

# UC Berkeley

## Berkeley Planning Journal

### Title

Ideas that Drove DCRP

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5352r3g3>

### Journal

Berkeley Planning Journal, 12(1)

### Author

Webber, Melvin M.

### Publication Date

1998

### DOI

10.5070/BP312113039

### Copyright Information

Copyright 1998 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

## **IDEAS THAT DROVE DCRP**

Melvin M. Webber and Frederick C. Collignon

### **Origins**

Back in 1948, when Jack Kent opened the door at DCRP, its context and mission were pretty clear. World War II was over. Infrastructure backlogs were huge, following nearly twenty depression-and-war years of deferred construction. Cities everywhere were attempting to replan and rebuild, creating new fervor for city planning. With the hard years behind and bright horizons ahead, the new department was being organized to lead the way by bringing planning to California's cities. At about the same time David Riesman was reminding his readers that city planning was the last stronghold of utopianism. The optimistic new Berkeley department set out to prove it.

Although lacking a history of its own, the department was heir to the postulates of the Enlightenment with its faith in perfectibility, of the Progressive Movement with its devotion to professionalized reform, of American Pragmatism with its insistence on ethical accomplishment, and of the Anglo-American City Planning Movement with its focus on buildings, infrastructure, urban design, and land use controls. It was also a direct doctrinal descendent of the British town planners, men such as Ebenezer Howard and Patrick Abercrombie, and of Britain's 19th-Century medievalist, William Morris.

Its approved models for the planned metropolis had evolved long ago among monarchs who'd built the great cities of Europe. They had evolved, too, in idealized preindustrial towns and villages everywhere, each small in scale and governed by its own community of local citizens. Both city and region were territorially defined and physically tangible objects, subject to conscious design and to deliberate manipulation in pursuit of both aesthetic and social ends.

All four founding faculty members were drawn from San Francisco, particularly its Department of City Planning. T.J. Kent, Jr. and Sydney Williams were initially trained as architects, Francis Violich as a landscape architect, Mel Scott in English literature. In addition to their shared professional experience, the four shared the widespread understanding that a good society depends on a good physical environment. Winston Churchill's

## **Berkeley Planning Journal**

dictum, "We shape our cities, and our cities then shape us," was an axiomatic precept in city planning circles, Berkeley's included. Overt focus was on structure and attributes of the physical city plant and on spatial distributions of activities within it. Primary instrument for guiding city development was the physical/spatial plan -- plan as two-dimensional map in the architectural and engineering idiom. Unlike faculties at other planning schools, DCRP's founders were expressly concerned for the social and economic functions of cities, not merely their aesthetic qualities and physical efficiency. By physically shaping the object, they aimed to affect its performance and thus to improve its social outcomes.

### **Foundations**

The 1950s, the Eisenhower years, were notoriously calm in America. These were times of rising family incomes, exploding suburbs, expanding roads, ubiquitous telephones, and rising ownership of cars and houses. Critics everywhere were excoriating the suburbs for sprawling across fertile farmlands while "homogenizing their residents into faceless automata." The Housing Act of 1949 had introduced urban renewal as a powerful new slum-clearance medium, permitting central cities to clean out the more unsightly sections of town. Despite wartime expectations of major postwar recession, the national economy was booming. So too was population growth in major metropolitan areas, especially in California where population was doubling every twenty years, fed by federal spending in defense-related industries and marked by suburban house-building and center-city redevelopment. The Department sought to respond accordingly.

Catherine Bauer, a contributor to earlier federal public-housing legislation joined the faculty in 1950, offering courses on housing and urban renewal policy. Donald Foley, an urban sociologist with city planning experience, came three years later introducing courses in statistics, demography, and the metropolitan region. Foley proved a strong link to the social sciences and to formal methods of inquiry. Bauer proved a strong link to the progressive Eastern Establishment of urbanists, architects, and conservationists -- the likes of Lewis Mumford, Clarence Stein, Charles Abrams, and Benton MacKaye -- some of the most influential contributors to the thoughtways and doctrines dominating American city planning in mid-20th century.

Bauer's eastern friends, like her western colleagues, sought social betterment through improved settings for social life through design of improved physical environments. Even when writing during the Great Depression, they were indomitably optimistic. Their hope-filled visions portrayed futures complete with gardens, playgrounds, and decent housing for everyone. Theirs was the utopian optimism that distinguished city planners from other public servants -- that marked them as authentic social reformers, as professional agents of betterment.

### The Big Transition

In the late '50s, Chancellor Kerr asked the free-standing department where it wished to make its permanent institutional home and what its own long-range plans aspired to. The faculty was quick to tell him. They wanted to join a new college devoted to comprehensive environmental design, to offer the Ph.D. degree, to establish a research institute, to expand CRP library holdings, and to add at least ten more faculty positions. Besides all that, they wanted to expand the extension program for practitioners and to promote a competitor school at UCLA.

In the years that followed, and with unremitting regularity, the University implemented the Department's plan. But, like other utopian schemes that generate unanticipated consequences, this one fundamentally changed its sponsor.

The simultaneous installation of the Ph.D. and faculty-led research Institute of Urban and Regional Development marked a radical shift in the Department's intellectual style. The sudden and wholesale substitution of desks for student drafting tables was a telling symbol of the transition from a focus on physical design to a focus on inquiry.

For doctoral students, the ruling criterion was excellence in scholarship and research, rather than proficiency in professional practice. So too was the criterion for selecting and then promoting faculty. In that context, annual additions to the faculty meant appointing persons with doctorates and devotion to research and scholarship.

In turn, the dominant pedagogy changed from learning-by-doing to learning-by-reading. The expanded library assumed increasing importance in the educational programs -- for masters and doctoral tracks alike. Students working as research assistants to professors soon acquired the habits of mind and the technical skills for systematic investigation. They were obligated to know existing theories and were expected to

## **Berkeley Planning Journal**

contribute to them. The faculty's ultimate aim was to find those students who'd prove to be the faculty's intellectual equals. Many passed that test and went on to careers as prominent professors, distinguished practitioners, and wise advisers.

Universities nationwide replicated Berkeley's transition, and so created academic positions for many DCRP alumni at leading institutions. In parallel, think tanks were eager to appoint bright young researchers who were methodologically skilled and likely to become creative contributors to their missions. DCRP post-docs became prized staff members. Students in the masters track were enrolled in most of the same courses as those seeking the Ph.D., so their educational programs were similarly enhanced by in-depth exposure to the rigors of formal theory and the scientific method. Professional careers of many MCPs later became nearly indistinguishable from those of many Ph.D.s.

### **A Different Paradigm**

The notion of planning had become familiar to everyone during the days of the New Deal and World War II. The National Resources Planning Board, the Office of War Mobilization, and dozens of project-specific agencies were devoted to rationalizing governmental activities in pursuit of explicit ends-in-view. Although none of them succeeded in developing a long-term development strategy for the nation, the power of planning was dramatically demonstrated in the mobilization of the national economy and successful conduct of the war. Inter alia, the short-lived agencies did succeed in generating state and local planning bodies across the country and establishing regional planning projects in the large river valleys. But then, no doubt influenced by the likes of von Hayek's castigation of planning as the enemy of both freedom and capitalism and by the Soviet Union's pervasive reliance on planning, Congress explicitly rejected national planning and peremptorily abolished the NRPB. The idea of planning had come to symbolize both virtue and sin.

That ambiguity has persistently surrounded the idea and has made for a Tower of Babel, even among planners -- a vagueness that continues to becloud discourse today. For some observers, planning means ham-handed control; for others it means simply making plans, of asserting goals, of being sensible. City plans are still widely perceived as two dimensional maps depicting desired land-use arrangements -- along with associated infrastructure, housing, open-space, and public facilities -- as required by law in many states. For some, planning is equivalent to budgeting, perceived as deciding how to allocate resources

among competing projects and programs. For others, planning is a benign attribute of ongoing processes of governing -- of projecting alternative sequences of actions, tracing potential consequences, and choosing among them. Others use the term to mean simply scheduling events. Still others say planning is merely the process of applying intelligence and engaging debate in the service of democratic decisionmaking.

Whichever the view, all are constrained by pervading uncertainty about the future. All lack irrefutable bases for determining appropriate time horizons, degrees of managerial centralization, levels of reliance on self-regulating processes, styles of control -- indeed, bases for adopting epistemological foundations.

Those dilemmas became unavoidable in the early '60s when expanding agendas brought people from many disciplines into the planning arena. Intensive and continuing debate has still not led to consensus about effective styles of planning, and conceptual differences continue to mark the field. Hovering over it all, Eisenhower's dictum continues to contend that "plans are nothing; planning is everything."

The program in planning at the University of Chicago, which opened in 1947, was explicitly searching for an operational concept of planning. It may have been one of the longer-lasting institutional residues of New Deal planning. It was surely a mirror of the New Deal's commitment to engaging social science and social scientists in the innards of governmental processes. That commitment, later resuscitated in Kennedy's New Frontier and Johnson's New Society, exploited and permanently integrated social scientists and economic theorists into policymaking circles at the highest levels of government.

Initially led by New Deal braintruster Rexford Tugwell and with a faculty drawn mostly from the social sciences, the Chicago school sought theoretic sophistication and methodologic rigor as underpinnings to its own off-brand style of city and regional planning. Rejecting environmental determinism and in pursuit of social betterment, it sought ways of intervening directly into the workings of social and economic systems. As the 1950s and 1960s unfolded, the school's influence spread, even to Berkeley's program in city planning.

A major contribution to an emerging paradigm arose during the '50s -- notably at Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh -- when groups of regional scientists, economists, geographers, and sociologists found themselves playing lead

roles in metropolitan transportation planning agencies. There they developed mathematical modeling techniques for simulating urban developmental processes and conducted metropolitan-wide surveys yielding the masses of quantitative empirical data their models required. Methods borrowed from the natural and social sciences introduced modes of systematic analysis and synthesis into professional settings that had traditionally been dominated by intuition based largely on personal knowledge.

Those metropolitan transportation planners were precursors of the many urban researchers in universities, think tanks, and government agencies who later built positive theories of urban development. They were learning how to predict probable consequences of hypothetical policies and projects, thus permitting normative pre-appraisal of potential outcomes that might follow proposed projects. Transposing the new techniques of systems analysis into city planning, they were calling on epistemologies and analytic skills previously unfamiliar within the city planning profession. Implicitly, too, they were laying bases for new content and different cognitive styles in university educational programs. And yet, their theories and their programs were largely directed to physical and spatial attributes of urban systems -- the domain of traditional city planning.

### Changing National Policy Context

In 1955 Rosa Parks refused to sit in the back of the bus, triggering a wave of demonstrations among blacks and whites alike, across the South, then across the nation, that resounded through the 1960s. In 1962 Michael Harrington published *The Other America*, surprising the nation with news that we weren't all middle-class white suburbanites and that 50 million of us were poor. In 1963, demonstrations in the South and the March on Washington brought the plight of the blacks and the poor onto network television and into the White House and Congress. Suddenly, white middle-class suburbanites were no longer prototypical Americans.

In 1964 the Berkeley campus exploded with a series of student revolts that soon ricocheted across the country. Congress enacted the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, accompanied by riots at Watts, Newark, and Detroit, demonstrations by civil-rights activists, and anti-Vietnam War protests. By then the national complex of topics and issues had been dubbed "The Urban Crisis." At Berkeley, DCRP in conjunction with IURD became a locus for confronting The Crisis.

### **Expanding faculty**

Alumnus Webber returned to the Department in 1956, after working on the BART planning project. Teitz joined the faculty in January 1963 with a new doctorate in Regional Science from Penn. He was followed in the fall by Dyckman, Wheaton, and Meyerson, all from the University of Chicago via Penn's pace-setting planning program. They, in turn, were met by activist students focused on urban problems surrounding race, class, and poverty -- socially, not spatially, defined issues -- and seeking careers as agents of planned social change.

In just a few years, it seemed, American city planning was shifting from its exclusive focus on the physical-spatial city and its *indirect* approaches to improving economic and social life to *direct intervention* into economic and social processes. In parallel, the mindsets and methods of the social sciences were pervading both city planning practice and city planning education nationwide.

Many came to believe that something akin to social engineering would soon be possible. If only we could accumulate sufficient scientifically derived knowledge of urban systems and if only we could apply that knowledge to social maladies, we could surely ameliorate troubling social problems. Some even talked about *solving* them. Economists were claiming they could "fine-tune the economy" by constantly monitoring and adjusting key variables. Surely enough was becoming known about societal processes, including race relations and urban systems, that planners could conduct comparably sophisticated systems-analyses and systems-management to guide societal processes in desired directions.

At the same time, many students were engaged in the neo-Marxist movements of the '60s and '70s, confident that social activism reinforced by citizen participation was the only strategy likely to accomplish those ends. Paul Davidoff's advocate planner became the model and encouraged many alumni to seek public-interest careers as champions of racial minority and economically deprived groups.

### **Social Policies Planning**

In 1967 the National Institute of Mental Health made a major grant to DCRP, creating a Program in Social Policies Planning as one among the department's emerging Ph.D. offerings. Twenty-five students later earned social-policy doctorates, and new courses contributed to the educational programs of many



## **Berkeley Planning Journal**

hundreds of students from many campus departments. Within the next five years the Department appointed ten permanent faculty members, while also attracting active participation of several others from UC Berkeley and visitors from elsewhere.

The Social Policies program reinforced the Department's redirection while encouraging major expansion. It emphasized analysis of perceived social problems, synthesis of potential remedies, and design of potential institutional means for attaining social ends. It turned the Department's central focus from land use and spatial models to multi-variable analysis of welfare policy, race relations, migration, child care, disability, manpower planning, police, crime, health care, social services, alleviation of poverty, economic development, fiscal policy, and other essentially nonphysical/nonspatial topics.

Spillover effects of the social policies program came to pervade the entire Department and to change it for all time. Although long imbedded in city planning tradition, ideals of equity, equality, and participation were now explicitly proclaimed and woven into the curriculum's fabric. One could no longer teach even traditional courses on land use, housing, or transportation, without specific attention to redistributive consequences. A standard question asked of new proposed projects, "Who will be helped and who will be hurt?"

Whether initially trained in the design professions or in the social sciences, faculty and students alike were learning to trace potential ramifications of given actions -- then to trace those consequences into whatever substantive domains they might intrude. Although the mindsets of American Pragmatism have pervaded city planners' thinking since the movement's origins early in the century, a standard question asked of new proposals, "What difference will it make?"

### **The Middle Years**

The Social Policies Program appears, in retrospect, to have affected the overall substantive emphasis of DCRP's Ph.D. Before the program was installed, most doctoral students were oriented toward regional science and its heavily quantitative concerns with spatial organization of economic and social activity. Over time, the catalytic effects of the program seemed to shift doctoral students' interests to social policy, planning theory, and social problems. By the mid-'70s, the central methods courses omitted techniques of spatial analysis, input-output models, and linear programming. Instead they turned to social science methods -- research design, multivariate

## Ideas that Drove DCRP, Webber and Collignon

regression, survey design, and interviewing techniques. Advanced courses stressed program planning and evaluation, systems and policy analysis, but not spatial interaction models.

By 1974, location theory was no longer taught as a principal theoretic basis for urban planning. Instead, courses emphasized public economics, structuralist views of politics and society, social and psychological theory of individual and group behavior, and eclectic institutional and policy analyses of specific cases. Despite the faculty's diversity, but reinforcing their views about sources of social problems, economics became the new lingua franca at DCRP. It drew simultaneously upon welfare economics and urban economics, but not to the exclusion of intellectual constructs from other disciplines.

These changes ultimately marked the professional MCP program as well. The distinction between professional degrees and the research degrees in applied fields has always been rather blurred, at least since the 1862 Morrill Act created land-grant colleges with their commitment to public service. Because the doctorate in this field is empirically focused on worldly affairs, the ambiguity is inevitable. It is reinforced for the MCP by increasingly rigorous training in theory and methods for masters students. Especially during this time of national preoccupation with problems of race and poverty, it's small wonder that masters students chose to enroll in social policies courses and to direct their individual studies to these topics.

Bolstered by large faculty research projects on evaluation of disability programs, California's economy, application of systems analysis to Oakland city government, evaluation of BART, and an array of other policy research, many MCP students became de facto policy analysts. Those working on traditional city planning topics -- land use, housing, transportation, regional development -- were equally caught up in the newly emerging idiom of policy analysis based in the social sciences, rather than in land-use plan-making or in regional science, qua science.

With reinforcements from the social policies program, DCRP's ecumenical faculty composition became truly extraordinary. Members have held *graduate* degrees in over 20 different fields - architecture, engineering, economics, geography, medicine, chemistry, political science, sociology, planning, and more. (See the appendix below.) They seem, nevertheless, to have been unified by a common vision of their collective mission and by a common claim on the idea of planning as a key instrument of professionalized reform and democratic governance. Despite

## Berkeley Planning Journal

their varied orientations, all are heirs of the Enlightenment, Progressivism, and American Pragmatism.

In the wake of the New Deal, all seem to have seen government as a prime agent for social and economic betterment. All are simultaneously at home in the worlds of policymaking, professional practice, and academic scholarship. Indeed, for most of them, these categories are indistinguishable, so intimately are they entwined. All see planners as inventive designers of future arrangement -- whether in urban design, zoning ordinances, social services, infrastructure construction, public finance, economic development, or private investment.

As Alonso once put it in an insightful essay, they've not been an interdisciplinary group, i.e., they were not brought together because of their academic specialities or because of their differences. Rather, they came together because of their similarities -- because they share an image of social betterment and because they understand that urban policy and urban conditions intimately affect human welfare. In that sense, he contended, they comprise a *metadiscipline*. And yet, they continue to lack a common and crisp conception of planning that might define that metadiscipline.

In search of the common thread that binds planners into a community, in the early '60s DCRP initiated courses that came to be named "planning theory." Initially taught by Cohen, Dyckman, Rittel, and Webber, and later also by Christensen, Collignon, and Innes, the courses might more accurately have been called 'explorations into the idea of planning,' for they were searching for the essential attributes that distinguish planning from other modes of deciding-and-acting. All doctoral students enrolled in them and wrote a qualifying examination. At times, most masters students joined them. For many years those courses furnished some of the glue holding this intellectually diverse department together. Indeed, those courses were the single intellectual exercise all doctoral students shared.

Among the many topics treated in the planning theory courses were models of rational planning, their criticisms and their alternatives; incremental styles of decision-making and master-plan alternatives; relations between science and planning; public economics and techniques for guiding allocations of resources; decision- and social-choice theories; and, more recently, implementation problems, institutional analysis, consensus seeking, and post-modernist criticisms. Throughout, in pursuit of wise decisions and as antidote to

technocratic styles, courses emphasized the roles of values and valuation, ethical bases for collective decisions, and the overriding importance of informed judgment.

### **Return to Professionalism**

Then, sometime during the '70s, the Department began to turn around, declaring land use again to be a primary topic. Partly in search of legitimacy within the organized city planning profession, partly in search of exclusivity within the University, physical and spatial features of urban systems' were reasserted, just as the nation was discovering the environment's deterioration. Congressional legislation aimed at environmental protection, clean air, and clean water and triggered programs to correct negative practices. But it also called for responsible advance planning for environmental improvement, making the sine qua non of planning -- appraisal of potential outcomes -- a legal requirement.

The revival of land use planning was led by faculty members with social science and legal backgrounds -- Cowart, Deakin, Dowall, Heyman, Innes, and Landis. Their emphasis was on policy formulation and economic incentives; on public-private partnerships; and on negotiation to mitigate negative outcomes. Their approaches sought to reinforce traditional methods of land use control -- map-based general plans, zoning ordinances, and infrastructure installation -- by employing indirect controls and market-place inducements.

A major revival of interest in urban design simultaneously swept through DCRP, initially led by Appleyard and Jacobs, later joined by Bosselmann and, after Appleyard's untimely death in 1982, Southworth. Theirs was a tight focus on neighborhood-scale improvements, livable streets, and sensitivity to plural publics' perceptions and values. The Urban Simulation Laboratory, created by Appleyard, psychologist Kenneth Craik, and Bosselmann, demonstrated ways of envisioning physical outcomes of policies and projects, facilitating public deliberation prior to development. Kent, Jacobs, Orman, and others helped create a regional land use advocacy and planning organization -- the Greenbelt Alliance -- which has become an international model emphasizing urban growth boundaries and responsible environmentalism.

Simultaneously, the Department sought to merge its early orientation to city planning practice in local government with the analytic styles of the previous two decades, aiming for enhanced professional proficiency. Students substituted professional

reports for research theses -- products of student work with real clients. The curriculum was reorganized with a required core emphasizing both quantitative and qualitative methods, applied economics, institutional analysis, a practicum, and the history and content of city planning practice and thought.

Students themselves were also changing. They were worried about employment prospects in a time of moderate recession and rapidly transforming economy, wanting to acquire salable skills. Yet, while reflecting the tides of national and international political-economies and the revival of conservatism, entering students still championed social reform, still saw themselves as agents of social change, albeit lacking the radicalism of the 1960s.

DCRP's intellectual explorations were scarcely tempered by the changing national political climate, however. Regional economic development became a central topic with Castells, Cohen, and Hall conducting comparative national studies and writing on changes in the world economy. Markusen, and later Saxenian, joined Alonso, Castells, Cohen, Hall, and Teitz, conducting in-depth analyses of industries in transformation, tracing their effects on the regional economies of California, the U.S., and other nations. New concepts of labor markets emerged, reflecting development of high-technology industries in Silicon Valley and elsewhere in the world. Cohen co-founded the Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy (BRIE) which engaged faculty and students campuswide with government officials and industrial leaders worldwide, examining the effects of public policy and economic change on industrial and national economies. Castells, Cervero, Dowall, Hart, Meier, Perlman, Tinker, and Webber spent a lot of time in the Third World, assessing government strategies and searching for resource-conserving approaches to modernization and social betterment. In the U.S., Blakely, Collignon, Hall, Teitz, and others were critically examining local economic development experience and succeeded in devising novel approaches to business and inner-city community development. Except for concern about spatial isolation of the poor within rural and metropolitan areas, much of the new thinking was directed to nonspatial relationships and causal patterns.

Dating from the mid-'60s, the Department offered a major program in housing policy, led by Christensen, Dowall, Gellen, Landis, McGuire, Montgomery, Teitz, and Wheaton. As federal money for low-income housing dwindled, the Department trained a generation of housing developers and planners who went on to

make nonprofit enterprise the principal source of new affordable housing in the Western U.S. In parallel, Cervero, Deakin, Hall, Webber, and later Wachs proved to be a fount of systematic empirical research into the workings of urban transportation systems, resulting in pointed criticism and bold proposals for improvement. Rigorous treatment of housing and transport policies were further reinforcements of traditional city planning concerns for the physical/spatial built environment, even as they were focused on the underlying economics and on redistributive effects.

More recently, concerns for environmental effects have come to preoccupy many students, requiring that they acquire knowledge in the biological and geological sciences along with ideas of risk analysis, public economics, and governmental regulation strategies. Led by Deakin, Dickert, Duane, Landis and Radke, the Department is seeking ways of making the Environmental Impact Review a more effective medium for protecting environmental resources while serving as a crucial step in the logic of planned decision-making. At the same time Landis, Radke, and students are working with the new GIS technologies. Notably, Landis has succeeded in turning GIS into an instrument of physical/spatial regional planning by exploiting highly disaggregated data in tracing urban-developmental consequences of variable policy choices and market responses.

Social policy research in the '80s focused on ways of addressing the needs of persons typically neglected in city planning -- physically and mentally disabled, homeless, addicted, elderly needing long-term care, children and runaway youth, divorced-and-working women, political refugees and immigrants, and the poor of varied ethnicities. Duhl has long emphasized the importance of both wholesome environment and remedial services in confronting human needs across the life cycle. He launched the Healthy Cities Movement that is now international in scope and is encouraging social entrepreneurs to promote positive well-being by affecting aspects of urban life beyond the health professional's traditional scope. Collignon and Teitz introduced program planning and evaluation methods for appraising social policies and for designing improved programs, suggesting ways of building on social networks to address the special problems of specific populations.

### **The Fiftieth Year**

Now, as DCRP celebrates its 50-year odyssey, it comprises a remarkably diverse yet remarkably integrated collection of

intellectual styles and interests. In conjunction with the Institute of Urban and Regional Development, it supports a wide array of research, engaging many of the ±150 students enrolled at any given time. Despite its dissimilarities, it remains a coherent metadisciplinary community. Faculty and students are comfortably at home in both practice and academic settings. Their creative contributions can seldom be classified as belonging to any one of the traditional disciplines or professions, so eclectic are they. As is appropriate to metadisciplinarians, they're concerned simultaneously with the physical, spatial, social, economic, fiscal, and political attributes of the systems they deal with. Indeed, so broad are their interests and varied their activities, it's increasingly difficult to delineate the scope of the professional field they occupy. However firm is each individual's commitment to "planning," their diversity suggests that planning remains a highly variable concept.

That may be most apparent in careers patterns of the alumni. The substantive work of some focuses on conventional city planning issues -- land policy and land law, housing policy, transportation management, and so on. But others have chosen to specialize in health policy, public finance, national defense, energy strategies, education policy, natural disaster mitigation, foreign trade, the social and economic effects of new technologies, and more. Among their defining traits are capacities for treating large systems with rigor, political savvy, respect for cultural differences, and concern for the welfare of individuals. As Meyerson once put it, they are do-gooders who are also good doers.

It seems now, in retrospect, that DCRP's original mission has been stretched to encompass virtually the full spectrum of domestic (and increasingly also global) policy issues. It's now clear that most students were not trained to be city planners in the conventional mold. Rather, the Department's educational offerings helped them to become generalist analysts/planners, albeit focused on urban and regional development. They learned how to think -- how to ask the critical questions, to search for responses to those questions, then to formulate policies and actions that would accomplish explicit aims. The dramatic successes of so many of the multifarious alumni pretty clearly suggest that DCRP has been doing something right. It's equally clear, now, that the University's decision to launch this effort, fifty years ago, has been proved both prescient and wise.

**Appendix**

*FIFTY YEARS OF DCRP FACULTY\**

(As of January 16, 1998)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Years</i>	<i>Academic Degrees</i>
T. J. Kent, Jr.	48 -74	Architecture, CRP
Mel Scott	49 -69	English Literature
Francis Violich	49 -75	Landscape Architecture, CRP
Sydney Williams	49 -53	Architecture
Catherine Bauer	50 -64	English Literature
Donald L. Foley	53 -79	Public Administration, Sociology
Barclay Jones	56 -61	Architecture, Economics
Melvin M. Webber	56 -90	Economics, Sociology, CRP
John D. Herbert	61 -64	Architecture, CRP
Corwin Mocine	61 -76	Landscape Architecture
J. Thomas Cooke	63 -70	Architecture, CRP
John W. Dyckman	63 -76	Mathematics, Economics, CRP
Michael B. Teitz	63 -	Geography, Regional Science
William L.C. Wheaton	63 -78	Political Science
Andrei Rogers	64 -70	Architecture, CRP
William Alonso	66 -77	Architecture, Regional Science
Ira Michael Heyman	66 -93	Law
Donald Appleyard	67 -82	Architecture
Richard L. Meier	67 -90	Organic Chemistry
Roger Montgomery	67 -95	Political Science, Architecture
Stephen Cohen	68 -	Political Economy
Leonard J. Duhl	68 -93	Medicine, Psychiatry
Douglass B. Lee	68 -72	Economics, CRP
Chester McGuire	68 -76	Business Administration

*continued*



**Berkeley Planning Journal**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Years</i>	<i>Academic Degrees</i>
Frederick C. Collignon	70 -	History, Economics, Political Economy
Thomas Dickert	71 -88	Landscape Architecture
Allan B. Jacobs	74 -	Architecture, CRP
Janice Perlman	74 -85	Anthropology, Political Science
Richard Dodson	75 -79	Political Science, CRP
David E. Dowall	76 -	Economics
Judith E. Innes	76 -	English Literature, CRP
Ann Markusen	77 -86	Economics
Karen Christensen	78 -	Architectural Sciences, CRP
Martin Gellen	78 -85	Economics, CRP
Manuel Castells	79 -	Public Law & Political Economy, Sociology
Edward Blakely	80 -91	History, Business, Behavioral Sci., Education
Robert Cervero	80 -	Economics, Transportation Engineering , CRP
Peter Hall	80 -92	Geography
Richard Cowart	83 -87	CRP, Law
Peter C. Bosselman	84 -	Architecture, Urban Design, CRP
Nezar AlSayyad	85-	Architecture
Elizabeth E. Deakin	85 -	Civil Engineering, Law
Michael Southworth	85 -	Architecture, CRP, Urban Design
John Landis	86 -	Civil Engineering, CRP
AnnaLee Saxenian	88 -	Economics, CRP, Political Science
Irene Tinker	89 -	Political Theory, Comparative Government
Timothy P. Duane	91 -	Human Biology, Civil Engineering

*continued*

**Ideas that Drove DCRP, Webber and Collignon**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Years</i>	<i>Academic Degrees</i>
Gillian Hart	91 -95	Economics, Agricultural Economics
John D. Radke	91 -	Geography
Robert Ogilvie	96 -	International Relations, Political Science
Martin Wachs	96 -	Civil Engineering

***PART-TIME AND TEMPORARY FACULTY 1948-1997\****

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Degrees</i>
A. K. Roland Artle	Economics
Gregory Bassett	Architecture
Gary Binger	Architecture, CRP
Arthur Blaustein	Political Science, Public Law & Government
John Blayney	Architecture, CRP
Henrik Blum	Medicine, Public Health
Ted Bradshaw	Sociology
David Bradwell	Economics
Raymond Brady	Demography, Regional Science
Denise Scott Brown	Architecture, Urban Design
John E. Burchard	Humanities
Dudley Burton	Philosophy, CRP
Leland Burns	Economics
Barry Checkoway	Sociology
Michael Cohen	Political Science
Charles Cole	CRP
Kenneth H. Craik	Psychology
Harold Dunkerley	Economics
Louise Dunlap	Literature

*continued*

**Berkeley Planning Journal**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Degrees</i>
H. Wentworth Eldredge	Sociology
Frederick Etzel	CRP, Law
Norma Evenson	Architectural History
Michael Fischer	CRP
David Forkenbrock	Economics
Giullermo Geisse	Architecture, CRP
Nathan Glazer	Sociology
Claude Gruen	Economics
Peter Hagggett	Geography
Jorge Hardoy	Architecture
Justin Herman	Urban Renewal
Larry Hirschhorn	Economics
Brandon Howell	Architecture
Warren Jones	Chinese History, CRP
Dennis Keating	Law, CRP
G. Thomas Kingsley	CRP
Naftalie Knox	Architecture, CRP
Peter Labrie	CRP
Richard LeGates	Law, CRP
George G. Mader	CRP
Martin Meyerson	Political Science, CRP
Harry Moul	CRP
Peter Marris	Sociology
Brian Muller	History, Anthropology, Public Policy, CRP
Larry Orman	CRP
Richard Peterson	CRP
Jesse Reichel	Art
Horst Rittel	Mathematics, Chemistry
Ira Robinson	Regional Planning

*continued*

## Ideas that Drove DCRP, Webber and Collignon

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Degrees</i>
Lloyd Rodwin	Economics
Barry Rosen	CRP
Victor Rubin	Public Affairs, CRP
Edgar Rust	CRP
Rula Sadik	Architecture, CRP
John Sanger	CRP
Karl Schmid	Architecture
Paul Sedway	Law, CRP
Jack Sidener	Landscape Architecture
Sheldon D. Siegel	CRP
William Sims, Jr.	CRP
Andrej Skaburskis	Architecture, CRP
Michael Smith-Heimer	CRP
Gordon Stephenson	Architecture
David H. Stimson	Business Administration
Virgus Streets	CRP
Julia Trilling	Literature, Landscape Architecture, Environmental Planning
Jerrold Voss	CRP
James Webb	Architecture
Carl Werthman	Urban Sociology
Coleman Woodbury	Urban Renewal
Michael B. Wornum	Architecture, CRP

\* Some fields recorded here may be inaccurate, and some names may be missing. If so our apologies to the individuals.