

# Foreword

---

As rich as the English language is—with its over 600,000 words drawn from and strewn over space and time—it is one language among scores, each of which opens up ways of being, thinking and expressing oneself. This collection of diverse essays may be thought of as comprising a language of planning: one language among the many of politics, economics, sociology, and others. These same languages are not isolated from one another, and exist in reciprocal relationships. Elements transfer back and forth, and frequently are changed by the actors in the real world power struggles. From a historical perspective, we can trace out these progressions—successes and trends—that when examined, tell us about what we have done and how things happened. Through introspection, we can learn why we have taken certain actions, what we might do in the future, and what we expect to be done. We can learn from our created language of planning, and about its argument for change.

The diversity of this collection, in the scope of subjects and viewpoints, convinces me that planning's essence encourages its authors to speak outside of some normative prescription. There is space made for complexity, doubt, and possibility. For example, Judith Innes, Tim Duane, and even Catherine Bauer, when she discusses the type of city Americans are forming vis-à-vis European urban models, all explore the roles and results of individual, institutional, and social interaction. And each of them explicitly argues for increasing discourse such that what is written is multiple in meaning, self-generated and flexible.

One exciting aspect of reading the older essays is discovering the presence of current day themes embedded within them. For example, this statement, "I will conjecture that the evolving urban system has made many places functionally interchangeable, [and]...most radically has altered the functional meaning and reduced the political importance of

place," does not come from Manuel Castells but from John Dyckman in early 1966. The introduction from Don Foley's 1960 essay is filled with currently used terms such as 'diverse,' 'deftly interwoven ideologies,' and 'simultaneous in time.' It seems that our new ideas may not be what's new, but the focus of our attention is what has shifted.

As a final thought, change is not instantaneous. Purposeful hope and fervent efforts are more probable than the adoption of exogenous, utopian solutions and rapid, massive paradigmatic changes. In one example in support of this, Peter Hall discusses Joseph Alois Schumpeter's belief that capitalism would not terminate cataclysmically, but imperceptibly. If we accept this premise about change, and that planning may be seen as an argument for and catalyst of change, a comparison of present day conditions with past conditions tells us that planning has been succeeding. Things are different, and things are better. In the essays, as the authors propose change and improvement, they allow for flexibility in prevailing conditions and tempering of their ideas as they face the reality of everyday practice. Frequently, the empirical result differs to some degree from the conceptualization, as both the agents (the politicians, the public, the practitioners, etc.), and the structures (the institutions, the time-intrinsic variables, the mental epistemes, etc.) evolve and condition the outcomes. No conclusive and universal amalgamation of "planned goals" is arrived at, but there is a consistent effort by practitioners, students, and academics to understand situations, influence outcomes, and anticipate change.

This collection of essays is a reassertion that planning is a field that is scripted into many definitions, that holds many narratives, and that can be seen to have informed and adjusted over the past fifty year span.

Skip Lowney  
University of California, Berkeley  
April 1998

