocarp@bart.nl