


The Greek Review of Social Research

Vol 32 (1978)

32



The transferability of city and regional planning expertise

Georgia Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides

doi: [10.12681/grsr.452](https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.452)

Copyright © 1978, Georgia Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, G. (1978). The transferability of city and regional planning expertise. *The Greek Review of Social Research*, 32, 127–152. <https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.452>

the transferability of city and regional planning expertise

by
**Georgia Kontogiannopoulou-
Polydorides**

City Planner, Dr. of Education

1. introduction

City planning practice expanded greatly in Greece in the decade of the sixties as a result of the extension of planning practice from the economic-national to the physical-city and regional-level.

The higher education system in Greece expanded in the midsixties as a result of policies, long overdue to respond to some of the increasing social demand, closely related to the economic growth the country experienced in the early sixties. Within this expansion I would include the sharp increase in the number of graduate students abroad in the late sixties, a good proportion of them being architects favoring city planning and related programs of study. These parallel developments have induced the evolution of a «planning paradigm» in Greek City Planning Practice. The origins of the paradigm are both the prevailing model of city planning education in the west as well as the relevant problems appearing in the actual Greek context.

The question which arises then is: to what extent the issues dealt with in the western city planning paradigm and the ones appearing as city planning problems in the Greek context coincide. Towards this end, the purpose of this study is to provide a comparative framework for the evaluation of city and regional planning knowledge transferable to Greece in the light of the Greek city planning problems.

2. the question of planning in Greece

Initial planning efforts in Greece after the war took the form of coordination of the construction of physical infrastructure, then, the State's basic contribution to capital accumulation and economic growth.¹ Authority of coordination of urban physical infrastructure was, before the war, in the Ministry of Public Works. After the war, it moved to the new Ministry for Reconstruction.² By the end of the fifties the reconstruction objective was more or less accomplished. The planning process, introduced at that time, at the national level, took a more exclusive focus on economic growth. Thus, by the early sixties, State

— The references that follow are the ones *in addition* to the body of North-American and Greek literature content-analyzed in the process of this research. The total number of the analyzed documents is 522 and it would be out of proportion to list them within this presentation.

1. Economic growth means increases in the aggregate indexes of the wealth of a Nation, i.e. gross national income or product and the like. Capital accumulation delineates the process through which economic growth is achieved; in a capitalist society this means that the accumulation of capital is appropriated by one specific class, the capitalist class.

2. International Federation for Housing and Planning, *Education in Town Planning*.

operations can be clearly approached as attempts *to plan rather than to reconstruct*.

The introduction of planning at the national level was promoted by the requirements of foreign aid agreements. Its proliferation and diffusion from five-year economic plans to physical planning efforts, was a logical extension linking national planning with the building of infrastructure.³

Both initial and subsequent planning efforts have been carried out by a mixture of State Agencies, semi-public organizations, and mainly the private sector (architectural firms or teams). A large part of the expertise has been provided by foreign consultants. The coordinators and staff of the public sector have been Greeks educated abroad, as well as locally (self-) trained planners. This imported expertise for economic growth, planning and research, has dominated planning activity ever since, at both the national-economic as well as the regional-physical levels. It reflects both a modernization process complying to models from western, advanced capitalist countries, as well as the complete lack of university training for planning within the country.

It is well known that the traditional origins of city planning itself have mainly concentrated on physical concerns (Europe/England). The University system in Greece has been only offering city planning courses within the programs training architects. So, the physical orientation of Greek planning practice is reinforced by the traditional domination of city planning projects by architects-planners and/or architects with practical experience in physical planning. The lack of a pragmatic, on specific problems orientation in the overall educational and professional experience of the past twenty years was reinforced by the lack of *real problem definition* within the Greek context. So, city planners in Greece have maintained a humanistic but sometimes unrealistic physical planning orientation. Due to their background in architecture, they have either been oriented to follow a physical planning education and practice, or, they have translated the input of planning training into physical implications.⁴

3. the necessary comparisons

It has been the English city planning paradigm which has dominated at first the western city planning theory and practice. The English paradigm has given its place to the US paradigm as USA has become a major economic power. Finally in the fifties and the sixties the North-American paradigm be-

came the most influential source of planning theory, methods and practice, following US economic hegemony in the western world.

The domination of the US planning paradigm in Greece was a fact accomplished in the sixties mainly for two reasons:

(a) The United States domination over the economic and political activity in Greece was at its peak in the decade of the sixties, when modern postwar city planning was introduced in the country. The requirement for national economic planning was expanded to planning for cities.

(b) The development of city and regional planning practice in Greece at the time when the US planning paradigm was greatly affecting planning approaches in the international scene.

The applicability of theories and methods of any policy formulating discipline transferred from the advanced capitalist countries to the dependent less developed ones has been questioned by the end of the «first developmental decade», when the promises of prosperity and economic growth failed to become reality.⁵

Economic growth in a country following the western model of capitalist development, depends on capital formation and private capital accumulation. The way to achieve this in a «backward» country has been the twofold process of foreign aid and foreign investment. Foreign aid has been aiming at securing the necessary infrastructure (physical, legal, institutional) for the investment of foreign corporate interests. The problem of economic growth becomes a question of securing industrial investment and capital accumulation. And the scope of city and regional planning becomes the vehicle for the creation of the necessary infrastructure and information of potential resources of the country's cities and regions.

Planning foreign consulting has been one of the necessary means towards the above purposes. It is well known how western (and mainly US) educational and research institutions have created relevant programs for the development of the underdeveloped. The criticism for these programs has been that they have hardly responded to the needs of the underdeveloped world,⁶ focusing mainly on the interest of the sponsoring countries.⁷

The efforts to develop research and training programs in the UDC's themselves could not help but have a similar outcome to the extent that they have been developed by western expertise. The orientation of these efforts has been toward physical plan-

5. Frank, G., *The Myth of Aid*.

6. Rizvi, *North American City and Regional Planning Education*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, 1972.

7. Bernstein, B., *A Survey of European Programs: Education for Urbanization in Developing Countries*.

3. KEPE (Center for Planning and Economic Research).

4. A survey in the course of the present research, addressed to the most active planners, supports the above arguments as regards both the origin of training as well as physical orientation.

ning in an era when, in the western world, physical planning was a derivative of economic, fiscal and emerging needs for social and urban planning. This orientation toward physical planning has not been the uneducated choice of the undeveloped countries themselves but the coordinated opinion of the foreign consultants and international organizations.⁸

There have been recent attempts in Greece to evaluate the existing city and regional planning practice⁹ and to research the orientation of a potential educational program at the graduate level.¹⁰ These efforts aim also at defining the theory and practice of city planning in Greece. It is my conviction that the necessity to research the manifestation of city planning practice and city and regional planning problems, as they have recently evolved in the country, is paramount and prior to any attempt to further institutionalize city planning as a discipline in its own right. Such a research would, first of all, shed light on the effects of the common practice procedure of reviewing the relevant city planning theories, practices and even educational programs abroad; this «reviewing» is mainly done in a mechanistic way, at the level of the content of theories, or the common place practices in the foreign case, never yielding a critical understanding of why all this has emerged the way it is now: let alone a critical understanding of the underlying compatibility with the socio-politico-economic structures of the respective countries. And of course this is many times coupled by the lack of critical understanding of the differences between the phase of development in which Greece finds itself and the phase in which the countries under consideration are.

This effort then, aims to respond partly to that need by comparing the Greek city and regional planning problems with the city and regional planning paradigm by which the international practice in general and Greek practice in particular have been affected: that is the US city and regional planning paradigm.

4. methodology

The US City and Regional Planning Paradigm (called from now on American Paradigm or ACRPP) is understood as a set of theories, values, problem definitions, methodologies, techniques and practices which deal with the city and the region. For the pur-

poses of the present research it is further defined as the planning knowledge and practice most likely to be transferred by consultants (North-Americans, or Greeks educated in the US) and the literature. More specifically the Paradigm is defined as *the set issues manifested and reflected in the prevailing city planning education in the US*. Operationally the ACRPP is defined as:

(a) the common body of literature in the required readings of the city planning education programs at Berkeley, Harvard and MIT.¹¹

(b) the articles in the Journal of the American Institute of Planners.¹²

(c) The Policy Statement of the American Institute of Planners, as the official professional organization's principles and guidelines of planning practice.¹³

The Greek City and Regional Planning Problems (called from now on Greek Problems or GCRPP) are understood as the problems of *and in cities and regions*, as well as of *city and regional planning practice*, as perceived and defined in the literature and by those dealing with the above questions in the country. Operationally, the selection of the literature has been based on an initial group of persons (defined by the author), who were asked:

(a) who, in their judgement, are the persons most able to define city planning problems;

(b) which, in their judgement, is the literature discussing these problems most sufficiently;

(c) which, in their judgement, are the important Greek city planning problems, to be dealt with.¹⁴

The methodology used in the context of this research is content of books as units of analysis and the issues as the meaning units or recording units. The analysis consisted of classifying the meaning units

11. Berkeley, MIT and UNC city planning programs are considered the most representative in the US (See Goldschalk, D., ed., *Planning in America Learning from Turbulence*). The Harvard Dept. of City Planning has been substituted for reasons of accessibility to the data to be collected. This has been considered quite acceptable by city planning educators. The sample year of this work is 1974-5, which is the year before the recent changes gave to the Harvard development a new orientation. The body of literature considered consists of the books or chapters of books and the articles which appear three or more times in the required reading lists of the courses of these three planning departments during 1974-5.

12. Commentaries, book reviews, biographical articles and the like have obviously not been included.

13. Thus, a total of 290 articles and chapters of books have been included and reviewed for the definition of the issues in the paradigm.

14. The answer to question (a) provided an evolving population to be interviewed which was well-defined and finalized as the interviews progressed. The answers to question (b) formed the body of Greek literature which I finally content-analyzed to derive the Greek City and Regional Planning Problems, while the answers to question (c) provided a second «set» of problems. Finally 233 items of the Greek literature on planning related subjects were reviewed.

8. Suggestions by international experts at the UN Conference in Puerto Rico.

9. Report of the Committee on the Evaluation of Master Planning. Architects Association; Athens, Spring 1975.

10. (a) Nat. Tech. Univ., School of Architecture, «Proposal for the City Planning Specialization Program». (b) Attkin Panepistimion, See Proposal for the Urban Studies Institute.

(planning issues) according to predefined categories relevant to the questions asked here. These categories are found in a classification system in the City Planning Dictionary.¹⁵

The dictionary used is differentiated into five major areas or categories corresponding to the questions asked in this research. The methodology required that each article and/or chapter of book be read and the primary issue and the secondary ones be identified and classified according to the city planning dictionary. The *frequency of appearance* of each item of the dictionary in the American Paradigm and the Greek Problems separately as an issue, is the basis of the statistical comparison. That is, the statistical comparison aims at comparing the frequency f_{1i} with which the issue i appears in the ACRPP with the frequency f_{2i} with which the same issue i appears in the Greek Problems as a primary problem. The statistical comparisons were based on frequencies aggregated at two different levels:

(a) The first comparison was made at the aggregate level, corresponding to the questions asked at the outset of this study and including the following comprehensive categories:

1. Categories

- A. Role of City Planner
- B. Focus and Scope of City Planning
- C. Urban Spatial Issues
- D. Urban Aspatial Issues
- E. Theoretical and Methodological Issues.

(b) The second comparison was made at the next aggregate level including sub-categories of the above listed categories, representing in finer detail the questions asked in this study:

2. Sub-Categories

- A. 1. The Planning Profession
- A. 2. Role Characteristics
- B. 1. Field Specialization
- B. 2. Process Characteristics

- C. 1. Urban Land
- C. 2. City Structure
- C. 3. Housing
- C. 4. Commercial, Industrial
- C. 5. Technology, Networks
- C. 6. Environment

15. The dictionary of city planning has been specifically constructed for the purposes of this study. This classification scheme has been constructed on the basis of the available city planning indexes and reference catalogues. These are the ones developed by Shillaber, Whittick, Abrams, and Neveling et al.

- D. 1. Economic
- D. 2. Legal Authority and Political Control
- D. 3. Society
- D. 4. Population
- D. 5. Aesthetics, Preservation
- E. 1. Theory and Concepts
- E. 2. Methods and Techniques.¹⁶

The results of the statistical analysis are informative but also limited. That is the statistical analysis has been proven useful as a screening device to identify where the major observed differences or similarities are located among the categories compared. So, it was found that the main differences in the frequency of issues, which are central in the Greek Problems and the American Paradigm, are in category E, that is the theoretical and methodological issues, followed by category C, that is the spatial issues. On the other hand the main similarity between the two cases is the frequency in which the issues appear in category D, that is the aspatial issues of legislative and political control, followed by category B, that is the issues defining the scope and focus of planning.

The quantitative analysis at the level of the subcategories gives us a more detailed picture of where exactly within category E the differences of frequency occur, as well as where the similarities within category D center. So, we can see that the quantitative differences of occurrence concentrate more within the E₁ subcategory of theory and concepts, while the similarity appears stronger in subcategory D₁, that is the economic issues. Similarly, we can point to the fact that within C, which is considered having a difference in the occurrence of issues in the GP and the AP, we observe that in C₅ (technology and networks) the frequencies are quite the same.

But what do these observations really reveal beyond this first screening in the approximation of the questions of differences and similarities between the Greek Problems and the American Paradigm? What they do show is only the areas of immediate concern (that is categories C and E) and the areas of possible similarities (that is category D). In order to really evaluate the relevance of the paradigm with regard to the Greek problems we need to go beyond this first screening. We need to further research the substance of the problems and the paradigm with respect to each one of the subcategories. In fact it is necessary to contrast the structures and processes generating the Greek problems with the structures and processes through which the American paradigm

16. The city and regional planning dictionary has been formulated by three qualified city planners who agreed on its final structure and content. It consists of 476 themes under the subcategories listed (A.1 through E.2).

emerges. The structures and processes generating the Greek problems are underlined by the social economic and political developments in Greece and are brought into focus through Greek planning practice. The structures and processes to which the American paradigm is geared to respond are underlined by the economic, social and political evolution of the United States and are interacting continuously with the paradigm itself.

Following this line of thought we are led to conclude that it is necessary to look back at the raw data which are the issues and problems identified through content analysis.

5. comparison of the issues

Following the argument presented in the previous chapter we are led to a different aspect of content analysis. This is not rigorous with respect to quantitative results. It, nevertheless, aims at establishing the basis for a comparative approach in dealing with problems of transferring expertise to another social-economic-political system. More precisely this aspect of content analysis aims at:

- (a) the restructuring of each issue as it derives separately from the Greek problems, and the American paradigm;
- (b) the comparison of each one of the GCRPP sub-categories (formed by a number of issues) with each one of the ACRPP subcategories, on the basis of the analysis in (a) above.

So, this part of the study includes a type of content analysis which leads to the comparison of the substantive elements rather than the frequencies of occurrence of issues.

6.1 scope and focus of city planning

The stated role of city planning, when it was introduced in Greece, has been contribution to economic growth. Economic growth in a country following the western model of development means capital accumulation. It means, more precisely, industrial capital accumulation by Greek and foreign investors. Greek planners criticize that scope of planning, and assert that the purpose of the ruling class is to maintain the status quo through planning. The way this can be achieved is first by assuring that the accumulation of capital continues and second by harmonizing the contradictions within society through legitimate processes of decision making. Planning could achieve this scope in two ways: It could have promoted capital accumulation first by providing domestic and foreign interests with the relevant information for their investment decisions, and second by designing an efficient physical infrastructure as the basis for

industrial expansion. It could have also provided a legitimation of the State's location and investment decisions on the basis of its rationality.

Radical planners in Greece have set forth a completely different role for planning. They consider it as a body of expert knowledge which can be used in the class struggle so that people can justify their demands from the State. This purpose of planning assumes the same form of rationality in planning practice for it needs to be legitimate in order to demand recognition, attention, approval.

With regard to the first scope, of capital accumulation and economic growth, city planning, as it stands now, has not served its purpose. This becomes apparent from the fact that it has not generated any support from business interests, but on the contrary, it has often become a tool in the hands of the people in their struggle against industrial interests. The reason is that planning has been mainly based on physical design criteria derived from the humanistic goals that the Greek planners set forth for their projects.

So, Greek planning, without contributing to the identification of opportunities for profitable investment, has remained within the realm of legitimation. It has, up until now, remained outside the State apparatus performed mainly by the private sector or by agencies of the public sector, cut and left out of the decision making process. Now, the legitimation which Greek planning practice seeks, adopts the basic characteristics of rationality and democratic pluralism of the US planning paradigm. The reasons are two: first the US paradigm has been accepted internationally as the legitimate form of planning; second the Greek paradigm follows the US paradigm, because it lacks a legitimate form of its own.

In contrast, the American model has served its purpose. American planning as a governmental activity has focused on providing the necessary social investment, directly contributing to capital accumulation in the form of activities geared to secure the «city beautiful» and the «city efficient». Planning promoted by the private sector also contributes to capital accumulation by providing the necessary expert knowledge for profitable investment in industry, housing and land; both of them are included under the heading of «community development planning» promoted by the developers-capitalists. The legitimation of this form of planning has been achieved through its scientific rationalization. Thus the promotion of scientific or technical planning has come to legitimize decisions promoting specific profit interests on the basis of rationality and efficiency.

The legitimation of planning has not been challenged in the US paradigm as long as it has dealt with new investment not affecting existing population and

parts of the city. Eventually, and as planning started being more instrumental, its effect in central city areas and neighborhoods has greatly affected the people, creating conflict between the developers and the city managers, on the one side, and those relocated from their neighborhoods, on the other. Liberal pluralism, the prevailing political institution of US Democracy gave the answer by incorporating various interest groups in the process of planning. The participation of interest groups was thought to be structured and limited by the principles of fair-play according to the rules of liberal pluralism and American culture: the strongest wins. The examples of the failures of participation in key decision making issues are well known.

The civil rights movement in the sixties gave a new momentum to a form of social struggle in planning. The main expression of the impact has been Alinsky's efforts for citizens organization and participation. We have seen that this movement has been focusing on the transformation of affected groups (by a city planning project), from passive participants to active organizers of a struggle and participatory process. The containment of the movement within the confined and predefined jurisdiction of city planning was achieved within the theory and practice of advocacy planning. So, advocacy planning, took the institutionalized form of citizens' organization and participation in the planning and decision making process.

The impact of the demand for participatory and democratic planning has reached «technical planning», too. Within the principles of liberal pluralism and the *sine qua non* of rationality, planners argue that the interest groups must be considered in the choice of goals, alternatives, strategies. The refinement of the tools of technical planning to accommodate interest groups led to the creation of models of social systems, multiple choice approaches, multiple objectives, hierarchical weighing of goals, etc.

This impact of the welfare economics approach to planning, that is the examination of multiple objectives and choices based on benefits, is in complete association with the prevailing liberal social theories which are transformed into specific governmental programs ever since the New Deal era.

6.2 the role of planners

In the Greek case the role of the consultant and the role of the decision maker or the member of the administrative machine are not too different. For in Greece, the State's functionaries, when it comes to planning, do not have a more effective role than that of a technical expert performing a consulting task.

The reason is that there is no systematic city planning implementation process, which would allow those decision makers to operate effectively within the State apparatus.

On the contrary the US administrator (decision maker, or bureaucrat) performs a very specific role within the administrative machine to realize the goals of local and regional efficiency and promote capital accumulation. Programs for housing development, industrial development etc., which the public sector promotes, have as their main role to secure investment and promote private profit. Furthermore, the role of the administrator includes involvement in the political game for which liberal pluralism sets up the stage. His role is then to harmonize the widely different interests involved in the negotiation process and achieve a compromise agreement.

The US technical expert, or the consultant, carries with him the legitimation of his expert opinion and the planning project he designs on the basis of his scientific, value free, and established knowledge and training. The recent legitimation crisis, involving planners, and the undertaken effort to re-establish the credibility of the profession, finds planners in a weak position with respect to recent politically sensitive issues involving contradictory social processes. The difficulty in this case lies in both the danger of impeding capital accumulation, and the inability to harmonize the commitments to different social groups.

In the Greek case the technical expert, or the scientist, is definitely isolated from the decision making process (performing only within the ideological apparatus of the State). His projects or advice are also legitimized through his expert knowledge, which, in this case, is not value free but is based on democratic ideology and strong humanistic values. In fact, in the Greek context the value-free attribute is considered a technocratic quality, undesirable and incompatible with conscious and knowledgeable scientists.

A good proportion of the Greek architects-planners belongs to the politically active groups evolving within the Architects' Association and reflecting the political parties. These groups are active in recent planning issues and are able to allow, through their work, the expression of contradictions of society and to offer their support to the social struggle. The members of the groups are professionals not directly involved with any one of the operations of the State (involved in teaching or acting at the «periphery» of mainstream planning practice). They are directly supported by the radical political parties and the groups are primarily sustained by the parties.

Recently, the radicalization of the planners and their support to the oppressed and the exploited in

the social struggle has added to the legitimization crisis of the planning practice in Greece. This crisis has been both a result of the lack of any enactment of large scale planning projects (for 10 years) and a result of the changing State policy with respect to city planning. The Greek planners find themselves in a comparable position to their north American counterparts: they are asked to compromise. A member of the liberal group draws the attention on the efforts of the government to create a highly centralized-control planning agency and warns the radicals in the profession that they will be left out of the action and their ideas too, if they keep on representing extreme positions. The resolution of this complex situation remains to be seen.

The US paradigm includes a large group of scientists, researchers, academicians operating within the ideological apparatus of the State which in fact accepts in its majority the prevailing ideology. This group has as its main task to create theories, methods and techniques to contribute to capital accumulation. A fraction of this group has become radicalized as a result of the recently expanding movement among social scientists in US universities. Based on their radical approach to the explanation of social phenomena, this group has neither the explicit support of political organizations nor has it been involved directly in the social struggle as yet. Their position is at the moment rather academic, not in direct contact with events in the real world, or any substantive penetration to the prevailing US planning paradigm as defined in the present work.

7.1 spatial issues: urban land

The major problem associated with the urban land is, in the Greek case, speculation in its interrelationship to the treatment of land as a marketable good. The planners hold the State responsible for the lack of intervention through public policy over the question of land.

Within this context one of the fundamental institutions of Greek society, the private ownership of land, is questioned as the major driving force behind the mal-functions of social and economic processes with respect to urban land.

On the contrary, the US paradigm accepts the basic economic institutions and social structure within which it operates. So, it builds its theories and techniques, related to urban land and its development, with the purpose of accommodating the «imbalances» created in the land market. Thus, the focus of the paradigm is to make the use of land profitable and create the incentives to accomplish some social or economical necessities within this pro-

fitability (preservation, urban renewal, etc.) and the responsibility of the owner.

The central issue in the American paradigm deals with the development of land, that is models, methods and techniques which will provide the most precise information with respect to development potential and market profitability. This direct contribution of the paradigm to capital accumulation by the private sector is only constrained (but not limited) by what society considers the imperatives for its reproduction, as environmental impact, the loss of rural land and the like. The American paradigm, unlike the Greek case, does not examine the alternative of a strong intervention including an active role in the control and development of the urban land. Within this context the issues related to urban land are reduced to ones of the operation of the land market.

The Greek planners, on the contrary, demand that the State controls the profit accruing to specific income groups through the commercialization of land, that is, they ask for a direct State intervention to restrict a process contributing to uncontrolled capital accumulation. What the Greek criticism fails to do is to go beyond the estimation of the malfunctions; it fails to examine how the expansion of the capitalist market economy has penetrated in Greece the process of use allocation in urban land and has thus dictated the evolution of the urban environment in its present form, structure, and value.

7.2 spatial issues: city structure

The consequences of uncontrolled urban growth are considered destructive and threatening social integration in both the US Paradigm and the Greek problems, the destruction of the physical environment being also a major concern. In the Greek case the problem created is growth in areas lacking the necessary physical and social infrastructure; in the US paradigm the issue focuses on the negative effects of large scale human settlements in the economies of the provision of public services. So, in fact, the problems identified are very similar as far as the effects of urban growth on the physical and social environment of the city is concerned.

The difference between the two paradigms manifests itself in the examination of the *causes* of the problems. In the Greek case the investigation goes beyond the immediate reasons of the destructive effects of urban growth. So, the more generic causes of political and economic structures are examined to the extent that they affect or rather regulate city expansion. Within this context industrial expansion in the major urban centers, where the physical infrastructure and the availability of cheap labor exist, is examined as solely taking into consideration capitalist

profit interests. The resulting economic, regional inequalities are perpetuated and the process of urban growth magnified. The State is blamed for the lack of controlling policies to guide expansion and protect the social and physical environment.

The problems of city structure in the Greek case deal mainly with the concentration of population, activities and industry in the Athens area. The driving forces are the economic and political interests, that is economic profit and political centralization and control. The generating force behind profit and control is the dependency of the country, as the mode of its integration within the world-wide capitalist system. It is this integration which forces centralized decision making, and thus centralization of political authority, geared to promote and support the economic interests of foreign and big Greek capital. This performance of the economic and political decision making leads to the conglomeration of activity in the Athens area, due to the existing infrastructure and the availability of cheap labor, factors which are in turn intensified by concentration itself.

Growth in the Athens area happens at the expense of the rest of the country and complies to the center-periphery tensions at the national level, well known to most countries with centralized economic and political power.

So, while the Greek planners are condemning state policies and the workings of the economic structures for the evils of urban growth, the United States paradigm has the possibilities of an advanced capitalist society to research, plan and implement remedies for the system's malfunctions. In the US paradigm the profit motive is accepted as a legitimate value guiding the decision making of the capitalists. Having accepted this, the planners search for means to guide the growth patterns on the basis of incentives promoting profit interests towards a more desired direction. Within this framework they develop theories and methods to detect future patterns and examine policies geared to achieve the desired effects. So, good city management, urban-rural balance, good housing and environmental protection through governmental action aim at remedying the imperfections of the market.

Urbanization is the manifestation of urban growth and is considered so both in the case of the American Paradigm and in the Greek Problems. In the Greek Problems urbanization is attributed to the sharp urban-rural contradiction, while the criticism again focuses on the lack of State policies to counterbalance the effects of regional inequalities.¹⁷The

17. Urbanization in the context of the Greek problems means mainly the concentration of activities and people in the Athens greater area. The movement of people to the center (and the paral-

American Paradigm investigates population movement and structure, designs efficient methods to manage the phenomenon of urbanization and attempts to introduce legislation for the protection of rural land.

So, it is clear in this case also that the difference is both in the phase of planning practice and in ideology. The advanced form of planning, corresponding to the advanced capitalist economy of the US is contrasted with the imported forms of planning in Greece operating still outside the State apparatus.

Urban growth, urbanization and migration are closely integrated in both cases too. In the US migration is examined as directional flows of population movement, and, within this approach, the research has focused on the structure of population and labor market in metropolitan areas. A result of the population structure, the physical pattern of the city's neighborhoods is examined to the extent it is affected by these movements. In Greece the migration problem is examined with respect to its causes and to its destination. Examination of the causes includes a critique of the economic structures and state policies which generate and promote migration. The destination of the migrants is examined in the sense that major urban centers abroad or at home offer a prospect for the unemployed rural migrant. Within this context the Greek planner introduces a radical critique in the problems of migration asserting that the main cause, the economic needs of a dependent capitalist economy, is perpetuated and reinforced by specific State policies geared to secure the availability of surplus labor and geared to contribute to capital accumulation.

In the Greek case the identification of urban problems and the urban crisis is not a major concern. Viewed mostly as an expression of the increasing contradictions of the urban society in a period of industrial expansion, «urban problems» are superceded and instead their causes are examined at the level of generic causes. The generic causes are industrialization and capitalist expansion in a country with dependent economic and political relationship from the western world. The State lacks any real power to object to these interests and the effects of the generic causes are felt as population concentration, intensification of class differentiation uncontrolled construction and land speculation.

These second order causes generate the so called urban problems; the planners are very critical with respect to these problems considering them as functional results, object of a mechanistic problem-solving which the State promotes for the purpose

lel movement abroad) is attributed to the «regional inequalities» between the center-urban and the periphery-rural.

of legitimizing its role and function, avoiding thus the confrontation with the real issues and the real problems of Greek society. On the contrary the American paradigm elaborates on the specifics of the urban problems and crisis, attempting only minor correlation with some first order causes and never touching the second order or generic causes. Thus the American planners do not attempt to question the existing economic and political order and never come into conflict with the status quo.

Unauthorized settlements are the direct effect of the whole and synchronized pattern of urbanization, growth and migration and is the manifestation of the urban-rural conflict. According to the Greek planners, the government is responsible for, and promotes the concentration of cheap labor for the private, profit-oriented industrial sector and has not objected, controlled etc., but rather accepted the illegal housing of the workers. The reason is that neither industry nor the State have been willing to bear the expenses for extensive programs of workers housing. So, directly related to the lack of possibilities for rural migrants, unauthorized housing is the manifestation of the human needs within what the social-economic-political structures offer. The production of this housing is the expression of the role of the working class and the un- or under-employed ex-peasants in shaping the urban environment. The concentration of these settlements at the periphery, close to industrial areas, is the spatial manifestation of social classes in Greek society.

The American paradigm's concern with the city's poor and blighted areas is very different from the corresponding Greek problems. The difference is geographical (center in the US paradigm, periphery in the Greek problems) as well as substantive. The concerns on slums and blighted areas are closely related to business interests on the value of downtown property and the viability of downtown areas bearing directly on profit making.¹⁸ This was one of the basic starting points of city planning practice and later urban renewal programs.¹⁹ The latter, in fact, came to be the legitimization for the process through which the State's social investment contributes directly to private capital accumulation.

The peripheral location of the city's poor, but mainly the homogenous ethnic descent of the Greek people make the concerns of the social and physical structure issues related to the city poor completely divergent. In the American paradigm economic interests and civic pride concerns are bothered by the concentration of blacks at the central blighted areas.

In the Greek context, it is the planners humanistic ideology, which is attracted to deal with the problems of the periphery of the city, and the periphery at the national level.

The major concern in the US paradigm, represents the relationship of the growing city and the surrounding environment and rural land. Unbalanced and uncontrolled growth has brought housing and industry into the country-side having destructive effects on both the environment and valuable agricultural land. The concerns over the natural environment have come to focus specifically on the threat of the expanding suburban ring and the towns. The consideration of the impact on agricultural land is closely related to global questions of food shortages and «limits to growth» type of philosophies. The planning paradigm shares or reflects these concerns along with the impact of uncontrolled urban growth, which is likely to distort the market of rural land and therefore have an undesirable impact on agricultural production. The States have already initiated programs to avoid the consequences of urbanization on agricultural land; the planners are now entering the scene to review the situation and offer their expertise to remedy the problems threatening urban-rural balance.

In the Greek problems, rural decay, as the counterpart of urban growth, is placed in perspective as the one side of the problem of urban-rural conflict. Greek planners have identified the lack of State policy to balance and correct the conflict by controlling urban growth and planning regional development. They have failed, nevertheless, to go beyond criticism and try to identify the process of the penetration of the prevailing economic order in all dimensions of Greek life, including the rural economy by exposing it to the dominating and exhausting exploitation of centralized economy and power.

The concern of Greek planners about the physical environment has recently focused on the traditional human settlements threatened by tourism and industry on the one hand, and decay and isolation on the other. The listed dangers from tourist invasion reveal the bourgeois values behind the fight for «preservation», against bad taste, commercialization of the vernacular elements of traditional art and architecture, and the like. The Greek planners have identified the major problem of the settlements: they are either dying abandoned, due to massive migration to the large urban centers and abroad, or are suffocating from traffic and culture congestion in the areas which have experienced urbanization or tourist development. What the planners view as economic and social problems in the traditional settlements are the expressions of the penetration of the capitalist market economy, which has integrated the settlements with the economy of the center. The direct

18. Scott, M., *American City Planning*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

19. All the literature on Urban Renewal supports this concern. For evidence see *Urban Renewal*, Wilson, ed.

effect of this integration is the elimination of local cultures and life styles of distinctive regions and islands, a loss which the Greek planners feel with a particular nostalgia. And, although they protest the folklorization of the vernacular elements of these environments by the menace of tourism, their proposals to preserve the settlements are reducing them to something transformed and saved for tourists to look at.

The failure to examine the socio-historic events and modes of production which have created these traditional environments leads to the romantic efforts to restore them by «architectural controls». There has been no effort to look at the historical economic-political-social context within which these settlements (which we now cherish) evolved. The qualities of «human scale» and «rich environmental space» are separated and admired in isolation from the social context which has generated them. But these qualities valued and preserved by themselves, are empty shells, striped from the social relations which produced them, and geared to be reduced to folklore qualities of some town.

Within this context I want to make the point that the traditional settlements are products of the precapitalist Greek society in which buildings and human settlements were built to satisfy the needs of the people: Things were built to be used and enjoyed and not to be exchanged; they were durable and artistic to satisfy the needs and provide pleasure, they were *not* profitable. The Greek planners talk about educating the people living in these communities (who object to any efforts to restrict «development») to appreciate the vernacular forms and install a public spirit and a sense of responsibility in their minds and hearts; this is against the inhabitants own feeling for success and drive for profit. What in fact the Greek planners want to do is to «change the world» in these «islands» of traditional environment, to reverse time and bring values, culture, and attitudes in their precapitalist form.

There is only one case in which the American paradigm deals with the issue of traditional buildings and historical monuments.²⁰ The question in the paradigm focuses on how to preserve these monuments within the existing capitalist market system. The solution provided is in full agreement with and reflects exactly the operation of the American economic system: The development rights of the land on which the structure (to be preserved) is located can be sold and applied on another parcel of land.

The so-called «development rights purchase» makes in fact possible the effort to separate a large

portion of the potential exchange value on that piece of land and sell it independently of the existing use value of the building itself; so that preservation operates within the market system. As one of the planners emphasizes, *the need exists to make the preservation of landmarks profitable.*²¹

The concerns with the growth of the American city go as far back as city planning itself and have grown together with industrial expansion. The expansion of industry has intensified the concentration of people and activities. In the contemporary American planning paradigm, urban growth is still a major issue, both because it affects the city itself and because it threatens with environmental destruction the hinterland.

What is clear is the emergence of the urban growth problems from disintegration to the urban-rural conflict. In the explanations and investigations of these concerns attempted within the paradigm itself, we see that urban growth and expansion are the reified and permanent threats. Now, what is behind growth? Migration, resources, scale economies. That is as far as the analysis of the paradigm goes. The mode of production which has historically separated the urban from the rural, has intensified urban concentration because of the advantages derived from locating near other businesses and a large supply of laborers; This aspect has not been brought into the scene as the cause of the «city system's» performance.

Planners and urban economists, have been referring to «economies of scale», «externalities» and the like for all factors which make the theories and explanations of the free market uncomfortable. And since the industrialists have never paid the costs of urbanization and growth, the growing industrial city has become their (the industrialists') resourceful base of «external economies».

«Scale economies» and «external economies» are the «scientific» explanations or the legitimization of planners for growth and concentration of activities and people; decay or the blighted areas in the central city are seen as deficiencies of the performance of the market system because of deficient information or miscalculation or speculation.²² The ghettos and blighted areas are undesirable and it is to the best interest of society to eliminate their physical manifestation. Urban economic theory has explained how the whole system of concentration of low-income and blacks in the central areas works, and how the poor are trapped in the city while the affluent and the jobs have moved out in the suburbs.

The solutions that the paradigm has offered are

21. Abrams, I., *JAIP*, 41/4.

22. Banfield is an exception to these liberal views, attributing the problems to permanent imperfections: he views the situation as inevitable and the poor are to blame for their condition.

20. Costonis, J., *Space Adrift*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974.

based on policies planned within the capitalist market economy; that is solutions are devised which do not challenge the continuation and continuum of the economic system. The result is that urban renewal has only spread poverty and «dissatisfaction» in other neighborhoods. The combination of desirable results and undesirable «side effects» leads to frustration and contradictory conclusions. So the policies are replaced with new ones and from urban renewal the paradigm has been oriented to rehabilitation and upgrading of the disadvantaged, and recently has opened itself to the ideas of integration.

Ever since the fifties urban growth means suburbanization of housing and recently jobs at the city's periphery. This change has brought about the conflict of the growing city, the central areas in decay, and the environmental quality, and rural lands. The first conflict intensifies the existing problems of the central city neighborhoods because it deprives them from valuable resources such as taxes and jobs. The direct impact on the planning paradigm is more efforts to research and promote policies and practices for the efficient management of the city's affairs; this concern, which has traditionally been at the center of city planning in the US, is directly derived from the structure of government at the local level and the organizational forms of its jurisdictions. Efficient management in the planning paradigm means making decisions about the allocation of the budget and the resources available to the city on the basis of techniques developed in welfare economics and urban microeconomics. For the city's politicians, efficient management means the delivery of the necessary facilities and services to the inhabitants at a reasonable cost. When the city fails to do that, and that has been consistently true in central city poor neighborhoods, it is necessary to set up policies, programs and controls at a more comprehensive level, that is at the regional (or metropolitan) and national level. Thus, the planning paradigm includes concerns and programs for the rehabilitation of the physical and social environment at a national scale.

Continuing the efforts to remedy what are considered the «market imperfections», the American paradigm fails to promote a critique of the generic economic and political forces which shape society and consequently the city environment. On the contrary it attempts to invent devices to correct the «imperfections» and thus contribute directly to the good performance of the economic system, often providing the legitimization of the methods followed and the decisions made, on the basis of its scientific and rational outlook.

What becomes obvious in this structural analysis of the problems is the lack of coherent explanation tying together the problems of the dependent capitalism

and the market economy (which are repeatedly referred to by the Greek planners) as the causes of urban problems. Such an assemblage would probably lead, those who believe that capitalism is to blame, to the conclusion that industrialization does not intensify class structure, it simply moves it around; urban expansion does not promote the treatment of land as an exchange value, for urban expansion can be considered itself as a result of the land being used as an exchange value by the capitalist market economy.

Having in mind the two main directions of the political ideologies of the Greek planners²³ (which are explained in more detail in the last chapter) we can group the planners' views on the urban problems along two lines of thought: In the first case it is argued that the strategy we need to follow, has to attack the urban problems at all levels of the estimated causes: national development, education of the experts and the people, mobilization of professional bodies, are necessary parts of the strategy. The goal is to promote legislation, decentralization, planning at the three levels of government, to achieve rational planning, functional land use, order, efficiency.

In the second case, the argument is mainly supported by a group²⁴ in the Architects' Association which holds that the State and the bourgeoisie are focusing on problem-solving at the functional level of transportation and the like because their goals are to cancel the imbalances threatening the function of the physical environment in the cities. But in doing so they want to avoid the real issues related with the problems created by the performance of the capitalist system as it is expressed in the prevailing economic and political interests.

Following these radical criticism the Greek planners come to propose the remedies or the solutions to the city's grave problems. What is necessary to change the situation can be summed up as a set of policies, legislative controls, administrative structures, planning programs and actions to control and guide expansion. The above, contradictory to the «causes», proposed remedies, can be explained in the light of the interviews I had with people involved with the planning activity in Greece. That is, the above presentation is the aggregate explanation of the views on problems in the literature. As an aggregate of opinions it includes conflicting views of problems and needs for remedies, to the extent that the Greek planners²⁵ represent a wide spectrum of polit-

23. These can be identified as liberal (center-democratic) and radical (leftist, Marxist), in a very *oversimplified* categorization.

24. Six of the people I have interviewed belong and support the views of the group.

25. This term is used in its wider sense to include all those involved in the planning activity and debate in Greece, as they derived from the selection process I have outlined.

ical ideologies (as we shall see in the concluding chapter).

Now, the similarity of what the Greek planners propose, with what the American planners (at least the most progressives) promote can be explained on the basis of the need for legitimation. That is, the rational model of theorizing and problem solving followed both by the radical as well as liberal Greek planners has been the only basis for the scientific legitimation of their views, proposals and approaches. Following the American model, which, unlike the case in the American paradigm, is not directly evolving from the Greek social-economic-political development or the corresponding philosophy of thought and praxis, the planning approach dealing with the city structure has been superimposed on Greek reality and has not stemmed from it.

7.3 spatial issues: housing

The fundamental differences in the evolution of the housing issues between the American Paradigm and the Greek Problems lies in the historical necessities which have generated in each case the housing question in relation to planning. In the Greek case the housing problems appeared first in the nineteen twenties, when the Greek State faced the problem of the Asia Minor immigrants. Up until then, neither urbanization nor industrialization (or any combination of the two) had ever created a mass concentration of population in a specific area, so that the housing problem would extend to a more serious issue than the mere replacement of the existing stock. The attempts to solve the immigrants' housing problem were limited and unorganized, first, because Greece was still a young nation, and second, because the role of these immigrants was not important for the economy at that time.

On the contrary, in the western paradigm, and more specifically in England, housing has been the generating force which eventually evolved into city planning. Housing has been the basic problem following step by step the industrial revolution in England; and the need for low-price housing close to the industrial areas has created the slums which the enlightened industrialists of the 19th century wanted to replace with the first «planning schemes».²⁶

In its evolution the American paradigm has dealt with the housing issues in close relationship to the economic, political and social environment. The question of slum housing, occupied by migrant workers²⁷ in the major industrial cities, was one of

the basic issues of the reform movement of the late nineteenth century²⁸ and one of the fundamental issues of city planning.

It is also industrialization that has brought about the housing problem anew in Greece, but in this case the questions evolved in a different way than in the western industrialized countries. The housing problem in modern Greece has appeared intensified at the periphery of the industrializing Athens Region, as unauthorized settlements, more like the squatter settlements of Latin America rather than the slums of the western industrial city.²⁹

There are two main reasons for the delay with which the unauthorized housing problems are tackled in Greece (in the 1970s) compared to when the settlements appeared and the problems aggravated. The first is that the education and the ideology of the Greek architects and planners has been traditionally aligned with the western models. So it is easy to explain how the problem of unauthorized housing has not been «discovered» but only after those Greeks studying abroad «discovered» the Latin American squatter settlements in western universities. The second reason is that the unauthorized settlements in Greece, unlike the slums in the industrialized countries are at the periphery of the city, close to the industries, quite «invisible» from the mainstream everyday life of the concerned professionals. Having being expanded in relationship to industrial expansion mainly, these settlements appeared outside the city which has already grown (unlike the western case and especially the American case where city growth and industrial expansion have been complimentary processes).

The result is that in the AP the housing issues have grown and have been dealt with in a continuous relationship to the economic-political-social structures and the history of city planning. More precisely, looking at the historical evolution of the housing question in the US, the initiation of the organized efforts to face the problem, has been in complete agreement to

industrial revolution, European migrants and later black rural migrants came to live in slums and tenements adjacent to the industrial areas in the cities of the Northeast. With the growth of the American City these neighborhoods found themselves in the central city area and continued declining. Their inhabitants were unable to follow the outmigration or the suburbanization of the upper incomes at first and the industry later.

26. Scott, Mel., *American City Planning*, chapter 1 «The Spirit of the Reform».

27. In Greece, where the two major urban centers grew before the expansion of industrial production in the country (their growth can be traced in the growth of the so-called «services» sector and «parasitic» intermediate jobs) the industry's found themselves locating at the city's periphery. So the majority of rural migrants located at the city's outskirts close to industrial employment opportunities and available cheap land.

26. HMSO: *Report for the Qualification of Planners*.

27. In the US, where the cities mainly grew in the midst of the

the prevailing socioeconomic system. That is the efforts have intended «not to set up government in the building of homes but to stimulate individual endeavor»,³⁰ that was in perfect agreement with the efforts to contribute to the revival and expansion of the cherished private enterprise economic system.

In the Greek case the first housing issues appear in the form of concerns over the lack of housing planning programs without any substantive reference (let alone the traditional kind of research) on the most aggravated form of problems, and never, until very recently, on unauthorized housing. These concerns have reflected the abstract superimposition of the western model of city planning issues rather than any generic questions on the Greek problems. Looking at the specific issue of low-cost and workers housing in Greece, one can distinguish the characteristics which set the dimensions of the problem. For one thing this form of State contribution to social consumption has not been necessitated as yet due to the specific process of capitalist development of the country. That is, the continuous existence of surplus labor has not necessitated any concessions to the working class. On the other hand the Greek rural migrant, with a very limited amount of savings, unemployed (or with earnings at the level of subsistence), and without any State support, buys or occupies a piece of land and builds «illegally».³¹ The problem has recently become grave, due mainly to the land price increases as well as construction costs increases, so that the State has to intervene and contribute to investment for workers housing, to respond to the increasing difficulties for housing in the process of the reproduction of the labor force.

In an advanced capitalist country like the US, where both labor and monopoly capital interests are powerful, the programs for low-cost housing have been long ago initiated by the State. In the postwar era the provision of housing was one more element in the efforts to re-orient a war economy and to create opportunities for massive investment in new sectors of the economy. So the combined effort for public housing and urban redevelopment gave the opportunity for the introduction of federal intervention in support of capitalist expansion.³² The need and the

ability to do so is closely related to the specific phase of capitalist development which required that the State contributes and promotes economic growth.

On the contrary, the Greek State has not created any substantial housing programs because the needs of industrialization have not been expanded but only recently, and the concentration of workers in the major urban centers has been accommodated initially within the existing low quality stock at the city's periphery and the unauthorized settlements.

Recently the increase of rural migrants-workers tends to create saturation in the available cheap agricultural land and the existing housing stock at the periphery of the large urban centers. More than that, the increasing costs of construction have contributed to the acuteness of the low-cost housing problem. The State has decided for the first time to deal with the issue: the proposed legislation for the organization of *KEPOS*, the Agency for Housing and Urban Development, is advocated as a viable solution to the questions of financing and managing the development of low-cost housing as well as middle income housing.

In the American Paradigm, housing programs and State policy along with the well established questions of redevelopment have been in the core of and a generating force for city planning projects. Housing policies in the fifties³³ stressed the need for regional and local planning as a precondition for federal aid and the prevention of slums and blight through urban renewal programs. The creation of a number of Agencies for Urban Renewal, Federal Housing, Public Housing and a number of programs were the operational devices through which federal intervention would integrate the communities, the labor force, the construction industry and the consumers. Within this framework the goals of the capitalist system, requiring expansion, would be promoted under the management of the liberal democratic institutions and their local or regional structures.

The official professional planning association has always supported the multiplicity of planning agencies as an integrated and permanent part of the administrative structures of the State,³⁴ to provide for metropolitan planning and assistance to state and

30. This has been among the stated scopes of the first Housing Act. H. Hoover, «Address» in *Housing Objectives and Programs*. Scott, M., *op. cit.*

31. Ownership is an important difference in the housing issue between the AP and the GP. That is, while the slum dweller and the low-cost housing renter in the US by and large does not own his shelter, a good proportion of the Greek poor workers do. The historical reasons for this social and economic difference have to do with the phase of the specific capitalist form of development in which each country finds itself, and have to do with the cultural structures which have generated the respective societies.

32. Federal intervention in the form of reform in home building

introduced by Hoover found respectability and applicability as planning laws ten years later. The goal was to fight the blight in the central cities, overcome the deteriorating values of central city property and revitalize central city business as well as to contribute to the transformation of a war economy to a peace economy. Scott, M., *op. cit.*

33. The Housing Act of 1954 introduced by reformers and liberals was the successor of the bill of the Housing Act of 1945, the first attempt to combine housing and urban redevelopment.

34. American Institute of Planners, *Proposed 1959 Position Statement*. Also *National Planning Policy*, 1974.

local government.³⁵ Within this context the American Paradigm has achieved the close relationship of the profession with the State machine, which, along with the traditional integration with the «private sector», contributes to the harmonious operation of the planning process. The paradigm evaluates programs and proposes shifts in emphasis towards directions which are determined within the existing economic and political institutions. That is, it examines federal programs emphasizing production oriented versus consumer oriented strategies but it fails to examine why and how such policies are determined and the role of the State in the process. Furthermore, the role of federal government in subsidizing private investment in housing is dealt with as an attempt to correct the housing market imperfection and never as a distinct contribution to capital accumulation. The major contribution of the paradigm in the process of making capital available for housing programs has a rather managerial character within the existing budget availability, and not (as in the case of Greek problems) a factual support to the demands of the people and specifically the working class.

To accomplish the successful and harmonious cooperation of private industry and State programs the paradigm focuses on the concern of housing supply, that is the response of the market to the demand for housing. So, the planners are caught between the housing programs and their eagerness to let the market work out its miracles. The filtering process is the planners' support to the housing market's powerful allocative operation which will eventually supply for the poor. The State programs have to come later to supply for what is lacking *after* the filtering process is left to operate.

The contribution of the planners to the «supply» of housing focuses mainly in the definition of the demand with regards to projection of the needs, the evaluation of the efficiency of the programs and in general research which guarantees a full knowledge of housing needs. These needs do not represent users needs as such, but market needs, the definition of which contributes to the profitable investment of the construction industry.

Another major concern of the American Paradigm is the location of the household and the factors which define location patterns. Within the above need for market predictability the planners have contributed to the building of a variety of models. The interest in this case is to predetermine again not people's «needs» but consumer «behavior» in order to maximize the profit potential of the developer.

Even more, while the Greek planners distinguish

and point to class difference characteristics in housing location, the American Paradigm projects and predicts and thus perpetuates.

The issue of housing discrimination and segregation appears as a major contradiction of American democratic liberalism centering around the goal of equal opportunity. Segregation and discrimination are more acute in the US than in other countries and appear as a double separation of income and race. The planners have created a «movement» searching for policy devices, in the effort to counterbalance this economic and social manifestation of social structures, and change it into an integrated pattern. In this process they have realized that housing type means to a great extent income, which also is unequally but definitely distributed among different ethnic groups. The liberal attitude of the planner places there the limit of the investigation of social formations and processes. The causes of discrimination are not deeply investigated. The planners have failed to openly state that the differences of income and race, expressed in housing segregation, are only the spatial manifestation of the different classes in society. They have also failed to realize that by de-segregating, or distributing spatially low incomes and ethnic communities, they distribute class conflict and thus weaken potential class consciousness. That is, the solutions proposed and applied are remedies geared to postpone or change the form of the housing problem, and not to solve it. Of course, the liberal planner's philosophy labels the approach as successive approximations towards the optimum solution without any realization of the possible perpetuation of the problem, stemming from the working of the prevailing economic system.

In summarizing the Greek housing problems we can distinguish two lines of thought: The one follows a quite similar to the liberal planner's ideology in the US, which, after identifying mostly the quantifiable housing problems, searches for the apparent causes. Then it proceeds to ask for governmental policies and action to undertake the task of providing decent housing in decent environments for the working class and the urban poor. The other group criticizes the role of the State and the economic system and attempts an elementary formulation of the view that these developments in housing are inevitable, consisting the expected course of events given the specific phase of capitalist development in which Greece finds itself. So the Greek planners attempt a deep analysis of the housing problem in Greece, trying to analyze the specific economic political and social circumstances which create the conditions for its manifestation.

The US planners have accepted the basic operations-role the State adopts, their criticism being li-

35. Scott, M., *op. cit.*

mitted to minor arguments for changes in policies. Moreover they themselves have contributed to the definition of State operations and their fluent management.

The Greek planners do not offer any apologetic for the State's non policy with respect to housing. Irrespective of whether their criticism leads to a «better housing alternative» (this remains to be seen) they criticize and demand that the State faces the problem. Furthermore, the politicized group of radical planners attempts to analyze the objective conditions of the present phase of capitalism in Greece as they relate to the creation of the preconditions of today's housing problem for the working class.

So the American Paradigm accepts and reinforces the existing political and economic system by offering solutions for its imperfections and the scientific legitimation for the State's role in the housing issue. More than that, the paradigm contributes to capital accumulation by offering expert knowledge and advocating policies which promote profitable investment for the private housing industry. On the contrary the Greek planners both criticize the policies of the State, and a good proportion of them attacks the existing economic and political order demanding radical change.

7.4 spatial issues: industrial

The acute housing and migration problems and the increasing concentration of working class in the two big Greek cities have forced the State to consider seriously the decentralization of industrial activity. That means more concessions to the industrial capital in order to provide them with equally profitable potential. Decentralization also means the penetration of capitalist relations and specifically monopoly capitalist relations in the rural areas and the «backward» regions. The Greek planners criticize the easiness with which the State promotes industrial interests without safeguarding national interests, that is the interests of the people in terms of environmental and social problems created in the process of industrialization.

The potential and actual contribution of the American Paradigm can be only considered in terms of industrial interests. That is the methods and techniques which the paradigm has developed can be considered completely relevant and useful to the industries themselves. Their potential help to the Greek side could be limited to the estimation of the contribution to economic growth by specific industry. But the more serious problems of the Greek case (as the effects of foreign monopoly industries on Greek economic-social structures and the effects of industrial location on social and economic life), cannot be

investigated on the basis of the American Paradigm.

The contradictions between the ideology and the aspirations of the people and the social relations, which the new mode of production and exchange forces them into, are apparent. The illusions of upward mobility to which the peasants aspire become clearer when the situation before and after tourist penetration is compared. The sharp and fast changes do not provide for the necessary socialization period the result being that the people refuse to submit to the new social relations, what the Greek liberal planners call «lack of adaptability to the new employment opportunities».

Greek planning occupies itself with the struggle of providing the communities (mainly workers' and rural areas) with public facilities. These facilities are understood both in the form of physical as well as social infrastructure for the social development of the people. What, in fact, the Greek planners ask is the socialization of the costs for the survival and reproduction of the working class. That is, the State is asked to provide for the people what neither the market nor their wages can provide for them. This question in Greece becomes a political issue, in the sense that it is considered the outcome of the struggle of the people against the State.

In the American Paradigm the concern of the planners centers around the costs of providing these facilities-services and the mechanisms to finance them. So, the question of public facilities becomes in this case a fiscal issue. That is, the American planners are mainly occupied with the problems of estimating, projecting, modeling the effective demand (not the need) for public facilities, as well as the means to finance them to the extent that the State has supplied the necessary programs. So, the coordination of the welfare state and its programs, with the potential provided by the activity of the local government has definitely reinforced the evolution of professional planning practice.

In Greece planning expertise can at the moment only serve the purpose of supplying the people's struggle with enlightenment, information and planning legitimation.

7.5 spatial issues: environmental

The problems-concerns in the Greek case mirror to a large extent the evolution of the built environment. So the first issue concerns the urbanization and urban expansion of the Athens center towards the periphery, destroying the surrounding physical environment and agricultural land. In the next stage industrial and tourist expansion, the main means of economic growth, appear to have a grave impact, too.

The impact of industrialization becomes an issue among interest groups, political parties and professional associations. Tourist expansion threatens a most valued heritage of the people, the cultural-physical environment. Tourism as a means to economic growth has a much more serious impact of cultural-historical disintegration with far-reaching economic implications, too.

The above forms of environmental destruction, affecting all the valuable physical resources, are obviously generated and aggravated in the process of capital accumulation and economic expansion. The exploitation of natural resources by foreign and Greek capital is the most obvious case of environmental destruction generated in the process of capital accumulation. The extracting industries and the methods they employ to exploit natural resources leave behind a destroyed physical environment and a negatively affected ecological balance. The Greek State appears to either have no choice but succumb to the wishes of big and foreign capital, or be eager to do so. The Greek planners have pointed to the questions of the uncontrolled exploitation of the country's resources criticizing the unrestricted profits made by Greek and foreign capital in the process; they examine the structural relationships and dependencies of the Greek economy with the world capitalist system and the manifestation of these dependencies in the Greek environmental problems.

In the AP the environmental concerns deal mainly with what is considered the destructive and undesirable effects of economic growth, industrial expansion, increased consumption. The environmental problems which result are considered as the inevitable corollary of progress but nevertheless manageable. The role of the State in the American context is to undertake the task to protect and clean the environment by supporting research and relevant projects. This way the State socializes the expenses which are necessitated in the process of industrial and capitalist expansion. The paradigm includes a multiplicity of concerns over the environmental crisis and the need for environmental quality. But any suggestion to counterbalance environmental decay is either presented within the overall profit process of the private interests or faced with the criticism for its negative impact on economic expansion.

The environmental impact statement is the State's response to the increasing threats to the environment endangering the «quality of life». It is both a restrictive device but also a procedure which legitimizes location decisions. The expansion of concerns for the environment in the American Paradigm overcomes the borders of that country and takes global dimensions. The reasons for that are manifold, and not very clear in the paradigm. It is only characteristic to

point out that these concerns include population growth, natural resource exploitation and the wealth of the sea but not any worries over specific present problems generated by industrial expansion of multinational corporate capital.

8.1 aspatial issues: economic

The fundamental difference between the paradigm and the Greek problems with respect to economic issues is the structure of the economy in each case. The Greek economy is a dependent variable in the world-wide capitalist system in which the main actor is the US economy. More precisely the Greek economy is dominated by the US economy to the extent that it is regulated by US capital in most activities of the industrial sector as well as programs of the State.

Having this decisive relationship of dependence in mind, and the resulting effects to all aspects of Greek life, the Greek planners argue that there can be no real economic and social development of the nation without national independence; furthermore, there can be no national independence without economic independence from foreign capital and monopolies.³⁶

Of course national independence in this sense of economic independence is not a relevant issue in the AP. The relationship of the economy with monopolies and the formulation of the paradigm is, nevertheless, an issue in one case.³⁷ The regional

36. For example the extraction industry at Itsea does not produce the finished product of aluminium (which would be more profitable for the Greek economy) because its production is controlled in the small countries so that the price of the product is kept at high levels. (Loss for the country is estimated to be \$9 million for each 100 million tons of extracted metal not transformed into aluminium).

In Pylos, where the recent controversy on an industrial location has focused, the harbor is on the junction of major sea routes (Suez Canal to Gibraltar, Bosphorus to Gibraltar) and there is a lot of speculation about the potential for the service of «metropolitan fleets». The present proposal concerns shipyards and includes the use of the natural historical harbor.

37. The fiscal crisis of the State is expressed both at the local and the State administrative level. The form of the crisis is different in each level. At the local level we witness the continuing elimination of responsibility for urban management through the proliferation of regional agencies of all kinds. This reflects the transition of the economic system from a competitive to a monopoly one, which necessitates the transition from the local decision making powers of competitive capitalism to the regional and federal decision making level, where monopoly capitalist interests prevail.

This is true of programs concerning transportation, or environmental control, metropolitan development agencies and the like (all operating increasingly at the regional level).

The «apologetic» for the final crisis isolates the phenomenon at the very local level and reduces it to political power in the sense that it is determined by the ability of the local officials to accept the challenge and in getting more money from the State.

issues, which increasingly occupy planning operations, continuously replace consideration at the local levels. The explanation in the paradigm presents that the continuous penetration of monopoly capital is related to the increasing need for large State Agencies at the metropolitan and regional levels. These new bodies of the State apparatus are necessitated as a result of the need to remove decision making from the local to the regional level according to the needs of monopoly capital and control.

A major concern in Greece and the reason for which planning appears to have been introduced is economic growth. Economic growth means capital accumulation by foreign and Greek capital. The State's contribution in this process is: the five year plans to form a favorable investment climate—legitimation—and create the necessary infrastructure—direct contribution; a set of «incentives» to increase substantially the potential for profitable investment—direct contribution; master plans and regional plans to also provide a favorable investment climate and the necessary information for the interested parties. Since planning for economic growth has come to mean securing the preconditions for capital accumulation, planning for economic growth also means: increasing profits for the capitalist class and increasing exploitation of the working class.

Regional economic growth and planning for regional development has only been a rhetoric in the Greek context. Intending to harmonize the urban-rural conflict, and, recently, due to the requirements of the Common Market, regional planning is presented as the process through which the periphery will be developed and the inequalities reinforcing the urban/rural dichotomy will be reduced. Agricultural exports and tourism are the main resources at the periphery and the basis of the exploitation concentrating profits in the hands of the capitalist class. Secondary (at the moment) but much more explicit is the exploitation of the region's natural and working resources by industry.

The issues of regional planning in the ACRPP follow the already established pattern: they consist of methodology and techniques estimating the parameters which define and project the market, its mechanisms and its needs. The paradigm also deals with the issue of growth trying on the one hand to estimate and define the sources of growth and on the other to offer an apologetic for the sharp regional inequalities.³⁸ Thus, contribution to the knowledge

38. Wage level differentials are explained in the pattern of capital-labor ratio employed in certain industries. So every region cannot hope to experience rapid increases in the volume of economic activity and population. But each region can enjoy a general level of living not «far away» from the level of the nation

of the market—that is contribution to the profit process—and an effort to harmonize the obvious inequalities are the characteristics of the paradigm in this case also.

On the contrary, the Greek planners, not only reject to offer any legitimation or contribution to State and private capital operations for capital accumulation by a specific class, but they try to expose the actual structure of the Greek economy and the role of the State, the capitalist class and foreign capital. So, the Greek planners research how agriculture, tourism, industry and natural resources are exploited and how these specific developments contribute to the degeneration of traditional economic structures in favor of international and monopoly capital expansion. To deal with these concerns the Greek planners focus extensively on the problems created by the «relationship» of corporations and the society at large. This examination makes clear the incompatible and rather contradictory goals between private corporations and the Greek society. The AP in this case also attempts to, first, develop and promote practices which will guarantee the manifestation of the ideal of the American pluralistic society. Furthermore, it attempts to facilitate the operations of the State on the one hand and the market mechanism on the other. The ideal of a pluralistic society in the economic issues finds its outmost realization in the concerns over the distribution of income. This issue, as a direct effect of the human rights movement, has been extensively introduced in the literature. In reality though, it has not led to the extensive examination of the social relations of production which establish and regulate unequal incomes. Rather the analysis has focused on mixed income neighborhoods and the effort to formulate policies-devices which would guarantee this mixture in physical space, i.e. residential areas.

The operations of the State and the market are facilitated by the specific contribution of planning. Budget and finance costs as well as tax issues are the manifestations of both the contribution and the apologetic-legitimation function of planning. These issues containing the essence of decision making for the socialization of costs and distribution of benefits in society are legitimized through a rational planning process. This process disguises the contribution of the whole society to capital accumulation under the complicated structures of socialization of costs in the process of taxation and the unequal distribution of benefits through the mystification of budgeting and financing.

as a whole. On the other hand non-growth areas can expect good results because of the interregional and international transmission of economic growth which overcomes space from growth poles to lagging regions.

8.2 aspatial issues: legal authority and political control

The question which prevails throughout the Greek literature and the interviews is: why is city planning practice introduced and exercised in Greece, or what is the intension of the State in sponsoring planning projects and commissioning master plans? The question following immediately is: what is the role of the State in the Greek city planning practice? and what is the role of the State in Greece?

The Greek planners define the role of the State as facilitating the accumulation of capital, legitimizing its own existence and operations, and reconciling the conflict among social classes. Keeping in mind that city planning has been introduced and always administered by the State apparatus, we can see the State's contribution to capital accumulation through planning: that is zoning, efforts to introduce planned unit development, large scale housing projects, as well as the main and traditional planning activity of coordinating and building the country's physical infrastructure, all contribute to capital accumulation. But the State has also administered a multiplicity of planning projects which have not been implemented but kept being commissioned. These projects come to substantiate the necessity for the legitimization of the State's operations; for, as soon as the resulting master plans failed to perform their role, but, on the contrary, came in conflict with the State's decisions, their continuation is at stake.

The American paradigm accepts primarily the role of the State in promoting policies, programs and decisions geared to secure capital accumulation. The whole evolution of planning practice testifies to that; while planning theory and methodology (as we shall see in the following chapter) legitimizes these processes. The paradigm does not occupy itself with the role of the State but only occasionally. The main critic of the role of the State in a modern capitalist society presents arguments about the role of the State in planning agreeing with the contribution to accumulation, harmonizing and legitimization.

The role of the State in Greece, as it is expressed through the main activity of government and public policy is viewed in light of the evolution of the Greek State within the western capitalist world and its specific capitalist development under dependent relationships with the advanced countries. So, capital accumulation means accumulation by foreign monopolies and big local interests; in this case the legitimization comes in the expressed overwhelming needs for foreign exchange and industrial development. The lack of any public discussion of the most crucial industrial location decisions, as well as the lack of any rational presented from the government's

part to answer the opposition's allegations, are strong indicators of the manifestation of the country's dependency relations.

The State's policy and governmental action in the American case is definitely in support of capitalism. Traditionally and recently, social and public policy supports the making of profit, social welfare, and change within the limits of the politically feasible, and always in accord with the capitalist economic institutions of the free market and accumulation. Planning programs and policies come to institutionalize these efforts by establishing the appropriate practices in the field of city and regional planning practice. The centralized policy making in Greece comes in contrast with the situation in the US; planning practice has been greatly differentiated in the two cases on that account. In Greece the centralized policy making is attributed to and agrees with the political and economic dependency relationships. In the US the increasing centralization of decisions and aggregation of local governmental units comes to respond to the need for vaster conglomerations of governmental units which in turn respond to the needs of expanding economic units and activities.

As it is apparent by now the Greek planners have traditionally come in support of the local government. The reason for this alignment has been twofold: On the one hand the liberal and leftist views of the planners supporting people's representation and power come naturally in support, on the basis of political ideology. On the other hand local governments are the ideal potential employers of planners aiming to serve the people and the people's political institutions. But when the Greek planners promote the potential of more jurisdiction to the local governments they fail to see the contradiction of their demand with the increasing penetration of capitalist dependencies in the political processes of the Greek State. Such dependencies in the course of capitalist expansion will tend to increase centralization and allow only nominal power or administrative operations to the local government. In the American paradigm there are two conflicting tendencies: the one promotes the jurisdictions of local government and the other argues for the consolidation of decision and financial power to aggregate levels of governmental structure. Responding to the economic needs for centralized decision the planners themselves support a «consolidated» or centralized administrative control.

The public sector and the adjacent planning agencies in Greece are viewed as the «outlet» or the «tool» of the State to operationalize its decisions and planning policies. The liberal view accepts the «good intentions» of the planning agencies to remedy the city and regional planning problems and explains the

failure in terms of structural and functional deficiencies of the administrative machine. Thus it fails to examine the possibility of the lack of aggravated city planning issues which would force the State to respond. It also fails to clarify the regional planning and industrial location issues which have been *de facto* solved. The radical view rejects the explanation of failure and examines the role which the public agencies have come to play in order to materialize the operations of the State. This role is to materialize processes contributing to accumulation. The planning agencies have not succeeded in playing the expert-advisor's role and thus have remained isolated and their operations have been outside the State decision making process. The US paradigm faces no problem in accepting the public planning agency as the direct expression of the State's executive action, completely controlled by the State, and geared to perform according to the State's concerns.

The initiation of planning in Greece was made by and in accordance with the ideology of the liberal attitudes in the early sixties promoting democratic institutions, rational decision making and development planning. This short-lived effort was very close and influenced by the image of democratic planning as supported in the Kennedy era. This manifestation of planning in a liberal democracy in the US has been accepted and promoted by the planners in harmony with the political environment of pluralism. In Greece the effort was hardly launched, and the planners disillusioned under a dictatorial regime have come to question the very activity of planning. The answers which the radical planners give centers around the issue of the role of planning. Their view is that planning contributes to the maintenance of the status quo either by being oppressive or by harmonizing the contradictions among the social classes, avoiding thus the social conflict and maintaining the existing power structure. What they look for is another «planning practice» which will not operate within the State's goal of supporting the economic and political elite but will actually serve the people.

Planning legislation in Greece is primarily non-existent and when it does exist it fails to serve its stated purposes and comes to reinforce the social differences and promote private profit with social interaction and contact within neighborhoods and communities. Also, the structure of these social-physical units takes a special importance as regards their role as the milieu for social activity and satisfactoriness. The planners investigate these social units from a variety of perspectives which can be grouped in: *the economic perspective*, which uses the social unit as a geographical area for the purpose of estimating variables helping the developers in their profit seeking venture; *the social perspective*, which accepts

the neighborhood and the community as a cohesive group of people in a defined physical space and tries, within this context, to estimate and anticipate dissatisfaction; and finally, *the political perspective*, which investigates the effects of community control and prevents any «disruptive» effects from the transferability of authority to local institutions.

The specialization of the issues concerning the community and their isolation from their interactive effects, which stem from the interplay of all three categories, is also a basic characteristic of the prevailing research approaches of the paradigm.

In the Greek case the issue of the community and the neighborhood has rarely evolved. The reasons are complex and of course derive from the historical evolution of the Greek society and its present phase of development. For one thing the form of economic development, physical mobility, specialization of activity and space have not been transformed in a way to create the social alienation observed in the «advanced» western societies. Furthermore, the lack of any substantial power of the local government has not transformed the Greek communities to economic and political entities. An even more important reason is the lack of a substantively organized social science and sociological research which would undertake the task of evaluating the situation, role, cohesiveness and the like of Greek communities.

One uniqueness of the structure of the American community is the racial issue. The social movements which have brought it in the concerns of the society is one more cause of differences between the issues in the paradigm and the Greek problems. But beyond that, Greek concerns include some initial issues and attempts to evaluate Greek social structure, and community structure on the basis of the guidelines offered by the American sociological perspective. The recent positions promoted by the radical group in Greece have completely dropped the above approach and have initiated a radical critique of the class structure of Greek society. This critique includes views on the role of the prevailing city planning practice and the urban structures which promote and/or reproduce this class structure.

For the traditional planning view, the fundamental problems of communities in Greece are those caused by disintegration generated by extended social and physical changes. Within this approach the Greek planners search for the variables of community structure affected by and affecting social change. The radical stance accepts class structure as the basic characteristic of social and community structure, and demands that planners free themselves from the ideological positions of opposing views. On the contrary, the radical view urges that effort should be made to relate the class structure of our society to the

issues of the built and natural environment.

In the Greek case the problem of social values is dealt with in relation to the social and economic structures within which social life is manifested. That is, the planners criticize the changing goals of the people, which have been influenced greatly by the commercialization of all traditional values and the penetration of the capitalist system in all aspects of the physical environment.

Three main sources (expressions) of economic growth (industry, tourism, urbanization), are the primary vehicles through which the traditional values are changing. The Greek planners believe that the quality of the environment affects people's goals, promotes their efforts to re-structure the environment, to also prevent the deterioration of human values. The radical planners on the contrary reject the idea that social change is possible through environmental changes and advocate that the social struggle has to take place in the political arena. They also argue that social values are conflicting due to the contradictions in the social relations of production.

On the contrary, the AP concern is due to the obstacle which social values present to rational decision making, evaluation and choice of alternatives. The multiplicity of choices between values and the difficulty of their measurement makes the issue difficult to tackle within the traditional and accepted political model of pluralistic society and philosophical model of rationality shaping the AP. So, when the American planners face the dilemma of a situation, which is very hard to quantify, they discredit values instead of starting questioning their mechanistic problem-solving processes. The harmonization of the hierarchical values of a pluralistic society and the rational of benefit maximization converge towards the welfare function, the mathematization of human values. On the basis of this formulation the AP deals with the goals and values and makes choices affecting the social processes of cities and, even more, a whole nation.

The question of citizen participation and Community Organization appears twofold both in the AP and the Greek case. In the American paradigm citizen participation is the direct manifestation of the pluralistic society and it is advocated on the basis of American democratic ideals.

In the Greek problems the stated need for participation is a demand of politicized groups as well as a necessity in the minds of the planners. Unlike the AP, the participation issue in the Greek context is not related to the prevailing social and political structures and is completely incompatible to the centralized administrative structure of the State apparatus. Having appeared recently in the context of city planning only, citizen participation in Greece

does not relate to any population effort or movement but seems to be an imported approach which found suitable grounds in the minds and hearts of liberal Greek planners.

Community organization is, in both the AP and the Greek case, the active realization of citizen's participation. Viewed more as a massive mobilization of the people, community organization is the only process through which people have intervened and actively demanded a part in the factors which shape the built environment. This mobilization is accepted by the radical planners as the only tool available to the people to demand from the State a consideration of their wants. The radical group has stated that only a legitimate form of popular participation can ever become substantive, and this, only when guaranteed through constitutional provision. In the paradigm, there is more trust to the people's movement and no effort to legitimize the impact of massive organization on the planning and decision making process.

The American paradigm loyal to the historical-cultural characteristics of individualism and competition, as well as the economic imperative of private profit, has traditionally supported the private interests (vs society's). The paradigm's concern with the public interest has evolved as a result of the political scientists' involvement in city planning; the way to the public interest has undoubtedly been through the multiple groups interest of the American pluralistic society. Yet the paradigm definitely has trouble with the definition of the public interest at an aggregate level. But it has nevertheless included the public interest in its approach and especially in the justification of planning techniques stemming from the model of rationality. Independently of the assumptions preceding such formulations, rationality and the public interest are the legitimate philosophical premises on which recent optimization and welfare function techniques have been employed at an aggregate societal level.

In the Greek case the notion of the private interest is definitely associated with the not so noble profit-seeking interests and power structure related interests. Planning is related to the private interest to the extent that the State intends to promote profit-interests through planning.

Now the public interest in Ancient Greece is an institution towards which other values and humans might be sacrificed. Reaching the importance of a deity, it is also absolute and identified to the nation's interest. In modern Greece, and in the traditionally prevailing liberal view, the public interest is understood (as in the US paradigm) as the aggregate of special interest groups, which is in fact the harmonizing element of liberal positions. In the radical view the public interest is aligned (if not identified) with

the people's interest (that is the poor's and the exploited class's interest). This public interest is incompatible and conflicting with the private interest against which the radical planners and the people struggle and consists the legitimization of radical planning goals.

The American paradigm has an interrelated set of concerns with respect to the needs of the users of the products of planning practice. Functional aspects, sociological and psychological needs have evolved in the effort to harmonize the diversity of goals and objectives and to legitimize the decisions made. Within the same view the Greek planners view their role as the expert who will define the needs of the people and help them realize their wants.

It is only very rarely that the true nature of the people's needs is exposed: in the American paradigm the conflicting people's interests and the dominant culture, and profit seeking interests are contrasted. In the Greek case the radical view questions any effort to simply determine the people's needs. For one thing the economic structure and monopoly interests determine their necessities as needs of the people and thus a contradictory alliance evolves presented as unifying the capitalist interests for industrial expansion and the people's needs for employment. This contradictory alliance has appeared in recent public discussions of industrial location questions, where the representatives of the capitalists have moved the rural workers (to-be) against the issues which the planners have raised in the name of the public interest and the needs of the people.

The Greek planners have not succeeded in this context to expand their positions and include a justified explanation which would urge the peasants workers-to-be against monopoly location decisions. Their «failure» is closely related to the lack of any alternatives to which they could re-orient the rural population. For the existing prospects of migration to the large urban center or Europe does not appear to appeal to all segments of the Greek rural society. Migration and alienation have already given their feedback of potential unemployment in the hostile new environment. Thus, the support of industrial monopoly locational interests by the rural population against the planners' and other professional groups' advice appears rational and justified due to the lack of other options.

8.3 theory and methodology

The Greek city planning practice has traditionally evolved as the result of imported planning theory and expertise. It has consequently accepted the rationality model prevailing in the western paradigm, *without any attempt to adopt or «fit» the model to the specific*

needs of the country. The imported paradigm has been only adopted *to fit the competence of the Greek planning expertise.* So, all the questions of developmental planning and efficiency for capital accumulation, which the American planning has sufficiently served, have been translated into or replaced by physical design criteria. The traditional rational approach to planning, including the setting of goals, the design of alternative plans, their evaluation according to the goals, and the choice of the final «optimum» solution, has been the model of planning practice prescribed by the planning agencies and faithfully followed by the Greek planners. The techniques included in the methodology are oversimplified copies of the sophisticated counterparts in the American and in general the western planning paradigm, with intuition playing the major role in the synthesis and evaluation of the planning proposals.

The master plan, the handy device incorporating the rationality model and comprehensive physical design, has been the strong hold of Greek architects-planners for more than fifteen years. Even in the light of unquestionable proof that implementation of such a plan is impossible, or at least not perceived as realistic, the planners have criticized the State, the planning agencies, and rarely, the quality of some of the master plans. But never has the master plan itself been seriously questioned and criticized as purely technocratic device geared to either serve the prevailing economic and political interests or be ignored.

The criticism which the Greek planners apply to the Greek planning theory and practice refers to the lack of social-political-economic preconditions, which would lead the processes of a pluralistic society to achieve the compromise agreements which would make a plan implementable. Thus, the assumption is made, that the master plan has a «metaphysical» quality of a «compromise agreement», which remains the same in the transfer from one socio-economic-political system to another, the question being whether it fits to the new system. But the master plan is a methodological approach (while in Greece it has degenerated into a technique), which does not have internal intentions. *It only manifests the intentions of the State apparatus or the society which uses the technique.* So, it can become a compromise agreement in a pluralistic political system when actualized through citizen participation; it can become an oppressive device under a dictatorial regime, or a legitimization front, for a right wing democracy.

In the American paradigm, the prevailing and permanent characteristic of planning theory and practice is rationality. In all shades of liberal planning rationality underlies the methodology and represents the core of planning ideology. The concept of rationality, nurtured during the evolution of western scien-

tific approaches, has become a basic ideological value in the formulation of the planning profession. The «alternative» models and styles of planning examined in the context of this work and prevailing in the theoretical formulations of the profession are variations on the same theme. So, whether planners advocate the political process, or economic efficiency, or public participation they always assume the fundamental principle, which is rationality.

The role which rationality has played in the evolution of the social science paradigm, and planning theory and methodology in particular, is that of legitimation of the decision making process. Keeping then this basic principle, the planning paradigm has legitimized its practices by developing theories associating and justifying the approaches and methods it employed, with the sciences. Scientific advances, and mostly in economics, have been the endless source of such a legitimation process: So, models, econometrics, decision theory, etc. have been the primary sources of adaptation of city planning. In the more theoretical framework, adoption of systems theory for planning purposes and the association of planning theory with the philosophy of science, have been the manifested routes which the legitimation of planning theory took.

The techniques which the planning paradigm employs have been borrowed, or adopted from the social sciences, or have been developed in close relationship with the scientific methodology. Mathematical models (as for example the models of urban development) are a very important part of such a methodology; their extensive use in the paradigm has a twofold importance for the planners: first, they have provided a reliable way of safeguarding the requirements of scientific rationality; and second, they could guarantee the «best» solution in terms of economic efficiency and cost minimization.

In fact (it has been made clear in previous sections that) all the methods and techniques, which the paradigm primarily employs, contribute substantially to the maximization of profit and accumulation. The simple reason is that the techniques are geared to estimate, predict, and project the valuable parameters according to which capital locates, invests, and expands. Thus, the determinants of industrial location, the estimates of the effective demand for housing, and the forecasts of labor availability, are among the concerns of city planners. All the techniques used toward the above needs undoubtedly correspond to the planning theories of rationality to which the paradigm aspires.

A very important part in the process of theory building and employment of techniques in the paradigm is played by research. Research and the findings of applied research are crucial for the legiti-

mation of any project affecting society and its environment. Specifically, research is the foremost legitimation of planning theory and practice for it involves the «truth» with respect to the needs and effectiveness of planning. The «approaches» which research theorists themselves suggest in order to «get around» the problems which some «truth» might create are the very proof of the role so often research plays.

9. overview of the comparison

In the context of this analysis city planning practice in Greece is considered in its organized and relatively extensive postwar form, while isolated projects and public works operations of the period are not included. Postwar city planning in Greece has been introduced by the State, first in the process of reconstruction, focusing on the coordination of public infrastructure. A decade later, and following the efforts for economic growth, city and regional planning were introduced as an extension of economic growth planning at the national level.³⁹ In contrast with the Greek case, in the US, city planning practice evolved after economic growth was already under way, as a series of local movements. These movements, sponsored by the city's business interests, were supported and carried out by the liberal reformers of the twenties. Their goals was to achieve the livability of central business areas.

As it is apparent, the specific origin of city planning practice in each country has been different, but, as it will be shown shortly, the reasons are the same. That is in Greece the basic concern has been investment in the construction of infrastructure and the development of city and regional plans to speed the State's efforts for economic growth; in the US the concern had been focusing on the betterment of downtown areas, the decay of which was threatening central city business interests. Economic growth in Greece as well as «business interests» in the US mean aims towards the same goal, that is the accumulation of capital. Planning then would be the process by which the socialization of the costs involved in the efforts for capital accumulation would be borne by the State, either by direct State investment (as most often the case in Greece), or induced by the State (as most often the case in the US). Economic growth has been the focus of the Greek State ever since the end of the reconstruction period. Planning for economic growth was introduced as a requirement for foreign aid at the

³⁹. This duality in the introduction of city planning is expressed in the agents of the State which are actually in charge of regulating planning practice, that is the Ministry of Public Works for the reconstruction efforts and the Ministry of Coordination in the economic growth era.

national level. City and regional planning was an imported practice introduced in the form of master plans in the mid sixties, as a direct requirement stemming from the overall economic relations of Greece with the west and mainly the US.⁴⁰

The origins of the city planning practice in the US follows a different course of events, and certainly goes forty years earlier. There, we find the park and civic center movements, which were the local government's effort to provide the necessary social investment which would keep the price of land and business activities in the city at high levels.⁴¹ This process provided a double opportunity for «economic growth» -capital accumulation of the central city areas. First, by upgrading downtown business areas, and second by creating the preconditions for profitable investment in the form of the development projects themselves. Within their role as designers, the early US planners worked close with both the businessmen and the developers, so that the end product would be profitable and contribute to accumulation.

These early designers were eventually replaced by a new professional species, the city planners; this was required by the evolution of city planning practice itself, as soon as it was clear that investment in physical betterment was not enough for capital accumulation in the central city. Then the «city efficient» movement was under way, as the legitimization of the local government's undertaking more and more fiscal responsibility towards central city interests.

In Greece the origins of postwar city planning are found in the process of reconstruction, which of course meant a need for the engineering professionals as architects and civil engineers. The development of city planning as an extension of national economic planning would require a multiplicity of social scientists, predominantly with a background in economics, to achieve the goal of city planning, that is to contribute to economic growth.

In response to the real needs, as well as following the European city planning practice, the coordination of the reconstruction process was carried out by architects and engineers. But neither the subsequent change of the focus of city planning (plan for economic growth versus design and coordinate infrastructure), nor the changes in the planning practice internationally, have affected the Greek City Planning Practice. That is, architects and physical

designers-planners dominate the activity of planning practice. The question then to be asked concerns the events which did not allow for the Greek planning practice to be transformed, like the American and European paradigm, to change and respond to the goals which the State sets forth for city planning. For there is a definite parallel need for the Greek planning to follow the US paradigm since planning for the «efficient city» and planning for «economic growth» are not at all different goals. For planning a city for economic growth means planning it to efficiently contribute to this growth.

The goal of economic growth in Greece was to be achieved through the identification of the country's resources for industrial and tourist expansion. As an extension of national planning, city and regional planning was presented as necessary for the same reasons. In this case city planning practice would serve the purpose of «indicative planning» (analogous to the French national planning), making planning responsible for providing the necessary information for industrial expansion. Indicative planning in this case plays the role of social investment (as O'Connor defines it) contributing directly to the accumulation of capital.

In the case of the US, city and regional planning, due to the decentralization of State power, does not only provide information for industrial expansion, it also provides specific incentives for industrial expansion in the form of the industry's contribution to the city's tax-base (a function provided in the Greek case at the national level).⁴² That is, what we have repeatedly seen in the course of this study, over and over again, with respect to the issues analysed. Furthermore, the function of planning in the US is expanded to create and include, or adopt techniques and methods which have as a purpose to define processes and operations directly contributing to the accumulation of capital. That is the scope of location models, transportation models, cost benefit analysis, PPBS and so forth (the way these models have been used so far within the practices of a capitalist economy).

Greek planning practice has produced over a period of ten years projects or rather master plans for a good number of cities and regions, which have all been approved by the State's functionaries but none of them has ever been put into effect. That is, the Greek planning practice has never served its officially stated purpose to structure the modern Greek cities.

The reasons are manifold: For one, the Center Union party which initiated the city and regional

40. One of the purposes of the Center for Planning and Economic Research (as we have already seen) has been exactly this: the exchange of planners between Greece and the US and the initiation of regional planning studies in the country by US consultants.

41. See Mel. Scott, *op cit.* and H. Perloff, *Education for City and Regional Planning.*

42. This is achieved in Greece by the specific incentives for foreign industrial capital which have the purpose to promote foreign investment and easy profit repatriation. See *Investing in Greece*, National Bank of Greece.

planning program and agencies was in power for only a short period. More precisely, State support to the whole of the industrial class during that period was terminated as soon as the junta took over political power. The junta supported foreign capital (mainly American capital) and big Greek capital aligned with foreign interests.⁴³ To the extent that city planning practice could become applied, eventually, as a device evaluating alternative possible courses of action proposed by individual industries (due to the State's policies supporting both indigenous and foreign capital), this was no longer the case.

But city planning projects continued being produced, although subsequent decisions disregarded the conclusions of their findings in favor of monopoly industrial interests.⁴⁴ What was then the reason of city planning projects during the junta period? The answer is legitimization, which becomes a high necessity for the State when a military regime is in power.⁴⁵

This is a major difference between the American city and regional planning and the Greek planning. That is the American planning served the purpose for which it has been initiated primarily, the accumulation of capital. All along its development, as a set of tools and as a professional practice, American city planning has focused on resolving the problems threatening one way or the other the accumulation process; it has done so by accepting the challenge to resolve the problems facing first directly the capital (as for example the various kinds of cost benefit analysis for development projects), and second the State in its effort to secure the accumulation of capital (as for example the increasing involvement of city planning with municipal finance as the fiscal crisis of the State gets deeper). The only legitimization that the US city planning needed has been the scientific outlook, which it got from its association with the social sciences and the objectivity of the quantitative techniques it employs.

The question now is: has modern Greek city planning been able to contribute to the accumulation of capital or has it been confined to a legitimization function?⁴⁶ I have already presented the argument according to which the process of economic growth during the military regime had a definite orientation towards the foreign and foreign aligned Greek capital; the fact that they could provide their own know-

how to collect the data and analyse the conditions of cities and regions, made Greek planning unnecessary. But of course they could have used the information and really take advantage of the proposals in the planning projects. This would have provided the industrial capital with two advantages: first they could reduce their costs by accepting the State's social investment to contribute directly to their profit making, and second they would have legitimized their expansion decisions by basing them on Greek planning projects.

But none of these possibilities has become clearly a fact. Have Greek planning projects remained unused and literally never consulted? Why? One possible explanation is that, as I have already presented, the professional training of Greek planners has mainly focused on physical planning and design. Coming practically all from an architectural background, they have oriented their post graduate studies abroad, or their practical experience at home, towards physical planning and design. Now this training could not possibly guarantee analysis and proposals leading to profitable investment, unless the physical designer's contribution was based on economic analysis focusing on the accumulation of capital through the planning projects.⁴⁷ We have seen that this has been the role which the American city planning practice has been focusing on very successfully. This has not happened in Greece: Even after the State required that the planning team had to be inter-disciplinary, including economists, demographers and so on, the coordinator and the decision maker in the team continued to be the physical planner. Furthermore, the planning projects themselves acquired the elaborate «economic», «social» and «population» analysis of the problem but remained based on physical criteria rather than economic criteria securing profitable investment.⁴⁸

An important factor, which has contributed to the course of events, is that the Greek planners are, in their majority, aligned to a range of ideology and political orientation which is from liberal-democratic to radical-socialist, with a strong humanistic element. This politicization of the Greek planners has contributed to the cause for the role that city planning practice has played in Greece. Their political-ideological beliefs were not geared to produce the

43. See Poulantzas, *La crise des dictatures*.

44. For example: Itea, Pylos, Volos and other cases.

45. See O'Connor's, *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* for an elaboration on legitimization as an important function of the State.

46. Modern Greek city planning here means the master and regional planning process initiated in the early sixties and carried on up until today. For in its basic form as the coordination of the construction of infrastructure it has definitely contributed to industrial expansion and economic growth.

47. This could have been achieved on the basis of location analysis, regional analysis, cost minimization, cost-benefit analysis and other methods and techniques which the American paradigm has adopted and developed.

48. By investment, throughout this work, we mean the kind of shorter-term, profit-oriented private investment as resource exploitation, raw-materials' industry, tourist industry and the construction industry; what is definitely not included here is the long-term social investment as health services, education, public and low income housing.

desired analysis and planning proposals to become the basis for profitable investment. On the contrary their politicization and humanistic ideology has led them to support the poor and the exploited classes, giving thus the final blow to the status of the city planning practice in Greece.

A second possible explanation which can clarify the problem is that Greek city planning *has* served its purpose. The difference is that the *real scope* of city planning in Greece has not been the betterment of the physical and social environment but another covert one. In this case the possible purposes of Greek planning are: (1) that the scope of city planning was to provide the natural and human resources information necessary for industrial expansion. In this case, city and regional planning in Greece may have served its purpose. The expansion of tourist industry has found a valuable resource in the form of the planning projects; (2) that the scope of city planning was to provide a legitimation for the decision and operations of the State and the private capital in relation to the physical space. In this case planning practice has rather failed. Recent controversies on the question of industrial location find all the Greek planners and planning projects opposing to the location expected to serve best «industrial interests», that is capital accumulation by the capitalist class. Eventually the official approval of the projects has been withheld by the State apparatus decision makers.

Of course we can see instances when the American city planning paradigm is also involved in supporting the exploited or the «disadvantaged». But this has not led to a crisis in the profession, even more, the impact of these events has been minimal when considering the legitimation of the profession and the discipline. We have seen how the dominant American paradigm has chosen to support and be concerned with issues widely accepted by the society's dominant classes and has been very cautious when dealing with «controversial» issues. Consider for example the issue of growth in communities where the dominant classes were aiming at the exclusion of the working class: The planners have been urged by their official professional association to try to legitimize their support for non-growth policies; what the professional association wanted to do, in fact, was to protect the role of planning in harmonizing conflicting interests in the process of its contribution to the accumulation of capital, accumulation by the dominant classes (i.e. in support of «economic growth» in the non «growth communities», but against «population growth»).

On the other hand, instances of efforts to support the exploited classes have been eventually isolated and exterminated or transformed into non-threatening theoretical alternatives, when the case

involved social action. The case of the participation of community organizers of the Alinsky organization in the struggle of the poor working class is the most striking example. The degeneration of the movement into community participatory issues was achieved by the planners' effort to bring the dissent back within the realm of liberal democracy.

More recently, the «deviants» of the mainstream planning ideology and practice in the United States have focused on the critical analysis of society and planning from a marxist perspective. The number of planners who consider themselves marxists, and the relevant literature are growing rapidly. They can survive within the State's Ideological Apparatus which allows for the contradictions of the struggle between the society's classes to evolve.⁴⁹ But the question is what will happen to the marxist planners in the United States if and when they decide to go beyond the University environments, where practically all of them are engaged, and become openly involved in the struggle?

Let us now see what happened in the Greek case when the Greek planners decided to participate in the social struggle: The forms which this participation has taken are ranging from active support of the working class efforts to fight against capitalist interests, to the theoretical analysis of concrete situations in the available to the Greek planners media. The struggle against industrial expansion in Elefsis and Megara, the resistance put up by squatters in the State's attempt to demolish their settlements, and the more recent cases of industrial expansion in Itea and Pylos are characteristic examples. In these cases the planners have been present both in the instances of physical struggle, protest, and defense put up by the workers, as well as they have organized working groups and public debates within the activities of the Architects' Association and the Technical Chamber of Greece. The struggle has been against the dominant efforts for capitalist expansion which was in the process destroying the working class communities or agricultural land. The planners were arguing in favor of the workers interests on two levels: the first was addressing issues of social justice; the second was trying to discredit industrial location decisions on the basis of scientific expertise, as it had been presented in the proposals of the planning projects (master plans) dealing with the corresponding area.

The recent decisions of the State to centralize most of the planning activity within the State apparatus, is definitely related to the role that the planners and the planning projects have played in the social struggles

49. The Architect's Association, formed by groups related directly to the political parties, is restricted within the ideological State apparatus:

of the recent years. So the Greek planners will have the choice of either participating in the State apparatus, as the managers and functionaries of the State's planning activities, or to remain at the «periphery» of planning decisions, where the State's design has put the Architects' Association and the Technical Chamber of Greece (i.e. «consulting» role).

The planners interviewed have projected a pollarization of the planning practice in the future of the Greek planning paradigm. On the one hand there will be the State's centralized planning practice trying to control the planning process and aiming to achieve the long due contribution to the accumulation of capital and economic growth. On the other hand, there will be the Architects' Association's and the Chamber's effort to provide the alternative planning practice supporting the interests of the exploited classes. This effort will have a formal organization of working groups and review committees which will present the official position of the professional associations; but it will remain outside the decision making planning which will presumably take place within the State apparatus.

Of course, it is fairly easy to see how the ideology of the planners will interact with these developments. The two views, identified so far, both attack the existing discrepancies, discontinuities and wrongs in planning practice. The liberal view aspiring to the perspective of a modern welfare State will rather accept the centralized modernizing agencies. The radical view, criticizing the existing practices on the basis of a socialist ideology is more likely to continue the criticism and avoid any alliance.

Summing up the problems and issues we have been concerned with in the course of this study, we can conclude that: planning in the US has evolved closely related with the economic-social-political structure of the country differentiating its characteristics through liberal pluralism and the welfare State, and

the monopoly phase of capitalism. Legitimized in the course of the association with the social and systems sciences, it promotes capitalist expansion and the harmonizing of conflict among the social groups.

The Greek city and regional planning practice reflects the relationships of the country with the western advanced world and has been imported and applied as an extension of national planning for economic growth. The initial form of infrastructure coordination has performed its role, while the role of the master plans can be presumably defined as promoting capitalist expansion through the provision of useful information for private investment, as well as legitimation of the decisions of the State regarding questions of capitalist expansion.

The planning problems manifested in the physical and social environment of the city are differentiated between the two cases due to the historical evolution of the economic-social and political structures in each country. But these manifestations of city problems however different they might appear as central city blight vs unauthorized settlements, decaying cities vs traditional communities, have their roots in the unplanned and uncontrolled expansion of capitalist investment.

The theory and methodology, which the American paradigm includes, has traditionally stemmed from the evolution of the role of planning and responds to the scope of planning practice; while in Greece, the theory and methodology has been imported, imposed and applied in the form of master plan.

The role of planners has been in both countries that of a technical expert; in the US the planner is quite often involved in the political process, politics here meaning the ramifications of interest groups' power games; in Greece the planner is an active part of the political process and quite often becomes a radical activist, politics here meaning the ideologically inspired and differentiated activities of the political parties.