MIT Open Access Articles

A Planners' Planner: John Friedmann's Quest for a General Theory of Planning

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A Planners' Planner: John Friedmann's quest for a general theory of planning

Bish Sanyal

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This paper honors the memory of Professor John Friedmann by reflecting on his professional contributions in two ways. First, the paper provides an overview of Friedmann's career as a planner and planning academic, which spanned six decades and three continents, and highlights how a confluence of factors led to a paradigm shift in his thinking regarding the role of planning in social transformation. Second, the paper assesses Friedmann's position on three issues of importance for practitioners—namely, problem formulation, the role of technical knowledge, and organizational learning. The paper concludes that the establishment of UCLA's planning program is a testament to Friedmann's critical view of planning practice, which posed fundamental challenges to conventional thinking. His publications were more inspirational than pragmatic, but they will continue to influence planning deliberations, as normative ideas underpin most planning efforts.

Introduction

Professor John Friedmann, the recipient of many professional awards in urban and regional planning, died on June 11, 2017, at the age of 91. He has been called "the greatest planning scholar of the twentieth century, and undoubtedly so in the field of planning theory" (Healey, 2011, p. xi). His death evoked praise and gratitude not only from the faculty and students at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), where he served as the founding director of the Urban Planning Department and taught for 27 years, but also worldwide—in Canada, Europe, Latin America, and Asia[1].

As Friedmann's student, my initial reaction to his death was to remain silent in grief. Later, a note from Dr. Sandra Rosenbloom, the editor of the *Journal of the American Planning Association (JAPA)*, to Friedmann's doctoral students inspired me to reflect on his professional contributions. Since much has already been written about Friedmann's contribution to planning theory[2], this paper probes how Friedmann's actual planning experience shaped his critical thinking about planning practice.

I have organized my overview of Friedmann's intellectual journey spanning sixty-two years (1955-2017) in two parts. In the first part, I provide a chronological record of his career, highlighting the stark paradigm shift in his thinking that had occurred by 1968. This shift resulted from a confluence of factors, both personal and professional, in a variety of organizational settings, at a time of social upheavals both in the U.S. and abroad.

In the second part, I distill from Friedmann's numerous publications his changing views on three concepts which may be of interest to planning practitioners: problem formulation; the role of technical knowledge in decision making; and how to create social learning systems which can best respond to intractable planning problems. Even though Friedmann is known as a planning theorist, he was concerned about practice, particularly how effective planning action required a

symbiotic relationship between professionals and citizens—that is, between professionals' codified knowledge and citizens' tacit knowledge. The paper assesses the applicability of Friedmann's views, highlighting his normative intention regarding how to formulate problems, how to ground technical knowledge in political understanding; and how to achieve social transformation through social learning and social mobilization.

I conclude with brief remarks regarding the continued relevance of Friedmann's thinking for planning theorists, practitioners, and educators. Even though contemporary planning context may be significantly different from that of the 1960s, when Friedmann willingly embraced a paradigm shift in his thinking, his insights about what constitutes good planning practice and how to educate practitioners for such practice will continue to influence planning deliberations.

Part I: Friedmann's Career: Planned or Forces of Circumstance?

Early Years

John Friedmann's planning vocation began at the University of Chicago (1949-1955), where the Committee on Social Thought had created a new interdisciplinary program. Until then, planning programs in other universities had been located within schools of architecture. The University of Chicago did not have a school of either architecture or engineering, so the new program was housed with social sciences and, hence, had a social science slant in the curriculum from the beginning (Sarbib, 1983). Rexford Tugwell, the founding dean, was a strong advocate for public planning. He had recruited eminent social scientists, including Harvey Perloff, who chaired Friedmann's doctoral dissertation committee. At Chicago, Friedmann was exposed to a broad definition of planning and read classical social scientists and philosophers, such as Karl Mannheim, Martin Buber, and Hannah Arendt, who strongly influenced his thinking about the power of planning to guide society. Tugwell (1939) believed that planning could become "a fourth branch of government," along with the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary branches. It is not surprising, therefore, that Friedmann had an expansive view of planning, one that was not restricted merely to city planning.

Friedmann's view of planning, however, was relatively pragmatic under the guidance of Harvey Perloff, a thoughtful but mainstream economist (Perloff, 1985a). Perloff's research was rooted in specific geographical contexts, be they cities or regions. His analysis was based on rigorous but conventional theories of urban and regional development built on neoclassical economics[3]. Friedmann's doctoral dissertation focused on how to utilize the new Tennessee Valley Authority, a river basin–based institutional innovation, for regional growth (Friedmann, 1955).

When Friedmann began his career, planning was widely accepted as predominantly a governmental activity. Private firms, incentivized by public policies, were to join with the government to provide utilities, create employment, and so on. No one was advocating then that "civil society" could serve as a key actor in public planning. Friedmann believed in the New Deal. He argued that it was government's responsibility to protect "the public interest" (Friedmann, 2015).

After graduation, Friedmann took an assignment as an advisor to the Organization of American States (OAS), an entity created to protect North American ideals and interests in the Cold War between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. He was based in Brazil for three years (1955-1958). From Brazil, he moved to South Korea, where he served as an advisor to the U.S. Operations Mission (USOM) and began to think about the ways in which spatial planning could facilitate

economic development (Friedmann, 2017). With China, North Korea, and Cuba having turned communist by 1958, the threat to democracy seemed large. Friedmann's concern at that moment was about spatial policies that would strengthen democracy and market-based economic growth.

As a North American advisor to sovereign governments, Friedmann had the opportunity to think about macro issues without the daily demands of bureaucratic work and political infightings that usually preoccupy local planners. He began to explore national development policies, going beyond his earlier work on regional planning in the U.S. (Friedmann, 2017)[4]. As an advisor, he did not have to answer routine questions about who was to implement what, in what time-frame, and with what resources, or worry about political support for his ideas. What concerned him was systemic issues, such as how political-economic trends in both Brazil and South Korea were showing signs of sliding into authoritarian regimes. He strongly believed in democracy, having witnessed, first-hand, the destructive power of authoritarian regimes in Europe[5]. Even though this experience had a lasting impact on his political thinking, he did not write about it at that time.

Friedmann's first academic appointment was at MIT, in 1961, as assistant professor of regional planning in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP). DUSP was assembling a team, as part of the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, to plan a new city in Venezuela, Ciudad Guayana. Friedmann's familiarity with Latin America and his doctoral research on regional planning made him perfectly suited for the job.

Friedmann was a prolific writer from the beginning of his career. He had published his dissertation on Tennessee Valley Authority as a book (1955). At MIT, he collaborated with William Alonso, who was then at Harvard, to coedit a volume on regional planning (Friedmann & Alonso, 1964), a book that set the intellectual ground for much of the writings on regional planning that followed. Also, by 1966, Friedmann had completed the draft of his second book on regional development in Venezuela (Friedmann, 1966) and published several articles in prominent journals[6].

A close reading of Friedmann's early publications indicates his eagerness to formulate a general theory of planning as a societal guidance mechanism. As a student at the University of Chicago, a course on planning theory, taught by Edward Banfield, had left a strong impression on his mind, even though he felt that Banfield's focus on planning as decision making was limited. Friedmann wanted to imbue planning with normative concerns of the kind raised by Mannheim, Arendt, Buber, and others with a philosophical bent of mind. In a way, Friedmann was trying to develop a counter argument to other Austrian philosophers, like Friedrich Hayek and Karl Popper, who had warned against the totalitarian tendencies of planning in the Soviet Union. This had led him to teach a course on planning theory in Brazil, right after his graduation. But, the course was not well received by students, and Friedmann himself grew critical of his first attempt at teaching planning theory (Friedmann, 1973). Nevertheless, he returned to the topic at MIT, even though he was discouraged by senior colleagues, like Lloyd Rodwin, Alan Altshuler, and Kevin Lynch, who were skeptical about grand claims that planning could serve as an all-encompassing societal guidance mechanism.

Friedmann disagreed with Rodwin and also Martin Meyerson, who co-led the MIT-Harvard Center's planning of Ciudad Guayana, at two levels. First, he wanted to explore macro issues, such as the city's relationship to national development strategies, similar to how he had formerly analyzed spatial development strategies in Brazil and South Korea. In contrast, Rodwin proposed to focus on the urban economy and how its growth could be facilitated by good design principles. Rodwin did not want to study the interconnections among multiple spatial scales because he believed that such as an analysis would lead to unimplementable recommendations.

Second, Friedmann wanted a spatial framework which would directly address questions of regional inequality, a problem that he feared would be exacerbated by focusing resources on only the one city of Ciudad Guayana. In contrast, Rodwin believed that selective investment only in growing regions was a more pragmatic approach.

Friedmann argued for a central role of planning, while Rodwin, Meyerson, Banfield, and Altshuler were deeply skeptical about the autonomous powers of public planning in democratic societies—particularly in the U.S. with its unique constitution which limited government's power to plan the economy. Meyerson and Banfield (1955) had described the limits of technocratic planning in their seminal book on Chicago's public housing project. Research by Herbert Simon (1972) and Charles Lindblom (1959) had demonstrated how planning organizations do not really practice synoptic planning—that is, to consider all possible solutions. Their research emphasized how understanding organizational limitations may be more important for planners than their normative claims to protect public interest, singlehandedly.

The argument about who was best equipped to articulate public interest is captured well in Friedmann's scholarly debate with political scientist Alan Altshuler (published in *JAPA*). Friedmann (1965) had laid out an elaborate proposal of how a city should plan for future growth with professional planners playing a leadership role to protect public interest. In contrast, Altshuler (1965) had argued that in democratic societies with multiple points of view, planners had no exclusive professional expertise to speak on behalf of the public interest.

Friedmann's disagreement with leading thinkers in the field—in particular, with Lloyd Rodwin, who headed MIT's planning program—led to his decision to leave MIT when he was denied promotion to the rank of tenured professor. This was a turning point. Friedmann became more determined to pursue his belief in planning theory as well as his distinct approach to regional planning. Nobel Laureate Gunnar Myrdal's research (1957) on regional inequalities had validated Friedmann's concern about uneven development. And his conviction that planning theory was an emerging field of scholarly inquiry never received support from Rodwin, who believed in organizational theory—not planning theory. By the mid-1960s, however, as the Civil Rights movement began to spread across the nation, normative questions of the kind Friedmann wanted planning theory to address no longer seemed to be utopian. As a result, Friedmann did not become intellectually insecure when he was denied tenure; in fact, this moment energized him to pursue more forcefully what he believed development and planning should be.

An assignment by the Ford Foundation to serve as an advisor to the National Planning Office in Santiago, Chile, provided Friedmann with the opportunity to distance himself, both spatially and intellectually, from MIT. In Chile, he advised the central government to deconcentrate Santiago by spatial distribution of economic activities. He also taught at the Catholic University of Chile. Chile was in political turmoil at that moment. The Ford Foundation was aware of serious threat to Chilean government from Marxist political parties. The Chilean experience made Friedmann skeptical of conventional policies of spatial deconcentration as Santiago's population increased steadily. But his concern about regional inequality and the need for normative planning theory solidified further as he taught advanced seminars on both topics at the Catholic University of Chile. Friedmann was awarded an honorary doctorate by the Catholic University as he was planning to return to the U.S. and direct a new planning program at UCLA. By then, he was convinced that conventional theories of regional development and planning did not work. In the U.S., too, the spread of the Civil Rights protests and strong opposition to urban renewal projects created public distrust of conventional methods. Friedmann returned to the U.S. with a new determination to push his intellectual agenda in the newly founded program at UCLA.

Paradigm Shift

By the time the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning (GSAUP) at UCLA was established (1968) with Harvey Perloff as the founding dean and Friedmann as the director of the planning program, the conventional theories of urban growth, national development, and planning had lost their earlier conceptual power. Most Latin American nations, including Brazil and Chile whose governments Friedmann had advised, had turned from democracies to authoritarian regimes. Earlier, the Cuban Revolution, followed by the failed Bay of Pigs Invasion, had led President Kennedy to launch the Alliance for Progress, in which Perloff played a significant role (see Perloff, 1985b). But, this alliance seemed futile in the face of increasing unemployment, growing shanty towns, and the rise of political parties which drew inspiration more from Che Guevara than from President Kennedy. As a result, there was growing pessimism about the ability of market-based economic development and political democracy to reinforce each other, as was envisioned after World War II (Sanyal, 1994).

The situation within the U.S. during this period was turbulent, too (Hoffman, 1989; D. A. Schön, 1971). The assassinations of President Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., and Robert Kennedy posed a threat to the political system. The simultaneous rise of the Civil Rights movement, the women's movement, and the environmental movement challenged conventional wisdom about how public policies were to be formulated. Opposition to America's deepening engagement in the Vietnam War was growing, as was the distrust of government. In sum, the social consensus of the earlier two decades, which had provided the conceptual foundation for governance and planning since the end of World War II, was overshadowed by the social conflicts and protests against conventional social norms. Keynesianism, which had provided the justification for planning since the Great Depression, seemed ineffective as budget deficits continued to rise, traditional business cycles became unpredictable, and government became a target of criticism from both the left and the right of the political spectrum (Sanyal, 1994).

This was the situation when Friedmann launched the planning program at UCLA with the determination to create a school of critical and alternative thinking. His intellectual imprint on GSAUP is evident in three ways. First, he recruited an outstanding faculty who, like him, were critical of conventional thinking. For example, Friedmann and Edward Soja, a neo-Marxist geographer, led the criticism of conventional development theories for creating a neocolonial relationship between "core and peripheral" areas. Peter Marris (1974) questioned social modernization. Peter Marcuse (1976) brought to the fore issues of class and race by arguing that conventional planning practice was inherently unethical. Dolores Hayden (1981) led the emerging feminist critics of patriarchal cities. Allan Heskin coined the term "radical planning" to describe a way out of the crisis (Grabow & Heskin, 1973). There were others who collectively made UCLA's faculty truly an outstanding group ready to build an alternative school of thought about cities, regions, and the role of planning in social transformations[7].

Second, Friedmann's intellectual imprint is evident in the unconventional organizational setup he created for GSAUP's administration. He believed that conventional systems of academic governance lacked transparency and were controlled by a handful of senior faculty, all white and male. GSAUP was going to offer a different kind of learning environment than MIT and other older planning programs. All decisions were to be made democratically at the recommendations of various working groups with representation by all stakeholders. Friedmann opened up all deliberations regarding admissions, course evaluations, faculty appointments, and even faculty promotions to students, faculty, and staff. This was his first attempt to experiment with a new model of governance at a micro level, which he believed should be replicated to address issues at

an even broader societal level. Friedmann expanded this alternative vision in much detail in his two books, *Retracking America* (1973) and *The Good Society* (1979b), proposing that good planning required small groups of active citizens to deliberate all issues. In the process, they would generate a new type of knowledge which was neither technocratic nor controlled by officially designated professionals. Friedmann called these: "dialogic interactions" and argued later in his career that this was the origin of what is now professionally acknowledged as "communicative planning" (Friedmann, 2017).

The third way Friedmann influenced GSAUP was by constructing a curriculum which was oriented towards educating unconventional planners who would serve as change agents in planning from below. This goal was to be achieved by offering courses critical of conventional theories of both development and planning. Conventional planning techniques were to be relegated to back burners, while unconventional techniques which rely on ethnography and anthropology were taught to question "objective knowledge." Face-to-face deliberations which sharpened social understanding by questioning conventional social values was given priority over analytical techniques which claimed to be value free. Friedmann worked tirelessly to educate a new group of innovative planners who would think more about social transformation than social maintenance.

Once GSAUP was well established, with a distinguished faculty, an unconventional curriculum, and a new system of academic governance, Friedmann returned to thinking about regional planning, but now—in the mid-1970s—his thinking was radically different. The scholarship on regional planning had evolved by then, primarily due to the increasing intensity of global movement of capital and commodities. New concerns about regional decline overshadowed earlier enthusiasm about regional growth. As Barry Bluestone and Bennett Harrison (1982) documented well, capital flight from the U.S. was on the rise and structural unemployment in previously prosperous regions seriously weakened the power of labor unions. Abroad, a growing number of development scholars had successfully raised fundamental questions about the conventional development paradigms of rapid industrialization and urbanization (Seers, 1979). There was call for a new international economic order to halt unequal exchange between the North and the South. Fulfilment of basic human needs was to be prioritized over growth through export (Streeten, 1981). Even the World Bank, under the new leadership of Robert McNamara, focused on addressing mass scale poverty (Ayres, 1983).

Since returning from Chile, Friedmann had gradually delinked himself from conventional developmental institutions, such as the United Stated Agency for International Development (USAID), the World Bank, and even from the Ford Foundation that had supported his earlier research. Instead, he accepted an assignment to advise United Nations Center for Regional Development (UNCRD) in Nagoya, Japan. This led to his collaboration with Michael Douglass, his doctoral student at the time, in formulating an alternative theory of "Agropolitan development" in which rural areas, not cities, were to become the focus of a new type of development which relied less on export earnings and more on fulfilling the basic needs of impoverished citizens (Friedmann & Douglass, 1975). This stress on fulfilment of basic needs over export earnings drew the attention of policy makers, but only for a very brief period, as the mounting debt crisis forced poor nations to implement severe fiscal austerity measures to earn foreign exchange which required increased export (Sanyal, 1986).

The field of regional development had taken a very different turn in the U.S., with deindustrialization as a central concern. Friedmann and Alonso's coedited book on regional development (1964) was still in circulation; and both worked to produce a second version (1975). But, unlike the first volume, the second volume did not sell well (Friedmann, 2001). Globalization

and growing concern for environmental degradation had posed new challenges to both conventional theories and the relatively static methods of regional inquiry, such as input-output analysis, which were unsuitable for the study of rapidly globalizing markets. Friedmann tried to grasp the essence of this new moment by co-authoring with Clyde Weaver, *Territory and Function* (1979). This was Friedmann's last major work on regional planning. It is a historical analysis of changing ideas about regions in the U.S. and Western Europe. The core argument of the book is that there are two contrasting notions of regions, one considers regions as "territories," that is, culturally produced spatial entities nurturing the "life space" of their inhabitants with territorial attachment. The other considers regions as economic entities primarily serving the need of capital moving constantly in search of higher profits, as deindustrialization demonstrated all too well.

Friedmann had not foreseen that regional planning could lose intellectual momentum when he started his career as a regional planner. He began to question whether regional planning could ever regain its earlier prominence. The rise of new methods of econometric modeling did not convince Friedmann that regions might once again emerge as viable units for spatial analysis. He had been very critical of all forms of economic modeling, and dismissed such efforts as irrelevant, at best, and counterproductive, at worst. As the globalization of trade and capital intensified in the 1980s, Friedmann made one last attempt to influence academic discourse on cities and regions by coauthoring with Goetz Wolff (1982) a well-cited paper on world cities, which were serving as the nodes in the circuit of globally moving capital. But, Saskia Sassen's major book on the global city (1991), with its empirical evidence from New York, London, and Tokyo, drew more attention. Friedmann now turned his attention, once again, to planning theory—a field of inquiry which he had helped create and which by the mid-1980s was being taught in most planning schools both in the U.S. and across Europe.

Planning in the Public Domain (1987) and *Empowerment* (1992) were the fruits of Friedmann's long quest to construct general theories of development and planning. Some have called *Planning in the Public Domain* a classic, a magnum opus covering three centuries of planning ideas (Douglass, 2016). This book demonstrates Friedmann's vast knowledge of social efforts by states, markets, and civil society to improve the human condition—from the European Enlightenment and till the end of the twentieth century. His attachment to European ideas and ideals is apparent, as is his deep knowledge of U.S. planning traditions. This book provides a breathtaking overview, reinforcing Friedmann's reputation as "the Pope of planning" (Douglass, 2016). The four major classifications into which Friedmann grouped all social efforts for human development—namely, policy analysis, social reform, social learning, and social mobilization— provided him with the opportunity to elaborate how he differentiated planning for "system maintenance" from planning for "social transformation." He fully embraced non-conventional planning by civil society over planning by state actors.

Friedmann deliberately excluded physical planners—land use planners, urban designers, and architect-planners, like Frank Lloyd Wright or Le Corbusier, or even Doxiadis—from the pantheon of planning history. This may seem odd considering that architecture and physical planning led city planning efforts since the beginning of industrialization (Hall, 2002). Friedmann's ignored these actors because he wanted to define planning broadly with clear support for efforts from below, by civil society, against planning from above.

This assumption that civil society must counteract the state has been a recurring theme in Friedmann's research since the paradigm shift in his thinking, but it intensified—particularly, after his second marriage, to Leonie Sandercock, a well-known planning theorist who published two well-received books, *Towards Cosmopolis* (1998) and *Cosmopolis II* (2003). Sandercock's

argument that planning should "make the invisible visible," and that "insurgencies" by marginalized groups were necessary to counter socially regressive policies influenced Friedmann's writings in his book *Insurgencies* (2011). By then, Friedmann's normative point of view had moved far beyond "dialogical interactions" and "transactive planning" on which he wrote in the 1970s. Now, he even dismissed the idea that negotiation and consensus building could be effective ways to fight disempowerment (Friedmann, 2011). Influenced by Sandercock's profound understanding of marginalized groups, Friedmann argued that such marginalization results not simply from lack of income but from a host of interconnected factors, such as lack of social network, information, and access to decision making, which collectively disempower marginalized groups from shaping their own decisions. In this line of thinking, the role of planning is to valorize alternative planning histories, as experienced by the marginalized groups, and provide support for decentralized and non-violent insurgencies which challenge dominant ideologies of economic growth and protect their "life space."

Friedmann and Sandercock left UCLA in 1996, when Friedmann retired and Sandercock was appointed as head of the Department of Landscape, Environment, and Planning at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology in Australia. This was a time of radical restructuring of UCLA's planning program, which was being delinked from the School of Architecture and relocated to a newly established School of Public Affairs. This organizational restructuring was orchestrated by UCLA's Chancellor Charles Young even though the planning faculty, students, and alumni opposed this decision. Chancellor Young was advised by Martin Meyerson, who had headed the MIT-Harvard Joint Center when Friedmann taught at MIT and was now president of the University of Pennsylvania, where he had successfully restructured the planning program.

The separation of UCLA's planning program from architecture was opposed by Friedmann even though he was never close, intellectually, to architects and urban designers. As a student at the University of Chicago, he had observed that an attempt to link the planning program to the architecture and urban design program at the Illinois Institute of Technology had "failed to materialize because of the deep cognitive division between the design tradition and the critical-analytic social science orientation we professed" (Friedmann, 2011, p. 222). Later, he noted that during the 1980s neoliberal years, the field of architecture and planning had moved in opposite directions: while architecture programs celebrated the design of unique buildings by star architects, planning had become more oppositional to dominant ideologies of that time (Friedmann, 1994). He disliked the idea of "place-making" celebrated by urban designers in the 1980s and criticized those who chose to design "street furniture" for lacking political understanding of urban problems (Friedmann, 2010). Despite this dislike of architects and urban designers, Friedmann had opposed the relocation of the planning program to the School of Public Affairs because he was even more critical of the neoclassical economists who dominated the field of public policy. Also, social work, which was to become a third department along with planning and public policy in the new school, was not intellectually attractive for Friedmann: He preferred theorizing about meta-level societal issues rather than worrying about micro-level social efforts to cure social ills, such as drug dependencies, foster care, or group violence.

After his retirement, Friedmann followed Sandercock to Australia, and then they both moved to the University of British Columbia (UBC) in 2001. At UBC, Friedmann returned to the study of spatial planning in China—a nation on the rise and one with which UBC was trying to build institutional linkages. Friedmann had always appreciated Chinese philosophy (Friedmann, 2017), but now he focused on the study of China's rapidly developing coastal cities (Friedmann, 2005). In this research, his analysis regained a kind of specificity of place and spatial planning

practice that had sometimes been lost in his general theorizing about planning. Robert Skidelsky (2005) in *The New York Review of Books* reviewed Friedmann's (2005) book on China favorably. Friedmann was inducted into the China Academy of Urban Planning and Design in 2008. He continued his research on China even as he occasionally wrote about planning theory as he was concerned about where the field was heading. At the last ACSP meeting Friedmann attended, in 2016, he expressed his frustration at how the field was losing its intellectual coherence. This was ironic because it was his broad definition of planning as the "application of knowledge to action" that had opened up the intellectual ground for young planning academics eager to publish their unique take on planning theory. The result was a paradox: planning theory was now being taught in most planning schools, as Friedmann had predicted when he was a young academic at MIT; but it was being taught with sharply varying course contents, which signified that there was still no professional consensus as to what planning theory is and how it should be taught.

Part II: Friedmann for Practitioners?

How useful is Friedmann's thinking for planning practitioners? Friedmann would have responded with a counter question: What is to be considered planning? And who are considered practitioners? As Friedmann argued in *Planning in the public domain* (1987), there are four planning traditions, if planning is defined broadly as the application of knowledge to action; and different actors are considered "practitioners" in each tradition. Each planning tradition has its central motivating question regarding state power, and each prefers a different organizational setting for practice. To Friedmann, practice was essential for planning; without it, knowledge could not be linked to action. The nature of practice varied widely, however, between bureaucratic planners who served the state and radical planners who challenged the state and other dominant institutions with "planning from below." This is the reason for the continuous political struggle between "planning from the top" and "planning from the bottom." In his professional career spanning sixty-two years, Friedmann's sympathy shifted sharply from the top to the bottom. Consequently, his advice for practitioners shifted as well. I analyze this shift by focusing on three questions which are of concern to practitioners both at the top and at the bottom—namely, how to frame problems, what is the role of technical knowledge in planning practice, which is inherently political, and do practitioners and the organizations within which they operate learn from past actions?

Problem Framing

All planning efforts begin with problem framing. Yet, there has been little theorizing about this component of planning. Rittel and Webber (1973) grappled with it in their classic essay on "wicked problems" that defy easy solutions. They wrote at a time when planners had fundamental disagreements about both the causes and consequences of urban problems, and consequently, there was no consensus on how to address them. Later, Schön and Rein (1995) wrote about how problems are framed, and reframed, to fit available solutions. In development planning, Albert O. Hirschman (1967) argued that planners need to understand the particular characteristics of each problem: why some problems, like airline accidents, draw more public attention than other problems which are more frequent, like road accidents. The point is that for planners to address any problem, it must be framed in such a way that something can be done about it.

From the beginning of his career, Friedmann was drawn to systemic definition of problems. That is why he read Mannheim (1949, 1950), Arendt (1958), and scholars of the Frankfurt School

with much interest. At the University of Chicago, however, Friedmann was advised by both Tugwell and Perloff to focus on relatively narrowly defined problems rather than planning theory (Friedmann, 2017). But, the nature of Friedmann's assignments abroad and his research on Ciudad Guayana strengthened his inherent conceptual style to define problems broadly, in a systemic way, which probed interconnections among multiple factors at multiple scales ranging from local to global. The social turmoil of the 1960s provided the ideal setting for Friedmann to pursue systemic thinking about problems both in the U.S. and abroad. Yet, unlike David Harvey (1973), Friedmann never blamed capitalism as the main culprit. Instead, he blamed the economic, political, social, and spatial theories of modernization which had shaped public policies in both capitalist as well as communist nations since World War II. Technocratic planning was partly to blame because it was the allocative mechanism which governments used to achieve high economic growth rates through rapid industrialization. For Friedmann, the key problem was the dominant way of thinking at "the top," led by bureaucratic and impersonal state actors, which valued technological change over social solidarity, economic growth over environmental protection, and bureaucratic efficiency over public deliberations.

This systemic critique led Friedmann to recommend holistic understanding of problems and integrated approaches to problem solving. He dismissed Charles Lindblom's incrementalism (1959), Herbert Simon's satisfying (1972), and the "reform mongering" of Martin Bronfenbrenner and others as counterproductive (Friedmann, 1979a). Friedmann described two broad types of planning: allocative planning, whose goal was "system maintenance" and, its opposite, innovative planning, which ushered in social change from below. UCLA's planning program was designed to educate innovative planners, not state agents for system maintenance. In *Empowerment* (1992), Friedmann proposed an integrated approach to both problem framing and systemic solutions. He argued that poverty resulted from not only a lack of income but a host of other factors, such as lack of information, political participation, social networks, and so on, which collectively disempowered the poor. Friedmann then prescribed an integrated set of policies to address poverty which resulted from an integrated set of factors. Yet, he also stated that empowerment of the poor was to be led, not by the state but by small communities whose world view was the opposite of the state. Such ground up efforts would lead to many small "insurgencies" empowering the poor and would ultimately reset the gross imbalance of power between the state and citizens. And thus an "active society" (Etzioni, 1968) would evolve—a society in which planners would listen to the people, learn from them, and be accountable to them.

To what extent can this systemic approach to problem formulation be useful for planning practitioners? Are there organizational limitations to what can be accomplished? Starting with Meyerson and Banfield (1955) and followed by H. Simon (1972) and Lindblom and Hirschman (1962), many scholars of organizations have pointed out how difficult it is to significantly alter organizational design and culture. Even Peter Marris (1996), Friedmann's colleague at UCLA, demonstrated how social change of any kind disrupts meaning by creating deep uncertainties about lines of authority, rules, and social conventions. Moreover, as Hirschman argued (1971), integrated planning to address integrated problems underestimate the difficulties of coordination among various actors with varying organizational capabilities. This is particularly true in the case of developing nations with nascent institutions and extreme resource constraints. Friedmann did not address such concerns directly, but he did alter his view of government, somewhat, near the end of his career. Addressing the United Nations to accept the Human Settlements Lecture award, Friedmann (2007) called for a stronger role of government. He also cautioned against the rosy portrayal of non-government organizations. The award demonstrated that Friedmann's writings

about development, planning, and civil society had not only influenced planning theorists, but also inspired planners across the world at a time when old ideologies of both socialism and capitalism were losing their original luster. The search for "an alternative development" may not be as utopian and impractical as it appears at first hearing. Even planners at "the top" appreciate normative thinking and look for ways in which they can contribute to progressive social change.

Technical Knowledge or Political Acumen?

For Friedmann, planning was, first and foremost, a political act. He defined politics broadly, encompassing both procedural and substantive democracies. His normative vision of progressive politics, however, valorized the role of substantive democracy over procedural one because he was disillusioned with the formal political process. Friedmann envisioned politics not simply as voting in elections managed by dominant social groups and institutions but as ordinary citizens' active participation in deliberations about all of the issues that affect their lives. He saw territorially based small communities as the ideal setting for such politics from below, and he urged planners to work with such communities to push for gender and racial equalities, social inclusiveness, and environmental sustainability. The goal of substantive democracy was to build pressure from below; and such pressure could take many forms, ranging from negotiation with the state to mass protests, social movements, and insurgencies. Friedmann never supported violent class conflicts or armed struggles to overthrow governments.

　　Professional planners who work within Weberian bureaucracies and deal with politicians, private developers, and also citizens did not interest Friedmann. He dismissed their efforts as "allocative planning" for "system maintenance," beholden to state power, and serving mainly the state machinery. He had very little to say about how these planners dealt with politicians or private developers and often worked hard to forge consensus with communities on urban development policies. Unlike Lawrence Susskind (1999), John Forester (1989), and Charles Hoch (1996), who proposed ways to improve planning practice, Friedmann assumed that bureaucratic planners were only capable of "seeing like the state," and that their goal was to neutralize political opposition from below, not to strengthen it for emancipation of socially disadvantaged groups.

　　Friedmann distrusted bureaucratic planners and disliked their planning style, which relies on technical knowledge and formal analytical techniques. He also disliked technological optimism, much like the scholars of Frankfurt School (Jay, 1973). In Friedmann's view, the term "expert knowledge" embodied all three elements—technical knowledge, analytical techniques, and technological optimism—which glorified "technocratic thinking" as inherently superior to all other forms of knowing (Friedmann, 1978, p. 82). And, this led to the "technocratic construction of society" overriding political opposition by social groups with alternative knowledge of social reality. This argument is fully developed in Friedmann's book *Planning in the public domain* (1987). Reviewing three centuries of planning efforts, he laid out four broad planning traditions— social reform, policy analysis, social learning, and Friedmann's favorite, social mobilization, which requires radical practice, not bureaucratic procedures. This form of planning draws inspiration from critics of dominant social values, not from technocratic management of problems. Radical practice required, above all, the ability to engage in face-to-face critical dialogue in small groups to think unconventionally, not about social reform, but social transformations. The challenge facing progressive planners was not their lack of technical knowledge but how to reveal the political agenda hidden behind the technical know-how of conventional planners.

This sharply differentiated view of politics and technical knowledge influenced the curriculum at UCLA's graduate school of planning. It also resulted in disagreements between Friedmann and several professional colleagues as well as professional organizations, such as the Planning Accreditation Board. At UCLA, planning theory, not analytical techniques, dominated the curriculum. Friedmann was not against students' learning of statistical analysis, economic modeling, or standard project evaluation methods such as cost-benefit analysis. But he sharply disagreed that such methods-based courses should be the core of planning education. This created serious professional disagreements with other distinguished planning academics such as such as Britton Harris (1985) and Ernest Alexander (1984), who argued that such methods are essential for rational analysis of problems and to strengthen professional expertise. Friedmann dismissed such concerns as technocratic thinking irrelevant to the political challenges facing planners. When the Planning Accreditation Board tried to ensure that professional planning degrees be awarded only to those who could demonstrate professional expertise, including technical skills, Friedmann and a few other academicians strongly objected (Marcuse, 1976; Bolan, 1999). It is important to note that Friedmann's opposition to technical knowledge did soften by the late 1980s. Accepting the prestigious Distinguished Planning Educator Award from the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning in 1988, Friedmann acknowledged that good planning requires technical knowledge as well as normative thinking. Technical knowledge of spatial planning had been important to Friedmann when he started his career as a regional planner, but he had increasingly deemphasized its role as he tried to construct a normative theory of planning. The acknowledgment that technical knowledge is essential for good planning was Friedmann's way of demonstrating to critics that he was not dogmatic in thinking about what constitutes good planning education.

A new disagreement with Manuel Castells regarding the power of technology, however, also marked the moment. Friedmann had been inspired by Castells' earlier book, *The City and the Grassroots* (1983), and had acknowledged its contribution to sharpening his own thinking about planning from below. What changed their intellectual interaction was Castells' new research on the power of information and communication technologies (ICT), which had ushered in a new era of positive thinking about technology and social progress. In contrast to the 1960s, when technology was blamed for virtually everything—e.g., mass consumption, centralized control, environmental crisis, and war—by the mid-1980s, and with the invention of personal computers and ICT's rapid spread, public perceptions were changing as to whether technology could be a positive force, democratic, and life enhancing. There was renewed optimism that ICT could help planners better understand the problems of daily life (Mitchell, 1995).

Castells' three volume of essays on ICT (1996, 1997, 1998), published at the end of the twentieth century, captured the technological excitement of the time. Friedmann, however, disagreed with Castells' technical turn, and wrote (Friedmann, 2000) that Castells, unlike fellow sociologist Mannheim, was losing his normative social vision because he was dazzled by ICT. But, this was not an accurate portrayal of Castells' position, because he had always highlighted both progressive and regressive aspects of technological changes (Castells, 1999).

For Friedmann, politics, not technology, was the essence of planning, but he had few insights about how alternative visioning and "insurgencies from below" would actually work in practice. His focus was more on why such alternative thinking was important for social transformation. He theorized about how small-scale, territorially-bounded groups could serve as the democratic cells of a socially woven network of communities motivated primarily to protect life space over economic space. That such a conception of society could be used by both progressive and regressive forces did not occur to him, in part because he did not conduct the kind

of field work that Castells (1983) and others (Tarrow, 1994; Tilly & Wood, 2015) had done to explain why and when social movements emerge, why some succeed and others fail, and what kind of social transformations are achievable under different political conditions. By dismissing bureaucratic planners' role in progressive social change, Friedmann ignored an important aspect of the complex process of how top-down and bottom-up planning may come together, occasionally, to bend the trajectory of history towards social justice which Friedmann cared about.

Social Learning Through Social Mobilization

Friedmann's publications are marked by the conviction that good planning requires, and also leads to social learning. In *Retracking America* (1973)—Friedmann's first book on planning theory—he proposed that social learning was the only way out of the impasse at that moment because neither conventional rational planning nor its opposite, Marxian state-led centralized planning, were adequate to address the social turmoil in the U.S. and abroad. Friedmann coined the term "transactive planning" as a third way to deal with the intractable problems facing planners. There were three assumptions underlying his theory of transactive planning: first, the conventional relationship between planners as experts and people as beneficiaries needs to be changed to a two-way flow of knowledge. Second, people need to convene in small groups to deliberate about the issues that affect them and to articulate new social values necessary to address new problems. Third, such a deliberative process requires a decentralized form of governance to ensure flexibility, accountability, and most importantly, social learning. This theory had not much to say about learning by either the state or private firms. The emphasis was on "communities" which learned from deliberations within and between communities.

Friedmann was not the first to emphasize the importance of social learning. He acknowledged the contributions of John Dewey (1904), Edgar Dunn Jr., (1971) Amitai Etzioni (1968), Donald Schön (1971), and others in developing his position that social learning was both a perquisite and an outcome of transactive planning. There are differences, however, between Friedmann and those whom he cited regarding social learning. Dewey, for example, wrote about how American pragmatism required an educational system which would create the ideal setting for "learning by doing." Schön focused his inquiry mainly on individuals—the reflective practitioner—and theorized about how they learn through a double loop process. Etzioni did focus on communities. He emphasized that active communities learn from action, but he did not have a theory of how such learning happens in practice. Albert O. Hirschman (1984) provided evidence of learning by newly industrializing nation-states, but he, too, did not have a theory of learning (D. A. Schön & Rodwin, 1994). More recently, Gardner (2004) focused on the specific question of why some individuals change their mind as a result of public deliberations while others do not. These kinds of questions are of particular importance for practitioners who must operate in highly polarized political environments, such as the U.S. (Schwartz & Sharpe, 2010).

Friedmann's view of social learning is a normative yearning, not a positive theory of how learning happens. He preferred small groups and face-to-face interactions and, conversely, dismissed any learning by state actors. He even questioned whether negotiations between state actors and communities can facilitate learning. Friedmann's views about planning became radical in reaction to the neoliberal era of the 1980s, and he rejected state-managed community interactions and negotiations techniques as manipulation, not learning mechanisms. In fact, Friedmann's books *Empowerment* (1992) and *Insurgencies* (2011) suggest that during the 1980s, he began to distance himself from his earlier call for social learning and advocated, instead, for

social mobilization. To him, social learning and social mobilization were different planning traditions (Friedmann, 1987). He preferred the latter over the former as a way to achieve social transformation.

But the new emphasis on social mobilization was normative as well, like Friedmann's earlier stress on social learning. He did not write about how social mobilization happens, why some actions succeed while others fail, or why some actors are coopted by the state while others continue to mobilize. Unlike Paul Davidoff (1965), who had proposed a concrete set of actions to challenge public policies in courts, Friedmann's normative views were more inspirational than strategic. He respected Saul Alinsky (1971) and Paulo Freire (2000), whom he included in his pantheon of "radical planners" (Friedmann, 1987, p. 57). Yet, unlike them, Friedmann was not inclined to specify either "rules for radicals" or steps of critical thinking. Friedmann's mission was to lay out broad visions and not be bogged down with what he called "how-to questions."

Conclusion

No history of urban and regional planning over the last fifty years would be complete without acknowledging John Friedmann's quest for a normative theory of planning. The review of Friedmann's career and his extensive publications demonstrates how a conjunction of unforeseen turns in his career during a time of social upheavals led to a paradigm shift in his thinking. This, in turn, led to the establishment of UCLA's planning program as a leading school of critical thinking and unconventional planning practice. As a scholar influenced by both European and North American planning experience, Friedmann defined planning broadly as "the application of knowledge to action." Through his long career of sixty-two years (1955-2017), Friedmann became increasingly skeptical of conventional planning practice by state actors and equally interested in planning from below though social mobilization. This shift led him to define problems in a systemic way, valorize political acumen over technical knowledge, and inspired him to advocate for social mobilization over social learning as the ultimate goal of normative planning. Overall, Friedmann was a visionary scholar who cared more about alternative thinking than about how to improve conventional planning practice. He will be remembered as a leading scholar in the field of planning history, theory, and education who questioned orthodox thinking and inspired those who prefer planning from below over conventional state-led planning.

References

Alexander, E. R. (1984). After rationality, what? A review of responses to paradigm breakdown. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *50*(1), 62–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944368408976582

Alinsky, S. D. (1971). *Rules for radicals; a practical primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Random House.

Altshuler, A. (1965). The goals of comprehensive planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, *31*(3), 186–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-017066-4.50017-5

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ayres, R. L. (1983). *Banking on the poor: The World Bank and world poverty*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Bluestone, B., & Harrison, B. (1982). *The deindustrialization of America: Plant closings, community abandonment, and the dismantling of basic industry*. New York: Basic Books.

Bolan, R. S. (1999). Rationality revisited: An alternative perspective on reason in management and planning. *Journal of Management History*, *5*(2), 68–86. https://doi.org/10.1108/13552529910260082

Castells, M. (1983). *The city and the grassroots: a cross-cultural theory of urban social movements*. London: Edward Arnold.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, M. (1997). *The power of identity*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, M. (1998). *End of millennium*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, M. (1999). The informational city is a dual city: can it be reversed? In D. Schön, B. Sanyal, & W. J. Mitchell (Eds.), *High technology and low-income communities: Prospects for the positive use of advanced information technology* (pp. 25–41). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, *31*(4), 331–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366508978187

Dewey, J. (1904). *The relation of theory to practice in education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Douglass, M. (2016). ACSP Distinguished Educator, 1987 John Friedmann. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *36*(2), 255–256. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456x16645361

Dunn, E. S. (1971). *Economic and social development; a process of social learning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Etzioni, A. (1968). *The active society: a theory of societal and political processes*. London: Collier-Macmillan.

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

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Friedmann, J. (1955). *The spatial structure of economic development in the Tennessee Valley, a study in regional planning*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Friedmann, J. (1959). The study and practice of planning. *International Social Science Journal*, *11*(3), 327–339.

Friedmann, J. (1960). Intellectuals in developing societies. *Kyklos*, *13*(4), 513–544. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6435.1960.tb00039.x

Friedmann, J. (1963). Regional economic policy for developing areas. *Papers in Regional Science*, *11*(1), 41–61.

Friedmann, J. (1964). Introduction. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, *30*(2), 82–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366408978100

Friedmann, J. (1965). A response to Altshuler: comprehensive planning as a process. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, *31*(3), 195–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366508978166

Friedmann, J. (1966). *Regional development policy; a case study of Venezuela*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Friedmann, J. (1973). *Retracking America; a theory of transactive planning*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Friedmann, J. (1978). The epistemology of social practice. *Theory and Society*, *6*(1), 75–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01566158

Friedmann, J. (1979a). A Rejoinder to Bronfenbrenner, Singer, and Ranis. *Development and Change*, *10*(1), 167–176. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.1979.tb00038.x

Friedmann, J. (1979b). *The Good Society: a personal account of its struggle with the world of social planning and a dialectical inquiry into the roots of radical practice*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

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

Friedmann, J. (1992). *Empowerment: the politics of alternative development*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Friedmann, J. (1994). A Quarter Century of Progressive Planning Education: A Retrospective Look at UCLA's Urban Planning Program. *Critical Planning*, *1*(1), 32–41.

Friedmann, J. (2000). The good city: In defense of utopian thinking. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *24*(2), 460–472. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.00258

Friedmann, J. (2001). Regional development and planning: the story of a collaboration. *International Regional Science Review*, *24*(3), 386–395. https://doi.org/10.1177/016001701761013277

Friedmann, J. (2005). *China's urban transition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Friedmann, J. (2007). The wealth of cities: towards an assets-based development of newly urbanizing regions. *Development and Change*, *38*(6), 987–998. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2007.00461.x

Friedmann, J. (2010). Place and place-making in cities: a global perspective. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *11*(2), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649351003759573

Friedmann, J. (2011). *Insurgencies: essays in planning theory*. New York: Routledge.

Friedmann, J. (2015). ACSP Distinguished Educator, 1983: Harvey S. Perloff. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *35*(3), 376–378. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456x15591165

Friedmann, J. (2017). Planning as a vocation: The journey so far. In B. Haselsberger (Ed.), *Encounters in planning thought: 16 autobiographical essays from key thinkers in spatial planning* (pp. 15–34). New York, NY: Routledge.

Friedmann, J., & Alonso, W. (1964). *Regional development and planning; a reader* (1st ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Friedmann, J., & Alonso, W. (1975). *Regional policy; readings in theory and applications*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Friedmann, J., & Douglass, M. (1975). *Agropolitan development: towards a new strategy for regional planning in Asia*. Los Angeles: University of California, School of Architecture and Urban Planning.

Friedmann, J., & Weaver, C. (1979). *Territory and function: the evolution of regional planning*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Friedmann, J., & Wolff, G. (1982). World city formation: an agenda for research and action. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *6*(3), 309–344. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.1982.tb00384.x

Gardner, H. (2004). *Changing minds: the art and science of changing our own and other people's minds*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Grabow, S., & Heskin, A. (1973). Foundations for a radical concept of planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, *39*(2), 106–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944367308977664

Hall, P. (2002). *Cities of tomorrow: an intellectual history of urban planning and design in the twentieth century*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Harris, B. (1985). Urban simulation models in regional science. *Journal of Regional Science*, *25*(4), 545–567. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9787.1985.tb00322.x

Harvey, D. (1973). *Social justice and the city*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hayden, D. (1981). *The grand domestic revolution: a history of feminist designs for American homes, neighborhoods, and cities*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Healey, P. (2011). Foreword. In J. Friedmann, *Insurgencies: essays in planning theory*. New York: Routledge.

Hirschman, A. O. (1967). *Development projects observed*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Hirschman, A. O. (1971). *A bias for hope: essays on development and Latin America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hirschman, A. O. (1984). A dissenter's confession: The strategy of economic development revisited. *Pioneers in Development*, *1*, 85–111.

Hirschman, A. O., & Lindblom, C. E. (1962). Economic development, research and development, policy making: some converging views. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *7*(2), 211–222.

Hoch, C. (1996). What do planners do in the United States. In S. J. Mandelbaum, L. Mazza, & R. W. Burchell (Eds.), *Explorations in planning theory* (pp. 225–240). New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Hoffman, L. M. (1989). *The politics of knowledge: activist movements in medicine and planning*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Jay, M. (1973). *The dialectical imagination; a history of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950.* ([1st ed.]). Boston: Little, Brown.

Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of" muddling through". *Public Administration Review*, 79–88. https://doi.org/10.2307/973677

Mannheim, K. (1949). *Man and society in an age of reconstruction: studies in modern social structure*. New York: Routledge & KPaul.

Mannheim, K. (1950). *Freedom, power, and democratic planning.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Marcuse, P. (1976). Professional ethics and beyond; values in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, *42*, 264–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944367608977729

Marris, P. (1974). *Loss and change*. London: Routledge & KPaul.

Marris, P. (1996). *The politics of uncertainty: attachment in private and public life*. New York: Routledge.

Meyerson, M., & Banfield, E. C. (1955). *Politics, planning, and the public interest; the case of public housing in Chicago*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Mitchell, W. J. (1995). *City of bits: space, place, and the infobahn*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Myrdal, G. (1957). *Economic theory and underdeveloped countries*. London: Duckworth.

Paul, S. (2017, June 13). In memoriam: John Friedmann, 91, was the father of urban planning at UCLA. Retrieved August 22, 2017, from http://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/in-memoriam:-john-friedmann-91-was-the-father-of-urban-planning-at-ucla

Perloff, H. S. (1985a). Puerto Rico's Economic Future: Public Services and Social Priorities. In *The art of planning: selected essays of Harvey S. Perloff* (pp. 141–150). New York: Plenum Press.

Perloff, H. S. (1985b). *The art of planning: selected essays of Harvey S. Perloff*. Plenum Press.

Rangan, H., Ng, M. K., & Porter, L. (2017). *Insurgencies and revolutions: reflections on John Friedmann's contributions to planning theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*(2), 155–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01405730

Sandercock, L. (1998). *Towards cosmopolis: planning for multicultural cities*. Chichester, New York: John Wiley.

Sandercock, L. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: mongrel cities in the 21st century*. New York: Continuum.

Sanyal, B. (1986). Rural Development and Economic Stabilization: Can They Be Attained Simultaneously? In S. K. Commins, M. F. Lofchie, & R. Payne (Eds.), *Africa's agrarian crisis: the roots of famine*. Boulder, Colo.: L. Rienner.

Sanyal, B. (1994). From the Benevolent to the Evil State: History of the Rise of Anti-government Sentiment in Developmental Discourse. *Cooperative Autonomy: The Dialectic of State–NGO Relationship in Developing Countries*, 3–32.

Sarbib, J.-L. (1983). The University of Chicago program in planning: A retrospective look. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *2*(2), 77–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456x8300200203

Sassen, S. (1991). *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Schön, D. A. (1971). *Beyond the stable state: public and private learning in a changing society*. London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd.

Schön, D. A., & Rodwin, L. (1994). Hirschman's Elusive Theory of Social Learning. In D. Schön (Ed.), *Rethinking the Development Experience: Essays Provoked by the Work of Albert O. Hirschman* (pp. 67–95). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Schön, D., & Rein, M. (1995). *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. Basic Books.

Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. (2010). *Practical wisdom: the right way to do the right thing*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Seers, D. (1979). The birth, life and death of development economics. *Development and Change*, *10*(4), 707–719. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.1979.tb00063.x

Simon, D. (2017). John Friedmann, 1926–2017. *IDPR*, *39*(3), v–vii. https://doi.org/10.3828/idpr.2017.14

Simon, H. (1972). Theories of bounded rationality. *Decision and Organization*, *1*(1), 161–176.

Skidelsky, R. (2005, December 1). The Chinese Shadow: II. *The New York Review of Books*. Retrieved from http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2005/12/01/the-chinese-shadow-ii/

Streeten, P. (1981). *First things first: meeting basic human needs in the developing countries*. New York: Published for the World Bank by Oxford University Press.

Susskind, L., McKearnan, Sarah, & Thomas-Larmer, J. (1999). *The consensus building handbook: a comprehensive guide to reaching agreement*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Tarrow, S. G. (1994). *Power in movement: social movements, collective action, and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, C., & Wood, L. J. (2015). *Social Movements 1768-2012*. New York: Routledge.

Tugwell, R. G. (1939). *The fourth power*. Chicago: American Institute of Planners.

Endnotes

[1]See, for example, (Paul, 2017; D. Simon, 2017).

[2] See, for instance, the book of essays from Friedmann's students (Rangan, Ng, & Porter, 2017).

[3] For a review of Perloff's work, see *The Art of Planning* (Perloff, 1985b). I had the opportunity to work as Perloff's research assistant for the publication of this book, which was published after Perloff's death.

[4] Thinking about national planning was unheard of in the U.S. because of the Cold War with Soviet Union—a nation that invented the five-year national plan.

[5] His family had emigrated from Vienna, Austria, to the United States in 1940, when Friedmann was fourteen years old, to avoid persecution by the Nazis.

[6] See, for example, (Friedmann, 1959, 1960, 1963, 1964).

[7] Among other faculty at UCLA were: Michael Storper, Martin Wachs, Leland Burns, Jackie Leavitt, Susanna Hecht, Rebecca Morales, Donald Shoup, Barclay Hudson, and Eugene Grigsby.