

**TOWARDS AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION FOR THE  
ADVANCEMENT OF PLANNING SCIENCE**

Introductory letter, *by Franco Archibugi*

The Proposed International Planning Association/Academy, *by Nathaniel Lichfield*

For a World Society of Planology, *by Antoni Kuklinski*

Conference Future Activity, *by Alex Michalos, Jonathan Morell and Barnett Parker*

The Open Questions that are Awaiting a Response, *by Franco Archibugi*

**Appendices**

1. Terms of Reference for a proposal of a first "International Conference on Planning Science" (or "Planology")
2. Questionnaire

**TO ALL THE FRIENDS AND COLLEAGUES WHO TOOK PART  
IN THE PALERMO CONFERENCE, OR, WHILST NOT ABLE TO  
ATTEND, WERE NEVERTHELESS INTERESTED IN THE  
PROCEEDINGS**

Dear Colleagues and Friends

I cannot but share the opinion (that which many of you wished to express) that the Palermo Conference achieved its main aim, that of initiating a process of communication and interaction between scholars of planning on a scale that is not only international, but also inclusive of many planning "fields" of application from varying disciplinary backgrounds.

It is obvious how much the success of the Conference essentially depended on the quality of the participants, and in this respect we must all be very grateful - for as many "weights" and "measures" that we wished to introduce - to each other.

We have in fact established a network, into which we must now infuse a certain amount of energy. We must in some way continue. We decided in Palermo - without any expressed dissent - to create an associative body, founded on a co-optative system. Our colleague Nat Lichfield, who presided over an ad hoc meeting dedicated to the subject, has kindly provided a verbal account of the meeting which, I believe will be useful to diffuse amongst us, to the advantage also of those colleagues who were unable to attend the Conference but were in some way involved in the initiative.

With this same aim in mind, I believe it will be useful to redistribute for the convenience of everybody in this pamphlet, both the document prepared for the launch of our society by Antoni Kuklinski and the note distributed on the same subject by Alex Michalos, Jonathan Morell, and Barnett Parker in their roles as editors of three important scientific journals in the field of planning. Finally I have reproduced the note which I sent to many of you earlier with the aim of sounding out opinions on the idea of promoting a periodical, stable conference on planning science and which constituted, so to speak, the "terms of reference" (see Appendix 1) for the Rome Brainstorming session of October 1991 and of the Palermo Conference itself in September 1992.

In Palermo we approved, as can be evinced from the Lichfield report, four principal "aims" for the institution of an international association; however, the way in which one should proceed to the constitution and even the choice of name for the association remain open questions (notwithstanding a generic mandate given to me and to some friends to proceed in some way); this is - among other reasons - because the time for the discussion of such matters was limited.

Thus, in order to proceed further, I have taken the initiative of summing up the present state of things in a few "fundamental questions"; these issues are the following:

1. Name
2. Aims
3. Foundation and Founders
4. Management Committee
5. Honorary Presidency
6. Statutory Code and Legal Statute
7. Sponsors
8. Operational Base and Secretaryship
9. Financing
10. Proposals for Future Activities
11. Publication of the Conference Papers

On each of these issues, I have taken the liberty (see the attached Note) to lay down the terms of the question and express my personal views.

The purpose of the Note is nevertheless to collect your opinions. Thus, I would ask you to express your points of view on each of the questions I have raised: in this way a "dossier" could be created of your points of view that I would willingly distribute amongst us.

Many of you have already done so with letters addressed to me personally: I would ask you as well to repeat and reorder your opinions according to the above listing. If on some questions you have no particular opinion, I would appreciate at least a sign of approval for my proposals.

Given the difficulties of direct personal communication between us, we have very much to rely on the postal services. This means that we have to put our opinions in writing and set up a rather "farraginous" decision-making system. However, I consider that in this initial phase of the definition of the spirit in which each of us adheres to the initiative, the time used in mutually clarifying opinions and points of view should not be considered superfluous, but rather as contributing to the success and aims of the initiative itself.

In conclusion, I would like once again to congratulate each and every one of you for the overall success of our meeting in Palermo and thank you all for the help given. I encourage you (as I was in turn encouraged by you) to pursue, with tenacity, the initiative we have undertaken together.

Many thanks

Franco Archibugi

**PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL PLANNING  
ASSOCIATION/ACADEMY  
A PROGRESS REPORT AT THE CLOSE OF THE PLANNING  
SCIENCES CONFERENCE IN SICILY,  
ON 12 SEPTEMBER 1992**

*BY NATHANIEL LICHFIELD*

1. During the Conference there was considerable informal discussion around the idea of forming a new Association/Academy for planning sciences. The discussion was mainly amongst a core group brought together by Franco Archibugi (Franco Archibugi, Antoni Kuklinski, Ignacy Sachs, Seymour Mandelbaum, Nat Lichfield), with others involved on occasions (for example, Vladimir Kollontai, Dalia Lichfield, Ernest Alexander, Tarcisio Della Senta).
2. The informal discussion was helped considerably by written contributions from Antoni Kuklinski, namely:
  - { World Society of Planology – Wosoplan: first note for discussion – the climate for Wosoplan;
  - { World Society of Planology – Wosoplan: the second note for discussion – the programme – the direction of thinking;
  - { World Society of Planology – Wosoplan: the third note for discussion: four dilemmas of modus operandi;
  - { on the idea of continuing our work (follow up of the First Conference).
  - { in addition, a note was circulated by Alex Michalos, Jonathan Morell and Barnett Parker giving their own views.
3. At its final meeting, the core group asked Nat Lichfield to present its conclusions to the General Assembly on the 8<sup>th</sup> of September. A summary now follows.

4. The idea of the Association was born from considerable work by Franco Archibugi over the past twenty or so years, which has generously acknowledged the work of others (e.g. Faludi, Dror, Kuklinski, Friedmann, Nijkamp, Holland, Johansen, Perloff, Lichfield and others). Under this stimulus, thought was focused at the Conference on three questions:

- is there a need for the new Institution in addition to those existing?
- if so, should the Conference advance the concept?
- if so, how?

5. On these questions there was general agreement amongst the core group and others who were involved in discussions on:

- there is a need;
- we should *advance* the concept;
- we should make a simple, low key *start* at the Conference as a base for growth.

6. This agreement around these points culminated in a first draft on four goals for the new Association/Academy, as follows:

- a) to promote the development of a multidimensional discipline analysing the theory and practice of planning and stimulating the studies on the methodology of integrated planning;
- b) 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);
- c) to monitor the progress in the practical applications of the concept of planning to establish a data bank of the planning experiences and especially of characteristic case studies documenting successes and failures of planning.
- d) 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 important objective of this activity.

7. While there had been considerable discussion amongst the groups, and also in the Assembly, on the wording of the four goals, para.6 was accepted as an initial indication of the direction in which the Association/Academy would move.

8. There was general agreement that the key person in the Association would be Franco Archibugi.

9. In response to the presentation, many points were made from the floor. On the whole they were points of detail with little primary dissent.

10. In order to advance the Association there clearly were a large number of details to be considered, such as:

- a) nomination for the initial Committee which would support Franco Archibugi;
- b) membership would not be open but by invitation according to rules to be prescribed;
- c) membership would be both from academia and professional practice, with contribution to the Association and its goals being the prime criterion;
- d) consideration would need to be given to the legal form;
- e) consideration would need to be given to dissemination, as for example, by a Journal when practicable;
- f) consideration would be given as to where the resources for the organisation come from?

11. In conclusion, the Assembly were asked to:

- { endorse the initial steps that had been taken;
- { leave nominations for an *initial* Committee to FA;
- { write to FA with comments on this Progress Report;
- { write to FA on any aspect which they thought should be taken into account.

19<sup>th</sup> Oct 1992

**FOR A WORLD SOCIETY OF PLANOLOGY  
"WOSOPLAN"**

*by Antoni Kuklinski*

**A. *The climate for WOSOPLAN***

The proposal<sup>1</sup> by Franco Archibugi to create a World Society of Planology is simply excellent. It is the right proposal at the right time – for two reasons.

1. The decade of the nineties will be the decade of the renaissance of planning as a concept, institution and social practice.
2. We have the materials of the Palermo Conference as a good sample of methodological and empirical approaches to the theory and practice of planning.

Part A of the paper will incorporate the following points.

- I. Why the nineties will be the decade of the renaissance of planning.
- II. The five features of planning of the XXI century.
- III. The scope of planning activities.
- IV. The object of Planology.
- V. The name of the Society.

*I. Why the nineties will be the decade of the renaissance of planning*

The nineties are a very peculiar time of the turn of centuries and even millennia. It will be very interesting if we enter the XXI century via the XX or via the XIX century.

The second solution has been suggested in an essay by James Morgan<sup>2</sup>, who represents the opinion that all the cataclysmic events which happened during the eighty years from 1912 to 1992 are insignificant historically and that now a new imperial age will be created similar – grosso modo – to the situation that prevailed at the turn of the XIX and XX centuries.

Three weeks earlier, a charming essay by Lord Skidelsky<sup>3</sup> was published also in the Financial Times. This is a Keynesian analysis of the XX

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter of Franco Archibugi to Antoni Kuklinski. Rome, June 15, 1992.

<sup>2</sup> James Morgan, *Rip van Winkle's new world order*. Weekend Financial Times, April 25/26, 1992.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Skidelsky, *Keynes here, how can I help you?* Financial Times, op. cit., April 4/5, 1992.

century and an interesting analogy of the lost historical opportunities after 1918 and after 1989.

These discussions are very important for the evaluation of planning as the historical innovation created by the XX century. If the XX century is just an aberration then also the innovation of planning has to be forgotten.

I think, however, that the next years will create a climate for the renaissance of planning in the framework of two grand ideological debates:

- laissez faire versus interventionism
- monetarism versus Keynesism.

The present hyper-liberal XIX-century ideology is not able to manage the global development and, especially, to solve the problems of post-communistic countries.

A new ideology must be developed for this purpose – this ideology will create the climate for the renaissance of planning.

## II. *The five features of planning of the XXI century*

For the *WOSOPLAN* Programme we have to outline a model of planning activities of the XXI century. This model should be a creative continuation of the experiences of the XX century. However the element of continuation should not be stressed too much. The planning of the XXI century must be a new planning. To my mind, there are five features of the new planning activities:

1. planning activities are human activities – a deeply multidimensional phenomenon analysed by a broad spectrum of interdisciplinary or meta-disciplinary studies in terms of both hard and soft sciences;
2. planning activities are goal-oriented activities. So the process of external and internal goal setting and the translation of those goals into grosso modo quantitative targets is an important part of planning activities. This brings the planning activities into the main stream of fundamental value judgements related to the future of the local, regional, continental, and global societies;
3. planning activities are developed and performed in the framework of deep rationalistic traditions. Ratios must be the foundation of Planning. The disasters of irrational planning of the XX century should not be repeated in the future;
4. planning activities are developed and performed in a climate of creative imagination. Without creative imagination there is no creative planning;



5. planning activities are innovative. The creation and diffusion of innovation is one of the most important features of the planning activities. This model of planning activities must be presented in the clear, simple language to be included in the Programme of *WOSOPLAN*.

### III. *The scope of planning activities*

The Palermo Conference is presenting an agreement on the classical scope of planning activities. The scope of *WOSOPLAN* must be broader – it should include also the planning experience of the grand corporations and the military planning experience being perhaps the oldest experience in the history of planning. So the great triangle – the planning of the civil public domain, the military planning and the planning of grand corporations – should be the foundation of *WOSOPLAN*.

### IV. *The object of planology*

There are three most important elements in the planning science:

- the development of the theoretical foundations of planning
- the development of effective methodological approaches creating an image and reality of integrated planning
- the development of empirical studies analysing the experience: in all fields of planning.

### V. *The name of the Society*

In this context I would like to formulate the suggestion to discuss an alternative name of the Society - World Society of Theory and Practice of Planning. Naturally, to original *WOSOPLAN* is shorter and maybe better but the case of theory and practice should be stressed very firmly in the Programme of *WOSOPLAN*.

## B. *The Programme - the direction of thinking*

### I. *The Character of the Programme*

It is impossible to prepare the Programme via the first shot. It is possible, however, to start the discussion opening the door for consecutive improvements and broad international consensus emerging around the suggestions which will be approved and promoted by the World Planning Community. So I would like to present the following principles:

- the Programme must be visionary and realistic at the same time. It should present a vision of the role of planning in the XXI century and the realistic tasks for the *WOSOPLAN* in the nineties;
- the Programme must be general and specific at the same time. It should present a general panorama of planning problems addressed to generally minded persons and institutions. It should also present specific problems of planning looking for the interest of persons and institutions involved in specific fields of planning;
- the Programme should have elements of an intellectual and social manifesto and a general scheme of the modus operandi of the *WOSOPLAN*.

### II. *The domains*

In this note I would like to outline the concept of *ten domains* of planology which have the following characteristic features:

- each domain has common intellectual roots;
- each domain is addressed to a group of persons and institutions which probably will support the activities in this field and be interested in the results achieved;
- the dynamics of the whole field of planology will be determined not only by the progresses achieved in the particular domains but also by the holistic approaches to the development of planology.

The ten domains can be outlined as follows:

1. The comparative evaluation of the XIX, XX and XXI centuries and the role of the emerging global planning in the development of global economy and global society.
2. The theoretical and pragmatic model of new planning addressed to the demands of the XXI century.
3. The methodological model of integrated planning.

4. The model of realistic approaches to the planning practice emerging from well-organized empirical studies.
5. The role of planning in the development of effective governments. Planning is an important element of the capacity to govern.
6. The dynamics of business planning in all scales of this activity/grand corporations, medium and small enterprises.
7. The military planning.
8. The international organisations and the development of the theory and practice of planning.
9. The history of planning.
10. The holistic and integrated approaches to planology as a new open multidimensional discipline.

#### *Comments*

Ad 1. This domain is very closely related to the activity of the Club of Rome. A modus operandi for the cooperation of the Club of Rome and *WOSOPLAN* will, I hope, be established very easily.

ad 2. This new model of new planning is seen as human planning, goal-oriented planning, rational planning, imaginative planning and innovative planning.

ad 3. This is to answer the question of how to implement the dream about integrated planning – which is so important in the historical experience of planology and for the future of this field.

ad 4. This should be a model of monitoring studies analysing permanently the evolution of the practice of planning at the global, continental, national, regional, and local levels. This should also be a data bank of planning successes and planning failures.

ad 5. The ideas of Y. Dror could be a starting point for this domain. Planning as an important element of the capacity to govern is especially valid for the discussion and solutions applied in Central and Eastern Europe.

ad 6. This is a domain that is extremely important for *WOSOPLAN* and almost totally absent in the Palermo Conference.

ad 7. This is an important value judgement – whether or not to open *WOSOPLAN* for military establishments. My point of view is very clear. The answer is ‘yes’. Military planning is as old as the history of the state. We should not disregard the intellectual traditions of military planning and the importance of military experiences for modern planning.

ad 8. International organizations as the UN or the European Community can be seen as effective or ineffective planning machineries.

ad 9. This should be not only a history of the conventional field of planning but also a history of business and military planning, etc. The construction of the road network in the Roman Empire is also a chapter in the history of planning.

ad 10. This domain is related directly to the development of planology. This is, at the same time, the domain of the general syntheses.

### III. *The domains in five perspectives*

The *ten domains can be seen* in five perspectives:

- the first is a task force of the Society as an intellectual and operational unit;
- the second is the title of a conference that should be organised by the Society;
- the third is the title of the post-conference volume;
- the fourth is the sphere of interest of a well defined community of scholars and practitioners;
- the fifth is the way of getting financial support not only for the general activity of the Society but also for the promotion of specific fields which are important for specific persons and institutions.

I am expecting the creative destruction of my idea of ten domains. I understand very well that each domain can be defined in different ways and that the numbers of domains can grow to 12 or perhaps to 15. I think, however, that the idea of clearly defined domains and task forces of the Society is a valid idea for the construction of the Programme of *WOSOPLAN*.

### C. *Four dilemmas of modus operandi*

I think it is advisable to discuss four dilemmas of modus operandi before we start to prepare the first draft of the statute of *WOSOPLAN*.

There are four dilemmas.

- I. The dilemma of modest versus ambitious goals
- II. The dilemma of a big versus small society
- III. The dilemma of a uniform versus differentiated society
- IV. The dilemma of managerially weak versus managerially strong society

We have to make some fundamental choices and establish a general vision of the Society – to outline the Programme and then to prepare the Statute.

#### I. *The dilemma of modest versus ambitious goals*

A modest, goal of the Society can be formulated as follows – to promote the development of planology as a multidimensional discipline analysing the theory and practice of planning and stimulating the studies on the methodology of integrated planning. So the modest version is the idea of an academic Society promoting the new discipline as a triple field of research, teaching and practical applications.

The ambitious version is to supplement the fundamental academic goal by two practical goals:

- a) to monitor the progress in the practical applications of the concept of planning - to establish a data bank of planning experiences and especially of characteristic case studies documenting successes and failures of planning;
- b) to act as an advisory body organising expertises on the application of planning in different situations. The restructurisation of planning institutions could also be an important object of this activity.

My preference for the ambitious goals is very clear. The mutual re-enforcement of the academic, monitoring and advisory functions will create the theoretical and practical strength of the Society and also facilitate the creation of the proper financial foundations of the Society. In this context, my note in part B should be seen – the idea of domains and task forces, including grand corporations, military establishments and governments as sponsors and markets for the intellectual products and practical advice of the Society.

In the ambitious version of the goals – the Society should also promote a Research, Conference and Publication Programme: Planning the experiences of the past – the prospects for the XXI century. The Society could also promote a long-term publication series, maybe using, inter alia, my experiences in the design and implementation of the Unrisd – Mouton Regional Planning Series.

## II. *The dilemma of a big v. small society*

There are two temptations in our situation. One – to establish a Society of 100 members of an earlier character, following more or less the pattern of the Club of Rome. The second temptation is to create an open democratic Society, inviting everybody who would like to join it. The power of the Society will be measured by the crowd of, let us say, 2000 members.

My suggestion is to think about a medium-sized Society of 300-500 members of a quasi-elitist character, built on the following structure of personal and institutional membership.

### **Persons**

1. Honorary members
2. Founding members
3. Ordinary members
4. Corresponding members

### **Institutions**

1. Institutional members
2. Institutional sponsoring members

The structure of membership should have both honorary and financial dimension. That structure should solve the dilemma of an open and – at the same time – quasi-elitist character of the Society. The idea of the corresponding member is an invitation for brilliant young persons without – as yet – high degrees in science, business, society or the army to enter *WOSOPLAN* and provide the brainstorming push of innovative ideas.

So my answer is – the Society of medium size and quasi-elitist character.

## III. *The dilemma of a uniform versus differentiated Society*

We can choose the vision of a modest Society having a flat membership of one category – and just a coordinating but not governing board of the Society. Such a Society will not be able to accomplish the great historical mission to promote the idea of the renaissance of planning.

My preference is for a differentiated structure of the Society. This differentiation is to be seen in the structure of membership and in the struc-

ture of operational units which promote and implement the ideas of the Society.

In this context, I would like to mention again the idea of Task Forces as an elastic tool to implement the Programme of *WOSOPLAN*. The task forces will be open not only for the members of the Society – the activity and membership of the task force will create 10-15 growth centres of the Society. This is the basic factor supporting the differentiation of the Society, keeping the spirit of the competition among the task forces and opening a scene for charismatic leaders of the task forces.

#### IV. *The dilemma of managerially weak versus managerially strong Society*

It is very fashionable now to argue that Scientific Associations could be managed by a symbolic office without any substantial material inputs. The idea of permanently absent half-time secretary is an irritating nonsense. It is also nonsense that we do not need some element of good and efficient bureaucracy for the management of a scientific society

Therefore, I believe that *WOSOPLAN* must have a strong and efficient managerial structure related to a strong Governing Board.

#### *Conclusion*

The ideas presented in this paper could – to my mind – help to prepare first drafts of the Programme and of the constitution of the *WOSOPLAN*.

I think those two documents should be kept as separate documents - to open an easy way for changes in the future. It is difficult to anticipate how our thinking will function in the future in the substantial field/the Programme/and in the managerial field/the Constitution. It is quite possible that the intensity of changes will be different in those two fields.

To close the cycle of the three parts – A, B, and C – let me present the following outline of the structure of the Constitution of the Society:

- The turn of the centuries and the climate for the renaissance of planning
- The Preamble of the Constitution.
- The goals of the Society in the ambitious version.
- The nature of the Society as an institution linking the World of Science and the World of Experiences in the field of planning/Governments, International Organisations, Business and Military Establishments
- The differentiated membership of the Society and the Competences of the General Assembly

- The Executive Board of the Society
- The Task Forces
- The Managerial Structure

*Final Remarks*

This is a vision of a grand and strong *WOSOPLAN*. Maybe it is a utopian vision. Sometimes a utopia is a good starting point to think about reality – the past and the future.

I hope that this reaction to the creative letter of Franco Archibugi is a good material for discussion. I am fully aware that there are many weaknesses and simplifications in my presentation.

Warsawa – Zoliborz

July 27, 1992



## CONFERENCE FUTURE ACTIVITY

*by Alex Michalos, Jonathan Morell and Barnett Parker*

We are circulating this memo in an effort to help reach consensus as to whether any post meeting activity should take place, and if so, what that activity should be. As we see it, issues to be decided fall into three broad categories:

1. interim steps;
2. need for an organization; and
3. content of follow-on activity.

### *Interim Steps*

Regardless of long term or enduring activity, it makes sense to disseminate the results of our deliberations and to set up an infrastructure to further the "invisible college" that is developing here. To that end several activities may be useful.

1. Several journal editors are represented at this meeting. We wonder if it makes sense to consider these journals as places to publish articles or special issues based on the papers presented here, or on derivative materials that may be written in the future. One or more of the journals may serve this purpose. Thus some coordination among the editors would have to be worked out.
2. One of us (Morell) is willing to set up a system *alias* on the ITI computer. Once established the *alias* could receive mail from any of its members, and automatically transmit the message to all other members. If enough of us have Internet or Bitnet connections, it would make sense to use this approach to facilitate communication among members of the group.

### *Need for an Organization*

We are not convinced that a new organization is needed, but we are convinced that some form of continuing organizational support is necessary. To explore what is needed, we propose a discussion that would cover the following issues.

1. What professional organizations do we now belong to, what do they do, and what are the interconnections among them? Given the answers to these questions, let's examine very carefully the need for yet another professional association.
2. Do we need a new professional group, or do we need to establish some kind of federation or other boundary spanning mechanism among those existing groups? If the former, what can be done to bring it about?
3. If a new organization is started, what should be its general purposes. We propose two elements to the group's charter. First, it should be a loose coalition in support of better planning. We believe that most of us have primary disciplinary homes and organizations which will take most of our energies. What is needed is a group to address that part of our work not covered by those other activities. Second, the group should place a heavy emphasis on supporting an interdisciplinary view of planning.
4. If we were to start a new group, let's make sure we have a sense of what it could contribute to:
  - practical planning efforts, and
  - our theoretical understanding of the planning process?

### ***Content***

Assuming that a new group should be formed, we propose that it address the following issues.

1. The interaction of planning and politics.
2. New planning methodologies and tools.
3. Technology and knowledge transfer mechanisms to disseminate those methodologies and tools.
4. The value of an interdisciplinary perspective *on planning*.
5. Interactions among two dimensions in the planning universe: levels of aggregation (global... local), and substantive topics in planning (health, urban, economic, etc.)

Sept 8, 1992

## **THE OPEN QUESTIONS THAT ARE AWAITING A RESPONSE**

*by Franco Archibugi*

### **1. NAME**

On the name to give to the new association, for the creation of which there was a certain convergence of opinion at the ending of the ad hoc meeting in Palermo, there have arisen after Palermo new proposals (also in writing). Firstly there was that of Yehezkel Dror suggesting the use of the word "Academy", in that it is indicative of a certain need to characterise the "study and research" aspect rather than only that of a "movement" of our initiative. Later other interesting proposals were had.

I thus thought that it might be useful to carry out a guided opinion poll amongst all the "potential founders". To this end Nikolai Sitter, the Palermo Conference secretary, has created a questionnaire in which, on the basis of a list of all the proposals for names, an attempt has been made to find a method by which everyone can express their preferences. Therefore I invite you to compile the questionnaire (Appendix 2) and return it to me as soon as possible.

### **2. AIMS**

With regard to the aims of the association wide consensus was ultimately found in Palermo: in the Lichfield report are listed four points, as emended during the discussion with respect to the text presented by the restricted committee that had initially proposed them. Further "touching up" of the text would demand a discussion procedure that would be difficult to manage over long distances. It would seem to me sensible to stop at these four points, possibly allowing for further elaboration later on in the life of the association (of the "manifesto" or "charter" type that was put forward as an idea), perhaps at a personal meeting of those involved.

On this point as well I would appreciate opinions on content and procedure that we could evaluate and divulge.

### **3. FOUNDATION AND FOUNDERS**

The founders of the association will be all those who took part in the Palermo Conference on Planning Science given that they express the desire to do so. Such a desire will have to be expressed by letter, perhaps with the same letter with which you reply to the questions herein.

Furthermore all those who in some way have had an interest in the initiative whilst being unable to attend the Conference itself for one reason or another will be founders.

I do not think there can be other criteria for the identification of the "founders". Comments and suggestions are welcome however.

As far as the more or less legal putting into effect of an act of foundation is concerned, I personally do not believe it to be particularly necessary. If it proves useful for administrative reasons the Steering Committee of the Association will in some way provide for it. There is the GEIE form in the EC that could give to such an act the most "international" character imaginable today. On these points as well comments and suggestions will be welcome.

#### 4. STEERING COMMITTEE

I believe that the Committee to which was entrusted the task of making proposals at the meeting (for which see the Lichfield report), may be considered, until a more formal constitution of the association, the Steering Committee of the initiative. I would also recommend considering as members those colleagues that edit scientific journals in the field of planning science. The new body needs, in order to fulfil its scientific aims, which were moreover defined in the four points approved in Palermo (see Lichfield Report), maximum communication in the appropriate scientific community. A "Club" of scientific journals, moreover present in Palermo cannot but be of benefit to future activity.

The Steering Committee could be composed therefore until the more formal existence of the association by:

Ernest Alexander	- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Franco Archibugi	- University of Naples, Planning Studies Centre, Rome
Andreas Faludi	- University of Amsterdam
Vladimir Kollontai	- International Institute of World Economics, Moscow
Antoni Kuklinski	- University of Warsaw
Dalia Lichfield	- Dalia Lichfield Associates
Nathaniel Lichfield	- University College, London
Seymour Mandelbaum	- University of Pennsylvania
Peter Nijkamp	- The Free University, Amsterdam
Ignacy Sachs	- The Advanced School of Social Sciences, Paris
Tarcisio Della Senta	- The United Nations University, Tokyo
Stuart Holland	- The European University Institute, Florence
Louis Albrechts	- Editor <i>European Planning Studies</i>
Michael Breheny	- Co-Editor <i>Planning and Design</i>
Luigi Mazza	- Editor <i>Planning Theory Newsletter</i>
Alex Michalos	- Editor <i>Social Indicators Research</i>

Jonathan Morell           - Editor *Evaluation and Program Planning*  
 Barnett Parker           - Editor *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*

Communication between members of the Committee will undoubtedly be difficult, especially between continents, but we will try and make them – via fax or other media – as regular and as intense as possible.

I would appreciate comments and consent on these points.

## **5. HONORARY PRESIDENCY**

I personally think that we could usefully ask to accept "honorary presidency" of the new organism Jan Tinbergen and Wassily Leontief, both of whom have dedicated a lifetime to the methodologies of planning. Again on this point I would appreciate comments and proposals.

## **6. STATUTORY CODE AND LEGAL STATUTE**

The new organism will need an internal statutory code and legal statute that will have to be approved by the founders. In the Kuklinki document there are many elements for such a code. On the basis of Kuklinki's proposals the steering committee should formulate a code as quickly as possible to be subjected for possible amendments and approval by all the "founders". I do not see any better procedure: comments will be welcome.

## **7. SPONSORS**

The new organism can have sponsors. If they are permanent and general sponsors, I think they cannot be other than bodies on a world scale, given the scale of the association. These cannot but be connected to the UN or other non-government world scale organisations.

The UN University and UNESCO would be, in my opinion, the most appropriate, within the UN family, to ask for our sponsorship (especially in view of the fact that they provided it for the Conference in Palermo). Other bodies, however, especially research bodies operating within the UN, could be interested in giving sponsorship. Existing opportunities or suggestions on the subject will be welcome.

I think however for single initiatives – territorially or sectorially defined – other sponsors as well may be considered: multinational organisms of cooperation, national or local governments, economic bodies such as Banks, Societies of Production etc. in consideration of the particular initiative (I am thinking above all of meetings and reunions).

## **8. OPERATIONAL BASE AND SECRETARYSHIP**

My own institution, The Planning Studies Centre, is prepared - within the limits of its modest resources - to continue to act as the operational base of the new organism as well.

Nevertheless if there was any other operational base prepared to share some functions it would be even better. Therefore I am awaiting possible proposals.

## **9. FINANCING**

The minimum basis for finance cannot but be members' contributions. The steering committee will make some proposals. In order to finance in part cultural initiatives (mainly meetings and conferences) financial help will come from sponsors and others. For the permanent activity of the Secretaryship – such as that carried out up until now by the Planning Studies Centre – contributions may be had "in nature" from some existing institutions. The management committee for the time being and the board of the organism in the future, will have the task of selecting and evaluating possibilities, case by case, bearing in mind the principles of independence and autonomy of the new organism.

## **10. PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ACTIVITIES**

I would consider that the organisation of a periodic World Conference is in itself a demanding enough undertaking for an organism such as that which we are creating.

In the meeting in Palermo (see the Lichfield report) and in the notes by Kuklinski and by Michalos-Morell-Parker, interesting proposals were given for other initiatives of an informatory type. It would be necessary to create a "pool" of proposals from which the Committee may choose those that are most feasible (technically and economically).

## 11. PUBLICATION OF THE CONFERENCE PAPERS

There is as well the problem of following up the distribution and printing of the papers collected in Palermo, as the first public manifestation of the new academic body.

I would include amongst those papers also those of colleagues who, whilst not being able to attend the Conference for one reason or another, participated in the formation of the initiative in some way, and may be considered present in spirit. I would invite you to do the same with suggestions.

It has been mentioned that these papers may be published, possibly in special numbers dedicated to the Palermo Conference by the journals that will sponsor the new academic body.

I wanted to wait for the new body to find its feet before taking steps in this direction. However this would run the risk of taking too much time. I have therefore taken the liberty of putting forward myself a distribution of papers based on various sets appropriate for various journals. All this will be the subject of a letter of mine as well as agreements ad hoc both with the journal editors and with the individual authors.

Above all it is urgent that *each author lets me have the definitive text of his or her paper (possibly with the support of a computer disk with the indication of the word-processing system used), or that he or she indicates that the text in our possession (i.e. that distributed at Palermo) is to all intents and purposes the definitive one.*

In the meantime, I have begun to sound out some publishing houses in view of possible publication by volumes of the papers. If any colleagues have direct relations with any particular publishing house and thus proposals to make, they are urgently invited to offer assistance in this respect.

## APPENDIX 1

**Terms of reference for the proposal of a first "International Conference on Planning Science" (or "Planology")<sup>1</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 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*<sup>2</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 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>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</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>2</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.

<sup>3</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 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 "respubblica".

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

### 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:

- 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.

## APPENDIX 2

**Questionnaire****THE NAME OF THE INSTITUTION**

Indicate your choice by putting 1 for your first choice and 2 for your second choice and so on in the relevant box

- Association
  - Academy
  - Society
  - Collegium
- 

- Planning
  - Planning Studies
  - Planning Science
  - Planology
- 

- International
- World

Inclusion of the phrase:

**«The I/W... A/S/C... for the advancement of P...»**

YES / NO (Please delete as appropriate)

Please detach and return to the Planning Studies Centre as soon as possible.