

**Georgia Institute of Technology
Graduate Program in City and Regional Planning:
The First 35 Years**

Larry Keating, PhD, AICP
Graduate Program in City and Regional Planning
Georgia Institute of Technology

April 4, 2003

On the Occasion of the Program's 50th Anniversary

Introduction

When the Graduate Program in City Planning at Georgia Tech opened in 1952, the region and the country were in the midst of exceptional expansion and change. Rapidly growing national and regional economies, driven by returning war veterans, women's increasing workforce participation, and pent-up demand from 15 years of Depression and War restricted consumption restructured regions and the social and political modes of their governance. Two million new housing units annually in 1949 and 1950 contributed to the transformation homeownership from 40% of the nation's households to 60% in a decade, changes which redefined the sociology of communities, the politics of development and the structure and geography of cities. The success of the Marshall Plan in Europe, the example of the redevelopment of Pittsburgh, and extensive and ubiquitous suburban development elicited new national commitments to urban renewal in core cities.

The convergence of such diverse forces as changes in banking systems fostering increased interregional capital flows, air conditioning, southern-dominated-Congressional-seniority-system directed expansions of military spending, economic exploitation of an undereducated labor force and selective industrial migrations drove southern economic growth to faster-than-national rates and contributed to even more transformative social and political changes in the Southeast U.S.

Resurgent African American migration from the rural South to the region's cities and to the North, stalled by the Depression and diverted by the War, transfigured cities and regions nationally. Over three-quarters of the 6.5 million black southerners who migrated

north between 1910 and 1970 moved after 1940,¹ converting race relations from a primarily southern issue to both an urban and a national geographic, economic and cultural concern. Political and civic leadership in Atlanta responded to some of these changes by creating the first entirely publicly supported official regional planning organization in the country, the Metropolitan Planning Commission of Atlanta in 1947,² and they joined with faculty at the Georgia Institute of Technology to promote the establishment of a graduate planning program at Tech.

Nationally, the American Institute of Planners (AIP) grew from approximately 240 members at the end of WWII to over 600 by the end of the decade and the 1940's added nine new graduate planning schools to the two previously existing. "[P]lanning is primarily concerned with integration and hence with the relationships of things to each other," wrote founding Georgia Tech City Planning Program Director Howard K. Menhinick in a co-authored report on "The Content of Professional Curricula in Planning" adopted by the AIP at their fall meeting in 1947.³ Students should have "... a general acquaintance with the structures and operation of our modern economic society,"⁴ as well as an understanding of the essential subject matter of sociology, economics, political science, public administration, law and geography. In addition, according to

¹ Lemann, Nicholas. 1991. *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. p 6.

² Scott, Mel. 1969. *American City Planning Since 1890*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press. p 442.

³ Howard, John T., Edwin S. Burdell,* Mark Fortune, Howard K. Menhinick, and Lawrence M. Orton. Winter 1948. The Content of Professional Curricula in Planning. *Journal of the AIP*. p. 6.

*Subsequent research reveals no relationship between Edwin S. Burdell and the George P. Burdell who has registered for over 100,000 hours of courses at Georgia Tech, including all 3,000 available credit hours in the first completely computerized registration in 1969.

⁴ Ibid, p. 8.

Menhinick and the other four members of the AIP's Committee on Planning Education, professional curricula should include methods and techniques of planning, the history of cities and of city planning, the elements of the physical city and the legal, financial and educational means implementing plans.⁵

At mid century, the orthodox view of planning academics and practitioners engaged in professional education objected to the increasingly highly specialized curricula characteristic of American universities and colleges. From this perspective, beginning courses in most fields were not the synthesizing examinations of the substantive knowledge planners needed but advertisements designed to encourage students to go more deeply into that particular field. This characterization and the breadth of knowledge sought led the founders of eight of the nine new graduate planning curricula in the 1940's to adopt a "program" as the administrative device which sought to overcome increasing university specialization and effectively access the breadth of requisite knowledge available at the universities.

In 1950 the committee which advised the Dean of Engineering and the Georgia Institute of Technology's administrative hierarchy regarding the desirability of creating a graduate professional program in city planning encouraged Tech to adopt the "program" model. The committee consisted of Menhinick, who was then the Director of Regional Studies at the country's most ambitious regional planning program, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA); Harold Bush-Brown, the Director of the School of Architecture (then also a

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 9-12.

Department in the College of Engineering); John Gaus, Director of City Planning, Harvard University; and Frederick J. Adams, Director of City Planning at M.I.T.

Following the Committee's positive recommendation, Georgia Tech sought and received a program initiating grant of \$251,000 in 1951, and in 1952 the Graduate City Planning Program, administratively a unit of the Department of Architecture but a program in the sense that other Colleges and Departments within the Institute committed to teach courses specifically designed for planning students, enrolled a class of ten students in the two year Master of City Planning degree program. Menhinick left the TVA to launch and direct the new program as one of the first Regents Professors at Georgia Tech.

Menhinick was a highly accomplished professional planner and scholar. He held a Master of Landscape Architecture in City Planning from Harvard, where he also taught from 1929 through 1936. He was a consultant to the National Resources Planning Board in 1935. He edited the *Planners Journal* from 1935 through 1937 and had published extensively in *Landscape Architecture* and in *City Planning*. In addition to his work at TVA and for the AIP, he was Director of the Headquarters Planning Staff at the United Nations for the Selection of a Site for the United Nations in the United States in 1946 (on loan from TVA). In 1948 he revised the International City Management Association's *Local Planning Administration*.

Fifty years on we know that the education of renaissance men and women in all of the relevant facets of urban life and development, in the sociology, social psychology,

psychology, geography, economics, political science of urban life, in the complex physical ecologies of different regions, in the multiple engineering disciplines required to adapt those ecologies to human use, and in the harmonious design of increasingly discrete urban land uses is beyond a single group of faculty's capacity to cohesively envision and is also beyond individual student capacities to accumulate knowledge. The vision of the present faculty to help educate people who help to construct humane communities is no less sincere but is slightly less expansive and more humble.

Menhinick's and the Committee's noble pedagogic aspiration was particularly difficult to implement at an Institute of Technology. Where the "program" concept provided some of the envisioned access to specialized bodies of knowledge in large, full service universities, a full complement of the requisite extensive knowledge was not available to the early graduate planning students at the Georgia Institute of Technology. Graduate courses in sociology, political science, history and geography did not exist. Most of the social sciences were grouped together in a single department designed to provide service courses to undergraduate engineers, not the substantive summaries the AIP Education Committee envisioned, and not the specialized courses in the history of the planning profession and history of cities the model curriculum specified. In 1950 only fragments of the history of the planning profession, especially in the U.S., had been compiled and urban history was a fledgling enterprise in the few places where it existed.

Menhinick absorbed the responsibility for teaching the history himself and managed to recruit social science support for two new graduate courses from the Social Sciences

Department for courses in sociology (S.S.605, Planning for People) and political science (S.S.601, Governmental Aspects of Planning). Additional work in sociology and psychology occurred in another specialized course in the required Psychology 409, Sociological and Psychological Techniques for City Planning, which was taught in the Management school. Statistics was taught by Industrial Management faculty in a fourth course specifically developed for planning students, I.M.621, Statistics for City Planners.

In addition, the 83 quarter hour required core included two Civil Engineering courses, which do not appear to have been developed specifically for the new Planning Program: C.E.647, Urban Transportation Facilities (a four credit course) and C.E.648, Urban Sanitary Facilities. Entering students without “previous training in design and graphic presentation” were required to complete two four credit (12 hour laboratory) architecture courses in Design and Graphic Presentation taught by architecture faculty, thereby raising their mandatory curriculum to 91 credit hours.

While the sociological, psychological and political dimensions of city planning were taught in other academic departments, Menhinick and the faculty retained responsibility for two social sciences within the Program: Economics and History. Economics was taught as Economics of Urban Development (CP626). The content of this course covered a spectrum of topics from resource measurement through urban economics and urban land economics, as well as applied subjects such as market analyses and economic base measurement. History was taught, as it has been in all but two or three of the subsequent 50 years, as a subset of a more extensive course. Mr. Menhinick taught CP600, Urban

Community Planning and covered “(O)rigin and development of cities; history of planning; basic planning principles and current planning practice ...”⁶

The initial academic curriculum was designed to educate a generalist planner. Ninety-two percent of the 90 hours required to graduate were specified. Although the catalog indicated that “(a) schedule of desirable supplementary courses will be worked out with the individual student,” there was precious little room for these supervised electives.⁷ In the aggregate, the courses constituted a social science based program in land use planning with substantial secondary foci on regional resource development, engineering and design.

Menhinick supplied the natural resource, regional and larger institutional perspectives in a required course he taught in Resource Development (CP604), which examined regional, state and some national government department operations in the area of resource development.

The land use planning focus manifested itself in CP601 – Land Use Planning, in two subsequent courses (CP602 and 603) in Planning Legislation and Regulation and in a four course sequence of (6 credit hour) studio courses entitled Problems in City Planning. Mr. Isaac “Ike” Saporta, a German educated WWII Greek resistance fighter, architect and social activist, taught sections of each of the studio courses, as did Mr. Richard Wilson of the architecture faculty. The first two courses focused on the “design of such urban land

⁶ Georgia Institute of Technology. *Catalog 1952-1953*. p 35-37.

⁷ Georgia Institute of Technology. *Catalog 1952-1953*. p 36.

uses as residential subdivisions, neighborhood units, local shopping centers, parks, playgrounds and industrial districts,” after an introductory examination of “... comprehensive land use planning, including determinations of the interrelationships and the general character, size and location of functional urban districts ...”⁸

In an ambitious display of optimism and hope, the third studio course designed a new town. The fourth and final studio was client based and often worked on urban redevelopment problems in Atlanta, suburban development issues on the periphery of the Atlanta region and on small town development and redevelopment. Little is known about the substantive content of many of these courses, but talks by Mr. Saporta in later years emphasized how the Program attempted to positively affect the operation of the Atlanta Urban Renewal Program by directly representing low income and minority client groups and by the design of plans aimed at serving low income and minority groups through some of his studios.

In addition to working on contemporary problems in land use planning, some students in the final studio worked on applications of planning expertise that illustrate that a broader definition of the field than land use was advocated by some. Problems of aging and elderly facilities; institutional organization for a variety of social, political and economic issues; natural resource protection and development; fiscal planning, and state planning occupied some of the studio students.

⁸ *Ibid.*

In addition to involving five other academic divisions in implementing the broad view of the curriculum to which Menhinick and the profession aspired, the Program sought to take advantage of its location in an expanding regional capital. One of the most intellectually invigorating connections with the larger community was the conduct of weekly seminars featuring a broad range of Atlanta and Georgia civic and private sector leaders. The Governor, Senators, Congressmen, State Legislators, Mayors, County Executives, County Commissioners, City Council members, major private developers, promoters of multiple different civic schemes from heliports to new rail systems, senior city, state and federal staff, advocates of a range of causes and policies, public housing resident leaders and other interesting or controversial people engaged in some form of (broadly defined) development each appeared at the Monday afternoon seminars. Attendance was obligatory for faculty and students, but the sessions focused on student engagement with the visitors. Faculty could ask questions, but only after the students had fully queried presenters.

For over thirty years students interacted weekly with many of the most significant actors and actresses in state and local development policy and implementation. Some of the later students referred to the required meetings, for which they were required to register but received no course credit, as “chapel,” but the reference was more to the obligatory format than to the substance, and not only were few absent, the discussions were spirited and lively.

A second way in which Menhinick and the early faculty engaged the Atlanta community was through an Advisory Committee composed of prominent corporate and political people. The Committee met annually for a dinner at the Commerce Club and included such local luminaries as Alvin Ferst (of Rich's and whose family is the namesake of Ferst Drive on the Tech campus), Charles Palmer (the motive force behind the development of Techwood Homes, the nation's first public housing community) and Franklin Hood of Georgia Power.⁹ The Committee generated support, helped engage the Program in important topical issues and provided recognition and stature. The record is not complete, but the Committee appears to have raised relatively small amounts of money that the Program used for visiting speakers and incidental expenses. The client-based capstone studio drew assignments from the Committee, and the members supplied contacts with important evolving issues for the studios.

The third way the Program engaged the larger community was through student projects in Atlanta and throughout the state. Professor Menhinick chaired the AIP's Special Committee on the Role of Planning Students and Faculty Members in Community Planning Projects in 1954 and the direction he set for both the Program and the profession immersed students and faculty in the problems and possibilities of governance and community development for many years.

The fourth way in which the Program capitalized on its context was development of a strategic linkage with the Georgia Power Company that endured for over 30 years. Because the power company had a material interest in the growth and development of

⁹ Keating, Larry and Roger Rupnow. December 13, 2002. Personal interview. Atlanta.

peripheral areas as the state grew, and because both the Program's professional responsibility, service mission and alumni employment prospects were enhanced by the concomitant spread of planning into these same areas, the two developed complementary missionary programs to proselytize organized (if not necessarily always planned or zoned) development. Very often these entreaties reached receptive ears and subsequent classes or outreach projects fostered the institutionalization of some form of planning apparatus. In other cases education was the immediate consequence, and governmental adaptations had to wait until the lessons had matured. In the 1960s Professor Catanese described one of these less immediately fruitful forays into the hinterlands as ending with the greeting of the arriving delegation by men who might have been armed and the latter's encouraging the former, of which he was a part, to put their "Communist propaganda" back on the power company's airplane (along with their persons) and depart. Education came in very small bits that night.

Early Graduates

The Program required a 15 credit hour thesis for graduation until 1974. A brief description of what we know of the first five students who entered in 1952 and who completed their theses and graduated in 1954 captures some of the Program's substance. First, the students and their theses: Edwin H. Folk, *Railroad Problems in Urban Planning*; Donald G. Ingram, *State and Local Planning for a Community College*; Arthur A. Mendonsa, *The Application of Selected Sociological Concepts to City Planning*; William H. Qualls, *The Problems and Delimitation of the Central Business District*, and

Kamal-Eldrin Sabry, *Building Height Regulations in Egypt and the United States*. Arthur “Don” Mendonsa initially became the first Director of City Planning for the Gainesville-Hall County Planning Board, an area that was then being substantially transformed by the construction of Lake Lanier. Mr. Mendonsa went on to become the longtime City Manager of Savannah, where he installed two planning staffs (one for the joint City of Savannah-Chatham County Metropolitan Planning Commission and the other under his immediate direction and reflecting some of his perspectives of governance, the “Bureau of Public Development”). He also required each line department to adhere to planning precepts.

One of the enduring tales of Mendonsa’s political acumen recounts the day in the late fall of 1991 when the recently elected Republican, Susan Weiner, came to his imposing suite of offices at the top of Savannah’s City Hall on Bay Street to explain how she wanted the City run after her forthcoming inauguration as Mayor. Mendonsa listened impassively for a relatively short time before abruptly dismissing her and her naïve proposition with the curt but accurate observation, “I have more votes on the Council than you do.” The postscript to this story is that Mendonsa and Weiner governed harmoniously throughout her (single) term. Both current and former Savannah planners, of which the Planning Program supplied many, agree that the only way that could have happened was if Don Mendonsa was running the government.

Edwin Folk interned at the Metropolitan Planning Commission of Atlanta, and after graduation he became assistant to the Executive Director at the American Society of

Planning Officials (ASPO) in Chicago, where, among other duties, he prepared Planning Advisory Reports.¹⁰

William “Bill” Qualls interned with Harland Bartholomew & Associates in their Atlanta office and, after graduation, he accepted a position with the Tennessee State Planning Commission where he had responsibility for Kingsport, Greenville and Johnson City, Tennessee and Bristol, Virginia.¹¹

Kamal-Eldrin “Kim” Sabry returned to his native Egypt, where he opened an architectural and planning consulting firm in Cairo. By November, 1954 he could report that he was prospering and loved his work.¹²

Also in 1954, the Program welcomed its first woman student: Ms. Cleo Thompson, a transfer student from Yale. Georgia Tech had begun enrolling women in 1952, so the Program was one of the first academic units with female students. On October 20, 1954 the Student Planning Society¹³ adopted articles of a proposed constitution, a step on the way to becoming a recognized student organization at Georgia Tech. That same month, L. R. Cooper, Chair of the Planning Commission of Cleveland and White County,

¹⁰ Georgia Institute of Technology. November 1954. *Graduate City Planning Program Newsletter*. p 1.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p 2.

¹² *Ibid*.

¹³ Or its predecessor organization.

published “How a Small City Benefits from Planning” in *The American City* (pp. 103-104) based on work that Planning Program students had performed for that community.¹⁴

Malcolm G. Little joined the Program’s faculty in 1953 and, characteristically, assumed responsibility for teaching seven of the curriculum’s courses: Land Use Planning, Planning Legislation and Regulation, Housing and Urban Redevelopment, and all four of the six credit hour studios, then described as “Problems in City Planning.” Little had received his Masters in City Planning from MIT in 1947 and spent the next five years practicing in North Carolina. Also in 1953 Professor Menhinick was a consultant to the Italian government regarding housing and planning issues in the economically less developed southern regions of the country.

Between 1954 and 1976 the faculty presented a two week Summer Institute in City Planning. Coordinated with the University of Arkansas (a member of the Academic Common Market¹⁵), the Institute targeted practicing planners throughout the region who had not acquired a professional planning degree. From all reports, the Institute was generally successful at its primary mission of strengthening the skills of planners who lacked academic preparation and it was also successful in drawing many practicing planners to Georgia Tech for the professional degree program. For many years during the operation of the Institute, between 15 and 30% of each class were students who had

¹⁴ Georgia Institute of Technology. November 1954. *Graduate City Planning Program Newsletter*. p 4-6.

¹⁵ Arkansas students could attend Georgia Tech for in-state tuition rates as a member of the Academic Common Market.

practiced planning, a component of the classes which considerably enriched the pedagogy.

Later 50s, Early 60s

The first PhD to have taught in the Program appears to have been Dr. W. R. Gable, who taught Social Science 601 Governmental Aspects of Planning, beginning in (c.) 1955. This course not only examined the politics of municipal governance, it also analyzed local government finance and capital expenditures budgeting. In addition, the final paper in S.S.601 developed a system of local government and finance for the new town planning students had designed in their CP612 Problems in City Planning course.¹⁶

In 1956 Professor Menhinick became a member of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, a post he held until 1962. In 1957 Professor Menhinick drafted the Georgia General Planning and Zoning Enabling Act, which the legislature passed and the Governor signed and which subsequently became the basic legal foundation for planning and zoning in Georgia.

In 1959 the faculty added new prerequisite requirements for entering students with the catalog statement that “(S)tudents with background deficiencies in research techniques, economics, sociology, and public administration are required during the first year to

¹⁶ Georgia Institute of Technology. *Catalog 1956-57*. p 105.

complete programs of directed readings in these fields.”¹⁷ There was no concomitant reduction in credit hours required for graduation. Also in 1959, Thera H. Richter was the first woman to graduate from the Planning Program. She later became Director of Planning in Birmingham, Alabama and is the namesake of the scholarship now given to an outstanding rising second year female graduate planning student.

In 1961 John Gould joined the Program as a part-time but core member of the faculty. Mr. Gould was a Masters of Regional Planning graduate of the University of North Carolina Planning Program through which he had interned with the TVA, where he met Mr. Menhinick. Mr. Gould subsequently spent several years with the Atlanta Metropolitan Planning Commission with Phillip Hammer, who was one of the founders of the economic research consulting firm Hammer, Siler George. Mr. Gould operated his own private real estate research firm. Initially, Mr. Gould taught the CP605 Housing and Urban Redevelopment course, which Mr. Little had taught since taking it over from Mr. Saporta in the mid-1950s, and he also taught the S.S.605 Planning with People course that had been taught by Social Science faculty. The subtle but significant change in the title – from Planning **for** People to Planning **with** People – reflected Gould’s and the profession’s increasing awareness of the desirability of engaging citizens in meaningful participation in the planning of their communities – an awareness that errors of the Urban Renewal program had begun to impress on both practitioners and academics.

In 1962 the Program and the Civil Engineering Department established the Program’s first joint degree program in Transportation Engineering. In its initial incarnation,

¹⁷ Georgia Institute of Technology. *Catalog 1959-1960*. p 3.

students with a substantial engineering background could obtain a Masters in City Planning and a Master of Science in Civil Engineering in two years. Students with less extensive previous engineering educations could obtain the MCP and a MS (undesigned) in two years or spend more time and graduate with the MS in CE.

Also in 1962 the Georgia General Assembly created the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Study Commission at the behest of Mayor Ivan Allen and the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. The Commission's task was to prepare plans for the region's transportation system and, in particular, the role heavy rail transit would play in that system. Professor Menhinick chaired the Commission. Nineteen sixty-two was an especially busy year for the Program Director, as he also served as President of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

In 1964 Doris N. Isely joined the faculty to teach two new core courses, CP623 and 624, Planning Reference Sources and Techniques. Ms. Isely also functioned as the librarian of the Architecture Library, one of the few and perhaps the only satellite library on the Georgia Tech campus. Her tenure with the program was a brief three years, after which the material in her two two-credit courses was at least partially absorbed by other core courses. Ms. Isely's courses were early information science courses that included a survey of planning literature, an introduction to the institutions and systems that provided planning reference services and bibliographies, as well as "the storage and retrieval of

planning information,” and “the utilization of legal, census and other special libraries
...¹⁸

Also in 1964 the program secured two years of funding (at \$100,000 and \$120,000) from the Richard King Mellon Charitable Trust. In addition the program had access to graduate student funding through the Sears-Roebuck Foundation and Loula D. Lasber Fellowships. In 1965 Menhinick had revised *A Planning Manual for Community Development*, which was the basic planning manual for Georgia communities and which he had first written in 1959.

In 1966 Menhinick secured the resources to add a faculty position to the core staff. He and the faculty determined that the increasing attention, complexity and controversy the national Urban Renewal program was accumulating dictated the need for an experienced Urban Renewal practitioner to teach the core renewal course, supervise theses and direct studios. Political changes in Madison, Wisconsin had led Roger Rupnow, formerly the Director of Urban Renewal in Madison, to the employment registry of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, which Menhinick consulted. Mr. Rupnow joined the faculty for the Fall Quarter, 1966.¹⁹ In addition to teaching urban renewal and housing courses, Professor Rupnow usually taught courses in Zoning and two of the Problems in City Planning Studios. At various times during his tenure, Mr. Rupnow taught courses in housing, in land use planning, in the history of city planning, in growth management and in state land use regulation. He had funded research with the

¹⁸ Georgia Institute of Technology. *Catalog 1964-1965*. p 48.

¹⁹ Keating, Larry and Roger Rupnow. March 5, 2003. Personal interview. Atlanta.

Georgia Manufactured Housing Association, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and for many years ran the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Minority Work Study Program.

Menhinick retired in 1968. In 1966 the American Institute of Planners awarded him its Distinguished Service Award. In the year of his retirement, the American Society of Planning Officials made him an Honorary Life Member. He had had an extensive 40 year career as an academic, as a practitioner and in public service to the profession and multiple communities. In addition to the previously noted contributions, he was Secretary-Treasurer of the AIP (1942-1943), a member of the AIP Board of Governors (1944-1947 and 1954-1957), Chair of the AIP Committee on Education and Personal Standards in 1945 (the Committee's Report was the first AIP-adopted Policy Statement), and Chair of the AIP Nominating Committee in 1964.

Malcolm Little followed Menhinick as Program Director, a position he held for the next 21 years. While Little subscribed to the precepts upon which the program was founded, he also believed that growth and change were integral to the field, and he led the program into a period of expansion and evolution.

Changes and Revisions

The late 1960s and early 1970s brought substantial change to the Program and its curriculum. Where the first twenty years of operation had focused on attempting to

educate a generalist whose intellectual breadth enabled the planner to recognize the intercies between the specialized functions of government and the particularly pertinent dimensions of the political, social and physical environments in which plans were developed, the enormity of the responsibilities that that entailed, and the accumulation of substantial bodies of knowledge in multiple fields of social organization, environment, governance and development, as well as the difficulties in implementing such broad perspectives, severely challenged both practice and education. Harvey Perloff's classic "generalist with a specialty" paradigm appeared to the faculty to point the way out of these dilemmas, as did the need to incorporate more extensive education in the multiple specific disciplines then composing the knowledge planners sought to command.²⁰

The addition of three PhDs to the core faculty in planning beginning in 1967 (Anthony Catanese), through 1970 (Clifford Bragdon) and 1971 (James Snyder) marked the beginning of these changes, as did the restructuring of the curriculum along the lines of a generalist with a specialty model.

Catanese, who was the first PhD from the University of Wisconsin-Madison Planning Program, made the first of his two contributions to the evolution of the Program between 1967 and 1972, when he left for the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He brought particular expertise in transportation, scientific methods, state planning, and in what he termed "systemic planning." He had applied some of these concepts as the head of the State Planning system in New Jersey prior to arriving at Georgia Tech.

²⁰ Harvey S. Perloff. Fall 1956. The Education of City Planners: Past, Present and Future. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. pp. 186-217.

Dr. Catanese's arrival marked the elevation of Scientific Methods to first a two- and later a three-course sequence. In addition, Dr. Catanese reinvigorated the Program's research program with development plans for MARTA, with contracts with the U.S. Department of Transportation and with contracts for several small city comprehensive plans. He returned briefly to the Program from Pratt Institute between 1984 and 1986 to help expand the Program's research with additional contracts with the Department of Transportation, the Army and Cardinal Industries.

Dr. Bragdon brought specialized knowledge in environmental planning from his prior practice and his PhD work at the University of Pennsylvania. Although one of his base specializations, in the highly specialized area of noise pollution, was then temporarily ascendant, his breadth within the larger environmental planning field enabled him to both organize a concentration in environmental planning and survive the dismantling of noise regulation later in the 1980s. In addition to teaching Environmental Planning I and II, Dr. Bragdon at various times taught Environmental Noise Management, Environmental Health Planning,²¹ Urban Spatial Management and Historic Preservation Planning. Before leaving the Program to direct Georgia Tech's Continuing Education Program, Dr. Bragdon conducted over 30 research projects for such varied clients as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Army Corps of Engineers, the General Dynamics Corporation, Exxon Corporation, the Community Services Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the

²¹ Which was co-listed with the Emory University College of Medicine, School of Public Health, between 1977 and 1990.

Department of Transportation, multiple agencies of the State of Georgia and multiple local governments.

Dr. Snyder was a generalist with sufficient strength to teach core methods and economics courses while moving gingerly through and across the transitory new specializations in criminal justice and energy planning that appeared and then receded in the 1970s. Together with the three core staff of Little, Rupnow and Gould, the faculty reorganized the curriculum to add specializations in particular substantive areas to the (necessarily reduced) generalist base.

The faculty constructed specializations by substituting a six credit hour thesis option paper for the 15 credit hour thesis (which remained an alternative for less intensively specializing students and for students who intended to pursue a PhD) and marshalling ten hours of electives for a total of 25 quarter hours of specialization work. In order to accomplish this shift, one of the four required six credit hour studios (Problems in City Planning) was dropped and at least 96 quarter credits were required. The Program still reached outside the discipline for courses in political science (Pol 651 Governmental Aspects of Planning), transportation (CE 650 Urban Transportation Facilities and Policies), sanitary facilities (CE 649 Urban Sanitary Facilities) and sociology (SS 677 Planning with People [although this course continued to be taught by Professor Gould]). Reflecting the education of the newer faculty and the shift of both the profession and the professional academy towards more rigor in the social sciences, Scientific Methods in Urban and Regional Planning became an internally-taught three-course (four credit hours

each) sequence, replacing the earlier Industrial Management statistics course. The third of these courses initially focused on Professor Catanese's formulation of "Systemic Planning" which included precepts of operations research, revisionist public administration approaches such as planning-programming-budgeting systems and further development of information systems. In addition, and again reflecting both the broader faculty horizons regarding governance and Dr. Catanese's expertise, a course, CP 606 in State and Regional Planning, was added to the required core.

While the transition from an exclusively generalist to a generalist-with-a-specialty structure opened the way for more intensive focus on particular dimensions of planning, the generalist ideology remained dominant to the extent that specialties were not circumscribed or delimited for many years. Program records from 1972 – when the curriculum changes were first codified,²² -- until 1980 do not enumerate particular specialties. Queries of faculty who were teaching during this period elicited some of the following alternatives, but most were compiled by Leon Eplan, who succeeded Little as program Director in 1979 and who was then trying to categorize the program's extensive offerings:

Community Development, Community Facilities, Criminal Justice, Economic Analysis, Economic Development, Energy Conservation, Environmental Planning, Historic Preservation, Housing, Urban Renewal and Urban Revitalization, Land Use Controls, New Towns, Parks and Leisure Services, Planning in the Federal System, Political Processes, Programming and Budgeting, Public Administration, Public Finance, Public Participation, Public Policy

²² Georgia Institute of Technology. *Catalog 1973-1974*. p. 46.

Analysis, Quantitative Methods, Real Estate Development, Resource Planning and Management, Scientific Methods, Social Services, Spatial Management, State Planning, Transportation, Urban Design, and Water Resources²³

The faculty had conceded that students could not learn everything about everything, but they had only marginally conceded that they could not teach everything about everything.

Malcolm Little's Employment Agency

Malcolm Little ran one of the most effective and extensive planning employment agencies in the country. In 1952 when the Program began, the University of North Carolina had the only other professional masters degree in planning in the southeast, so for many years the Georgia Tech Planning Program had a near monopoly in many areas of the region on jobs for qualified professionals. Little strategically tracked both openings and former students' career development. Because he knew each of the graduates so well, and because for many he was an almost mythically perceptive mentor, he could call an alumnus who was a planning director in some place in Alabama and tell him or her that they had exhausted the challenges to their professional development there, and that they needed to take a just-announced job in South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, Georgia or Florida. If they concurred, as many did, he would encourage the advertising employers to contact (and hire) the alumnus and set about finding a replacement for the Alabama job from more recent or suitable graduates.

²³ Leon S. Eplan, Memorandum to the Faculty, October 23, 1980.

Because Georgia Tech helped educate the first wave of planning professionals in the region, alumni were the first to occupy planning directorships in many of the southeast's cities and counties. Little exploited this tactical advantage to move Tech planners across the region and into increasingly responsible jobs like a chess master, well beyond the time when there were only two southeastern planning schools. To him and consequently to the alumni, every new planning job portended the possibility of two or three employment openings.

Larry Keating joined the Program in Fall 1973. Keating was the fourth graduate of the University of Wisconsin to serve on the Program's faculty (after Little, Rupnow and Catanese). He was hired to teach the introductory Planning Theory course, which he did for the next 30 years, as well as courses in housing policy, practicums in community development, and allied courses. In 1975 Keating and two Program students, Dennis Grady and Kevin Johns, began attempting to build community and financial support for a Community Design Center to channel some of the Program's and the Department (soon to be a College) of Architecture's outreach activities to low income and minority neighborhoods in Atlanta and the state.

Also in 1975 Keating co-taught Social Policy Planning with an adjunct faculty, Gerald T. Horton, who had just completed a book on the same subject. Horton was a planning consultant and state legislator who had just led the re-writing of state legislation/regulation to comply with the omnibus Title XX reorganization of social policy planning at the federal level.

The mid '70s recession dampened funders' enthusiasm, and it was not until 1977 that Keating, Johns and Eleanor Matthews (who had replaced the departed Dennis Grady) secured, with Horton's assistance, City of Atlanta funding for the Community Design Center of Atlanta (CDCA). Now in its 26th year, the CDCA has worked with Program and College of Architecture students and faculty to provide advocacy planning and architectural assistance to over 100 Atlanta neighborhoods, community groups and community development corporations. In addition the CDCA has conducted policy research with Program students and faculty on multiple issues of concern to low income residents of the City and the state. Discrimination in mortgage lending, housing needs, housing policy, *in rem* policy, enabling legislation for land bank authorities in Georgia, the status of nonprofit community development corporations and the collaborative engagement of Atlanta universities in outreach to low income communities (culminating in the formation of the Atlanta Outreach Consortium by Clark Atlanta, Georgia State and Emory Universities and Georgia Tech) have each engaged CDCA energy and effort.

Jim Grant, a recent graduate of the Program, filled in for the recently departed Dr. Catanese for two years from 1973 to 1975. In addition to teaching the Scientific Methods sequence, Professor Grant taught "a boot camp course in statistics for liberal arts majors who had been avoiding math all their lives."²⁴ He then moved on to private consulting where he developed a practice in health systems which eventually led to a position at Emory University.

²⁴ James B. Grant, response to City Planning Questionnaire, January 16, 2003, Atlanta.

Dr. Jay Stein, a University of Michigan PhD, became a program faculty member in 1976. Dr. Stein, a native New Yorker, specialized in economics and fiscal policy and also brought substantial strengths in social policy, scientific methods and the equity analyses welfare economics were beginning to refine.

Tom Debo, a program alumnus and a PhD in Civil Engineering at Georgia Tech (1975), also became a Program faculty member in 1976. Dr. Debo has taught courses in water resources planning, public works planning, project economics and life cycle costing to Program students for over 30 years. Professor Debo built a substantial research program in water resources planning and urban sanitary facilities with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs, cities and counties across the state and region, the Georgia Water Resource Institute, the U.S. Department of Transportation and the U.S. Geological Survey before moving to administration as an Associate Dean of the College in the early 1990s.

Gene Willike was an adjunct faculty member who participated in Program faculty deliberations as a full faculty between (c.) 1975 and 1978. Willike's academic strengths were in the water resources planning area, but he was intrigued by the sociology of planning and developed several projects that sought to explore new approaches in communications and organization for planning.

Catherine Ross, a Cornell PhD, was hired by the Program to teach transportation planning and scientific methods in 1979. Dr. Ross was the second woman and the first

African American Program faculty. Her subsequent work in transportation planning specifically and urban policy generally has been recognized regionally and nationally. In addition to sabbaticals or leaves of absence with the National Science Foundation and, most recently, as the first Executive Director of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, Dr. Ross has served as Director of the College of Architecture PhD Program and as Vice Provost for Academic Affairs of the Institute.

Silver Anniversary

The celebration that transpired about the same time as the Program's twenty-fifth anniversary was, fittingly, a celebration of Malcolm Little's 25th year with the Graduate Program in City Planning. Howard Osofsky led an exceptionally vigorous group of students that included James B. Blackburn, Jr., Jeffrey Feagan and Fred van Vonno in organizing the (surprise) Malcolm G. Little Roast and Testimonial Dinner on May 27, 1978. Held in the ballroom of the (c. 1926) Biltmore Hotel, for many years one of Atlanta's highly regarded special events locales, the event featured a range of significant testimonials to Little's career, influence and the esteem with which he was held.

Ben W. Fortson, Jr., then Secretary of State of Georgia and a fixture in Democratic Party politics, delivered the keynote address. Tony Catanese returned from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, where he was Director of the Planning Program, to praise Little. A. A. "Don" Mendonsa, a member of the first graduating class, came from Savannah where he was City Manager. W. Elmer George, Executive Director of the Georgia

Municipal Association, described the contributions graduates were making across the state and in the region. Recognizing that Little's first priority was students, James B. Blackburn, Jr. presented original artwork intended for the student lounge by E. Lee Moore and Dan Thompson. J. J. Industries of Dalton contributed carpet to fully cover the floor of the student lounge.

But the grand finale in the evening's festivities was the presentation of a surprise gift by Mr. and Mrs. Pat Payne. Osofsky and his cohorts reasoned that the object that occupied the window of Pat Payne's liquor store in Omaha, Nebraska was the quintessential Malcolm appreciation gift. In fact, it was quite likely the only remaining object of its type, for the students had scoured the country in search of one. When contacted by Osofsky, he was reluctant to part with it, but Osofsky's relentless negotiating skills eventually convinced Mr. Payne that the recognition of his and his wife's 38th wedding anniversary in front of a large crowd in Atlanta was a sufficient *quid pro quo* for him to part with the 16 ft. Budweiser canoe (which was filled with its namesake's brew) that he presented to Little at the end of the evening.

Transition

In 1979 the Dean of the College of Architecture decided that new leadership was needed for the Planning Program's next phase of development. The Program's physical isolation from the College in the Old Civil Engineering building adjacent to the library at the center of the old campus and Malcolm Little's transparently shrouded determination to

direct the Program without much interference from an architecture Dean contributed to Dean William Fash's decision to change Program Directors.

With minimal consultation of the faculty, an oversight which undermined the new Director, the Dean hired Leon S. Eplan to direct the Program. Eplan had served as President of the American Institute of Planners and had just overseen the merger of the AIP and ASPO into the American Planning Association and the simultaneous birth of the American Institute of Certified Planners. He had a national planning practice and had served as the first Commissioner of Planning and Budget under the charter reformed Atlanta City government in the mid 1970s. He and Dr. Keating were just completing an edited book on local governance and housing costs in collaboration with the Urban Land Institute and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development when the Dean's invitation came.

While the Dean sought to draw the Planning Program more closely into the administrative hierarchy of the College, Malcolm Little had a few more maneuvers to make before he surrendered control. Professor and Director Eplan had been charged with, among other tasks, maintaining and expanding the Program's visibility regionally and nationally. Although Professor Little appeared to cooperatively cede responsibility to the new Director on some elements of Program administration, he retained responsibility for many more elements by either not revealing them or simply continuing to perform them. Eplan's speeches and legislative testimony away from the campus

provided a convenient rationale for the fact that “this form” or “that paper” had been submitted to the administration in his absence.

Eplan attempted to enlist the faculty in defining new directions for the intellectual evolution of the Program. He organized a series of retreats for the faculty and endeavored to explore new paradigms for the planning academy. The curriculum that the faculty designed through these interactions subdivided the substantive content of the field into core elements (Theory, History, Scientific Methods, Law) and two parallel foci: Development and Redevelopment. In essence, the post-core curricula would emphasize the Redevelopment of Existing Cities and New, Primarily Suburban Development. While retaining the regional context that linked the two, the former incorporated precepts of planning as management, community redevelopment, community organization and participation, and the problems and opportunities of governance in contexts of established institutions, organized polities and existing social, economic and physical infrastructure. The new Development curriculum’s foci were on development issues at the urban periphery, land use succession from rural or agricultural to urban, edge cities, planning less constrained by prior history and previous commitments, and new forms of urban development. In addition to the two primary thrusts, the curriculum retained its prior emphases in environmental (with energy added) planning, transportation planning and social policy planning. Although the new curriculum was approved by the Institute faculty, by the time it had been approved, the “facts on the ground” had changed substantially.

The Early 1980s

Segments of the faculty continued to chafe at the absence of participatory processes in Eplan's appointment and never fully accepted his Directorship, the recently deposed Director refused to be deposed, and the bottom temporarily dropped out of the society's interest in planning and governance.

The conservative juggernaut that swept Ronald Reagan into the Presidency in the 1980 election reached into the Atlanta academy. Where the preceding election of a Georgian as President had opened departmental doors in Washington for Program faculty and the affiliated CDCA, the chill of retrenchment diminished not only research funding but student interest in planning and government service. When Reagan spoke derisively of "planners, grantsmen and other middle men" in his first State of the Union address, it reflected an attitude that temporarily threatened the Program's existence. Applications had declined and only 14 students matriculated in the Fall Quarter, 1980. Despite concentrated efforts by the faculty to recruit more new students, the next year replicated the same low number of entering students. Central administrators at Tech, where the Program had always been somewhat of an anomaly, began to wonder "whither Planning?" and subsequently began a three year process that might have led to the termination of the Program and did lead to substantial changes in the Program's personnel and administration.

But before those changes began, the central administration moved to bring the Program into compliance with Institute conventions. In the spring of 1981 Dr. Frank Roper,

longtime Georgia Tech Registrar, informed the Planning faculty that their customary ignoring of Institute regulations regarding the six year matriculation-to-graduation rule would no longer be countenanced. Led by (previous) Program Director Malcolm Little, who rarely met a bureaucratic stipulation he could not think of a way to circumvent, and who put his version of students' interests at the top of his priorities, the faculty had routinely ignored the six year rule for over two decades. Between 1958 and 1980 if a former student finished a thesis option paper or a thesis more than six years after beginning the Program, a Petition to the Faculty for an exception to the six-year rule cleared the student to graduate. Rule ignored and problem solved.

Roper produced data showing that the City Planning Program, one of the smallest academic units on the campus, had accounted for an absurdly disproportionate volume of Petitions for exceptions. It is not clear whether the precarious position the Program found itself in in the conservative mood of the early 1980s had stimulated Roper's analysis and edict; but legitimate speculation connects the central administration's initiation of the program review process with the mandate to comply with the rules. Whatever the source of the new attention to the Planning Program's compliance, the Planning Program had to comply.

A call went out to all alumni who had not completed their requirements for the degree informing them of the change. The records are not complete, but it appears that approximately 14 people who had departed more than six years from starting wrote thesis option papers that spring and summer, joining another 15 or so folks who had left Tech

and for whom the six year clock was still ticking, who also produced theses or thesis option papers by August, 1981.

Resolving the compliance problem with Institute regulations reconciled Institute and Program administrative conventions, but it did not abrogate the program review process. Within the College, Professor and Director Eplan, who was not tenured, was terminated, and the cadre of Assistant and Associate Professors who had agitated for more democratic approaches to Program governance listened skeptically to the Dean's offer of a rotating Program Chair, occupied sequentially by them, to lead the Program out of what he viewed as the current malaise. Fearing the "iron hand in the velvet glove," and threatened by the central administration's moves, the junior faculty demurred, lobbying instead for a national search to replace the now departing Director. The Dean concurred and the next year the Search Committee recommended and the Dean and the administration hired Dr. David S. Sawicki away from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee as Director of the Program.

Dr. Sawicki, the first PhD to direct the Program, arrived in the Fall 1983 with both the mandate and the determination to reshape the Program according to the values of the contemporary academy, the central tenets of which were increased scholarship, expanded extramural (funded) research and a reconstituted faculty consonant with these values. The three faculty without PhD degrees (Little, Gould and Rupnow) were pushed into other endeavors: Little was forced into retirement, Rupnow moved into the central

administration and Gould's part-time teaching assignment was terminated, so he expanded his consulting firm.

New hires were slated to replace those faculty and any of the remaining professors who were not in accord with the realigned focus. In 1984 Sawicki and the faculty redesigned the curriculum to emphasize a core of regional theory (the substantive content of which emphasized regional economics), heightened methodological competency and concentrations in transportation planning, environmental and land use planning, land development (including real estate) planning, economic development and urban design.

Dr. David Arbeit joined the faculty as a Research Scholar in 1983 under a central administration funded research development program which seeded the position and then provided decreasing support over a three year period. Dr. Anthony Catanese returned to Tech from Pratt Institute in 1984 in a similarly funded position. Dr. Michael Elliott joined the faculty in an academic position that same fall and Dr. John Landis was hired as an Assistant Professor later in 1984. Dr. Debo expanded his externally funded water resources planning contracts. With the Reagan-era demise of domestic funding for housing and community development, Professor Keating shifted his research and some of his teaching foci to international development planning and began a five year program of research and faculty exchanges with academic and research institutions in India in 1984. In 1985 he secured funding from the Urban Land Institute for a three-year program to redesign the real estate and land development concentration. Jay Stein moved on to Chair the graduate and undergraduate planning programs at the State University of New

York-Buffalo in 1986, and Dr. Catherine Ross moved partially out of the Program to direct the College's PhD Program in 1987. Dr. Carla Robinson was hired as an Assistant Professor in 1987 and Dr. Erik Ferguson in 1988.

A tumultuous five years reorganized and refocused the Program on more narrowly and precisely defined concentrations. Despite the substantial shifts in personnel, the arrivals and departures canceled out, and the faculty remained a ten person Program. All of the faculty held PhDs and, over a longer time, the externally funded research program expanded to become the most substantially funded academic and research unit in the College.