

Chapter 2

The Origins of Planning Education: Overview

Christopher Silver

Abstract Planning education in the early twentieth century developed in response to the need for professionals in architecture, landscape architecture, engineering, public health, and law to understand and address the unique challenges of rapidly growing cities and regions. It was in the United States and the United Kingdom that the first standalone planning education programs flourished prior to World War II. Former colonial nations expanded planning education initially on the model provided by the West, often because their leading educators were products of the Anglo-American system. The proliferation of planning education programs in Eastern Europe, sections of Asia and Africa and especially in China since the end of 1980s owes to increased global engagements coupled with continuing challenges of urbanization. Throughout the twentieth century, transnational exchanges of ideas and strategies have helped to shape the global planning education movement.

Keywords Anglo-American origins • Transnational exchanges • University of Liverpool • Colonialism • GPEAN

Introduction

In most societies, identifying the origins of city planning requires examining its earliest human settlements. Planmaking was an established art long before even a modest portion of human settlements could be regarded as urban. The formal processes of training to create a body of professionals engaged in the physical, social, and economic transformation of these urban places according to preconceived strategies (that is, planning education) are of much more recent origins, however. In the United States and Europe, the origins of planning education coincided with the flourishing of the modern city planning movement in the early

C. Silver (✉)
College of Design, Construction and Planning, University of Florida,
Gainesville, FL, USA
e-mail: silver2@ufl.edu

twentieth century, a movement prompted by concerns over congested and unhealthy conditions in growing industrial cities. In other world regions, including South America, Africa, and Asia, urban development took off later, as did planning education, initially as a colonial import but eventually through the intervention of external agencies or indigenous efforts to better control emerging urban challenges. Often individuals trained in the West introduced the developed world models but also helped to shape new indigenous planning education programs.

As this overview of the origins of planning education will show, it is possible to identify three rather distinct phases in the development of planning education from a global vantage point. The first phase, running from the early 1900s through the 1940s, saw the emergence of what is best termed the Anglo-American epoch, whereby the pioneering education programs geared to training planners were largely confined to North America and the British Isles, and diffused through their colonial connections to selected places in the developing world. The demise of the colonial empires following World War II triggered a second phase characterized by the emergence of indigenous planning education initiatives outside the West and proliferation of Anglo-American planning education to address postwar reconstruction. In the US, long festering problems of poverty, inner city decay and stifled urban development owing to nearly two decades of economic depression and wartime conditions, led to a growing demand for professional planners—especially at the local and state levels—from the 1950s through the 1970s. In the post-Soviet era beginning in the 1990s, in what represents the third phase, there was a new impetus in planning education to enable Eastern European nations to more fully integrate into the global economy. The same can be said about China in the post-Mao regimes, which advanced planning education in line with its greater engagement within the global marketplace, and as urbanization processes advanced so dramatically.

Pioneer planners in all world regions were drawn from various disciplines, including civil engineering, architecture, landscape architecture, surveying, public health, and the law. They drew upon their disciplinary training and experiences to devise interventions. Select educational institutions offering professional programs in these fields, initiated the first courses to offer a “planning” component to their graduates. From these humble origins a distinct discipline of planning emerged early in the twentieth century. Quickly, however, the demand for trained urban professionals grew beyond the capacity of these related disciplines to respond effectively. The result was the creation of standalone city planning programs in many Western countries in addition to programs offering planning specializations as part of other degree programs.

The historical origins and early evolution of planning education exerted a profound and global impact on planning because these early initiatives were not done in isolation. It is important to acknowledge that throughout the twentieth century global exchanges and international professional linkages were important factors in advancing planning education. As the cases highlighted in this section demonstrate, there was a significant and continuous degree of sharing of planning expertise across national and cultural borders. The remarkable continuities of proposed

planning interventions in the diverse circumstances of urban development in various global regions were advanced through these interchanges. There were at once both strengths and inherent dangers in this transnational planning dialogue. On one hand, the transnational dialogue facilitated sharing of best practices. Yet, some of these imported practices could also be a source of perpetuating problem conditions when they did not account for varying local circumstances. This was especially the case when practices that seemed sound for developed urban societies were applied uncritically in resource-deficient and rapidly growing cities and regions in the developing world. Under these circumstances, the powerful force of established and formal planning practices often displaced local traditions that might have engendered more effective interventions.

Overall, however, the planning education movement that blossomed globally in the post-World War II era advanced the practice of planning by producing a vast army of urban professionals who worked directly with citizens and government leaders to advance the justification for, and acceptance of, planning. This postwar global boom in planning education was built upon the foundation of planning education programs already well-established in the United States and in the United Kingdom. As will be discussed below, the planning education movement has become truly global in scope.

Anglo-American Origins

The first national conference on city planning in the United States was held in Washington, DC in the Spring 1909 (Meck and Retzlaff 2009). It brought together leading planning practitioners, and some well-placed politicians to explore the challenges presented by the problems associated with unregulated urban development, with particular attention to congestion. Although aspects of planning had been practiced in US cities for at least one half century, the 1909 DC gathering was the first time that the professionals from many associated disciplines collectively engaged in a critical discussion of the current state of practice, the challenges planning confronted, and how the emerging profession might chart its future. The organizer of the 1909 national conference, Benjamin C. Marsh, was motivated by the problem conditions evident in congested US cities but also inspired by the promise offered through planning practices he had witnessed firsthand in Europe. In 1907 and 1908, Marsh toured European cities and cataloged his findings in *An Introduction to City Planning* (1909 (reprinted 1974)), a book released in concert with the national conference. Concurrent with the Washington DC conference, 1909 also saw the introduction, in England, of the first national legislation with the term “planning” in its title. That same year the architecture program at the University of Liverpool established a Town Planning and Civic Design degree program. At Harvard University (USA), James Sturgis Pray, a landscape architect by training, premiered a course entitled “Landscape Architecture 10—Principles of City Planning” (Alofsin 2002, p. 41-46). Within the Horticulture Department at the

University of Illinois, a leading planning practitioner was hired as the first Professor of Civic Design in the US in 1912. University College London followed in 1914 with an initial offering in planning instruction (Collins 2016), and on the continent, the University of Karlsruhe began to teach planning in 1915 (cited in Frank et al. 2014, p. 37).

The pioneer planning educators connected to all of these initiatives were in regular communication with each other about their work. Given the transatlantic dialogue underway at this time regarding urban reform approaches such as the garden city scheme, housing regulations, zoning, and open space planning for cities, it is not surprising that these initial forays into planning education occurred simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic. Yet, there were fundamental differences between planning practices in the United States, with its tradition of relative weak state intervention into urban processes compared to Europe with its legacy of centralized control. Marsh's catalog of cases from Europe in *An Introduction to City Planning* (1909 reprinted 1974) underscored the differences. What they shared in common was that these early efforts in planning education developed from similar disciplinary perspectives. New planning courses in architecture and landscape architecture programs were not intended initially as a new discipline but rather to broaden the scope of design education to better prepare graduates to practice in an urbanizing society. With few exceptions, this process of incremental development of curricula within these disciplines characterized the bulk of planning education advances through the 1930s. Only later did US planning education programs emerge separately from the design (or engineering) disciplines as self-sustaining units. After World War II, in both the US and the United Kingdom, planning education stepped out from the shadow of the design disciplines to fashion distinctly different training programs. It is useful first to examine several examples of the pioneering planning education, in the US and England, that supported the transatlantic planning dialogue as a prelude to the global dispersion of planning education in the post-World War II era.

When in 1909 Harvard's landscape architecture department chair, James Sturgis Pray, offered the first course completely devoted to city planning—Landscape Architecture 10—Principles of City Planning, this served as the foundational component of what became the first formal planning program in the United States in 1923. Pray had graduated from Harvard in 1898 and joined the nation's top landscape firm, the Olmsted Brothers, a firm that also functioned as a planning consultancy. He stayed with them until 1904 when he formed his own firm, which expanded in 1906 to a three-person partnership, Pray, Hubbard, and White. Pray began as an assistant in Harvard's landscape architecture program in 1902, moved to the rank of instructor in 1903, and then became assistant professor and chair in 1905, replacing Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. as the Charles Eliot Professor of Landscape Architecture chair in 1915, a position he later passed on to his practice partner, Henry Vincent Hubbard. It is Hubbard who is credited with separating the city planning program from landscape architecture in 1923, making it the first freestanding master-level planning program in the US (Alofsin 2002, p. 65).

Pray's passion for planning to treat the wide ranging problems of the modern city obviously had been nurtured through his long association with Olmsted Brothers. Pray not only taught the new city planning course, and simultaneously carried on a landscape practice, but he also wrote extensively on the subject of city planning. In a 1914 speech to the Annual Conference of Mayors held in Aurora, New York, Pray conceptualized the planning function and how he intended to train the planners at Harvard in this new field. He emphasized the critical role of collecting data through various surveys in order to effectively plan for cities. He stressed that while the survey techniques might be standardized, the results were likely to be unique for each city. He called for topographical surveys incorporating both the natural features of the land as well as the built environment. Sociological data would be secured through surveys of population, housing, school, sanitary, recreation, and traffic conditions and even what he referred to as delinquency and vice (namely crime data). There was a need to gather data on local economic and financial conditions, and to understand how local regulations addressed the problems revealed through the surveys. Although a practicing landscape architect sensitive to the aesthetic component, Pray stressed the need for efficiency as the primary goal of planning, not in lieu of beautification, but as a necessary antecedent. As he observed, "...a city planned perfectly for its practical purposes, like a sailing vessel, will of necessity possess the highest type of organic beauty, without which all other beauty in the city plan is of little value" (Pray 1914).

In collaboration with Harvard librarian and future wife of Hubbard, Theodora Kimball, Pray published in 1913 a reference source for planners entitled *City Planning: A Comprehensive Analysis of the Subject*. Later Pray served as President of the American Society of Landscape Architects (1915–1920) but also was a founding member of the American City Planning Institute, and held memberships in the American Civic Association, the British Town Planning Institute, and the International Garden Cities and Town Planning Association. These affiliations linked Pray directly to the transatlantic planning dialogue which decidedly influenced how planning was taught at Harvard.

The Harvard experiment in city planning was launched in full knowledge that the University of Liverpool (England) also had established a city planning program within its architecture faculty. As Alofsin (2002) pointed out in his history of the design fields at Harvard, "Pray and Pond both had copies of the original prospectus from the Department of Civic Design for 1909–1910" and continued to study this new academic initiative (Alofsin 2002, p.44). Later in 1911 and 1912, Pray conducted an extensive city tour of Europe to collect teaching materials, including stops in thirteen countries. Materials collected on the European tour became the core of the landscape architecture and city planning collections in Harvard's School of Architecture library. It also ensured that future planning students would be well versed in the European models that shaped the formative years of planning education in the US as well as England.

There were several other pioneering efforts in planning education in the US in this era. In 1913 the University of Illinois hired the prominent city planner,

consultant, and author, Charles Mulford Robinson as Professor of Civic Design. He produced some of the most widely read treatises on planning and city beautification, initially intended for civic organizations but readily available for use in the classroom (Robinson 1916). As with Harvard, the Illinois planning education initiative centered in the landscape architecture program, a program housed within its Horticulture department rather than its longstanding architecture program. Robinson's untimely death in 1917 cut short his influence on the academic program at Illinois. But in 1918 Illinois secured a worthy replacement. Harland Bartholomew, a rising star among planning consultants based in nearby St. Louis, would become one of the nation's most prolific planning practitioners. Bartholomew, the trained civil engineer, broadened the scope of planning education at Illinois to match the breadth of his planning practice during his four decades of teaching there. Credit must be given also for sustaining the planning education components of the landscape architecture program to its director, Karl Lohmann, who practiced planning in Illinois and who published one of the first planning texts intended to be used in the classroom (Lohmann 1931).

Architecture programs also nurtured planning curricular developments. At the University of Florida, the impetus to offer planning education came when Rudolph Weaver was hired as director of the newly created School of Architecture in 1925. The university hired Weaver in two capacities, one being the school's director and the other as the architect for Florida's Board of Control, the organization that managed construction on all of the Florida public universities. He came to academia after a 20-year professional career that included designing buildings on several university campuses. Weaver wanted architecture students to gain knowledge in planning. Within the first year of his directorship, new courses on planning and physical design were taught by his faculty, along with two courses in the Landscape Architecture program, one entitled "City and Town Planning" and the other "Suburban and Rural Planning." The College of Business Administration and the College of Engineering also offered courses related to planning. Weaver served on the American Institute of Architects' Committee on City, Community and Regional Planning and was chair of the local planning board in the late 1930s. He spoke publically and enthusiastically about the necessity for cities to develop master plans, to embrace planning as a dynamic process of regulating development to realize the goals of the city beautiful.

Three new planning programs launched in the 1930s, the first at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1933, and then at Columbia University and Cornell University, quickly became leading centers of planning education in the US. Lawrence Vale's case study of MIT's program (see Chap. 4) shows how its curriculum provision became more specialized and sophisticated as the demands for planning expertise burgeoned during the Great Depression and how the program served as the training ground for future planning educators and administrators. Like elsewhere, programs at these universities derived from the suite of courses covering planning issues established in related disciplines earlier. For example, Cornell's first course on the history of planning was offered by Everett V. Meeks in 1918. An urban planning seminar course was added in 1928, and in 1935 a grant from the

Carnegie Corporation supported instruction in regional planning, an emerging field in the 1930s, under a joint architecture and engineering program.

At Columbia University, the development of the planning program followed the trajectory of the Harvard and Illinois models, beginning with two required courses for its majors in town planning (or civic design as it was referred to then) in 1912 initiated by the Director of the School of Architecture, Austin William Lord. Joseph Hudnut, Dean of the School of Architecture, began recruiting full-time planning faculty in 1934 and by 1950 Columbia had in place “a full-fledged, degree-granting program—the Master of Science in Planning and Housing,” as reported by Goldberg and Beauregard in an unpublished text from 2008 (pp. 1–7).

Despite their academic orientation in architecture, Columbia’s faculty believed that planners needed more than design training. The town planning courses embedded into their architecture curriculum were intended to “provide instruction in defining the economic necessities of the community; the safety, health, and rights of the individual; and the devising of plans to satisfy these demands” (Reidenburg 1954, p. 28, cited in an unpublished draft by Goldberg and Beauregard). The broadened planning education topics reflected in Columbia’s curriculum adhered closely to recommendations that came out of a historic gathering of practitioners and academics it hosted in 1928, with support from the Russell Sage Foundation. The purpose of the 1928 Columbia conference was to examine the state of planning education in the US. The Russell Sage Foundation was a logical supporter of the conference since it had deep interest in advancing the state of planning education as the sponsor of a path breaking regional plan for New York City in the 1920s. The plan had been prepared with input from leading US planners such as Thomas Adams, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and John Nolen, all of whom attended the 1928 conference. These planners acknowledged the valuable contributions derived from working in an interdisciplinary manner on the plan, bringing together “experts in social welfare and economics, transit and transportation, political science and public administration, industrial management, and public health” (Scott 1971, p. 265). Having themselves been largely “self-taught” in city planning, the regional plan consultants recognized the need not only to expand opportunities for formal city planning education but also to broaden its scope, and to more precisely articulate what separated planning from the related professions that had nurtured it in the US.

One outcome of this gathering was a redefinition of the scope of planning instruction and research that moved beyond its longstanding grounding in landscape architecture, engineering, and architecture. As the report from the conference suggested, “the time had come when more ample provision should be made for fundamental research, for the development of the profession and for the training of younger men entering it” (Scott 1971, pp. 265–267). The implication of emphasizing research and professionalization was to move planning education beyond its purely design-based roots. The conferees posited that “city planning was not merely a special field for the application of the skills of any single profession, . . . but must draw upon the several arts and sciences, including architecture, political economy, the science of government, sociology, sanitary science, physical geography, and

publicity, public movements and organizations. Even though it might be impractical...to be a master of all aspects of city planning,...a master of one, at least, which provides training in design and, in addition, should possess a sufficient understanding of the manner in which others impinge upon [the] total problem to be able to coordinate the efforts of other specialists in any project of research, teaching, or practice” (quoted in Scott 1971, p. 266). One follow-up action from the 1928 conference was distribution, under the auspices of the National Conference on City Planning, of a questionnaire to approximately 200 selected colleges and universities to determine the extent of instruction in city planning and related disciplines. The results were published in *City Planning* in two installments in January and July 1929. Writing in 1943, Harvard University’s planning program chair J. Gaus captured the importance of the 1928 Columbia University gathering as follows: “The men who have thus far been leaders in city planning had no well-rounded course of specific training because none was available. They began as engineers, architects or landscape architects, as the case might be, and cultivated for themselves—and usually by themselves—more or less special ability in the broader field of city planning.” Unfortunately, Gaus continued, “these self-trained men, who have acquired the experience requisite to the making of valuable contributions to the science and art of city planning, have to devote themselves to the daily practice of their several professions, and are therefore unable to do what is needed in the way of developing and disseminating fundamental knowledge about city planning” (Gaus 1943, p. 48).

Hubbard at Harvard anticipated the call for devising such a unique city planning curriculum. As he wrote in 1927 in an article in *City Planning*, the official publication of the American City Planning Institute, “there does exist a very important and rapidly growing mass of knowledge which is not engineering, which is not architecture, which is not law, which is not medicine, but which furthers certain general goods toward which, each in its specific way, all these specialized professions and a good many more are contributing” (Scott 1971, p. 266).

In addition to Harvard, the new planning program at MIT and the expanded offerings of Columbia University fully embraced this broadened vision of planning education. Thomas Adams, who had been part of the 1928 conference, was recruited in 1932 by William Emerson, Dean of MIT’s new School of Architecture “to outline a new course in city planning” (see Chap. 4, p. 50).

Planning education in the early decades of the twentieth century in the US also aimed at creating a more planning savvy public. As Henry and Theodora Hubbard documented in their classic work, *Our Cities To-Day and To-Morrow* (1929), various local organizations across the United States embraced the mission of educating the public about the meaning and value of city planning. There was, for example, the City Parks Association of Philadelphia founded in 1888 but also groups such as the Civic Improvement Association of Boulder, Colorado, the Buffalo City Planning Association, the Kessler Plan Association in Dallas, a planning association in Schenectady (NY) and similar groups in Johnstown, Pittsburgh and Altoona (PA), Cincinnati (OH), Jacksonville (FL), Savannah (GA) and Tulsa (OK) (Hubbard and Hubbard 1929, pp. 77–82). The most notable

example of public planning education was the campaign orchestrated by Walter Moody in conjunction with Daniel Burnham's Plan of Chicago. As historian Carl Smith notes, Moody's campaign included a mixture of public lectures (500 in all to more than 150,000 listeners over a 7-year period), a series of books to explain the content, and potential benefits, of implementing the plan (which, of course, required supporting a large bond issue), and the multi-edition *Wacker Manual of the Plan of Chicago*, named for the chair of the Chicago City Plan Commission, Charles Wacker. One edition of this was modified for use in Chicago's public schools. Moody prepared a film, *A Tale of One City*, which was shown in theaters throughout the city and planted articles espousing the Chicago plan in magazines and newspapers (Smith 2006, pp. 122–125).

As documented in Paula Posas' study of the pioneering planning program at the University of Liverpool (see Chap. 3), the evolution of educating planners from being an extension of architecture to one which maintained one foot in the design disciplines and another in the emerging social sciences in England mirrored the developments in the USA. It is also evident that the Lever chairs at Liverpool were being recruited based on their accomplishments in practice but then, in turn, expanded the quantity and quality of planning education throughout the UK. Liverpool had strong connections to emerging US programs, and a profound influence on planning practice and education worldwide. Following the launch of the Liverpool program in 1909, University College London followed quickly in 1914 with a second postgraduate program. In 1939, several more universities, including Newcastle, Manchester and Leeds, and the Edinburgh College of Art began to offer planning curricula (Healey and Samuels 1981).

Planning Education in the Post-world War II Era

The marriage of the British and US planning education efforts influenced planning education in the developing world. Ellen Shoshkes explores this nexus in an assessment of how British planning educator Jaquelin Tyrwhitt and Harvard's Martin Myerson, along with other US and British colleagues, helped to create the first school of planning in Southeast Asia at Indonesia's Institute of Technology, Bandung (Chap. 5).

Across Europe, the postwar period witnessed a range of responses to the need for trained planners. Remarkable is the wide variance in time frames when there were standalone education programs in planning set up in cross-national comparison. In Portugal, for example, modules entitled "Improvements in Urban Planning" and "Urbanology" appeared in the curriculum of the University of Porto, Faculty of Engineering and the College of Fine Arts in Lisbon and Oporto, respectively, in the mid-1940s. But it took another 30 years for a fully articulated specialization in spatial planning to appear in several universities (Frank et al. 2014, p. 49). In Turkey, the first 4-year undergraduate planning program, using the design studio model and concentrating on physical and design planning, began in 1961 at the

Middle East Technical University in Ankara. The first German planning education program was established at the Technical University Dortmund in 1969 (Frank and Kurth 2010). In Greece, where planning education is to this date offered for the most part as specialization of engineering and architecture programs, an undergraduate standalone planning program was established only in 1989 at the University of Thessaloniki (Gospodini and Skayannis 2005). In Spain and Finland, despite established planning practices, planning still struggles to gain recognition as an independent field of study and only recently the first postgraduate planning programs were launched (Frank et al. 2014).

Poland offers another model, given the more than four decades it was under Soviet rule after 1945. As early as 1913, the Lvov Technical University had created a Department of Town Building. After World War II, it became a specialization available to architecture and engineering students. "In 1958, the Polish Academy of Science established the Committee for Spatial Economy and Regional Planning (CSERP)...with the objective to inspire and define new studies in spatial economy and planning in Poland" (Frank et al. 2014, p. 63). After 1989, the ground work of the CSERP resulted in two 5-year programs in spatial planning and land economy. In Slovakia, the Institute of Urban and Municipal Development was created within the Faculty of Architecture and Civil Engineering at the Slovak University of Technology in 1948. "Consistent with central European culture, spatial planning was conceptualized as a part of architecture" (Frank et al. 2014, p. 68) but similar to Poland it took until 2002 to create standalone planning degrees.

Planning education in the UK and in the United States expanded rapidly from the 1940s onward. In the US, there were thirteen new master planning programs created between 1940 and 1949, including full degree offerings from two of the pioneering institutions (Illinois and Florida). Unlike the pioneering education initiatives though, the vast majority of these were linked more to social science foundations (rather than to architecture, landscape architecture or engineering). This included master-level programs at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Chicago, Rutgers University, the University of California, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of North Carolina. Three more architecturally based programs started in the early 1950s at Yale University, Georgia Institute of Technology and the University Southern California, with the University of Pennsylvania program emerging out of its College of Fine Arts. From the 1960s through the 1990s, 68 new master programs were launched in the US, forty-four of these (64%) being based in urban universities and typically connected to the social science and public policy orientation (as contrasted with the early connections to design fields) that now dominate the US planning education emphasis (Adams 1954).

The evolution of the planning curriculum at the University of Florida from the 1940s through the 1980s exemplifies the transition from a design-based approach to one more deeply grounded in the social sciences and oriented to planning practice. In the late 1940s, Dean of Architecture William Arnett was determined to have the UF planning program recognized alongside those recently established at the University of North Carolina and Georgia Tech. He assembled from across campus

an interdisciplinary faculty, including not only from Architecture and Landscape Architecture, but also Sociology, Real Estate, Economics, Forestry, Public Health, Agricultural Economics, Civil and Industrial Design, and both Education and Physical Education, to support a Community Planning program. This new graduate program, launched in 1955, was short-lived. Soon after its creation, when one of its four lead faculty members left to pursue a doctorate, the new Architecture dean decided not to refill that faculty position and to terminate the program. Several years later, the Florida legislature authorized funding for a planning program but the funds went instead to Florida State University whose master program was founded in 1965.

It was in 1970 that UF looked to re-establish its planning program in response to growing national and regional demand for qualified planners. UF secured the prominent Washington-based planner Carl Feiss to head an urban research institute and to develop a curriculum in urban studies and planning. Feiss had been a founding faculty in Columbia University's planning curriculum in the 1930s and had previously worked for various planning organizations in Florida. The opportunity to close his career at UF was attractive. Although trained as an architect, his inclination was decidedly interdisciplinary and oriented toward practice.

But at the age of 63 in 1970, Feiss seemed an unlikely candidate to launch, or to re-energize, Florida's planning program. When the decision was made to create a degree-granting program, UF secured Earl Starnes, the state planning director and a UF alumnus, to direct the program. Starnes and Feiss were central figures in Florida's pioneering planning legislation in the 1970s. In 1972, under Governor Ruben Askew, the Division of State Planning was created within the state's Department of Administration and headed by Starnes. The new planning faculty at UF were key players in Florida's "quiet revolution" in land planning that led to passage of the "landmark" Local Government Comprehensive Planning Act in 1975 (Pelham 2007, pp. 1–9). These same Florida planning faculty also played pivotal roles in formulating Florida's Growth Management Act in 1985, under Governor Bob Graham, who had taken courses with several UF planning faculty (Rubino and Starnes 2008, pp. 215, 245, 249–250). These links to the growth management movement in the state infused within the planning program at UF a focus on applied research, a blend of design and policy training with a studio context, and the value of student engagement with Florida's growth challenges. In turn, Florida local governments and regional agencies, and development firms, absorbed as many planners as the UF program could produce.

Similar transformations were also underway in the UK. The new planning act of 1947 expanded the demand for professional planners which stimulated the creation of new programs. A shift from the architecture, landscape architecture, and engineering orientation to a more interdisciplinary orientation of the master and bachelor programs took place as "planning practice began to embrace the rational-planning model as well as to consider issues such as transport, social issues and policy" (Frank et al. 2014, p. 74). By the 1970s there were eighteen accredited graduate offerings, and another ten undergraduate planning programs together generating more than 350 planners each year and these programs expanded

enrollments to reach roughly 3,000 students enrolled in Royal Town Planning Institute-accredited programs by the early 2000s (Shaw et al. 2003).

As previously noted, many alumni from UK and US programs went on to spread planning education internationally (see Chaps. 5 and 6). Chinese pioneers in planning education are typical of this. Hou shows that multiple traditions shaped modern planning education in China. Particularly, these included the pre-revolution influences from the west as well as Japan, the post-revolution influences of the Soviet state planning system, and then following the Sino-Soviet break, the increasing importance of indigenous influences beginning with the introduction of a market economy component. Hou stresses the pivotal role of the fourteenth China Community Party Congress in the 1990s in launching the modern planning movement, led by Tongji University in Shanghai.

The first three master planning programs in Australia, at the South Australian School of Mines and Industries (SASMI), the University of Sydney and the University of Melbourne, were all post-World War II initiatives. As Freestone, Garnaut and Nichols note in their case study (Chap. 7), the half century leading up to these new programs involved a diffuse array of initiatives to promote interest in, and competency to undertake, planning through courses in existing architecture programs, public lectures and exhibits, and the ambitious few taking correspondence courses through the UK-based Town Planning Institute. Through the sponsorship of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, Gavin Walkley studied the British system of planning education and then brought it back to South Australia through the new program at SASMI. The University of Sydney's program emerged out of its extension course program with the backing of the Town and Country Planning Advisory Committee, a ministerial advisory body of New South Wales, and commenced within 3 months of Denis Winston assuming the position of Chair of Town Planning within the Faculty of Architecture in early 1949. In Melbourne, the influence of the British Town Planning Institute curriculum was pivotal in the establishment of a Town and Regional Planning program through the School of Architecture. In many respects these three pioneering programs in Australia were extension of the University of Liverpool civic design course since several of their graduates played such pivotal roles in promoting planning education there.

Planning education in twentieth century Brazil evolved in ways unlike any of the cases previously noted. As Cristina de Leme notes (Chap. 8), planning was embraced under the broader umbrella of urbanism and was solely the province of civil and architectural engineering. This helps to explain why the most widely cited example of planned intervention in the early twentieth century was the construction of Rio de Janeiro's Central Avenue. By the 1920s, there was a growing cohort of urbanists, drawn from civil and architectural engineering, and architecture. They focused on reshaping the central city areas in Brazil's main cities. They prepared plans, but regarded their work as most appropriately defined as urbanism rather than planning per se. It was the creation of an urban studies center in the School of Architecture and Urbanism at the University of Sao Paulo that launched the Brazilian equivalent to planning, "combining education and practical work in partnership with several local authorities in Sao Paulo State" (Chap. 8, p. 129). The

military coup in March 1964 led to centralized interventions by the national government which made it appear that planners were instruments of the authoritarian government and led to urban planning being indiscriminately associated with authoritarian and repressive practices. The denial of a certain type of planning was the denial of all types of planning. Since the 1980s, Brazil's process of re-democratization, the financial crisis of the State, and economic restructuring generated both expansion and fragmentation of urban planning education. The expansion is evident in the growth of the Association of Research and Post-Graduate Courses on Urban and Regional Planning (ANPUR) as a group of five programs in 1983 to more than 66 by 2014. The fragmentation has become evident in the highly diverse profiles of these new programs, some focusing on urban development, others on environmental planning or regional planning, and some with an orientation to the broader field of urban studies. As the cases in Brazil and China demonstrate, the emerging form of planning education was directly connected to the prevailing political ideology.

Toward the Current Condition

Although the historical traditions in planning education continue to exert influence on current conditions, the emergence of national and international associations of planning educators, beginning in the United States in the late 1960s, demonstrated that educators, as well as practitioners, had achieved a state of self-identification. The Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) constituted the academic offshoot of the professional American Planning Association (APA). ACSP's creation ushered in an era of network formation amongst planning education providers at the national and regional scales. Several other national and regional associations appeared in the 1980s, including the National Association of Postgraduate programs in urban and regional planning (ANPUR) and the French speaking institutions in France and beyond (APERAU), as well as the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP). As its founding president, Klaus Kunzmann acknowledged, ACSP provided the model that European planning educators emulated when he and Patsy Healey returned to Europe from participating in ACSP's Atlanta conference in the 1980s. Following in the 1990s and early 2000 were the Asian Planning Schools Association (APSA), the Association of Canadian Planning Programs (ACUPP) (also an offshoot of their professional planning organization), and the Association of Latin American Planning Schools (ALEUP, founded in 1999), as well as organizations in Turkey, Indonesia, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

In 2001, at the first world congress of planning education hosted by Tongji University in Shanghai, the Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN) (see Chap. 1) was constituted by the nine education associations that were represented there. Now numbering eleven recognized planning education associations, representing nearly 700 individual programs, GPEAN underscores the

global breadth of the planning education movement. Ironically, the host nation of the first world planning schools congress in 2001, China, remains outside GPEAN even though its 193 planning programs by 2012 makes it the largest single national planning education schools cluster. Chinese planning schools are also for a variety of reasons not engaged with APSA—the Asian Planning Schools Association like those from Japan or India. As Tan noted, the planning education movement in China, led by the National Steering Committee of Urban and Rural Planning Education, continues to be challenged to bring enough education programs up to global standards. As of 2014, only 25 master programs in China had been accredited by the national committee (Tan 2015, pp. 4–5).

The formation of the global network as well as the growth of the national and regional association cannot be viewed as a cause for an expanded planning education provision, although in some cases they have protected planning education from being targets of reduced educational funding. Perhaps more importantly, the associations have stimulated scholarship through meetings and conferences which has enabled planning educators to continue the tradition of sharing expertise nationally and transnationally. As the cases in this section demonstrate, there is a high degree of diversity in the circumstances that influenced the evolution and current approaches of planning education when viewed from a global perspective. This will become even more apparent as we broaden the geographic scope of planning education as it is practiced today. But first it is essential to begin with the historical legacy of planning education as revealed in the chapters of this Part I of the volume that carry forth the “beginnings” of that global endeavor.

References

- Adams FJ (1954) *Urban planning education in the United States* Alfred Bettman Foundation, Cincinnati
- Alofsin A (2002) *The struggle for modernism: architecture, landscape architecture and city planning at Harvard*. W.W Norton, New York
- Collins MP (2016) *The development of town planning education at University college London 1914-1969: the contributions of professors S. D. Adshead, L.P. Abercrombie, and W.G. Holford*. *Plann Perspect* 31(2):283–298
- Frank A, Kurth D (2010) *Planning education in Germany: impact of the Bologna Agreement*. *DISP [Documents and Information on Local, Regional, and Country Planning in Switzerland]* 182:25–35
- Frank A, Mironowicz I, Lourenço J, Franchini T, Ache P, Finka M, Scholl B, Grams A (2014) *Educating Planners in Europe: a review of 21st century study programmes*. *Progr Plann* 91:30–94
- Gaus J (1943) *The graduate school of design and the education of planners*. Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
- Gospodini A, Skayannis P (2005) *Towards an ‘integration model’ of planning education programmes in a European and international context: the contribution of recent Greek experiences*. *Plann Theory Pract* 6(3):355–382
- Healey P, Samuels O (1981) *British planning education in the 1970s and 1980s*. Social Science Research Council, London

- Hubbard HV, Hubbard TK (1929) *Our cities today and tomorrow*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Lohmann KB (1931) *Principles of city planning*. McGraw-Hill, New York
- Marsh BC (1909) (reprinted 1974) *An introduction to city planning*. Arno Press, New York
- Meck S, Retzlaff R (2009) A familiar ring: a retrospective on the first national conference in city planning. *Plann Environ Law, Commentary* (April)
- Pelham TG (2007) A historical perspective for evaluating Florida's evolving growth management process. In: Chapin TS, Connerly CE, Higgins HT (eds) *Growth management in Florida: planning for paradise*. Ashgate, Aldershot, UK, pp 7–19
- Pray JS (1914) The survey for a city plan. *Landsc Architect* 5 (October 1914-July 1915):5–14
- Pray JS, Kimball T (1913) *City planning: a comprehensive analysis of the subject arranged for the classification of books, plans, photographs, notes and other collected material, with alphabetic and subject index*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Reidenburg TK (1954) *A history of the school of architecture*. Columbia University, New York
- Robinson CM (1916) Collegiate instruction in city planning. *The City Plan* 2(1):12–17
- Rubino RG, Starnes EM (2008) *Lesson Learned? The history of planning in Florida*. Sentry Press, Tallahassee, FL
- Scott M (1971) *American City Planning Since 1890* University of California Press, Berkeley
- Shaw T, Pendlebury J, Mawson J (2003) *The supply and demand for qualified planners*. Royal Town Planning Institute, London
- Smith C (2006) *The plan of Chicago: Daniel Burnham and the remaking of the American city*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Tan L (2015) Behind the growth: planning education in China during rapid urbanization. *J Plann Educ Res* 34:1–11



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-55966-7>

Urban Planning Education

Beginnings, Global Movement and Future Prospects

Frank, A.I.; Silver, C. (Eds.)

2018, XV, 345 p. 24 illus., 8 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-55966-7