

**International Society
of City and Regional Planners**

**THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF ISoCaRP
and the State of the Planning Profession**

The Hague, 2000



**International Society of City and Regional Planners
Association Internationale des Urbanistes
Internationale Gesellschaft der Stadt- und
Regionalplaner
Asociación Internacional de Urbanistas**

Mauritskade 23
2514 HD The Hague - The Netherlands
Phone: (31-70) 346 2654
Fax: (31-70) 361 7909
e-mail: secretariat@isocarp.org
homepage: <http://www.isocarp.org/>

COLOPHON

© ISoCaRP 2001

**35 Years of ISoCaRP
Reflections drawn from Presidential Addresses**

Published by The International Society of City and Regional Planners

Editor, Lay-out Judith Ryser, Secretariat ISoCaRP

Printing ISoCaRP

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Thirty-five Years of ISoCaRP and the State of the Planning Profession

Part 1 Reflections drawn from Presidential Addresses of ISoCaRP

Judith Ryser, City Scope Europe, London, United Kingdom

Part 2 State of the Profession

Sam van Embden, President 1965-1975	23
Gerd Albers, President 1975-1978	33
Lanfranco Virgili, President 1978-1981	38
Derek Lyddon, President 1981-1984	40
Manuel da Costa Lobo, President 1984-1987	45
Karl Otto Schmid, President 1987-1990	51
Javier de Mesones, President 1990-1993	55
Serge Domicelj, President 1993-1996	60
Halûk Alatan, President 1996-1999	65

Part 1

***Reflections drawn from the
Presidential Addresses***

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF ISoCaRP AND THE STATE OF THE PLANNING PROFESSION

Reflections drawn from Presidential Addresses of the International Society of City and Regional Planners

by Judith Ryser

PART I: RECURRENT THEMES AND CHANGES: SYNTHESIS

1. Background

The optimistic, almost euphoric times of the sixties were difficult to imagine in the austere nineties. They are also alien to the new millennium as it has still to assess the comprehensive merits and drawbacks of the 20th century. Planning is very much a product of the 20th century enjoying its greatest influence arguably after the second world war. Thirty-five years ago, in 1965, ISoCaRP (the International Society of City and Regional Planners) was founded in an atmosphere of plentiful. No longer considered the "not-so-gifted colleagues of architects" (2), planners were expected to create an adequate setting for the new post war society which was thriving on growth, technology and full employment. Planners, thus put in the driving seat of urban development felt the need to promote the planning profession, forge its identity and specify the services it could provide, together with the conditions required for planning to function. This was to be achieved through interchange of experiences between recognised and highly qualified individual planners from the world over. Through their international network, they were to promote planning, advance planning research, theory building and education and bring the planning debate into the public realm.

Attempts of establishing legitimacy, authority and professional status were not new. ISoCaRP itself emerged from the International Federation for Housing and Planning (IFHP) and continued to work with it as the Standing Committee of Professional Planners set up in 1955. In 1941, when both the architectural profession and the world were in crisis, architects created the CIAM (International Congresses of Modern Architecture) to lay down the deeds of 'good architectural practice' and the principles of the 'functional city'. In 1959, Team 10, the 'Phoenix' arising from CIAM's ashes, was shaking off the shackles of the CIAM 'Athens Charter' "to make imagination once more triumph over common sense" (2). Thus ISoCaRP knew from the outset that it had to steer between Cylla and Charibdis when seeking a global consensus on professional ethics and practice. Arising from a culture of repairing war damage, planning was not prepared for peace (6). This proved an arduous task. Only during the late nineties the European Town Planning Council (ETPC) attempted with other professions to rethink a Charter intended to further sustainable development.

Unlike architecture, planning is a recent profession. Moreover, it exercises wide ranging activities which vary between countries and cultures. In some areas, architects maintain the lead over the professions of the built environment and extend their activities to urban design and 'urbanism'. In others, the social sciences hold a crucial position in planning while, elsewhere still, engineering and the computer sciences play a dominant role in modelling and infrastructure-led planning. Countries like the UK have a long standing planning profession with its own professional institute since 1914. The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) represents professional interests and plays a formal role in planning education by ensuring that the curriculum satisfies the requirements of planning in practice. When a similar organisation was being set up at the European level in the context of the single

market, it became clear that not all European Union (EU) member countries had comparable national bodies. France has no less than five national planning organisations while other countries have bodies which encompass architects. The membership of ETPC reflects the wide variety of planning organisations. Naturally, they are even more diverse at world level. Many new professional specialisms entered the built environment, such as transportation engineering or urban design. They were infringing on traditional planning activities or broadening them to cope with the changing perception of the built environment. No longer a static physical asset ready for manipulation the object of planning adopted the dynamic mantle of sustainability spanning over generations. Spatially linked to place and location, planning is nevertheless affected by globalisation and the emerging information society. Alatan (9) expressed that in his evocation of mega-schemes such as the Silk Road Project reaching from Japan to Europe.

The planning systems themselves differ from one country to another. So do the planning practices. ISoCaRP facilitated comparisons for its 450 ISoCaRP members from 69 countries by compiling an international manual of planning practice¹. Written by practising members rather than government officials, it gives a short account of the main elements of each planning system with some insights into how it works in practice. It thus provides the context for an increasingly mobile planning profession. It is not intended though to reflect the state of the profession itself. The Society is dealing with this demanding issue by keeping it as an on-going debating point on the agenda of its seminars and congresses. The addresses of outgoing presidents on the state of the profession assure continuity and hindsight.

Part I of this paper aims to draw together the main points from ISoCaRP's sustained effort to examine the state of the profession and to make positive contributions towards it.² It also shows how the profession has changed its perception of planning and rethought its tasks.

Part II reproduces the original speeches of the past ISoCaRP presidents.³

¹ Adriana Dal Cin and Derek Lyddon (eds). International Manual of Planning Practice. Three volumes, covering 61 countries.

² Presidents of ISoCaRP:

Mr. Sam van Embden	Netherlands	1965-75
Prof. Gerd Albers	Germany	1976-78
M. Lanfranco Virgili	France	1978-81
Dr. Derek Lyddon	UK	1981-84
Prof. Manuel da Costa Lobo	Portugal	1984-87
Mr. Karl Otto Schmid	Switzerland	1987-90
Mr Javier de Mesones	Spain	1990-93
Mr. Serge Domicelj	Australia	1993-96
Mr. Haluk Alatan	Turkey	1996-99

The article is based on the speeches of the ISoCaRP presidents on 'the state of the profession' from inception to the present. It aims to consolidate the long term objectives of ISoCaRP which remain topical throughout the presidential speeches and to show how preoccupations of the planning profession have changed over the past forty years. It puts the speeches in the context of planning and attempts a consolidated outlook. **Figures in brackets in the text refer to the respective speeches. They are reproduced in Part II.**

³ The speeches of the ISoCaRP presidents on which this paper draws are: see page 9

1. "State of the Profession". Introductory speech by Mr. Sam van Embden (ISoCaRP president from 1965-75) on the occasion of the fifth General Assembly of the International Society, Düsseldorf, , Germany October 1969

2. Common Threads

Perhaps the most striking feature of the presidential addresses is the very consistent preoccupation with *professional ethics*. Although not explicitly mentioned in any of the speeches, the planning profession is conceived foremost as a service to the people (4). A moral stance runs through the analysis of the state of the profession like a silver thread which ought to guide the duty of planners to arbitrate in favour of equitable distribution and access to land, infrastructure, the built environment and open space. Even in its early stages with fewer members mainly from Europe, ISoCaRP adopted a worldwide outlook, extending the planners' responsibilities for equitable distribution of resources to the North South divide (4) (5). It maintained its global perspective (9) and continued to extend its views on professional ethics worldwide.

The second common feature of the presidential addresses is the pursuit of *consistency* in the evolution of the profession and *continuity* of debate to foster the exploration of the planning profession in depth. Most presidents refer back to the ideas of their predecessors. They also reassess their own ideas, seek to reconfirm them if they consider them still valid or, if necessary, supersede them with new conjectures. The Publication prepared by ISoCaRP for the 25th anniversary of ISoCaRP includes many such retrospective reflections and changes of heart⁴. Together, ISoCaRP's common pursuits constitute a remarkable effort of building up a collective memory to consolidate the image and standing of the profession.

After two decades of working towards a consensus on professional identity, Lyddon proposed in 1984 (4) to convert these efforts into an ISoCaRP Charter and a common ISoCaRP Frame. He too, had second thoughts about his proposals later. In 1990, he thought that Charters were inadequate and considered the more pragmatic Planning Practice Manual of greater use. It was preferable to concentrate on greater continuity between the themes of the ISoCaRP congresses, thus leading to knowledge in-depth which could be consistently disseminated through the ISoCaRP

2. Sam van Embden. "Some Reflexions on My state of the Profession of 1969. The Struggle between Imagination and Common Sense". Address at ISoCaRP Jubilee Meeting, Kaiseraugst, Switzerland, September 1989.
3. "Remarks on the State of the Profession". Introductory speech by Prof. Gerd Albers (ISoCaRP president from 1976-78) on the occasion of the General Assembly of the International Society of City and Regional Planners, Helsinki, Finland in August 1976.
4. "Trends that are likely to Influence Planning". Speech by Lanfranco Virgili (ISoCaRP president from 1978-81) at the occasion of the 25th anniversary of ISoCaRP in Warsaw, Poland in 1990.
Lanfranco Virgili. La situation de la profession. Éléments du discours de clôture, AIU ISoCaRP congrès de Stockholm, Sweden in 1981 (November 1995).
5. "State of the Profession". Speech by Derek Lyddon (ISoCaRP president from 1981-84) in Braga, Portugal in 1984.
6. "The State of the Profession". Address by Prof. Manuel L Da Costa Lobo (ISoCaRP president from 1984-87) in New Delhi, India in 1987
7. The mission of planning. Opening address by Karl Otto Schmid (ISoCaRP president 1987-90) in New Delhi, India in 1987.
8. "State of the Profession". Address by Karl Otto Schmid (ISoCaRP president 1987-90) in Warsaw, Poland in 1990.
9. "The State of the Profession". Address by Prof. Javier de Mesones (ISoCaRP president 1990-93) in Glasgow, United Kingdom in 1993.
10. "State of the Profession". Address by Prof Serge Domicelj (ISoCaRP president 1993-96) in Jerusalem, Israel in 1996.
11. "The State of the Profession". Address by Halûk Alatan (ISoCaRP president 1996-99) in Gelsenkirchen, Germany in 1999.

⁴ 25 Years of ISoCaRP/ IAU, IGSRP. ISoCaRP, The Hague, 1990.

Bulletin and congress reports. Project based work was considered better able to translate the work of planners to the outside world.⁵ This did not prevent ISoCaRP from making contributions at its 1999 congress to the ETPC attempt of creating a new, albeit less prescriptive and more flexible charter for planning. It also offered its ideas on the contribution of planning to the future of cities at the URBAN 21 global conference 2000 in Berlin, having already pleaded through Domicelj (8) for more strategic attention to planning at the 1996 Professional and Researchers Forum within the UN Habitat II conference.

The long term nature of planning itself may perhaps explain the '*longue durée*' perspective which ISoCaRP presidents have adopted in examining the state of the profession. In 1969, van Embden denounces the discontent with the profession in a rapidly urbanising world but evokes the planner's paradox which is to design immovables to accommodate ultra-movable matter (1). In 1993, de Mesones picks up the theme again when he confirms that despite the pressure on planners to constantly modify their position and adapt to society's relentless evolution, planners have faced the same set of problems for hundreds of years (7). Alatan refers to even more eternal issues such as the suffering of mankind and the need for world peace (9).

Two contextual themes are a consistent ISoCaRP topic over its thirty five years' existence. They are concerned with the dialectics between outside attitudes towards planners and attitudes of planners towards their profession under the influence of these outside influences.

At the outset of the debate on the profession, van Embden (1) starts from the 'is-state', the discontent of people with the built environment and by inference the planning profession responsible for producing it. He then proceeds to give external causes which are outside the remit of planners for this state of affairs and lists the necessary conditions which would enable planners to carry out their jobs more satisfactorily.

De Mesones is more critical with the planners. Like Buddha and Jesus before them, they undergo and should resist three types of temptations: the economic temptation which leads to personal gain, the political temptation to use privileges and power to destroy and replace what others have built and nurtured, and finally the temptation of arrogance and contempt (7).

The other contextual theme, which appears in most speeches, is the insufficient legal context of planning. This raises dependency between planners and politicians and pressures from the private market. While they consider that the general public holds an erroneous conception of the planner's role in the deficiencies of the physical environment, they also voice their concern about planners' lack of humility as well.

A further topic which runs through the assessment of the state of the profession is its technical content. Planners' tools of the trade have changed dramatically over the last thirty years and, in particular, the place which computing takes in planning (6). The technological content of planning is linked to the debate about the rationality of planning (3), its legitimacy and its position vis-à-vis the less tangible merits of creativity, sensitivity and sensorial dimensions (5).

For a Society which is essentially a debating forum, as well as a voice for the profession, it is important to keep these contradictory key issues on the agenda for which "each generation will have to find its own solution" (1).

⁵ Ibid. p 51.

3. Changes

Alongside these relatively permanent themes concerning the state of the profession, each president dealt with the changes that had taken place during his period of office and how they affected the planning profession. Until 1993, all ISoCaRP presidents had come from Europe and their remarks applied essentially to the developed world. This changed when Domicelj from Australia broadened ISoCaRP's outlook both in geographic and generational terms as he made a major contribution to attracting young planners and giving planners from the developing world special access to the young planners workshop and the poster competition. Similarly, Alatan from Turkey addresses issues affecting the developing world profoundly, such as population explosion and uneven distribution of resources.

During the lifetime of ISoCaRP, planners were continuously exposed to criticisms. However the nature of these grievances varied, together with the types of people who voiced them against the planners. Often dissatisfaction was aimed at the deficiencies of the built environment and, only by inference, at the planners who were nevertheless considered to be responsible for them. Therefore, ISoCaRP presidents were keen to show the real causes behind the ills of towns and cities in their addresses, which for them lay much more in the economic, social, political and later environmental context than in planning interventions themselves. Nevertheless, with planning problems increasing in complexity and size, ISoCaRP recognises the responsibility of planners in urban development.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

Van Embden's period of office was marked by the belief in industrialised building technology, bulldozer renewal, frantic urban growth and sprawl. He was worried before his time on their effects on the natural environment, as well as on society as revealed by the rising tide of urban sociological critique. The '68 student movements had a profound impact on the public realm and triggered the debate on 'the right to the city' led by the likes of Henri Lefebvre and Manuel Castells.

In van Embden's (1) view in 1969, these turbulent changes required both flexible planning and orderly public infrastructure funding. The latter reflects the stable role of the public sector at a time when it employed the majority of planners in a political context which accepted a just balance between public welfare and private property rights. He spearheaded notions of integrated and comprehensive planning based on scientific findings at a time when environmental determinism of which he was suspicious had entered the scene in the USA. He denounced zoning and the return to eclectic historicism as it could not solve the massive housing needs. Nor should planning offer solutions at a macro-scale to the detriment of urban design, attention to detail and mixed uses. He also dwelt on the timelag between political decisions and implementation. By blaming planners of the day, people tend to ignore that decisions have been taken long before, often in a very different political context. However, this does not exonerate the planners in charge of implementation. In the absence of sound research explaining the aversion of people against their contemporary public realm, progress would have to occur by example. Unlike their predecessors, the present urban population likes modern dwellings but prefers historic rather than contemporary urban settings. This means that planning has to reestablish a good balance between individual and collective needs.

Van Embden's arguments betray his modernist background. He objects to 'inhabited sculptures' and prefers to build on continuity. But planning should not become "a regimentation of life and end all adventure". His challenge to the profession is thus to learn how to plan as if there was no planning.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

In 1976, *Albers* explored the state of the profession in a very different context. The property boom and bust had just sent its shock waves through Europe against the backcloth of the Club of Rome's limits to growth⁶ campaign. Disillusionment had hit mathematical modelling which had found its way from Nasa into Californian planning theories, then in the sixties to British universities and the practices of their professors and later to continental Europe. Decision makers were no longer able or willing to seek 'rationality' in a panacea of 'scientism' and substitute their thinking by the computer industry. The post '68 reforms had bred a new generation of community activists who joined forces with the greens and got world exposure at the UN environment conference in Stockholm in 1972. Douglas Lee's 'Requiem for large scale planning models'⁷ marked a turning point away from single solutions to diversity and localism with which the postmodernists have challenged the certainty of modernity.

The 'petrol shock' triggered by OPEC's quadrupling of the oil price sent tremors through the foundations of planning based on the supremacy of the motor car. Conservation awareness has also reached the architectural heritage. But just like the slump in the early eighties, material preoccupations were once more displacing idealism in the mid-seventies, as *Futuribles'* longitudinal work on European values shows.⁸

Involved in both teaching and practice, Albers (2) is advocating better cooperation between planners and researchers to establish a clearer link between transformations of the built environment and those due to planning and in order to respond to the requirements of flexibility. Planners are now facing the political nature of planning and its ideological undercurrents which prevents them from hiding behind technical or aesthetic arguments. Moving them closer to reality, politics also locks planners into a double bind between the planning authority and the people who demand participation. But participation becomes one way 'consultation' at the local level outside important decisions and planning laws are emasculated by procedural precautions.

The fascination for reductionist modelling gives way to complex mechanisms of regulating the interplay between physical, social, economic and fiscal policies which no single profession can master. And vertiginous speed of change gives way to the preservation of resources and conservation of the existing built environment. Yet curbing change may lead to immobility, conservation may hamper innovation, quantitative analysis may constrain the autonomy of the environment and its own ecological and aesthetic requirements too much, reflection may stifle action and creativity.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

In 1981, *Virgili* finds 'complexity and responsibility' the key features of the planning profession. This is not surprising against the backcloth of turbulent economies with fluctuating inflation and debt levels which politicians do not seem able to tame. Preoccupations with the nuclear threat and a

⁶ Donella H Meadows, Dennis L Meadows, Jorgen Randers, William W Behrens III. 1972. *The Limits to Growth*. A report for the Club of Rome project on the predicament of mankind. Earth Island, London.

⁷ Douglas Lee. 1973. Requiem for large scale planning models. In: *The Journal of the American Institute of Planners*

⁸ *Futuribles, analyse et prospective. L'évolution des valeurs des Européens*, numéro spécial 200. July-August 1995, p 140.

stifling cold war context are raising awareness of worldwide instability. Virgili reconfirms that dealing solely with physical matters is no longer enough to resolve the complexity inherent in all urban projects. Planners traditionally trained as architects or geographers need knowledge in sociology, economy culture and politics, hence ISoCaRP's guidelines for a multidisciplinary training programme for planners.

Perhaps the greatest challenge for planners is the time frame of urban projects which evolve slowly under the influence of conflicting interests, changing public perceptions and short-term economic cycles. The planner becomes a negotiator, preserving the basic principles of a project and its public interest while adapting it to the realities of the day. Political in essence, an urban project needs transforming into operational actions. It is the planners' role to propose a methodology, devise programmes and monitor implementation without mortgaging the future. Planners are not disinterested partners as their choices imply gains and losses, together with judicial, economic and social consequences for which they have to take responsibility as a profession and as individuals.

Virgili (3) takes the long range approach at the 25th anniversary of ISoCaRP in 1990, when he reconfirms his views on the state of the profession during his presidency and formulated earlier in the "ISoCaRP Programme Text" of Lyon in 1967. Over twenty years, the planning problems forecast by ISoCaRP have indeed entered the consciousness of politicians and society at large. However, it could be argued that the 'planners' foresights which Virgili refers to were coined and reconfirmed mainly during expansionist times.

In the recessionary period of the early eighties, quantitative demand still needs to be satisfied. The plea for shelter of the UN Habitat conference in Vancouver in 1976 is far from fulfilled and paying greater attention to quality and citizens' needs will not simplify matters. Geopolitical events continue to dominate the world. International bodies have signed ecological agreements, such as the UN convention on transboundary air pollution. The 1980 North South Report: a programme for survival produced by the Commission on International Development Issues under Willy Brandt reminds the world of its global responsibilities. This time, planners are better prepared. They meet the second petrol shock with energy efficiency measures and resource conscious urban renewal. Greater responsibilities are also claimed at the local level. Decentralisation is imminent in France, leading to more community based iterative development. Project-based interdisciplinary teams come into being and such professionalisation is assisted by a more sophisticated planning education. The planning profession is coming of age.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

Cities and their development are very much at the centre of attention during *Lyddon*'s term of office which covered a world recession and perhaps the most frantic start towards recovery. Many other professions have moved in on cities and share a common knowledge base with planners. Lyddon sees the planners as part of a transdisciplinary team, making sure though that they are not losing their capability to plan and to act. Planning means making rational use of land, specialising in the craft of synthesis and revealing forms through visual images: "a vision of the shape of place which responds to the territorial imperative for physical identity".

In his address in 1984, Lyddon (4) picks up the question of whether planners are ready to declare their position. He boldly proposes a Charter for ISoCaRP and an ISoCaRP Frame to resolve what he terms as 'the crisis in human settlements' after a particularly deep depression in the early eighties. His move is prompted by his conviction that the planners are unable to put themselves across. They have no standing, for example, with the World Bank. A Charter could announce to the world who

planners are and what they can do. This presupposes consensus on the 'state of the profession': on '*idées forces*' without '*idées fixes*'. Lyddon suggests three headings: type of planning; administrative system; unique capability of the profession to the benefit of its clients.

To-date, ISoCaRP has no Charter and no Frame. The reason may be that the planning profession is made up of too many diverse skills and aspirations. A charter means a declared cause with a collective identity. No charter may mean that planners may not want to engage in corporate campaigning. In any case, Lyddon has second thoughts about his charter and is opting against it at the 25 year anniversary of ISoCaRP in 1990, because it would be pompous, give rise to misunderstandings and stultify the profession. In reality, ISoCaRP does not lend itself to operate as a lobby for planners with government, the private sector and client organisations. He prefers to disseminate information widely on the profession and its successfully achieved activities.⁹ As regards "the ISoCaRP Frame", he thinks that linking planning themes to the state of the profession assists in building up ISoCaRP's knowledge base, its 'collective memory', which it then communicates to the outside world at its public events and through its publications.

Nevertheless, Lyddon makes some specific points on the state of the profession in 1984 when planning is seen to stand in the way of development and when the private sector considers itself a better "manager of uncertainty" and asks to leave "making arrangements for the future use of space by people" to the market. Such liberalism contradicts his proposed physical planning system. It consists of two foundation stones: capturing the increase of land value for the community; and public participation, not lip service consultation in decision making. There are also five pillars of regulating change: a multiple perception of "the client" as the commissioner, the developer and the citizen; and the role of planners as custodians of the physical fabric over time.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

In 1987, **da Costa Lobo**'s address is a departure from past speeches as it takes place in the 'developing world' in New Delhi. A year before, Portugal and Spain have joined the European Communities drawing their attention somewhat away from their ex-colonial links and the Southern Mediterranean. Influenced by a new materialism based on competitiveness and individual self-advancement, the Single European Market preparations shift the emphasis of European cooperation towards economic and trade requirements. Wealthy fortress Europe looms at the horizon and triggers protectionism elsewhere. Such segregation is contradicted by the 1987 Brundtland report on Our Common Future for the World Commission on Environment and Development which strongly advocates worldwide solidarity and cooperation, including on the urban challenge. ISoCaRP maintains its global and inclusive perspective, not least by accepting corporate membership of professional planning bodies. Da Costa-Lobo (5) advocates a regional structure for ISoCaRP, together with strong links to global and regional organisations (UNESCO, UN, INTA, the Council of Europe, etc). He also postulates that international help is a prerequisite of successful worldwide cooperation.

On the state of the profession, da Costa Lobo focuses on continuity with previous ISoCaRP statements. He consolidates the main findings to the benefit of members outside Europe who have less opportunities of actively participating in ISoCaRP events. What he adds is his view that new development should no longer be opposed to conservation, but that planners should make them work together as interdependent factors of planning. He also believes that planning has to play a dual

⁹ International Manual of Planning Practice. Op. cit.

role in circumstances when all the technical tools can be put to use, as well as on the ground where instant action is needed by "barefoot planners". Replacing Lyddon's man from space with children, he raises challenging questions about the role of planners and probes to what extent they are able to fulfil the expectations of future generations.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

The end of the cold war, arguably the least expected and most dramatic event during the whole existence of ISoCaRP, had preceded **Karl-Otto Schmid**'s assessment of the profession in Warsaw. ISoCaRP was before its time when it planned the 1990 congress, moreover on cities and the environment which are highly sensitive areas in Eastern Europe. What is becoming 'one world' thriving on the peace dividend presents unprecedented opportunities for planners. Yet, the uncertainties and instabilities in the wake of the cold war may have an even greater influence on the state of the profession. Fragmentation and the race for instant solutions is appearing in every walk of life, from TV zapping to key-in-hand private development parcels in cities.

Schmid (6) warns of ready made comparisons which are likely to result in sweeping generalisations and foresees difficulties in the transfer of planning experiences across cultures. The problems of comparisons and knowledge transfers are becoming even more topical in a world without clear-cut ideological camps, dominated by the market economy in which planners can move more freely. Identifying similarities and differences among professional practices becomes important when planners expect to play a greater role in a changed world and at a more global level. They also need to re-establish their credentials which seem to have waned since the self-confident years after the inception of ISoCaRP. Rising expectations and greater political awareness are questioning the technocratic and often reductionist tools of planners: mathematical modelling, rigid planning legislation and monitoring techniques.

Meanwhile, decision makers are circumventing the realm of the planners. Schmid lists a host of areas which infringe on the planners' realm. Governments may bypass legal procedures or abbreviate with emergency measures what they consider as unreasonably drawn out planning processes. Other consultants who promise quick fixes replace planners in emergency programmes and those with complementary skills should be drawn into cooperation, as planners cannot do and know it all. Scenario writing is out, instant solutions are in with politicians. But planners still have the duty to pinpoint long term problems disliked by political short-termism. The same is true for the need of generalists who can bring together the expertise of an ever growing set of specialists locked up in unbridgeable technologies to avoid sub-optimisation. The planners should consciously hold on to their expertise as negotiators and compromisers and call for counter-expertise in fields which resort to the stratosphere of technology. Schmid urges the profession to brace itself for reconquest. The only way though for planners to win back their legitimacy is by demonstrating appropriate skills.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

The 'state of the profession', presented by **de Mesones** in 1993 is set against the backcloth of yet another world recession, this time paired with a 'first world' austerity drive. The boom-bust cycles seem to get shorter and steeper and occur in an increasingly turbulent environment. Steady, traditional values appear to lose relevance. Actions are taken with little reference to past achievements or failures at a hectic speed in a world of merry-go-round takeovers and turncoats. Persistently high unemployment and structural changes in the economy which will not absorb it even during output growth may create a lasting rift in society. Some observers fear the emergence of an underclass with all the dangers of frustration, rebellion and lawlessness. The political and societal

backlash after the initial euphoria and consumer boom which ensued the demise of the Berlin wall, together with rising nationalism and jingoistic localism couched in overall lack of European and world solidarity mark a menacing fin de siècle. A glance at the Kondrachev curves is not more reassuring.

This may explain why de Mesones (7) had chosen a long range perspective to revive an ethic for planners. He opposes very deep rooted recurrent phenomena to the destructive short-termism of the nineties. He uses the parables of the temptations of Buddha and Jesus to indicate how the planners should uphold their moral stance. In particular, they should resist personal gains from added value which stems from planning interventions and is owed to society instead. He denounces fashions, especially when they hijack serious matters like sustainability and appeals to planners to show civil courage. Circumstances have changed enormously during the thirty years of ISoCaRP's existence. However, on the state of the profession, de Mesones goes almost full circle to arrive back at van Embden's initial plea for professional ethics.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

Domicelj enters the new ISoCaRP decade with energy and innovative spirit. He has been instrumental in attracting many more young planners and giving them a forum to bring new ideas to ISoCaRP. He also established closer links with AESOP to influence planning education. His address from a New World perspective compares issues for planning professionals between the industrial and developing worlds, focusing on participatory governance. Intractable globality is antagonising tenacious localism. Not everybody is happy with the World Trade Organisation whose free trade philosophy is challenged by poorer and smaller countries with traditional local economies. Barefoot movements act against concentration of power and enforced changing lifestyles. For them liberalising (tele-) communications infrastructure is emphasising the divide between information rich and information poor. However, the impact of freer, faster and more widely accessible means of communication help also to circulate ideas and knowledge to remote places. The impact of information technology on cities and the countryside is only just making its mark and it does not come as a surprise that civil society wishes greater control over its local destiny. Ironically local authorities are increasingly resorting to information technology for their service delivery and even electronic voting.

For Domicelj (8) planning practice takes divergent orientations. Professional mainstream focus on the environment and technology often lags behind scientific advances. Sectoral emphasis distinguishes planning practice in the developing regions to eradicate poverty: economic solutions are sought in Asia, geographic ones in Africa and sociological ones in Latin America. The effects of the post cold war hegemony of capitalism are giving planning a new lease of life, although corporate pressures attempt to reduce it to imagery and hygiene.

Fragmented grassroot planning activities are adding to a loss of planners' focus not necessarily credibility. The HABITAT II professional and researchers forum run by ISoCaRP claimed that planners should become reformers and synthesisers with better communication skills to gain understanding of civil society and their governance, acquire better information and mediate in conflict situations as partners of collective urban pacts. Thus ISoCaRP members could use their knowledge base as a collective exchangeable resource. How this would happen in a globalised and growing ISoCaRP without fragmenting it beyond its own viability remains to be solved.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

Alatan's address was caught in the contradiction between the dawn of a new and hopefully better millennium and the imminent dangers of destabilising peace in Europe which had lasted over half a century. The conflicts in Yugoslavia seeping into Europe, the Middle East and Russia are triggering destruction and human displacements far beyond the capacity of the planning profession. Like previous turns of centuries, there is no golden age but the seeds of the century to come are ready. The scientific advancements in microbiology, genetics and communication technology, for example, carry great potential of positive social change and material wealth but raise enormous ethical issues. Wrongly applied, these powerful tools can generate fatal conflicts. Local wars and their corollaries of poverty and corruption have never ceased since the second world war and the gap between rich and poor is increasing as shown in the 99 UN Human Development Report. While the withdrawal of public investment has continued in the developed world with adverse effects on its poorer citizens, the repercussions of such a strategy on the developing world is immeasurable.

Alatan (9) sees minimum urban standards allocated equitably as the panoply of improving the human condition. Like with waving debt in poor countries, this would require consensus and solidarity, both of which are not readily forthcoming in a competitive and materialistic world. Volunteers and aid was forthcoming during the Turkish earthquake but these are on the whole punctual interventions with little continuity or long term impact what planning should be about. Learning from knowing the reasons of mistakes is also important for planners who did not respect geological information when allocating settlements in earthquake zones. Alatan proposes to involve ISoCaRP in organising international competitions and international cooperation on large scale transnational projects as two measures to improve the knowledge base for planning practice.

4. The State of the Profession revisited

Besides the periodic three yearly reviews of the state of the profession by its presidents, ISoCaRP had also dedicated three congresses to this theme.¹⁰ A confrontation between third world and first world requirements of planners led to the most demanding reconsideration of orthodox ideas from which a set of recommendations were derived for ISoCaRP. They encompassed:

- ?? long term planning of the use and management of resources;
- ?? achieving planning objectives without economic growth;
- ?? improving public participation and implementation;
- ?? redressing adverse distributional effects based on effective monitoring;
- ?? influencing politics through better planning; developing an effective planning system adapted to the needs of the public;
- ?? and finally sustaining a robust professional ethic by subjecting it to perpetual appraisal.

Perhaps the most daring and original feature of revisiting the state of the profession are the reflections which the presidents made on their own speeches with hindsight.¹¹ They prove that ISoCaRP is able and willing to rethink its position and to adjust to changing circumstances. It is not only responding to the past and present though. It is also anticipating the future and making its

¹⁰ Professional practice and its evolution was the theme of the following ISoCaRP congresses: Turing 1968, Munich 1974, Montreal 1978. A summary of the findings is presented in the "25 Year ISoCaRP publication pp 17-19.

¹¹Ibid. pp 39-54.

prospective views known. The review of the presidents' reflections on the 'state of the profession' shows that many perceptions have remained valid and many predictions have come true.

Both Albers and Virgili reconfirm their previous views. Albers reiterates his German experience which he had checked against other countries in the meantime. He concludes that most of them are still valid after 13 years. It remains important to achieve a workable balance between self-regulating mechanisms and planning interventions. Reminding the profession that there is cause for modesty, Virgili recalls the planners' fate to be at fault when things go wrong and omitted when things go well. Rejecting his proposed ISoCaRP Charter, Lyddon still thinks that using a Frame has led ISoCaRP to identify global problems which planners need to address to make the profession useful all over the globe. Sam van Embden puts his views into a very long term perspective which spans his formative as well as his practising years. When discussing the CIAM debates and, in particular, the controversy between common sense and imagination, he comes down in favour of a light spectrum with reason on one side and fantasy on the other, ranging from Pascal's '*raison de raison*' and the '*raison de coeur*' which are both needed to achieve planning master pieces.

5. Conclusions

No amount of introspection and rethinking can solve certain contradictions which seem inherent in the planning profession. The balancing act between rationality that can resort to hard technologies and imagination which lies entirely in the gift of individual planners will run on. Similarly, the subjective judgements, the '*prêt-à-penser*' of planners which stem from their education, their practice and most of all from their professional bodies will only be judged with hindsight, often by new generations when the authors of projects will have long gone. This is all the more a reason for ISoCaRP to pursue its search for similarities, as they may provide a more certain foundation for the necessary changes and adjustments which the planning profession has to make continuously under new circumstances. Yet, even if some invariances can be derived with reasonable certainty, this does not mean that they are directly transferable between places, scales of operation and over time. Only dialogue and intercultural communication between planners from different countries will enable them to share their experiences and apply them successfully to new projects. Meanwhile, the call for modesty remain indeed topical.

Over thirty-five years, ISoCaRP has contributed effectively to such constructive exchanges. Starting as a Eurocentric organisation, it has gradually become more global. It aims to put Europe into the global context and with growing membership outside Europe, it may well achieve to become global in its own right. Nevertheless, planners have to constantly keep in mind that they are only one contributor to a complex system of actors, and that their inputs are poorly backed by science and research. The pressing nature of planning problems and the political time horizon impose a rhythm on planning which is difficult to match with scientific reflection and analysis. A multitrack operation may be required here. Planning research and analytical studies should run alongside planning practice, while constantly drawing on it. Similarly, findings from research and practice should be continuously fed into education and training in the real world. Only thus can the planning profession build up a collective memory and a knowledge base which reflects a true learning process and may lead to real progress over time.

A final word of caution. Akin to architecture, planning has long been the preserve of mature gentlemen. Growing criticism voiced at planning is also concerned with its male dominated values which may shape a built environment adverse to women. ISoCaRP has a role to play in attracting more women as well as young members and let them make active contributions to the state of the
18

profession. Only a membership from all walks of life would be suited to respond to the end of the cold war and to plan for harmony, prosperity and lasting peace in the new millennium.

PART II: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES: 1969-1999

1. Sam van Embden (ISoCaRP president from 1965-75). "State of the Profession". Introductory speech to the fifth General Assembly of the International Society, Düsseldorf Germany, October 1969.
2. Prof. Gerd Albers (ISoCaRP president from 1976-78). "Remarks on the State of the Profession". Introductory speech at the General Assembly of the International Society of City and Regional Planners, Helsinki Finland, August 1976.
3. Lanfranco Virgili (ISoCaRP president from 1978-81). "The State of the Profession". Extracts of Speech at the General Assembly of the International Society of City and Regional Planners, Stockholm Sweden, 1981.
4. Derek Lyddon (ISoCaRP president from 1981-84). "State of the Profession". Speech at the General Assembly of the International Society of City and Regional Planners, Braga Portugal, 1984.
5. Prof. Manuel L Da Costa Lobo (ISoCaRP president from 1984-87). "The State of the Profession". Address at the General Assembly of the International Society of City and Regional Planners, New Delhi India, 1987.
6. Karl Otto Schmid (ISoCaRP president 1987-90). "State of the Profession". Address at the General Assembly of the International Society of City and Regional Planners, Warsaw Poland, 1990.
7. Prof. Javier de Mesones (ISoCaRP president 1990-93). "The State of the Profession". Address at the General Assembly of the International Society of City and Regional Planners, Glasgow Scotland, 1993.
8. Prof. Serge Domicelj (ISoCaRP president 1993-96). "The State of the Profession". Statement at the ISoCaRP General Assembly, Jerusalem, Israel, 1996.
9. Halük Alatan (ISoCaRP president 1996-99). "The State of the Profession". Address at the ISoCaRP congress in Gelsenkirchen, Germany 1999.

Part 2

State of the Profession of ISoCaRP Presidents

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

*Sam van Embden, The Netherlands
Founder of ISoCaRP and President from 1965-1975*

At our Council in Dublin, I have been asked to say something about the 'State of the Profession'. I will try to do so, though those among you who know me rather well, will be prepared to expect rather suggestions and questions than pertinent statements.

This certainly is an appropriate moment for a general survey of the situation.
The world is full of discontent, and our profession is in the midst of it.
This should not astonish us at all: all things are in rapid motion; urbanisation is progressing irresistibly. Towns swell into monstrosities, new towns are founded. The remnants of the gradually devoured open space are denatured by scattered urban fragments and the degradation of the landscape is spreading to the countryside.
There are the pollution of air and water, the abolition of silence and solitude.
Before long the last sea-shore will be liquidated.

All this makes demands for planning and building. Building is going on feverishly.
But how about planning, planning that should proceed building? Undoubtedly here things are most confused and confusing, flatly in contradiction with the notion of planning itself.
People are very well aware of all that. In their discontent, worded by representatives of disciplines not unfamiliar to us, modern urban surroundings are judged 'inhospitable', 'sterile' or even 'uninhabitable', they are accused to lead at the same time to 'loneliness' and to 'loss of identity'. But there is more than only verbal criticism: the factual massive, continuous and irresistible exodus from the town speaks its own language.

Should *this* then be the final result of all our efforts?

And what do we planners do, what do we ourselves think of all this? Time has come to draw up the balance-sheet, objectively and inexorably.

Of course here in this circle of physical planners who, when founding this Society, deliberately decided in favour of personal membership, I myself will give only my own, personal opinions as a physical planner, very well conscious of the limitations imposed by the incompleteness of my personal experience. A collegial interchange of views may help us afterwards to broaden our common insight.

Now, before coming to our profession proper I want to discuss the organisation and shaping of space. I first have to indicate a fundamental change in our working-methods, a change that has already been going on for quite a period. I mean the transition from a static to a dynamic attitude towards our subject-matter.

If it is really true that our time is marked by change, then our work has to accept the consequences: we find ourselves before the paradox that we have to design immovables for the housing of movable, ultramovable matter.

We have long recognized that here lies a turning point for our profession: planning no longer should aim at a final, static situation, but rather at the preparation of a continuous process and a process without a predictable course.

Our planning-methods must be adapted to this mobility, changeability and uncertainty. Programming, design and materialisation are *one* indivisible process.

- Programming should not pretend to prophecy, but only to indicate possibilities and probabilities.
- In the *phase of design* our plans should remain 'open' as long as possible.
- The time-table for the realisation of the respective components of the planned urbanistic totality will often be decisive for final success (public transport should precede the building of a new settlement; social and cultural amenities should be present already at the same time at least as the dwellings and certainly never later). This asks i.a. for a coherent and coordinated, well-timed *system of financing*.
We must be prepared to accept the fact that during realisation - especially in the case of long-term projects - some of our basic hypotheses will change or be omitted. As the design will have to change, the team of planners should remain permanently present.
- After realisation not only the basic infrastructure, but also the material constructions and building should prove adaptable as much as possible to uses not foreseen (and often unforeseeable).

All this provides ample themes for further discussions in our circle.

This is not meant as a festive speech, for this occasion.

Therefore, when examining these results of our endeavours I want to point out mainly the weaknesses: let us be stimulated by Holy Discontent.

In the first place I have to make some preliminary remarks on quite a series of indispensable basic conditions for our work, conditions that may be considered as absolutely indispensable, but which nevertheless are lacking in very many cases.

- Satisfactory planning is unthinkable without an appropriate, up to date legislation, reflecting a general sense of justice.
- In this connection we should be well aware of the momentary aggravation of the conflicts between private interests and common welfare.
In those respects, however, the situation appears to vary strongly from country to country; each of us should draw up the balance-sheet on circumstances at home.
- Good planning, decent urbanism asks for serious restraints on private property, especially of the soil, and for an appropriate legislation on landed property.
Acceptable plans are hardly thinkable if destined upon only as instruments for private commercial operations. Again: everyone of us may ask himself how things are in his own country.
- Physical planning is part of comprehensive planning; its proposals for the organisation and shaping in space should be based on the conclusions of economic, sociological, hygienic and cultural planning-programs.
- On the other hand, physical planning itself should be comprehensive: in its turn integrating land-use planning, and planning for traffic (local and interlocal, on the road, on the rail and on the water), for energy and industry, for agriculture and landscaping.
And again: everybody here present may ask himself how in those respects the situation is at home.

- The possibilities for good planning depend on the system of administration. Planning is doomed to failure everywhere where authorities and governments behave as representatives of autonomous political units, involved in a mutual competitive struggle, considering their neighbours as potential rivals; this holds true equally for municipalities, provinces, department and national states. Planning is doomed to failure as long as the laws of the jungle prevail.

Again: think of the situation in your own country.

There are just a few examples of the outward obstacles that we, as professionals, find on our way. And I could go on like this for a long time: the number of material and organizational preconditions indispensable for real planning, and very often lacking, are practically inexhaustible.

I now come to the visible shape that is to the final result of our own specific professional contribution to the combined planning effort.

Here I will confine myself mainly to the citizen's everyday environments, that is to the visible surroundings of his home. I do this partly for time's sake, but mainly because it is especially on this visible shape that most of the prevailing general criticism is concentrating.

In passing it should be noted that the general public is apt to consider the author of this shape as the prototype for all planners, thus burdening them with the blame for all failures. Though I would provisionally propose to speak of 'cause' rather than of 'blame', I think we should be glad that apparently the visible form of things is still universally considered to be representative of their essence, their shape of their contents, and consequently the author of that shape as representative of the planner in general.

When we try to find out the *causes* of those deficiencies we find little help from criticism from outside.

The *population's detailed* complaints deal mainly with the poor quality of their own dwelling, and with the lacking of concrete elements in the neighbourhood: trees, playgrounds, public transport, car-parks, schools and Kindergarten, shops and social amenities.

Part of these deficiencies are due to inevitable circumstances, i.e. the fact that the new living-quarters are still incomplete (which may account for the fact that some indispensable social and cultural institutions are provisionally missing, just as well as grown-up trees, so essential however for satisfactory town-scape), but for another part they are caused by political decisions, which - a fact that often is forgotten afterwards - too many times simply reflect the populations; real opinions about priorities at the moment where those decisions were taken. We should keep in mind that most planning and urban design operations generally take up so much time (in particular their political and administrative preparation) that the results, once they become visible, are the spatial consequences of political decisions from possibly twenty years ago.

Fundamentally much more important for us are the population's *non-detailed* criticisms, the complaints about a general vague feeling of discontent.

Part of this may be explained by sociological causes (again due to newness: a young population brought together in new quarters, causing an unbalanced composition of ages, immaturity of social contacts, etc.)

We should however be ready to admit that at least part of such lack of quality will undoubtedly have to be explained as deficiencies in our own work, I will have to come back to that later on.

This work of ours on the scale of the neighbourhood is closely related to that of the architects and also to that of the manufacturers of houses. Now undoubtedly the housing-industry at this moment is still in its infancy, which means that the factory techniques impose strong restraints on all kinds of legitimate demands and exigences of the future inhabitants and of the town planners.

In most cases, however, those inhabitants do not look so deeply into the matter, they simply complain of 'monotony', 'lack of fantasy', or perhaps they go so far as to speak of the lack of 'urbanity', the quality which urbanizing man is learning to appreciate again, after three quarters of a century of Garden city movement.

The criticism of the *experts*, which certainly is lacking, the judgement of sociologists and social psychologists, does not, alas, help us much more. They indicate long recognized deficiencies, but hardly make any concrete suggestions for better solutions.

Let us confess that this sometimes makes us a bit impatient, and this even more when we ourselves get more and more convinced that it is Man and his behaviour which should stand in the very centre of all our endeavours. For that reason we are badly in need of, and would have been happy with, information from especially those specialists who deal with the behaviour of Man. However, let us not judge too rashly. We have to consider in the first place that those social sciences are just as young, or maybe even younger, than our own discipline, and in the second place that their activities might be defined as human research and human explanations of human behaviour as human reactions. We might speak of the search for collective knowledge about the collective self, or of a collective endeavour to collective self-knowledge.

Now self-knowledge and especially *collective* self-knowledge is a very special kind of knowledge, with on the one hand indeed very special possibilities, but on the other hand also with very special, and fundamentally insuperable, limitations. Notwithstanding that however, if we are really serious when we say that we want to place Man in the centre of our field of interest, we should try to cooperate with the social sciences and get *together* with their representatives. Here again lies a task for our Society.

I hope you will not have the impression that, until now, I have been trying to build up an alibi for us planners. There is nothing special in the fact that the matter we have to handle proves itself to be refractory, nor that the circumstances under which we have to work and to work together, are seldom favourable; any other creative worker will in most cases meet the same difficulties.

Even the most ideal systems and regulations, even the most perfect materials and ideal circumstances would remain without effect without the right man, with the right conceptions, in the right place.

During our common excursions we have witnessed - much too seldom, alas! - most enjoyable performances, even under circumstances far from ideal, apparently due in the first place to the personal endeavours of only one brilliant magistrate, who apparently has succeeded in attracting the right men to stand by his side, and who has known how to inspire them and to procure them with sufficient elbow-room. This at the same time has convinced us that the *client* comes in the first place in the team indispensable for any good results. No planners, however gifted, will ever be able to reach any really important result when working with an, unwilling or uninterested client, either an individual person or a collectivity. On our excursion we have also seen, alas, how even with the help of good legislation and notwithstanding very competent planners it has proved to be impossible to master spatial chaos, apparently through lack of interest (or even worse: through an excess of 'interests') from the officials. Whether in such cases there should be a collective obligation for our Society to take action will be discussed later on.

Of course it is simply not always true that everything that becomes visible today and is inhabited now, should be exclusively the spatial rendering of earlier political decisions, that is of views and insights of

the community of some decades ago. Undoubtedly the personal ideals and personal intentions (and abilities) of the planners of that moment have influenced the results just as well, and even to a very high degree (personal ideals and personal ideas which were of course closely connected with the political ideologies of that time).

Saying this I think in the first place of the 'heroic' twenties, with their 'cosmic consciousness', with their perhaps somewhat naive optimism, with their joyous faith in industrialisation, with their pious cult of machine. 'Cosmic consciousness': everything should be *open* not only for the sake of sun and air; but in the first place because the continuity of cosmic space should pervade everything, should be felt everywhere and should bring a feeling of *liberation*. The open building-block and the 'Zeilenbau' were the typical motifs of those days.

'Joyous industry-mindedness and pious cult of the machine' industry and normalised mass-production were not only the possible answers to the demands of massive social housing, the uniformity of its production could be considered at the same time to be the expression of social equality.

'Industrial housing, with all your heart or if need be?': that was the home question at a meeting of architects at that time. The answer was decisive for one's classification as 'progressive' or 'reactionary'.

Not only the uniformity of the industrial production was positively appreciated by the planners of that time, but the regular repetition of the same uniform architectural accent was a favourite motif.

I only need to refer to the publications of the great leaders of that time to illustrate what I mean. I must remark at the same time however, that in reality what people have wanted to *read* out of them, has been of more importance than what they have really said or *written*.

Please, do not misunderstand me: in my opinion from those great days, works have come to us which will always remain classics.

However, I have warned that this was not intended to be an official festival speech, that I would speak mainly about deficiencies, and that I will be mainly in search of the causes of those weaknesses.

At the same period it has been recognized that a fundamental analysis should be the basis for careful programming of all planning. It must be stated, however, that in many cases the result has been a direct translation of these analyses into landuse plans with carefully isolated 'pure' living quarters, equally 'pure' and isolated industrial areas and zones for recreation and traffic systems. And this kind of planning has mainly caused sterility, killing liveliness, variety and simultaneousness, in short all urbanity.

It should be admitted that it is easier to indicate the causes of this sterility than to cure them. We are speaking very much now of 'integration of functions', but in practice this is meeting quite a range of difficulties.

It should be observed here that in the days we are speaking of now, warning have not been lacking of dehumanisation, 'massification', loneliness, alienation, loss of identity; in short of all those phenomena that have since in fact revealed themselves. But (apart from the short-lived, but then wide-spread, romantic reaction of the decorative Amsterdam School of Architecture) those warnings were coming mainly from real conservatives, who had no other alternative to propose than a return to eclectic historicism, but had no real answer for the needs and necessities of mass housing.

But there are still other facts to be stated.

The inhabitant usually evaluated his surroundings in the first place according to what he can immediately see and touch, after the quality of this own dwelling, after the quality of the zone of transition between his dwelling and the street, and of this street itself.

In many of the first settlements, created by idealistic corporations and their equally idealistic architects, who at the same time acted as planners, all those visible details were looked after with love and care and in most cases with exemplary results. But later on the field of our activities has been immensely enlarged, from town planning to regional planning and to national planning and even beyond.

Of course in those larger fields Man remains fundamentally just as important for us as in planning a simple living-quarter (housing estate): the organisation of these wide structures must be consciously prepared in such a way as to provide for the basic conditions for those detailed plans, worthy of human living.

The ordinary inhabitant, however, will hardly be able to recognize the qualities of those large background-plans, he will concentrate, as I said already, mainly on his 'micro-environment'. We must admit, however, that as a consequence of the broadening of our field of activities the centre of our own personal interest has been more or less displaced, and this alas not without harm to our attention for that 'micro-environment'.

This shifting of the centre of our interest has caused a gap, exactly at the place where on the contrary there should be an overlap: between town planning and architecture.

Architecture not understood only as the shaping of buildings, but also as the care for everything belonging to the environment for daily living, including the street furniture and the pavement, and in particular, the zone between the dwelling and street, between the private and the public world, a zone that is so very important but which in our days is so very often and much neglected.

Everybody who has tried for himself to look seriously after those details, knows how much trouble it takes, how much strenuous exertion, and how much stubbornness to obtain even humble results.

This means that many of us should turn at least part of their attention again specifically to this domain of small-scale work, and we should also orient planning-education more towards this group of subjects.

At the same time we should accept the fact that the total field that one man is able to encompass is per force always limited, invite the architects to take part in our work at the earliest possible stage.

This requires not only a high degree of mental conformity among the people involved, but also much good will from both sides, much discipline and much self control (and all this not only between us and the architects, but also among us and the officials who have to join the planning work too).

I know that in this respect much progress has been made already in many places, but I also know that in many other places there remains undoubtedly still very much to be done by our Society to improve the climate for this kind of cooperation.

There are endeavours to tackle the whole problem still from a more fundamental, less historically inspired side. Our students and also our colleagues, the sociologists and socio-psychologists ask for a more fundamental approach, they ask for a concrete definition and, if possible, even for the quantification, of immediately demonstrable causal relations between the shaping of the spatial

environments and the psychological effects of those shapes upon the spirit of the inhabitants. Until now but apparently little research has been done in this direction, and with only very scarce results. I venture to doubt whether such results, ever be obtained in the future, will lend themselves to be summed up in simple formulations, or could lead to right-away prescriptions for direction application. For that to happen the reactions of the human spirit are too arbitrary, too dynamic, and too paradoxical on the one hand and on the other hand, the language of spatial shape is far too equivocal, too open to many different interpretations.

This latter quality of spatial language, its 'poli-interpretability', in relation to our just-mentioned mental mobility, may account for the fact that the appreciation of spatial and plastic forms and shapes is often only so temporary.

It is remarkable however how a direct dependency in the reverse direction is generally, and in my opinion justly, accepted as an immediate evidence: we feel ourselves fully entitled to consider the works of town planning and architecture of the past as the immediate and immediately recognizable expression of the mental atmosphere and the social system of their time. At the same time it should be noted that apparently later generations had never felt any 'ideological aversion' from living in the heritage from their ancestors, though coming from a different spiritual and social world.

Apparently, later generations have long felt themselves equally at home in the buildings of oligarchical city republics, in the houses of the newly-founded towns of the enlightened Princes of the 18 century, and even in the medieval burger towns, yes, even in rebuilt and adapted palaces of Roman Caesars.

On the other hand, however, we never heard that they went so far as to prefer these old and antiquated surroundings above those of their own days. On the contrary, apparently the moving into new, then 'modern', surroundings was usually experienced as something enjoyable and festive. Today, however, this appears not to be so obvious any longer. Maybe, even now, a new *dwelling* may be better appreciated than the old one, but for the new *living-quarter* this is most certainly very often no longer the case.

What we therefore need most urgently is well-orientated research on the evaluation by the inhabitants of the *spatial qualities* not the material and *quantitative ones of their daily* surroundings. For this, we all will have to cooperate with social-psychologists and architects.

As long as the results of such research are not available we will have to work, just as until now, on the basis of hypotheses. We are simply not allowed to interrupt our work; the construction of new buildings is going on feverishly everywhere.

For the foundation of these hypotheses we have but little other choice as to turn to already existing, universally positively evaluated, examples of urban surroundings.

The main quality those surroundings have in common - at least in my opinion - is the settled balance between the Collective and the Individual.

On the one hand the totality as well as its parts have preserved their uniqueness and their individuality, but on the other hand they remain more or less anonymous, as in a landscape. But the difference with the landscape is, that the townscape is always experienced as a work of men, though - and this may be a key to its anonymity - the personality of the authors who once shaped its details is not felt as obtrusive any longer, it has faded away with time.

The human dignity of the inhabitant and the visitor is nowhere affected, and the human scale is respected, at least it is not violated anywhere.

The details are close to man, show a rich variety and give evidence of an ingenuous ingenuity, and they often also speak of a conscious or unconscious sense of humour. And finally I would mention the autonomous qualities of form of those creations, qualities introduced either consciously or unconsciously.

Today we are simply forced to accept the supremacy of the collective, with all the dangers this implies for the individual. We simply have to accept it, already because of the big numbers we have to handle, which only can be mastered by technology and mass-production. For us, planners, those big numbers have to do in the first place with housing and traffic.

Everywhere in the world, planners are facing those phenomena, those threats, which cannot be eliminated. The first, promising, results of their most recent endeavours are already becoming visible. They bear witness to the effort to do justice to the newly won insights, without however losing the positive values developed in the twenties.

Of course, those new creations will also need the help of time for ripening to their complete development; but even in the shape they show today, in their newness, they look full of promise for the future, and for possibilities of an autonomous further development.

They are of course only the first signs of a new spring. Much has to be done still. Traffic and transport still remain to be mastered. The building-industry will have to learn how to adjust itself further to human requirements and to the demands of town planners, so that their product can be better adapted to planning principles.

Even more than from all that, at this moment, is built and has become visible already (and consequently again is only the materialisation of ideas from several years ago), the future can be guessed from all that is being prepared at this moment on the drawing boards and in the model studios.

I do not think, however, that all the ideal-projects publicized today are to be applauded. There are alas quite a number of obtrusive 'architectures' which will never lay down their self-conceited individuality (even not when they are repeated many times, as uniform units, in regular rows). They impose their own identity on the inhabitants and by their self-centred appearance they seem to subdivide the total population into sharply distinguishable separate units, a subdivision that is flatly in contrast with the real social development tending to greater unity and increasing communication among all. I am speaking now of proposals for inhabited 'sculptures', either of strictly regular or more fantastic shape.

Personally, I have far more confidence in the future of continuous 'structures', which are in accordance with the ants of steadily growing coherent connections which men are seeking today.

Those proposals are also open to future changes and ready to evolve together with the general evolution. At the same time those studies will permit us to specify the qualities the building-industry will have to grant to their products, to make them suited for their use as basic material to shape man's surroundings.

Of course, all our needs will best be illustrated by the language of shape spoken by our works, our plans. But apart from that, personal action from each of us will remain indispensable. For this we have to prepare ourselves within our Society.

For that, however, our members are still too few; the domain of our activities is growing much faster than the (growing) number of our members.

A sufficient contribution from the side of our International Society will ask for a much more numerous membership, and for an even stronger and more enthusiastic personal endeavour of a much larger part of our members.

I know of course that all of us are overburdened with our own obligations. I also said already, that our own performances might finally prove to be our most important and most convincing arguments. Nevertheless we will surely never be able to measure up completely to our obligations towards Society, without direct action. There are quite a long range of external obstacles, simply not to be overcome by the convincing qualities of our work: wrong legislations, inadequate structures of administration, unfavourable economic and social powers.

In those fields however, an International Society mainly aiming at providing opportunities for collegial meetings and discussions, should proceed carefully. At least, if we do not want to put at stake the existence of our organisation.

We have simply to count with the fact that our members are coming from many different sides and have very different convictions in many fields. It is exactly, this manysidedness and multifariousness which lend interest and pith to our discussions.

Of course, we should not risk to lose that. But on the other hand we should not be too cautious. For that, the values we have to defend are all far too important.

Personally I think we should stand ready permanently to come to the aid of all justified actions of national groups of members when they ask for it, whenever and wherever the fundamental conditions indispensable for decent planning are lacking or in danger.

For this State of the Profession, I have looked around, and also somewhat in the past; but our real subject remains the *future*. 'Future' means 'successors', and thus: 'education'.

This theme of great importance has not been mentioned yet. We are very well conscious of the fact that in this field, we have a very special task; we have started working on it already, but it asks most urgently to be carried on further.

When speaking of Planning-Education we are well aware that modern Planning, and consequently also modern Planning-Education ask not only for new insights and knowledge, but also - and even in the first place - for a new mental disposition.

And here I begin to feel uncertain; I have to admit that when I prepared this introduction my conscience has been raising an ever stronger warning voice.

I have pointed all the time at gaps in our planning system, gaps to be filled. I have pointed out the necessity to improve and complete that system, to introduce corrections and add extensions.

However, it might be asked (though in reality we have long known the answer) whether the prevailing uncomfortable feeling about planning-results among the general public really originated in the first place from the quality of the plans, or whether there are much deeper roots for this general discussion.

Is it not so that planning *itself*, omnipresent, inescapable, is resented as an always farther increasing restriction and narrowing of freedom, as a regimentation of life, as the end of all adventure?

And would not the impact of this experience on the mind of men be much stronger than the somewhat poor qualities of their daily environments?

Here we are on the horns of a dilemma, for there is no doubt whatever that we simply cannot stop, or even slow down, planning and organizing without immediately endangering the existence of the three, soon six billion inhabitants of this planet. But the more these planning-systems will extend and

tend to organize their lives, the more each separate individual will feel exasperated and the stronger it will scane the restrictions laid upon it in the name of the Community.

The only answer I would know to this dilemma for the moment refers to a renewal of our mental disposition.

In the first place it concerns those who have to accept planning, but also (and from our point of view this is the most important side) of those who are actively involved in the planning-work. For all of them the main objective should be to find out *how to plan freedom*.

In my opinion this means: to learn how to plan as if we were *not* planning. This is more a question of mental attitude than of method, more of wisdom than of knowledge. To this, just as to every other really fundamental problem, there is no real and lasting answer. Each new generation will meet it under another appearance, each generation will have to find its own solution.

We should search for ours.

And its is for that purpose that I put the question here.

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

*Gerd Albers, Germany
President 1975-1978*

Nearly seven years ago, our President Sam van Embden spoke to us on the State of the Profession, on the problems at hand, on the increasing range of aspects and arguments to be considered, on the professional role of the planner.

In preparing this conference, the Executive Committee felt it might be a good idea to take up this topic, to review the situation and the changes apparent in it from time to time. So we thought each President of ISoCaRP should once within his period of office address the General Assembly and give his opinion on the State of the Profession and on the direction in which it seems to move - and possibly in which it ought to move. This will happen roughly on a three year basis - time enough to register some changes in the landscape of planning and in the underlying principles, methods and values.

I have to cover a wider span of time, and many things have happened within these years. Nevertheless, the main features of the picture that Sam van Embden sketched are still valid. There is still much criticism directed against the results of planning, the interpretation of planning as a dynamic process with a need for flexibility has gained even more weight, and we are still in need of better cooperation between planners and researchers, in need of a closer linkage between planning concept and the shape of the three-dimensional environment. On the other hand, there are some changes in emphasis and some new developments, so that the picture is somewhat different today. Most of the more visible changes in roles and regulations are, of course, national in character, yet there seems to be a strong common undercurrent of thought sweeping across national boundaries. I shall try to identify some of its components.

1. Planning has come to be recognized more widely as a political task, as a procedure to choose between possible alternatives in the allocation of spatial and financial resources. The awareness has grown that, behind such alternatives, there are not only technical and aesthetic variations, not only different ways to attain a given goal, but more often different goals or combination of goals - or even different concepts of society.
2. Therefore, we encounter an increasing degree of interdependence between the content of traditional physical planning and a variety of measures of social, economic, and fiscal policy. Obviously, this has to do with the growing complexity of the mechanisms with which we try to direct the course of society. I do not say that we are mastering this problem, the danger is undeniable that such mechanisms become so unwieldy as to stifle most actions.
3. A similar trend is apparent in the procedure of planning: the political implications lead to an increased sensitivity of planners and politicians to public opinion, this is reflected in the emphasis on public participation and on other means to improve and to make more transparent the processes of decision making. Consequently, we encounter new interpretations of the planner's role in society. He seems to be bound by a double loyalty, as it were: to his authority and to the people involved - two different manifestations of his abstract client: society.

4. On the other hand, much stress has been laid on more comprehensive theory as a prerequisite for better decisions. This has led to a flood of publications in this field, some of them very abstract, and to a corresponding disappointment of those who expected from theory the output of blueprints for action.

The tide of models to aid planning decisions was still rising when we listened to Sam van Embden at Düsseldorf. Today, it obviously has passed its highest point and is ebbing away. Of course, quite a number of models and simulation procedures which have been developed, are in continuous use, and are worthwhile keeping - but the hopes for a much brighter planning horizon due to large scale models have been largely buried. This cannot surprise: obviously, the city may be considered as a system, but this system is by far too complex to be reproduced adequately in a model. Moreover, the natural preference of the model for quantitative aspects - since this is the only food it can digest - makes it rather insensitive to questions of quality which in the end are our main concern.

5. But behind the fascination by models was more than just an interest in the numerical representation of a part of reality. Behind it was a remarkable optimism with respect to the ends and means of planning. Many of us were more careful in this respect, and Sam van Embden's speech reflects this scepticism of the experienced planner. However, "change" was still a good word at that time, whereas by now it has lost much of its charm. On the contrary: there is a strong feeling, at least in Western Europe, and probably in some other areas of the world, too, that change has been too widespread and too fast, that change has not fulfilled the promises it seemed to hold, that change ought to be controlled if not arrested.
6. This has also to do with the realization of possible "limits of growth", with the depletion of resources and the increasing difficulties to dispose of the waste of our industrial civilization. Population stagnation in some countries is a related phenomenon which has contributed to what I am tempted to call a new climate in planning.
7. All this has nourished considerable scepticism directed toward the products of modern planning and modern architecture, and has strengthened the tendency to conserve the buildings of earlier periods as documents of continuity and of local individuality. The European Architectural Heritage Year was an indication of this turn of the tide: it would not have been as successful as it was, were it not for an underlying disposition of many people to mistrust change and to stick to what we have. This holds some dangers in store for rational planning: conservation may easily be overstressed, overloaded with too high expectations.
8. Education for planning has been broadened in scope, taking in a number of new fields, and has increased in recruitment. Many young people were motivated by the challenge of the situation and by the desire to contribute to the common cause by directing their efforts toward improving the environment. In some countries, however, there are signs of overproduction in market terms: although tremendous problems are still unsolved, the positions in public service and the funds for employment of consultants are lagging far behind. This is a dangerous situation for the future of planning.

These few points give, of course, only an incomplete description of the present situation and of the climate of planning. To round it off, let me say that, in very general terms, I see the situation of planning characterized by three major contradictions:

- We see that more and better legal instruments are necessary, and so bills are drawn up, put before Parliament and enacted - but along with the provision of new tools we develop so many precautions against their misuse that many of the instruments prove impracticable.
- We want to give the citizen more right to influence planning, and this works best at the local level. But at the same time, with growing complexity of planning, more and more real decisions are being made on higher and higher administrative levels, leaving relatively unimportant matters to be decided locally.
- Realizing this complexity of planning we have tried to learn more and more about the interdependencies of man and environment: we should, therefore, be able to make better plans by virtue of our improved knowledge. But it seems that this increase in knowledge has reduced our disposition to act, our courage, and our good conscience. It looks like Hamlet's problem:

"And thus the native hue of resolution
is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."

Some of you may feel that this picture is a little overdrawn - but I hope they will concede that the general tendencies seem to work into the directions indicated. If this is so, the new situation cannot but affect the planner, the scope of his activities, his notions of desirable goals, his self-interpretation.

Now let us look from here at the perspectives of planning and the consequences for the profession. A few points seem to emerge:

1. We are going to face more criticism, more challenging of goals and procedures of planning than before. We must count on continuous political interest in - and interference with - planning. The planner will have to respond to it - becoming more alert in the political field, adapting himself to the discussion with the public. The planning office as a seclusion to think about future developments recedes into the past: more objections, more hearings, more law suits, more press conferences are in the offing; and we cannot afford to stay out of them, because otherwise our cause will suffer. This is not meant to be an elegy; the integration of planning into politics is a price to be paid for an increased influence on reality - in contrast to the splendid isolation of earlier times with a much more secluded role, but with the disadvantage of not being listened to. Still I feel I should sound a note of warning against "overpoliticization". What is needed is political consciousness and a sense of political responsibility; this does not necessarily mean political partisanship. In this respect, the findings of Aix and of Munich are still valid.
2. The time of naive extrapolations and of continuous growth perspectives has gone. Economizing resources, utilization of existing heritage will be important. This means striking a balance between innovation and conservation, between hectic change and immobility. The planner will have to exercise his judgement in preparing plans; he should be aware of the values involved, of the moral as well as of the functional side of the problem.
3. The hope for better and more unassailable decisions resting safely on more facts and figures put into EDP programmes are likely to lead to disappointment also in the future. Quantification may clarify limits for reasonable action, thereby reducing the range of planning choice - but it will not work as a substitute to the inventiveness and the creativity, the powers of combination and coordination which we expect of the planner. We should be aware of another pitfall: there has

been a strong tendency to develop and to refine planning procedure as if its strict observance would safeguard the best results; one can even speak of "legitimation by procedure". But this again is expecting too much. Good planning procedure is necessary but is neither a substitute nor a guarantee for the qualitative content of planning.

4. The International Congresses of Modern Architecture stated nearly 50 years ago that they wanted to put architecture and town planning back on their real plane: the sociological and economic. Since then, social and economic goals have been considered paramount -and I should add: rightly so. However, this has led sometimes to a neglect of the qualities of the space itself, regardless of its service function to society and economy. This is clearly reflected in the increasing criticism directed against planners for their failure to take account of ecological and aesthetic problems. Different though these fields may be, they have in common that they derive directly from spatial conditions, from the autonomy of the environment.

That does not mean advocating the neglect of social and economic considerations: they still are of primary importance. But it does mean to acknowledge the importance - and the acceptance - of planning issues relating primarily to ecological and aesthetic considerations. Here also, we have the problem of a balance between competing demands - and the planner is the one who is called upon to find it.

5. There is another balance worth mentioning: the experiences of the last years have shown clearly that society is in need of planning, that the free interplay of forces cannot be trusted to bring about socially desirable results. But at the same time, experiences have shown that planning is faced with overwhelming difficulties if it tries to do away with all mechanisms of self regulation, if it tries to replace all sorts of spontaneous decisions of individuals by a thoroughly planned system. This calls for modesty in our profession: it does not seem reasonable to construct an alternative of extremes: either market with no planning or planning with no market. What is really needed, seems to be in the middle: the maintenance of self regulating mechanisms as far as they can be made compatible with common goals - and on the other hand, the construction of a framework for planning which will secure that the professed values of the society may find expression in the actual process of shaping our environment.
6. All this seems to make the definition of the planner more difficult. What, then, is the profession whose state we are discussing? Obviously, a group of persons with a basic academic training who, however, are thinking not so much in terms of cognition and research, as of decisions and actions. This calls again for some sort of balance: between the attempt to gain as much certainty of scientific grounds as possible and the resolution to decide even under conditions of uncertainty. This is what distinguishes the planner from the researcher: the latter will only speak if and when his findings warrant conclusions, but the planner must be ready to give his advice and to present his plans at any given time. If he fails to do so because he looks for more certainty the decisions will also be taken - but without him and probably by people who know less about the problem than he does.

Traditionally, the profession has been understood as being concerned with physical planning. In the last years we have seen a tendency to sneer at such limitations and to expand the profession's claims to all matters of change in society. Much as I understand this tendency, it seems to me far too ambitious. If a profession is characterized by some degree of expertise in a given field, I do not think that there could be a profession for planning society, economy, and spatial development at the same time.

On the other hand, we should see city and regional planning not in too narrow terms. The expertise in preparing decisions for spatial development may manifest itself in a number of different fields, influencing urban visual form, by preparing statutory plans, by designing regional economic policy, by proposing guidelines for social or even legal policy with respect to space. This may give a hint to our membership policy within the framework of our statutes. There is no stereotyped image of a city and regional planner, to which everybody would conform, but rather a wide and rich variety of people with different skills and different fields of detailed expert knowledge. What unites them and what makes them eligible for our Society is their concern with spatial development and their sense of responsibility to society as a whole.

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

Lanfranco Virgili, France
President 1978-1981

(elements of his speech, held in Stockholm, 1981))

Complexity and Responsibility

Since its creation, AIU/ISoCaRP, and more specifically in its Text Programme (LYON 1967) has committed itself to analyse several factors of this complexity and its relation with the planning profession.

Thus a progressive and continuing procedure has been initiated to deal with clearly defined themes, congress after congress, which has enabled ISoCaRP until today - and I hope also in the future - to better understand planning in its complexity and its evolution, and to develop a better competence in the practice of our profession and of all those who work towards the same task.

The major characteristic of any urban project is its complexity

Urban projects are complex: apart from their physical, geographical, functional dimension, other elements are at stake: political, social, economic, cultural, architectural, the management of the built environment and other activities of the public and private sector.

This complexity puts a heavy responsibility on planning

The planner has always been concerned with material aspects, taking care of defining the spatial planning of territories and urban design. These tasks were favoured by a basic education which was in most cases that of the architect or geographer who developed spatial perception. But this is not enough any more.

The urban project is interdisciplinary in its essence Planning is team-work

To enable the Planner to relate to different disciplines and their specialities which lead to planning, the planner must have - above his initial competences as regards spatial matters - knowledge on the contribution of each discipline: sociology, economy, culture, politics.

Hence, the importance of education and of interdisciplinary practice

The work of AIU/ISoCaRP (Aix-en-Provence, Tunis etc.) has already thoroughly dealt with this problem, but today we have to note that examples remain rare.

The planner's approach progresses with time

The urban project can be defined in general terms, it is progressive though in its application. Interferences of all kinds show up: conflicts, contradictory interests, economic context, the evolution of political perceptions, the general public. Adaptations, compromises have to occur.

Contrary to the architect, the planner does not carry out his work alone. He has to adapt it and adjust all the time in conjunction with his partners.

Third source of complexity: the management of conflicts

The planner has to devise, to propose solutions - respecting the main lines defined earlier and preserving the future. His profession evolves more and more towards the **task of mediator, of negotiator**. He has to listen, without prejudice, and to understand the different actors in each sector, to help them in the dialogue between them, to perceive the collective interest. And there, the planners are on the edge of a razor, facing influences of contradictory interest groups.

Urban projects are firstly of a political nature, which progressively materialises through operational actions. The planner has to take care of translating and rewriting these actions - through dialogue which he stimulates. He has to propose an operational methodology, elaborate the programme and the documents and to monitor and control their operational implementation while being well aware of not signing away future options.

But we should not forget that the planner is subjected to moral, social, political pressures of conflicting interests in the transcription of a political urban project.

In all these steps, there is risk of failure of initiative! Planners participate in actions which can have effects on economic and social justice. Their proposals and transcriptions can lead to profits for some and to negative consequences for others and at the same time create privileges and disadvantages.

Thus this major responsibility implies a great rigour for planners, an ethic, a deontology which, although they apply to the planning profession as a whole are essentially personal.

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

*Derek Lyddon, United Kingdom
President 1981-1984*

Resolution of Crisis

1. Let us imagine a being from another planet visiting our world for the first time; and he asks many people the questions " What is the planning profession?" and "What is the state of it?".
2. From all the answers he may well come to the conclusion that there is a crisis of identity as to who we are: a crisis of purpose as to what we do: and that therefore the profession is in a critical state.
3. Let us also imagine that he asks "What is the state of your human settlements, your regions, towns and countryside?"
4. Would he come to the conclusion that they too are in a critical state?
5. Would he not think it odd - or perhaps typical of earth's human affairs - that planners were so evidently needed to help solve the crisis in human settlements - yet felt so unwanted and appeared so unappreciated.
6. The visitor to this World might visit the "World Bank" and find they do not know or register the "planner" as a profession or a skill which can help the World!
7. How can we explain this paradox to our visitor from space?
8. We might say it is a fault of communication in a noisy and complex world. We do not communicate among ourselves as planners and agree our identity and purpose: We do not tell our clients what we are and what we can do.
9. But considering the 20 years in which this Society of ISoCaRP has been active; communicating, exchanging ideas and experience; building up our identity; and considering the analysis of the State of the Profession contributed by our three Past Presidents, **I wish to suggest that our profession has now grown to a state when we can resolve the crisis:** We are ready to move from a critical state to a stable state.
10. The Chinese Character for crisis also means "dangerous opportunity". The time has come to seize this opportunity and to agree on who we are; announce what we can do.
11. Turning the crisis into this opportunity is dangerous because:
 - we may not agree among ourselves on who we are and thus make confusion worse confounded;
 - we still may not be understood by our clients and asked to work;
 - by stabilising on our identity, we may lose flexibility and the ability to change and develop.
12. I think our profession is strong enough to overcome those dangers; to take the risk and to seize the opportunity.

13. How can we do it? I suggest two initiatives or two "communications":
 - a. An **ISoCaRP Charter** which states what physical planning is and what planners can contribute to the improvement of human settlements;
 - b. An **ISoCaRP Framework** into which we can weave our work so that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts; greater than the results of each individual congress; and so that stability becomes fertility and continuity.
14. If you agree our profession is now in a state to make these two statements, we will need to work at them. I can here only outline some ideas for each.

ISoCaRP Charter

15. The statement will need to be short and specifically addressed to our clients. It will need to be in the form of "les idées forces", while avoiding "les idées fixes".
16. I would suggest there could be 3 sections:
 - a. What type of planning are we talking about?
 - b. What type of administrative system or client body is needed for planning to operate?
 - c. What unique capability can our profession offer to our clients?

I make some remarks on each of these.

Type of Planning

17. We all plan: a family; a holiday; the household budget. Planning is a basic human activity: it involves essentially making arrangements for the future.
18. It is a healthy activity: the World Health Organisation definition of health is " A healthy man, women or organisation seeks and solves problems". Not to seek and solve problems is to be morbid, to be sick.
19. Noting then there are all types of private and public planning; what type of problems can we say we seek and attempt to solve in physical planning?
20. Basically I suggest **we are making arrangements for the future use of space by people:** and we attempt to secure that those arrangements are carried out.
21. We can neither make those arrangements in a plan, nor secure that the arrangements are carried out by control or implementation, in an administrative vacuum.
22. Some form of planning system is necessary for us to operate efficiently and effectively. We note however that planning is also the management of uncertainty.

Type of System

23. Here I will betray no doubt my planning origins, but I cannot avoid the conclusion that our Charter must state two foundation blocks and then five pillars, on which any planning system must be built if it is to be effective.
24. The two foundations of wider public policy are:
 - a. Some means of capturing for the community the increase in land value arising from physical change.
 - b. Some means of ensuring the participation of the community in decisions which concern them.
25. These are both issues of public policy which go wider than physical planning and should not be part of the planning system alone; but they are a vital foundation for any system, and on them I erect my 5 pillars. to define these pillars I would like first to go back to my basic definition of physical or spatial planning in para. 20 as "making arrangements for the future use of space by people". The arrangements will be concerned essentially **with change in the use of land or space; promoting or controlling** these changes. If this is accepted, then the 5 pillars or essential components of the planning system may be described as follows:
 - a. Definition of **type of change** in the use of land or building, which is to be the subject of the arrangements.
 - b. The allocation of a right or power to **make the arrangements** (i.e. to plan).
 - c. The need for permission to make the defined changes (separate from permission to build).
 - d. Right of appeal against refusal of permission.
 - e. The means of making arrangements at different scales and of resolving conflicts between scales.
26. If our Charter can define physical planning, and the elements of the system necessary for it to work, then we can go on to suggest the particular contribution which our profession can make.

The Job and Capability of the Physical Planner

27. Since our profession first established the need to devote particular attention to the form and function of cities and regions, new professions and disciplines concerned with the evolution of human settlements have emerged; dealing with for example economic development, transport, social problems, housing, recreation and ecology. Most of these share with planners a common knowledge base.
28. Clearly one of our roles is to contribute to the federation of these skills engaged in seeking and solving the many problems of human settlements.
29. Such transdisciplinary work is for many problems essential: it involves sinking one's identity in the corporate team; while being clear where our particular contribution and capability lies.
30. Has our identity become too submerged? Have we become excited by new types of work, but which others may do equally well and lost sight of what it is we are uniquely skilled to do.
31. We should not let the **knowledge base** we have in common with many other disciplines absorb our **capability** to plan.
32. How should we express this capability? Here are some ideas:

The way land is used or re-used is important in all countries: our business is the rational use of land.

Physical planning is necessary in every country to pave the way for efficient and effective, physical action.

We join with others in the science of analysis, taking things to bits - but we **specialise** in the craft of synthesis; which is putting things together; making a coherent whole out of the parts.

Function asks for analysis, but **form** based on function seeks for synthesis.

Analysis of function relies on words and numbers, but form is based on revealing spatial relationships, through the visual image at a variety of scales simultaneously. We offer a view of the urban or rural tissue, a vision of the shape of place which responds to the territorial imperative for physical identity.

Who are the Clients

33. Can we offer our clients some form of Charter like this which attempts to define the subject, the system, our capability? We will need to balance clarity with humility; this will come from understanding our clients.

34. We have I suggest 3 types of client:
 - a. Those who commission and pay us.
 - b. Those who act on our plans - that is the developer.
 - c. Those who suffer or benefit from our plans - the citizens.
But also we serve the living, the dead, and those yet to be born.

35. This should give us humility. But we should also note that in some cultures and languages - certainly in English - the "planner" is anybody who makes a mistake. When planning works it goes unnoticed as the natural order of things (perhaps just because it is a natural and healthy activity).

36. In his State of Profession address in 1969, Sam van Embden, our first President, said: "We have to learn to plan as if we were not planning. This is more a question of mental attitude than of method; more of wisdom than of knowledge."

ISoCaRP Frame

37. If then we succeed in communicating externally to our potential clients what we are and what we can do, how can we communicate among ourselves in such a way that adds to our wisdom and experience?
Again I wish to suggest that the State of our Profession, that is the state of understanding we have built up between us in ISoCaRP, should allow us to move forward on this front.

38. Starting with the Text Programme Lyon, we have always looked for a relationship and continuity between the subjects we discuss at congresses and seminars. At present we have a theme "Implementation and Partners" which runs through three congresses.

39. Can we go further than this and look for a framework which will allow us to relate the **function** of each subject to the **form** of our profession?

40. We need to discuss this in great depth, but to start that discussion I would propose four "vertical columns" in our frame or matrix which would be:
 - a .**The changes** that have taken place and are coming in future.
 - b. **The current ability of planning** to deal with these changes.
 - c. **The research**, knowledge, understanding, of these changes which we need, in order to plan for them better.
 - d. **The new objectives** or improved practice which we should attempt to establish.
41. In each one of these vertical columns we could list the results of our past work and case studies. Reading horizontally we will find relationships and gaps. Future subjects and case studies can be related through all four columns. For example: for the Berlin Congress, 1985: the influence of implementation practice of economic changes, and the state of planning, looking for results for research and changes in practice.
42. Or by taking one "column" theme, such as Research in 1986, we could structure the congress to determine the research needed to improve practice in the light of current state of planning and economic or social changes: and at the same time record and revive the results of the Rome seminar.
43. I must apologize if, in a few words, I have not made myself clear: but I think we could find some way of recording and evolving our work in order to achieve continuity.

Conclusion

44. In summary I have tried to suggest that after 20 congresses, 5 seminars, and 3 presidential reviews of the State of the Profession our Society and our profession is now in a state when we can and should:
 - a. Resolve the crisis of identity and respond to the crisis in human settlements
 - by stating who we are,
 - by announcing what services we can offer.
 - b. Evolve a framework for co-ordinating our discussions and seeking wisdom with humility.
45. I propose that we should produce an ISoCaRP Charter and an ISoCaRP Frame to show that our profession has "come of age" internationally and to celebrate, next year, the Society's 21st birthday.

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

*Manuel Da Costa Lobo, Portugal
President 1984-1987*

1. Learning from the Past

Where is the profession of urban and regional planning today?

As we get used to having a periodic review of this issue at every third ISoCaRP Congress, made by the passing Presidents, I can ask myself if there is still something new to say or something old worthwhile to repeat. After some meditation, I decided to take the risk of presenting to you some thoughts of my own, where some comments will be as old as ISoCaRP and others will try to bring something new or at least put old ideas in a new way. I remind you that Professor van Embden's State of the Profession was held 18 years ago, and the last one by Dr Lyddon just 3 years ago.

Urbanists became one of the most asked professionals in the forties and fifties for the reconstruction of our destroyed towns all over the world after World War II and to design and create the towns of the future. But people get so used to destruction by wars that urban policies forgot to settle a planning strategy for peace. Plans of that period suggested the demolition of obsolete centers, the opening of ring roads, the disruption with the old way of life to build a new one, the levelling of standards, the cold rationalism of functions for pre-conditional communities, the development based on growth.

In one sentence: a too strong planning approach for human beings!

Most people, most regions, most countries could not follow the system. They got behind, they got lost, they got marginalized. The settled format of planning has been responsible for the speed of marginalization, that became one of its more dramatic and negative side effects.

All this has already been stressed during our congresses. From the fifties and sixties onwards there was a great evolution of some principles of urban planning. They include the following changes:

- a. Planning must learn to work for development even where there is no growth. This needs new administrative strategies.
- b. Planning must learn to design updated towns and old tissues without destroying them. This needs imagination.
- c. The architectural heritage must be respected and old areas must be rehabilitated and revitalized. This needs culture.
- d. The human scale, nature and feelings must be considered. This needs participation, and participation needs information, dialogue and education.
- e. The town has been created and must be the home of men and every man of each community must have his place in the town in order to achieve the integration of activities and purposes. This is what a town is for.

- f. Human marginalization must be abolished and the dignity of every man respected, being a task of public administration to look for the overall strategy that could fulfil that requirement. This needs efficiency of public administration and very pragmatic management.
- g. The interdisciplinary method of work must put a strong accent on the environment, fighting the trends of increasing pollution and danger of catastrophes, and it has to learn how to develop in depth impact studies. This needs permanent research.

2. Changing Structures

Urbanists' education and training, planning approach and public administration have to change in order to cope with new goals and new awareness. Furthermore, changing must be differentiated throughout the world. Professionals must announce that planning within a frame of human freedom is not only possible, but the very way of respecting the dignity of every man and of attaining the targets of society. The concept of plans have to play the important role of communication and of settling the rules to be followed between the partners. Planning will include the process of implementation and the system of research and monitoring, of creative activity for change and development, of management, of settling objectives and strategies, of safeguarding values and heritage, of choosing the tactics.

In recent years there has been a big change in professional structures. In most European countries there are now professional associations of urbanists (town and regional planners). The former Liaison Committee, aiming at getting a link between professional associations and the EC has been transformed into the new European Council of Town Planners. In other countries and continents there are also similar organizations. Differences between them ask for working towards better understanding and better communication. ISoCaRP accepted last year collective membership of institutes and organizations within the Society. Through this initiative, we hope to get a stronger participation of professionals of distant countries and to speed up the process of common definitions of the basic concepts:

- a. the urbanist, as a recognized professional of town and regional planning;
- b. the ethics of the profession;
- c. the education;
- d. the city and the region;
- e. the urban planning procedures;
- f. the planning fields of work;
- g. the role of planners.

Furthermore we intend to expand our Society to more countries and only a regional frame and greater international help will avoid the negative side-effects of being spread out over the world. From the regional point of view, and outside Western Europe we need some strong support and poles of regional attraction in:

- Eastern Europe and the USSR
- North America
- South America
- North Africa
- Meridional Africa

- East Mediterranean countries and the Near East
- Far East and Australia
- India, China and neighbouring countries.

We need to develop the idea of stronger links between professionals of different countries and we hope that more colleagues who are with us today will offer themselves for this effort, with their work and their enthusiasm to reach our common objective.

Each year there are more regional seminars and meetings besides our main ISoCaRP annual congress, which shows the vitality of our members. This is the way of less expensive interchange of ideas within regions. It seems to me that this is a good trend. We are also making an effort to develop our Bulletin and Newsletter, to promote the communication of facts and ideas between members. Furthermore we are trying to strengthen the links with other organizations, such as IFHP, INTA, and of course, UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

3. Last Year's Main Trends

Besides the general evolution in town planning and in the role of professionals which I referred to before it seems possible to think about the developments in planning over these last 3 years. Let me suggest 7 points to stimulate your thoughts:

1. The population of industrialized countries is declining in number and in number of persons per family, most of them getting more sophisticated jobs which often leads to strong labour force migrations, even between continents. Demographic increase in developing countries is still going on but shows, here and there, some signs of slowing down.
2. Ecological disasters are becoming more frequent and known and society is becoming more conscious of the decline of natural resources and of the danger of hazardously taken decisions with negative ecological side-effects.
3. Cultural heritage conservation is becoming a subject of high priority for governmental policy. The awareness of cultural and architectural heritage values is increasing very rapidly. A theoretical approach is being developed and conservation is being included in the aims of political programs. Rehabilitation has been the subject of research and experiments. Creativity of professional planners and architects demonstrates that it is feasible and positive to bring the past back to life. This is the new direction of urban development, much richer, much more human and more promising.
4. The well-known interdisciplinary and systematic concept of planning is developing new formats, being more integrated, open to new sciences and professions, and experimenting interschool training courses.
5. A new boom of planning is taking place in several places. Professionals are organizing themselves within national and international associations of planners, and experiments have been undertaken with new formats for plans and planning. As far as non-planning has been tried: facts showed its failure - a kind of trap for public administration and people in general: less coordination, malfunctions, economic losses and utopic increase of personal freedom, only possible beyond planning limits by reducing the freedom of others.

6. Land used as a capital good is increasing very rapidly and its acquisition for economic investment is becoming a general concern all over the world. Prices are going up and land turns out to be an alternative to gold. It became an important component of the planning strategy. Agricultural land is therefore decreasing, land ownership is being questioned and a kind of anxiety touches millions of families.
7. Economic crises are developing in industrialized countries and spreading to the Third World. The main alternative switch from weapon industry (creating jobs) to science and advanced technology (to spend on big international infrastructures, like tunnels and bridges, or new ways of transportation and communication) and to Third World aid programs, including housing. The latter forms the link of these thoughts with the subject of our congress - the homeless issue - and with the aim of peace and solidarity.

These seven points are enough to show us how important the development in town planning has been during the last three years and how relevant this development is for professional strategies.

Looking at Professor Albers' "State of the Profession", eleven years ago, I think we could still repeat most of his remarks, as the one, for instance, where he stated that planners needed a basic academic training leading not only to knowledge and research but also to decision and actions, within permanent conditions of uncertainty. He also spoke about modesty while both Professor van Embden and Dr Lyddon asked for humility. I would claim, today, for more professionalism of urbanists, including also care for urban space and other important qualities to perform our tasks. It also seems to me that some changes in emphasis are taking place on the way of planning. We all agree on the need of supporting the process of decision, but the importance of forecasting went down while the importance of monitoring went up, asking for a kind of planning and management that brings the careful timing of decisions and actions to the first place of our professional targets. Strategic planning becomes crucial and now we learn that shape and size of towns can play a part in it. Urbanists are well aware that they must work within a team, where they play their role through their knowledge and experience on spatial arrangements but strongly inter-facing with the other professionals. Our job must be a formal synthesis, where the creative and artistic capacities of the planner and the culture of the community must come together to get the final result.

We also learn that participation is a must for success, but not a kind of participation limited to freedom to give an opinion on planning matters. What we need is real participation, meaning effort, work, investment and all other inputs of people. Plans need to fit well with them and operate. This is why professionalism is so important.

Fitness of planning includes the concept of conservation of cultural heritage in a dynamic way. This is why we have not to ask today for a balance between innovation and conservation. Urbanists discover how to get them together, discovering that innovation can be done through a new concept of conservation and rehabilitation and that conservation is only possible through innovation and imaginative creation and in-puts.

Looking now to Dr Lyddon's address 3 years ago, we can conclude that he was right. The planners' crisis was beginning to be solved and new ways were being discovered for our professional role and behavior. The professionals in charge of arranging things on the territory work either at their offices, with sophisticated methods, in cooperation with architects and engineers who contribute to the projects. Or they are directly working in the field - namely where there is no time for sophistication of procedures and where the projects are executed by the heads and hands of traditional builders. Sometimes the urbanists become even so-called "barefoot" planners, where other means are scarce.

The point is that we must be present everywhere. Where a locational issue is raised, a complete structure has to cover the needs.

Dr Lyddon was also right to ask for an ISoCaRP Charter. The idea was fruitful and now we have already an agreement between European town planning organizations.

Maybe we could make an analogy, whereby physical planning would play the role of hardware, in the teams, and the social sciences the role of software. The physical planners would centre their action around spatial synthesis, art and implementation, and their proposals would bring the long-term approach to:

- social issues;
- physical planning; and
- economic issues.

Dr Lyddon spoke about the two foundations of wider public policy, capturing the increase in land value for the community and ensuring participation. We can stress today that the two are deeply connected and participation would have a very poor meaning if it did not include the offer of resources, namely finance and land, that communities must get to develop their purpose. Now, may I remind you of the exercise Dr Lyddon involved us in, simulating a being which came from another planet and questioning us. Could we change it today a little and simulate a child asking us some questions knowing that we are planners, creating the towns of the future, the ones for children to live in:

1. Why do you not make enough towns with sufficient housing for everyone?
2. Why do you let towns decay and be untidy?
3. Why do you destroy buildings and spaces we love, because we were born there and played there with our friends?
4. Why do you not make safe streets and safe crossings?
5. Why do you allow cars parking on the pavements, which are intended for people?
6. Why do you not make nice paths for children to go to school and urban parks for little wild animals to live in?
7. Why do you make such ugly housing estates where we are having difficulties to find and identify our own house and street?
8. Why do you not put more love in your professional tasks, getting more human scale to layouts and urban images?

The answer could be simple: "Well, there are a lot of things you are not yet aware of. When you grow up you will understand. You know, we depend on public administration and decision makers, we depend on money, we depend on human deficiencies and sins (some people are jealous, others are ambitious, other are lazy, others do not care about their neighbours, etc)". Having said so, we would fail to add, with that humility that means professionalism: "O.K. we need your help, your participation, in order to be able to build better towns".

4. The Uncomfortable Issues

Coming to the point we cannot be happy about what is going on. We know that public administration, investors and planners are too often making wrong plans, not fitting with reality, bringing side effects that are worsening the urban environment and the life of people. Planning is

making people homeless, planning is forgetting homeless people, planning is suggesting long-term improvements and does not care about today's dramatic situations, planning is presenting misleading policies and actions to people, planning is shown through plans in an inadequate format. But we know that every day is good enough to change our attitude towards ourselves, towards our neighbours and towards the world population in general. Human culture has become more and more universal from the 15th century onwards and it is time to reach maturity, to feel that solidarity is not only a moral duty but also a natural development of human nature in the struggle for survival. We must be aware that most actions we launch are very often too late, though the essence of our profession is to anticipate problems.

We still have a long way to go. We have always been stressing that planning should integrate all facets of life. A relatively new planning approach is the high priority given to our environment and eco-systems. Our economic systems should take into account the environment. That is the basis for a correct planning approach. We must take action to get the needed changes. Planning must be in the center, to help big decision making, but must also develop to the periphery, where people and urban buildings are. The two-way feed-back is essential for the strategic component of our job. We cannot be honest with ourselves without feed-back and putting research in practice into impact studies. We have to go on fighting: fighting for peace, fighting for participation and fighting for more professionalism.

5. ISoCaRP Programs

At a last point I would like to speak about our future programs and the proposal of Dr Lyddon. I would like to show it within a matrix:

	changes	ability	research	objectives
1986 Paris		x_____x		
1987 Delhi		x_____		x
1988 Taormina	x_____x			
1989 Switzerland	x_____		x	
1990 Poland				

Starting in Paris with the link between research and practice in New Delhi we return to the link between ability and objectives, where practical answers have to be done on the spot and cannot be postponed. Then we have to proceed to fields where changes are urgently needed: the suburbs, the periphery of towns, the urban fringe. There we have to argue about practice, the way of dealing with the complexity of the urban fringe. In 1989 we would tackle changes in a more sophisticated way, doing research and working with telematics for the world of tomorrow, in order to anticipate moves that could be very meaningful for urban and regional planning. In 1990 we are invited by our Polish Delegation. It is time to think more deeply about that congress, but I feel that I must give way to the new President of ISoCaRP to let him talk to us about the future.

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

Karl Otto Schmid, Switzerland
President 1987 - 1990

Since our Society published the international manual of planning practice, with the comparative presentation of planning systems in a dozen countries, some of us experienced a sigh of relief. The very substantial efforts behind this publication remained mostly hidden. In researching the fundamentals of planning legislation and some characteristics of plan implementation in every country which is represented in the book, the comparison reveals a lot of common ground. It gives you the impression that we must be doing the right thing. The planning mechanism could be captured in a common frame of reference. International communication in our field is much more meaningful with the knowledge of identifiable comparable components or recognizable differences in the legislation, methodology, and organisation of planning.

However, a mathematician would caution us for the comparison of unequal things. There is very little evidence that urban planning is more efficient in one country than in another because the planning processes are more or less centralized, more or less legally determined, more or less submitted to citizens' participation, different in methodology, private sector involvement, etc.

Urban Planning education is mostly directed towards one system, i.e. the national context of the educational institution. Even in such specialised courses as "planning in developing countries" where these countries are clustered into one group of similar traits, we ignore - very generally speaking - that in reality there are enormous differences among planning systems and procedures. There are equally enormous differences in the perception of what is most dominant among the goals of planning, in the sophistication levels of planning, in the resources allocated to planning, in the known levels of effectiveness, in the transparency of the planning processes, and many more. The differences prevail in most crucial comparative situations, which makes it so difficult to transfer experiences from one place to another. However, this does not make our congresses unproductive. If planners are not able to make some mental adjustments to such obstacles as *deviations in perception* they may also not be flexible enough to perform their function on the home front. Deviations of perception are part of a planner's life.

But the fact remains - a valid appraisal of the **state of the profession** is extremely difficult, partly because of these differences among the systems.

Some elements, however, are relatively clear - *All planning efforts, in every country, reduce a complex reality to manageable proportions of this reality*. The typical form of presenting a future state of development combines plans, models, and descriptive statements of policy and procedure. We have workable and well-accepted ways of regulating land use, infra-structure and financing procedures. The results are often encouraging and we have held congress after congress with presentations of success stories. It is a more recent fact that the failures and deficiencies of our body of knowledge have become a substantial part of our discussions. But we are not only far from perfect; it seems to me that we are even losing ground. Urban Planning is certainly more disputed today than it was thirty years ago. It also has been increasingly disputed in recent years in terms of its effectiveness.

Despite great progress in monitoring development with up to date statistics and mathematical models, despite more and more rigorous planning legislation, despite more sophistication in the

methods of implementation, the expectations have risen more quickly than our collective ability for adequate performance and delivery. (If anyone feels much more satisfied with the performance of planning, remember the discussions at our congress in India or the ones we are holding here in Poland.)

Several adverse trends can be identified among the political reactions to the inadequacies of planning.

Adverse trend nr 1:

Abbreviation of the Planning Process

There is a long legal procedure in most countries for the implementation of planning policy, before general options for political action, general planning concepts, general goals and the like can be translated into specific operational measures. This path is even longer in terms of time if the normal procedure includes an open planning process with public participation and/or if the process can be challenged in any part through court procedures. The typical time lapse for an important scheme may be 10 to 15 years.

For several reasons political impatience will result in an attempt to abbreviate the process. Whether such short cuts result in circumventing legally prescribed procedure, or whether political leaders take the matter out of the hands of law-abiding planners and submit it to emergency measures, our profession is seriously affected. We all know how we risk going along with political currents to remain in the mainstream. We may recommend changes in the legal base, we may venture into vast publicity games to promote faster acceptance, ...somehow we become the victims of a process in which we assisted when it was legally established. We all know, furthermore (and our colleagues from developing countries know this best,) that political leadership calls for quick delivery, at best faster than the term of office of our elected governments.

Adverse trend nr 2:

Consultation of Specialists from outside the Planning Profession

In real crisis situations, e.g. when we confront serious environmental problems, or when millions of new jobs and homes should be generated almost overnight, political leadership tends to consult with specialists who promise quick delivery and who address only the urgent issue at stake.

I have observed in several countries that such specialists perform their assignments by throwing overboard everything that thoughtful planning had developed with its typical comprehensive approaches and with seemingly wrong premises. It would be a shame if our profession lost contact with such expedient processes because of moral or legal obligations. A whole new breed of environmental specialists who monitor environmental problems, ecologists, physicians, chemists and others require our recognition. We must be open to permit their integration into the planning process. This requires much more than opening the door. Many of these specialists have demonstrated successfully that there is a gap in our perceptions.

Adverse trend nr 3:

Rejection of complex Procedures for long-range Strategies, e.g. Scenarios

How can it be explained that such outcries as Rachel Carson's book, over twenty years ago, or the analysis of the Club of Rome, largely failed to generate political action? A similarly reserved response can often be observed with scenarios, or very generally, whenever too many variables are submitted to a political process. Political leaders expect clear-cut concepts for approval or rejection. They shy away from long deliberations over years. Even parliamentary bodies show this tendency, although in a less impatient form. The lesson to be learned is clearly to separate learned elaborate thinking from action plans, and to debate the former mainly in professional circles while observing the urge of political bodies to be involved primarily in decision making. Many planners may regret that in really complex subjects they cannot count on the involvement of politicians in a series of blueprints of what are the components of a problem and what are the options for taking action. Like many other aspects of our lifestyle, politics have become more hectic and time is unforgivably scarce. (In a remotely comparable situation of household management, the food industry has resolved the dilemma of prolonged cooking procedures by offering TV dinners that are ready to eat after a few minutes in the micro wave.)

Adverse trend nr 4:

Aversion against bleak Prophesies

There seems to be an increasing sensitivity on the part of the political leadership to being linked with problems of a long-term nature with limited chances for quick solutions. No government likes to admit that there will be increasing unemployment, a great shortage of housing, soaring inflation or a drug problem out of control. On such issues we must resist the tendency to play down the facts. We cannot accept that environmental pollution, to mention one major field, is handled in the manner of the Sun King in France, who is reported to have said '*après nous le déluge.*' Even if the outlook is bleak, if no one likes to hear it, we must speak up.

Adverse trend nr 5:

Management Gap due to Specialisation

I have already indicated that the field of urban planning is constantly widening, both in terms of subject matter and in terms of sophistication, but also in terms of expectations. It was always clear that no single individual could embrace it all, unless we talk about really small communities. While the field is expanding, a new, tempting device has seemingly helped to keep under control the enormous amounts of information at any stage in the planning process - the computer. In their advanced applications, computer-based programmes can simulate a multitude of future developments. Our work has become unthinkable not only without the use of computers, but also without the specialists to handle this tool. Yet, while in our field specialists proliferate, including computer specialists, it becomes more and more imperative to train generalists, people capable of defining the pertinent questions that should be put to all the many specialists involved, who are capable of drawing on the essential expertise, and skilled in developing a synthesis. Many segments of specialisation develop their own line of independent thinking and there is a permanent danger of optimisation in one sector at the expense of equally significant issues elsewhere. This is also a political dilemma. Where consultation draws only on the advice of a narrow field of specialists, the recommendations will very likely ignore the impact on other sectors of the planning process.

Specialists are rarely trained in the art of necessary compromise. It requires skill, moreover, to persuade the many parties involved that the highly superior knowledge of the specialists in their particular field must be integrated and often partly subordinated to obtain an optimal solution. The problem is age old. But the dimensions of specialisation call for new and innovative processes of team work. This is all the more urgent where the leading forces in a planning operation have no way of verifying the findings of the specialists, let alone the results of computer models. A typical way out, regrettable but obviously necessary, is the method of calling for counter expertise. A high level of professional integrity is required in such processes by all persons involved.

To conclude my analyses, if urban planning is in an advanced stage of sophistication, and if the chances for centrifugal forces and for confusion are equal to those for integrated approaches towards adequate action, one thing is clear - our profession is very much alive and as exciting as ever.

Let me take this opportunity to thank you for the intriguing assignment of the presidency. I thoroughly enjoyed working for you and for the Society. Because I opened my series of prospective statements three years ago with the reference to being the captain of the ship, let me conclude by wishing the passengers, the crew, and particularly the new captain, Javier de Mesones, all the best.

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

*Javier de Mesones, Spain
President 1990 - 1993*

It is an ISoCaRP tradition that the last speech of the President is related to the '**State of the Profession**'.

I do not like to turn this paper into a "medical report", because neither planning nor planners are, or will be, a "Unit of Intensive Care".

The world population grows daily at the frightening rhythm of about 200.000 people, which means theoretically that every 24 hours one new team of numerous planners could devote their whole life to design, build and manage a new big city. It seems that there is no shortage of work.

Under these circumstances, the "**planner's role**" is often considered as a theme of top interest, probably because it is supposed that the planner, in permanent confrontation with change, has to constantly modify his position and to adopt always a new and different attitude with regard to a society in a non-stop evolution.

BUT IT IS NOT LIKE THIS, at least not in its authentic reality, because I am not referring to the external, formal or accidental aspects. I am referring to a **whole, deep and characteristic substratum of our profession**.

For hundreds of years the planner faced the **same set of problems** which have only changed in quantity but not in quality. The issues are changing their intensity without modifying their inherent nature.

You know well that I am not speaking about technical issues, which could also be seen through the same philosophy, but to a whole spectrum of **attitudinal conflicts** which are more important than technical issues.

I say that they are more important, because they have something to do with the planner's position regarding society and his attitude when faced with the wide range of planning challenges.

Recently I read "**The Power of Myth**" by Joseph Campbell, and I was struck when I discovered that two great historical personalities, responsible for the way of life of thousands of millions of people, had **parallel experiences in similar situations** in their lives. I refer to the famous temptations to which **Buddha** was exposed and which were repeated six centuries later for **Jesus**. As is known, **Buddha** had to confront and overcome three propositions before reaching illumination.

'In the first temptation, the Lord of Lust displayed his three beautiful daughters before Buddha. Their names were Desire, Fulfilment and Regrets - Future, Present and Past. But the Buddha... was not moved. Then the Lord of Lust turned himself into the Lord of Death and flung at the Buddha all the weapons of an army of monsters... Again, he was not moved, and the weapons flung at him turned into flowers of worship.'

'Finally the Lord of Lust and Death transformed himself into the Lord of Social Duty and argued, "Young man, haven't you read the morning papers? Don't you know what there is to be done today?" The Buddha responded by

simply touching the earth with the tips of his fingers of his right hand... That night, the Buddha achieved illumination, and for the next fifty years remained in the world as teacher of the way [of life of thousands of millions of people.]"

Jesus also was exposed to three temptations -

*'First there was the **economic temptation** where the Devil comes to him and says "You look hungry, young man! Why not change these stones to bread?" and Jesus replies "Man lives not by bread alone..." And then next we have the **political temptation**. Jesus is taken to the top of a mountain and shown the nations of the world, and the Devil says to him "You can control all these if you'll bow down to me" which is a lesson, not made known well enough today, of what it takes to be a successful politician. Jesus refuses. Finally the Devil says, "And so now, you're so spiritual, let's go up to the top of Solomon Temple and let me see you cast yourself down. God will bear you up, and you won't even be bruised." This is known as **spiritual inflation** [or temptation.] But Jesus...says, "You shall not tempt the Lord, your God." Those are the three temptations of Christ, and they are as relevant today as they were [two thousand years ago.]'*

-----.

The evolution and development of mankind in its demographic, cultural, social and economic aspects is the engine of **CHANGE**.

The physical and legal reflection of CHANGE over the binomial CITY/REGION is the object of **PLANNING**.

To answer conveniently to CHANGE, PLANNING often has to alter the delicate balance between **URBAN** and **RURAL LAND**, sometimes by urbanising rural areas or, at other times, by intensifying the use of certain urban areas that also were rural in the past.

Every intensification of use, both the change from rural to urban and the increase in quality or quantity of its potential use, implies an **ADDED VALUE**, in accordance with the inexorable law of supply and demand.

It is evident that planning has the power to generate added values as an inseparable consequence of its proper object, and as a result of its specific activity.

The logical and unavoidable generation of added values has to be done **WHERE** the CHANGE requires it, that is to say, where it will be more positive for development.

The planner has to **FULLY JUSTIFY** his decisions and to adopt his determinations in the most scientific way, always along the principle of sustainability of the proposed development.

But do not be mistaken! Let us be sincere, at least with ourselves... **Decisions are not taken only by planners**. They have, in each case, to design the plan and to shape it in accordance with decisions adopted by others.

Who these other partners or agents are has been the topic of some of our past congresses. When the proposals are promoted by **ECONOMIC AGENTS**, the political-administrative agents and the planners are responsible for their analysis and approval - or rejection.

When the decisions come directly from the **POLITICAL-ADMINISTRATIVE AGENTS**, without prior technical justification or without full cooperation with planners, the decisions might seem at least **suspicious**.

In many countries Land Acts establish fairly that a part of the **added values has to revert to the society** whose evolution justifies and produces the change. This premise is only applicable at the end of the process, once the real added values have been generated. It often happens that the one who obtained the profits has vanished by then.

Children of my country write letters to the **Three Wise Men** asking for toys. It is said that the night of January the 5th, the Three Wise Men, mounted on exotic camels, leave the toys in the children's shoes. In other countries, children write to Santa Claus, a kind, elderly man, who also gives them toys on the night of 24 December.

I ask myself, what politician or businessman has not at one time or other been tempted to write a letter to Santa Claus asking for money, power or social esteem? We, the planners, are often like Santa Claus and our plans frequently leave important gifts in someone's shoes.

Let us now look at the scenery from the other side, from the part of Santa Claus. Which planner does not like to be rich, powerful or socially esteemed as well, in the same way as others are going to be owing to his plan, as payment for changing stones into bread (rural land into urban land)?

Or, on the contrary, who is not afraid of the revenge of a powerful businessman or politician, converted into a "Lord of Death", who feels ignored or betrayed because the planner does not bow down to him fulfilling his desires?

There is a story, in which a very old profession was justified with these words "they enjoy it so much, it is so easy to me... and it resolves so many problems..." All of us are in a certain way the Santa Claus of somebody. But, beware! Do not operate, nor argue as in that old story. This way of life, in our case, has another name - its name is **CORRUPTION**, but it is something similar.

Let us not accept **to change stones into bread for anybody**; let us not bow down to the "**Lord of Lust**"; let us not kneel down to those who offer us the whole world in exchange for ourselves; and let us not tremble before the "**Lord of Death**" when he tries to press us by dread.

The world is every day more **overcrowded** and our society is becoming more and more **competitive**. Nowadays many young and adult people confess that their highest social goal is to be **rich and famous**. They do not care how they reach fame. The only thing they want is to be known and wealthy.

It does not matter to them which way they use to reach fame and wealth. It could be through arms traffic or by getting the Nobel Prize. Actually it is very difficult to achieve wealth and reach fame as well. Unfortunately it is **easier to kill the poet than to write a poem**.

Everyday, people need to wake up early to read in the newspapers what the latest invention has been; **what is 'in' and what is 'out'**; what has to be done to be in fashion and what has to be avoided in order not to be frowned upon.

It is necessary to be constantly high up; it is risky to get down a minute from the pedestal. Curiously the people who suffer most acutely from this illness are those who are responsible for publishing every day the figures of the 'fashion stock market'; these publicists of the social duties live enslaved to the idol that they themselves have created - **FASHION!!**

In other cases, using the same mechanism, **temples of "papier-mâché"** are built to enthrone **prefabricated "idols"**, other new **Lords of Social Duty**" whose most important worth is to have the **same ideology** or to belong to the **same lobby**.

These "idols", full of vanity and dogmatism, proclaim **compulsory by-laws** from the highest tower of their temples, convinced that their footmen are going to pick them up in the air, if their fame crashes against daily reality.

Meanwhile, the big majority read **the latest magazine at breakfast**, to design their projects in the latest style or fashion, not only in their shape but in the most basic aspects, always in accordance with the **"voice of the Lords of Social Duty"**.

This is even more depressing and astonishing when the fashion appears to be charged with **"messianism"**.

When you are not following the messianic by-laws of the gods you are not only going to be considered **"outside the establishment"**. Even worse, you will be an **"Enemy of the People"**. One day, you may find, without prior warning, that you are the people's enemy through faulting a by-law coming from the "temple."

But **what is wrong with these attitudes** except for the **ridiculous vanity** of wishing "to be important" or always wanting "to be IN"?

Why did **Buddha** only touch the earth with his fingertips when the **Lord of Social Duty** asked him if he knew what he had to do during the day? **Why is fashion dangerous?** ...THE IMPOSED FASHION.

Imposed fashion, good or bad, is dangerous **because** it is **born a thousand times** and a thousand times replaced by the next one, which is always more attractive and beautiful, simply because it is the most recent, until the moment that it gets older, loses its value and disappears leaving, its place to the next newborn.

It is because our profession is too serious for people's happiness to be understood as a fashion.

Because there are **fashions that do not deserve to be fashions**, not even for the short time of their own lives. But, above all, because there are **fashions that have to be considered with more respect** than a simple and ephemeral fashion that will only live for the fleeting flash of fame.

It hurts me to listen to the '**Lords of Social Duty**' proclaiming their faith in such a serious matter as for example "sustainable development", forgetting that yesterday they had their mouth full with **another issue that is totally different**, if not **contradictory**.

And it does not hurt me because their faith or their publicity lasts a short time, but because they create a **'fashion object' that will be soon thrown** into the memory closet and will be replaced by

another new and sparkling slogan. And those people, who only know how to live by following slogans, will abandon something that is **absolutely necessary to survive**, that is **totally scientific** for planning and that is **unquestionably serious** such as the respect for the Earth.

Let us be loyal to ourselves. Let us propose not to follow the imposed fashions, nor the by-laws of the "**Lords of Social Duty**". But if, despite it all, fashions will have enslaved people, let us ask the "gods" **not to talk about serious matters; not to turn them into fashions** and to speak only about **trivialities**.

Years ago **Pablo Ruiz Picasso** answered a young man who asked him, following his daddy's advice, what he had to do to become 'famous': "*Say goodbye to your parents, and come back to see me again*". Well....actually he did not say "goodbye".... but his real words cannot be translated....As a good Spaniard, Picasso always had a **hard way of expressing** his thoughts and, also as a good Spaniard, he was **never easily understood**.

What Picasso meant within his wild freedom was simply that we cannot reach to be something in our life if we do not decide to act by ourselves, following our proper "**bliss**" or our own "**calling**" without recipes, fashions, dreads, instructions, dependencies or by-laws.

All the thoughts set out here could be defined as the deontological attitude of which today's world is so in need. In short, we ought to avoid these rejectable attitudes -

*** FEAR
* SUPERFICIAL
STYLISHNESS**

*** CORRUPTION * DOGMATISM**

* FASHION * MESSIANISM

And we have to avoid these, without submitting to -

*** GREED** *** AMBITION** *** PRIDE**
(turn stones into bread) (I'll give you all that) (angels will hold up their arms)

Nor should we kneel down in front of the **Lords of -**

As was taught us **thousands of years** ago by those two big figures of human history.
Many thanks for your attention.

STATE OF THE PROFESSION

Serge Domicelj, Australia

President 1993 - 1996

Colleagues, friends :

I am pleased to continue the tradition of departing presidents in offering a concluding 'professional amen', after three years full of lessons and experiences, shared with colleagues. In one way my task is made easier by **recent comprehensive reviews** on the topic, notably by Judith Ryser and Erik Wirén on the occasion of ISoCaRP's XXX Anniversary in 1995 and the 1996 HABITAT II Forum Report in Istanbul, organised by ISoCaRP and other bodies.

In another way, the task has become intricate through its newly uncovered complexity, for which there are more questions than answers. Nonetheless, the above valuable contributions are full of **pertinent issues** which ISoCaRP should now seriously examine.

My overview will briefly cover **three parts**:-

- ?? first, current aspects of the profession;
- ?? second, possible 'ways to go' for a professional society;
- ?? and third, ISoCaRP during 1993-96 and into the future.

A risky agenda, as a small contribution to members' valuable views, assembled over thirty years.

State of the Profession : Some Aspects

The addresses of former presidents have provided both guidance and critical analysis of the profession. Sam Van Embden (1960s) upheld a comprehensive and balanced approach to planning and the tools of a modern profession; Gerd Albers (1970s) critically analysed the dilemmas facing the actors in planning, at times of political upheavals; Lanfranco Virgili (early 1980s) claimed for planners a responsibility for the public good, to be exercised through expert negotiation; Derek Lyddon (mid-1980s) defined a new professional agenda for planners, consolidating an ethical role vis-a-vis the rising market influence; Manuel da Costa Lobo (late 1980s), promoted an international agenda for planners, in cooperation with development agencies, geared to tackle world problems; Karl-Otto Schmid (early 1990s) warned of the threats in a competitive economy and of the needs for re-tooling planning skills; Javier de Mesones (mid-1990s) decried the ruthlessness of the modern world and called for the adoption of new professional ethics. Over thirty years, a **rich commonality** with fluctuating emphases.

Undoubtedly, in the mid-1990s, the planning profession has continued to **diversify** in both perception and application. At times operations have become further specialised while at others the need to be comprehensive has grown even more paramount. An intractable globality and a tenacious localism have both become entrenched, often in opposition, and requiring planning intervention. In **industrial countries**, the environment and technology, reactive or proactive, now form the professional mainstream focus, but one which lags behind scientific advances. In **developing regions**, sectoral emphases continue to characterise the nature of planning practice: economic inputs in Asia, geographical ones in Africa and the sociological in Latin America (Stren, 1996).

In industrial countries, after a declining concern for planning during the 1980s, a **resurgence, with global implications**, is manifest in the mid-1990s. **Some tendencies** are:

- (i) a search for more participatory and collaborative urban governance;
- (ii) an emphasis on decentralisation, devolution and support for local government and,
- (iii) continued attempts to eradicate poverty.

Although not entirely new, these global trends reinforce the need for social equity in the face of new economic and technological circumstances, with vast political and ethical implications. New trends are evolving through painful, fluctuating transitions in which forward development thrusts challenge separate planning attempts to adapt to, or compensate for, rapid change.

Last year Erik Wirén warned us of **current challenges** to planning from pervasive global influences, unregulated market competition and scientifically based systems which, when taken together, could negate the need for the planning profession. And yet, in the face of unmanageable crises, the **need for planning physical environments has heightened** and is recognised even by endemic marketeers. It has however influenced planning briefs, defined by corporate agents, which demand **physical 'cleanliness', and an emphasis on the imagery of places** at the expense of basic sociocultural considerations. Cities thus become an abstraction lying between image and a project mentality. Often planners are forced to respond to stereo-typed social considerations and so to abrogate specific community responsibilities.

Simultaneously, quite different opportunities for engaging planners may result in a **close cooperation with communities**, with their regular involvement in the provision or rehabilitation of local services and places. However valuable, such interventions often go unrecognised, leaving the impression of insignificance in the face of powerful pervasive forces, which originate beyond the local environment and away from its control. Although leading to community improvement, such planning efforts have not created the sustained development of human resources, and may result in the loss of professional status. One conclusion is that the concentration of strategic resources on the one hand, and the sustenance of cultural diversity on the other, have contributed to the proliferation of planning roles, in response to different clients and requirements. **Pursuing very different challenges the profession has lost focus rather than credibility.**

A matter which is fundamental in our uncertain times is, as John Udy reminded us in Cordoba in 1992, **the perception of planners' roles, whether inside or outside the profession**. In analysing an intriguing variety of roles, originating from both practice and theory, he listed no less than sixteen! Of his comprehensive list, **in view of the enormity of problems** affecting cities and regions and our traditional concern for communities, I feel the critical need for **two roles to be exercised: the reformers** (such as advocate planners) and **the synthesizers** (human strategists). Of course, the others must continue to exist and develop too.

One **consideration** is that, in pursuing traditional social aims, **planners should improve the effectiveness of their delivery to the community, and so clarify their professional focus**. This will only be achieved by tackling diverse problems in a range of circumstances by different means. In practice, the scale of demands will only be met if planners secure **extended partnerships and further define their own roles**. While planning activities along these lines have been observed for some years (often with participation by the informal sector), they now need urgent strategic attention. **The 1996 Professional and Researchers Forum**, held in Istanbul within the UN HABITAT II Conference, developed this approach and the means to apply it.

Partnerships and Roles at the 1996 Istanbul FORUM

Domiceli

The **Forum's report** states that planners need to **redirect their sense of professionalism**, recasting the current understanding of skills, performance and, ultimately, service to the community. This implies new knowledge, information deployment and ability to negotiate in situations of conflict. First, **a new understanding of civil society, governance** and the nature of public resources is thought to be essential in creating alternative paths for human development (Porio).

Second, there is the need for **new information**, as the basis for a 'social production of knowledge' (Malusardi). A fortunate phrase which considers at least two systems: one translating the use of natural resources into everyday terms and the other ensuring their informal, creative use by disadvantaged communities, in their unorthodox quest for improvement. Third and fundamental is the development of **mediation skills** to resolve conflict and to develop amongst stakeholders a sense of shared, or at least mutually respected, goals.

In implementing the above approach, it was thought in Istanbul that professionals should develop a diverse range of roles **to extend service within the informal sectors**. Through modified forms of expert intervention, they could function reactively, proactively or **interactively**, according to the specific needs of clients and communities (Srinivas). Professionalism depends on flexibility in the choice of clients and partners, to respond effectively to competing briefs. Finally, and significantly for professional bodies such as ISoCaRP, the ability of communities and **professionals to establish truly global partnerships** gave hope for a more precise understanding of complex development matters.

The 1996 Istanbul Forum report concluded by outlining the technical instruments by which professionals could contribute to improved development - essentially through the establishment of '**collective urban pacts**' in collaboration with governments and communities (Das). To clarify complex urban issues, a partnership of professionals and empirical researchers was thought essential. From the earlier analysis and the Forum, it can be concluded that planners need to redirect and focus their activities, mediating transactions over the allocation of resources and space in city and region. Significant new circumstances and opportunities make this challenge exciting, with high stakes and looming crises.

Operational Issues for a Professional Isocarp

Erik Wirén analysed with clarity the conditions affecting the opportunities for professional societies to operate effectively in today's complex world. Derek Lyddon responded with a different proposal while Gerd Albers, through the 1996 Bulletin, commented and encouraged further views. **The debate amongst members is open** and is essential for the future of the Society.

The recent HABITAT II Conference and its preparatory meetings opened new possibilities for professional exchange. ISoCaRP led preparations on behalf of planners and the professional Forum itself. It was also represented on the International Facilitating Group of NGOs led by the Habitat International Coalition, of which it is a member. We now have to hand both recent experience and networks to orient global activities with **better insights of 'primary source' developments**, on the ground.

With appropriate partners, public and private, ISoCaRP is now well placed to extend its international activities. Our '**bridging-nexus**' role helps us to offer a profile which is open to new associations beyond the profession. Our greatest strength is the **professional expertise** of our members. As John Udy reminded us, we should take stock of our knowledge base and articulate it

as a collective, exchangeable resource. **Selective tailoring of our deployment** could be to the perceived commonality of planning issues and/or to the requirements of societies in need of planning, such as countries in a state of transition.

In this regard, the *International Manual of Planning Practice (IMPP)* provides an excellent basis for further programs; these could address how 'actual practice' takes place in the respective countries and regions, including the plethora of circumventions, however unpalatable. Operationally, the coordinated contributions of generous members, on a renewable time roster, could be a means of promoting member contributions. Technology could do the rest, as shown by Hari Srinivas with the Internet.

The vastness of planning as a field of professional expertise **requires focussing in discrete areas of application**. Though recognised professionally, this compartmentalisation is still to be adopted within ISoCaRP's activities. The four *International Professional Networks' (IPN)* initiated by members (*on mediation, conservation, technology and developing countries*) are a start, but need further member inputs and programs. One topic, which responds to our first aim of association, is planning practice. It could become the focus for a new network on '**advanced planning practice**'. Other sister organisations operate such a framework. ICOMOS, for example, in the field of conservation, has fifteen international scientific committees, focussed on processes, types of place and materials.

And a word on the **Young Planners'** program, now in its sixth year of successful operation since Mexico, 1991. Though providing new energy and a reassuring voice in the ISoCaRP agenda, there are as yet **untapped possibilities** for an even more effective program. The views of young professionals could be posed at Congress and articulated as an **alternative viewpoint in times of rapid change**. Both the 1996 and 1997 Congresses, on topics of urgent global concern, could well serve to deploy such young universality.

With its headquarters and most members in Europe, **the geographical context and intensity of ISoCaRP's activities** have been significant policy issues. Changes in the 1980s-1990s in the world and in ISoCaRP itself have made the question relevant and have extended discussion on regionalisation and decentralisation. So far, for good reasons, unity has prevailed. In the Society's earlier years, it was seen as 'adding a global context to Europe' while more recently it is read as '**putting Europe in a global context**', a process now in progress. The next stage could be the development of a global context in its own right. This I proposed on ISoCaRP's XXV anniversary.

On the separate but related issue of the **size of membership**, again, there have been two views. The 'small is beautiful', and more friendly view, has prevailed, partly by choice and partly by circumstance. Indeed, the network of good friends is such an asset to the Organisation, that colleagues wish to join for this reason alone ... (thus, of course augmenting the Society!) However ISoCaRP, being globally networked and with programs held beyond Europe, is appealing and applications for membership are bound to increase.

There was a **10% increase in membership in 1995, nearly half from outside Europe**, from twelve countries where planning is vital. This was matched by a similar 'pruning' of members, so that membership has remained fairly stable. Conditions for growth and renewal have however been put in place as vital for development. Some growth is needed to attract excellent practitioners and, even if doubled in size, ISoCaRP will remain a small Organisation of individuals and friends!

ISoCaRP in the Mid-1990s

Continuing earlier efforts, and with the hard work of the Secretariat, the Executive Committee and other members, the Society has developed new initiatives in 1993-96. Some examples follow.

Through **meetings** in new regions (Prague, Sydney and Jerusalem); HABITAT meetings (in Geneva, Habana, Nairobi, New York and finally Istanbul) and planning the 1997 Congress in Japan, the **global** policy has been emphasised. Our counterparts in joint programs in Australia and Japan have been the national planning bodies. New **partnerships** have been established with bodies such as AESOP, AAP, UNCHS, GURI, ICOMOS, the World Bank and UNCRD, while existing ones, such as with UNESCO, have been renewed. On the **publications** front, both *Congress proceedings* and *the Bulletin* edited by Gerd Albers have gone from strength to strength, while *Network* has usefully disseminated information.

With a recent cooption, the Executive Committee now has two members from **Asia**, a region with which ISoCaRP has established firm links. The pre-Congress tour to Thailand in 1995 and, in particular, the 1997 Congress planned for Ogaki, Japan, with a tour to Seoul, offer new development prospects for the Society. The link with the Japanese Association of Planning Administration, through the good efforts of Yoshinobu Kumata, is particularly promising. Earlier contacts have been renewed, as with our representative at UN Headquarters. And the list could continue.

We are now pointing in a direction with **global** aspirations. It has been but a small step, with some commitment to continue. More member contributions and resources are needed to pursue common interests and take up the abundant challenges on the horizon. It appears the 1990s will continue not to be a decade of routine!

State of the Profession

***Halûk Alatan, Turkey
President 1996 - 1999***

It is September 1999, ISoCaRP is approaching its 35th anniversary and realising its 35th annual congress.

Our world, mankind is entering a new century, a new millennium, and the topics of this new millennium are globalisation, localisation, nation states, oil, wars, famine, natural catastrophes, migration, racism, environmental problems, nationalism, fundamentalism.

ISoCaRP, as an international NGO, has always stayed out of politics and will do so also in the future. This principle, however, does not prevent us from seeing the realities, the facts: the suffering of mankind. Just have a look at the past few years: We are witnessing an incredible human drama in the middle of Europe, which we characterise as the most developed continent. Exactly at a time we are speaking about globalisation, about the boundaries loosing their importance, about people getting closer and closer to each other as regards economics, technology and culture, seeing people making war against each other is just beyond human understanding. This contradiction at the end of the 20th century is a global drama. What we have seen happening in Bosnia and Kosovo is absolutely heartbreaking. It is not important where the truth lies, who is right, who is justified and who is wrong. Millions of innocent people have had to leave their home and native country and, in miserable conditions, simply take the road to the unknown. In the chaos, it was the children and the old people who suffered most. The children had to testify scenes which all their life long cannot be erased from their brains. While the situation in Europe is like this, do you think the scenery on the other continents is much different? Absolutely and unfortunately not! Also from there we get extremely often news shattering our hopes and breaking our hearts.

In these circumstances, it is certainly difficult to speak about our profession and its problems. On the other hand, in order to get free from this tangle of controversies, to disentangle at least a part of it, becomes possible if we discuss our profession and produce some proposals for solutions. Our profession is an important element in the human history and the global culture. Our main subject, towns, are the most important instrument invented by mankind on its way to create culture. As a matter of fact, the towns founded by our ancestors to prepare a place for trampa, trade, are today the focal points of our profession. Our aim is to make the towns more liveable, more sensitive to nature, to ensure that better service can be offered to the inhabitants in these urban areas.

Entering the 21th century our world is experiencing globalisation, localisation and regionalisation in an interesting controversial way. And the problems, instead of gradually lessening, are unfortunately increasing.

In the 1990's the idea of globalisation has gained more and more impetus. The markets of the world are becoming united, creating positive results. Unfortunately, however, increasing production and developing technology are not evenly distributed among the countries.

The "Human Development Report 1999" prepared by UNDP disclose the above fact. Here are some figures showing that developments in the two fields I mentioned above, that is, in increasing production and new technology, are not global but a monopoly of a few rich countries: 77 % of the world production is realised by 25 industrialised countries. Just the share of the USA of the world

production is 27 %. According to the report, the richest 20 % of the world realise 86 % of the total production in the world.

There we have two very important points: The first one is the geometric rate of growth in the difference between rich and poor during the past 20 years. The second fact is the production monopolisation in fields, which are vital for the developing countries. As an example we can see that 85% of agricultural chemicals which are of vital importance for the developing countries, are produced by 10 companies in industrial countries.

Further, according to the Human Development Report, while the difference ratio of income between the 20 % of the richest and the poorest countries in the world in 1960 was 30 to 1, this ratio was 60 to 1 in 1990, and in 1997 it had gone up to 74 to 1. These startling, alarming statistics bring to the agenda and force us to think whether the globalisation is based on common values.

The “Human Development Report 1999” proposes a series of measures. Here are some examples: to support the anti-trust sanctions of the World Trade Organisation, to collect tax from e-mail in the developed countries and use the funds to encourage and support the use of internet in poor countries. The use of computer in planning is getting more and more important, and spreading out the use of net would at least to some extent contribute to closing the gap between countries. If a US citizen buys a computer with one month's salary and a Bangladesh citizen needs his 8 years' earnings to buy one, the importance of this proposal is very clear.

The most important point in this connection is that the developing countries reach a certain educational level and life standard. Only this way, it is possible for them to profit from the benefits of globalisation. This fact has been especially underlined in the report. Public investments are decreasing in a serious way in the competition society. This means that sufficient, adequate investments are not made in basic services like education, health and maintenance. This is where our profession shows its importance. To establish the minimum urban standards” describing the level of civilisation and determining the standards of life in towns, and distributing the areas in a balanced way on the plan, is probably the most important factor as regards investments in human life. The primary aim of physical planning especially in developing countries, is the equal distribution of social services like education, health and green areas, and of technical infrastructure services like transportation, water, and sewage, within certain standards in urban areas.

I have experienced and believe that the decisions in physical planning, spatial planning and sometimes even the planning of a single lot effect the development of a town. My opinion is that we should apply the directives and standards of physical and spatial planning on all scales. These lines were written before the recent earthquake disaster in Turkey. After the earthquake which was one of the biggest in this century, our neighbours as well as the whole world rushed to help us, to participate unselfishly in the rescue work, and to give not only their material but also moral support. More than 60 countries participated in the rescue work with people, rescue and medical teams, equipment and material aid. Especially the help of volunteers from numerous countries was morally vital for the people hit by the disaster. Hundreds of people were rescued alive from the ruins. The return to life of a child made the whole world happy. I know that our foreign friends watched those scenes with tears in their eyes.

What a remarkable manifestation of solidarity it was! It really gave new courage and joy of living to everybody. It brought to us all the feelings we need to be able to look hopefully into the future of

mankind. The hearts of the Turks are full of gratitude, obligation and appreciation. Unselfish helps without return, diminishing pain by sharing it, is a quality of humanity.

Mistakes have been made from the point of view of our profession.

Ignoring our warnings, necessary measures were not taken, planning decisions were not adapted in the region as regards settlement and distribution of population and industry.

Anyway, we should not look back now. The truth lies in the words: "I forget my mistakes but never their reasons". It is time for us to profit from our experiences. New important work and decisions are waiting for us as physical planners.

As physical planners, as ISoCaRP, what can we do and what should we do? I would like to draw your attention to two issues: First, international physical planning competitions. Competitions are a means to bring planners together to work for a joint aim. International competitions offer a milieu where, besides new ideas and opinions being presented and compared, planners, executors, representatives of culture and politicians are brought closer together. The international Gallipoli Competition last year, converting First World War battlefields into a Peace Park, is a good example of this. 120 participating planner groups worked and competed to create an idea of how to turn the cold and cruel face of war into a Peace Park for international peace and humanity. Among the members of the jury of this planning competition, covering an area of 33.000 hectares, there was only one planner. This is a reason for self-criticism. In the future, ISoCaRP should participate in the Organisation of such competitions from the nomination of jury members to the final judgement of the jury. Apart from this, we should support the idea of organising all kinds of competitions on different scales.

These competitions are projects requiring teamwork. In consequence, it does not only bring about closeness between countries and understanding for each other's problems but also enhances the solidarity and co-operation between different professions. One of the most beautiful aspects of our profession is that it gives us the pleasure to work together, to search for and find solution together. This pleasure is only heightened by the happiness it is bringing to people and to the new generation, and in this way giving strength to us. As our founder, Honorary President Sam Van Embden said 20 years ago: "We have to enrich our work by finding the balance between imagination and reason."

The second issue I would like to draw your attention to, is the support to and increasing the number of international, even intercontinental physical projects. As an example, I would like to present to you the Silk Road Project, which has entered the agenda lately. Once in historical times, the Silk Road was a corridor from Japan and China through Middle Asia and the Caspian Sea to Black Sea and from there to the West, to Europe. At that time, the main reason for this link between East and West was silk, but the important rehabilitation project is based on the attractiveness of oil. The richness of oil in the region of the Caspian Sea, the largest inland sea of the world, is of course the basis of West's interest in this Eurasian project. A modern infrastructure must be built in order to transport the natural resources to the markets in the Western world. The responsibility for this gigantic project, this huge investment, and not only from the point of view of trade and economy, but also ensuring careful implementation as regards environment, culture and historical values, is upon planners, businessmen, investors, politicians, diplomats and many other professionals. It must be our most important duty as planners to safeguard the protection of environment, nature and historical values on all scales, and the peace, well-being and stability between communities and people.

Alatan

We should make this project, crossing boundaries and bringing nations closer to each other, a “Project of Hope” for the mankind. This road will not only connect countries to each other but also history to future.