

UC Berkeley

Berkeley Planning Journal

Title

Introduction

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5d24w16v>

Journal

Berkeley Planning Journal, 7(1)

Author

Steiner, Ruth

Publication Date

1992

DOI

10.5070/BP37113099

Copyright Information

Copyright 1992 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>

INTRODUCTION

As I prepared to write this introduction, I reread all of the introductions prepared by the previous editors of this journal. These introductions presented a continuing debate about the role of planning and the boundaries of the planning profession. Hilda Blanco (1985), editor of the first two volumes of the *Journal*, frames this debate well when she says:

Some faculty find the rise of new fields in planning evidence that planning has failed to define itself as a profession, and so picks up new trends in academia or reacts to larger societal or economic trends instead of trying to consolidate its own core of expertise. I think differently. To me, there is an ideal of comprehensiveness in the concept of planning that reaches out to other fields. There is something inherently in planning that doesn't love a wall. If these fields become passing fads, it most likely has more to do with the academic profession's failure to integrate them within the established core, rather than with their not belonging in planning in the first place (Blanco 1985: 2).

As we look back at Blanco's introduction seven years later, the debate about the boundaries of the planning profession are still alive. As Blanco wrote her introduction, the field was moving away from physical planning to social and economic development. Today, largely due to the rise of environmentalism and growth control movements, we are seeing an increasing interest in physical planning. As we increasingly focus on our physical environment, we can neither ignore social equity nor economic development. The plight of the poor and the disenfranchised are inextricably linked to our social, economic, and physical development policies.

This lesson came sharply into focus at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro this past June. In this forum, leaders from throughout the world came together to discuss how to balance economic development while guaranteeing the protection of the global environment. While a wide range of issues were discussed, the debate has largely been seen as the developed countries saying to the less developed, "control your population growth to ensure a sustainable future for the world." To which, the less-developed countries respond that the developed countries should consume less of the world resources to ensure the survival of the planet. Thus, each side is beginning to recognize the relationships among social equity, economic development, and protection of the global commons.

In our own country, the relationship between the physical environment, economic development, and social equity came into clear view with the Los Angeles riots in the wake of the acquittal of the four police officers charged in the beating of Rodney King. While the decision of the jury sparked the riots, the destruction of middle-class and low-income neighborhoods shows the discontent among people who feel that economic development has left them behind. Their actions harked back to the riots in Watts and other cities in the 1960s. The 1992 Los Angeles riots have forced a re-evaluation of the role of private and public actors towards poverty and the role of the federal government in rebuilding our decaying cities. While the plans of the 1960s and the Great Society pro-

Berkeley Planning Journal

grams were designed to address the decay of the city, the needs of the poor in those cities, the funding for cities and their residents has decreased over the last decade. Ultimately, we might ask the question, have we abandoned the cities as our population (and our wealth) has moved to the suburbs?

Finally, in the recently completed Presidential election campaign, a variety of plans were discussed by each of the candidates. Governor Clinton developed a series of plans to address domestic needs (e.g., health care, economic revitalization, economic conversion of the defense industry). President Bush responded by packaging several of his proposals into plans similar to those proposed by Governor Clinton. Ross Perot questioned our effectiveness in implementing those plans when he suggested in the debates: "Please understand, there are great plans all over Washington nobody ever executes. It's like having a blueprint for a house you never built, and don't have anywhere to sleep. Now, the challenge is to take these things and do something with them" (*New York Times*, October 20, 1992). But even Perot had a plan, which is not likely to be executed, to eliminate the federal deficit within six years.

This issue of the *Berkeley Planning Journal* presents articles that reflect the diversity of the planning profession. Some articles highlight the importance of implementation of plans. Others highlight aspects of physical, social, and economic development planning. Finally, the globalization of planning is demonstrated with articles about the United States, Latin America, and Asia.

The first major theme in Volume 7 is economic development. **Cynthia Kroll and John Landis** evaluate the role of housing costs in the decisions of businesses to relocate, remain, or expand in a region. They conclude that while the high housing costs are a significant deterrent to the ability of firms to recruit qualified labor, it did not either attract businesses to new sites, or cause them to leave existing sites. **Subhro Guhathakurta** discusses the policies of the Indian government toward protection of small businesses in the metal furniture and television manufacturing sectors. Guhathakurta proposes a new role for the state to better promote the dual objectives of social equity and industrial growth. He contrasts the stated policy of the government (the protection of small entrepreneurs) with the outcome of those policies (the protection of wealthy owners from competition). The *Journal* presents, for the first time, a critique of the methods used in a book and a response to those criticisms. **Elizabeth Bury** argues that **Ann Markusen, Peter Hall, Sabina Deitrick, and Scott Campbell** could have shown the importance of defense spending in their book *The Rise of the Gunbelt* by considering the statistical relationship between the level of spending and economic vitality of regions with high defense spending. Markusen and her colleagues respond to Bury's critique. You can decide for yourself with whom you agree. In a continuing tradition of the *Journal*, **Raphaël Fischler** analyzes recent trends in French urban development (and in French cooking) in the Urban Fringe Piece. And you were wondering what happened to former editors of the *Journal*. . . .

A second theme is physical planning and its implementation. **Tim Duane** uses the "Earth Summit" in Rio as a means of focusing on five trends in environmental planning and policy: the globalization of environmental impacts, the democratization of pollutant sources, the shift to life-cycle analysis, the shift from regulating emissions to limiting exposures, and the shift to incentive-based regulation. While using the international events as a point of departure,

he suggests that domestic policy-makers need to consider these trends to be effective in implementing environmental plans. **David Simpson** proposes a community-based response to dealing with the needs of people during natural disasters by discussing activities in the San Francisco Bay Area in response to the Loma Prieta Earthquake of 1989 and the Oakland Hills Firestorm of 1991. While his recommendations are focused on the needs of community to respond to the immediacy of these two types of natural disasters, this article provides a community-based model for responding to all types of disasters. **Michael Neuman** makes the unlikely comparison between Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* and Kevin Lynch's *Wasting Away*. He argues that while Lefebvre focuses on production and Lynch on consumption (through reuse, recycling, and rebirth of space), they both are arguing for the need to make settlement more humane by understanding the processes that make them tick.

The final set of articles provide a new perspective on a growing body of research on developing countries that recasts the way we understand traditional planning themes in the United States in the long run. This volume presents different views in a special section on the Informal Sector as we continue the "Current Debates" section, which was introduced in the last volume. **Lisa Bornstein**, in a separate introduction, outlines the debate on the informal sector by highlighting the arguments of the four authors who discuss different aspects of the informal sector: **Michael Leaf** reviews the literature on informal land markets; **Ayşe Pamuk** reviews the literature on informal housing markets; **Lisa Servon** discusses the informal job sector through the case study of the Women's Self-Employment Program; and **Roberto Laserna** describes production in the illegal sector with the example of coca production in Bolivia. In a separate article, **Lisa Bornstein** discusses the migration of Japanese-Brazilians back to Japan for the purposes of earning higher salaries than in Brazil. She presents results of interviews with guestworkers and recruiters and outlines the complexity of the economic and social relations that underlie this migration.

We hope you will enjoy the diversity of views of planning presented in this volume. They illustrate the broad and "wall-less" boundaries of the planning profession.

Finally, I would like to conclude this introduction by expressing my appreciation to all of those who at helped to make the production of this volume possible. The members of the Editorial Collective provided insightful guidance with their timely reviews of articles and ideas on the contents of this issue. The Institute of Urban and Regional Development (IURD) and the Department of City and Regional Planning (DCRP) provided financial support. I would especially like to thank IURD for their staff support throughout the production of this volume, David Van Amam for his skillful work in typing and formatting, and Dave Simpson, the assistant editor, for his support throughout the process of production. All of these individuals and organizations together have made it possible to continue publication of this journal in the tradition of scholarly debate that is the heart of academic writing and publishing.

Ruth Steiner, Editor

REFERENCES

- Blanco, Hilda. 1985. "Introduction." *Berkeley Planning Journal* 1(2), Winter: 2-4.
"Transcript of 3d TV Debate Between Bush, Clinton and Perot," *New York Times* (Tuesday, October 20, 1992): A12-A15.