

# UC Berkeley

## Berkeley Planning Journal

### Title

Introduction to Volume 10

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/50t8r6sj>

### Journal

Berkeley Planning Journal, 10(1)

### Authors

Weinberger, Rachel  
Huang, William

### Publication Date

1995

### DOI

10.5070/BP310113057

### Copyright Information

Copyright 1995 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

## INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME 10

Rachel Weinberger and William Huang

As the last pages are being proofed, the last diagrams formatted, and every pre-press detail is accounted for, we sit down to perform our final *Journal* task: writing the introduction. In 1973, Aaron Wildavsky argued that planning includes too much, asserting that "If planning is everything, maybe it's nothing."<sup>1</sup> To the proponents of Wildavsky's argument, we seek to demonstrate with this volume that planning may in fact be everything; but it certainly is not nothing.

The *Journal* tends not to be thematic, and this year is no exception. The scale and scope of the issues addressed in this collection span planning along several dimensions. The contributions range from a site-specific technical analysis for bicycle route selection, to an analysis of national planning policies for sustainable development, to general critiques of the planning profession and planning epistemologies. We could attempt to highlight the points of convergence and divergence among the articles, but perhaps that is a labor best left to the reader.

In this, the tenth volume of the *Berkeley Planning Journal*, we are particularly pleased to have as our lead article, "Pragmatic knowledge codes," written by **Hilda Blanco**, the founding editor of the *Journal*. The article fashions a broad critique of planning practice, focusing on the way in which professional knowledge is guarded and disseminated. Blanco argues that effective democracy relies on informed constituencies. She suggests that knowledge exists in domains and that expert knowledge and institutions in planning must be de-mystified to facilitate greater democratic participation in policymaking. According to Blanco, advances in computers and artificial intelligence could transform planning by increasing its transparency and by allowing for greater citizen access to expert knowledge.

Taking a different view of planning, in "Economics, environment, and equity," **Dara O'Rourke** examines the conflicts that underlie efforts to promote "sustainable development" in Vietnam. According to O'Rourke, economic development, environmental protection, and social justice goals must be integrated under the auspices of a single institution. He examines the shift from a centrally controlled economic system to a market economy, looking for opportunities to integrate expert knowledge in the three distinct domains. O'Rourke's

## Berkeley Planning Journal

perspective on planning for sustainability looks at the need for new institutions to address familiar problems in an unfamiliar frame.

In "Transnational communities, regional development, and the future of Mexican immigration," **Rafael Alarcón** documents the existence of transnational communities that channel migrants from Western Mexican villages to certain cities in the United States. He concludes that the social and professional networks which tie these villages to the U.S. are so strong that economic development in nearby Mexican cities will not divert emigration until wages are equal in the two countries. He notes, however, that truly local development which allows potential emigrants to remain in their villages has reduced emigration in some cases. Alarcón concludes that U.S. policies to reduce illegal immigration from Mexico by encouraging economic development in Mexican cities will have little effect on emigration from villages that are parts of transnational communities.

In "Transit-oriented development as a congestion-reduction strategy in the San Francisco Bay Area," **Daniel Luscher** evaluates the potential for transit-oriented development to reduce automobile travel in the San Francisco Bay Area. Transit-oriented development clusters high-density, mixed-use development around transit stations. Luscher shows that, even using optimistic assumptions, adoption of this alternative land use form would reduce vehicle miles traveled in the Bay Area by just 5 percent. He concludes that although transit-oriented development may have other worthwhile benefits, it will not significantly reduce congestion or improve air quality in the Bay Area.

**Yuanlin Huang** and **Gordon Ye** demonstrate that a geographic information system (GIS) can be used to select bicycle routes in a city. In "Selecting bicycle commuting routes using GIS," they identify criteria for the selection of bicycle routes and apply those criteria to Berkeley, California.

The two current debates echo themes that appear in the articles. In "Feminist theory and planning theory," **Mary Gail Snyder** explores feminist epistemologies and their implications for planning. Like Blanco, Snyder focuses on the roles of experts and citizen participants in the planning process. The perspective she offers, however, is fundamentally different. Instead of focusing on technologies to disseminate expert knowledge, feminist theorists have emphasized the need to recognize other voices and other ways of knowing, such as personal experience or sentiment. Feminist planning requires the recognition of multiple publics and the fact that varied interests and values cannot be assumed to be commensurable or resolvable.

**Yodan Rofé** evaluates three theories of the relationship between urban form and social structure in "Space and community – The spatial

## Introduction to Volume 10

foundations of urban neighborhoods." According to Rofé, "urban neighborhoods emerge from patterns of interaction created by shared use of paths and facilities." The neighborhood unit paradigm that has dominated urban development since the 1930s, however, focused on defining boundaries for communities and neglected the role of the street as a complex social space. Rofé challenges New Urbanists – including the proponents of the transit-oriented development Luscher analyzes – because they also think in terms of separated and identifiable communities, not in terms of the structure of the urban whole, out of which neighborhoods arise based on local differences between more and less integrated streets.

Finally, **Karen Christensen** reviews *Common interest communities*, a recent book by Stephen E. Barton and Carol Silverman that examines the "private governments" created by condominiums, planned unit developments, and housing cooperatives. Christensen focuses on the book's conclusions about the relations between private property and public life, and the need to distinguish public and private sectors (government or nongovernment ownership) from the public and private domains of life.

In putting together the *Berkeley Planning Journal* this year, we have learned more about production and management than we may have cared to know. The editorial collective has been exceptional, and our most heartfelt thanks must be extended to all who helped this year. We have asked people to review articles, to work with authors, to edit, and to proofread. We have asked sometimes for overnight turn-around, we have asked people to read and re-read the same articles several times. Without this help, there would be no *Journal*.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Wildavsky, Aaron. 1973. If planning is everything, maybe it's nothing. *Policy Sciences* 4(2): 127-53.