

## Globalization and planning education

---

H Amirahmadi

Urban Planning and Policy Department, Lucy Stone Hall, Livingston Campus, Rutgers University,  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903, USA

Received 28 February 1992; in revised form 4 June 1992

---

**Abstract.** The current globalization calls for a globalizing pedagogy of planning education. By 'globalization' is meant a process whereby certain megatrends are made universal to the human condition, although they are differently experienced by diverse cultures and activities and at various territorial scales. A 'globalizing pedagogy', on the other hand, is a mode of education which brings these trends to bear upon the planning profession in such a way as to allow for the advent of common global visions and locally specific practices. The author gives the rationale for a global approach to planning education, indicates the main characteristics of the current globalization, discusses past attempts at cultural universalism, and pedagogical innovations, and outlines some of the main features of a globalizing pedagogy for planning education. Some of the major challenges that the planning profession faces for adopting a global approach are also identified.

### Introduction

A growing number of planning educators have recently argued that their profession will soon go into a recession, or become irrelevant to the new world, if it is not advanced beyond its traditional ethnocentric (largely Anglo-Saxon) and local parochial bounds. Specifically, they are concerned that the prevailing approaches to planning education are spitting out planners that are inadequately prepared for the emerging interdependent world. They cite several reasons to convince their colleagues and university administrators: inappropriateness of planning education in developing countries for students from the Third World, global influence of local actions and vice versa, internationalization of planning action, and transnationalization of planning knowledge. They are, thus, calling for incorporation of an interdisciplinary multicultural global (general) outlook in planning education that allows for disciplinary specialization, better local practice, and cultural diversity (Amirahmadi, 1988; Buffalo Conference, 1990; Collins, 1985; Dalton, 1985; *Ekistics* 1988, Hemmens, 1988; Krueckeberg, 1985; Lim, 1988b; Niebanck, 1988; Sanyal, 1989; Sawicki, 1988).

This new vision of planning education is predicated upon the understanding that the world is experiencing a 'globalization' process, superimposed on the more established trend for localization, and that planning (technical or normative, adaptive or transforming) can and should be a universalizing activity in order to respond adequately to the emerging borderless situation where complex decisions have to be made and intricate negotiations among largely interdisciplinary, often contradictory, multicultural interests have to be mediated at various spatial and social scales. Meanwhile, the rising number of foreign students in planning programs in the West, the United States in particular, has become another alarming force against the traditional mechanical and ethnocentric planning pedagogy that prevails there and which is not suitable to the students from developing countries (Amirahmadi, 1988; 1990a; Lim, 1988b; Sanyal, 1989).

However, dictums such as 'think globally, act locally', 'advance multiculturalism, live your culture', or 'foster interdisciplinary education, specialize for better practice' are easier vocalized than operationalized. For planners whose profession

---

must merge knowledge and practice at various spatial levels, the difficulty is even more real. They must be capable of globalizing planning education in a manner such that it will assist in better local planning practice while furthering common human causes and generating a global vision of shared human responsibility. Otherwise, such a project will receive support neither from the parochial localists, nor from the visionary globalists. The two key challenges are thus: (1) to develop a suitable globalizing pedagogy that allows for a better understanding of the mutual interdependencies and influences of diverse cultures and local-global conditions; (2) formulate a set of strategies that yield a globally informed local practice and engenders respect for diversity and shared responsibility.

In this paper I focus on the first of these challenges. Specifically, this paper represents a second attempt toward identifying the main characteristics of a globalizing pedagogy which facilitates a more informed comprehension of local-global dynamics and multiculturalism. Elsewhere, I have distinguished the pedagogy by the adjective 'interactive' to emphasize its mutual-learning approach and socializing nature (Amirahmadi, 1988). The pedagogy may be defined as an interactive mode of education that helps combine cultural and local-global diversities and similarities in specific curriculum formats that can facilitate learning through contrast and mutual influences, and promote interdependency and shared responsibility among seemingly self-contained entities. The pedagogy is based on the assumption that other experiences matter and that a good planning education is one that makes connections among people of differing cultures and spatiality.

Attempts at developing a pedagogy that promotes multiculturalism and dialectical learning abound in general education and cognitive literature. These include the interdisciplinary approach, international cuisine approach, area studies (cultural) approach, cross-cultural approach, comparative (cross-issues or cross-country) approach, transcultural approach, participatory education, experiential learning (cooperative education or internship work experience), and most recently the globalization approach (Amirahmadi et al, 1993; Dewey, 1963; Gutmann, 1987; Hirsch, 1987; Lim, 1986; *NYT* 1991; Sanyal, 1990; Simonson and Walker, 1988; Simpson and Blake, 1990). However, although very useful, such writings tend to remain limited at a conceptual or academic level, making it hard for practitioners to benefit from their full potentials. They also have not been helpful in facilitating a better understanding of the ongoing global changes and cultural resurgence and how they should be brought to planning education for a more effective local practice.

Efforts by planners, on the other hand, remain inconclusive as they often focus on the relevance of planning education in developed countries for students from developing nations (Amirahmadi, 1988; Banerjee, 1990; Dix, 1980a; Dunham and Hilhorst, 1970; Friedmann, 1967; Healey, 1980; Heumann, 1991; Lim, 1988b; Oberlander, 1962; Perloff, 1971; Sanyal, 1989; Tetteh, 1980; Zetter, 1980). A small section of the literature have also focused on general pedagogical issues in planning education, including the experiential learning approach and adaptive planning education (Amirahmadi, 1990a; Foerster and Hemmens, 1988; Klostermann, 1981; Mann, 1972; Rodriguez-Bachiller, 1988; Tyson and Low, 1987). The present paper builds upon this existing literature but diverges from them in a very specific respect: it is focused on planning education from the perspective of local-global dynamics and multiculturalism. After a brief discussion of the past attempts and global trends, I outline the main elements and characteristics of a globalizing planning pedagogy, and then explain opportunities and challenges that await planning educators in globalizing their profession for more effective local practice and multicultural literacy.

---

**Past attempts**

Under colonialism, the West pursued what Ward (1967, page 42) termed “naive universalism” in international education, which he defines as “the uncritical belief that mankind is destined to be Westernized in due course”. This was to be accelerated by Westernization of education in colonies and dependencies, along disciplinary categories and cultural destruction or assimilation. Textbooks glorified Western history, culture, and achievements and ignored those of the non-Western societies, thus producing a distorted picture of human history. Such an education would produce, wrote Macauley (the British politician/educator) in his famous “Minute” on education in India in 1835, “a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals, and in intellect” (Ward, 1967, page 39). Colonialism rightly feared cultural diversity and thus attempted to create a world after its image: a world in which Western values and way of life dominated. Only then could the direct political force over colonies and dependencies be eased and gradually replaced by more reliable sociocultural means of control. Thus, naive universalism was aimed at acculturation of the non-Western world and could not establish a link between local and universal conditions and imperatives. But, before the strategy was able to fully realize the desired cultural and spatial assimilation, it led to self-assertion of less developed countries (LDCs) and turned into its opposite — a more politicized cultural diversity and local revivalism.

The concept of modernization in the postcolonial era also reflected a similar naive universalism and assimilation policy, although it fascinated intellectuals more than it did the practicing imperialists. The fact that neocolonialism was not based on the application of direct political force in the oppressed nations made it the most indifferent to cultural diversity or local specificities. This attitude, along with a growing sense of limitation and self-consciousness induced in developed countries (DCs) as a result of self-assertion of LDCs, led to a change in their approach to international education: thus the strategy of assimilation yielded to one of cultural adaptation and local recognition (Ward, 1967, pages 40–41; Hirsch, 1987). More specifically, the naive universalism of the colonial era turned into its opposite in the postcolonial period, in the form of a dual program of education, one for DCs and another for LDCs. From that time on, the non-Western world was to be studied in terms of its uniqueness and differences from the Western world. The introduction of area studies and interdisciplinary education also dates back to this development. This first revolution in international studies was pioneered by US educators and “grew out of American concerns with national security and insecurity” (Fernea, 1987, page 1) particularly since the end of World War 2, from when the USA has maintained its superpower status (Winder, 1987, pages 42–43).

In the newly created field of planning, the new approach meant chopping existing programs into two unequal pieces and devoting the smaller portion to education of students from LDCs who focused on national and more abstract, international development problems and strategies as defined and formulated by Western theorists based on Western experience (Amirahmadi, 1990a; CPE, 1987; Dix, 1980a; EPA, 1977). Hardly any local experience with these problems and strategies or their links with larger spatial scales and general development processes were spelled out. LDCs were blamed for their problems and their inability to design and implement meaningful strategies, and DCs were portrayed in terms of benevolent donors of development aid and technical assistance. The so-called international programs or areas of concentration so created soon became isolated enclaves within the planning departments: they had their own faculty, courses, in a few cases a small budget, and, sometimes, lecture series; and faculty members and students not involved with international studies hardly even noticed their existence

---

except of course in departmental brochures or when they had to take required core courses. They were isolated not only from the mainstream life in the department and the larger university community but also from the object of their studies, LDCs. A few students, books, articles, faculty travel and research, and conferences were the only links between the enclaves and LDCs. Neither the relevant literature from LDCs nor their students' views or experiences were incorporated into the curriculum. The interdisciplinary revolution thus became confined within the narrow space given to international studies.

The strategy of compartmentalizing international education into area studies and concentrations continues today, though with much weakened political and ideological support. The emphasis of the approach on specific Western experience, the abstraction of general concepts, the ignorance of the experience of LDCs and their shared problems with DCs, and the lack of awareness of common perspectives led to serious obstacles for the improvement of crosscultural and international understanding and local practice. Since the late 1960s, however, limited attempts have been made by a few educational institutions, including planning schools, and individual educators to integrate the enclaves into their larger programs and orient attention to more cultural diversity, local issues, and Third World experience. A variety of means were used but the introduction of 'comparative' and studio courses, and 'regional' literature emerged as the primary policy tools (Hemmens, 1988; Klostermann, 1981). In most cases, however, such courses have remained restricted to Western-based abstract theories and the comparison of development policies of a few LDCs with each other or at best, and only in rare occasions, with policies in DCs (Amirahmadi, 1990a). Moreover, local-global dynamism, differences in views, cultures, and life-style between LDCs and DCs, and the impact of such diversities on policy differences remain largely irrelevant to comparative classes. Few faculty members also crossed the border into or out of the enclaves taking their views and teaching materials to students from both worlds, or tried to apply them to both local and global levels. Although these and other pedagogical developments remained inadequate, any significant strategy change depended on financial support from public and private institutions for global and multicultural education. Moreover, sufficient support was not forthcoming and the trend took a turn for the worse when it began to diminish during the recession in the mid-1970s (Winder, 1987).

The situation is rapidly changing, however. In the most recent years, political, ideological, and financial support in DCs, in the USA in particular, has been mounting for a new approach to international education and research (Winder, 1987, pages 53-58; Williams, 1990). The adaptationist strategy seems to be running its course and may well be negated by its opposite, a more monist approach which calls for multiculturalism and a global education that has direct relevance for local practice. Specifically, although DCs are again poised for another move toward universalism in international education, LDCs find it imperative to participate actively in shaping its eventual form and contents. The quest to "extend the concept of interdisciplinary studies beyond the parochial interest in Western civilization to include other civilizations" and for "global interdisciplinary studies" seems to be gaining increasing popularity (Fernea, 1987, page 2).

Similar attempts are also being made in the field of planning, where a growing number of educators are calling for a variety of teaching and learning strategies. These include a crosscultural/comparative approach that combines the general and specifics, a transcultural approach that focuses on the general and abstracts from the specifics, an 'experiential' approach that capitalizes on the cooperation and first-hand experience of the learner, a 'one-world' approach that calls for the

---

breaking of the wall between LDCs and DCs, and an 'interactive' pedagogy that is aimed at combining diversities and similarities within a single learning format. The North American Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) now has a Commission to study the globalization of planning education, and a good number of universities, colleges, and even high schools are devoting time and resources to promote a curriculum in globalization.

This new trend toward globalization, multiculturalism, and local practice would complete the dialectical cycle of thesis-antithesis-synthesis, standing for naive universalism, dualism, and globalism, respectively. The new more genuine universalism would strive toward a better management both of the existing diversities among nations and of the growing internationalization of human relations, problems, and aspirations. It would not be confined to any particular continent or region; rather the whole world would be drawn into the process in due course, as it already has been to some extent. Nor would it study the 'international' in abstract terms as in the past or remain ignorant of local-global dynamism and cultural specificities. Rather, it blends the two in a holistic education within which we will strive toward a more comprehensive, yet practical, understanding of planning issues.

#### **Globalization and global restructuring**

My conviction that the demand for a more genuine universalist approach to education in general, planning education in particular, will increase is rooted in and reinforced by a number of global trends and developments that I collectively call 'globalization'. By this term I also refer to a process whereby these megatrends become universal to the human condition and to a growing institutional interconnectness that is embodied or caused by them (Buffalo Conference, 1990). These megatrends are evidenced in economic, technological, ideological, political, spatial, ecological, and sociocultural dimensions of human life, cover a wide variety of local, national, and international relations, and leave impacts that are normally differentially experienced at various cultural formations, activity levels, and territorial scales. Some of the global trends are local specific (such as the deforestation of the Amazon), but have a universal impact on the human condition as on the global environment. Other trends have universal origin but local significance and (differential) impact, such as fluctuations in oil prices (Amirahmadi, 1990b; 1993; Blanchard et al, 1989; Bressand, 1990; Cetron and Davis, 1991; Gill and Law, 1988; Gorbachev, 1987; Streemtem, 1991).

In the term globalization I also point to the movement for learning about these megatrends and their interconnections in order to make them into a new culture of global existence and awareness concerning mutual dependency of nations and crosscultural understanding, and for better management of local issues. Therefore, globalization not only refers to global trends and to the process that generates them but also to the knowledge that is needed for a better management and operationalization of these trends at local and global scales. The task of global planning education is, thus, to incorporate these megatrends into a core curriculum to bear upon the planning theory and practice; this involves a critical understanding of their nature, causes, and consequences, as well as a comprehension of what teleology they may assume in the foreseeable future.

To begin with, the emerging one-world system is an unevenly developed and culturally diverse global community in which nation-states have become highly interdependent and thus sensitive to each other's behavior and actions. This world system is better characterized as multipolar and bicentric, incorporating a multitude of asymmetrical, interdependent, and function-specific centers and poles.

Specifically, the system is unipolar in political terms (the USA), tripolar when economic strength is considered (the USA, the EEC, and Japan), bipolar with respect to military balance [the USA and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), that is the Russian Republic and its allies], and multipolar in cultural and ideological nomenclatures as reflected in religious, ethnic, and nationalist movements. The system is also bifurcated in that the nation-state is now challenged by a multitude of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that operate at global and local scales and which impact local conditions and practices on a continuous basis. Examples include multinational corporations, human rights organizations, and grassroots movements for environmental safety and economic justice. Thus, the emerging world system also comprises two 'state-centric' and 'NGO-centric' subsystems where the state-centric dominates but at an increasingly reduced effectiveness. Under these conditions, a global multicentric balance of power has become the main focus of a stable world order in which local-global and mutual dependencies are increasingly intensified at the expense of superpowerism and parochial politics (Amirahmadi, 1993).

The most critical feature of this new-world system is a built-in tension in its drive for simultaneous stability and chaos. In particular, the system is caught between two diametrically opposing tendencies, one calling for integration and cooperation and the other creating conditions for disintegration and conflict. This volatile situation is caused by two sets of influences, namely world-integrating forces (WIF) and world-disintegrating forces (WDF). They exist side-by-side, at both local and global scales, are mutually reinforcing, and operate with a more or less equal force and urgency. Although WIF tend to bring nation-states and NGOs ever closer to each other and beget global homogeneity, WDF have resulted in the creation of smaller local competing poles and global heterogeneity. No wonder increasing political and economic integration and mutual dependencies among nations and NGOs is matched by a similarly growing tendency toward cultural schism, national assertiveness, and local home rule.

WIF and WDF together constitute the causal influences that underlie the ongoing globalization and restructuring discourses of the international political economy. Among the most critical WIF are the globalization of capital and its preconditions for accumulation leading to a global spread of industrial production, tertiary services, commodity markets, multisourcing, mass consumption, and popular culture. Global flows of money, people, and ideas were equally pivotal for spreading the Fordist accumulation regime to LDCs in the form of peripheral Fordism (assembly operations). International economic and language integration and interdependency, multilateral and bilateral organizations, and transnational corporations and grassroots organizations, among other NGOs, also act as powerful WIF. International division of labor and specialization, and the uneven distribution of useable resources at a world scale have provided additional impetus for intensified international socioeconomic and political relations and interdependence. Last, but most important of all, revolutions in information, telecommunication, and transport technologies have been momentous for a growing world integration and the need for international cooperation. The collective impact of these changes has led to a historically unprecedented time-space compression, a development that has tremendous potential to facilitate political integration among otherwise competing nations. Yet, the ultimate effect of these revolutions could be increased conflict between the countries that produce and control the technologies and those who use them as purchased commodities.

WDF, on the other hand, include the decline in the overall influence of the USA and the CIS, and the consequent emboldening of smaller power centers in a world

in transition to a new order. Meanwhile, the rise of Japan and the EEC as new technology leaders and economic competitors for the USA has created a potentially unstable tripolar economic world where each of the poles fear the possible coalition between the other two against its interests. At the same time, international debt has become the cause for a slow capital movement to the Third World where economic conditions remain explosive, threatening political stability in both the South and the North. The growing asymmetrical interdependence is also crippling national governments' efforts to consistently follow an economic policy, as this has become too closely related to developments outside the national border. The rising level of world education and mass awareness has also played a cardinal role in grassroots movements that have turned democratization and human rights into universal values and demands. Growing ethnic, racial, and gender consciousness, and widening cultural and religious chasms have equally contributed to the emerging world discord. Meanwhile, rising nationalism (and traditionalism) in an age of massive world-wide migratory movement, neomercantilism (state-sponsored protectionism) in an era of global trade, and neocontinentalism (regional trading blocs) in a free-trade world have largely increased the potential for disorder and disintegration in the multicentric world (Amirahmadi, 1990b; Geiger, 1988). An additional source of tension is the current dispute among nations, between DCs and LDCs in particular, over a global approach to environmental problems.

On the fast moving and growing technology side, Fordism has produced its counterpart in the form of post-Fordist accumulation schemes, as production for mass consumption is being undermined by the new trend toward a more fragmented production process otherwise known as flexible specialization, with far-reaching implications for spatial and global market integration. The trend is encouraged by the electronicization, computerization, and robotization of production and information technologies. Even more influential have been the widening gap among nation-states, between the North and the South in particular, and the distending social inequalities within the nation-states, which are being exacerbated daily by a population explosion in the Third World. This disparity has been, in turn, institutionalized by the adaptationist strategy for international education which has hindered crosscultural communication and mutual understanding, leading to further monopolization of knowledge development in DCs and hindrance to its diffusion elsewhere. The resulting increased international relative illiteracy, and mutual distrust and misunderstanding among nations, coupled with past abuses and colonial practices, have weakened the potential for global cooperation, endangering world peace and political stability.

Among the many political and economic ramifications of the ongoing global restructuring, the contradictory tendencies for integration and disintegration, in particular, are I believe, pivotal for a new paradigm of planning education, namely the diminishing utility of illegitimate power, offensive force (militarism, violence), and ideology in gaining societal hegemony or maintaining popularly undesirable status quo in favor of a hegemon or its praxis. Thus, civil and international wars have become less and less effective in gaining dominance over the incumbents. Under the new condition, dictators and undemocratic centralizers are increasingly forced to accept a certain level of democratic processes and individualistic civil rights, as most did in the 1980s. No wonder democracy and public participation are slowly spreading across the globe, significantly in the East and South, and national ethnic sovereignty has become a major force and demand in international relations.

The increased sensitivity of the existing global balance of power to any balance-altering force is at the root of this new development against offensive force. The United States, which considers the status quo to be in its favor, shows even more

---

irritability to any balance-altering force. This sensitivity was well demonstrated by the world's decisive response to Iraq's annexation of Kuwait in August of 1990. The growing utility of defensive force (power to resist aggression) in countering illegitimate domination is another reason for this new development. The current wave of universal demand for autonomy, self-determination, democratization, and human rights is in turn at the roots of the enhanced power of defensive forces. The trend is also caused by the increased utility of multilateral negotiation and the growing effectiveness of the United Nations (UN) in mediating and policing international conflicts and national discords, as indicated by its growing peace-keeping role. Meanwhile, the introduction of cultural forces in international political relations has put new limits on the use of brute force for the purpose of gaining hegemonic domination.

As the power of offensive force has diminished, economic force and information technologies have become the most effective means of influence and domination. Indeed, Japan and Germany have grown into powerful international forces almost solely by means of their economic strength and information-processing capabilities. On the contrary, the USA and the CIS have been increasingly weakened in international politics despite their growing military might. As economics and information emerge as new fields of force, economic development and information technologies would become among major components of a national defence strategy. This change will, in turn, lead to a shift of more resources, including technologies, to nonmilitary sectors and provide planners and policymakers with a more persuasive power to advocate a 'conversion' strategy. In the meantime, increasing global awareness about environmental degradation and resource exhaustibility is expected to cause a further shift of resources toward intensive civilian uses and sustainable development, away from extensive military projects and narrowly conceived economic-growth objectives.

The projected trend toward less military spending is also based on the assumption that defensive force is becoming an effective means for power projection and deterrence. Thus, it can be expected that the current competition among nation-states to build up offensive forces, particularly in areas of conventional forces and multilateral military base-development, will be replaced by technological competition for the building of defensive forces of small, mobile, and high-tech variants. Because the costs of force projection and deterrence are significantly lower than the costs of building an offensive force apparatus or of waging wars, less money will go into the military and warfare in the future. I shall also argue that the idea of 'disarmament for development' would gain increasing global acceptability, as in the UN system, and, as international tension and militarism decrease, the 'peace dividend' would grow in size in many parts of the world, particularly in countries that were directly affected by the end of the Cold War.

A number of other emerging trends must also be accounted for in formulating a new planning education. Negotiated political transitions are becoming a new facet of the political culture in many parts of the world, a tactic that was successfully experienced in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. A few developing countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa with dictatorial regimes have also experienced the method and others are expected to follow suit. This development has in turn become critical for the promotion of democracy and development across the globe. The current thirst for public participation and decentralisation is also better served as more people are brought into national political and planning processes and the idea of tolerance and mutual respect replaces tendencies for violence and self-centeredness.

---

The ideological rigidity of the last few decades about the role of public and private sectors in a development process is waning, and their partnership or cooperation has become the subject of new theoretical enquiries. Unrealistic assumptions about the social side of human nature and the unquestionable desirability of an egalitarian society are also under careful scrutiny. The current gap between planning and market forces is being bridged in new approaches in which a balance and a division of tasks between the public and private sectors are sought. Governments are rethinking national industrial policies and most now favor an export-oriented strategy that promotes high-tech production. The role of foreign capital in Third-World development is also being reassessed and its positive impact is now emphasized and captured by the formation of new joint ventures. The IMF's stabilization and the World Bank's structural-adjustment programs are also expected to become widely practiced in the Third World, notwithstanding their negative consequences for the poor. Meanwhile, the idea of a pluralistic economy alongside the emerging political pluralism is gaining increasing acceptability. State, private, and cooperative sectors are expected increasingly to combine energies to provide a more sustainable economic basis for communities and nations.

Meanwhile, considerable perceptual differences have developed between the largely experiential knowledge of LDCs and the more or less abstract mainstream Western literature on social sciences and humanities, including planning and development. The gap reflects the uneven development of capitalism and human knowledge at a world scale, as well as cultural diversities among nations. Whatever its causes, the perceptual gap has been accentuated by the adaptationist strategy and is becoming a serious obstacle to global education. Specifically, it has led to a rejectionist attitude among students from LDCs studying in the West, resulting in a tendency to resist learning even concepts and techniques that could otherwise benefit their countries (Amirahmadi, 1990a). Reinforced by a number of other factors such as foreign-policy disasters in DCs, the rejectionist attitude would endanger the hopes for any future communication of knowledge and experience as well as mutual understanding and cooperation between the developed and less developed worlds.

Moreover, as human problems and aspirations for development continue to internationalize, the dividing lines between various theoretical and strategic positions become increasingly blurred. The emergent shared areas of mutual agreements and understandings have enhanced the chance for crossconceptual and crosscultural acceptability and cooperation among otherwise diverse cultures and nationalities. Admittedly, localism, and nationalism continue to persist, international differentiation still remains a distinctive character of the present world, and we are by no means near 'the end of ideology'. Thus, the expanding shared theoretical and practical areas, it must be emphasized, represent only those aspects of international diversities that have converged to create a common basis for a more universal solution to the problems of humanity as a whole and in terms of its specific constituencies. To augment this shared portion, conscious attempts would have to be directed toward cross-cultural education and understanding, while respect was increasingly paid to national and cultural differences.

Finally, the quest for universalism grows out of a new consciousness and conviction that the world community represents "a dialectic of polarity, one in which unity and diversity are redefined as simultaneous and necessary poles of the same essence—the humanity", and that "while the differences of traditions, of cultures, of languages, of arts, should be protected and preserved, the interrelationship and unity of the whole should at the same time be accepted" (Anshen, 1971, pages 171–175). The practice of this new awareness demands unification and integration

of human knowledge of the world by means of universalized education. This is so because the present incoherence of human relationships is a direct result of the past disintegrative educational and knowledge-communication processes. Instead of attempting to assimilate diversities, as under naive universalism in the colonial era, or avoiding and perpetuating them as under adaptationism in the neocolonial period, the new universalism should globalize teaching materials by creating universal concepts reflecting shared international realities and by developing a pedagogy capable of teaching such concepts and integrating diversities with universal aspects of the study subject.

### **Implications of global trends**

The global trends outlined above have far-reaching implications for planning education, research, and practice in the coming decades. Foremost, they imply that a more interactive and democratic course of planning has become more feasible than in the past and that it is possible to promote multiculturalism within one's culture and to link global understanding with local practice. Note that the global megatrends take off from and land at specific localities and thus carry with them local-specific or cultural-specific conditions and have territorially differentiated impacts. It is, I wish to assert, this new understanding of global-local and crosscultural dynamism that should guide the formulation of a new planning pedagogy. In other words, an effective management of global diversities, similarities, and interdependencies calls for intelligent and informed choices and decisions which could be made only by individuals with deep cross-cultural understanding and profound insights into international and local issues. Meanwhile, the decline in the US hegemony has made the West sensitive to and conscious of a more sophisticated international education and research.

The requisite pedagogy should thus take account of the mutual influence and interdependencies among cultures and between local problems and global trends. More specifically, it should propagate a sense of shared responsibility among otherwise heterogeneous cultures to better the human conditions locally and globally. The pedagogy should also assist in the universalization and sophistication of planning education and research by incorporating global trends and their complexities into local actions. We could thus achieve this universal-local stature by helping to create a common language that would also facilitate the communication of scientific as well as popular knowledge among planners. This development would not necessarily negate cultural or intellectual pluralism. On the contrary, it would promote them by bringing them face to face.

Such a globalizing planning pedagogy also abandons old myths and modes of operation in favor of new realities and alternative perspectives. A planning education that is based on a bipolar or unipolar world system, that assumes a monolithic cultural perspective, that adopts a moralistic view of human nature, does not fully reject the use of force, that ignores the status quo, that favors a small elite group, and remains hostage to an inescapable choice between socialism/equity or capitalism/efficiency is simply irrelevant to the present complex world where a wide range of possibilities and constraints are emerging at all levels of human community, the so-called global village. Also the notion that comprehensive long-term planning or a completely free-market mechanism may be used to create a more desirable future is inadequate and the idea that local and global scales cannot successfully merge to create a more informed planning theory and practice is erroneous. Planning educators are thus called upon to seek balance and become more creative as they are confronted by seemingly contradictory conditions and demands.

---

In the planning profession, the issue of a suitable pedagogy for the 'new world' arises as planning educators ask themselves in what direction their profession should go, or where it will be, as the twenty-first century approaches. These and other similar questions imply that planning educators need to identify what they should teach their students in a global age when teaching conditions and materials are rapidly changing and a good portion of the old wisdom has become obsolete or irrelevant for effective local practice. From the foregoing analysis of global trends, it may be concluded that the following areas are the most relevant: methodologies and quantitative techniques; physical and spatial sciences, militarism and politics of offensive and defensive strategies, environment and ecology; history, linguistics, and area studies; ethics, gender relations, and human rights; economic growth and technology development; conversion and peace dividend; equity, democracy, and public participation; global change and multilateral agencies; ~~ethnicity, nationalism, and self-determination; negotiation and conflict resolution;~~ human nature and political pluralism; public-private partnership and market-planning complementarity; economics of international trade and finance; foreign investment and IMF/World Bank programs; and finally crosscultural communication, local-global interdependencies and shared human responsibilities.

Planning educators also need to identify the substantive areas of emphasis and specialization from the above, rather long, list of complex and often directly relevant, as well as contradictory, fields and topics to fit better the education to the particular needs of their students who often come from diverse social backgrounds, national perspectives, and interest orientations. How this identification should be implemented remains an area of urgent research and analysis. Moreover, as most of these areas are potentially beneficial to the profession, planning educators must find ways to integrate them with a view to the real-world trends and demands which change continuously and rapidly. Most educators would argue that the current trends call for the integration of theory and practice, with a pragmatic emphasis on integration of policy-physical, local-global, and common-divergent poles (Buffalo Student Report, 1991). Meanwhile, demand for new skills that incorporate general perspectives with comprehensive specialization has been growing along with pressure for accountability and ethical values. However, there is a tension between the need for the students to have a set of skills that may or may not be relevant in a particular situation, and the need to expose students to the global aspect of planning. Nevertheless, planners must find the right intersections between the globalization trends and these directions in planning in order to arrive at a pedagogy that helps enhance local practice. For example, it is obvious that the globalization calls for a generalist perspective; yet generalist planners may not succeed in the real world where practices usually focus on specific problems or projects and take place in specific localities and within the context of a given culture. To succeed, the planner also needs to develop a comprehensive specialization and a deep understanding of local forces and mechanisms.

The educators also need to find ways to close the gap between the culture of academia, which is largely positivistic, and the culture of practice, an essentially pragmatic tradition. The positivistic culture sees planning as a response to the failure of the free market. Planning educators should reject this approach to the meaning of planning. Instead, they have to broaden their perspectives to include both conventional and radical explanations, and underscore the fact that planning needs to complement the market as this needs to complement planning. Planners should be particularly ready to expose the nature of current antiplanning ideas and its dangers for a healthier society. They need to include in their teaching materials trends that favor planning and trends that work against it, and explain why planning

---

or socialism in Eastern Europe and the former USSR failed. They should explain to the students a crucial fact: that what has failed is not planning but the way it was or is done. Planners should also develop a utopia for the future of not only the profession but societies they wish to build, formulate a more responsive theory of the state, and include in their teaching materials contextual issues of global and local significance. Finally, indispensable is a more interdisciplinary approach that gives adequate breathing space to disciplinary views and knowledge.

Aside from the contextual issue for the development of a suitable pedagogy, it is critical to find a response for the question of how best and effectively students are taught or helped to learn about the new ideas, local issues, and global trends. Clearly, such a pedagogy should first and foremost be designed to create knowledge for critical thinking, mutual understanding, problem-oriented action, and human enrichment at individual and social scales. It shall certainly be realistic in accounting for its limitations, collegial concerns, and available resources. The pedagogy should also give students a sense of sharing in theory-building and help them develop self-criticism as a means of self-actualization. Taking a comparative perspective of the pedagogy can be particularly helpful because planning is essentially an interdisciplinary field. Comparative in this context should mean the comparison of common themes that cut across planning contexts. Learning from relevant disciplines can be critical for successful implementation. The real value of an incentive system for global education as a complement to the pedagogy should be carefully assessed.

#### **A globalizing interactive pedagogy**

In what follows I will give the main characteristics of an interactive pedagogy that accounts for some of the above concerns with the contents and form of planning education and assists planning educators to educate better their student audience. An interactive pedagogy may be defined as a mode of education that promotes the exchange of knowledge and experience as well as perceptual differences and shared views among nations, cultures, and localities by combining them in a common format, and facilitates learning through contrasts, comparisons, and mutual influence. It is focused on global trends and their differential implications for local and national territories in an attempt to respond better to such trends at a more micro scale and for the purpose of practice. The pedagogy allows citizens of different nations to exchange their largely varied knowledge and experiences about global megatrends and their local impacts and thus learn not only about their own life condition but also about that of others.

Moreover, by bringing together students and teaching materials from different nations with common problems and aspirations but with diverse cultures, views, and development qualities, an interactive approach can help combine diversities and similarities in comparative formats and allows crosscultural communication and understanding. Students, teachers, and practitioners from a variety of racial, gender, and religious backgrounds with a multitude of national origins and cultures are brought into several required courses on interdisciplinary and disciplinary subjects, and teaching materials are drawn from a variety of literature, case studies, and audio-visual devices covering many topics and regions. Various modes of teaching and student participation are employed including lectures, seminars, class discussions, presentations, short critical papers, and group projects. Existing studio and comparative courses might be utilized as beginning formats for more effective ones to gradually emerge.

Relevant topics and trends are also introduced in nonrequired classes by way of an infusion model, and through recognition of what is globalizable and what is not, collaboration with alumni, joint research with overseas colleagues, and the use of

---

abstracts in journals from other countries. Infusion is good for courses that focus on local issues that have global linkages; core-course, specialized internationalization, on the other hand, best suits courses that concentrate on global issues with local linkages. Other modes of education could include study-abroad programs, sister-university and/or sister-city programs, university linkage programs (exchange programs), visiting scholars, and coteaching with colleagues (one interested in local issues, the other in global issues). Educators should also use seminars, conferences, lecture series, field research, informal collegiate linkages, the United Nations system, and collaborative research and teaching, using alumni and colleagues in other nations, including the Third World.

Interactive pedagogy helps differences be adequately expressed, heard, and fully understood with deep sympathy in such critical areas as living style, point of views, and perceptions among nations, and between globalists and localists. It also assists educators to create interest among students to learn about and from such differences. Constructive evaluation and criticisms are inevitable in interactive education and they should be particularly directed toward distinguishing prejudices and stereotypical brandishing from cultural and logical differences and arguments. Crosscultural and global education is an incremental process and skepticism may prevail for a long time because of powerful forces of inertia, localism, and cultural diversities. Unwise acceleration, however, could lead to unhealthy rejectionist attitudes on both sides (global-local and crosscultural). Flexibility and adaptability to classroom circumstances are, therefore, of paramount importance. Methods of teaching as well as the focus must change once they become unacceptable and/or unproductive.

Interactive pedagogy calls for the application of critical and historical methodologies to education. The historical method allows for a factual and chronological explication of changes over time in issues, knowledge, and practices of different spatial scales and cultures, and investigates their interconnections. The critical method, on the other hand, strives to find fault and merit in them, and subject them to careful analysis and judgement. If correctly applied, the method should lead to the formation of a perceptual crisis and anxiety in the minds of the participants, effecting a change in the character of student-teacher relations as well as the course, and make the teaching-learning process dialectical and reinforcing. The critical method also promotes critical thinking which is indispensable for the promotion of local democracy and global understanding. Significant facts are learned about international perceptions and relations, including the problem of the domination of LDCs by DCs, if interactive education is designed within the framework of a critical and historical pedagogy. Moreover, the comprehensive knowledge so produced might lead to a better, more informed local practice and thus to the creation of new social orders.

Interactive pedagogy promotes education beyond mere training of technocrats and practitioners. It encourages critical thinking, collective creativity, and cooperation. It creates inquisitive minds and facilitates dialectical thoughts: objective conditions and subjective developments are grasped in terms of their unity and opposition, continuity and change, similarity and diversity, and interconnection and isolation. It thus forces education to move beyond mere descriptions and understanding of phenomenal forms to reach the essential relations and causal networks hidden at deeper conceptual levels. This is why the pedagogy is indispensable for the advancement of the ongoing conceptual development in the planning field at a time when the emerging new world is caught between the two opposing forces of integration and disintegration.

Interactive pedagogy does not restrict education to schooling (Illich, 1971). It involves students more fully in the intellectual life of the university and of the

---

larger society. This is promoted by increased socialization outside the classroom and by participation in various out-of-class modes of education including field research, conferences, and consulting work. Socialization is particularly important because planners are at the point of articulation between knowledge and action, theory and the real world, and among various social groupings, geographic spaces, and academic disciplines, and as such they must learn to facilitate the formation of solidarity within and among different interest groups, particularly at a local level. Interactive education can help produce such planners by its inherently multidisciplinary and holistic approach to human problems as well as by its purposeful issue orientation and local-global focus.

Interactive pedagogy benefits conceptual developments by revealing the pros and cons of different views and by facilitating students' self-awareness as well as their cross-national understanding. Specifically, most students from LDCs or communities within DCs would become able to recognize the superficial/ideological nature of some of their experiential knowledge as well as their rejectionist attitude towards unfamiliar concepts. For example, they may come to the realization that they are not just exploited but that they could also be exploiting others. This will help them become pragmatic and screen their experiential knowledge: abandon some, preserve others, and synthesize many more with the ideas they get exposed to in the classroom, elevating them to a higher level of sophistication. Similarly, the pedagogy is expected to influence students from DCs and more sophisticated communities who normally hold an idealized and contemptuous view of the Third World and the smaller communities, their peoples, cultures, and problems alike. Moreover, interactive pedagogy can turn the perceptual differences that exist between students from LDCs, the mainstream Western literature, and students from DCs into educational assets of significant value.

It is the responsibility of planning educators as well as students to be sensitive to these differences and the danger that uncritical application of abstract perception may cause for conceptual advancement and mutual understanding. Along with diverse and tremendous opportunities to learn in and from developed communities, such differences constitute the real basis for interactive education in planning. For example, the complex view of students from LDCs toward education and opportunities in the West should be considered as an asset in a classroom where students from DCs are also present. One may safely assume that students from DCs also have a complex view of LDCs which should equally contribute to the intellectual environment of the classroom. The views clash as they are exchanged and are advanced as they clash. The classroom dialectic of such give and take can be tremendous. Only in this way does it become possible for the diverse and often competing interests or perspectives to understand each other better and thus contribute to the advancement of human knowledge and practice. After all, science is the product of tensions within peoples and between them and nature.

Despite all these and other advantages to be gained from interactive education in planning, the approach as defined in this paper remains at an incipient stage in most universities of DCs and is almost completely alien to educators in LDCs. The existing comparative courses hardly fill the gap. The literature and other teaching materials offer only a juxtaposition of different views, causes, and processes rather than an in depth exploration of what is shared internationally and what yet remains unique to many nations. Moreover, most comparative courses are reduced to listing readings on experiences of various countries in syllabi which students are then asked to read in isolation from each other. The general apathy is largely rooted in the belief that societies are too dissimilar in terms of their development issues to be combined in any other common format. This view fails to appreciate

---

dissimilarities, differences, or diversities as assets in a learning process involving various cultures and spatial scales.

Planners and educators of students from diverse cultures have a particular responsibility to advance the interactive pedagogy proposed here. The problem of the relevance of DC planning education for LDC students and for the emerging world condition perplexes the tasks of planning education; yet planning educators must accept the responsibility to educate and train an increasing number of planners who are capable of grasping global trends, local dynamism, and multicultural fusion of views and practices. In questing for the universalization of planning education, planning educators not only need to integrate diversities and similarities but also must make LDCs and local communities in DCs partners in such a process if a more internationally balanced and locally practicable universalization and sophistication of the field is desired. Finally, these are all formidable tasks and their accomplishment will no doubt require significant expenditures of money, intelligence, time, and energy. For the beginning, however, such resources should be channeled toward development of a more general framework for interactive education, gradually going beyond the one advanced here.

#### **Opportunities and challenges**

Developing a common language and the requisite pedagogy to teach it is a formidable task, particularly in the field of planning because of its interdisciplinary nature and underdeveloped status. Most existing universal planning concepts, such as growth pole, urbanization, economic space, and comprehensive planning, are either imported from the related disciplines or are advanced on the basis of past DC experience and reality. Equally inadequate is the existing comparative literature: it is limited in volume and mostly offers only a juxtaposition of views, processes, and causes rather than exploring what they share and where they diverge. Thus, neither universalism nor diversity is adequately explained in the existing planning literature. Yet the future of planning as a field of study and its global acceptability lies in its ability to respond adequately to the growing quest for a better grasp of international diversities and for the inevitable transition from diversity to universalism, and from this to better local practice.

This formidability of the task notwithstanding, advancements in science and technology, as well as in international scholarship since the 1960s, have placed planning education in a better position to develop the kind of knowledge that is being called for. Research and writings on various aspects of internationalization of human material conditions, social relations, and aspiration for development and peace have increased to an unprecedented level over the last two decades. Voluminous publications and audio-visual materials on various cultures and cross-cultural issues are also readily accessible throughout the world. Classrooms are now more culturally mixed than at anytime in human history, and educators are not always from the same cultural background as their culturally diverse students. Changes in Eastern Europe and the former USSR have created additional pressure for cross-cultural education and a more focused local practice based on a broad global literacy. These and other challenges need to be used to develop the requisite knowledge by using an appropriate epistemology.

Although conceptualization of internationally shared realities and debate over the related epistemological issues are becoming popular with planning educators, as they have been with educators in such related disciplines as architecture, economics, and geography for several decades now, only scant attention is being paid to developing the requisite pedagogy to teach it. This shortcoming is crippling not only planning education and therefore practice, but also the continued development of a

---

more adequate common language for theoretical planning. The interactive method proposed in this paper should help initiate serious thinking about the requisite pedagogy, improve existing comparative education and research in planning, and consequently foster the creation of internationally acceptable universal concepts. It should also facilitate the task of integrating diversities into the education of universal concepts and thus speed up the inevitable transition from diversity to universalism. The proposed framework is tentative, incorporates suggestions of a general nature, and represents, needless to say, views of an educator rather than an educational planner or expert. My primary concern has been to indicate certain means needed for interactive education, ways they should be used, and the types of impact we may expect.

The successful implementation of the proposed pedagogy will depend on us paying attention to the questions of where, who, and when to teach. To take the where question, how would the pedagogical strategy differ when various spatial levels are considered or the DCs versus LDCs question is raised? Can a DCs-centered strategy, say a brain bank in DCs, work for planning education in LDCs, or will the latter have to develop their own brand of planning education by using certain resources from DCs? Similar questions must also be raised and answered concerning costs and quality. Funding for teaching and research and for linking them to practice also has to be addressed as planners move toward a new curriculum and pedagogy.

The need for institutional support is too obvious to need elaboration. University administrators and colleagues must be convinced of the need for the new pedagogy and what it is designed for. They can help implement the new approach by designing new incentives and programs, following well-defined rules and directions, and offering moral persuasion. The size of the program can make a difference as can the overall mission of the university. Large programs in universities committed to international education have a better chance of implementing an interactive pedagogy. A more comprehensive institutional approach should not neglect the active role that the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) can play in bringing about global planning education. ACSP can, for example, design new monitoring and incentive (award, prize) systems, change its Planning Accreditation Board strategy (add a diversity requirement, for instance), provide news of international job opportunities, buy subscriptions to planning journals from LDCs, and make abstracts of articles from such journals available to interested faculty at a cost through a central clearing house.

Finally, many other issues would also have to be carefully accounted for. Conservative forces and resistance to change have to be properly challenged and overcome. Local forces and practitioners of local issues must be convinced of the need for or relevance of a global education and this requires, among other things, a clear demonstration of how local-global dynamics are related; case studies may be used to show that local issues have global dimensions and vice versa. Instilling a sense of shared responsibility in participants can help tighten the bond between otherwise conflictual forces. Such a sense of responsibility must be ignited at the level of specific conditions and must avoid creating normative feelings with no solid grounding. We need to develop a positive attitude toward responsibility. For example, US students may not respond to the shared-responsibility concept unless they are told and convinced that solving their local conditions have made it imperative that they learn about global issues or help solve problems elsewhere in the world. This approach is particularly important because of rising localism, neonationalism, pancontinentalism, and ethnocentrism. We must also be aware of the potential for abuse of globalization concept. A businessperson, for example, can use globalization

as a pretext to exploit people in LDCs while leaving DCs' working people in ruin as he/she exports capital. Note that naive universalism was also a major tool of colonialism. Lastly, globalization of planning education, just like any other educational process, is successful only when it takes place within an environment of trust where the walls of cultural, racial, religious and ethnic differences are at least partly broken. Where such a wall exists, the sharp edge of the pedagogy should be targeted toward breaking it and breaking it to pieces.

#### References

- Amirahmadi H, 1988, "Universalism in planning education: toward an interactive pedagogy" *Ekistics* 55(328-330) 69-76
- Amirahmadi H, 1990a, "Incongruities between the theory and perception of regional development in less developed countries: toward bridging the gap", in *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education* Ed. B Sanyal (Plenum, London) pp 211-230
- Amirahmadi H, 1990b, "Global restructuring and prospects for Third World transformation", in *Dynamic Transformation: Korea, NICs and Beyond* Eds G-C Lim, W Chang, Consortium on Development Studies, Seoul, pp 511-528
- Amirahmadi H, 1993, "Global restructuring, the Persian Gulf War, and the US quest for world leadership", in *The United States and the Middle East: A Search for New Perspectives* Ed. H Amirahmadi (State University of New York Press, Albany, NY) pp 363-429
- Amirahmadi H, Condon E, Resnick A, 1993, "Middle East studies and education in the United States: retrospect and prospect", in *The United States and the Middle East: A Search for New Perspectives* Ed. H Amirahmadi (State University of New York Press, Albany, NY) pp 323-359
- Anshen R N, 1971, "World perspectives—what this series means", in *Deschooling Society* Ed. I Illich (Harrow Books, New York) pp 169-181
- Banerjee T, 1990, "Third World city design: values, models and education", in *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education* Ed. B Sanyal (Plenum, London) pp 2173-2189
- Blanchard O, Dornbusch R, King M A, Krugman P, Layard R, Park Y, Summers L, 1989 *World Imbalances: WIDER World Economy Group 1989 Report* World Institute for Development of Economics Research of the United Nations University, Helsinki
- Bressand A, 1990, "Beyond interdependence: 1992 as a global challenge" *International Affairs* 66(1) 49-65
- Brooks W, Hormats R (Eds), 1990 *The Global Economy* (W W Norton, New York)
- Buffalo Conference, 1990, September 1990 Conference on Global Approaches to Planning Education, Buffalo, NY
- Buffalo Student Report, 1991 *Toward a Global Mindset in Planning Education* prepared by student participants in Planning Lab under the supervision of Professor I Jammal, Department of Planning and Design, State University of New York, Buffalo
- Castells M, 1985, "High technology, economic restructuring, and the urban-regional process in the United States", in *High Technology, Space, and Society* Ed. M Castells (Sage, Beverly Hills, CA) pp 11-40
- Cetron M, Davis D, 1991, "50 trends shaping the world" *The Futurist* September-October, 11-21
- Cohen S, Zysman J, 1987 *Manufacturing Matters: The Myths of the Post-Industrial Economy* (Basic Books, New York)
- Collins J, 1985, "Education for practice: a local authority view" *Town Planning Review* 56(4) 458-467
- CPE, 1987, "Listing guide to Tapes of Conference Proceedings" (and the seven accompanying tapes), Conference on Planning Education, University of California, Santa Cruz, 27-30 March
- Dalton L C, 1985, "Why the rational paradigm persists—the resistance of professional education and practice to alternative forms of planning" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 5(3) 147-153
- Dewey J, 1963 *Experience and Education* (Collier Books, New York)
- Dike A A, 1979, "Misconceptions of African urbanism: some Euro-American notions", in *Development of Urban System in Africa* Eds R A Obudho, S El-Shakhs (Praeger, New York) pp 19-30

- Dix A, 1980a, "Planning education for developing countries: a review and some proposals for a policy" *Ekistics* 285 396-403
- Dix A, 1980b, "Two conferences on planning education: Liverpool 1987 and Tunis 1980" *Ekistics* 285 443-449
- Dunham D M, Hilhorst J A M, 1970, "International education for regional planning in developing countries" *Development and Change* 2(3) 45-50
- Ekistics* 1988 55(328-330) Special issue on planning education
- Emmerij L (Ed.), 1989 *One World or Several?* (OECD, Paris)
- EPA, 1977 *Planning Education for Developing Countries* Reports 1 and 2, Education for Planning Association, London
- Fernea E W, 1987, "Presidential Address" *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin* 21(1) 1-7
- Foerster J F, Hemmens G C, 1988, "Adapting planning education to changing student demands" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8(1) 19-23
- Friedmann J R, 1967, "Education for regional planning in developing countries" *Regional Studies* 2 131-138
- Friedmann J R, 1986, "The education of urban planners: an imaginary interview" *Plan Canada* 26 234-239
- Geiger T, 1988 *The Future of the International System: The United States and the World Political Economy* (Unwin Hyman, Winchester, MA)
- Gill S, Law D, 1988 *The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems and Policies* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD)
- Gilpin R, 1987 *The Political Economy of International Relations* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ)
- Gorbachev M, 1987 *Perestroika* (Fontana, London)
- Gutmann A, 1987 *Democratic Education* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ)
- Healey P, 1980, "The development of planning education in the UK and its relevance as a model for other countries" *Ekistics* 285 416-420
- Hemmens G C, 1988, "Thirty years of planning education" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 7(2) 85-92
- Heumann L F, 1991, "It is time to take stock of the education of foreign students in North American planning PhD programs" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 10(2) 154-157
- Hirsch E D, 1987 *Cultural Literacy* (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA)
- Jenkins R, 1988 *Transnational Corporations and Uneven Development* (Methuen, New York)
- Illich I, 1971 *Deschooling Society* (Harrow Books, New York)
- Klostermann R E, 1981, "Contemporary planning education: result of a course survey" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 1(1) 1-11
- Krueckeberg D, 1985, "The tuition of American planning: from dependency towards self-reliance" *Town Planning Review* 56(4) 421-441
- Lim G-C, 1988a *Korean Development into the 21st Century: Economic, Political, and Spatial Transformation* Consortium on Development Studies, Urbana, IL and Seoul, Korea
- Lim G-C, 1988b, "Education for foreign students in American planning schools" *Planning and Public Policy* 14(3) 1-3
- Lim G-C, 1986, "Development of interdisciplinary course in planning using task-performance oriented teaching method", mimeo, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL
- Mann L, 1972, "Education for planning: a more focused future" *Planning* September, 189-195
- Miller P A, 1967, "The post-educational careers of American-educated students from the developing countries" *Higher Education* 53-62
- Naisbitt J, Aburdene P, 1990 *Megatrends 2000: Ten New Directions for the 1990s* (William Morrow, New York)
- Niebanck P L, 1988, "Planning education: unleashing the future" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54(4) 432-442
- NYT 1991, "One nation, many peoples: a declaration of independence" *New York Times* 21 June, pages A1, B4
- Oberlander H P, 1962, "Planning education for newly independent countries" *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 28 116-123
- Perloff H S, 1957 *Education for Planning: City, State and Regional* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD)

- 
- Perloff H S, 1971, "Education for regional planning in less developed countries", in *Issues in Regional Planning* Eds D M Dunham, J G M Hilhorst (Mouton, The Hague) pp 15-27
- Rodriguez-Bachiller A, 1988 *Town Planning Education: An International Survey* (Avebury, Aldershot, Hants)
- Sanyal B, 1989, "Poor countries' students in rich countries' universities: possibilities of planning education for the twenty-first century" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8(3) 139-155
- Sanyal B (Ed.), 1990 *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education* (Plenum Press, New York)
- Sawicki D, 1988, "Planning education and planning practice: can we plan for the next decade?" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 7(2) 115-120
- Simonson R, Walker S (Eds), 1988 *Multicultural Literacy* (Graywolf Press, St Paul, MN)
- Simpson J M, Blake S, 1990 *Emerging Voices: A Cross-Cultural Reader* (Holt, Reinhart and Winston, New York)
- Stewart M, 1984 *The Age of Interdependence: Economic Policy in a Shrinking World* (MIT Press, Boston, MA)
- Streemtem P, 1991, "Global prospects in an interdependent world" *World Development* 19(1) 123-136
- Teitz M B, 1988, "Planning as a vocation" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 7(2) 79-84
- Tetteh A, 1980, "Third world experience in education for planning: Africa" *Ekistics* 285 436-440
- Tyson B T, Low N P, 1987, "Experiential learning in planning education" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 7(1) 15-27
- Ward F C, 1967, "From manpower to mankind (the West and the rest)" *Higher Education* 39-45
- Williams R H, 1990, "Internationalizing planning education, 1992 and the European ERASMUS Program" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 10(1) 75-78
- Winder R B, 1987, "Four decades of Middle Eastern study" *Middle East Journal* 41(1) 40-63
- Witty D, 1986, "Planning education: the needs of practitioners" *Plan Canada* 26 240-245
- Zetter R, 1980, "Imported or indigenous planning education: some observations on the needs of developing countries" *Ekistics* 285 410-415