

**THE FIRST WORLD-WIDE CONFERENCE  
ON PLANNING SCIENCE  
(Palermo 8-12 Sept 1992)**

**POST CONFERENCE NOTES**

**1. Introduction**

- [1.1 The Crisis of Planning](#)
- [1.2 The Present Requirements of Planning](#)
- [1.3 The Need for a More Integrated Approach](#)
- [1.4 The Steps Towards an International Debate](#)

**2. The Palermo Conference**

- [2.1 List of Presentations](#)
  - [2.1.1 First Session: Planning and Planning Institutions in a Global Framework](#)
  - [2.1.2 Second Session: Planning and Planning Institutions in a Multinational or National Context](#)
  - [2.1.3 Third Session: New Approaches to Planning](#)
  - [2.1.4 Fourth Session: New Methodologies for Planning](#)
  - [2.1.5 Fifth Session: Planning and Democracy](#)
  - [2.1.6 Sixth Session: Planning Institutions: Structure and Design](#)
- [2.2 A brief appraisal of the debate](#)

**3. The International Planning Association – The Academy**

**APPENDICES**

- [1. Abstracts of the Conference Papers](#)
- [2. Terms of reference for the proposal of a first "International Conference on Planning Science" \(or "Planology"\)](#)
  - [2.1 The emergence of the "planologic approach"](#)
  - [2.2 The application of planning science to global management](#)
- [3. Post-Conference comments and conclusions: an interview for "Cronache Parlamentari" with Prof. Franco Archibugi](#)
- [4. The Who's Who of "The First World-Wide Conference on Planning Science"](#)
- [5. The Conference Programme](#)

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 The Crisis of Planning**

There can be no doubt that planning, with its related studies, is currently in a state of crisis. This will be evident from an examination of any area where planning has been applied, across the range of types of planning as well as states in which it has taken place. Indeed, the 'sixties saw great expectations which arose from the successes of post-war planning; such expectations and optimism have since been replaced by doubt and frustration.

This current crisis has affected the whole range of planning activities, from macro-economic to development, physical, social, urban, regional and environmental planning. The institutions of planning, in the full range of states, have suffered similarly.

In Western Europe, national plans have suffered a crisis of implementation, the causes of which have been and are a subject of debate. Developed in a climate of ideological opposition as well as that of corporate interests, many planning agencies still exist, but are functionally all but dead. This prompts the question of the reason for the failure of institutions' capacities to keep up with technological developments. Much the same goes for the experiences of planning in the United States, at state as well as federal level, including the latter's "planning-programming-budgeting-system". Pragmatic implementation of the "Welfare State" appears to have been preferred over abstract planning procedures everywhere – and even that has been subject to crisis, perhaps partly for this reason.

The crisis of economic planning in ex-communist Europe is blatantly evident. Yet it should be pointed out that here planning was associated with political regimes found lacking in democracy and freedom, the instruments thus assuming the blame also for political inadequacies.

Finally, the crisis can be seen in the "third world", where the effects of development planning have been limited at best and counter-productive at worst, with respect to the aim of reducing the gap to the "first" world.

## **1.2 The Present Requirements of Planning**

Today more than ever before there is an emerging need for planned management of development, coming from all directions.

The advanced but chaotic development of economies and societies has not resolved any of the chronic problems of the world over the fifty years since the Second World War. In the Western world we have "development" without real progress, elsewhere we do not even have development.

Western economic development – impressive from the material point of view – dissipated all chances to approach and solve the problem of global under-development. This is a world where the advances of technology integrate and

shorten distances between countries, and where under-development is no longer a "foreign" rather than "domestic" affair for the developed world.

Added to the world emergency of the under-developed world there is today another emergency – at world, national and local scale – of the conservation of the planet and the environment in terms of balanced or sustainable growth.

The environmental emergency has its own global dimension. This can be managed through a "choice-" or "decisions-system" only if implemented on a global scale and by means of a supra-national rather than international planning authority. As in the 'sixties the European Community realised that the serious opportunities for development for all could only be guaranteed through widening their common economic activities at a supra-national level of decision-making, so today a majority of the countries of the world need to be convinced of under-development and that the environment cannot even be approached, let alone resolved. And how can this approach be implemented if not through advanced planning systems?

Thus it is difficult to conceive sustainable development without an adequate process of global planning, and without a relaunch of the studies and institutions capable of steadily sustaining a growing support for such global planning.

The need for strategic planning is becoming increasingly evident – especially in certain areas. For instance, it is doubtful whether the conversion of the so-called "socialist" (or rather "bureaucratic") economies to pluralist economies with strong elements of private, or free, enterprise (profit and non-profit orientated) could be achieved without basic choices managed in a systematic way.

Similarly, it is dubious whether the "de-etatisation" process in the more advanced Welfare States – as predicted in Gunnar Myrdal's call for the "post-Welfare State" – and its accompanying development of a non-profit "associative economy" could possibly be achieved without choices based on systematic strategic planning.

Above all, we must take advantage of the recent astonishing technological developments to escape from the current chaotic socio-economic development, which is subject to very limited influence by operators, and develop a new "conscious development". By this one intends a development subject to, and conscious of, the preferences of the target people. Here application of advanced polling techniques or systems for monitoring public preferences may be appropriate.

### **1.3 The Need for a More Integrated Approach**

Clearly the ideas outlined above were not represented in the old models for planning. It is thus doubtful whether these old models used in the various fields of planning are still adequate – and indeed if they ever were. The extent to which they contained deeply rooted deficiencies, rendering them obstacles to the implementation of the plans they promoted, must be examined.

The lack of integrated approaches to planning represents one of the most serious defects of planning; a defect often pointed out and that one has tried to

avoid. Yet attempts to avoid this fallacy, and to develop a unified approach to planning, came to little as planning entered its general crisis. Thus even plans developed by inter-disciplinary teams featured the biases of sectoral approaches reflecting their subject matter. Hence economic planning has not been sufficiently integrated with social planning, i.e. due account was often not taken of the social goals and the values of the plan. Similarly physical, urban and territorial planning has frequently failed to consider the economic constraints involved thoroughly. Planning relating to social sectors such as health and education has an even worse track record, often failing to appreciate the need for quantification with respect to limited financial resources, let alone considering the needs of financial accounting, and so forth.

Altogether, this absence of an integrated approach has allowed a multitude of initiatives, projects and programmes which do not, strictly speaking, qualify as plans to proliferate under the umbrella of "planning".

The shortcomings of disintegrated approaches are furthermore reflected in the structure of the education of planners. The various fields of planning are approached through separate disciplines, no curriculum dealing adequately with the issue of integrated planning. Despite inter-departmental exchanges theories and principles, which are developed within one discipline and tend to remain there, ignored by the others, their general character and applicability notwithstanding. Yet the present problems of integrated planning go far beyond the central issues of each discipline, as do the problems of working out any kind of plan. There is, however, an opportunity to deal with this problem of mutual ignorance more extensively than through inter-disciplinary exchanges: the education of future planners *within one discipline*, since there are certain criteria all plans must fulfil, their separate and different requirements notwithstanding.

This new discipline could be formed on the base of a new paradigm, giving birth to a decision-oriented, normative approach.

#### **1.4 The Steps Towards an International Debate**

The Planning Studies Centre, together with a considerable amount of scholars from various different planning disciplines and activities, has arrived at the conviction that the time has come to deal with the conventional and obvious issue of adapting institutions to the new needs of planners. The danger is that despite the best of intentions the result will rather be planners adapting to institutions - a result we seem to have achieved long ago. Perhaps it is time that we concern ourselves with making sure that the methodology of planning is consolidated theoretically and technically, which at the present moment we have far from achieved.

This is the spirit in which the initiative of the Planning Studies Centre to launch a series of periodical academic and scientific conferences on the "planning sciences" was born. The idea was to gather people whose paths have crossed time and again during a lifetime of academic planning-related research, to examine and

evaluate the opportunities for regular meetings of this kind in order to address the question of a "neo-disciplinary" approach to the problems of planning.

In a preparatory document, which was submitted to a group of colleagues as the "terms of reference" (see [Appendix 2](#)) for a proposed series of meetings, the emergence of a *planological approach* was evoked, i.e. an integrated, unified approach to planning. This would comprise the different schools of thought and research that have sprung from the academic fields of economics, political science, sociology, public administration, urban studies, ecology etc. over the last four decades.

Thus arose the idea of a brainstorming session on these problems in general. This took place in Rome in October 1991 and was organised by the Planning Studies Centre. The participants at this meeting came from a range of disciplines, and the opinions aired were by no means all convergent. Yet there was general agreement on one point: the expediency of increasing multi-disciplinary exchanges on the subject and to proceed with further meetings. The session concluded that the theme of the first World-Wide Conference on Planning Science should be the *Relationships between Planning Technologies and Planning Institutions*. The participants were to be selected and invited, moreover, upon suggestions from participants of the Rome meeting and new invitees.

This "*First World-Wide Conference on Planning Science*" took place in Palermo on September 8th - 11th 1992, was sponsored by the UN University (Tokyo), the European University Institute (Florence) and UNESCO (The Regional Office for Science and Technology for Europe). The Italian National Research Council also assured financial support.

The brainstorming session laid down a set of terms of reference for the subsequent Conference. This was considered a two-dimensional grid within which the conference papers should be located, the two dimensions being the *planning technologies and institutions* referred to in its title, and the *territorial* dimension. Beyond this, strict guidelines were not laid down and invitees were asked to choose the topics of their papers freely, although special attention to the problems of *ex-communist states* and *developing countries* was encouraged.

A short glossary of terms was laid down in order to ensure conceptual clarity:  
"*planning*" refers to the construction of plans as well as their application, implementation, management, and review, in any field in which this is practiced. It is this in its entirety that makes up the "science of planning" (planology);  
"*technology*" refers to both theories and methodologies of planning, on the one hand, and its techniques and procedures on the other;  
"*institutions*" refers to actual institutions as they exist and are structured in the real world, as well as how they should be conceived and designed to facilitate the planning process;  
"*territorial scale*" refers to three preferred levels: a) global, b) multi-national and national, and c) sub-national.

## 2. The Palermo Conference

The Conference took place over four days, three of which were dedicated to the presentation and discussion of about fifty papers by as many participants. The fourth day was dedicated to actual current planning, the cases being the Sicilian Region's *Regional Development Plan* and spatial planning at the European Community level, *Europa 2000*. The set of papers for discussion was divided into six half-day sessions, in which the presenters gave brief ten-minute presentations, after which a general debate and specific questions followed. At the close of the third day the issue of the need for – and possibility of – establishing a new international planners' association was discussed (see in [Appendix 5](#) the Conference Programme).

### 2.1 List of presentations

There now follows a rapid "bird's-eye view" of the six Conference sessions (in [Appendix 1](#) the abstracts may be found for the various papers prepared and presented for the Conference).

#### 2.1.1 First Session: *Planning and Planning Institutions in a Global Framework*

A paper submitted by **Jan Tinbergen** (*in absentia*) on the "Duration of Development" opened the conference, the first session of which was dedicated to *Planning and Planning Institutions in a Global Framework*. This paper argued the time required for developing countries to catch up with the developed ones must be measured in centuries (between five and nine of these, depending on Western aid), and that this duration of development is constantly increasing. **Wassily Leontief** agreed (*in absentia*) to include a paper within the framework of Global Planning. His paper discussed the need for accurate alternative scenarios in order to arrive at a compromise between different countries' competing interests. These various scenarios should objectively describe the effects of one particular combination of rules that, whilst protecting the environment, would secure normal operation and sustainable growth for the economies of all the countries involved. **Tarcisio G. Della Senta** and **Yehezkel Dror** subsequently argued the need for a new paradigm, both of them considering the issue in a global framework, the latter arguing for fundamental reconsiderations of the paradigms, restructuring of institutions and a global approach to planning. This theme was carried forward by **Bruno Amoroso**, writing on the need to reconsider and change planning theories and institutions, as well as concepts of modernisation, in the face of globalisation; and **Barnett Parker**, arguing the need to take a multi-disciplinary view, using the case of health care planning. The session was wrapped up by an examination of instruments for trade policies by **Mario Centorrino** and a paper on regional management submitted by **Sergio Boisier** *in absentia*. The ensuing discussion included a debate on the extent planners' roles integrated concern with

implementation, plans' feasibility, consensus building and legitimation. The issues of preferability versus optimality (given uncertainty), planning as continuous interaction and the concept of "global" were also raised.

### *2.1.2 Second Session: Planning and Planning Institutions in a Multinational or National Context*

The second session was dedicated to *Planning and Planning Institutions in a Multinational or National Context*. As suggested and expected, this included focus on the problems of the ex-communist states, particularly those related to the transition from "communism". **Antoni Kuklinski's** call for a new network of strategic planning institutions and concern about a deficit of planning was reinforced by **Sergei Artobolevskiy's** call for EC-style planning institutions in the ex-USSR in order to benefit from Western experience. **Jacek Szlachta's** case study of Poland concluded with a similar call for strategic planning during the transition to market economies, whilst bearing in mind the problems of implementing planning as it has been discredited. **Harald Hagemann** argued that the consequences of the lack of a planned transition were evident in the case of German unification and its problems. Remaining in the same area, **Vladimir Kollontai** focused on the unprecedented nature of the transition process, pointing out the problems of the impact of non-economic factors such as the perceived legitimacy of the emerging market and property relations. Other cases were presented by **Yasuo Katamura** (the Japanese experience), pointing out international implications, and **Dalia Lichfield's** comparison of planning institutions' impact on planning technology in the US, the UK and Israel. The session's final paper, by **Pasquale Lucio Scandizzo**, discussed models and strategies for trade patterns, cooperation and growth. The extent to which the ex-communist states could benefit from Western advice, the merits of the old regimes' planning, and the problem of inadequate information and market regulation were discussed subsequently.

### *2.1.3 Third Session: New Approaches to Planning*

*New Approaches to Planning* was the theme of the third session, opened by **Ignacy Sachs'** call for global vision and a new approach to planning for democratic regulation of the mixed economy, as the concept of development is challenged on environmentalist grounds. On the similar issue of sustainable development, the environment and the Brundtland Report, **Nathaniel Lichfield** concluded that sustainable development must be translated into an operational concept, dealt with through integrated approaches to planning. **Peter Nijkamp** subsequently examined the case for government planning, discussing market failures, government failures and the achievement of social goals, and illustrating it with the case of transport planning. The issue was taken further by **Alex Michalos'** discussion of the issues of measuring the quality of life and principles

to be concluded from these. The session proceeded with a discussion of the success of Dutch planning with respect to theory and methodology by **Andreas Faludi**, of the dilemmas in planning for historic cities by **Giorgio Piccinato** and **Luigi Mazza's** considerations on the reconstruction of planning tools with respect to the increasing focus on choice between conservation and expansion in land-use planning. The following debate touched on the questions of how to consider the history of planning, its various types, and the fallacy of the planning/non-planning dichotomy.

#### *2.1.4 Fourth Session: New Methodologies for Planning*

The fourth session on *New Methodologies for Planning* was opened by the **Franco Archibugi's** paper entitled "Towards a New Discipline of Planning", discussing the roots, merits and limits of the trans-disciplinary approach and outlining the routes towards a new discipline and its integrating themes. It concluded with a call for a new methodology of planning.

#### *2.1.5 Fifth Session: Planning and Democracy*

*Planning and Democracy* was debated in the penultimate session of the conference. **Seymour Mandelbaum** opened with a discussion of the relationship between communitarian sensibilities and planning, arguing the importance of moral limits in the design of communities. **John Forester** followed with a discussion on political judgement in planning, stressing the importance of considering both value (Aristotelian) and inclusiveness and participation (Habermasian). **Patsy Healey's** contribution concerned planning in democratic pluralism and the issue of the democratic dimension of plans, focusing on the planning of urban change in particular. **R. Scott Gassler** subsequently discussed the contribution of planning science to the study of non-profit economics, dealing with the policies, studies and management of the latter. One such policy in the UK – the provision of public housing – and its effect was then considered by **Judith Allen**, moreover raising the issue of the role of ambiguity in planning, and imagination as a precondition for goal oriented behaviour. The session's final presentation by **Howell Baum** dealt with the issue of consensus and community in planning, covering such issues as definition of the "community", the legitimacy of planning on certain issues, and interest group politics, drawing on the case of the Baltimore Jewish community. The ensuing debate brought up issues such as the ambiguity of civil society, and democracy in contexts such as nationalism and challenges to legitimacy.



### 2.1.6 Sixth Session: Planning Institutions: Structure and Design

The final session of the conference was dedicated to *Planning Institutions: Structure and Design*. **Stuart Holland's** opening paper dealt with planning and the mixed economy, discussing a range of experiences and the "meso-economic" sector in particular, and stressing planning as a vision of an alternative future, requiring negotiation and accountability. **Ernest Alexander** took up the issue of institutional design with respect to coordinative planning, the link between strategic planning and implementation, discussing interorganisational coordination in particular. **William Dunn** presented a paper on the use of problem structuring methodologies for planning in turbulent environments. **Hector Correa** stressed the issue of the implementability of plans, presenting an approach to operational integration of the political and technological aspects of planning and indexes of the actors' support and opposition based on costs-benefit analysis. On a similar topic **Louis Albrechts** discussed the legitimate role of planning in changed circumstances, concluding that it must be undertaken more selectively and requires institutional adaptation. Still on the topic of institutional design, **Richard S. Bolan** considered the lessons from Eastern Europe's transition process, raising the legitimacy issue once more. **Efim Nisevich** then discussed problems related to redesigning planning institutions in Russia, with the new functions of saving the economy from collapse, forming and regulating the market and indirect macro-planning. **Giuliano Bianchi** concluded the presentation of papers with a discussion of attempts to overcome the institutional and technical problems of regional planning in Sicily and Tuscany.

## 2.2 A brief appraisal of the debate

Amongst the themes raised during the discussions which followed the presentations of the papers, considerable attention was given to the environmental, social and political complexity (qualitative and quantitative) in which planning today takes place all over the World, at macro and micro level. This complexity requires a revision of both the relationships between the various disciplines and the entire disciplines themselves. This question may also be considered as necessary to elaborate a sophisticated theory of democracy by an epistemological community of planning. Indeed the problems of government appear totally new and call for a redefinition of terms: statecraft needs additional bases in terms of pieces of learning. In this context of great and largely unknown transitions, it is not hazardous to consider planning as assistance to crisis management.

A second issue dealt with in the discussion was the concept of "global". Some thought of this as a threatening setting – but the discussion rather stressed its being a method, i.e. "global thinking": in the marriage of technology and institutions, a global strategy is deemed critical. In this respect, some spoke of endogenous global variables.

Amongst the 21st Century's requirements for planning, that of mediating between problem solving models linked to implementation and frame-setting

models for future decisions was mentioned. Also, there were recommendations for a down-to-earth, barefoot approach to planning which avoids stabilising situations by over-simplifying them in order to limit uncertainty. Goal setting, or the choice of priorities, was contrasted to frame setting as a characteristic of planning. It was moreover stressed how all planning is variant thinking (that does not lead to optimality) to perform less badly than without planning. Amongst other definitions proposed during the sessions, we may recall those for which planning is the organisation of hope (the deliberative notion of planning, where planning involves reorganisation of means and ends). In the current context, marked by increasing democracy and also increasing conflict, the point is how to transform interdependence and conflict into deliberation. Another important aspect which was recalled is that goal oriented behaviour in normative thinking has imagination as a precondition. Planning therefore needs to be ambiguous, not to reduce ambiguity.

This inevitably led to questions on the character of the planner and what exactly was his science, knowledge, methods and profession. In turn, these questions led one to ask if there was an academic place for planology.

The proposal to create an international organisation for planology is born out of these questions and is orientated towards providing institutional opportunities for research into the answers to these questions.

## **1. The International Planners' Association – The Academy**

As mentioned above, the question of a new international planners' association was discussed at the close of the third day of the conference.

The full discussion took the form of a General Assembly of the conference participants, chaired by Nat Lichfield. The discussion took off from a presentation of ideas given in a note by Kuklinski and a note prepared by Michalos, Morell and Parker<sup>1</sup>, as well as a text on the *Resetting of Planning Science* by F. Archibugi – of which the opening pages of this document represent a rough summary.

The general agreement that emerged from the informal discussion on an international planners' association was that there was indeed a need for such a body and that the Conference should advance this concept. It was agreed that the Conference should represent a low-key start to this body, and the following five points were laid down as tentative draft goals:

1. To promote the development of a multi-dimensional discipline analyzing the theory and practice of planning and stimulating the studies on the methodology of integrated planning;
2. To create a forum to exchange experiences among planners and planning institutions working in different fields and in different economic, social and political environments at different spatial levels (global, national, regional, local);

---

<sup>1</sup> For these notes see the working document prepared by the Planning Studies Centre: *Towards an International Organisation for the Advancement of Planning Science* (see link on this webpage).

3. To monitor the progress in the practical applications of the concept of planning;
4. To establish a data bank of the planning experiences and especially characteristic case studies documenting successes and failures of planning;
5. To act as an advisory body organising expertise on the application of planning in different situations. The restructuring of planning institutions could also be an object of this activity.

Franco Archibugi was nominated the key person in the association, and it was agreed that he would nominate members of an initial steering committee. Membership of the association is to be restricted, i.e. open by invitation only. The Assembly in Palermo was furthermore asked to submit comments and thoughts on the matter to Archibugi.

This thus represents a launch of the "association", or "academy", though at the current stage (Nov. 1992) there are still a number of issues to be sorted out, such as its legal form, its resources and dissemination by Journals when appropriate. One first step will however be the publication of the papers presented to the Palermo conference in *special issues* of the six (English language) journals represented there by their editors, who are also members of the Steering Committee, and by other journals: in Russian for the Russian Academy of Science and in Italian for the Italian National Research Council as well as others.

The First World-Wide Conference on Planning Science can thus be considered the beginning of an institutionalisation of an integrated version of a planning discipline, which is more independent of its disciplinary roots. Yet it is quite possible that the resulting new knowledge concerning methods used by planners, and thus also their education, will have no more of an impact on planning than has been the case in the past. Nevertheless, the present need for informed and competent long-term management is greater than ever before. If – as is highly probable – the political demand for competent planning were to increase, the scientific community would at least be better equipped to furnish adequate support this time around than has been the case in the past.

## APPENDICES

### 1. Abstracts of the Conference Papers

Louis Albrechts  
Professor of Urban and Regional Planning  
The Catholic University of Leuven

#### **Dilemmas in Planning: What is and what Ought to Be**

The legitimation of planning as a political process to guide the forces, which determine the development of an area/sector in a socially acceptable direction, has been increasingly questioned in the last two decades.

Planning is essentially constructed within the social, economic and ideological framework that is dominant during a given historic era.

So planning moved from a rather well respected discipline that was considered to steer developments in a 'desired' direction towards a practice in which utilitarian tendencies dominated planning culture and distributive issues were neglected or obscured.

This paper tends to reconsider critically the role of planning and planners taking into account their traditional strengths and eradicating their traditional weaknesses but also taking into account the changing circumstances. Some first ideas will be offered as a way towards a realistic rethinking of the role of planning and planners.

Reconsidering the role of planning also needs adapted institutional structures to make this planning work.

\*\*\*\*\*

E.R. Alexander  
Professor  
Institute of Urban & Regional Studies  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

#### **The Architecture of Institutional Design: Interorganizational Coordinative Structures**

Planning as commonly understood, and as described in normative rational decision making models, is essentially strategic planning, i.e. it involves deciding what to do. But there is another aspect of planning which is less well appreciated: coordinative planning, which is essential in any complex undertaking where large or multiple organizations are deployed. Once a course of action has been chosen through strategic planning, coordinative planning is the interactive process of

determining how to get it done. Coordinative planning is what links planning to implementation.

Markets and market-like collective decisions in the economic and political realms do not need planning. But, extending transaction cost theory, I have shown that planning is associated with hierarchy, and with the complex organizations and interorganizational structures which complement political and economic markets in society as we know it. Action in these contexts requires coordination, of organizational units in single complex organizations, and of independent organizations in interorganizational systems, "action sets" or "implementation networks".

Coordinative planning includes the design or selection of coordinative structures, the "architecture" of organizational and interorganizational coordination. A set of coordinative structures is described and reviewed, arrayed on a continuum from least to most hierarchical. They range from informal networks through market-like frameworks of norms and rules (e.g. for common resource pool associations), interorganizational groups (e.g. commissions, boards, task forces), and coordinating units, to single organizations formed from merger or created de novo.

Selected cases of interorganizational coordination (IOC) will illustrate the performance of these structures in contexts including regional development, new towns planning and development, neighborhood revitalization, metropolitan government, environmental control, social services delivery, and public-private and private enterprise. The cases are drawn from experiences in IOC in France, Germany, Israel, the Netherlands, the U.K., the U.S. and Venezuela.

Analysis and evaluation of these cases suggest some common aspects of IOC which provide material for descriptive and prescriptive conclusions. The former address the relation between perceived transaction costs in the interorganizational field prior to the emergence of a formal interorganizational network, and the degree of hierarchy in the IOC structure through which the network is coordinated. The latter present some contingent prescriptions relating different types of undertakings and various contexts to IOC structures, and offer some tentative principles for interorganizational design.

\*\*\*\*\*

Judith Allen  
Professor  
Faculty of the Environment  
University of Westminster

### **Imagine That! The Effects of the 1988 Housing Act on British Housing Associations**

The UK Government's aim, in the 1988 Housing Act, was to force housing associations (non-profit providers of social housing) to become private sector landlords, by changing the financial subsidy arrangements. The effect was to force

the emergence of a "third sector" in social housing provision, poised between market and state provision. This paper traces the effects of the 1988 Housing Act on the organisation and planning techniques of one of London's largest Housing Associations, whose mainstream provision has been concentrated in three Inner London Boroughs. The aim of the paper is to identify the ways in which the emergence of a third sector requires new approaches to strategic planning at this local level.

\*\*\*\*\*

Bruno Amoroso  
Professor of Economics, Director  
Dept. of Economics and Planning  
Roskilde University

### **Planning Theories, Technologies and Institutions in a Context of Globalization and Polycentric Economic Systems**

Development in planning theories and technologies has taken place under condition of national capitalism and national welfare systems. Present development in the European communities is characterised by increasing globalisation and EC integration.

Three main problems are in sight:

1. The increasing number of EC member states from 12 to 18-20 before the end of this decade.
2. The increasing tendency toward "triadic globalisation" followed by new inequalities within the Community members and regions.
3. The destabilisation of the regions around the 12 EC countries representing about 2/3 of the wider continental Europe.

Destabilisation around and marginalisation within the Community are symptoms of the same problems: the failure of the process of development in European regions outside the EC. They can both be cured by reactivating a process of development of the regions by a polycentric institutional market structure.

The aim of this study is to analyse which changes in planning theory will be required for what it concerns aims, means and institutions in order to sustain such polycentric development. Particular attention will be given to:

1. The strategic economic variables connecting the regions (at continental level: the EC - Mediterranean - Baltic) with each other. These variables are identified in the new technologies and international price system regulating strategic products.
2. The design of a new system of specialisation based on complementarity between needs and production within each region and among the regions.
3. The institutional frames required in order to plan such cooperation.

\*\*\*\*\*

Franco Archibugi  
Professor of Planning, University of Naples  
Director, the Planning Studies Centre  
Rome

### **Towards a New Discipline of Planning**

Towards a new "discipline" of planning, or a new "planning science" (or Planology). This is the direction in which *inter-disciplinary* collaborations, *trans-disciplinary* techniques, and *multidisciplinary* approaches, applied in many fields and "experiences" of planning, have been pushing for four decades. Initially a brief *excursus* of this will be done.

For the same four decades economists, sociologists, urban planners, project engineers, ecologists, geographers, and political scientists have met, and at times collided, in their different *fields* of application. These fields may be summarised as: a) *macro-economic planning* (predominantly at the national level, but also at regional level); b) *"social" planning* (ranging from social service projects to grand programmes for cultural advancement); c) *urban and environmental planning*; d) *planning public expenditure*; and e) *evaluation and design* of single investment projects.

Frustration and failure have been features of the experiences in all these fields, across the political and historical range from ex-communist states to the welfare states and developing countries.

Despite the development of inter-disciplinary cooperation in each of these fields of application a disciplinary culture has prevailed. Hence macro-economic planning has been dominated by economics and economists; social planning by social sciences and social scientists; urban and environmental planning by urban studies and urban planners; public spending by operational research, systems engineering, and related professionals; investment projects by economics and system sciences and managers; and so on.

Notwithstanding the predominance of one discipline in each field, the increasing inter-disciplinary collaboration in all the fields of planning mentioned above has led to the emergence of two distinguishable "moments" of the process: analysis and synthesis. The former is mainly concerned with disciplinary analytical competence (provided that it develops within adequate epistemological guidelines) and is based on "objective" knowledge. The latter, on the other hand is more concerned with "subjective" evaluation, and is accordingly further from objective knowledge. This is the moment that precedes and postulates the choice and decision.

The "moment" of synthesis, or evaluation, has long been considered within the reign of the decision-makers, that is those who are entitled to decide. However, the complexity of goals, phases, and levels with respect to which decisions are made, and knowledge of the inter-dependence of different decisions (this goes for the individual as well as group, national, and increasingly global human levels) has led to the development of support-techniques for decision-makers. These

serve to help the latter in their choices, and though they do not substitute decision-makers they clearly belong to the moment of synthesis or evaluation, and not that of disciplinary (scientific) analysis.

These techniques for the support of decision-making are often presented as "decision-making techniques", operational research, "praxiology", linear (and non-linear) programming, dynamic programming, systems analysis, cost-benefit analysis, or cost-effectiveness analysis, and can all be considered "evaluation techniques". They are all married to the original disciplines of the various fields of planning: economics, sociology, urban studies, etc., across the board, creating a kind of "*trans-discipline*".

Yet this trans-discipline, though applied in the various fields of planning to varying extents, has yet to lead to the creation of a common methodological framework. Thus these techniques have failed to transform themselves into one general methodology of planning.

It is notable that the various fields of actual planning are strongly influenced by the institutions carrying out planning. It is doubtful whether it can be possible to progress far towards methodological unification of the various disciplinary approaches under one trans-discipline of evaluation before planning institutions at national, local, micro- or macro-economic level free themselves of this one-sidedness, or one-facet approach.

Yet one should not exclude the possibility of steps toward the integration of the institutions of planning and of their "fields" being realised following the development of a clearer, well defined, disciplinary field of planning. Furthermore this could lead to clearer and better-defined education and developments within the planning profession, which today is still tied to the original disciplines.

As in the past, the relationship between scientific progress and institutional change is reciprocal. Here we are mainly concerned with the effects scientific progress in the area of developing a "unified approach to planning" may have upon the process of institutional change and improvement of implementation. This should ensure more stable operationality, and hence increased success rates, of planning.

The lines along which the research toward a new "discipline" of planning should develop will be indicated.

\*\*\*\*\*

Sergei S. Artobolevskiy  
Senior Research Fellow  
Dept. of Economics & Geography  
Institute of Geography  
The Russian Academy of Sciences

### **Regional policy in present Russia: The New Role of the State**

Traditional regional policy in USSR/Russia was part of economic activity of branch ministries (soviet monopolies). It has pure branch aims (not even macro-



economic) and support areas of concentration of separate industries. Such regional policy really increased spatial socio-economical variations.

Escape of the USSR, political and economic restructuring, general disorder were the end of this traditional regional policy. But at the same time all spatial problems became more acute, as well as situation in all problem regions (depressed old industrial and rural, underdeveloped, ecological etc.). But the answer of state was devolution: more and more rights were transferred to the hands of regional and local authorities (some were conquered by them). It is real danger that the place of industrial monopolies will be occupied by regional/local ones, which will pay no attention to state spatial problems. The result of such policy is disintegration of Russia, political disorder in some areas and so on.

Current pure liberal policy of government does not leave any space for regional policy (even economic, not saying about social of western type). But social problems, necessity to maintain the unity of Russia will lead to creation of real regional policy. Its scale will be limited because of lack of money in budget and opposition of population to any territorial redistribution of money. This new regional policy will be mainly social oriented. At the same time it will be economical regional policy, which will help advanced areas industrial exploitation of deposits etc. It will be better if these two regional policies be institutionally separated.

It saves time and money if new Russian regional policy will be based on western experience (especially EC). The first steps of this regional policy has to be monitoring of spatial problems and problem regions (and official delimitation of them), creation of institutional infrastructure. Groups of western specialists may participate in this work.

\*\*\*\*\*

Valery Babintzev  
Professor  
High Economic Council  
The Russian Federation

### **Techniques of Optimal Planning and the New Russian Economic System**

The entirely new economic situation in Russian Federation may be characterised as a transition period to a market economy. This situation demands application of relevant planning technique on different steps of this period. At the same time we have a set of methods and techniques of optimal planning, developed during several decades. The problem is to apply the methods and techniques and elaborate missing ones.

The paper discusses issues of assessment and application of the planning techniques, developed in the framework of socialist planning system, system of optimal planning of socialist economy, etc., for new conditions. Namely it deals with the problems of applications of forecasting techniques for national economy indicative planning, state planning techniques for planning in corporations, sector

planning techniques for planning in consortium, and so on. Utilisation of relevant planning techniques for the new economic system not only saves time and money for reconstruction of the planning system, but also more easier solving problems of planning on all levels of the national economy.

\*\*\*\*\*

Howell S. Baum  
Professor  
Dept. of Urban Studies and Planning  
University of Maryland at College Park

### **Community and Consensus: Reality and Fantasy in Planning**

The paper analyses a strategic planning process conducted by an American Jewish community organization. Formally, the process involved community members examining changes in their community and deciding on policies, organizational structures, and services to respond to the changes. Tacitly, the process involved conflict over community definitions.

Socially, Jews in the metropolitan area were divided by national origin, economic status, generation, and religious practice and affiliation. Should they be considered members of the same community? The community organization identified "the community" with its network of activities, offered itself as the community's "central address", and asserted "We are one".

Religious leaders challenged the centrality of the civil community organization and the oneness of the community. They asserted that synagogue membership was more important than participation in the community organization. They said that differences in religious affiliation and practice made "the community" both heterogeneous and multi-centered. Implicitly they argued that a Jewish community was primarily religious, rather than civil.

The community organization faced the test of ordering the planning process in a way that would be sufficiently inclusive as to legitimate its claims of being the community centre, without allowing the introduction of issues that would challenge the civil definition of the community or create such conflict as to vitiate the image of a single community with a centre.

The community organization emphasized making decisions by "consensus", a phrase that connoted unity. While "consensus" sometimes reflected broad agreement, it often resembled conventional political activity. Although the latter could produce apparently unanimous agreements, the reality of pressure politics created cynicism about decision-making and questions about the unity of "the community". The greatest challenge to "consensus" decision making involved conflicts over issues that some parties defined as civil and others defined as religious.

Not only did different groups want different policies, but they favored different methods for reaching decisions. Political and religious liberals promoted

"consensus" among pluralistic interests, with each point-of-view considered equally legitimate.

Religious conservatives insisted simply that decisions reflect their interpretation of the Old Testament.

This case study in the politics of community planning analyzes the different communities to which people belong and appeal. Planning favors an empirical analysis of differences among groups, and rational analysis is appropriate for identifying differences. Interest group politics is a way of negotiating priorities. However, the wish for security leads to imagining an ideal community, and fantasy is the vehicle for finding a safe, inclusive community.

\*\*\*\*\*

Robert A. Beauregard  
Professor of City and Regional Planning  
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs  
University of Pittsburgh

### **Theories and Techniques of Subnational Economic Development Planning in the United States**

The purpose of this paper is to present and evaluate the institutional constraints on planning theories and techniques within the realm of subnational economic development planning. The context for this investigation is the United States where, over the last two decades, state and local governments have become extensively involved in developing plans and programs for enhancing economic growth within their jurisdictions.

Despite a great deal of innovation in economic incentives, a large expansion in governmental funds devoted to such activities, and an obvious increase in the amount of research conducted, few instances exist where states or localities have engaged in inclusionary plan-making or utilized new techniques for analyzing subnational economies. Rather, subnational economic development policymaking tends generally to be highly fragmented, not well coordinated within jurisdictions, opportunistic, and volatile from one year to the next. Certainly, instances exist where states have focused their efforts (e.g. the Ben Franklin Partnership in Pennsylvania), regions have targeted specific industries (e.g. machine tools in Western Massachusetts), or localities have developed "plans" (e.g. Chicago, Philadelphia). These are, however, exceptions rather than common occurrences.

At the same time as techniques and plan making have been relatively stagnant, theoretical advances in how to understand subnational economic development have been minimal. Policymakers, for example, tout diversification but have weak arguments as to its benefits or how to achieve it. Business retention strategies are based on simplistic "stimulus-response" models in which businesses respond to any incentive which saves them money. At another level, the integration of subnational into national and global economies is not well understood. This makes

it even more difficult to develop theories which suggest how to enhance growth within the subnational arena.

What explains these weaknesses of technique and theory? Why is planning fragmented at best? The answers, I believe, lie mainly in the institutional settings which harbour subnational economic development policymaking. Those settings are highly politicised (leading to a heightened sensitivity to short term results). In addition, the tight boundaries drawn around the use of private property, the employment relation, and the channelling of capital investment further hinder governmental plan making. Finally, the uncertainty inherent to any economic development intervention (an uncertainty not due simply to the "private" nature of investment processes) undermines any long-term planning.

One must also ask why academic researchers have not addressed the need for more concerted and coordinated economic development initiatives, but have rather preferred to look at only specific programs or fragments of the subnational economy.

These themes will be explored by looking at subnational economic development policymaking as it appears in the United States at the state, county and municipal levels. Examples will be drawn from the literature and from interviews with economic development officials.

By looking at the intersection of planning technology and planning institutions, I hope to better understand the limits and opportunities for improved planning and policymaking within the realm of subnational economic development.

\*\*\*\*\*

Giuliano Bianchi  
European University Institute  
and IRES Toscana

### **Regional Planning: Requiem or Renaissance? Methodological Hints About Two Empirical Experiences of Regional Planning in Italy: Sicily and Tuscany**

Both global and project planning at regional scale proved to be rather ineffective, over the last three decades, in Italy: the former approach because of its "generality", the latter owing to its "specificity". Moreover many surveys about Italian regional planning experience demonstrate the overall existence of three weakness points within plan making and implementing processes: organization shortcomings, lack of ex ante evaluation methods, rough, if any, monitoring procedures.

A "new wave" of regional planning, currently in progress in Sicily and Tuscany, tries to overcome the difficulties above mentioned, aiming at embodying in planning exercises lessons stemming from a critical appraisal of past experience and opportunities supplied by some novelties of the new stream of European Community regional policies.

The paper illustrates Sicily and Tuscany case studies in order to draw some general methodological remarks.

### *Contents*

1. Regional planning in Italy: a brief critical rundown
2. A possible new approach for a viable regional planning
3. Regional planning structure: logical, functional and information models
4. Evaluation and monitoring within the planning processes: the need of appropriate model system
5. Trying to generalize Sicily and Tuscany experiences

\*\*\*\*\*

Sergio Boisier  
Director of Planning and Regional Policy  
The Latin American and Caribbean Institute for  
Economic and Social Planning of the UN  
Santiago  
Chile

### **Regional Management in the New International Order: Quasi-States and Quasi-Firms**

The purpose of this paper is to suggest a methodology for local (subnational: regional, communal, etc.) development *management* (not traditional planning) compatible with the international system and national development projects today. Achieving this goal means introducing new concepts concerning the region, its organization and its administration.

This paper is divided into four sections: i) The international scene at the end of the century: unipolarity and multipolarity; ii) Regional microcosms: individual and territory; iii) The regional macrocosm: organization and territory; iv) Thus spake Zarathustra: planning is dead.

The first section describes the new world order based on the coexistence of a global single-axis political system (United States of America) and a global triple-axis economic system (first, Canada, the United States and Mexico; second, the European Economic Community (EEC); and, third, Japan).

This new world order was formed in part as a by-product of a larger phenomenon: the globalization of the international economy. This phenomenon was accompanied, moreover, by a set of decentralizing megatrends. As a whole, the forces today assign *organized territories* (regions, etc.) and active role in world-wide competition.

Understanding new ways in which regions can integrate internationally in a globalized, interdependent and deregulated world means rethinking the very definition of the regional concept and its forms of internal organization and management.

*Identity* and *culture* become basic building blocks of these new concepts.

The second section of the paper in fact discusses the relationship between individual and territory in the context of the crisis of modern rationality.

Modern man's renewed sense of "territoriality" or "return to his home turf" has been prompted in part by the collapse of the Welfare State and the major social support structures that characterized it, which now increases the tendency to feel solidarity with *local areas*. In part, too, in this crisis of modern rationality, with its explosion of heterogeneity and diversity, local territory has emerged as the synthesis between alienation and individuality.

The crisis of the modern age has been interpreted as a conflict between "territory and function" or between the universal "code" and the specific "territorial anticode".

The third section introduces the concepts of "quasi-State" and "quasi-firm" as two basic pillars, one political and the other managerial, which establish the parameters of a modern regional vision.

The region as *quasi-State* ("quasi" in the sense of shortfall) is the product of the implementation of political and territorial decentralization policies which make regions into autonomous entities.

The region as *quasi-firm* ("quasi" in the sense of excess) is the product of applying strategic corporate planning criteria to the management of regional development, rather than becoming mired in the concepts of traditional public-sector planning of decades past.

*Identity* and, as a consequence, *culture*, are again surfacing as key elements in this regional thinking.

The fourth section of this paper describes at some length a methodological proposal on regional development management. It proposes using a systemic methodology that would lead to the preparation of genuine *regional political projects*, based on consensus and therefore involving considerable social participation. The role of regional development "agents" is highlighted in the proposal, which is based on the premise that regional development hinges more on collective attitudes and forms of social governance than on material resources.

\*\*\*\*\*

Richard S. Bolan  
Professor  
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs  
University of Minnesota

### **Institutional Design for Planning: Lessons from Central and Eastern Europe**

The nations of Central and Eastern Europe are seeking to move through a process of radical and rapid social change - moving from communist, one party centrally planned societies to democratic, free-market societies. Almost three years have passed since these processes surfaced and the peaceful revolutions were completed. The road has been very difficult, but lessons for the issues of

institutional design have already surfaced. This paper will explore these lessons, using a theoretical framework of structuration derived from Giddens. Transitional problems focus clearly on traditional sociological issues of legitimation and socialization but also give rise to deeper problems steeped in dialectical categories and ambiguities suggesting potential interesting illuminations of the inherent inner contradictions of structuration processes. The presentation will conclude with an examination of the implications of these problems for how societies can incorporate effective planning mechanisms into institutional frameworks.

\*\*\*\*\*

Marios Camhis  
Head of Division  
Directorate General for Regional Policies  
Commission of the European Communities  
Brussels

### **Perspectives of the Development of the European Community's Territory: The Operation "Europe 2000"**

The document *"EUROPE 2000": Outlook for the development of the Community's territory* has been prepared under the authority of the Commissioner for regional policies. This does not mean that it deals with regional development as such. Community's regional development policy renewed under the reform of the structural funds of 1988 covers only one part of the territory. It is designed to assist three types of areas: the less developed regions (covering about 40% of the Community's area and 20% of the population), the zones of industrial decline (15% of population) and the areas of rural development (5% of the population). They receive about 38, 7 and 3 BECU respectively for the period 1989-1993 for their economic development.

Europe 2000 is a complementary action, it is not about direct assistance to less favoured areas. It is an attempt to look at the factors which shape the organisation and structure of the European territory as a whole and the trends for the next decade and beyond. It aims at contributing to a more balanced and harmonious development of this territory.

- Why did the Commission embark in such an operation?
- What is the nature of such a reflection on the use and the development of the Community's territory?
- What procedures did we follow in its preparation?
- What does the document contain? Which are the issues raised?
- Where do we go from here?

This paper will try to address these questions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mario Centorrino  
Professor of Economics  
Faculty of Political Science  
University of Messina

### **An Instrument for Optimal Foreign Trade Policies: The Trade-Gap Analysis**

Optimal foreign trade policy requires the implementation of measures effectively addressed to efficient international specialization.

Foreign trade policies usually consist of incentives for exporting firms intended to lower transaction costs and to favour the penetration of domestic production inside foreign markets. However, optimal planning should imply a two-step procedure, aimed:

- a) to identify an efficient domestic international productive specialization model;
- b) to find proper measures addressed to individual productive sectors according to specific needs.

For example, it will be *inefficient* to stimulate investment for a manufacturing industry showing a good export performance associated to a productive surplus - what requires *commercial* rather than *investment* policies.

The trade-gap analysis, based on the joint evaluation of sectoral foreign trade and of the degree of utilization of productive capacity, offers a simple tool to evaluate domestic international specialization dynamics and to identify specific intervention measures needed by individual sectors.

Our paper introduces trade-gap analysis and proposes it as a guide-line for optimal planning, presenting a specific application to Sicilian foreign trade in the late '80s.

\*\*\*\*\*

Hector Correa  
Professor  
Graduate School of Public and  
International Affairs  
University of Pittsburgh

### **An Approach to the Operational Integration of the Technical and Political Aspects of Planning**

The objective of the paper is to present a model to maximize the implementability of a plan taking into consideration a) the social elaboration and b) the socio-political constraints determined by the motivations of the actors playing roles in the planning process (planning actors). As far as possible, a concrete form of the model will be included as an example. For this, data from actual planning processes, mainly in Latin American Countries, will be used.



Planning is characterized as a process in which its actors, i.e., the persons playing the roles of representatives of interest groups, government policy makers, public administrators and technical planners, perform decision making, technical, implementation and control functions.

The analysis has three main components:

- a) the characterization of a technical plan;
- b) the construction of an index of implementability of a plan based on the support or opposition to the implementation of the plan of its actors and on their power to achieve their objectives; and
- c) the integration of the components in a) and b) in the optimization model.

The main output of the technical function is a technical plan characterized as a set of input-output relationships, which can be expressed as a set of mathematical functions in which changes in the inputs generate changes in the outputs. The inputs generate social costs and the output social benefits. A technical plan suggests courses to maximize net social benefits.

A key problem in a planning process is that costs and benefits are not evenly distributed in a society, and, as a consequence, a plan that maximizes social benefits might not be implemented because the interest groups that receive the benefits lack the power to overcome the opposition of the groups that pay its costs.

The index of support or opposition and power of the planning actors is based on a combination of ideas used in the method of political analysis called PRINCE<sup>1</sup> and in the economics of public choice.

The points of departure in the construction of this index are a) the assumption that the planning actors behave in agreement with the principles of economic rationality, i.e., each one of them attempts to maximize their personal satisfaction, and b) the identification of the objectives that each one of those actors have.

Once the personal objectives that motivate each one of the actors in a planning process are identified they can be related to the costs and benefits that the implementation of a plan generates. With this it is possible to derive indices of the degree of support or opposition that the actors have to that implementation. The construction of these indices is based on the methods of analytic hierarchy processes<sup>2</sup>.

The relationships between the indices of support or opposition to the implementation of a plan and its costs and benefits take the form of mathematical functions that can be estimated from statistical data.

The influence of the support or opposition of each planning actor on the implementability of a plan depends on the power that he/she has to impose his/her preferences on the other actors. Indices of the power of the different actors can also be constructed using the methods of analytic hierarchy.

Combining the indices of support or opposition to the implementation of a plan, and of power of its actors, it is possible to construct an index of the implementability of a plan. This index aggregates the intensity of support or opposition and the power of the different actors. The methods for its constructions are also based on the methods of analytic hierarchy.

Since a) the index of implementability of a plan is a function of the indices of support or opposition and power of the different actors and b) the indices of support or opposition are functions of the costs and benefits of the technical plan, it follows that the index of implementability is a function of the costs and benefits of the plan. As a consequence it is possible to analyse the values that the costs and benefits of a plan should have in order to maximize its implementability. In this analysis attention must be paid to the input-output relationships that link the costs and benefits of a plan and that are the basis of its technical component.

---

<sup>1</sup> Coplin W. D. and M. K. O'Leary, 1976, *Everyman's Prince: A guide to understanding your political problems* - Revised edition, Duxbury Press, North Scituate, Mass.

<sup>2</sup> Saaty T., 1980, *The analytic hierarchy process: planning, setting priorities, resource allocation*, McGraw Hill, New York.

\*\*\*\*\*

Tarcisio Della Senta  
Professor, Planning and Development Division  
United Nations University (Tokyo)

### **Planning in Global Framework: Theory and Practice of Planning in Global Setting**

The paper will present a "critique" of the assumptions underlying the practice, and an analysis of planning in institutions with a global mandate. The United Nations University will be taken as a case in point for such analysis. The paper will focus on the process of planning and its functioning in the organizational structure, as well as on its involvement in decision-making, management and evaluation.

\*\*\*\*\*

Yehezkel Dror  
Professor of Public Administration  
Department of Political Science  
The Hebrew University  
Jerusalem

### **Planning in the 21st Century**

This paper is predicated on the thesis that radical changes, up to jumps, are needed in planning as a discipline, profession, and study (not science, though based in part on scientific knowledge and approaches). Viewing "planning" as one of the modalities and grounding of policymaking which is characterized by 1) long range perspectives and 2) coherent look on broad sets of issues, this paper presents twenty one principles ("technologies" being too narrow a term), concluding with some points on institutional implications.

In essence, this paper applies to planning the works of the author on policymaking improvement, being also related to a Club of Rome report on which the author is working on "Governance for the 21st Century".

\*\*\*\*\*

Andreas Faludi  
Professor of Planning  
Institute of Planning and Demography  
University of Amsterdam

### **Dutch Planning Doctrine: The Social Construction of a Planners' Paradise**

In terms of the matrix, my proposed paper relates to the national and to some extent the sub-national level of planning; to fundamentals in relation to theories and methodology; and to a country where planning is highly institutionalised, (what you might call 'structured').

\*\*\*\*\*

John Forester  
Professor  
Department of City and Regional Planning  
Cornell University

### **Perception, Political Judgment and Learning about Value In Transport Planning: Bridging Habermas and Aristotle**

Current views of neo-Aristotelian rationality suggest that we must recognize the ways that planners deliberate not only about (appropriate!) means but also about inevitably multiple, ambiguous, and conflicting "ends" and norms (responsibilities, obligations, mandates, goals, and so on). Analyses of rationality, as James March has argued within decision theory, can no longer be silent about this exploration of ambiguity. Analyses of practical judgement, as Martha Nussbaum has argued, must illuminate the perceptive appreciation of value – the ways we learn about value as well as about "facts". This paper will explore the ways planners must, can, and at times do learn about value in their everyday work – theoretically bridging Aristotelian perception and Habermasian justification in an account of rationality and practical judgement in planning.

\*\*\*\*\*

John Friedmann  
Professor of Planning, Urban Planning Program  
UCLA Los Angeles

## **Educating the Next Generation of Planners**

My project is an immodest one. I want to design an educational setting that will prepare the planners we shall need over the next 30 to 50 years. Four decades ago, when I worked for a while as Harvey Perloff's research assistant at the now defunct planning program at the University of Chicago, we wrote down our experience with that program. The chapter would become the centrepiece of Perloff's *Education for Planning*.

Now it is time for another look. I don't propose to go over the old ground again. Still, the Perloff book is, so to speak, my point of departure. It influenced the education of two generations of planners as no other writing has done.

In my paper I outline a new, non-Euclidean understanding of planning and stress the innovative, normative and entrepreneurial roles of the professional planner.

\*\*\*\*\*

Robert Scott Gassler  
Professor of Economics and Business Administration  
Ursinus College, Pennsylvania

## **Non-profit Economics and Planning Science**

In a letter from the Planning Studies Centre, I was asked to submit a paper "putting into relief the relations existing between the planning process (at whatever level) and the institution of the 'non-profit' sector". The paper will assess three sets of the contributions made by planning science: to economic research on the non-profit sector, to management of non-profit organizations, and to public policy toward the non-profit sector. The focus will be primarily on the USA, because of my previous experience there, but it will also include references to the literature from other areas: Europe, the ex-socialist countries and developing countries.

The paper is located in the framework in the following way: technology dimension; economics; institutional dimension; how it should be; territorial scale dimension; comparative national scale.

\*\*\*\*\*

Harald Hagemann  
Professor, Institut Fuer Volkswirtschaftslehre  
Universitaet Hohenheim  
Stuttgart

## **On Some Macroeconomic Consequences of German Unification**

I have suggested a paper on Macroeconomic Problems of German Unification because I thought that it would fit into your program. In the information leaflet I received from your Planning Studies Centre on page 3 the "territorial scale" and "ex-socialist countries" were explicitly mentioned, of which the former GDR is a special case. The current economic problems in East Germany are quite topical, although more in a negative sense - due to a lack of macroeconomic planning.

In the paper I want to address the following topics:

- Wages, employment and productivity
- West Germany after 1948 and East Germany after 1990; analogies and differences
- Growth and structural change, i.e. the long-run perspectives of the East German economy
- Some international consequences of German unification.

Emphasis, in general, will be on economic policy, i.e. public controls in a democratic society in the sense of Adolph Lowe. According to Lowe the main issue is the question of whether the market system of late capitalism is endowed with a self-regulating mechanism capable of achieving compensation by the uncontrolled actions of private consumers and producers, or whether public intervention is necessary in order to counter destabilizing tendencies that an uncontrolled market is likely to create. This holds in particular for transition processes of ex-socialist economies.

\*\*\*\*\*

Patsy Healey  
Professor, Department of Town and Country Planning  
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne

## **In Search of Democracy; New Ways of Using Old Tools; the Form and Content of Development Plans**

In the traditional approaches to land use planning, development plans were conceived in terms of sets of rules for realising specific organising principles (urban design, economic development). In the 1960s, the plan was re-conceptualised as a vehicle for articulating policy principles to guide the management of environmental change.

Both approaches have been discredited. This has tended to discredit more generally the idea of planning and certainly of plans. The reaction has been a "retreat" to projects, with policy principles articulated, if at all, through discussion of individual projects and their impacts. This approach is now in turn criticised for the lack of a strategic view of processes of urban and environmental change.

Is there a way to recover the role of development plans? The paper will explore what plans may be for and how they may be produced where the agenda for managing urban change emphasises economic development, environmental

sustainability and social inclusion, and where the requirement is for policy processes which reflect the demands for transparency and empowerment associated with movements for democratic pluralism.

\*\*\*\*\*

Stuart Holland  
Professor of Economics, Department of Economics  
The European University Institute (Florence)

### **Planning and the Mixed Economy**

Leading European economies, Japan and newly industrialising countries such as South Korea have undertaken a range of agreements negotiated with leading firms. These included "contrats de programme" and later "contrats de plan" and "contrats de regions" in France; "contrattazione programmatica" and "contratti di piano" in Italy, and a series of "contrats de gestion", "contrats prototypes" in Belgium. In Japan the bargaining process with the big business "keiretsu" has been undertaken by the Ministry of International Trade and Industry on an informal but extensive basis. South Korea has been signing up to as many annual contracts with foreign multinational firms as there are days in the year.

The paper proposes an analytic framework for evaluation of these otherwise apparently disparate experiences. They all concern large multinational companies in either the public or the private sector. In practice these constitute a mesoeconomic sector between smaller micro firms and macroeconomic aggregates. All of the policies have been designed to reconcile some aspects of divergence between external costs and internal benefits through the free working of the market: e.g. long-term investment projects which otherwise would not have met private criteria for internal rates of return, the promotion of R&D and innovation, diversification from traditional to modern sectors, countering oligopolistic pricing, or the promotion of regional development.

The paper argues that such planning by agreement with the mesoeconomic sector constitutes a key but under-recognised success of the functioning of the mixed economy, with considerable potential for the reforming economies in their transition to a market system.

\*\*\*\*\*

Yasuo Katumura  
Economic Advisor  
Economic Planning Agency  
Tokyo

## **Economic Planning in a Market Economy**

### **The Japanese Experience in the Economic Planning and its International Implication**

The Japanese economic planning is one good example of indicative planning in a market economy.

The character and scope of the Japanese economic planning have changed significantly through 50 years, from fairly simple pursuits of economic recovery and growth in a small country to economic and social programs of a complicated large country. Policy priority shifted from economic efficiency to improvement of people's life. In this line, the government approved a new Five Year Plan this summer.

The role of the economic planning in Japan is generally understood to be 1) to present a medium- and long-term economic outlook, 2) to announce the basic policy directions of the government and 3) to provide systematic information to the general public. But the government's role to implement policies are gradually changing.

As to the effectiveness of the economic planning there are some debates, but it is considered to have had positive effects by reducing uncertainties and providing extensive information, thus supporting steady economic growth.

Japan had an experience of transforming itself from the wartime controlled economy to an open market economy. This experience might be suggestive to the economies in transition. Also, introduction of indicative planning may be helpful to these economies.

Since many Asian countries have indicative planning, communication with them will be fruitful.

Finally, the international saving-investment relation can be an interesting subject to be tackled from a longer-term point of view.

\*\*\*\*\*

Vladimir Kollontai  
Professor, The International Institute of World Economics  
The Russian Federation

### **Some Specifics of Economic Reform in Russia**

The transition from centralized planning to a regulated market economy is a totally unprecedented process; its numerous specifics have to be spelled out and the relevant policy conclusions drawn. Of special importance, as points of departure, are the existing high levels of industrialization, division of labor, complex interdependencies, as well as alienation, lack of market experience and infrastructures, precarious state of the life support system in the former socialist countries. Ratios between major economic indicators (micro and macro-economic structures, material goods and financial flows, etc.) are very different from those established under normal market conditions. Various profound structural gaps and

imbalances have to be overcome. This creates numerous new transitional problems, which demand conscious intervention and a pre-planned interaction between spontaneous market forces and state activities. A growing importance in the transition period is acquired by such non-economic factors as legitimacy of market and private property relations, social cohesion and various aspects of governance. These problems are discussed in detail in the proposed paper.

\*\*\*\*\*

Antoni Kuklinski  
Professor, European Institute for Regional and Local Development  
University of Warsaw

## **The Future of Strategic Planning in Central and Eastern Europe**

### *I. The deficit of prognostic studies and strategic planning in Central and Eastern Europe*

The revolutionary changes and difficulties in the process of creation of a new system in Central and Eastern Europe *ex necessitate rei* concentrate attention of the government and other public institutions on short-term issues. The pressures of the present day almost eliminate the interest for strategic and prognostic studies. This phenomenon should be evaluated in the negative way because such studies are necessary to develop appropriate policies in the different spheres of reality.

The deficit or even absence of long-term thinking in Central and Eastern Europe have dramatic negative implications.

### *II. The negative legacy of chaotic planning in Central and Eastern Europe*

The ideology and practice of planning were very strong in the conditions of real socialism. But that planning was of a very low quality - it was a kind of chaotic planning to use the terminology of Prof. Hans Willgerodt of the University of Cologne.

The fascination with *laissez faire* and the psychological image of chaotic planning have created a serious barrier for the development of long-term thinking in Central and Eastern Europe.

### *III. The new careful planning in Central and Eastern Europe*

To use again the terminology of Hans Willgerodt, in Central and Eastern Europe we need a new system of careful planning as an instrument to promote development of the new market economy.

The global experiences in this field should be analysed very carefully in this context.



#### *IV. A new network of strategic planning in Central and Eastern Europe*

The conference in Palermo should be seen as an inducement to create a new network of institutions in the field of strategic planning in Central and Eastern Europe.

\*\*\*\*\*

Wassily Leontief  
Professor of Economics,  
New York University, Nobel Prize

#### **World Environment Planning: What to do and how to do it**

The world community has by now become convinced that the physical well-being of men, women and children and, as a matter of fact, of all other living beings is bound to be greatly and in many instances irreversibly impaired unless drastic measures are taken both in the developed and in the less developed countries to protect the environment from degradation brought about by expansion, or even maintenance of present levels and present methods of production.

With the steadily increasing interdependence between all parts of the world economy actions benefiting the great majority of interested parties can, however, be expected to cause pain to some. It is not surprising that people whose employment, income, comfort, or just pleasures might be negatively affected by adoption of this or that protective measure object - often quite vehemently - to it.

In the ensuing debate each side cites facts and figures supporting its position and tends to neglect the, possibly, equally, relevant evidence presented by the other side.

The plan of action finally agreed upon will necessarily represent a compromise between, to some extent, competing interests of different countries and even different interest groups within each country.

Such compromise can be best attained by comparison of alternative scenarios. Each of these different scenarios should describe as accurately, and as objectively as possible the effects of one particular combination of rules and regulations that while protecting the environment from progressive degradation would secure normal operation and sustainable growth of the economies of all developed and less developed countries.

What is involved in this task is not unconditional prediction of development of all parts of the world economy but realistic mapping of several alternative paths that they could actually follow.

Twenty years ago the United States initiated work on a projection of the "*Future of the World Economy*", with emphasis on the possibility to reducing the discrepancy between accelerating the growth rates of the developed and less developed countries. After five years of hard, and incidentally relatively well-financed, research its results were published in 1978. Now similar worldwide economic projection, however, with special emphasis on prevention of

environmental disruption is being prepared again under the auspices of the United Nation.

Under condition of rapidly expanding international trade the economic interdependence between different countries the substitution of one type of fuel, of for example, of one primary material for another in one country can affect the economic prospects or other countries. Moreover, rivers, oceans, streams and winds do not respect national borders. Hence, different governments will have to coordinate their action so as to secure for each country the possibility of sustainable economic growth, that would endanger neither its own or any other country's environment. Creation of a common database will be indispensable for successful negotiation of such an agreement.

One of the most important steps should be the decision on the ways and means that would enable the ecologists, economists, engineers, and other experts now working on these problems in different countries to join hands in carrying out that challenging task.

\*\*\*\*\*

Sumner Levine

Professor

Former Editor-in-chief of "Socio-Economic Planning Sciences Journal"

State University of New York and Nortech Associates

### **Thoughts on the Planning of Technological Development**

A country's potential for technological innovation and development depends on a variety of cultural, economic, and political factors. In this report we compare the role of these factors on the technological development of Japan, the USA, and Western Europe. To facilitate the analysis a triphasic representation modelling each region will be discussed.

The following topics will be explored among others:

- the positive and negative aspects of group versus individualistic culturations;
- the consequences of profit vs. market shares maximation;
- the effects of trade and tax policies;
- the impact of government involvement, particularly with respect to taxes and trade policies;
- the policy implications of this analysis on planning technology will be developed.

\*\*\*\*\*

Dalia Lichfield

Dalia Lichfield Associates, Urban and Environment Planning

London

## **Effect of Land Use Zoning on Planning Technology: A Comparison in Four Countries**

Prior to World War I Palestine was part of the Turkish Empire. As such it had no town planning institutions. This changed on the victory of the British in 1917, which led to their Mandate Government. This immediately introduced, with considerable effect, town planning for Jerusalem and, in the 1930's, for the whole country.

For this countrywide system the Mandate adopted that practised in Britain under the Town and Country Planning Act, 1932. In essence this involved "town planning schemes" which regulated by zoning ordinances the use of specific parcels of land, carrying with it distinctive features of legal rights in the land, rigidity of plans, slowness in review and change.

The need for change in this system was recognised on the setting up of the State of Israel in 1948. But although some 17 Bills for the change in the law were introduced in the Knesset over the ensuing years, it was not until 1965 that an Israeli Planning and Building Act became law. However, except for the introduction of sectoral planning at the national level, the system of the 1965 law echoed strongly that of the 1936 Town Planning Ordinance introduced by the British from England. However the British had by then transformed their own pre-World War II planning system into the development planning system of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947, which introduced many revolutionary changes. For example, development values were nationalised, so that restrictions on land use and development carried no compensation to the owners; the form of planning was intended to be flexible so that changes were much more readily seen.

The result was a considerable anomaly. Britain, a fully developed country in its post-industrial age, threw off the restrictive zoning system for a development planning system, which was capable of being used for dynamic change. In contrast, Israel, which in 1948 was not a developed country, with only a colonial type urbanisation in its coastal areas (Haifa, Tel Aviv), faced with dramatic immigration and urbanisation, had to cope with a system geared to the static conditions of pre-World War I Britain. This law in turn affected the governmental machinery set up to administer the planning. In essence, considerable tension has resulted between the needs of the country to achieve full development and urbanisation, within an institutional framework completely unsuited for the purpose. It is here that parallels with the United States also emerge: possibly the most dynamic growth in the whole world achieved with a planning system which originated in the 1920's and is still fundamentally unchanged.

Against this background the paper will explore the implications for the growth and development of Israel since the foundation of the State by needing to utilise the institutional framework introduced when it was administered under Mandate by the colonial power of Britain.

These tensions have been well recognised in Israeli practice over the years and efforts made by the practitioners to overcome them, including by Dalia and Nathaniel Lichfield in their consultancy practice in Israel, introducing development plans and a method of more discretionary development control.

More recently they have been appointed by the Ministry of the Interior (responsible for town planning) to continue earlier work by proposing changes in the institutions which would liberate Israeli planning from its restrictions. This paper will make reference to the approach.

\*\*\*\*\*

Nathaniel Lichfield  
Professor Emeritus of the Economics of Environmental Planning  
University of London  
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd  
Development Planning Urban Design Economics  
London

### **Planning and the Environment: Institutions for Sustainable Development**

#### *Focus*

Within the overall context of the Conference, this paper has the following focus:

- planology: art and science of urban and regional/environmental planning in Britain
- theme: past, present, and future integration of the urban and regional/environmental planning
- issue: relationship in this evolution between technology and the institutions
- institutions: law and machinery which sets up the planning system for coping with the planology on behalf of the public
- purpose: to trace the historical evolution as a pointer to the future.

#### *Outline*

What is today called "environmental protection" originated in the middle of the nineteenth century as a reaction to the squalid conditions in the newly mushrooming urban areas following the first industrial revolution. These conditions led to a series of legal measures covering various aspects of public health (sanitation, atmospheric pollution, rivers).

These in effect tackled the polluting consequences of growth. They gave rise to the recognition in the early twentieth century of the parallel need to do so by planning the urban development in advance. It was the evolution of the planning system set up in 1909, which represents the vastly changed contemporary British planning system.

From its early days, the planning system was concerned with the "environment" (open space, sanitary conditions, amenity, historic buildings etc). This somewhat modest concern was overtaken with the explosion of the wider concerns for the environment and the natural resource concerns which arose in the mid-twentieth century (Club of Rome, United Nations Stockholm Conference, United States National Environment Protection Act). But despite the ties between

the two streams, the institutions which were set up have been kept separate. But they are co-ordinated in practice so that their separate concerns have some degree of integration.

### *Policy*

The contemporary scene is raising many questions such as:

- how can integration be improved?
- how did the separate fields influence each other?
- what modifications are required in the law to cope with the integrations?
- what modifications are required in the institutions to do so?

### *Conclusion*

The paper will draw conclusions about directions for the future.

\*\*\*\*\*

Seymour J. Mandelbaum  
Professor, Dept. of City and Regional Planning  
University of Pennsylvania

## **Communitarian Sensibilities and the Design of Communities**

Communitarianism is a philosophic arrow. When we seek guidance to resolve difficult ethical dilemmas in concrete cases or to justify the patterns of our ordinary choices, the marker points us away from abstract principles grounded in the nature of Man or the Right. It directs us, instead, to inquire into the practices and understanding of a community and to ground our moral life within them.

Like every such arrow, communitarianism creates around it a world of moral difficulties: are all communities deserving of respect? in a field of overlapping and internally conflicted communities, which norms are morally compelling? How may we invent and alter communities to express our ethical choices? Brought to bear upon the noisy street of practical politics, the marker loses its sharp declarative point and becomes, instead, a set of loosely coupled sensibilities: diverse positions are enrolled under a common flag without resolving their philosophical differences.

The paper will explicate the often ambiguous terms of these sensibilities, shaping a critical perspective that may be brought to bear upon the practices of community design at many different scales: the EC, a neighbourhood in Palermo, a hospital ward.

In the setting of this conference, I particularly expect to explore the ways in which communitarian sensibilities realign our ordinary professional conception of the instrumental justification of planning technologies. Experience in the diffusion of both substantive and procedural planning innovations has taught us to appreciate that whether technologies work efficiently or effectively may or may not be important. The "fit" of innovative planning technologies is, however, always vital to those who adopt them and those who feel their impact. Sensibly

interpreting even the most severe formal technologies as institutions, they are bound to wonder whether the innovations express the moral order of the community in which they are implanted; whether they affirm the ordinary intuitions of members of the community or challenge them; whether the change can be institutionalized without a communal revolution.

\*\*\*\*\*

Luigi Mazza  
Professor of Urban Planning  
Editor of "Planning Theory"  
Dipartimento di Scienze del Territorio  
Politecnico di Milano

### **An Exercise in Re-constructing a Planning Tool, Second Thoughts on Italian Land-Use Planning**

The occupation and ordering of space, which during the last century characterized urban growth, have been legitimated by land-use planning. The plan was a tool for legitimating both obligation to traditions and exclusion (without which expansion would not have been developed), and choices of projects competing for steering expansion. When space is entirely occupied and infrastructured, what was once perceived as a void also becomes a place and land-use processes meet a new conflict: expansion clashes with place resistance. Expansion encounters something more abstract than a void space; it encounters the description of the place which is the premise of place conservation and at the same time the acknowledgement of the needs and opportunities of place transformation.

The key issue is no longer the choice between alternative expansion projects, but between expansion and conservation. Consensus which once supported expansion is lacking, and is secured by exclusion. The fall in consensus breaks the screen of planning and, due to deregulation experience, expansion faces a dilemma: the freedom of action without plan constraints versus the guarantee of rights and legitimation of choices which only a formal planning system can give. An attempt to solve this dilemma is based on the separation of expansion and conservation within the plan and the appointment of description as the term of reference of choices. Value structures, on the basis of which expansion and conservation projects are produced and discussed, are made explicit with reference to description, then description is the field where the new relationship between expansion and exclusion is played.

The discussion of projects is a political and technical debate which results in choices. Formal legitimation of choices, traditionally given by conformance to the plan, is now given by the procedural "rule" which govern the debate. Description and the rule are the new "plan" produced by our exercise. Choice and legitimation are released from a comprehensive prevision and lead to the comparison with our modes of perceiving from a comprehensive prevision and lead to the comparison

with our modes of perceiving and describing the reality, and our strategies of change. Legitimation is no longer given by the plan, it is given approving project justifications. Unlike traditional planning practice, in the hypothetical process political-technical legitimation and formal legitimation coincide. In this perspective there are neither "optimal" and privileged proposals, i.e. traditional plans, nor a privileged proponent, the state. Expansion and conservation projects face each other openly and are judged on the basis of reasons.

\*\*\*\*\*

Alex Michalos  
Editor, "Social Indicators Research"  
University of Guelph, Ontario

### **What Every Planner Should Know about Measuring the Quality of Life**

In democratic societies, it is reasonable to expect planners to obtain some direct input from people whose lives will be affected by the plans if the latter become implemented. So decisions must be made regarding how to obtain such input, whom to ask, who to do the asking, using what procedure, what technology and what methodology. There are many more questions than answers; but it is possible to formulate some general principles for all practitioners based on the research literature of the past 20 years on quality of life and social indicators. This paper will review some of the literature and formulate some useful principles.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jonathan A. Morell  
Dr., Editor "Evaluation and Program Planning"  
Industrial Technology Institute  
Ann Arbor

### **Integrating Technological Change into Planning: the Case for an Interdisciplinary Perspective**

Technological change affects the personal lives of populations, and the economic viability of industries, regions and nations. That change occurs within a complex political, economic and social context, and must be understood within that context. To be effective, planners must understand how technology may develop, and how it may affect larger scale planning efforts. Issues to be considered include the likelihood of radical technological change; the impact of incremental improvement in technology; relations among government, technology developers, and end-users; and the norms of society concerning the acceptable uses of technology.

This presentation will discuss relevant issues with regard to technology planning, and outline a methodology, which will help planners systematically consider technological change.

\*\*\*\*\*

Peter Nijkamp  
Professor, Department of Economics and Econometrics  
The Free University of Amsterdam

### **The Changing Role of Governments: the End of Planning History?**

In this paper recent mega trends in roles of governments will be outlined, leading to the question whether there is a case for planning at all. The era of deregulation, decentralisation, and privatisation, followed by the collapse of centrally planned systems, has provoked far-reaching issues on the tasks of modern governments at all levels (local, regional, national, international).

After a sketch of current trends (with a specific focus on physical planning and transportation planning) the principal justifications for an active role of government in planning are reviewed, viz. *abatement of market failures and achievement of ethical goals or social values*.

It is conjectured that a focus on *mission planning* is a sine qua non for maintaining the posture of planning as a necessary condition for balanced and effective policy-making.

\*\*\*\*\*

Efim Nisevich  
Professor, Institute of Economics  
The Russian Academy of Sciences

### **Some Theoretical and Practical Problems of Planning Institutions Redesign in Russian Federation**

During many decades while the centralized planning system was in action in the former Soviet Union, planning theory was elaborated and planning organisations were developed all over the country.

Unfortunately, the foundation of the theory was of ideological character and planning institutions were designed as a hierarchy vertical.

The paper discusses some theoretical and practical problems connected with the change in planning techniques as a result of transfer to the market economy. Problems of indicative planning of the national economy, state programmes planning, planning in public domain are under discussion. Planning in public domain is considered from the point of view of that share of public property will be shortened as a result of the privatisation programme implementation.



Problems of reconstruction of planning systems on enterprise level (state, municipal, private ownership) are under analysis. Special emphasis is made on saving information (statistics etc.) the planning institutions have at their disposal as a basis for planning activities.

\*\*\*\*\*

Barnett R. Parker  
Professor, Editor-in-chief "Socio-Economic Planning Sciences"  
Dept of Health Policy and Administration  
Univ. of North Carolina on Chapel Hill

### **Ensuring a Responsive Health Care Planning Function in Emerging Regions of the World**

In their furious efforts to achieve "Health For All by the Year 2000," developing country governments at the national and sub-national levels are now confronting problem phenomena that have long plagued governments in more developed regions. These phenomena include demographic shifts, increased population mobility, the rising cost of more sophisticated medical technologies, increased emphasis on preventive care, increasing competition, and critical shortages of selected health care professionals.

The success of a government in supplying appropriate health services to its population under such dynamic environmental conditions requires the design of technologies/strategies that are at once population-responsive, technically effective, and logistically feasible. This paper develops a multi-disciplinary approach to the design of health planning strategies that best satisfy these criteria. In this regard, the approach appreciates the generally limited technical support levels and planning infrastructures found in less developed regions while recognizing the fundamental importance in such regions of cultural, ethnic, and religious diversities.

Examples are given, together with a discussion of model sensitivity analysis.

\*\*\*\*\*

Giorgio Piccinato  
President of the Association of European Schools of Planning  
Professor Dept. of Urban Planning  
The University Institute of Architecture  
Venice

### **Reconsidering Planning for Historic Centres**

1. The changing image of historic centres: from obstacles to modernization to objects of desire.

2. The dilemma of conservation vs. incorporation in the overall urban dynamics: threats to physical assets or social transformation?
3. Public planning and private strategies in urban change and development: how special is the case of historic centres?
4. All cities are historic (but some more so than others).

\*\*\*\*\*

Stanislav Pirogov  
 Deputy Director, Institute of Economics  
 The Russian Academy of Sciences  
 The Russian Federation

### **Nature of Planning Systems and Contradictions of their Practical Use**

Retrospective analysis of originating and developing of planning systems of economy witnesses a contradictory character of this process. Practical use of scientific principles of centralised planning of national economy experiences flights and falls. Understanding of reasons of these events gives the correlation of economic and political logic. Most of all it is seen during the economic and political reform of the end of the 80s - the beginning of the 90s in the countries of social system.

Practice shows that at the beginning of the reforms in Russia a distinct development of rejection of achievements of the planning system of the economy and transfer to priorities of principles of self-regulation in economic behaviour of market persons. For the economic system this can end with big losses. Scientific and practical task is to create synthesis of planning and self-regulation.

Perspectives of the Russian economic science and practice of economy include rehabilitation of achievements of the planning system and their adequate realization in economics.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ignacy Sachs  
 Professor, Director of Studies  
 The Advanced School of Social Sciences  
 Paris

### **What State? What Markets, For What Development? The Social, Ecological and Economical Dimensions of Planning**

The neo-liberal counterrevolution exploits the collapse of the "real socialism" to dismiss the concepts of planning and belittle the role of the State in the regulation of mixed economies. Yet, in a form or another, these economies dominate the present world scene to the extent to which the command economy

has lived and the hayekian version of market economy and society is a pure abstraction.

At the same time, the concept of development is being challenged on environmental grounds by two different groups of critics:

- for the green fundamentalists the very notion of development is not acceptable insofar as it implies economic growth;
- for the hard scientists dealing with the global environmental change development is too vague a notion to be taken into account.

The criteria for development should be *social equity, environmental prudence and economic efficiency*. For a development strategy certain questions are pertinent: What state, what market, what roles for the civil society? What forms of interaction between the social actors of development processes in a mixed economy? What modes of articulation between the different development spaces - local, national, global? This paper examines these questions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Pasquale Lucio Scandizzo  
Professor of Political Economy  
University of Rome  
President, the Institute of Studies for Economic Planning

### **Trade Patterns, Cooperation and Growth**

Objective of this paper is to study the interdependences between groups of countries and income distribution in the context of a world-wide model of trade and exchange. In particular, the paper focuses on the implications of cooperative, non-cooperative and partially coordinated trade strategies for international economic policy. The literature in this issue has been characterized by an attention to macro-economic policies, with a recent emphasis on the game-theoretical approach (Canzoneri & Gray (1985), Manning (1987), Carraro and Giavazzi (1988)). Here, I focus on the pattern of trade and factor movement, through a general equilibrium model of the world economy and a descriptive repeated game similar to the one recently formulated by Jackson (1991). In this game three groups of countries: the "low income", the "middle income" and the "high income" interact as Bayesian players, who maximize expected national payoff and revise their expectations according to the new information collected at each round of the game. In another paper (Scandizzo, 1990), I examined the question of the effects of various degrees of liberalization on the "North" and the "South", also through a static general equilibrium model. In the present paper, instead, I propose to examine three broader questions:

- a) which pattern of trade restrictions, comparative advantage and trade and factor movement would prevail in the long run in the three groups of countries;
- b) which joint strategies would be selected and why;
- c) what would the likely time path followed by each country group to converge to the long run solution.

The plan of the paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on comparative versus competitive advantage, with special reference to the application of game theory to international trade. Section 3 briefly describes the features of a theoretical game formulation of a general equilibrium problem and proposes the model to be used in the sequel of the paper. Section 4.1 presents the results from the construction of the computable general equilibrium model from world trade and country economic statistics and examines the features of its basic runs. Section 4.2 describes the characteristics of the Montecarlo runs of the policy game and discusses the main results obtained. Section 5 presents a summary of the results and draws some policy conclusions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Gustav Schachter  
Professor, Northeastern University  
Department of Economics  
Boston, Massachusetts

## **Multiregional Input-Output Systems for Socioeconomic Planning<sup>1</sup>**

### *1.0. Introduction*

Regional planning has to be comprehensive, part of a national plan and internally consistent. To implement regional planning one needs a model and a methodology suitable to the regional and the national environment. According to the objectives sought, one may choose aggregated and/or disaggregated models. Macroaggregated models are generally based on the Harrod-Domar theory of economic growth. These postulate that growth is a function of saving and marginal efficiency of capital. That is, growth is explained merely in terms of accumulation and productivity of capital. Variants on this theme include two-gap models that account for foreign trade bottlenecks and absorptive capacity, dual systems where labor moves from agriculture to industry; and extended labor models that account for the availability and productivity of labor. Macroaggregated models are unidimensional and allow for policy decisions on overall fiscal and monetary policies, but are limited in usefulness for changes in socioeconomic structure. But this is the crucial difference between growth and development. Growth refers to a mobilization of resources while development refers to allocating of resources and/or changes in structure. Therefore development planning requires disaggregated models.

### *1.1. Regional Input-Output Analysis*

For regional planning purposes a system of regional input-output tables is usually developed. There is an array of regional tables possible, such as a single region matrix, interregional matrices, and multiregional matrices. The single matrix is usually the outcome of a regional survey where national data are not necessarily considered. The interregional systems constitute an inductive method in which each region is constructed on its own, and the sum forms the national

matrix. If a regional survey at the national scale is undertaken, this system yields better results than the single region approach. Still, a national matrix to impose constraints is needed, and the surveys must be uniform over *all* the regions of the nation.

The construction of a multiregional input-output system comprises a deductive approach where a national matrix is disaggregated into its regional components. Usually, these tables are based on secondary regional data. The main shortcoming of multiregional input-output (MRIO) systems is that one must wait until a national matrix is available in order to be able to construct a MRIO system. Yet, national tables often take a long time to be completed<sup>2</sup>. If one considers that it takes two to four years to complete a MRIO system, such tables are available usually six to ten years after the fact. On the other hand, the comprehensive consistency necessary for regional planning is present.

Pioneering work in multiregional models originated with Leontief and Isard (Leontief, 1953 and Isard, 1953); Moses developed a three-region, eleven-sector model for the United States (Moses, 1955) and Chenery, Clark, and Cao Pinna developed a two-region, twenty-two sector, Input-Output model for Italy (Chenery, 1953).

Our task here is two fold. First, we will examine the problem in construction multiregional systems. Secondly, we will attempt to survey potential applications of such techniques for regional planning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Part of this chapter is based on Chapter 2 in Pilloton and Schachter, *Input-Output Italia: A Multiregional System*, Case del Libro, 1983.

<sup>2</sup> The United States Input-Output Table of 1972 was made available in 1980, and the Italian National Table (84X84) for 1975 in 1981.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jacek Szlachta  
Professor  
Deputy Director of the Regional Policy Department  
Central Planning Office (CUP)  
Poland

#### Dilemmas of National and Regional Planning during Transformation to the Market Economy (Case Study Poland)

Deficiencies of central planning known from other countries together with specifically Polish features contributed to a steady deterioration of the Polish socio-economic situation.

After the disintegration of the socialist system, central planning was named as one of the socialist economy elements responsible for the crisis in East-Central Europe.

In Poland a "Central Office of Planning" has replaced the discredited Government Planning Commission; this body is radically different from the latter in its functions, powers and administrative structure.

However, the negative associations of "central planning" are so persistent that they threaten the very existence of this newly formed body.

As reform progressed in Poland a great many problems appeared with no solutions provided by macroeconomic theory. Solving them required flexible and adjustments of state economic policies. A side effect of it was an excessive concentration of resources and emphasis on current problems and a crisis of long-term and strategic studies. The time span in economic policy shrank also due to the frequent changes of cabinets and ruling coalitions.

After a three-year trial period it turned out that the transition would take much more time than initially assumed and that it would be a painful experience for society. However, the negative sentiments towards planning have taken a deep root in society at large and the very mention of planning still brings the socialist system to mind.

Therefore an analysis of the situation in Poland in 1992 must take into consideration, besides the negative experiences of the socialist economy, also the effects of the three years of systemic transformation based on the neoliberal doctrine. The basic questions concern the following problems:

1. Is strategic planning necessary during the period of systemic transformation?
2. Which particular spheres and problems should be embraced by strategic planning?
3. Can planning tackle these problems, considering the personnel, institutions and technical limitations?
4. Are there any social or political powers that would be interested in employing strategic planning as a state policy instrument?
5. What kind of activities should be taken up to create conditions for implementation of strategic planning in Poland?

\*\*\*\*\*

Nestor A. Terleckyj  
Professor, President NPA Data Services  
The National Planning Association  
Washington DC

#### Institutional Requirements for Effective Use of Quantitative Indicators in Policy Planning

The late 1960s and the 1970s were a time of intense innovation efforts in social sciences and policy analysis. These efforts extended to many parts of the world, and involved academic and governmental organizations. The common element in these endeavors was quantification of social objectives.

They included social indicators measurement in a number of countries and by international organizations (UN and the OECD). Economists were attempting to extend the economic measurement system to measure social output and costs beyond those included in traditional GNP accounting. Government officials were supporting attempts to introduce explicit, quantified measurements of cost effectiveness of public programs.

However, by the late 1970s these initiatives have weakened and by now they largely ceased. After compiling social indicators from the already existing statistics, the social indicators effort ran up against the barrier of lack of basic work of measuring additional objectives or refining the data. Governmental programs for cost effectiveness in public planning ran into political controversies and real trade-offs. Also important has been the hostility of politicians and bureaucrats to efforts of measuring the success of policies for which they were responsible. Finally, the spectacular failure of central economic planning negatively affected perception about formal policy planning in general.

Yet formal planning with specified indicators of progress is vastly superior to planning of expenditure alone. It is worthwhile to keep up the efforts to support it, especially, now with rising concern about slower growth, high taxation, and the quality of government. The rejection was not complete. Planning and development of the environmental policies for air, water and land at the local and national level in the advanced industrial countries has on the whole been widely accepted and quite successful. Local and national policy planning in many nations for a variety of programs have advanced in the degree of sophistication and effectiveness. What is lacking, however, is an institutional infrastructure for promoting public policy planning on a broader basis.

To understand the requirements, it is instructive to study the situations where the policy planning with indicators has been successful. The best example of successful policy use of quantitative indicators is the macroeconomic policy. Every advanced country in the world uses such macroeconomic indicators as the rate of inflation, the interest rate and the rate of unemployment in evaluating the health of the economy and the success of public policies. These indicators are backed up by large academic research establishments, by central banks, budgetary processes and other policy institutions, and they are continuously monitored by the business community, political parties, the press and the citizens in general.

Similar institutional environment is needed to develop more effective policies in social fields. Explicit quantitative cost effectiveness data needs to be linked to governmental budgeting for the specific programs. A wide dissemination of strategically selected indicators to the public and the information media is required to maintain public interest. Also, serious research effort is needed to maintain credibility of these planning approaches.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jan Tinbergen  
Professor of Economics, Nobel Prize

## The Duration of Development

The aim of development policy is to eliminate the differences between the average incomes per capita of developed and underdeveloped countries. Depending on the rates of growth of both average incomes, the time needed for elimination will be found; it will be called the duration of development.

With the present trade policies and development assistance (0.35% of donor countries' incomes) the duration will be more than five centuries. It is doubtful whether the population of the underdeveloped countries will be prepared to wait so long. Now already they immigrate into the developed countries, legally or illegally. The developed countries react to this immigration with police violence. It is in the interest of all that the duration be reduced. This may be done by increasing development assistance and figures will show the effect of various amounts of assistance. Finally the question is considered of the optimal level of assistance.

.....

## 2. Terms of reference for the proposal of a first "International Conference on Planning Science" (or "Planology")<sup>2</sup>

*by Franco Archibugi*

From many fields of activity, many disciplinary realms, and many cultural roots, a new body of research and scientific activity is emerging which concerns itself with "planning". These activities exist at several levels: local, regional, national, multinational, trans-national and now worldwide.

However such "Planning Sciences", or "Planology", are not at all well defined, and lack a certain precise identity.

At academic level, orthodox or less orthodox, the date of birth of this "paradigm" could be assumed to coincide with the late 1969 publication of the first issue of the international Journal: *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*<sup>3</sup>. Over the past twenty years, the editorial board and many of the contributors of this Journal have included many disciplinary fields and different cultural roots. But we cannot assert that this Journal includes all the groups, movements and circles, which in the same period have produced somewhat of a convergence in the planning sciences.

It is time to explore if this convergence is real; if there is room to set further progress on the lines of such a convergence; and, especially, whether now is the

---

<sup>2</sup> A background paper written in March 1990 as the first step towards a debate on an international conference and association of planning science.

<sup>3</sup> To which followed other important journals of a multidisciplinary approach such as *Environment and Planning* (1969), *Policy Sciences* (1969), *Journal of Development Planning* (1969), *Social Indicators* (1974), *Evaluation and Program Planning* (1977) and many others.



time for a transition from the plurality of planning sciences to a unique planning science, which reflects a more unified method and basic approach.

It is proposed to explore such issues with a symposium of scholars from different schools, disciplines, and nationalities<sup>4</sup>.

The first approach to this suggested cooperative and colloquial exploration focussed on one or two issues, one formal and methodological, (or "meta-disciplinary"), and the other substantial and applied.

For instance:

the emergence of the "planologic approach" in several disciplines, as the foundation of a possible "neo-disciplinary" synthesis;

the application of the supposed planning science to the management of an emerging planetary "repubblica".

The following few lines about the contents of the two issues are simply for clarification.

## **2.1 The emergence of the "planologic approach"**

This issue could explore and debate:

the implications of the normative versus positive approach in the social sciences, and, more precisely:

- the methods of modelling social realities;
- the relations between "forecasts" (and forecasting methods) and "decision-making" (decision theories);
- the use of quantitative analysis and techniques (econometrics, statistics) in planning procedures;
- the problems of the relationship between decisions (or choices, or plans and programmes) and the levels at which they are taken (local, urban, regional, sectoral, national, multinational, etc.).

b) The cultural "roots" of the "planological approach", more precisely:

- in philosophy, including "pragmatism" ;
- in sociology, and the "sociology of knowledge";
- in economics, including Marxist and radical, institutional or evolutionary;
- in political sciences;
- in management sciences: operational research, systems engineering;
- in urban and regional planning;
- in the ecological sciences, including impact evaluation, environmental management.

c) The historical-political "roots" of the supposed "planology", more precisely:

---

<sup>4</sup> The Conference could be held in Venice, Florence, Capri or Tokyo, over three days, in October 1992. This could be sponsored by: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Rome; European University Institute, Florence; United Nations University, Tokyo; and it could be organised by: the Planning Studies Centre, Rome (The "Planning Studies Centre", Centro di studi e piani economici, was the organizer of the First World Congress of the Econometric Society in 1964, in Rome; and the Director of the Centre, Prof. Franco Archibugi was the General Secretary of that Congress).

- the rise of the public economy and of economic control by the government on the whole economy;
  - the emergence of conflicting relations between ethics and economics in economic policy; or between ecology and economy, and so on;
  - in the rise and decline of so called "planned economies" or socialist economies;
  - in the parallel "failure of the market" in the so-called "market economies" or "capitalist economies";
  - in the experience of "development planning" and of the economic theory of development;
  - in the so-called "crisis" of the Welfare State;
  - in appraisal of the social, environmental and economic impact of new technologies, their control and planning.
- d) The foundation of a new disciplinary constituency, more precisely:
- to set up a creative, "meta-disciplinary approach" (including "systemic planning", integral or comprehensive planning, unified approach to planning, and so on);
  - to form new professional skills and roles (the emerging requirements for new "public managers", or for non-profit oriented managers; for new analysts and planners);
  - to review the arrangement of the higher education institutions in this field.

## **2.2 The application of planning science to global management**

This issue could explore and debate:

- The "globalisation" of the "respubblica".
- The requirements for global integration (east-west, north-south).
- Peace, as a factor and function of Welfare.
- The state-of-the-art in global modelling.
- International political perspectives and their relation to Planology (considered as Technology for Planning).
- The role of international organizations, namely the UN System and the improvement of the supra-nationality, trans-nationality and future patterns of worldwide Planology.

## **3. An Interview on the Conference for "Cronache Parlamentari" with Prof. Franco Archibugi**

### *1. What do you consider to be the peculiarities and limits of current international planning policies?*

As far as policies are concerned, the question may refer both to policies on an international or on a global scale and to those that are applied on other scales in

the world. At the Palermo Conference, during which the discipline of "Planology" was officially launched, we distinguished for convention's sake three scales: the world scale, the national or multinational one, and the sub-national local one. The question implies three distinct answers for the three different scales. I will answer the question with reference mainly to the world scale.

At this scale we are still at year zero. But we are experiencing for the first time in the history of humanity the development of a common political awareness (that of scholars and thinkers had already developed in this direction in various ways) of the need for a stronger coordination of states and nations in view of a common planning strategy of aims and resource use on a world scale. The emergence and awareness of environmental issues and the collapse of the political/military power blocks, together with the more traditional problem of the "under-development" of the vast majority of the world's population are factors that have shaken contemporary political conscience out of its state of inertia.

Naturally on a world scale we cannot do better than look to the UN, and its reinforcement and transformation into a real body of supranational power, as the essential institution for the greater coordination of political action which is now felt to be so necessary. It is symptomatic that two of the sponsors of the Palermo Conference were the UN University and UNESCO - two UN bodies.

But – as emerged from the debate on the subject in Palermo – any relevant action cannot but pass through a process of clear study and research into planning on a world scale. Today such studies are completely lacking in suitable research bodies; the scientific community present at Palermo has become the standard bearer for such a need, with, however, a certain amount of self-criticism for the dearth of appropriate planning studies given the absence of a "political demand" in this direction. Thus there has been a certain gap in the quality and quantity of adequate technical instruments for this purpose.

The Nobel Prize winner Jan Tinbergen (who is one of the most authoritative founders of planning science) in a brief and masterly contribution to Palermo Conference drew attention to the fact that if we carry on at the same rate as that of the last five decades, even allowing for the optimistic hypothesis that Western countries destine 30% of their annual income to helping the developing countries, it will take 420 years to reach equality in income levels between the two parts of the world. Will these peoples – with the explosion of the mass-media and exchange possibilities and the resulting cultural integration – be prepared to wait all this time to acquire Western well-being? This provocative and cunning question is obviously only for intellectual stimulation and reflection on all the factors in play that go well beyond the dichotomy adopted. But how can we know and, above all, attempt to control these factors in play unless there is a patient and rational planning effort?

It is on this point that we are at year zero.

Apart from some praiseworthy, but basically conjectural works of prediction of world development (more or less those indicated by the Club of Rome), the only serious organic approach towards planning took place at the end of the 'seventies with the United Nations project directed by Wassily Leontief (another Nobel Prize winner, whose commemorative lecture in 1974 was dedicated to this

very subject), this project began to set out the cognitive instrumentation for the evaluation of world economic interdependencies. That work and its follow up, however, were not supported later either at the level of the United Nations or at that of the most important countries.

This follow up should have been permanent and intense, with the support of a special UN "Planning Agency". Even if Leontief's lay-out had only been set up for comparison with other models concerning factors that determine world development, but in coordination with the aims of world planning, that work would have borne its fruits.

Therefore, for the world scale I answer thus: there is still much to do, but I hope that cooperation develops in a more and more federative form, and that unified and independent planning bodies are created on a world scale. The Western nations have in this area very great responsibilities, and they should give themselves more to the multilateral aspect of the initiative, which is to say to supranational initiatives (now that in the West, the reason – and sometimes the pretext – for security is largely not there anymore).

But there are some UN institutions that – if justly appreciated and supported financially – could as of now begin the research activity I mentioned before; I am referring to the United Nations University (that is based in Tokyo) and to some of the bodies connected to it: for example the Wider Institute (the World Institute for Research into Economic Development) in Helsinki, the infant Institute on "Governance" in Barcelona, and – why not? – perhaps a new still to be created centre for the development of research into the field of world planology.

It is to be hoped that the message sent out by the scientific community in Palermo is taken up by someone.

1. *How would you judge in the light of history the Eastern European Countries' planning model in comparison to planning experience in the industrialized West?*

A disaster. A historic disaster, not only for the ex-communist countries, but also for the West. Stalinist totalitarianism has completely discredited the totally modern attempt (but alas carried out in a backward country that hadn't even had an industrial revolution) to ensure adequate knowledge and coordination of government actions for the overall development of the (national, regional etc.) community.

Without democracy and political liberty, planning was a tool for tyranny in the hands of a class of bureaucrats and autocrats who, although, on the one hand, realised (and let us not forget it) in a few decades the transformation of an economically backward country into a highly developed one, on the other hand, impoverished the country through a total waste of resources (let the examples suffice of the enormous cost of military spending and the social parasitism of the "*nomenclatura*" that was extended to a large part of the exploitative and unproductive population with no incentive for initiative, work or productivity by conditions of free (trade-union, political, market, etc.) bargaining.

The consequence of all this is the total misunderstanding, in the West, of the concept and methods of planning; it has weakened the technical and political proposals for the application of modern systems of public management, with respect to the backward forces keen on maintaining in their own hands full control of the economy, and not on letting it slip into those of a power based on common democratic decision; and it has held up therefore the possibility of introducing modern methods of planning and management in the public sphere and of guidance of the private one.

From a certain point of view the industrialized economies of the West and the Soviet system have both been, historically, systems that were "planned" by oligarchic interests (the great political-industrial-financial complexes); only that, in the West, at least, this oligarchy has been and still is efficiently opposed, to the advantage of the whole community, by the trade union's contractual freedom and by a certain political liberty, although with an initial level of industrialisation in the West that was much higher than that of Tsarist Russia.

The absence of planning, in some Western countries with market economies (like for example those of Latin America) that started off on an equal if not indeed superior footing to that of Tsarist Russia, has not improved, but rather worsened the rate of economic-industrial development with respect to the levels of the Soviet world; this has not happened because of the economic regime (planning or free market, which it would be senseless to oppose), but rather because of the political regime: both totalitarian regimes dominated by autocratic and parasitic classes. In conclusion, we must not think of the failure of Eastern European political regimes as the failure of planning; this latter failed because the political regimes failed and not vice versa.

Thus in the West the existence of acceptable political regimes has led us to support serious social waste of wealth, evident social inequality, the destruction of the environment, urban crisis and decay, and unresolved grave social problems (poverty, unemployment, inefficiency in public services) despite the absence of the planning that could have made up for or avoided the consequences of "market failures" (to use the economists' technical expression) manifested by these unresolved problems.

### *3. What do you consider to be the limits of the current relationship between institutions and planning technologies?*

The whole of the Palermo meeting was dedicated to this core argument. It is my opinion that institutions should be made by "decision makers", elected politicians and functionaries at every level, according to their level of responsibility, who must be influenced by a planning "culture" that is nothing but an awareness of coordinated and rational choices. This planning culture may be introduced in different ways that are all useful and/or necessary; between in essence these two paths: that of education and that of institutional reform.

Even if politicians are not necessarily technicians, they have a cultural level based on an overall scholastic training. Today in all countries there is a lack of

civil education aimed at operationality and planning. Economic, historical, social and in the best of cases urban awareness is developed; but there is no tradition of reasoning in terms of operational analysis and of the "interdependency" of social phenomena and actions. In Anglo-Saxon countries, the prevalence, from primary and secondary schools onwards, of a less humanistic and more technical-scientific culture may constitute some danger for the development of a critical sense, but in our case it has worked in favour of a general aptitude of the people for evaluating socio-economic and political problems in "system" or systemic or management terms. This in itself represents an improvement in the operational abilities of the political decision-makers. I believe, however, that today in these societies as well there are some noteworthy limits to the education of a general representative political class adequately prepared from secondary school onwards for the management of public affairs.

What is lacking in every country, even in those that are most culturally advanced, is the creation of a school of managers of public affairs that is capable of managing and applying the techniques and methods of planning. This problem does not concern the representative or elected political decision-makers, but rather the executive decision-makers at all levels of public administration, from the local level to the international level, and those of non-government administrations that have a role that interests the public and social sphere. "Technicians" abound in this or that activity in the public sphere, and, in the best of cases, judicial experts. But our universities or our post- university programmes have not allowed for a wide preparation of public managers, at least to the same extent as those of the private sector. And the heart of the preparation for public managers is indeed planning science, where decision is indispensable both in coordination with public decisions as a whole, and with a much more complex vision of political-social strategy than that of the private sector. Our schools of Political Science prepare political scientists; but the management of public affairs does not need political scientists, it needs planners.

In truth, we must recognize that in the scientific sphere planning science has struggled to define itself and find an identity such as might influence the University systems. The Palermo Conference represents the beginning of this process of self-identification.

Anyway, if it is the case that planning, in order to develop and realise itself, needs more planners coming out of the schools and working for it, it is also the case that these planners will increase in number if more institutions require and use them. And the planning institutions will increase, if adequate reforms of the institutional procedures and systems, as regards public decision-making and management, are carried out. The institutional systems of nearly all modern countries, founded on democratic constitutions (systems which have inspired moreover many developing countries), have aged greatly, with respect to the needs of modern public economy management. Decision-making and public spending processes connected to spending that, for example, does not cover more than 5-10% of the national product (sometimes more sometimes less in the countries in question), are very different from those that are necessary and rational for spending that takes in 50-60% of the national product. The inter-institutional

coordination of public spending becomes thus one of the fundamental problems of public management; and such coordination is unthinkable without modern methods of programming and planning.

4. *Could you illustrate the role of the about to be created "International Planning Academy" in the framework of the development and exchange of planning techniques?*

The Palermo Conference felt the need not to waste the useful contact established, under the aegis of United Nations University, UNESCO, and the EC European University Institute, not only between scholars from different countries but, and more important still, between scholars from different scientific disciplines, who have agreed to integrate their experiences for the foundation of a common innovative methodology. Thus we intend to give birth to an academic organism of liaison between scholars and of reference for bodies and institutions interested in planning, with the aim of:

1. promoting the development of a multi-dimensional discipline (planning science or planology) that has the task of analyzing the theory and practice of planning and of stimulating study of the methodology of integrated planning;
2. creating a forum for an exchange of experiences between planners and planning institutions that work in different fields, in different environmental, social, and economic contexts, and at different levels (i.e. global, national, regional, local);
3. recording the progress obtained in the practical application of the concept of planning - with the aim of setting up a databank of planning experiences and in particular "case studies" so as to document the failures and successes of planning;
4. acting as an organism of consultancy, with technical assistance, in the application of planning in different situations. A subject of its activity could be the restructuring of planning institutions.

#### **4. The Who's Who of "The First World-Wide Conference on Planning Science"**

ALBRECHTS Louis  
Professor of Urban and Regional Planning  
The Catholic University of Leuven,  
Belgium

ALEXANDER Ernest R.  
Professor  
Institute of Urban and Regional Studies  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee,

USA

ALLEN Judith  
Professor  
Faculty of the Environment  
University of Westminster,  
GB

AMOROSO Bruno  
Professor of Economics  
Department of Economics and Planning  
Roskilde University,  
Denmark

ARCHIBUGI Franco  
Professor of Planning  
University of Naples  
Director, the Planning Studies Centre, Rome,  
Italy

ARTOBOLEVSKIY Sergei  
Senior Research Fellow, Dept of Economics & Geography Institute of Geography,  
Russian Academy of Sciences,  
The Russian Federation

BABINTZEV Valery  
Professor  
High Economic Council,  
The Russian Federation

BAUM Howell  
Professor, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, University of Maryland at  
College Park,  
USA

BEAUREGARD Robert  
Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs  
University of Pittsburgh,  
USA

BEGUINOT Corrado  
Professor,  
President of the Institute for Territorial Planning and Management  
The National Research Council,  
Italy



BIANCHI Giuliano  
Professor of Regional Economics, European University Institute and IRES  
Tuscany,  
Italy

BISOGNO Paolo  
Professor  
Director of the Institute for Studies on Scientific Research and Policy, The  
National Research Council,  
Italy

BOISIER Sergio  
Director of Planning and Regional Policy, The Latin American and Caribbean  
Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) of the UN, Santiago,  
Chile

BOLAN Richard  
Professor  
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs  
University of Minnesota,  
USA

BREHENY Michael  
Dept of Geography  
University of Reading,  
GB

CABIANCA Vincenzo  
Professor  
Department of Urban Planning  
University of Palermo,  
Italy

CAMHIS Marios  
Head of Division  
Directorate General for Regional policies, Commission of the  
European Community DG XVI,  
Belgium

CAMPIONE Giuseppe  
Professor of Economic Geography  
University of Messina, President of the Sicilian Region,  
Italy

CENTORRINO Mario  
Professor of Economics  
The Faculty of Political Science  
University of Messina,  
Italy

CORREA Hector  
Professor  
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs  
University of Pittsburgh,  
USA

DELLA SENTA Tarcisio G.  
Professor, Planning and Development Division  
United Nations University, Tokyo,  
Japan

DROR Yehezke  
Professor of Public Administration, Department of Political Science  
The Hebrew University, Jerusalem,  
Israel

DUCHIN Faye  
Professor, Institute for Economic Analysis  
New York University,  
USA

DUNN William  
Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs,  
USA

FALUDI Andreas  
Professor of Planning  
Institute of Planning and Demography  
University of Amsterdam,  
Netherlands

FORESTER John  
Professor  
Department of City and Regional Planning  
Cornell University,  
USA

FORTI Augusto  
Director, UNESCO Regional Office for Science and Technology for Europe  
International Centre for Science and High Technology, Venice,  
Italy

FOX Karl  
Dept of Economics  
Iowa State University of Science and Technology,  
USA

FRIEDMANN John  
Professor of Planning  
Urban Planning Program  
University of California Los Angeles,  
USA

GASSLER Robert Scott  
Professor of Economics and Business Administration, Ursinus College,  
Pennsylvania,  
USA

GOPINATH Padmanabh  
Director International Institute for Labour Studies,  
Switzerland

HAGEMANN Harald  
Professor  
Institute of Economics  
Hohenheim University, Stuttgart,  
Germany

HALL Peter  
Institute of Urban and Regional Development,  
USA

HEALEY Patsy  
Professor  
Department of Town and Planning  
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne,  
GB

HOFFMANN Alessandro  
Professor  
University of Palermo  
Deputy Director of the Regional Planning Directorate (Sicily),  
Italy

HOLLAND Stuart  
Professor of Economics  
Department of Economics  
European University Institute, Florence,  
Italy

KATUMURA Yasuo  
Economic Advisor  
The Economic Planning Agency,  
Japan

KOLLONTAI Vladimir  
Professor, International Institute of World Economics,  
The Russian Federation

KUKLINSKI Antoni  
Professor  
European Institute for Regional and Local Development  
University of Warsaw,  
Poland

LEONTIEF Wassily  
Professor of Economics  
New York University,  
Nobel Prize,  
USA

LEVINE Sumner  
Professor, former Editor-in-Chief of "Socio-Economic Planning Sciences  
Journal",  
The State University of New York and Nortech Associates,  
USA

LICHFIELD Dalia  
Dalia Lichfield Associates, Urban & Environmental Planning, London,  
GB

LICHFIELD Nathaniel  
Professor Emeritus of the Economics of Environmental Planning  
University of London  
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd., Development Planning Urban Design  
Economics,  
GB

LOMBARDINI Siro  
Professor  
Dept. of Economics  
University of Turin,  
Italy

MANDELBAUM Seymour  
Professor  
Department of City and Regional Planning  
University of Pennsylvania,  
USA

MAZZA Luigi  
Professor of Urban Planning, Editor of "Planning Theory" Department of  
Territorial Science, Polytechnic of Milan,  
Italy

MICHALOS Alex  
Professor, Editor, "Social Indicators Research", University of Guelph, Ontario,  
Canada

MORELL Jonathan A,  
Dr., Editor "Evaluation and Program Planning", Industrial Technology Institute,  
Ann Arbor,  
USA

NIJKAMP Peter  
Professor  
Department of Economics and Econometrics  
The Free University, Amsterdam,  
Netherlands

NISEVICH Efim  
Professor  
The Institute of Economics  
Russian Academy of Sciences,  
The Russian Federation

OLSSON Gunnar  
Professor  
Nordic Institute for Studies in Urban and Regional Planning, Stockholm,  
Sweden

PAELINCK Jan H P  
Professor, Erasmus University, Rotterdam,  
Netherlands

PARKER Barnett R  
Professor, Editor-in-chief "Socio Economic Planning Sciences" Department of  
Health Policy and Administration, University of North Carolina on Chapel Hill,  
USA

PICCINATO Giorgio  
President of the Association of European Schools of Planning  
Professor  
Department of Urban Planning, The University Institute for Architecture Venice,  
Italy

PIROGOV Stanislav  
Deputy Director  
The Institute of Economics, Russian Academy of Sciences  
The Russian Federation

SACHS Ignacy  
Professor, Director of Studies  
The Advanced School of Social Sciences, Paris,  
France

SCANDIZZO Pasquale Lucio  
Professor of Political Economy  
University of Rome "Tor Vergata"  
President of the Institute of Studies for Economic Planning, Rome  
Italy

SCHACHTER Gustav  
Professor,  
Centre for European Economic Studies,  
Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston,  
USA

SCIMEMI Antonio  
Director of the Regional Planning Directorate (Sicily),  
Italy

SZLACHTA Jacek  
Professor, Deputy Director of Regional Policy Department, Central Planning  
Office (CUP),  
Poland

TERLECKYJ Nestor E.  
Professor  
President NPA Data Services  
The National Planning Association, Washington DC,  
USA

TINBERGEN Jan  
Professor of Economics, Nobel Prize,  
Netherlands

## **5. The Conference Programme**

### **Tuesday, 8 Sept. 1992, h. 9.00: Opening Session**

1. Introductory remarks by F. Archibugi, Director of the Planning Studies Centre
2. Inaugural greetings by the President of the Regione Siciliana, G. Campione
3. Greeting by A. Musco, Vice President of CERISDI
4. Introductory remarks on behalf of UNESCO and CNR by P. Bisogno

5. Introductory remarks on behalf of the UN University by T. G. Della Senta
6. Introductory remarks on behalf of the EUI by S. Holland
7. Introductory speech by C. Beguinot, President of the Institute for Territorial Planning and Management, The National Research Council

**h 9.30: 1st Session**

**1. PLANNING AND PLANNING INSTITUTIONS IN A GLOBAL FRAMEWORK.**

*Chairman: A. KUKLINSKI*

Jan TINBERGEN	The Duration of Development.
Wassily LEONTIEF	World Environment Planning: What to do and how to do it
Tarcisio G. DELLA SENTA	Planning in a Global Framework: Theory and Practice in Global Settings.
Yehezkel DROR	Planning in the 21st Century.
Bruno AMOROSO	Planning Theories, Technologies, and Institutions in a Context of Globalization and Polycentric Systems.
Barnett PARKER	Ensuring a Responsive Health Care Planning Function in Emerging Regions of the World
Mario CENTORRINO	An Instrument for Optimal Foreign Trade Policies: The Trade-Gap Analysis.
Sergio BOISIER	Regional Management in the new International order: Quasi-States and Quasi-Firms.

**Tuesday, 8 Sept. 1992, h.15.00: 2nd Session**

**2. PLANNING AND PLANNING INSTITUTIONS IN MULTINATIONAL OR NATIONAL CONTEXT**

*Chairman G. SCHACHTER*

Antoni KUKLINSKY	The Future of Strategic Planning in Central and Eastern Europe.
Harald HAGEMANN	On Some Macroeconomic Consequences of German Unification.
Sergei ARTOBOLEVSKIY	Regional Policy in Present Russia: The New Role of the State



Jacek SZLACHTA	Dilemmas of National and Regional Planning during Transformation to the Market Economy (Case Study Poland).
Dalia LICHFIELD	Effect of Land use Zoning on Planning Technology: A Comparison in Four Countries
Vladimir KOLLONTAI	Some Specifics of Economic Reform in Russia
Yasuo KATUMURA	Economic Planning in a Market Economy - The Japanese Experience in the Economic Planning and its International Implications
Pasquale Lucio SCANDIZZO	Trade Patterns, Cooperation and Growth

**Wednesday 9 Sept. 1992, h.9.00: 3rd Session**

3. NEW APPROACHES TO PLANNING

*Chairman: E. ALEXANDER*

Ignacy SACHS	What State, What Markets, for What Development; the Social, Ecological and Economical Dimensions of Planning.
Nathaniel LICHFIELD	Planning and the Environment: Institutions for Sustainable Development.
Peter NIJKAMP	The Changing Role of Governments: the End of Planning History?
Alex MICHALOS	What every Planner Should Know about Measuring the Quality of Life.
Andreas FALUDI	Dutch Planning Doctrine: The Social Construction of a Planners' Paradise.
Luigi MAZZA	An Exercise in Re-constructing a Planning Tool, Second thoughts on Italian Land-Use Planning
Giorgio PICCINATO	Reconsidering Planning for Historic Centres.

**Wednesday 9 Sept. 1992, h.15.00: 4th Session**

4. NEW METHODOLOGIES FOR PLANNING

*Chairman: J. MORELL*

Franco ARCHIBUGI	Towards a New Discipline of Planning.
John FRIEDMANN	Educating the Next Generation of Planners.
Stanislav PIROGOV	Nature of Planning Systems and Contradictions of their Practical Use.

Valery BABINTZEV	Techniques of Optimal Planning and the New Russian Economic System.
Sumner LEVINE	Thoughts on the Planning of Technological Development.
Jonathan MORELL	Integrating Technological Change into Planning: the Case for an Interdisciplinary Perspective
Gustav SCHACHTER	Multi-Regional Input-Output Systems for Socioeconomic Planning.
Nestor TERLECKYJ	Institutional Requirements for Effective Use of Quantitative Indicators in Planning.
Robert BEAUREGARD	Theories and Techniques of Subnational Economic Development Planning in the United States

**Thursday, 10 Sept. 1992, h. 9.00: 5th Session**

5. PLANNING AND DEMOCRACY

*Chairman: T. G. DELLA SENTA*

Seymour MANDELBAUM	Communitarian Sensibilities and the Design of Communities.
John FORESTER	Perception, Political Judgement and Learning about Value in Transportation Planning: Bridging Habermas and Aristotle.
Patsy HEALEY	In Search of Democracy; New Ways of Using Old Tools, the Form and Content of Development Plans.
R. Scott GASSLER	Nonprofit Economics and Planning Science.
Judith ALLEN	Imagine That! The Effects of the 1988 Housing Act on British Housing Associations
Howell BAUM	Community and Consensus: Reality and Fantasy in Planning.

**Thursday, 10 Sept. 1992, h.15.00: 6th Session**

6. PLANNING INSTITUTIONS: STRUCTURES AND DESIGN

*Chairman: N. LICHFIELD*

Stuart HOLLAND	Planning and the Mixed Economy
Ernest ALEXANDER	The Architecture of Institutional Design: Inter-Organizational Coordinative, Structures.

Hector CORREA	An Approach to the Operational Integration of the Technical and Political Aspects of Planning
William DUNN	Use of Problem Structuring Methodologies for Planning and Policy in Turbulent Environments.
Louis ALBRECHTS	Dilemmas in Planning: What is and What Ought to Be.
Richard S. BOLAN	Institutional Design for Planning: Lessons from Central and Eastern Europe.
Efim NISEVICH	Some Theoretical and Practical Problems of Planning Institutions Redesign in the Russian Federation.
Giuliano BIANCHI	Regional Planning: Requiem or Renaissance? Methodological Hints about two Empirical Experiences of Regional Planning: Sicily and Tuscany.

**Friday, 11th Sept. 1992, h.9.00 Public Session**

Discussion amongst decision-makers and planners

THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF SICILY: EXPERIENCE AND PROSPECTIVE (With audio-visual projection)

Antonio SCIMEMI	Introductory Remarks
Alessandro HOFFMANN	The Regional Plan: The Project
Giovanni PITRUZZELLA	The Regional Plan: The Instruments of Implementation
Rino BATTIATO	The Regional Plan: The Instruments for Control and Monitoring
Francesco TERESI	The Regional Plan: The Institutions for Regional and Sub-Regional Planning

**Friday, 11 Sept. 1992, h.15.00: Public Session**

Discussion amongst decision-makers and planners

SPATIAL PLANNING ISSUES AT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY LEVEL

Marios CAMHIS	Perspectives of the Development of the European Community's Territory: The Operation "Europe 2000"
---------------	--

**Friday, 11 Sept. 1992, h.17.00: Closing Session**

FINAL ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION AMONGST SELECTED POLICY-  
MAKERS AND SPONSORING AGENCIES

*Chairman:* *The President of the Regione Siciliana*  
*Giuseppe CAMPIONE*

*Participants:* Franco ARCHIBUGI  
Guliano BIANCHI  
Paolo BISOGNO  
Vincenzo CABIANCA  
Tarcisio G. DELLA SENTA  
Stuart HOLLAND  
Ignazio MELISENDA  
Antonio SCIMEMI  
Leonardo URBANI

**Saturday, 12 Sept. 1992, 9.00 to evening**

VISIT TO THE ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES SELINUNTE, SEGESTA AND  
MOTIA.

\*\*\*\*\*