

**Terms of reference for the proposal of a first
"International Conference on Planning Science" (or
"Planology")¹**

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 world-wide.

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*². 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 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 nationalities³.

¹ A background paper written in March 1990 by Franco Archibugi as the first step towards a debate on an international conference and association of planning science.

² 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.

³ 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

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.

1. The emergence of the “planological approach”

a) 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.

Econometric Society in 1964, in Rome; and the Director of the Centre, Prof. Franco Archibugi was the General Secretary of that Congress).

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

- 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. 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.