Chapter 1

**Introduction**

Building global integration in planning scholarship

*Bruce Stiftel and Vanessa Watson*

In the fall of 1985, Patsy Healey of the University of Newcastle and Klaus Kunzmann of the University of Dortmund sat in a restaurant in Atlanta, USA, discussing the potential for a new pan-European affiliation of urban planning schools. Unbeknownst to them, similar conversations about the value of learned societies for planning were taking place that fall in Brazil; others had recently concluded in France. These conversations were to lead to a quantum leap in communication among urban planning educators worldwide. Today, the Planning Schools Movement has the potential to facilitate growth and maturation of scholarship in urban planning in ways that could not have been imagined 20 years ago. This volume is a significant step in that movement.

Healey and Kunzmann were in the United States for the 27th annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP). This was only the sixth such meeting that featured presentation of scholarly papers, as opposed to discussions of institutional issues facing university programmes. ACSP had begun as a vehicle for department chairs and deans to share tactics and develop common projects that might advance the interests of planning education within universities, as had the Association of Canadian University Planning Programs (ACUPP), begun in neighboring Canada in 1974. Then, in the late 1970s, the ACSP leadership debated stepping beyond those boundaries and working directly to improve the quality of scholarship in the field. ACSP president Ed McClure, vice-president Jay Chatterjee and others, had to push hard to convince the elected leadership that an independent scholarly conference and a journal devoted to planning education would be feasible. Both these projects began in 1980. By the mid-1980s, ACSP had 86 full member schools and its own journal with over 800 subscribers, and was a partner with the national professional institute in the accreditation of planning schools (Chatterjee 1986).

So, when Healey and Kunzmann sat down over steak dinner in 1985, they had observed several days in which 348 urban planning researchers (ACSP 2000a: 5–3) presented, contrasted and questioned their research. The impact was obvious. A venue that permitted serious discussion of research and pedagogy in planning, absence of the incessant calls for immediate policy relevance that characterize most professional conferences in a practice-based field like urban planning, was
leading to meaningful improvements in research design and the quality of theory. It seemed that it might be possible to build a discipline of urban and regional planning that could sustain a rigorous level of growth in ideas, that could hold its own in university assessments of performance, and that could foster innovation in professional practice based on realistic, empirically-grounded but theoretically informed scholarship. Could this happen in Europe? Healey and Kunzmann thought it must.

Fifteen months later, 12 European planning academics met at Castle Cappenberg in Germany’s Ruhr valley to found the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP). Dieter Bökermann from the Technical University in Vienna, Andreas Faludi of the University of Amsterdam, Dieter Frick of the Technical University in Berlin, Jean-Claude Hauvuy of the University of Paris VIII, Luigi Mazza of the Politecnico in Milan, Giorgio Piccinato of the University Institute of Architecture in Venice, Willy Schmid of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, René Perrin of the University of Tours, and Gerd Hennings and Michael Wegener from the University of Dortmund, joined Healey and Kunzmann at Cappenberg. Kwasi Ardakwa from Ghana also participated in the discussions. The group imagined that a pan-European learned society of planners could foster an increased appreciation for the value of planning as a discipline, and could enable national communities of planners to learn from each other across the continent. Programs for exchange of scholars could be arranged; a journal could be developed. Officers were selected, and in the next months, incorporation papers prepared, so that when formal membership was opened in October 1987, 67 schools of planning from 21 countries became original members. That
November, over 100 scholars met in AESOP’s first congress in Amsterdam, chaired by Andreas Faludi. It had taken just two years for a pan-European association of planning academics to move from notion to reality (Kunzmann 1998).

In Brazil, 1985 was a time of social pressure for re-democratization. In the aftermath of over 20 years of military control of government, Brazil’s planning schools found themselves between pressures for technocratic control of urbanization and critical interpretation of the social realities of urban life. The national Council of Urban Development was pushing for a clear national agenda for cities and wanted the five urban planning schools to play significant roles. Not everyone in the schools was comfortable with the implied directions. When the Council proposed to assess the state of the art in technology, planning and the built environment, the schools knew they needed to respond.

Lucio Grinover at the Federal University in São Paulo took the initiative to bring representatives of the five Brazilian postgraduate planning programs together. The meeting in São Paulo included Martim Smolka of the Federal University in Rio de Janeiro, Ricardo Fariet of the University of Brasilia, Warama Parizza of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul in Porto Alegre and Guillerme Varella of the Federal University of Pernambuco in Recife. They recognized that, if the schools were to be effective as independent voices, they would have to band together. In São Paulo, they named themselves as the provisional board of a new association of urban planning programs, and committed to preparing by-laws.

In 1986, Smolka hosted an open meeting of planning academics in Rio de Janeiro, for what became the formal creation of ANPUR, the National Association of Urban and Regional Postgraduate and Research Programs. With 40 persons in attendance, the group hammered out by-laws in a meeting that lasted until three in the morning. The underlying sentiment was that school curricula should be determined in the schools and that planning needed to have an identity that could not be manipulated by the authorities. As a result, in 1988, when ANPUR held its first official national meeting in Terasópolis, it was prepared to respond to a new government program for rating all postgraduate schools that would determine future funding levels (Smolka 2004).

French planning schools were no strangers to stress in the mid-1980s. As early as 1982, national institutional reforms had led to challenges in the authority of urban planners, retrenchment from many of the social aspects of public policies championed by planners, and re-definition in universities that tied planning to secondary status. Seven French planning programs responded to these challenges by creating an association in May 1984. APERAU, the Association for the Development of Planning Education and Research, was founded by the planning institutes at the universities of Aix-Marseille III, Grenoble II, Lyon II, Paris VIII, Paris XII, and Tours, and the Paris Institute of Political Study, to promote
the discipline, reflect the interests of the schools, and facilitate cooperation with professional bodies (Motte 1991).

The 1980s forces prompting creation of AESOP, ANPUR and APERAU, and stimulating ACSP to branch beyond its early charter, are consistent, if regionally distinct. As the ideas of the Reagan–Thatcher revolution developed, supplanting Keynesianism, urban planning came under considerable pressure in many nations. Schools connected to the profession experienced lowered student demand, and reductions in opportunity for funded work. At the same time, universities were increasingly attentive to unit productivity and many planning schools found themselves under criticism, if not outright threat. The twin incentives of organization to combat national challenges to the planning profession, and integration to promote better scholarship that might lead to stronger positions within universities, led planning schools on three continents to independently create or strengthen school associations. By the end of the 1980s, the Planning Schools Movement was an idea whose time had come.

Since 1990, the number of associations linking urban planning schools has continued to increase. The Asian Planning Schools Association (APSA) was formed in 1993, following a successful pan-Asian conference in Tokyo convened by Sadao Watanabe of the University of Tokyo in 1991, and a similar event in Hong Kong convened by Anthony Yeh of the University of Hong Kong in 1993. APSA’s original membership included 19 schools in 15 countries (Asian Planning Schools Association 2004).

The Australian and New Zealand Association of Planning Schools (ANZAPS) began with a resolution taken on 7 July 1995 at a national meeting of Australian planning schools hosted by Jeremy Dawkins at the University of Technology, Sydney. This momentum for the association was built at two workshops in 1994 hosted by Martin Payne and Greg Mills at the University of Sydney and by C. Tong Wu at the Queensland University of Technology. The several dozen participants in these meetings believed that the small size of Australian planning schools necessitated better communication among the nation’s planning faculty. They also wanted to find a way to provide input into a review of education policy underway by the Royal Australian Planning Institute. ANZAPS chose less formal organization than the other planning schools associations existing at the time: it has no constitution, no elected officers, nor formal membership criteria, but rather prides itself on its status as a peer-to-peer network (Witherby 2004).

The Association of Latin-American Schools of Urbanism and Planning (ALEUP) began in 1999 with five member schools in Argentina, Mexico and Venezuela. Roberto Rodriguez of Simon Bolivar University (Venezuela), hosted a meeting in Caracas in September, called for the purpose of founding the association, which had been under informal discussion since 1995. Antonio Ruiz
Tenorio of the Benemerita Autonomous University in Puebla, Lucia Andrade of the Autonomous University of Aguacalientes, Alberto Villar of the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, Juan Lombardo of the General Sarmiento National University, and Rodriguez sought a mechanism to address the void in communication across national boundaries among planning academics in Central and South America (Rodriguez 2004).

Just two years ago, a new association was created linking planning schools in sub-Saharan Africa. This association followed from discussions beginning in 1999 in Dar-es-Salaam during a PhD workshop funded, in part, by the Danish Danida Foundation. Staff from the planning school at the University of Dar-es-Salaam, including Tumsifu Nnkya, were joined by Kofi Diaw from Komasi University in Ghana and Vanessa Watson from the University of Cape Town. They discussed the often inappropriateness of African planning school curricula for the African context, and sought to use Danida funding to support efforts to address such issues through a network of planning academics. Danida funding did not materialize, but through contacts with other planning school associations, the idea of the ANZAPS model of peer-to-peer networking emerged, and in 2002, 16 schools in 10 countries agreed to become founding members of the Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS).

Nineteen years after Healey and Kunzmann dined in Atlanta, AESOP has 141 full and associate member schools in 29 countries, draws as many as 400 scholars to its annual congress, sponsors European Planning Studies, and has served as the conduit for European Union student and scholar exchange and curricular development. Its PhD student summer workshops, begun in 1991, are thought to have led to great strides in bridging the academic cultures of the various European nations and language groups.

ANPUR has grown to 32 institutional members. Its most recent biennial conference in May 2003 drew 550 persons to Belo Horizonte. The association publishes Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais, has fostered a national identity among urban planning students, has opened up international linkages for Brazilian planning scholars, and has prevented the creation of a national planning school entrance exam.

APERAU has 23 members in four French-speaking countries. It hosts an annual conference, conducts research, and represents the French planning schools to university and government authorities involved with accreditation, school organization and European integration.

ACSP has 99 full and affiliate member schools in the US, publishes the Journal of Planning Education and Research, draws as many as 900 persons to its annual conference, conducts a biennial administrators conference and an annual workshop for doctoral students, is a partner in school accreditation, and has committees active in a variety of curricular, institutional and faculty interest areas.
APSA has 19 members schools in 13 countries, conducts a biennial congress, most recently drawing 199 presenters to Hanoi. ANZAPS has active faculty in a dozen universities in Australia and New Zealand and is actively considering expansion to Papua New Guinea and other island Pacific nations. Its annual conference draws about 100. ALEUP has ten member schools and sponsors two conferences each year. Leaders of ACUPP’s 16 member schools meet annually in conjunction with the conference of the Canadian Institute of Planners. AAPS has 16 member schools.

Also in these past 19 years, the world’s planning school associations have begun to do things together. In 1991, AESOP and ACSP held a joint congress in England. In 1997, ANPUR sent a delegation of 27 scholars to the ACSP conference in Florida. Most notably, in 2001, four planning school associations joined together to hold the first World Planning Schools Congress (WPSC) in Shanghai. This successful congress, organized by Tongji University, drew 650 planning scholars from over 250 planning schools in 60 countries.

In Shanghai, leaders of ten planning school associations met to exchange information about their organizations and to discuss the potential for further cooperation. They shared information, discussed common objectives and possible future actions. The discussions were diplomatic, with a spirit of good will and a sense of historic purpose. They reflected considerable differences among the associations: national and multi-national; formal and informal; old and new; well-
financed and poorly financed. They considered the potential for future world congresses, mechanisms for internet linkages and other electronic communication, publication of joint scholarship, communications among persons with similar functions in the various regions, advocacy of the visibility of planning, and student exchanges. At the conclusions of the meetings, they unanimously agreed to what has become known as the Shanghai Statement, signed by representatives of all ten associations at the closing ceremony of the Shanghai Congress. This statement reads:

Representatives of national and international planning education associations gathered at Tongji University in Shanghai and agreed on the goal of increasing mutual communication in order to improve the quality and visibility of planning and planning education. To achieve this, it was agreed to establish a global planning education association network and committees to plan holding the second World Planning Schools Congress and to develop an inclusive communication network.

The Shanghai Statement was subsequently formally endorsed by nine of the associations, each of which sent representatives to a first meeting of the Global Planning Association Network (GPEAN) in conjunction with the AESOP Congress in Volos, Greece in July 2002. In Greece, the GPEAN delegates crafted an action program and agreed to principles for operation of the network; officers were selected. Ten months later in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, in conjunction with an ANPUR Congress, a charter was developed, which has since been ratified by all nine founding member associations. The GPEAN charter sets up two standing committees: a coordinating committee, now chaired by Angus Witherby of ANZAPS, and a World Congress Steering Committee, co-chaired by Louis Albrechts of AESOP, Johanna Looye of ACSP, and Zhiqiang Wu of APSA. All together, the associations linked in GPEAN represent over 350 planning schools on all six continents.

This volume, the first in a series of books presenting selections of quality urban planning scholarship from each of the world’s regions, originated with discussions in Shanghai. The discourse among scholars from the various countries represented at the first world congress demonstrated that much of the work planning scholars do is not known outside their home countries. The benefits of expanding our scholarly discourse to the global scale were seen as potentially very powerful. Face-to-face conferences were an important step, but other methods would be equally valued. They left Shanghai hoping to find ways to expand the sharing of published scholarship. In Volos the idea was honed, and in Belo Horizonte, Routledge was chosen as publisher and an international editorial board was named.
Each association formed its own editorial committee and made submissions in its own fashion. Most associations solicited open nominations and a jury chose the selections to put forward. In some associations, this meant putting forward the winner of a standing competition, such as AESOP’s Prize Paper award and ACSP’s Chester Rapkin and JAPA Best Paper awards. APSA selected its submissions from among the papers presented at its 2003 congress in Hanoi. APERAU chose not to submit for this first volume, but is committed to making submissions for the second volume to be published in 2006. In the final round, papers to be published were chosen by the international editorial board from among the submissions from the eight associations.

Looking back on the history of the various associations, the first World Planning Schools Congress, and the birth of GPEAN, it is clear that the Planning Schools Movement serves important scholarly and institutional purposes. Planning scholarship and planning education have been weaker because of the relative isolation of the various schools and the various national corps of planning educators. Cooperation, first nationally and regionally, and now globally, has made us stronger and has the potential to make us much stronger still.

As a relatively small profession, it has been difficult for us to have rich debates about our scholarship – debates informed by a variety of perspectives and many active research projects. In the USA, for instance, there are about 800 full-time planning faculty and ACSP’s Guide lists 36 distinct areas of study (ACSP 2000b). That works out to 22 full-time faculties per area of study nationwide. This is often too few for effective discourse. In other countries, of course, the numbers are smaller still. Communication across borders is increasing the size of the groups of investigators who are aware of each other’s work, resulting in more robust debates.

As a profession with widely disparate traditions and broad interdisciplinary connections, we have significant differences across national boundaries. International comparisons force us to re-evaluate our national decisions about the structure and nature of our discipline and to understand better why we choose to do what we do, and the way we do it.

As a profession entangled with national legal and institutional structures, our scholarship has often lacked variation in key variables. Communication across national boundaries has the potential to increase variation in our scholarship and to therefore reduce the level of assumption which we must use in our work.

Finally, given the extent of difficulty planning schools often have explaining their purposes and justifying their cost structures within universities, the growth of international cooperation allows us to gain new ideas about how to effectively represent our accomplishments and our purposes to our own institutional leaders.

International cooperation brings difficulties, of course. The various corps of planning scholars are as different in outlook and resources as the cultures they
represent. Centuries of colonial history leave no shortage of concerns about exportation of hegemonic views. But, the early experience of GPEAN cooperation suggests that these fears need not dominate our interactions. The spirit of GPEAN’s development has been one of cooperation and sensitivity. We have moved slowly in recognition of the need to respect different views, different decision cultures and different resources of the various associations. We have undertaken only that which is in harmony with the needs of all the associations. We have consciously adopted principles of exchange. These first steps position us as colleagues joined together to explore a common future.

So many times in Oxford, Toronto, Shanghai and Leuven, sites of the various multi-association congresses, we heard scholars exclaim surprise at alternative approaches used to study the very issues they study, by people they previously did not know existed. So often we have heard complaints that whole journals exist in one country, that students and teachers in other countries do not know about. So often we hear frustrations about the limitations in international exchange posed by language differences and differences in educational systems. The Dialogues project is a small but significant step toward remediation of global isolation in planning scholarship.

Global themes

The chapters in this volume indicate some key themes in current international planning scholarship. Significantly, while these contributions come from very different parts of the world, and while some authors stress the particularity of their context, it appears that certain planning issues and concerns are common across a wide range of countries. The emerging commonalities, we would suggest, make the task of bringing together these regional contributions both an interesting and a necessary one.

Three central themes are identified here. A first theme has to do with the relationship between planning and economy. Grant’s article (Chapter 2) focuses on a common and contemporary planning strategy: the promotion of mixed urban land use in order to achieve more accessible, efficient and sustainable cities. Using empirical material from Canadian cities, she finds that while the policy and legal environment has been changed to facilitate mix, important cultural and economic barriers continue to promote the separation of land uses and social groupings. Searle (Chapter 3) also explores an attempt by planning to intervene in an urban economy. He analyzes the impact of the construction of two large stadiums for the Olympic Games in Sydney, Australia. Both were developed in partnership with government on the grounds that they would generate wider economic benefits for the city. In commenting on the lack of financial viability of
the stadiums and the questionable economic impacts of the investments, Searle points to planning’s increasing subordination to market forces in a context of economic uncertainty, and hence planning processes that are more reactive, short-term and unpredictable in their consequences.

The article by Lombardo, Di Virgilio and Fernández (Chapter 4), which analyzes the shaping of urban land use by forces of capital in Buenos Aires, echoes the conclusions of the other two articles in this group. Space is being shaped by market forces, causing a fragmentation of the city and isolation of lower-income people. Upper-income residential forms increasingly occur in gated villages and country clubs, while the excluded or devalued zones of the city are left to the public sector and the poor. Private capital, and not government or planning, has become the main organizer of the city.

The second theme evident in these articles is that of environment and conservation. The Dolman, Lovett, O’Riordan and Cobb article (Chapter 5) describes a ‘whole-landscape’ approach to rural management in Britain that ensures conservation and the enhancement of biodiversity in farmed landscapes. Drawing on the emerging discipline of landscape ecology, they consider how the structure and juxtaposition of landscape elements affects their function in terms of ecosystem processes, resilience to change, the regulation of environmental quality and the dynamics of species assemblages and individual populations. Zhang’s article (Chapter 6), concerned with the rapidly changing urban setting of Shanghai, looks at the common problem of balancing needs for conservation with the management of urban regeneration. Drawing on case study material, Zhang shows how China’s incomplete urban conservation policy framework, and the lack of a theoretical foundation to conservation efforts, results in insufficiently effective planning tools, difficulties in countering pressure from both the market and other local government departments, and variable interpretations by different agents of how landscapes should change.

The article by Acevedo (Chapter 7) takes as its subject the process of ecological-economic zoning in the Brazilian Amazon region, but he uses this to explore the theoretical issue of the use of planning as a means of surveillance and control of people and territory. Drawing on the theoretical resources of Foucault and de Certeau he highlights the gap between the conception of space informing the planning process and the lived reality within that space. Planning in this case forms a mechanism through which power can be exercised, and its effectiveness in protecting environment and livelihoods has been minimal.

The third theme of the collection gathers together those articles primarily concerned with the nature of planning processes and decision-making. An important issue in all of these contributions is that of how to manage, or how to understand, consensus-seeking decision-making processes in contexts character-
ized by multiple stakeholders and interest groups, and increasingly, by cultural diversity as well.

Umemoto (Chapter 8) and Bollens (Chapter 9) both begin their pieces with a common concern: the problem of participation in situations of cultural diversity, and communication across culture-based epistemologies. Both address the US planning profession, yet both are drawing on empirical material on cross-cultural planning efforts from very different parts of the world: Umemoto from Hawai‘i and Bollens from three ‘polarized’ cities – Belfast, Jerusalem and Johannesburg. Both authors draw attention to the need for planning to accommodate difference, and to develop methods and epistemologies that can bridge the gap between different worldviews. Jamal, Stein and Harper (Chapter 10) offer planning practitioners and theorists a way around multi-stakeholder and multicultural dilemmas. They consider how a neopragmatic approach to collaborative planning, in a situation involving nature-based tourism in a remote region of Canada, could have avoided conflict between stakeholders. Neopragmatism suggests an interactive, learning-based approach to planning under conflict, where term definitions and categories are not imposed on participants but are left to evolve over time through debate. Watson (Chapter 11) tackles this issue from a different perspective, and asks how appropriate are current normative theories of planning which deal with communication and multiculturalism, and with equitable city form, in the very different context of Africa. She concludes that while these theories have value, they are all based on assumptions about culture, economy and place that do not hold in this very different context.

Two further articles make important theoretical contributions to the planning themes of difference, communication and consensus. Sandercock (Chapter 12) advocates the use of stories in planning: as a way of gaining mutual understanding (particularly between people with different worldviews); as a way of communicating and debating; as a form of persuasion and policy shaping; and as a way of teaching. Stories, she suggests, can form the basis of both an epistemology and a methodology that is particularly appropriate to planning in the contemporary world. Mantysalo’s (Chapter 13) article is aimed at criticizing the currently hegemonic position in planning theory: critical planning theory, which draws on Habermas for its theoretical base and which has informed communicative and collaborative planning action. He asks if critical planning theory can really be considered a new paradigm in planning and concludes that it should be seen as no more than a partial theory of legitimacy in participatory planning. It fails to acknowledge the presence of power in all planning actions and fails to inform the organizing, problem-shaping and problem-solving aspects that are central to any planning process.

This collection of articles, which has emerged from selection processes at
both regional and global level, creates the opportunity to consider what the planning community currently regards as ‘good scholarship’. The Dialogues International Editorial Board did not set standard criteria for selection by the associations, but it became clear as the articles were assembled that there are commonalities in terms of what is regarded as a good article.

In the first instance they are all contemporary and speak to current and pressing regional concerns in planning. Thus it is not surprising that many of the contributions from the United States, Canada and Europe show a concern with decision-making processes in planning in the context of increasing multiculturalism and multi-stakeholder societies, as it is these parts of the world which represent the destinations for the largest global migration flows. Similarly, it is not surprising that in those parts of the world that have been experiencing rapid urban growth and change, there are concerns about the ability of planning to protect local heritage and environmental resources, to create more accessible and sustainable cities, and to accommodate the poor in the face of strong and often global market forces.

A second characteristic is the ability to ground an argument in an analysis of concrete practice, and to link this analysis to a broader theoretical debate. Such practice can be illustrative of a more general argument that is being made, or can itself generate new theoretical propositions. Many of the articles use this methodology to produce new understanding, and the Sandercock article fits well with these in suggesting the use of stories as a way of gaining and presenting situated knowledge.

Following from the above, a third characteristic of the good scholarship represented here is a familiarity with broader theoretical debates in the field of concern. The articles here all indicate a good knowledge of relevant literature and an understanding of the need to be able to frame current debates and then to take them forward. For some of the authors, assembling such debates has meant crossing language and geographical divides, but the rewards for testing ideas outside of their original context are certainly high.

A final issue to be explored here is the extent to which thinking about planning in various parts of the world is cross-connected and integrated. We argue here that such integration in scholarship is something to be fostered as it exposes all of us to the widest possible range of ideas and debates, and allows us to better understand the complexity and diversity of situations in which planners find themselves. One rather simple way of gauging the extent of cross-connection is to examine the literature sources cited by various authors, and the degree to which these sources are geographically local or more widespread. A quick scan of the literature sources used by the authors in this volume suggests that while there may be common themes and issues that connect them, the integration of intellectual traditions and ideas is partial.
The chapters in this volume indicate a tendency for authors to draw primarily on local sources. This is particularly true of authors in regions with good publishing outlets for planning scholars, efficient marketing and distribution networks for planning literature, and larger concentrations of planning academics. North America and Europe fit these criteria, as does South America (where planning is part of a broader urbanism field). Authors from regions less well equipped in these terms may have little option but to look elsewhere both for intellectual input and publishing opportunities. Africa, for example, does not have a single supra-national, dedicated, planning journal, and Australia and New Zealand are only a little better off. This gives rise to a degree of (uni-directional) integration, but there may be little incentive for authors from literature-rich regions to reciprocate, unless they are drawing on case material from these other parts of the world. Both the Bollens and Umemoto chapters fall into this category.

Authors also draw on local sources when language barriers prevent them from accessing literatures more widely. The Zhang chapter, originally produced in Chinese, is a good example of a breach of this barrier, allowing the author to draw on the extensive British literature on heritage management. But there is little evidence of English-speaking authors drawing on literature sources produced by other language groups, and little evidence of authors crossing barriers between languages other than English.

It is in relation to the overcoming of such barriers that the GPEAN publishing project is intended to play an important role. The aim is to make available best scholarship from whatever source languages, to English-speaking readers, and to use both websites and publishers to make the contents of the book available in languages other than English. The promotion and distribution of this material through the organizational structures of the nine planning school associations which make up GPEAN will help to make this wide-ranging material available in parts of the world where it would not normally be accessible, and will, it is hoped, help to make intellectual connections which will integrate and enrich the body of planning scholarship.

The growth of the Planning Schools Movement onto a global stage offers potential to reduce the problems of scholarly isolation in urban planning, and to build a stronger, more rigorous, richer profession of urban planning. This volume is a significant step in the very young global history of planning schools cooperation. We hope that you will find these papers stimulating and that they will suggest new directions, bibliographically, methodologically, theoretically or substantively, that will lead directly or indirectly, to improvements in your own work, changes in your schools and improvements in the practice of urban planning in your communities.
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