

# KBN

KOMITET BADAŃ  
NAUKOWYCH  
STATE COMMITTEE FOR  
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
REPUBLIC OF POLAND

SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT SERIES

*SOCIETY  
SCIENCE  
GOVERNMENT*

FRANCO ARCHIBUGI

## The Resetting of Planning Studies

### 1. The planning crisis

No one denies that planning, and its related studies are in a state of crisis today.

The crisis is more or less evident in every area where planning made significant progress in the modernization of government systems in the latter half of this century. This includes macro-economic, development, physical, "social", urban and regional planning, and so on.

The great expectations of the sixties and the notable performance achieved in those years were shared by governments and institutions, international as well as national and subnational. Now expectations have been lowered, to the point where we have fallen into a pit of frustration, mistrust, doubt and skepticism.

This crisis affects all the planning activities listed above, as well as planning institutions.<sup>1</sup>

In Western Europe the "national plans" which many governments worked out against considerable opposition, both ideological and from corporate interests, fell into crisis. So did all planning related agencies ("central planning bureaux", ministries, commissariats, Planning Development Councils or Committees, etc.). Many of these still exist officially, but are functionally dead. This has happened in France (the cradle of indicative planning), the Netherlands, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, Denmark, and Belgium. It has been a crisis of implementation, the causes of which are controversial. They have promoted a kind of permanent, and often futile, political and sociological debate. The question is: why the imbalance between the progress of technical planning capacities and the capacities of institutions to use and manage these?<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> One of the more informative contributions, taken from the vast range of literature on the crisis of planning during the sixties and the seventies, is the conclusions of a meeting at the Institute for Development Studies of the University of Sussex in 1969 (Faber & Seers, 1972).

<sup>2</sup> The most significant work on the crisis of the systems of planning in the major West European states (France, F.R.G., U.K., and Italy) is a volume edited by Stuart Holland *Beyond Capitalist Planning*. This contains contributions throwing light on the above-mentioned experience by Jacques Delors and Jacques Attali for France, Norbert Wiczorek and Karl Georg Zinn for the F.R.G., Thomas Balogh and Stuart Holland for the U.K., Giorgio Ruffolo and the author of this paper for Italy (Holland, Ed. 1978).

Even in the United States planning has fallen into crisis. This includes the socio-economic experiences of planning at state level (numerous in that country). The same goes for the so-called “planning-programming-budgeting system” and related national goals and priorities at the federal level.

Everywhere in the developed Western countries pragmatic implementation of the “Welfare State” has been preferred to abstract installation of planning procedures. However, even the Welfare State has entered into crisis, perhaps due to the absence of an appropriate trade-off process between the pressing political demand for social services and the public use of limited resources, which a planned system would allow.

Everywhere in the East European countries economic planning, the *modus operandi* of the so-called “socialist” countries, entered into crisis. But this has been associated with political regimes, lacking freedom and democracy, thus assuming sins and responsibilities belonging to the liberticidal regimes of which planning was an instrument. It is superfluous to remind ourselves of how much the negative experience of the East European countries favoured — in the West — the enemies of every kind of planning, and how this has been a major cause, albeit indirectly, of the failure of planning in the West.

Even at the international level, or that of “Third World” individual countries — strongly dependent on international action — development planning fell into crisis. The results of the efforts made to promote the modernization of such countries and to reduce the gap between these and the developed countries have been negligible; in many cases they have even been counter-effective. Even in these countries the rhetorical aspiration to introduce “national plans” (and related agencies) in the first UN development decade, the sixties, was matched by an inability to implement any positive initiatives. These countries returned to their role as the theatre of the most backward social and material life, a role they have played for centuries.

Everywhere in the world physical (urban and regional) planning entered into crisis, overwhelmed by the violent urbanization process. In no part of the world is a “master plan” considered an effective instrument of the government of land-use (except when it constitutes *ex-post* legitimation of decisions already taken and implemented).

## 2. The requirements of planning

And yet, today more than ever before there is an emerging need for planned management of development, coming from all directions.

The advanced but chaotic development of economies and societies has not resolved any of the chronic problems of the world over the fifty years since the Second World War. In the Western world we have “development” without real progress, elsewhere we do not even have development.

Western economic development — impressive from the material point of view — dissipated all chances to approach and solve the problem of global under-development. This is a world where the advances of technology integrate

and narrow distances between countries, and where under-development is no longer a "foreign" rather than "domestic" affair for the developed world.

Added to the world emergency of the under-developed world there is today another emergency — at world, national, and local scale — of the conservation of the planet and the environment in terms of balanced and sustainable growth.<sup>3</sup>

The environmental emergency has its own global dimension. This can be managed through a "choice-" or "decisions-system" only if implemented on a global scale, and by means of a supra-national rather than international planning authority. As in the sixties, the European Community realized that the serious opportunities for development for all could only be guaranteed through widening their common economic activities at a supra-national level of decision-making, so today a majority of the countries of the world need to be convinced that without global perspective and authority the problems of under-development and the environment cannot even be approached, let alone resolved. And how can this approach be implemented if not through advanced planning systems?

Thus it is difficult to conceive sustainable development without an adequate process of global planning, and without a relaunch of the studies and institutions capable of steadily sustaining a growing support for such global planning.

The need for strategic planning is becoming increasingly evident — especially in certain areas. For instance it is doubtful whether the conversion of the so-called "socialist" (or rather "bureaucratic") economies to pluralist economies with strong elements of private, or free, enterprise (profit and non-profit oriented) could be achieved without basic choices managed in a systematic way.<sup>4</sup>

Similarly it is dubious whether the "de-etatisation" process in the more advanced welfare states — as predicted in Gunnar Myrdal's call for the "post-welfare state"<sup>5</sup> — and its accompanying development of a non-profit "associative economy" could possibly be achieved without choices based on systematic strategic planning.<sup>6</sup>

Above all we must take advantage of the recent astonishing technological developments to escape from the current chaotic socio-economic development, which is subject to very limited influence by operators, and develop a new "conscious development". By this I intend a development subject to, and conscious of, the preferences of the target people. Here application of advanced polling techniques or systems for monitoring public preferences may be appropriate.

---

<sup>3</sup> A good representative synthesis of the vast range of literature surrounding this argument would be the famous World Commission on the Environment and Development (WCED) report *Our Common Future*, better known as the Brundtland report, named after the Norwegian Prime Minister presiding over the WCED at the time.

<sup>4</sup> An overview of these arguments can be found in a recent volume edited by Efim Nisevich (1992), published in "Planning Theory" No. 5-6 (Summer-Winter 1991).

<sup>5</sup> See Gunnar Myrdal, 1960.

<sup>6</sup> For major developments on this argument see the present authors's report to the OECD Inter-Governmental Conference (Archibugi 1985).

### **3. The need for a new planning model**

Clearly the ideas just outlined were not represented in the old models for planning. We should thus consider whether these old models used in the various fields of planning (macro-economic, development, physical, social, etc.) still have any validity today, or indeed if they were ever valid. In other words if those models contained some deeply rooted deficiencies, rendering them obstacles, even if only minor ones, to the implementation of the plans they promoted — and which as described above widely failed.

Anyway, blaming the failure of planning technologies on inadequate implementation has long been part of the chorus of planning theory. Whatever the truth of this allegation, we must now ask ourselves whether the type and quality of the plans produced by these technologies were adequate with respect to their needs even at the time, let alone to a wider and more effective system of planning.

### **4. The historical lack of a thoroughly integrated approach to planning**

The lack of integrated approaches to planning represents one of the most serious defects of planning; a defect often pointed out and sought avoided. Yet attempts to avoid this fallacy, and to develop a unified approach to planning, came to little as planning entered its general crisis. Thus even plans developed by inter-disciplinary teams featured the biases of sectoral approaches reflecting their subject matter. Hence economic planning has not been sufficiently integrated with social planning, i.e. due account was often not taken of the social goals and values of the plan. Similarly physical, urban, and territorial planning has frequently failed to consider the economic constraints involved thoroughly. Planning relating to social sectors such as health and education has an even worse track record, often failing to appreciate the need for quantification with respect to limited financial resources, let alone considering the needs of financial accounting, and so forth.

Altogether, this absence of an integrated approach has allowed a multitude of initiatives, projects and programmes which do not strictly speaking qualify as plans to proliferate under the umbrella of "planning". If "planning" is to be a meaningful concept it should be taken to imply a set of co-ordinated and mutually coherent actions, with consideration of all relevant constraints. Let us call the former "spurious" plans, or in the words of Dudley Seers, "pseudo-plans".<sup>7</sup>

Let us grant that it is probable that the non-implementation of these "pseudo-plans" has had much to do with institutional failures. Yet there are clearly legitimate reasons for suspecting that some parts the failure of these "plans" have been due to their running into external constraints or conditions not sufficiently

<sup>7</sup> Dudley Seers, 1972.

well considered in advance, i.e. factors which have not been "internalised". This is clearly a technical, not a political defect.

## 5. A unitary methodology not yet consolidated

The old models of planning were deficient in other technical respects as well. Notably plans of every type often failed to include precise references to procedural aspects such as the timing and method of their realization, let alone evaluation and periodical progress reviews. This is not merely a question of "hard" and "soft" technology such as new computing instruments, information technology, telematics, Geographical Information Systems and Remote Sensing etc., which is obviously limited by scientific developments and technological innovation. Rather than this it is the methodology which is found lacking. That is to say, the procedures for the elaboration, construction and management of plans have not been sufficiently well defined, let alone consolidated, and have thus failed to influence the production of plans.

Of course there have been numerous attempts to define such methodologies, and subsequently consolidate these, notably at the international level. These have however been isolated events, which have had little impact.

As an example I recall a UN seminar in Bucharest in 1969 featuring experts and politicians involved with national territorial policy from a number of countries. Here the UN Centre for Housing, Building and Planning promoted an examination of the relationship between said policies and national economic development, aiming to establish a **common** methodology.<sup>8</sup> Subsequently this organization organized a seminar of more limited scope in New York in 1973. Here the focus was on integrating physical and economical planning, and the participants included academics such as Klaas, Rodwin, John Friedmann, and others. Yet the initiative died there and then; it was not even honoured with a decent publication.<sup>9</sup>

In the period from the end of the sixties to the mid-seventies international seminars on the subject of macro-economic planning techniques flourished, under the aegis of the UN Economic Commission for Europe. Crossing the iron curtain, these focused on the perfection of methodologies of planning. These flows merged with the seminar on "Uses of a System of Models for Planning" in Moscow 1974, which represented the climax of this trend.<sup>10</sup> This turned out

---

<sup>8</sup> The conclusions from this seminar were never published by the UN, but were the subject of a text written by the present author which did not go beyond a mimeographed version (Archibugi, 1969).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. a publication summarizing the seminar, with which the present author was involved at the time (UN 1975). As concerns the arguments of each of the participants mimeographed editions exist. See Klaassen & Paelinck (1973); Friedmann (1973); Kukliński (1973); Rodwin (1973); Lakshmanan (1973); Mandelker (1973), and others.

<sup>10</sup> At this occasion the present author had the opportunity to present a paper summarizing earlier work on a technical approach to the management of the 2nd National Five-Year Plan for Italy (1971-75). Indeed this approach consisted of a "system of models" (of which not all were formalized). It was however soon abandoned, as were the national planning activities themselves. See Archibugi (1975).

to be the swansong of a long process, which ought instead to have continued to progress. Notwithstanding the fact that all the seminars resulted in UN publications<sup>11</sup> I am afraid that this has been forgotten by today's younger students.

In the field of social planning the mid-sixties brought a series of studies on unified approaches to planning, prompted by resolutions of the UN Social and Economic Council. These research projects were entrusted to a small but valuable group of scholars in Geneva under the UNRISD.<sup>12</sup> This research developed in stages, and was at times controversial. It may be fair to say that the quality of the results was no higher than that of the original resolutions. At any rate time and generational change have killed even these limited achievements, and ruled out the possibility of continuity in the pursuit of a methodology for a unified approach to planning. Under the directorship of Kukliński the UNRISD furthermore conducted research in the area of regional planning — a topic which was then as fashionable as environmental planning is today. This came much closer to something akin to a unified approach to planning. Yet even these studies were not given the attention they merited.<sup>13</sup>

I have only cited a few examples of research in the fields of planning — deriving from personal memories. I am sure there are many other examples I could have used, perhaps even more at the national level than the international. However, these have stagnated rather than prompting further research; leading to scientific regress rather than progress in this field.

## 6. The shortcomings in the education of planners

The shortcomings of the unintegrated approaches to planning are clearly demonstrated in the structure of the education of planners. Though the systems of higher education differ widely in various countries they have one thing in common. No curriculum deals adequately with the issue of integrated planning. In all countries the potential macro-economic planner studies economics, while the future social planner follows courses on sociology and psychology, and the physical planner those on architecture or urban studies. Obviously there are inter-departmental exchanges, but the curricula remain separate.

Thirty years after amongst others Alonso's call for going "beyond the interdisciplinary approach"<sup>14</sup> very little has happened in terms of studies at university-level.

<sup>11</sup> The publications referred to are those of the UN of 1965, 1966, 1967, 1970, 1971, and the above mentioned UN-ECE 1975.

<sup>12</sup> See UNRISD reports of 1972, 1975 and 1980.

<sup>13</sup> A series of eight volumes were published by Mouton Publishers (Kukliński Ed. 1972). Of these we point out the last four in particular: a) *Growth Poles and Growth Centres in Regional Planning*; b) *Regional Information and Regional Planning*; c) *Regional Sociology and Regional Planning*; d) *Regional Disaggregation of National Policies and Plans*. Another volume by the same editor and publisher was subsequently published on *Social Issues in Regional Planning* of which the contributions constitute further progress toward an "integrated" conception of planning (Kukliński Ed. 1974). We mention in particular the contributions (see references) by Paul Dreve, J. H. Cumberland, Benjamin Higgins, Harvey Perloff, Leo Klaassen, Charles Leven, Herman Baeyens, Janusz A. Ziolkowski and others.

<sup>14</sup> Alonso 1971.

The methodological problems of integrated planning, and of the construction of plans of whatever type, today go far beyond the central problems of each academic discipline, be it economics, sociology, or "urban studies", and thus pose a greater challenge and represent a great threat. Hence theories and principles that are developed within one academic discipline remain within that discipline, ignored by the others, their general character and applicability notwithstanding. I will mention but one example: Ragnar Frisch's principle recommending separation of the selection and implementation "problems" in planning procedures and what he himself called the "pyramidisation" principle.<sup>15</sup> Frisch's principles are valid for all planning processes, yet they have still to be included in the curriculum of the urban planner or social worker.

Similarly economists remain ignorant of the processes of developments in the social fields, such as thought on measures of welfare and identification of welfare indicators.<sup>16</sup> We may rest assured that even Frisch, preoccupied as he was with defending his principles within his own field of economics, and always bearing in mind macro-economic settings, did not consider the relevance of his principles to other types of planning.

Of course we are aware that this kind of inter-disciplinary exchanges will develop naturally through academics' curiosity if left to itself, and that this process has yielded fruitful results before. Yet here we are concerned with something else: the possibility of educating future planners **within one** discipline — since all plans must fulfill certain criteria, their specific needs notwithstanding. This common discipline (personally I would call this "planology") could be formed on the basis of a new paradigm. In other words this would constitute a planning- or decision-oriented approach, i.e. an approach oriented to the planning of objectives and the programming of actions. Only in a secondary way would this be based on the "positive" paradigms of economics and sociology. It is through such a decision-oriented approach that any kind of plan or planning methodology can, and should, find a common base. Only this way can we escape the risks of "pseudo-planning".<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> See Frisch 1962 (paragraphs 4.7 and 4.12). It is superfluous to point out the importance to planology of Frisch's later works (Frisch 1963, 1969, 1970) reprinted posthumously in 1976, which were largely ignored in conventional economic literature. *Lectures on Macro-Economic Planning*, written by Leif Johansen (1977-78; two volumes, the third having been interrupted by the author's death), one of Frisch's colleagues at the Institute of Economics at the University of Oslo who followed up his work, similarly constitutes another neglected contribution to planology.

<sup>16</sup> There are however some significant exceptions to this generalization. One can be found in the works of Karl Fox (especially 1972, 1976, and 1988); a neglected scholar who has made important contributions to planology. These represent attempts to integrate quantitative political economics and a system of goals and targets based on a new system of social accounting. Another important exception is Richard Stone's *System of Socio-Demographic Accounting* written at the request of the UN Statistical Office (UNSO 1975), following a series of scientific works dedicated to macro-economic modelling (Stone & Croft-Murray 1959, Stone & Brown 1962, Stone Ed. 1962). Finally a number of other contributions merit mentioning: those of Drewnowski who constructed *A Planning Model for Social Development* (Drewnowski 1970); of Terleckyj (1979 and 1981) who further developed the concept and structure of a social production framework; and of Juster & Land (1981), who in various ways gathered, classified, and organized research pertaining to *Social Accounting Systems*.

<sup>17</sup> For an in-depth epistemological survey of this approach see Faludi (1986), and others (Camhis 1979; McConnel 1981; Alexander 1986).



## 7. Toward a more extensive debate on the planning sciences

The time has thus come to deal with the conventional and obvious issue of adapting institutions to the new needs of planners. The danger is that despite the best of intentions the result will rather be planners adapting to institutions — a result we seem to have achieved long ago. Perhaps it is time that we concern ourselves with making sure that the methodology of planning is consolidated theoretically and technically, which at the moment we have far from achieved.

This is the spirit in which the initiative of the Planning Studies Centre to launch a series of periodical academic and scientific conferences on the “planning sciences” was born. The idea was to gather people whose paths have crossed time and again during a lifetime of academic planning-related research, to examine and evaluate the opportunities for regular meetings of this kind in order to address the question of a “neo-disciplinary” approach to the problems of planning. This should allow us to widen communication between planners from the various fields, and thence to construct a new common discipline, leaving behind the above mentioned “pseudo-planning”.

In a preparatory document which I submitted to a group of colleagues as the “terms of reference” for a proposed series of meetings I thus evoked the emergence of a **planological approach**, i.e. an integrated, unified approach to planning. This would comprise the different schools of thought and research that have sprung from the academic fields of economics, political science, sociology, public administration, urban studies, ecology, etc. over the last four of decades.

I have argued that this theme could be approached through an analysis and evaluation of the implications of the normative as opposed to the positive approach in the social sciences. More precisely this could be done focusing on the methods of modelling used in social sciences, the relationship between forecasting methods and decision-making theories, the use of quantitative analysis techniques such as econometrics and statistics in planning procedures, and on the problems of the relationship between decisions as such (choices, plans, programmes) and the levels at which these must be made (regional, local, sectoral, national, multi-national etc.).

Furthermore the analysis would comprise the cultural roots of such a “planological” approach. More precisely this comprises elements from philosophy (eg. pragmatism); from sociology (eg. the sociology of knowledge); from economics (eg. including marxist, radical, institutional, and evolutionary economics); from political science; from management sciences (eg. operational research and systems engineering); from the ecological sciences (eg. impact evaluation and environmental management); and from urban and regional planning.

Similarly in the third place the historical and political roots of “planology” would be subject to analysis. This would focus on the following topics: the growth of the public sector of the economy and increased state control of the entire economy; the emergence and salience of ethical issues in the political economy, including amongst others ecological considerations; the rise and fall

of the so-called "planned" or socialist economies; the parallel market failure in the so-called "market" or capitalist economies; the negative experience of "development planning" and theories of development economics; the so-called crisis of the welfare state; and the evaluation of the social, economic and environmental impact of new technological developments, including the control and planning of these.

Finally, the discussion reaches the founding of a new discipline. This would include discussion of the following: the setting up of a new meta-disciplinary approach, to include "systemic", integrated, or comprehensive planning, described above as a unified approach to planning; the formation of new professional skills and roles, cf. the emerging demand for "public" (i.e. not profit-oriented) managers, and for new analysts and planners; and finally a comprehensive review of the arrangements for higher education in these fields.<sup>18</sup>

To conclude I would like to encourage my colleagues to discuss the applications of the new science of planning to a set of problems which is becoming increasingly pressing, that of global management. Here I am particularly concerned with the following: the globalization of public affairs, the "res-publica"; the need for major steps in east-west and north-south integration; the problems of peace, as a factor and function of welfare; the state of the art in "global modelling"; prospective international politics, with respect to the planning sciences (planology); and finally the role of international organizations, notably the UN, in the improvements of supranational powers, notwithstanding the increasing respect for local power.

## 8. The International Conference on the Planning Sciences (Planology)

Thus the idea of a brain-storming session on this problem in general. This took place in Rome in October organized by the Planning Studies Centre, and featured a range of opinions of which not all were convergent. However, at least one thing was agreed; to take advantage of the opportunity to proceed with further meetings and the expediency of increasing multidisciplinary exchanges on the subject.

Following a thorough discussion the Rome meeting came to a decision on the theme of the first conference: *The Relationships between Planning Technologies and Planning Institutions*. It was furthermore decided that the number of participants at this first conference would be limited.

The Rome meeting took place under the sponsorship of the Italian National Research Council, the European University Institute (Florence), and UNESCO (The Regional Office for Science and Technology for Europe). The first International Conference on the Planning Sciences, which will take place from September 8th – 11th 1992, will be sponsored by the UN University (Tokyo) and the Sicilian Region, as well as the European University Institute and UNESCO.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Archibugi 1991.

A set of terms of reference for the Palermo Conference was laid down during the Rome meeting, though obviously all possible orientations of the conference were not exhausted. Those invitees who will present a paper at the conference have been asked to choose topics that fall within a grid representing the intersection between the two dimensions of the general theme of the conference, i.e. planning technologies and institutions, and a territorial dimension. The latter refers to the various territorial scales and levels on which planning occurs, and in which the relationships between technologies and institutions can be located.

The territorial scales generally preferred by the participants of the Rome brain-storming session were as follows: a) the global scale, b) the national or multi-national scale, and c) the sub-national or local (regional or urban) scale. In the choice of themes for the papers to be submitted to the conference particular attention to the problems of the ex-communist and developing countries has been encouraged.

A short glossary of terms has been laid down in order to ensure conceptual clarity:

- "planning" refers to the construction of plans as well as their application, implementation, management, and review, in any field in which this is practiced (macro-economic, urban and rural, educational, health etc.). It is this in its entirety which makes up the "science of planning" (planology);
- "technology" refers to both theories and methodologies of planning on one hand, and its techniques and procedures on the other;
- "institutions" refers to actual institutions as they exist and are structured in the real world, as well how they should be conceived and designed to facilitate the planning process;
- "territorial scale" refers to the three preferred levels mentioned above; global, multi-national and national, and sub-national.

The first International Conference on the Planning Sciences thus represents the beginning of an institutionalization of the discipline in its "neo-disciplinary", integrated version, independently of its disciplinary roots. The latter have, until now, contributed to the growth of the various fields of planning practice, yet this has hardly yielded impressive results.

It is probable that the achievement of new knowledge at the level of the methods used by planners, and thus also at that of their education, and of the type of institutions necessary for planning will not have much more of an effect on planning in the future than has been the case in the past. Yet we are living in a world in constantly increasing need of understanding and knowledgeable long-term management and organization. In such a world there can be no doubt that if, as is quite probable, the political demand for planning were to intensify at all levels the scientific community would find itself much better prepared to supply adequate support than has been the case in the past.

## References

- Alexander E. R. (1986), *Approaches to Planning. Introducing Current Planning Theories, Concepts and Issues*, Gordon & Breach, New York 1986.
- Alonso W. (1971), *Beyond the Inter-Disciplinary Approach to Planning*, Journal of the American Institute of Planners, vol. 37, 1971.
- Archibugi F. (1969), *Physical Planning and Economic Planning in National Development*, prepared for the UN Centre for Housing, Building and Planning, 1969 (UN Interregional Seminar on Physical Planning for Urban, Regional and National Development, Bucharest, Sept.–Oct. 1969) (mimeo).
- Archibugi F. (1974), *A System of Models for the National Long-Term Planning Process*, (Paper to the UN Seminar on "The Use of Systems of Models in Planning", Moscow, Dec. 1974) (Reprint of the Planning Studies Centre, A/83.8).
- Archibugi F. (1985), *The Possibilities for Employment Creation in the "Third Sector"*. [In:] OECD, *Employment Growth and Structural Change*, Paris 1985.
- Archibugi F. (1991), *Introduction to Planology. A Survey of Developments Toward the Integration of Planning Sciences*. (Provisional edition), Planning Studies Centre, Rome 1991.
- Baeyens H. (1974), *The Sociological Failure in Regional Planning: Comments on Some Recent Publications in the Field of Sociology and Planning*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.
- Camhis M. (1978), *Planning Theory and Philosophy*, Tavistock, London, 1978.
- Cumberland J. H. (1974), *Regional and Environmental Planning in Social Perspective*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.
- Dreve P. (1974), *Regional Policy as Social Planning*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.
- Drewnowski J. (1970), *A Planning Model for Social Development*, [in:] UNRISD, *Studies in the Methodology of Social Planning*, Geneva 1970.
- Faber M., Seers D. (eds.) (1972), *The Crisis in Planning* (Vol. 1 – *The Issues*, Vol. 2 – *The Experiences*), Chatto & Windus for Sussex University Press, London, 1972.
- Faludi A. (1986), *Critical Rationalism and Planning Methodology*, Pion, London, 1986.
- Fox K. A. (1972), *Combining Economic and Non-Economic Objectives in Development Planning: Problems of Concepts and Measurements*, [in:] W. Sallekaerts (ed.), *Economic Development and Planning* (Essays in Honour of Jan Tinbergen), MacMillan, London, 1972.
- Fox K. A. (1976), *Social Indicators and Social Theory: Elements of an Operational System*, Wiley, New York, 1974.
- Fox K. A. (1988), *Social System Accounts. Linking Social and Economic Indicators Through Tangible Behaviour Settings*, Reidel, Dordrecht 1988.

- Friedmann J. (1973), *Integration of Economic and Physical Planning* (Group of Experts on Integration of Economic and Physical Planning) (mimeo), United Nations, New York, 1973.
- Friedmann J. (1974), *Comprehensive Planning as a Process*, Journal of American Institute of Planners, vol. 31, 1965.
- Frisch R. (1962), *Preface to the Oslo Channel Model. A Survey of Types of Economic Forecasting and Programming*, [in:] Geary R. C. (ed.), *Europe Future in Figures* (Vol. 1), North-Holland, 1962.
- Frisch R. (1963), *An Implementation System for Optimal National Economic Planning without Detailed Quantity Fixation from a Central Authority* (Conference Internationale de Recherche Operationelle, Oslo 1963), Reprints Series No. 18, The Institute of Economics, The University of Oslo.
- Frisch R. (1969), *From Utopian Theory to Practical Applications: The Case of Econometrics* (Nobel Price Lecture 1969), [in:] R. Frisch, *Economic Planning Studies*, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1976.
- Frisch R. (1970), *Cooperation between Politicians and Econometricians on the Formalisation of Political Preferences*, (Paper presented to the Federation of Swedish Industries, 1970), [in:] R. Frisch, *Economic Planning Studies*, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1976.
- Higgins B. (1974), *Welfare Economics and the "Unified Approach" to Development Planning*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.
- Holland S. (ed.) (1978), *Beyond Capitalist Planning*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1978.
- Johansen L. (1977/78), *Lectures on Macro-Economic Planning*, Vols. 1–2, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam 1977–78.
- Juster F. T., Land K. C. (eds.) (1981), *Social Accounting Systems Essays on the State of the Art*, Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- Klaassen L. H., Paelinck J. H. P. (1973), *Integration of Socio-Economic and Physical Planning*, (Group of Experts on Integration of Economic and Physical Planning) (mimeo), United Nations, New York, 1973.
- Klaassen L. H. (1974a), *Integral Planning: Some Considerations*, Netherland Economic Institute, Rotterdam, 1974.
- Klaassen L. H. (1974b), *Urban Planning and its Impact on the Quality of Urban Life in West European Cities*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.
- Kukliński A. (ed.) (1972), *Publications Series: Regional Planning* (from the UNRISD), 8 volumes, Mouton, The Hague, 1972.
- Kukliński A. (1973), *Integration of Economic and Physical Planning. Some Critical Remarks* (Group of Experts on Integration of Economic and Physical Planning) (mimeo), United Nations, New York, 1973.
- Kukliński A. (ed.) (1977), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1977.
- Lakshmanan T. R. (1973), *Integration of Physical and Economic Planning*, (Group of Experts on Integration of Economic and Physical Planning) (mimeo), United Nations, New York, 1973.

- Leven C. L. (1974), *The Urban-Regional Dimension in Regional Planning Research*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.
- Mandelker (1973), *Legal Aspects of Integrating Physical Planning with National Economic*, (Group of Experts on Integration of Economic and Physical Planning) (mimeo), United Nations, New York, 1973.
- McConnel S. (1981), *Theories for Planning. An Introduction*, Heinemann, London, 1981.
- Myrdal G. (1960), *Beyond the Welfare State: Economic Planning and its International Implications*, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1960.
- Nisevich E. (ed.) (1991), *Planning and Perestroika in the USSR and Russia* (a set of 12 articles), [in:] *Planning Theory Newsletter*, No. 5-6, Summer-Winter 1991, Angeli, Milano.
- Perloff H. S. (1974), *A Framework for Dealing with the Urban Environment: Introductory Statement*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.
- Rodwin L. (1973), *On Integrating Physical and Economic Development Planning*, (Group of Experts on Integration of Economic and Physical Planning) (mimeo), United Nations, New York, 1973.
- Seers D. (1972), *The Prevalence of Pseudo-Planning*, [in:] Faber M., Seers D. (eds.), *The Crisis in Planning*, Chatto & Windus, 1972.
- Stone R., Croft-Murray G. (et al.) (1959), *Social Accounting and Economic Models*, Bowes & Bowes, London, 1959.
- Stone R., Brown A. (1962), *Behavioral and Technical Change in Economic Models*, (mimeo), Cambridge, 1962.
- Stone R. (ed.) (1962), *A Programme for Growth*, Part 1, Chapman & Hall, Cambridge, 1962.
- Terleckyi N. E. (1979), *Production of Well-Being* (draft manuscript), National Planning Association, Washington DC, 1979.
- Terleckyi N. E. (1981), *A Social Production Framework for Resources Accounting*, [in:] F. T. Juster, K. C. Land (eds.), *Social Accounting Systems Essays on the State of the Art*, Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- United Nations (1965), *Economic Planning in Europe*, (Series of Reports published in the annual "Economic Survey of Europe", 1962), Geneva, 1965.
- United Nations (1966), *Report of the UN Seminar on Planning Techniques*, (Moscow, URSS, 8-22 July, 1964), New York, 1966.
- United Nations (1967), *Macro-Economic Models for Planning and Policy-Making*, (Papers for the 4th Meeting of Senior Economic Advisers to ECE Governments, June, 1966), Geneva, 1967.
- United Nations (1970), *Multi-Level Planning and Decision-Making*, (Paper presented to the 6th Meeting of Senior Economic Advisers to ECE Governments, Nov. 1968), United Nations, New York, 1970.
- United Nations (1971), *Long-Term Planning*, (Papers to the 7th Meeting of Senior Economic Advisers to ECE Governments, Nov. 1969), United Nations, New York, 1971.

- United Nations – Economic Commission for Europe (1975), *Use of Systems of Models in Planning*, (Paper presented to the Seminar on the Use of Systems of Models in Planning, Moscow, USSR, 2–11 December 1974), United Nations, New York, 1975.
- UNRISD (1972), *Report on a Unified Approach to Development Analysis and Planning* (23th Session of UN Commission for Social Development, 25 October, 1972) (mimeo).
- UNRISD (1975), *Report on a Unified Approach to Development Analysis and Planning* (24th Session of UN Commission for Social Development, 6–24 January, 1975) (mimeo).
- UNRISD (1980), *The Quest for a Unified Approach to Development*, (with an assessment by Marshall Wolfe), Geneva, 1980.
- WCED (1987), *Our Common Future*, The World Commission on the Environment and Development, Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Ziółkowski J. A. (1974), *The Integrated Social Science Approach to Regional Planning in Developing Countries*, [in:] Kukliński A. (ed.), *Social Issues in Regional Policy and Regional Planning*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.