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The world’s first large-scale meeting of planning educators from both sides of the Atlantic, the joint AESOP-ACSP Congress held in July 1991 in Oxford, U.K., may have opened a new era in planning education and research by facilitating the transfer of knowledge across the Atlantic. New Avenues for international exchange present us, as a group of planning educators, with a timely challenge: To develop a systematic body of knowledge about the contests in which planning practice and planning education occur cross-nationally.

This paper offers readers some observations comparing planning education and the planning profession on the two sides of the Atlantic. The purpose is to contribute to the creation of an international scientific and professional community of planners and planning educators by removing some of the barriers that currently make dialogue difficult. Difficulties arise from the considerable differences that exist among countries in the format and content of planning education and the planning profession. Indeed, the very concept of “planning education” may not be understood to refer to the same thing.

There are few published efforts that employ cross-national research in order to enhance our understanding of planning practice or planning education. Notable exceptions are Kaufman (1985) who has contributed to the comparative study of planning practice by researching the views of American and Israeli planners, Rodriguez-Bachiller (1988) who presents an excellent comprehensive survey of planning education in Europe and the U.S., and Sanyal (1990) whose book is the only major work that goes beyond comparison and directly tackles some underlying issues about transferability of planning education (Sanyal 1990).

In a recent article, Baum (1990) describes planning as “the extraordinary attempt to institutionalize intelligence in public action.” Planning education—the major vehicle for training professionals in the hope of instilling intelligence in public action—occurs in particular national or regional contexts and is to some extent conditioned by them.

In these pages, I present some observations about differences between planning education and practice in the U.S. (and Canada?) on the one hand, and European countries on the other hand. Although I occasionally extend the discussion to some other parts of the world, the major scope for comparison is the North Atlantic. This restriction is justified for two reasons. First, the contextual differences among North Atlantic countries are not as large as among some other parts of the world. Despite significant differences in culture, language, and political-legal structure, North Atlantic countries represent the world’s major agglomeration of democracies in the more developed part of the world, and these share, for the most part, common historic, linguistic, and cultural roots. In the past few years the shared traits have
grown stronger, as East European countries have been slowly recapturing this community of countries. Second, ACSP and AESOP are for now the world's only large regional associations of planning schools, and thus it is reasonable to seek a comparison of their institutional structure.

This paper is based on the author's ongoing involvement in ACSP and AESOP, personal observations over the years about planning education on both sides of the Atlantic, and current literature. It also reflects the author's direct role in setting up planning education and the planning profession in a country where until recently these did not exist as a distinct field, and thus the necessity to be aware of the differences between educational and professional models of planning in various parts of the world.3

I have selected particular aspects for comparison which have relevance for planning theorists and educators who are seeking to learn from the experiences of other countries. The comparison does not aim to be comprehensive. The latter part of the paper poses a set of questions for research that merit the attention of planning theorists.

II Planning Education

Is There Distinct Planning Education?

Planning education means different things in different countries, sometimes so different that an educator who trains what he or she calls planners in (say) Spain, Finland, or Poland, may not easily recognize the American training that goes by the same name. While in the U.S., Canada, or the U.K., planning education rings a bell with a shared sound range that will be recognized across the 50 U.S. states, Canada's 10 provinces, Australia, New Zealand, or parts of South Africa, the same term may ring quite a different set of chords in many continental European countries and most other parts of the world.

Today, in continental Europe, one may speak of two concepts of planning education: the new concept that some AESOP member schools are trying to promote and the traditional modes. This paper focuses primarily on what I shall call "the new planning education," meaning specialized training that is significantly distinct from architecture, engineering, or the like, to be recognizable as independent training. There are a great many forms in which this distinction can take place—from a specialization offered within another profession, such as architecture or engineering, to a totally free-standing degree program (see Rodriguez-Bachiller 1988).

It may surprise American readers to learn that planning education as distinct professional training is a longstanding, well-established tradition mostly in the "Anglo-Saxon" world (as Europeans call English-speaking countries in the more developed parts of the world). In most other parts of the world, including most of continental Europe, specialized professional planning education is either nonexistent or a relatively recent innovation.

Some Vital Statistics

The U.S. has by far the world's largest number of planning schools in a single country, with some 100 ACSP-member schools. In the U.S. and Canada graduate education clearly dominates the scene (in the U.S. and Canada there are 88 ACSP-member graduate programs9). Undergraduate programs are, with a few exceptions, weak and small (ACSP Commission on Undergraduate Education 1990). If one is allowed to play around with numbers, one can say that, relative to the U.S. population of some 250 million, this country has one planning program for approximately every 2 million people. The U.K., considered the motherland of planning education and the planning profession, today has 21 schools that are full members of AESOP. This yields a not too dissimilar ratio of one school per 2.7 million people, but, of course, this can be misleading: U.K. schools are generally larger. Curiously, Australia may hold the world's record number of schools relative to population size, with its 24 schools and a population of only 17 million7. In the U.K., professional planning education is either undergraduate (then requiring a "diploma" qualification) or graduate.

In terms of age, the world's most veteran and well established planning education granting a separate degree is in the U.K., with roots in the interwar years. American planning education, with its major foundations in the 40s5, may be called "middle aged."

The story of continental Europe is quite different. The major pioneer "new planning" programs there were established in France and Germany as late as 1969 and 1970 (in the Middle East, only Israel parallels these dates). The Netherlands followed in 1973 (Shaw et al. 1990). We might call planning education in these pioneering countries "adolescent." In most other European countries—from Scandinavia to Italy, Greece, Spain, and Portugal—planning education as a distinct field is still in its infancy, or has not yet been established. In all of Eastern Europe, including Russia, urban planning programs distinct from architecture and other disciplines did not exist under communism; the first program in the process of being established there is in Weimar in East Germany (Shaw et al. 1991; Kunzmann 1991). In continental Europe, where the distinction between undergraduate and graduate degrees does not parallel that of the U.S., planning education is often undergraduate and graduate combined, as is common in other fields of professional education as well.

Outside the U.K. the number of distinctly-planning schools in each of AESOP's member countries is usually small. France is the only exception, with 11 schools. Even in Germany, where planning education is better established
than in some of the other continental countries, there are only 5 schools. In most other parts of the world, including Japan, the number of schools in each country—if any at all—is small. Of course, that is not to say that planning is not practiced as a major function of government or private action. Paradoxically, in many of these countries, much more planning may be carried out by government than in English-speaking countries where a tradition of an independent planning education exists. This can mean one of two things: either that persons who fulfill planning functions are trained in other disciplines and professions and do not regard themselves as professional planners, or that these people do indeed regard themselves as planners, but view their training in a more dominant discipline or profession such as architecture, engineering, geography, or economics as constituting the proper—maybe the only—avenue for professional training in planning.

The Pattern of Development of Planning Education

The shared story in most countries seems to be that the initiative for setting up planning education must be taken by some individual educators who see this as a mission. Once planning education has emerged, countries diverge in degree and source of regulation and degree of government involvement.

Perusal of the AESOP Directory of Planning Schools (Shaw et al. 1991) indicates that in many continental European countries, national oversight appears some time after emergence of planning education. It is carried out either directly by government or indirectly through an officially recognized planning profession. In the U.K., where planning education was initiated and is continuously directed by a strong professional body (Rodriguez-Bachiller 1988, 191), the national government has also shown interest and involvement in planning education. In 1950 the British government commissioned the Schuster Report in order to provide directives for the desired reorientation of planning education in post-war reconstruction (Rodriguez-Bachiller 1988, 42–43; Healey 1983). In France the government commissioned the 1982 Domenach Report (Motte 1988), in Germany national guidelines for planning schools were developed in the mid-1980s in what is called the Schwanberger Modell8, and in Sweden a national study of needs was commenced in 19909.

By contrast, an important factor that has shaped the form and content of planning education in the U.S. is its purely “bottom-up” process of emergence and the general absence of government oversight. There has never been an American equivalent to these European reports. This difference strongly mirrors the tradition of decentralized initiative in American institutions, and public affairs in general. In comparison, Europe, even today after Thatcherism and post-socialism, displays a much greater expectation of government involvement in many areas of public affairs (see Hall 1991).

In its uninhibited terrain, American planning education has been allowed to develop as a reflection of the initiatives of particular educators or universities in particular locations. And yet in the U.S. (and Canada10) there is an impressive degree of cooperation and regulation of planning education—but this is achieved not through any government involvement, but through a process (common to many disciplines) of voluntary peer control called accreditation. In planning, this is carried out by the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB), a body created jointly by ACSP and the American Planning Association (APA)—the closest group there is to a professional association in the U.S. This mechanism was introduced in 1984 through the initiative of the community of planning educators; previously, a less rigorous process of “recognition” was operated by ACSP (PAB 1990). The process of accreditation is carried out with impressive consistency, flexibility, and self-evaluation11.

The result of the bottom-up evolutionary process has been a rich variety of programs differing significantly in course content, view of desired product, and style of teaching. At the same time, voluntary and informal mechanisms have been operating in the U.S. and these have succeeded in achieving an impressive degree of shared character, so that planning educators and graduates from 50 states and 100 schools can often engage in shared dialogue and feel that they belong to the same profession, defined in broad (and vague) terms. The mechanisms that have helped to create this shared aspect are ACSP on the one hand, and APA and its predecessors on the other hand.

The PAB accreditation process works to create some common denominator among schools that wish to be accredited, by requiring a minimum set of courses, such as in planning theory, urban systems, and an applied workshop. One can assume that these requirements are a legacy of some prior near-consensus among planning educators achieved before the creation of PAB through the existence of an academic community of planning educators and researchers. Accreditation itself has since 1989 opted for more decentralized criteria than in the 1980s, reflecting the view that each planning school has the right (and obligation) to define its own goals and terms of reference (PAB 1990).

The ostensibly equivalent mechanism to ACSP in Europe is AESOP. However, AESOP is a very new body, still far away from anything like accreditation. It was recently still in the business of evolving criteria about which of the highly varied forms of planning and quasi-planning education in existence in the member countries would be eligible for AESOP membership; this task has created considerable internal disagreement among member countries. Another European mechanism is a legislative one—the directive, which has come into effect in 1992, of the European
Community about mutual recognition of professional degrees. While it is likely to have some harmonizing effect in the future, planning education in Europe now remains highly varied among countries (Masser 1992).

The transatlantic comparison presents a somewhat paradoxical picture. Planning education in the U.S. and Canada is much more open-ended and internally varied than planning education is currently (and will likely be) in any single European country. But at the same time, planning education in North America has more in common across the vast distances of 50 states and 10 provinces than is the case among some European countries that are only a few hours’ drive away from each other. In Europe, on the other hand, national oversight and coordinating mechanisms often work to create greater uniformity within a particular country but no effective mechanism exists as yet for creating greater uniformity across national borders.

Product Specificity

The goal of professional planning education in any country is to produce persons trained in a manner that potential employers will recognize as useful and will wish to employ. Product specificity can be achieved in one of two ways: by making graduates experts in particular areas of substantive knowledge or by teaching students a particular set of analytic tools that are identified with the profession. On both of these counts, from a comparative perspective, the profile of planning education in the U.S. is probably the most open-ended and diverse in the world today.

Specificity of substance is another way of stating the old “substantive versus generic” (or in its earlier version, Perloff’s [1957] “specialist versus generalist”) dichotomy. This dilemma has plagued planning educators for many decades. Traditionally, the substantive area that has characterized the history of planning education in all countries is land use planning. Here, one can distinguish between two subtypes of traditional substantive expertise: on the one hand a professional focus on land use planning and the newer area of environmental planning and on the other hand a disciplinary focus on urban and regional studies that includes urban geography, urban economics, urban sociology, and urban politics (what the French call urbanisme).

Planning programs in Europe generally have one or both of these foci. In many schools in Europe, urban planning programs are an integral part of architecture or engineering departments (that is the case for most of Southern Europe, Scandinavia, some counties of Central Europe, and all of East Europe). They tend to have a strong emphasis on land use planning, urban design, land layout, and real estate development. The newer, distinctly-planning programs in France and Holland can probably be correctly described as having more of an urbanisme expertise. In France this orientation is expressed in the official placement of planning programs under the auspices of departments of geography (Motte 1988). Planning education in Germany and Austria, which is undergraduate-graduate combined and emphasizes professionalism, has a strong focus on land use and environmental planning, as well as on urbanisme. In the U.K., town planning education tends to be strong on both land use planning and on urban studies. In British-speak, planning programs are classified as part of the “built-environment professions” (see, for example, Smith and Wood 1991), along with architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, chartered surveying and estate management.

By contrast, planning education in the U.S. presents, on the whole, a weaker profile of common substantive expertise of either type. In the 1950s and 1960s, beginning with the Chicago school of planning, planning education—and planning theory—underwent what I have called the generic explosion that has shaped its course. It was argued that planning is a way of thinking and acting upon any type of problem and in any type of context (Saribib 1983; Alterman and MacRae 1983). Meanwhile, planning and architecture have drifted very far apart to a point of no convergence, as planning educators see themselves as part of the community of social scientists. Even though planning departments in the U.S. are often located in schools of architecture, this is no more than an institutional convenience (Dagenhart and Sawicki 1992; Kreditor 1990). The generic explosion has influenced planning education in many European schools as well, but its effect varies from place to place and is generally much weaker than in North American schools.

Land use planning (or, as the Europeans would call it, physical or spatial planning) is considerably weaker in the U.S. in comparison with planning programs in most other parts of the world[3]. This statement may be difficult for many American planning educators to accept; after all—they would answer back—knowledge of land use planning is a required component in the AICP exams, it is one of the more frequently offered specializations in U.S. planning education, and it has been on the ascendancy since the early 1980s. Yet, in relative terms, the difference between this focus in the U.S. and Europe is not just a matter of degree.

A recent survey by Miller and Westerlund (1990) has shown that (only) 65% of planning schools in the U.S. and Canada offer land use planning as a specialization. The researchers’ definition is quite broad, so the figure would be lower if a narrower definition of physical planning were to be adopted. Another study conducted recently also surveyed U.S. and Canadian schools. Focusing distinctly on physical planning, this study concludes that “even though physical planning subjects can be studied in a number of planning programs, many schools are not particularly active or have recently abandoned activity in the physical planning area” (Pivo 1989; see also Levy 1992).

This picture is quite different from the prevalent European picture. I would hazard a guess that one could
scarcely find any planning school in the U.K. or continental Europe—or for that matter in most other parts of the world—that would not have land use or spatial planning as its major specialty, whether on the urban or regional scale. Indeed, in most cases this would probably be regarded not as a specialty, but as an identifying feature and a built-in part of the program's core. The old institution of the planning studio, still a trademark feature in many urban planning programs in Europe and other parts of the world, has withered down considerably in most American schools, despite various calls since the 1980s to restrengthen it (e.g., Lang 1983). Recently, the debate among American planning educators about the role of land use and physical planning has intensified (Birch 1988), and some planning educators have called for restrengthening the physical planning focus (Sawicki 1988; Parson 1988; Krueckeborg 1984).

And what about the urban studies focus? The disciplines associated with urban studies are certainly not absent from U.S. planning programs, and PAB accreditation guidelines expect courses to be offered in these fields (PAB 1990). Yet the package of courses offered, its scope and weight, varies significantly from program to program. In some schools, the package of courses required in urban studies is weaker than in European planning programs.

The second avenue to product specificity is through training professionals to master a set of analytic or creative tools that are particularly identified with the planning profession. Possible candidates for this shared package could be tools of decision making, management, forecasting, community organization, economic analysis, mathematical modeling, legal analysis, negotiation, conflict resolution, etc. These, of course, are tools shared by many other professions, but not as an integrated package.

Although not substantiated by formal research, it appears that there is significant variety among American planning schools in the types of analytic techniques they see as basic to the planner's kit of tools. Indeed, the question of what should be the components of a planner's package of tools has generated considerable debate among planning theorists: between those emphasizing rational, quantitative skills and those emphasizing community development, participatory tools; and between those who would like to see planning adapt to the trend toward ad hoc negotiated decision, and those who bemoan the abandonment of the future-oriented, integrative view (see Galloway 1992). Where national oversight exists, such as in France, there is likely to be somewhat greater coordination and agreement among schools about the "trademark" kit of tools. In the future, the European Community may act as a further stimulus toward some degree of harmonization in the product of planning education. This may come through the directive of the European Community which, as of January 1991, calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications (Smith and Wood 1991; Shepley and Fryer 1991).

A particular area of expertise that spans both the substantive category and the tools category is the legal and administrative tools of planning controls (what Europeans call statutory planning systems). In reading descriptions of both U.K. and Continental European planning programs, one is struck by the much greater prominence they give to this area compared with their American counterparts. Indeed, in Europe, in-depth knowledge of planning and environmental laws and procedures is a trademark feature of professional training in planning. Why this difference between the U.S. and Europe? It is perhaps a reflection of the unitary, coherent, and visible national systems of planning legislation in European countries, compared with the more local, incremental, and evolutionary systems of zoning and other controls prevalent in most U.S. states (see also Hall 1991; Hague 1991).

This difference between Europe and the U.S. is likely to grow once the European Community sets out to implement its decision about mutual recognition of professional degrees. The "Core European Curriculum" that AESOP proposed is perhaps an early start in this direction. It promotes the teaching of planning procedures not only of one's own country, but of other European countries, and of the Community as a whole (Albrecht et al. 1990). This area of expertise is probably the one area which is uniquely planners' own in many countries. According an important place to knowledge of legal controls is probably a wise decision not only on its own merit, but also as a strategy for achieving some professional product-specificity.

In sum, then, American planning education has produced a product that is high on flexibility and adjustment to market demand, new tools, and new ideologies, but, compared with many other countries, is low on creating an identifiable core of expertise that can easily and consistently be identified with the planning profession. Indeed, unlike planning education in many other countries, there are few external trappings that mark planning education in the U.S. A typical European planning student visiting many American planning schools will not discern at first sight that he or she is in a planning program as distinct from a program in political science, economics, or policy analysis. The lower degree of product specificity may partly explain the incapacity of American planning education to contribute to the creation of a strong planning profession and to provide clear guidelines to planning practice (see below).

Academic Freedom, Freedom of Expression, and Freedom of Information

Rarely mentioned is whether academics in planning are free to be critical of government policies and ideologies. In the democratic countries of North American and Western Europe, this is usually not an issue, at least at the universities. Indeed, many of these countries offer as much academic freedom as humankind has ever offered. But in...
many parts of the world today, despite *glamor* East-European style, academic freedom is still significantly constricted.

In many countries, free access to information, considered a birthright at universities in western countries, is not allowed by government. As Cherry (1986) notes, this fact of life is a real inhibiting factor for planning research (and, one could add, teaching) in East European countries. Although Gordon wrote his article before *glamor*, recent evidence gained by this author indicates that restriction on information is still exercised in Russia today, and many types of social, economic, education, and morbidity statistics considered to be the ABCs for urban planning in western societies, are still restricted in some ways. In countries where until very recently even city maps were distorted, public control of information may take a long time to thaw out.

The social science model of planning in most countries of North America and Western Europe draws not only from the descriptive, politically neutral sciences, such as geography, but also from a strong tradition of social, economic, political, and philosophical criticism. This tradition was until recently virtually nonexistent in countries of East Europe, and has long way to go there. Perusal of writing produced by urban studies academics in East Europe before 1989 shows a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical. For example, reports about housing systems in Hungary, Poland, or the former U.S.S.R., were often replete with numbers, but devoid of critical problem-identification that points to a need to change policies. This is, of course, the situation in many, perhaps most, countries in other parts of the world today. Dunlap (1990) points out how lack of a tradition of critical thinking in many Third World countries (and the personal dangers of pursuing it) produces a way of writing and thinking that shuns criticism.

This factor has far-reaching implications for a country’s capacity to establish planning education of a social science, critical basis (the “new planning”). Indeed, it may not be a coincidence that under the communist regimes of East Europe, we do not know of a single professional planning program with a critical social science basis. This logic applies to many Third World countries. As El-Shakhs (1990) notes, social science critical planning programs have found it difficult to take hold in those countries as well. Planning-related education in East Europe took the form either of urban design or of a form of neutral urban analysis based on geography, economics, or ecology. One might expect that with democratization, new-planning programs will begin to emerge in East European countries if resources and professional interests permit. However, the disparity which the very notion of planning has gained in former East Bloc countries, might dim the attractiveness of planning education there (Kummann 1991) until the public in these countries can distinguish the difference between the old planning and the new planning.

### Professional Milieu

**Saliency of Professional Association**

In some countries the opportunity to belong to a strong, formally organized profession is critically important for a person’s professional identity, social status, and chances for moving up in the work world. This is vividly so in formerly East Bloc countries. In the former U.S.S.R., for example, belonging to an organized profession still means access to food, better jobs, housing, entertainment, summer-house lots (so called *dacha*), and the other things that make life minimally tolerable in an otherwise very difficult society. One’s status at work is much more important there than in more open societies. This is probably also true in less-developed countries where professional identity may be crucial for social mobility.

In countries where professional association is important, the professions usually depend on legal or administrative recognition by government agencies or other public agencies, and seek to carve out for themselves a terrain that is distinctly their own. Where there is a strong tradition of professional organization, members of a new profession will probably seek to have their educational qualifications recognized by an existing professional umbrella or will seek to create a new one. This will likely hold for planning.

In many countries of Western Europe, belonging to an organized profession is traditionally important, though it may not be as essential for the basics of life as in East European or less developed countries. This is most clearly apparent in the British case. The British Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) is the model of all professional associations in planning. Established as early as 1914, it is the oldest planning association in the world and was accorded royal charter in 1959. With some 15,000 members—all accredited professionals or students studying for a professional degree—rather than lay members—the RTPI is the world’s largest professional planning association, not only relative to population size, but in absolute numbers as well. In Britain, other land development professionals, such as chartered surveyors and architects, also belong to strong, officially recognized professions. Other professions or disciplines do not seriously contest the status of RTPI as the association of professional planners. RTPI is intensively involved in guiding and accrediting planning education and in making policies about practice. The government frequently consults RTPI for its opinions about desirable legal or administrative changes for promoting good urban policies. In short, although not recognized by a particular enabling law, RTPI has all the trappings and linkages of a full-fledged association akin to that of the “major” professions.

In other countries of Western Europe where professional planning associations distinct from architecture and other
professions exist, they are much smaller and weaker than in the U.K., sometimes numbering several score or a few hundred members (and none in some East European countries). In most of these countries the status of the planning profession is vehemently contested by other associations—architects, urban designers, or engineers—who claim to be the real planners and would sometimes place stumbling-blocks before any official recognition of the planning profession.19 In Israel, despite 22 years of planning education, this has been for me and my colleagues, "the story of our lives."19

Many of the new European planning graduates may, in the future, want to benefit from the privileges and status gained by membership in an officially recognized, organized profession. This is already happening, for example in France where the increasing number of graduates of the relatively new Institutes d'urbanisme have been petitioning the Ministere de l'Interieur to grant them professional recognition similar to that of the engineers (Motte 1988).

A potentially strong boost to the status of a professional organization in European planning practice was provided in 1983 by the establishment of the European Council of Town Planners (ECTP)20, which in 1990 had 11 national members (Shipley and Fryer 1991). As an association that accepts only national institutes rather than individual members, the ECTP reflects the importance of professional membership in Europe (ECTP 1989). In line with the European tradition of seeking official and legal recognition for the professions, the Council has obtained recognition and status from the European Community. It now has influence over mutual recognition of academic degrees and skills in planning, and through this mechanism, requires member countries to agree to three sets of charter definitions that are the makings of any professional identity: "the field and nature of the professional town planner's activities," "education and training," and "professional conduct requirements" (National Institutes and Associations of Professional Town Planners Within the European Economic Community 1989).

The ECTP charter defines "the field and nature of the professional town planner's activities," placing land use planning distinctly at the center:

The Field and Nature of Town Planning: Town Planning embraces all forms of development and land use activities. It operates in all social strata and on several interrelated spatial levels—local, rural, suburban, urban, metropolitan, regional, national, and international. It is concerned with the promotion, guidance, enhancement and control of development in the constantly changing physical environment. ... The members recognize the crucial role of national, regional, and local physical land use planning in achieving and maintaining physical, social and economic organization and environmental quality (National Institutes and Associations of Professional Town Planners Within the European Economic Community 1989).

It is reasonable to assume that the establishment of this supranational planning association will, with time, provide a stimulus toward professionalization of graduates of the new planning programs in European countries—both in countries that are already members of the Council, and those that are not21. The most clearly visible process is likely to occur among members of the European Community. The 1987 Single Europe Act of the Commission of the European Communities (CEC 1987) sets the rights and obligations of member countries to mutually recognize professional qualifications (Smith and Wood 1991). The directive on this topic came into effect January 1991, but it requires national ratification. This requirement is contingent upon the existence of a national professional association that recognizes the degree. So, planners or planning schools wishing to benefit from this mobility bonus may want to push for national professional organization and recognition. Such a process has already occurred in the Netherlands in 1991, a short time after the directive came into force.22

On the scale of salience of professional organization and status, the U.S. probably occupies one of the lower rungs. In a highly mobile and decentralized country where in many fields, individual skills and enterprise carry more weight than formal certification, belonging to an organized profession is simply not as important as in many other countries. It is perhaps no surprise that in most states, the planning profession has never fought legal recognition.23 Instead, a voluntary form of association has been the preferred option. The American equivalent of a professional planning association is the American Planning Association. Despite the absence of legal status, this association has played a crucial role in the formation of the planning profession and planning education in the U.S. (Birch 1980), and, today, jointly runs PAB with ACSP. APA has also held national certifying professional examinations whose "glueing" function for a national profession cannot be underestimated. Indeed, given the difficulties posed by the need to muster agreement among professionals in 50 states, the role played by APA is very impressive. And yet, the role of APA has been much less central and publicly visible than that of the RTPI.

Although in 1990 APA had some 25,000 members, this is not its net professional strength. Only some 6,700 are members of the American Institute of Certified Planners (Dagenhart and Sawicki 1992)—i.e., those who have degrees recognized by APA and have been interested in passing a professional examination. The other members are interested citizens or planners who do not seek certified
status. Considering that the cumulative number of graduates from all U.S. planning schools is reported to be some 25,000 (Patton and Reed 1988), it is clear that somewhere around 50% of currently-practicing American planners simply do not view membership in a professional association as being all that important. In per capita terms (relative to country population size) the number of AICP members in the U.S. is 12% of the membership in RTPI and may not be too far away from the rate in some of the newly formed and still embryonic Continental associations.

Recent research into the views of practicing planners in the United States supports my argument about the relatively low weight assigned by American planners to professional membership. Reporting on the implications of his research on planners’ views about practice, Baum (1990) writes:

Although they think of themselves as planners, they do not identify with any organized planning profession. Few look for guidance from a professional association, and fewer find any.

Similar findings are reported by Hoch (1988) who notes that planners find little intellectual or ethical support from any organized professional community. He draws a picture of the loneliness of individual planners, working alone with little peer support (see also Baum 1990). Other American planning educators have also noted the weak link between planning education and the planning profession (Teitz 1984; Stifel 1990). Galloway (1992) laments the disengagement process which, in his opinion, has grown into a rift.

Competition or Interface with Related Professions

Planning as a public function is carried on whether or not formal planning education is available. What other professions compete for primacy over planning in general, and urban and regional planning in particular? There are variations among countries on these questions as well.

Architecture, Engineering, and Surveying

Perhaps the best known “claimants to the crown” are architects, civil engineers, and surveyors, in that order—Kunzmann (1991) calls the former the “usurers” of planning. Architects are the major contenders in most of Europe (excepting the U.K.), including the Middle East, South America, Japan, and some other parts of the world. In many continental European countries, the authority to sign statutory plans still requires an architecture degree (Smith and Wood 1991). Engineers have a parallel claim on planning in some Scandinavian countries and in France. In some European countries, particularly the U.K. and Sweden, there is another contesting profession which hardly exists in the U.S.: the chartered surveyors—a highly trained group of professionals in real estate management and development. In the U.K. this profession, like architecture and civil engineering, exists alongside planning and does not claim to replace or displace it. By contrast, in Continental Europe, turf war between planning and architecture, and to some extent also with engineering and surveying, is by no means part of long-gone history. ECTP recently had a skirmish with the European architects' organization after the latter declared itself to represent “the real planners”.

The American planning profession has been free from the traditional turf war with the architects for several decades now. I doubt that the majority of current-generation planning educators or the leaders of APA have ever encountered strong overt friction. Dayeh and Sawicki (1992) report that the divorce between the two fields does not seem to be regretted by either side, as the two fields have pursued two totally different courses in terms of underlying theory, academic organization, and tools of practice. Meantime, someone in the U.S. must do traditional physical planning. I know of no systematic research that documents which professions or skills have stepped in to fill the vacuum. Within the openness of the American professional world, a mixture of professions and skills has probably stepped in, among them architects, landscape architects, some planners from the few programs (mostly undergraduate) where such skills are usually still emphasized. In order to fill the gap some have called for instituting more specialized urban design programs (Kreider 1990).

Geography (and Economics)

In several European countries—Netherlands and France, some Eastern European countries, and to some extent Germany as well—the new, social science based planning programs find that they are in strong competition with geographers, who see themselves as the urbanists, and would like to claim for themselves the newly emerging planning discipline. This front of competition is quite muted in the U.S. American geographers seem to be less competitive over planning turf than some of their European counterparts. This is perhaps partly because in the U.S., geography as an academic field does not hold as prominent a place as some other social and natural sciences. This contrasts with many European countries—both West and East—where geography is a major attractor of students and faculty.

Policy Analysis

The American planning profession has its own type of interface with the growing field of policy analysis. Dating only from the 1970s, policy analysis is an increasingly close bedfellow, sharing many characteristics with American planning. Policy analysis is "any type of analysis that generates and presents information in such a way as to improve the basis for policy makers to exercise their judgment" (Quade 1975, 4). As yet, policy analysis has not
shown a clear desire to organize itself as a profession, rather functioning as an academic discipline (Alterman and MacRae 1983).

If planning is defined as a totally generic field without a special substantive concentration in urban and regional systems or in land use planning, then it is difficult to distinguish it from policy analysis. Although MacRae and I have argued that it is possible to identify other differences between planning and policy analysis, these differences are much more subtle, and pertain to particular normative, ideological, and ethical elements conveyed by planning theory and tradition (Alterman and MacRae 1983). Some differences are also apparent in particular situations of planning practice, such as those dealing with long-range, comprehensive problems. Our conclusion was that, in some ways, American planning and policy analysis are on a converging, or colliding, path. Where planning practitioners seek jobs that are not clearly linked with urban and regional spatial problems but rather offer their generic skills, actual differences between planning practitioners and policy analysts might be very small. Aware of this problem, some American planning educators continue to be concerned with identifying and promoting differences between planning and policy analysis, but the task is not easy.29

While policy analysis as a practiced field is not exclusively American (it is emerging in other countries, including the U.K.), competition with planning practice in these countries is less acute. In the U.K., where town planning is well recognized by the broad public as a distinct profession, few would confuse policy analysis with town planning, even though these two fields share some ways of thinking and professional tools. In other countries where planning and policy analysis may both be new fields of higher education, the degree of competition would depend on the path of development of these two areas. In view of the greater focus in European planning schools on a substantive definition of planning as concerned with spatial aspects and the physical environment, I expect that the convergence and competition between the two fields will not be as strong as in the U.S.

Community Work

One more professional interface, though a less prominent one, merits mention. Both planning theory and planning practice in the U.S. have developed an important interface with community work. This has found expression in planning theories in general and social planning in particular, where community organization is viewed as one of the planner’s important roles (Checkoway 1986). I assume that this interface exists or will develop in West European countries as well, although possibly to a somewhat lesser degree. By contrast, in the former U.S.S.R., community work did not exist either as a profession or as an academic training program (interview with Tamara Drözse, Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences, Moscow, USSR, Oct. 1989). This type of public service has simply been absent under most communist regimes (probably for both political and socio-ideological reasons). Some first steps toward the introduction of community work have recently been taken in these countries, but it will probably take some time before community work becomes a major academic and professional tradition. Meanwhile, its absence may lead professional planning practice in these countries to delay its focus on community-intervention skills and ethic.

Degree of “Planning Mindedness” of Competing Professions

What can explain the different intensities of reaction to professional territorial claims in different countries? One possibility is what I’d like to call the differences in “planning mindedness” of competing professions in various parts of the world. By this I mean the extent to which these professions, in the absence of a planning profession or in competition with it, are asked to perform tasks that require considerable planning-type skills. This partly depends on scale. In countries where government habitually initiates a major portion of city or regional planning—large housing “estates” (to use a European term), urban redevelopment, or new towns—architects, engineers, or other professionals charged with producing plans for these areas may develop some of the skills that are typical of planning and may learn about modes of public decision-making and legal and administrative mechanisms for land development.

This scale of design for the public sector was, or still is, the norm for East European countries; for many developing countries; and was, until the recent trends of privatization, also typical (with different style and dosage) of Western European countries. One thus finds that many architects in these countries still possess urban planning skills acquired in practice. An exception is the U.K., where even under Labor governments, when large-scale public initiatives were common (and world famous), the professional demarcation line between planners and architects remained relatively clear, probably because it had already been well enough established before World War II.

By contrast, in the U.S., public sector initiative carries only a small portion of urban and regional development (excepting “classic” public works and a very restricted portion of housing). Architects usually deal with private clients, and much of the development is incremental. Architects are not often called upon to produce large-scale land use or urban development plans. They may therefore be less “planning minded” than some of their counterparts in other countries and are also less visible in debates with planners.

Where competing professions already possess significant planning skills, reaching professional identity for planning will likely be more difficult and the turf war is likely to come out in the open. In order to successfully promote the
emerging profession, planning educators in these countries would have to be self-conscious about the need to clearly articulate the particular range of skills that distinguishes planners and gives them an edge over competing professionals.

Range of Jobs Held by Graduates

A recent survey of graduates of American planning schools (Glasmeyer and Kahn 1989) provides a marketplace corroboration for the open-ended character of American planning education and the low degree of product specificity. It turns out that graduates of planning schools hold a very large spectrum of jobs. The Glasmeyer and Kahn survey sought to find out what proportion of the graduates hold nontraditional jobs. The findings are that 38% hold such jobs, as compared with 50% who hold traditional jobs. At first sight this proportion might not seem to be noteworthy, but it becomes so if one takes into account the very broad definition of traditional planning which the researchers employed. It included all the following fields: land use planning, current land use planning, regional planning, comprehensive planning, environmental planning, physical planning, social planning, transportation planning, housing, human services planning, redevelopment, and general planning. This means (although not stated in that report) that the residual—nontraditional planning—has little to do with urban or community planning or any spatial aspects.

Comparison with equivalent figures for European graduates encounters a definitional problem that reflects some of the differences between American and European planning education. An RTPI 1985 survey found that two-thirds of the members of RTPI worked in planning departments in local authorities, and some of the others also worked in traditional planning jobs in other public or private agencies (Rodriguez-Bachiller 1988, 46–47). One can reasonably assume that the definition of planning jobs used in U.K. planning departments is considerably narrower than the definition of traditional planner used by the American survey. Evidence about Continental European schools is even more difficult to compare, for the very reason that these schools are in the process of carving out an image of professional planning practice. Kuzman reports that only some 75% of graduates of Dortmund get work in traditional planning.30 One can surmise that some of what the Americans include under traditional, such as human services planning (perhaps health service or crime prevention planning), or some types of social planning, might be regarded as nontraditional planning in Germany and in the U.K.

A different and only partially overlapping split is between the public and private sectors. The findings of the Glasmeyer and Kahn (1989) survey for the U.S. indicate that 53% of the graduates work in the public sector and 30% in the private sector; another 7% work in the nonprofit sector. A significant growth of the private sector share of planning jobs in the 1980s has also been reported for the U.K., Canada, and New Zealand31, and has probably occurred to varying degrees in most European countries as well, depending on government policies and economic trends of privatization. Planning educators in all countries report on the various adjustments and conceptual challenges produced by this trend, but these are beyond the scope of this paper.

Market Share and Potential Impact

What is the market share of substantively-planning jobs that are held by persons trained as planners? This, in my mind, is a better indicator of both the market recognition of planning as a profession and its potential to leave a visible mark on public action. Of course, part of the difficulty—which may explain why research on this question is rare—is how to define the universe of planning activity that merits a professional on the job. The more open-ended is the definition of the core of professional work—what the researchers cited above called the traditional type of work—the more difficult it is to undertake such research.

I know of no U.S. data on market share, but we can look at some surrogate indicators. The annual number of graduates collectively in all planning schools in the U.S. in 1987 was 1,269 masters level graduates and 102 Ph.D. graduates (Patton and Reed 1988). In a large country of some 230 million people, with some 10,000 local authorities and many other government and public agencies, it is obvious that planning school graduates occupy only a portion of the jobs even in a narrowly defined core of traditional activities. As good as planning schools might be, I would hazard to guess that the cumulative effect of planning graduates is considerably smaller than in countries such as the U.K. or Australia. In the U.S. the planning profession is but one of a number of competing professions and disciplines whose members offer overlapping skills. Given the lukewarm degree of professionalization and very wide job spread, one can doubt that planning in the U.S. will make a major breakthrough in market share in coming years. One author who has looked at planning education needs in the next decade (Galloway 1992) sees the number of jobs rising in proportion to the total work force, not beyond (or below) that. So, planning practice is likely to maintain its position alongside other professions and disciplines, but will not significantly increase its visibility.

Compare this situation with the U.K. where the planning profession is probably the most institutionalized in the world. There, the number of graduates relative to population size and to the number of local authorities is considerably larger. Furthermore, although in Britain too there are many who practice planning in nontraditional jobs, the presence of planners in a well recognized core of professional practice is significantly more distinct than in the U.S. One survey estimates that in 1980, 68% of holders of the job
title "planner" in public service in the U.K. were qualified planners (reported by Thomas 1991). It was possible to undertake this survey because in the U.K. the job title "town planner" is well recognized, not only by potential employers, but also by the person in the street.

In the majority of countries where planning as a recognized professional practice is still in formative stages, planning educators and the emerging profession will have to decide which model they would like to strive for: one where the term town planner conjures up in the listener's mind an image of a recognized (and recognizable) profession, but where graduates will less easily move into nontraditional fields; or one where the term "planner" is fluid and highly responsive to market demand, allowing its holder to apply for a wide range of jobs, but where the impact of the profession as a group of persons with a shared task, will always be harder to gauge.

My personal experience in working closely with job placement of graduates in a country where planning education and the planning profession are relatively new, indicates that a reasonable strategy for the formative years is to train students for jobs that last on, at least to some extent, to a traditional conception of urban and regional planning, and expand and improve on that. This is more reasonable than introducing graduates to a totally new field based on their generic skills only. Once an image of the core of the profession has been created, planning education can more easily expand to train graduates for a range of nontraditional jobs.

### SOME CHALLENGES FOR TRANSNATIONAL RESEARCH

The current stage of planning education in the world provides opportunities for research which should not be missed. We are at a period when we can observe, concurrently, countries where planning education and professional practice are in their formative stages, searching for ways of gaining recognition and legitimacy, alongside other countries where planning education and practice are well established and, at times, taken for granted. Cross-national research about planning education and practice offers the opportunity to escape from the assumptions and values in which single-country research, bound to a particular context and stage in the development of planning thought, is inevitably captive.

In the research agenda proposed, I look at only a small segment of possible questions that could be addressed, and shall limit myself to those aspects about planning education and professional organization that were discussed above. Many other issues—those pertaining to socio-political, cultural, economic, and administrative differences—merit separate discussion (see also Alexander 1991).

### Agenda for Studying the Emergence of Planning Thought

The first set of research questions offered by the cross-national perspective is retrospective. It adopts a "sociology of knowledge" approach to the analysis of the emergence of planning thought in particular national or cultural contexts. Institutions of planning education are the social-intellectual milieu where the vast portion of planning thought is generated. The transatlantic comparison presented above offers an initial set of questions that probe the relationship between the academic-professional context and the creation of knowledge. Several examples follow.

### Size of the Planning Education Community

One can ask to what extent the demographics of planning education have some bearing on the creation and transmission of knowledge in planning within a particular country. Take the size factor. Since academic exchange is based on peer groups, one can ask whether the existence of a large enough community of peers sharing a similar "planning culture"—and, most importantly, understanding the same language—is necessary for the generation of planning thought. The U.S. has by far the largest group of planning educators in a single country, speaking the same language (the latter asset should not be taken for granted when comparing with Europeans who still find it difficult to share knowledge across language boundaries). This community of American educators has been large enough to produce an impressive group of planning theorists who have established an intellectual community of peers which dynamically builds up knowledge through vigorous mutual citations and critique. A similar process has occurred within the world's second largest community of planning educators—the U.K.

Research into the creation of planning thought in countries or groups of countries where planning education is new and the community of scholars small, can teach us something about the conditions for the creation of knowledge in planning and the strategies that could help overcome demographic and language constraints. The conscious promotion of transatlantic and, indeed, global exchange among planning educators and planning theorists in particular, and the development of mechanisms for overcoming language constraints, may turn out to be a necessary strategy toward the creation of an international community of planning scholars and educators.

### Age of Planning Education

In the U.S. and Canada, in view of their relatively long history of planning education, many of today's educators in planning are likely to be second- or third-generation planners, whose teachers and at times their teachers as well, were educated in planning schools. This may be even more
pronounced in the U.K. By contrast, in most countries where planning education is new, the teachers are likely to be either first-generation planners who have been trained in other fields, or persons who received their planning degrees in another country—mostly the U.S., the U.K., and more recently, some continental countries. What do these teachers teach their students and to what extent do they adapt U.S.- or U.K.-based (or other) planning theories to their own needs?

To what extent is the generational factor related to the development of planning thought within a given country? Looking at the pioneer U.S. planning educators, some of whom are still with us today, one notices that they were awarded their degrees in fields other than planning; in architecture, law, political science, or sociology. Indeed, much (perhaps most) of the American-based literature that some of us read in the 1960s and 1970s was written by theorists who did not necessarily see themselves as planners. I would hazard a guess that an analysis of Klosterman’s (1992) list of most frequently included references in planning theory reading lists in the U.S. would reveal that today’s lists include a much higher proportion of items written by theorists who are planners first. This statement is in no way meant as a judgment of the quality or utility of planning thought of any generation. On the contrary, the first group gave us many of our shared concepts, and produced many of our role models and “classic” literature. But it would be interesting to research the differences between the first-generation layers of planning thought, and the current third- and fourth-generation literature. One may be able to discern a pattern of development that reflects these demographic facts, such as the recent emergence (beginning in the late 70s and strengthening in the 80s) of a strong focus on empirical studies of planning practice and the views of practitioners, graduates of planning schools (see Dalton 1989).

Pattern of Emergence of Planning Education

Another factor that may have influenced the formation of planning thought is the manner in which planning education has emerged. In the U.S. this has been an evolutionary, highly decentralized process, with no government guidelines and with soft-handed guidance by ACSP and APA. To what extent has this pattern of evolution contributed to the fact that no dominant doctrine or ruling theory has developed? Rather, a variety of theories and approaches about the desirable set of skills for planners appeared, tending to change with time. It would be interesting to study whether planning thought in countries where planning education is more centrally guided, will tend to develop in a different pattern.

Effect of Academic Freedom on Transmission of Planning Theories

Much current planning thought in western countries takes freedom of speech and freedom of action for granted. It calls upon planners to take positions critical of official agencies, if necessary; to be custodians of truthful information to be provided to government to citizens; and to be agents of activities that empower weaker groups. These themes, in various versions that change over time, have been an integral part of planning thought since the late 1960s.

In those numerous countries around the globe where academic freedom, freedom of information, and freedom of speech are curtailed today, this factor likely has a major effect on which planning theories and approaches are overtly espoused or promoted by planning educators and transmitted to students, and on which theories graduates apply in practice. This is a rich and, in my view, tempting area for cross-national research. But alongside the exciting questions which this area of research raises, it also encounter difficult research constraints and caveats related to the very problem it addresses—freedom of information and expression. Researchers would have to use indirect indicators or to interview planning educators and graduates outside their home county.

Initial Agenda for Cross-National Research on Planning Practice

Planning theory has in recent years developed a new focus on planning practice—what Kaufman (1987, 1990) has called the new planning theory. This fast developing area of research has produced a growing body of empirical research either on individual planners or on samples drawn from among members of planning organizations (Dalton 1988). Into this growing body of knowledge, Bryson (1991, 164) has offered the challenge, with which I wholeheartedly agree, that “there is no substitute for an empirical defense of planning and planners.” But needless to say, with few exceptions, this body of research is largely noncomparative, focusing on a single country and is generally oblivious to the meaning of the particular national context in which it operates. The differences in national contexts of education and professional organization presented above can yield a rich set of new questions for empirical research on planning practice.

Relationship Between Generic and Substantive Focuses in Planning

The transatlantic comparison indicates that in many countries the planning profession is viewed as drawing its primary identity from its focus on the spatial aspects of planning, known variously as physical planning, town planning, spatial planning, or urban and regional planning. Yet much of the literature in planning theory has been
almost silent on the big question that planning educators in many countries ask: how to integrate the generic enterprise of planning and the substantive areas of focus. Planning theory literature rarely addresses the relationship between the generic conception of planning in the public domain (to cite the title of Friedman’s influential 1987 book) and the attributes of particular substantive areas of planning. Furthermore, most research on planning practice does not differentiate between types of planners (i.e., by types of expertise or types of problems addressed), nor for that matter does it generally focus systematically on differences in organizational or professional contexts for planning practice.37

Some U.K. planning theorists have criticized what they call the “contextless and contextless” view of planning theory and have called for a closer integration between generic theory and the substantive content of urban and regional planning (Healey et al. 1982; McDougall 1990; Reade 1987). Are they right? The answer lies not only on the theoretical level, but also on the empirical one. It merits research both on uninstitutional and cross-national levels. If, within a given country, there are planning schools with different conceptions of the professional product, it may be useful to research the degrees of satisfaction and effectiveness of graduates in practice. A cross-national view offers researchers the opportunity to compare more widely differing conceptions of planning education in terms of their capacity to carve a niche in the marketplace and to gain public recognition.

Salience of Professionalism in Planning

Planning theorists have long debated whether a greater degree of professional organization is desirable for planning. Those in favor argue that greater professionalization would give planning greater status and provide planners with a greater degree of support. Those opposing argue that the independence and flexibility of individual planners and of the profession as a whole would be hampered. This debate can go on as long as there is no data comparing planning in countries where it is highly professionalized with countries where it is not. Does a higher degree of professionalism help planners be more effective?

The comparative information presented in this paper has shown differences in degree of articulation and potency of the planning profession in various countries, as well as a difference in focus placed by various planning education models on planning as a discipline versus planning as professional practice. Planning theorists might consider developing models to guide the reality of practice in those countries where development of a professional identity is likely to be slow, and to distinguish these from models of practice where planning professionalism has reached a high level of institutionalization. The salience of professional organization also merits empirical research into planners’ views about the degree of importance they attribute to professional organization and status. The type of transnational research that has already commenced in the U.S. in recent years, could be usefully extended to the transnational format. The findings would help planning educators and professional planners in many countries set up their national agendas for the desired link between education and professional organization. As in any cross-national comparative research, one would have to be very careful to be aware of contextual differences that make a difference.


title: Interface Between Planning and Other Professions and Its Effect on Planning Practice

We saw that one of the important facts of life about attempting to introduce planning education and practice in many countries is the interface (at times fierce competition) with related fields. Comparative research on this topic could provide useful insight into the differences between, for example, an interface of planning with architecture and interface of planning with policy analysis. One could, for example, study potential employers’ views about the suitability of the skills of the competing professions. In countries where planning is new, findings would be relevant for planning educators who wish to assess the best strategy for building up the profession.

Effectiveness of Graduates of Planning Schools Compared to Those Trained in Other Disciplines

If, as Bryson (1991) argues, there is no substitute for an empirical defense of planning and planners, then the effectiveness of graduates of planning schools compared with competing professions is the “64,000 dollar question” for research into planning practice. To date, most research into planning practice has placed the limelight on persons trained as planners or on members of planning organizations. Alternatively, it has focused on the function of planning and has studied persons who perform planning tasks, whatever their training. What is still largely missing is research that views graduates of planning schools as a subgroup of persons who practice planning. Such research might usefully investigate the modes of work of planning graduates, evaluate their effectiveness, and study employers’ views about their impact in comparison with other professionals.

Conclusion

The major role of planning education is to train professionals who are able to serve as agents for the extraordinary task of institutionalizing intelligence in public action. Planning educators in many countries are today nurturing young plants of academic programs and of professional practice. Planning theorists everywhere may be interested in
developing a body of knowledge that could guide this enterprise. International collaboration and exchange in the development of planning education and planning thought hopefully received a boost in 1991 through the world’s first joint congress of ACSP and AESOP. Beyond the relative coziness of the transatlantic horizon, one can expect that the meeting of the world’s two largest groups of planning schools would provide a boost to the internationalization of exchange on a worldwide basis. The energy released could be directed toward more cross-national research into differences in modes of planning education and planning practice. The long-term aim of such research would be to create a community of planning educators and scholars that would transcend national contexts and language limitations, and would be able to pave the way for mutual learning so as to strengthen the planning enterprise and its potential social, economic, and ecological contribution around the globe.

**NOTES**

1. The linkage between the Association of European Schools of Planning and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning could provide other boosts to the internationalization of exchange on a worldwide basis.

2. The reference to Canada will be partial. I cannot do justice to current Canadian planning education because most U.S. literature on the subject either lump Canada together with the U.S. or does not mention it at all. Based on my personal knowledge of Canadian planning in the past (as a graduate of Manitoba) and based on some current literature, I would like to hazard a guess that Canadian planning education and professional practice exhibits a meeting point of some of the characteristics of planning in Europe—namely, the U.K.—and typically American characteristics (see Bradley 1989).

3. My limited knowledge about Third World countries is based on the experiences which many of us share, of educating students from these countries, but also on the particular position of Israel which, alongside its dominant attributes as a western country, also exhibits some of the attributes and public agenda of a developing country.

4. This number is correct for July 1991; ACSP executive meeting, Oxford, U.K., July 8, 1991. Of this number, 62 schools have already gone through the accreditation process and been accredited.

5. This large number of schools is coupled with a low degree of organization and cooperation. Information on Australia is obtained from a paper by McLoughlin (1989) and from personal conversations with Australian planning educators.

6. The influential Chicago school was established in 1946. The first freestanding department of planning was established at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill in 1949 (Garab 1983).

7. Exceptions are Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand, where the British tradition took root in the 1950s (see McLoughlin 1989; Barry 1989).

8. Information kindly provided by Klaus Knutmann of Dortmund University, who chaired the commission.

9. Based on several personal conversations with Swedish colleagues in 1989–1992, among them Bo Johansson, Göran Persson, Göran Carlsson, and Ingrid Lundahl. Lundahl was directly involved in the initiative for the national study.

10. There is a parallel Canadian organization to ACSP. In addition, most, perhaps all, Canadian planning schools have chosen to become affiliate members of ACSP and to date at least two Canadian schools have chosen to go through the American accreditation process (Peach and Hoofdeveld 1990).

11. This is my impression, based on ACSP reports of the Planning Accreditation Board. I have also had the opportunity of being a "participant observer" (as the non-American) in two meetings of a group of American planning educators, called the Planning Education Group, who met first in 1987 in Santa Cruz as the initiative of Paul Nickel and subsequently in 1988 at Airline House near Washington D.C.


13. Evidence shows that in the work place, planners on either continent may not be immune to employer retitulation (Krutmann, personal communication 1992; see Hoch 1993).

14. Conversations with an emigre from Russia to Israel who, until the last part of 1991, held a high-level professional position with an agency that handles information for socio-economic planning for Moscow (April, 1992).

15. As noted above, the 1990 AESOP directory reports that this first school is in the process of being established in former East Germany (Shaw et al. 1991, Introduction). See also Krutmann (1991).


17. That is not to imply that all British planning is happy with their professional organization. Hague (1991) describes some of the dismay expressed in organized fashion by radical planners.

18. The example of the Netherlands is instructive. In 1989, the AESOP directory about Dutch planning education, Falski notes that there is no professional association of planners as yet. But there is another group of professionals—the urban designers—who obviously see themselves as planning. In fact, the Netherlands is a founding member of the architect-led ECPT and first hosted the inaugural conference in 1981. In an informal conversation in July 1991, with Barry Needham of the University of Nijmegen, I learned that in June of that year Dutch planners were convened and encouraged to form a professional association in order to be eligible for the mutual-recognition clause of the European Community, that came into effect in January 1991. This clause is contingent upon the existence of national recognition of professional degrees by a national professional organization.

19. In Israel planning graduates have for the past decade been seeking avenues to formal recognition and professional status. Most prefer legal recognition similar to that accorded to architects and engineers, but the much stronger association of architects and engineers strongly objects. In 1992 the architects managed to encourage the passage of legislation in the Knesset that strengthens legislative hold on local planning-related positions even further.

20. An initial step toward the establishment of the Council was taken in 1983 when the precurser to the Council was established.

21. However, some planning educators point out that the charter of ECPT deals with town planning, and view this organization as normative of regional planning, for example.

22. See note 18.

23. To the best of this author’s knowledge, only one or two states have legislated a licensing process for planners. According to information provided by Carol J. Hallett (pers. comm., Sept. 1993), member of APA Board of Directors 1988–1992, a few other states are currently considering legislation along these lines.

24. I am not sure about other parts of the world, but I assume this is also true for Japan and some other Far East countries, but not so much for Africa.

25. In the U.K., this is a powerful, high-status professional group—with Royal charter—which has some 5 times as many members as RTPI.

26. Based on information provided by Joan Coffey, President of ECPT, and the AESOP Congress in Tours, France, November 1988.

27. This is the situation in Israel as well, where the academic level of geography in all universities is generally high, and most have developed strong specializations in planning-related subjects.

28. The U.S. PAB has often faced this issue. Could a policy-analysis program be accredited as a planning program if it adds some urban content? Where is the demarcation line? The continuing concern with this subject led David Savicki to organize a special panel on this topic in the 1990 ACSP national conference in Austin, Texas.
parallel panel dealt with the interface with architecture.

29. Updated in a conversation with Natalya Gorbachev, who in 1992 immigrated from Russia (the U.S.S.R.) to Israel, where she had held a high-level professional position in a public-service planning bureau (April 1992).


31. All British speakers stressed the magnitude of this trend at the conference on planning education held at the Faculty of the Built Environment, Birmingham Polytechnic, 12–15 September 1989. The conference was organized in celebration of the Royal Town Planning Institute's 75th anniversary. For Canada see Bentley (1989) and for New Zealand, see Barry (1989).

32. On the somewhat humorous anxieties created by language even among speakers of English see Brechin (1991), Williams (1989), and Alterman (1991). The barriers between academics who do not speak the same languages—within Europe itself or across the Atlantic—are a more serious matter that inhibits the creation of an international community of scholars.

33. For example, Lindeboom, Fziook, Meyerson, and Basford

34. Levy (1992) takes a critical position on this development.

35. Perhaps the most clearly defined and well argued recent expressions of these themes are by Forester (1989) and Krukmel and Forester (1990).

36. I know of two exceptions: Kaufman's 1985 study comparing the views of American and Israeli practitioners on issues of ethics in planning and Alterman's (1992) study also comparing the views of Israeli planners on issues of ethics, and comparing the results with those reported by Kaufman.

37. In recent years, as Baer notes in his introduction to his 1987 book, some of the studies about practice have moved from studying planners in a morally "footloose" way, to focusing on the meaning of the context of working for public organizations. But, I would add, this literature does not yet focus on differences in types and levels of organizations and on subject areas of planning.
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