Journal of Planning Education and Research
32(1) 107–114

DOI: 10.1177/0739456X11420441
http://jpe.sagepub.com
SAGE

Fifty Theses on Urban Planning and Urban Planners

Raphaël Fischler[1]

Abstract

The aim of this essay is to propose a common basis of definitions and principles for the field of urban planning. A general thesis places a number of dilemmas and paradoxes at the heart of planning; the next nine theses explain the meaning and origins of planning; another ten pertain to the substance and uses of professional planning; ten more suggest what makes for good planning and good plans; the following fifteen concern urban planners as individuals; the final five deal with planning education and research.

Keywords

definition of planning, norms of good planning

Urban planning as a field is ill defined in contents and in scope, and the public hardly knows what to expect of its practitioners.[1] This essay is a proposal for a common understanding of what urban planning is, of the dilemmas that planners face, and of the norms we can use to assess their practice. It does not do justice to the diversity of the field (for instance, in terms of geographic differences), but it does touch on the main issues that planners in practice and in academia must address to explain what they do and why they do it.

I argue that urban planning is both challenged and enriched by a number of contradictions and tensions at its heart. Some of these are specific to the field; others are not. Some can be resolved; others cannot. Whether or not they are particular to planning and whether or not they are amenable to resolution, these dualities are a given of urban planning. The positions one adopts in response to them significantly shape one's conception and practice of urban planning.

The forty-nine propositions that follow the opening argument represent my position on these critical issues. I call all fifty statements "theses": they express what I hold to be true but know to be open to refutation. I submit these theses as a contribution to debates in the field—as definitions of key concepts and as norms for professional and academic practice—in the hope that they will constitute a useful reference and will help others to enunciate their own definitions and norms.

I present the theses with few citations, referring to specific works (mentioned in endnotes) only where I use particular expressions borrowed from others. Where there are no references, informed readers will recognize the ideas of noted practitioners and scholars (e.g., Christopher Alexander, Alan Altshuler, Guy Benveniste, John Friedmann, Peter Hall, David Harvey, Patsy Healey, Alan Jacobs, Norman Krumholz, Kevin Lynch, Jane Jacobs, Shoukry Roweis, Leonie Sandercock, William Whyte, and Oren Yiftachel). My debts are especially large to my teachers at M.I.T. and Berkeley, especially Donald Schön, Judith Innes, Michael Teitz, and the late Melvin Webber, as well as to colleagues and friends such as Howell Baum, John Forester, Jonathan Levine, and the late Jeanne Wolfe.

A somewhat similar attempt at defining the field, the "Anchor Points for Planning's Identification" (published in these pages in 1997), was also useful in the preparation of this statement. I have not tried to position myself explicitly vis-à-vis the statement of Dowell Myers and coauthors, but I have incorporated elements from it as well as from some of the comments that accompanied the statement.

Another source of inspiration is my personal experience as a teacher of urban planning, as a researcher in the historical and contemporary practice of urban planning, as a participant in municipal decision making in a large metropolitan area, and as a consultant to various levels of government and to private and not-for-profit organizations.

The theses apply primarily to public-sector planning in Western countries, but I have written them in the most generic way possible, to make them as useful as possible to as many people as possible. I use the term "urban" as shorthand for a larger array of adjectives; thus "urban planning" stands for "city and regional planning," "town and country

Initial submission, September 2009; revised submissions, February and July 2011; final acceptance, July 2011

[1]McGill University, Montreal, Canada

Corresponding Author:
Raphaël Fischler, School of Urban Planning, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2K6
Email: raphael.fischler@mcgill.ca

planning," "community planning," "territorial planning," and "spatial planning," even though these terms do not mean exactly the same things. "Urban" also refers to human settlements at all scales, from small towns to whole regions.

General Thesis

1. Urban planning is hard to define and harder to practice because it is the unsteady, always renegotiated resolution of a number of contradictions, paradoxes, and tensions:
   - between urban planning as a transhistorical form of social action and urban planning as a modern profession born in the late-nineteenth century
   - between urban planning as a comprehensive attempt to improve urban life and urban planning as a specialized field of practice focused on the use of land
   - between urban planning as the attempt to bring us nearer to ideals and urban planning as a pragmatic response to specific problems
   - between urban planning as the design of spaces and places and urban planning as the design of institutions and processes
   - between urban planning as a political activity and urban planning as a technical activity
   - between urban planning as value-based advocacy and urban planning as unbiased advice
   - between urban planning as instrument of empowerment and of expansion of choice, and urban planning as means of domination and constraint
   - between urban planning as the expression of collective will and urban planning as the expression of individual creativity
   - between urban planning as practical achievement and urban planning as ideological claim
   - between urban planning as plan making for the community and urban planning as deliberation by the community
   - between urban planning as substantive resolution of problems and urban planning as facilitation of problem-framing
   - between urban planning as long-range plan making and urban planning as incremental adjustment
   - between urban planning as strategic agenda setting and discretionary decision making and urban planning as client- and standards-driven problem solving
   - between urban planning as the exercise of power and urban planning as service to the powerful
   - between urban planning as an intellectual exercise performed in isolation and urban planning as lived experience on the ground
   - between urban planning as a product of systematic research and urban planning as the outcome of ad hoc action
   - between urban planning as the outcome of university training and urban planning as the product of learning by doing
   - between urban planning as it can be at its best and urban planning as it generally is

The existence of these dualities goes a long way to explain the difficulties that planners face in defining their mandate and methodology as practitioners and as educators.

Theses on the Meaning and Origins of Urban Planning

2. Planning is the mobilization of will in order to reach certain objectives, the design of a course of future action to reach these ends, and the adoption of guidelines for the allocation of resources (time, money, effort, etc.) to that effect. The will, the course of action, and the guidelines are stated in plans. Plans vary in kind from rigid specifications of future action to flexible principles for decision making.
3. Urban planning is the collective management of urban development, the use of purposeful deliberation to give shape to human settlements. It is the mobilization of community will and the design of strategies to create, improve, or preserve the environment in which we live. This environment is at once physical (natural and built) and cultural (social, economic, and political).
4. Urban planning is also a profession whose mandate is to give expert advice on how to organize place-based communities and on how to make decisions on their organization. Professional urban planners are not the only ones who "do" urban planning; they "do" urban planning on a professional basis but work alongside many other actors.
5. Urban planning as a social activity (the collective management of urban development) has existed ever since cities appeared on the surface of the earth, several thousands of years ago. Urban planning as a professional activity (the supply of expert advice on the management of urban development) originated in the industrial era. It was in gestation during the nineteenth century, was born toward the end of that century in Europe and in the beginning of the twentieth century in North America, and grew to maturity over the following decades.
6. Modern urban planning is the progeny of a marriage between science and utopia, between empiricism and idealism. At its inception, it expressed both the ambition to understand the laws of nature and of society and the desire to create a better commonwealth and better living conditions. Social reform and environmental improvement were seen as necessary to each other: one could not occur or be successful without the other.

7. Modern urban planning found its raison d'être and its modes of action in local attempts to solve the social, functional, and aesthetic problems of the industrial city. It spread as officials and professionals diffused innovative ideas globally by means of voluntary emulation and political imposition. It was built and continues to be built through a slow process of incremental change in which a multitude of actors in multiple fields think of ways to meet new challenges and exploit new opportunities, find new methods to deal better with ongoing problems, devise new technologies to perform tasks more efficiently or effectively, and help to put new objectives on the public agenda. Although the diffusion and importation of ideas play an important role in this process, all planning ultimately is local, in the sense that it is tailored to a particular territory and society. Ideas imported from elsewhere must be adapted to suit local interests and conditions. This process of incremental invention or tinkering follows no master plan. It yields unexpected consequences that become issues for a next generation of planners to address.
8. Urban planning in the industrial era was characterized by a concern with good government in matters of urban development, the need to manage rapid urban growth and to limit the negative social and spatial externalities of industrial development, the search for common standards of good development, and a high level of trust in expertise. Its dominant goals were economic growth, social harmony, and physical beauty. Like much social reform and public policy, it was predicated on the belief that complex systems such as a city or a region can be understood and perfected and that the public interest can be defined as a synthesis of particular interests. The dominant norms of urban planning were those of the growing middle class; many plans contributed to the definition and diffusion of a middle-class standard of living.
9. Although some ideas and techniques of industrial-era planning continue to hold currency today, postindustrial urban planning is characterized by the need to manage decline as well as growth, a stronger desire to protect existing natural and urban environments, deeper respect for differences among people and places, and greater acceptance of input from people other than experts. Urban planners can no longer claim that one can really understand—let alone control—a complex system such as a city; they must therefore draft abstract rules of behavior that ensure order in the long term and design strategic projects that make a positive difference in the short to medium term. They also are expected to recognize the fundamental diversity of values, interests, and preferences in society.
10. Change in urban planning in the late twentieth century has come not only from the transition to a postindustrial economy but also from the emergence of social movements such as feminism and environmentalism. These movements aim to replace millennia-old doctrines and practices predicated on domination and exploitation (of women by men and of nature by humans) by institutions and behaviors based on collaboration and interdependence. "Sustainable development" represents the new ideal of economic growth that meets human needs, of social institutions that foster equity and of human activities that are respectful of the natural world. In its most pragmatic forms, sustainable development simply means more economical, more just, and more environmentally friendly development. In its more utopian guise, it means progress toward a society in which human potential is maximized, conflicts are resolved peacefully, and humans live in harmony with nature.

Theses on the Substance and Uses of Urban Planning

11. Urban planning is a design activity: it is the design of places of human habitation (from a residential subdivision to a metropolitan region) and the design of institutions and rules for managing their future development.
12. Urban planning is a political activity: it is public decision making on the future of communities. It is driven by values, that is, by conceptions of how one should lead one's life, how society ought to be organized, and what environment is conducive to living well in a good society.
13. Although the notion of the public interest has been discredited, urban planners still find legitimacy in the service of a collective will. In effect, they try to influence individual and institutional behaviors in order to achieve collective aims. Despite the difficulty of defining a public interest in a heterogeneous society, they must make recommendations that serve a greater good than the interest of one or another stakeholder and that uphold the rights of minorities as well as of majorities.
14. Even when it aims to increase freedom, urban planning interferes with individual liberties. It must therefore be practiced with caution.
15. Urban planning can be a force for good but also a force for evil. It has been used in both ways, to free people from hardship and enable them to reach their full potential but also to marginalize and repress them. It has been instrumental in improving the lives of many but has been used to keep many others in poverty, within confined "reservations" or neighborhoods. Land-use

regulation, especially in its North American form (i.e., with its hierarchy of housing types and housing densities), has served to a large extent to segregate different populations on the basis of income and, therefore, on the basis of social status, ethnicity, and race.

16. Urban planning is a focused multidisciplinary field. Historically, it brought together architects, engineers, geographers, sociologists, economists, social workers, landscape architects, real-estate developers, and others to attack urban problems in a comprehensive manner. It still draws on people with such varied educational backgrounds today. In theory, urban planners are generalists of urban development: they know some of what the architect, the engineer, the geographer, the sociologist, the economist, the social worker, the landscape architect, the real-estate developer, etc. know about the ways in which cities and regions function, change, and are shaped. In practice, most planners work in one of several specializations that overlap with other professional fields: they work with engineers in transportation planning, with lawyers in land-use regulation, with architects in urban design, with social workers in community development, with economists in economic development, etc. The activity that is more or less exclusive to their profession is the preparation of long-range plans for the physical development of cities and regions. The ambition that they generally share across specializations is to improve the quality of human settlements.
17. Urban planning deals primarily with the spatial organization of society, the relationship of people to their environment, the allocation of land to human purposes, and the design of the built environment and its infrastructure. Therefore, even if they are generalists of urban development, urban planners are specialists of land use: through research, advice, education, facilitation, and other means, they help social actors define how land is to be used in a given territory, how human activities are to be distributed spatially, how artificial and natural features of the environment are to be designed or preserved, and how decisions about these issues are to be made and implemented.
18. Urban planning is a means to rationalize (i.e., make more efficient and more legitimate) the processes whereby individuals, households, companies, communities, etc. use land and other resources to sustain themselves in cities and regions. It helps to make land usable, to influence its use, to make its allocation among users orderly and to make the resulting spatial order socially acceptable. The societal function of urban planning, therefore, is both instrumental and ideological.
19. Urban planning can help to prevent, lessen, and mediate territorial conflicts among players who vie for the same place, and it can help to diminish or compensate for inequalities in quality of life that result from this (highly uneven) competition. Alternatively, it can help to reinforce and institutionalize these inequalities.
20. Urban planning is a means to create or attract development that is seen as beneficial and to keep out development that is seen as detrimental. It serves to foster economic growth and manage its environmental impacts and also to handle the consequences of economic decline. In other words, it is used to maximize the benefits and minimize the harm generated by the locational choices of economic actors.

Theses on Good Planning and Good Plans

21. The quality of urban planning can be assessed in terms of outcomes and in terms of process. Good urban planning helps to improve human settlements as physical environments and as political communities. More specific definitions of good urban planning are based on norms of good urban form and of good governance.
22. Planners who do good urban planning in terms of outcomes help to shape human settlements in such a way as to make individuals better able to act on their capabilities and to develop them. They work to ensure health, to give meaning to the environment, to support human activities, to provide access to needed resources, to give people control over their environment, to limit the expenditure of resources, and to distribute them equitably.
23. Planners who do good urban planning in terms of process help to make planning an opportunity for public learning and public deliberation. They compensate for imbalances of power in society in terms of access to information, to forums of decision making, and to decision makers. They work to make public discussions on urban development issues transparent, constructive, and respectful of differences.
24. Urban planning is carried out through plans that are made up of policies, programs of action, and physical designs (in a variable mix). These policies, programs, and designs can be more or less implicit, that is, accepted as parts of a tacit understanding of what the community should be, or more or less explicit, that is, presented in detail in formal documents. Urban plans are implemented by means of building projects (infrastructure, spaces, and buildings), regulations (guidelines and requirements), incentives and disincentives (monetary and nonmonetary), and advice (models, recommendations, and technical information).

25. The impact of a plan may be tangible (e.g., a greater supply of affordable housing units, a more attractive civic realm) or it may be intangible (e.g., a greater concern with the environment, a more equitable process of project evaluation), or both. What constitutes a positive impact can be assessed according to local community values, higher-order ideals, or other norms. In general, good urban plans work to widen the range of options available to people as users of land and as members of the community.
26. Good urban plans have the following characteristics: they convey a clear sense of purpose (a vision, a set of values) and a clear definition of the issue(s) at hand, express regard for diverse community needs, present a realistic action plan focused on a limited number of projects or actions, and contain provisions for monitoring. Good plans marry idealism and realism: they help shape the collective environment according to certain goals for tomorrow and in accordance to the means available today. Good plans also combine sound analysis of problems and artful design of solutions. Without a clear definition of issues and goals, without political support from the powers that be (which, in a democracy, includes the voters and their interest groups), and without a sensible implementation strategy, a plan is not likely to have much impact.
27. Good plans benefit from the input of all people and institutions on whose collaboration successful implementation will depend. Stakeholder participation is all the more useful if it occurs at an early stage in the planning process, when issues and goals are being defined and the relevance of various factors and facts is being ascertained. Early participation increases the likelihood that participants will see the plan as their own blueprint for action. Paradoxically, public input is less easily obtained early on in the process and is more likely to gain in intensity later on, when details become the focus of attention. Most people tend to get involved in public decision making when they perceive direct threats or opportunities to their own environment and quality of life or when they can respond to a specific proposal. Beyond certain basic requirements, the extent and method of public participation are rarely specified by laws or official mandates, and planners often have much discretion on these matters.
28. Good plans may take a long time to be made and adopted, and they may take an even longer time to be implemented. Speed may be required under specific circumstances (for instance to rebuild cities after a natural disaster or to accommodate a large number of immigrants), but haste is generally the enemy of good planning. Planners must be able to adopt a long-term, historical perspective and to rely on thorough analysis and consultation, even as they must respond quickly to the public's expectation for action and to the demands of masters who think in terms of immediate financial or political returns.
29. Especially in already urbanized areas, incremental change by means of a large number of small projects pursued by different actors is preferable, all else being equal, to fast change brought about by one or a few large projects. Where large-scale planning is required for major urban transformations, plans must be clear in their basic principles but flexible in their details; they must be implemented gradually, with due regard for lessons learned from each phase.
30. For the majority of planners who work in physical or land-use planning, the most important activity in terms of professional status is the preparation of comprehensive plans and the design of implementation mechanisms. The most important activity in terms of human resources and time, however, is the evaluation of individual development projects against plans and regulations. Urban planners rely on quantitative standards and qualitative criteria to assess the merits of proposals and their conformity with official policies. Political and methodological variations in such evaluation systems translate into vast differences in the level of discretion afforded to planners. Nondiscretionary controls are useful to simplify and speed up the review process and to guard against the granting of favors. Discretionary controls are necessary to regulate aspects of the project that do not lend themselves to quantification; they offer more flexibility in the design of the project and enable the planner to participate in that design. Planners who use discretionary controls must have professional skills similar to those of developers and their consultants; they must also enjoy a certain level of trust on the part of their superiors and clients. Where planners are not trusted as professionals or where officials do not want to be bound by their judgment, discretionary controls are likely to offer opportunities to strike political deals rather than to improve projects. For regulatory systems, a good rule of thumb is, What is important must be required, and what is required must be spelled out clearly.

Theses on Urban Planners

31. Urban planners play many roles: they are analysts, advisors, designers, advocates, managers, mediators, educators, facilitators. They must sometimes play several roles at the same time. When they play these

roles well, they are community builders: they help to give shape and meaning to social life in a given place.

32. Urban planners try to influence people's perceptions, aspirations, and decisions so that their actions will contribute to the public interest. When they work in the private sector, this mission is theirs by virtue of their membership in a profession; when they work in the public sector, it is also theirs by virtue of their position in government. Urban planners also try to affect how the public interest is defined.
33. Urban planners are expected to be objective in the analysis of facts, patterns, trends, and possible solutions and to be rational in the design of recommendations. Like all professionals, their legitimacy and effectiveness rests in part on the reliability of their analyses and on the soundness of their proposals. But they must be willing to take a stand on goals and means once they are convinced that these represent the public interest or the interest of underrepresented or underprivileged groups. In other words, their professional credibility and efficacy also rests on their ability and willingness to express an informed opinion and to argue for it.
34. Urban planners as a group are appreciated by few, tolerated by some, and blamed by many. They will more likely be criticized for constraining action than be praised for enabling it.
35. Urban planners must love the city in order to improve it. Good planners care about the people whose well-being they are helping to enhance and about the places whose quality they are working to improve.
36. Urban planners must know the city in order to improve it. Good urban planners know intimately the community for which they work and the territory (neighborhood, city, or region) in which they work. They spend time to get to know the people and the place directly, by interacting with them in person and over a certain length of time. No planner can claim to know a community or a place by studying it on paper or on the screen.
37. Like most people who participate in urban planning, urban planners too often disregard the fact that cities are complex systems of human action, largely self-regulating and subject to various forces that we control only minimally. They also forget too frequently that an urban settlement is first a spatial arrangement of people and activities and then only a composition of physical structures that shelter people and support their activities. In physical planning, these intellectual flaws translate in (and are reinforced by) planners' strong reliance on two-dimensional plans and their relatively limited ability to bridge the gap between abstract notions of land use and density, on one hand, and the real unfolding of daily urban life, on the other.
38. The main strength and the main weakness of urban planners are one and the same: their comprehensive approach to urban development. Informed by intellectual curiosity, methodological rigor, and good judgment, this attitude enables them to attend to a wide array of factors and to synthesize a large number of elements into meaningful, creative schemes. Without the benefit of these qualities, comprehensiveness leads planners to propose general statements and produce superficial plans.
39. Urban planners are not powerful actors in the planning process. Very rarely do they have any decision-making authority. They are advisors who make recommendations to elected officials, business people, and other parties. Politicians and investors are the most powerful players in the urban planning game, but well-organized community groups and civil-society organizations can acquire great clout as well. Planners can help them by including them in deliberations on ends and means and by giving them information and expertise.
40. Urban planners acquire political power thanks to the reliability of the information they provide, the credibility of the analyses they supply, the validity of the recommendations they make, and the political usefulness of the advice they give. How well planners communicate their ideas is therefore crucial. The ability to make clear, succinct, and convincing oral and written presentations is critical to their influence.
41. Planners also draw power from the alliances that they build, formally and informally, with other professionals, with officials and with members of civil society. They must build networks or coalitions in order to have access to information, expertise, and political influence.
42. Urban planners work in politically charged arenas that call for strategic thinking and acting. At the same time, they must build relations of trust between themselves and the public, their clients, superiors, and colleagues. To this end, they must treat people with respect, listen actively, welcome criticism, and maintain a professional demeanor.
43. Urban planners always have some room for discretion in their work. Using this discretion wisely, they can exercise leadership in the stewardship of the public good and in the definition of their career, mandate, and practice.
44. Urban planners must cultivate many virtues, above all passion, honesty, patience, and courage.
45. Good planners are motivated individuals who want to help improve people's living conditions and expand the range of options available to them in that respect. They are open minded and learn from experience. They work to effect change in the short term but also understand that real change in a city or region must

be assessed over decades, if not centuries. They are brave enough to acknowledge their mistakes and to stand up for their beliefs. They possess a thorough knowledge of the city and its development and have the skills needed to analyze problems, design solutions, and communicate their advice effectively. They can handle themselves well in situations characterized by complexity, uncertainty, instability, and conflict. They know that each situation is unique, that problems do not come fully defined, and that wise judgment matters at least as much as adherence to established rules. They see themselves as members of institutions and networks, and they work actively to build coalitions. They listen well to others and speak to them with respect. They do not place their ego at the center of their individual action but put their ego at the service of collective action. They wield power by shaping the perceptions of problems and of possible solutions and by managing processes of deliberation and decision making.

Theses on Planning Education and Research

46. Planning schools perform several functions. The most important of these is attracting bright, motivated, courageous, reflective people to the profession. A second is enabling these young men and women to develop the skills and knowledge they will need to work as planners. A third is contributing to good planning in the community, through projects and contracts. A fourth is doing research and diffusing its findings.
47. Planning education is at its best when it enables students to acquire a good understanding of the process of urban change (and of all actors and factors involved), to develop the ability to frame urban problems comprehensively and critically, to learn to design places and processes, to become good team players and communicators, and to understand their own learning process. Ideally, planners should benefit from four years of schooling in urban, social, or environmental studies or in a design field, followed by at least two years of professional training in urban planning. Their master's curriculum should include practical projects, internships, and/or other requirements through which they can learn to anticipate the difficulties of planning practice and in which they can learn to learn from practice.
48. Planning curricula should include at least one course in planning history and theory, in order to introduce students to the field and profession they are about to enter, its origins and its evolution over time, its normative theories and descriptive theories. Such a course gives students models with which to frame their thinking and their actions (from theoretical concepts with which to put a name on their ideals to design precedents for use in actual plans), puts their individual work in historical perspective, and can, in so doing, instill in them both pride and humility.
49. Most progress in planning comes from innovations on the part of creative people in the field. The task of researchers is to help assess these innovations and diffuse the most promising ones. Planning academics, like researchers in other fields, can push practice forward by developing new technical instruments or by participating in planning processes. As researchers in a policy field, they contribute to practice mostly by teaching to many what some (including they) have learned from experience, by analyzing particular cases or by generalizing across cases. Practitioners cannot know from research what they ought to do in specific cases. They can learn from it what seems to work in general and under what circumstances, what factors seem to be critical to success and what problems may be anticipated. This knowledge can help them frame problems in productive ways and identify the potential advantages and disadvantages of various solutions. But because each situation is unique, every plan or policy must be crafted to suit local conditions at a given time and must benefit from lessons learned by trial and error.
50. Schools of urban planning are under increasing pressure to model themselves after science and engineering departments and, hence, to emphasize subsidized research and peer-reviewed publication. But they must remain centers of professional education, whose professors are active in the field. To a certain extent, the demands of academic research are contrary to the needs of practice, and greater methodological rigor often comes at the expense of practical relevance. Although planning is the application of knowledge to action, lack of improvement in urban planning and in actual urban conditions is due much less to poverty of knowledge than to failure of will.

Much more can be said about urban planning in all its guises. Additional theses on various specializations (e.g., community building, economic development, housing, transportation and urban design) and on diverse locales (e.g., in developing countries, socialist economies and post-conflict societies) deserve to be added. Alternative definitions, descriptions, and norms could also be put forward. It is hoped that the fifty theses above will be seen as groundwork for a more complete list and as a basis for debate.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks the editors of the journal and the reviewers of the manuscript for their help in improving this article.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References for Specific Expressions and Arguments

Thesis 2. John Forester and Howell Baum both recall Stephen Blum, a classmate in the doctoral program at Berkeley, speaking of planning as the "organization of hope" (Forester 1989, 20; Baum 1998, xii). Martin Meyerson and Edward Banfield provided a good generic definition of planning in terms of means and ends (1955, 312).

Thesis 19. On the idea of planning as the mediation of territorial conflicts, see Roweis (1983).

Thesis 22. The definition of human well-being as the realization of capabilities is Sen's (1999). The criteria of good urban form are Lynch's (1984).

Thesis 24. Reps (1964) categorized the means of plan implementation by means of the acronym ACID: advice, control, incentive, development.

Thesis 30. The need for clear demands in land-use regulation is the conclusion of William Whyte's analysis of incentive zoning in New York City (1988, chapter 6).

Thesis 31. Marc Weiss (1987) used the expression "community builders" to designate the developers of large-scale residential developments in the first decades of the twentieth century. John Forester, Raphaël Fischler, and Deborah Shmueli (2001) used the expression to designate planners and designers who work to improve living conditions at the local, regional, and national levels.

Thesis 45. Donald Schön's book on reflective practice (1983) is behind much of this thesis.

Thesis 50. Jonathan Levine discusses the dilemma of rigor and relevance in his book on land-use and transportation planning (2006, chapter 9). John Friedmann (1987) defined planning as the application of knowledge to action.

References

Baum, H. 1998. *The organization of hope: Communities planning themselves*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Forester, J. 1989. *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Forester, J., R. Fischler, and D. Shmueli, eds. 2001. *Profiles of community builders: Israeli planners and designers*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Friedmann, J. 1987. *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Levine, J. 2006. *Zoned out: Regulation, markets, and choices in transportation and metropolitan land-use.* Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Lynch, K. 1984. *Good city form*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Meyerson, M., and E. C. Banfield. 1955. *Politics, planning, and the public interest: The case of public housing in Chicago*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Reps, J. W. 1964. *Requiem for zoning. Planning 1964 (56-67)*. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials.

Roweis, S. T. 1983. Urban planning as professional mediation of territorial politics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1(2): 139-62.

Schön, D. A. 1983. *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Sen, Amartya K. 1999. *Development as freedom*. New York: Knopf.

Weiss, M. A. 1987. *The rise of the community builders: The American real estate industry and urban land planning*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Whyte, W. H. 1988. *City: Rediscovering the center*. New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books.

Bio

Raphaël Fischler is Director of the School of Urban Planning at McGill University, a member of public advisory committees and a consultant in Montreal, Canada.