

PARADIGM SHIFTS AND URBAN REGENERATION PROCESS IN PLANNING HISTORY

Ebru GÜRLER (PhD Candidate) & **Nuran ZEREN GÜLERSOY** (Prof.Dr.)

Address: *Istanbul Technical University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Taskisla-Taksim. 34437. Istanbul, Turkey.*

e-mail: *ebrugurler@gmail.com; gurlere@itu.edu.tr; gulersoy@itu.edu.tr*

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates paradigm shifts in urban planning and their effect on urban regeneration process by an analytical and comparative method in the framework of historical progression of urban planning. This paper is built upon three successive sections within that perspective. Firstly, dominating paradigms surpassed in each period and restructured planning theory throughout the planning history will be explained. Then, theoretical and practical differentiations on urban regeneration process will be investigated by evaluating the planning approaches, strategies and models on urban change in each period. Finally, as a response to neo-liberal challenges on the contemporary historic preservation and urban conservation agenda, a strategic model integrating theory, practice and method in its framework will be proposed by comparing similarities and differences in organizational and spatial levels on the issue of urban regeneration. Conclusively, this paper underlines the need for systematizing an integrated, strategic, multi-agent and collaborative model unifying theory, practice and method in its framework for planning, managing and sustaining the urban regeneration process by releasing a debate on the contemporary neo-liberal conjuncture in which the political, economical and planning paradigms on urban development and change are conjoined competitively in global cities.

INTRODUCTION

Poly-centric formation of a philosophical system connecting philosophy of science and planning philosophy has given rise to various differentiations in the planning theory encompassing approaches, strategies and models for urban development and change from the 20th century. The main criterion outlining that differentiation is based on the assumption that contemporary planning theory is a spatial response of planning approaches and strategies in the framework of paradigm shifts. Paradigm shifts after the 1980's under the scope of globalization might be accepted as evidence about the approaches, strategies and models differentiated by neo-liberalization process. Thus, this study focuses on urban development and change in order to point out the planning, management and sustainability of urban regeneration process in global cities under the framework of the 21st century conjuncture. Moreover, this study aims to provide a paradigmatic evaluation on urban regeneration process in planning history with a target of debating contemporary neo-liberal challenges. Therefore, argument in this study has a threefold objective: to investigate the modification in the planning approaches, strategies and models on urban change for planning, managing and sustaining the process, to debate the contemporary neo-liberal challenges in global cities under the framework of paradigm shifts, and to propose a model for the process.

POLY-CENTRIC FORMATION OF PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEM BY PARADIGM SHIFTS

There has been an interlocking relationship between philosophy and planning. Due to the progress in the philosophy of science by the 1960s, urban planning -both in theory and practice- has gained a multi-paradigmatic character as a result of shift from mono-centric to poly-centric approach in the philosophy of science. The basis of this progress is rooted in the Kantian Critical Philosophy in the late 18th century and the Neo-Kantian Transcendental Philosophy in the 19th century (Rosenberg, 2001; Carnap, 1995; Russel, 1961).

Philosophy of Science encompasses studies on assumptions, foundations and explanations in the field of natural and social sciences. Philosophy of science focuses on explanations and disputes on epistemology (*theory of objects of knowledge*) and ontology (*theory of knowledge*) of scientific knowledge. Main approaches in the philosophy of science include some debates on concepts, formal logic, scientific method, observation, inductive-deductive types of reasoning and objective-subjective types of scientific logics of inquiry. Philosophy of Science has an effective role on the establishment of specific philosophical view belong to the scientific disciplines, i.e: Planning Philosophy (Rosenberg, 2001; Carnap, 1995; Hall, 1988). Planning Philosophy includes studies on hypotheses, conjectures, theories and approaches in the field of urban (planning) science. Planning philosophy focuses on the issues of urban problems-solutions and explanations-debates in ontological and epistemological grounds. Main approaches in the planning philosophy include some themes on planning method, concepts, theoretical formulations and principles for urban practice (Fainstein & Campbell, 1996; Healey, McDougall & Thomas, 1982; Paris, 1982; Camhis 1979; Faludi, 1973). In the philosophy of science, there is a paradigmatic basis for planning philosophy. Paradigm is a structure for thought comprised of a set of ideologies and common values taken granted as a model in an epistemological context by a certain scientific discipline within a specific period. In other words, Paradigm is a regulating framework for a field of science to be formatted. In the Philosophy of science, there is a lot of paradigm shifts substantiated from ancient to contemporary period. Paradigm shift is a radical change in the regulating framework. Each paradigm shift in the philosophy of science triggers the formation of a new planning philosophy which includes specific (urban) planning theory. Planning Theory determines the 'accurate' scientific method based on the regulating/dominating philosophy of science whereas Urban Planning Theory borrows some concepts and theoretical formulations both from natural and social sciences (Ersoy, 2007; Fainstein & Campbell, 1996; Taylor, 1998; Paris, 1982). Therefore, Planning Theory is used for defining the planning scientifically in a more general and holistic manner (Faludi, 1973). In the 1980s, contemporary bias in planning theory includes thoughts on procedure rather than substance. The emphasis is on the differentiation between Planning Theory focusing on the theories of planning process based on procedural theories and Urban Planning Theory focusing on the theory of planning phenomenology based on substantial theories in urban science (Camhis, 1979; Faludi, 1973). The rationale behind this differentiation is based on the need for establishing a planning philosophy defining the urban science affected by the changes in the philosophy of science after the 1960s (Faludi, 1973). Furthermore, Planning Approach systematizes the methodology in

14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

(Urban) Planning Theory. By the interaction between the philosophy of science and planning philosophy, each (urban) planning theory produces specific planning approaches consisted of principles and procedures compatible with the regulating/dominating paradigm.

Debates on Paradigm(s) and Progress in Science:

During the 1960s, there were active debates generated by the philosophers of science and scientific historians –namely Karl Popper, Thomas Khun, Paul Feyerabend and Imre Lakatos– on the empiricist ontology of the philosophy of science (Hall, 1988). Both of them focus on explaining the progress in science with different ideologies which utilize different ‘logics of inquiry’ (Gürler, 2001; Tekeli, 2000). Each debate on the progress in science opened a new path for poly-centric philosophy of science and influenced the planning philosophy, theory and practice.

Popper, -who published The Logic of Scientific Discovery in 1959 and Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge in 1963- uses empirical methods of critical rationalism in order to explain progress in science via the method of falsification by considering Biology as a model science. Popperian model for the explanation consists of progressive mechanisms in a continuous change. Popper initiated a method for “metaphysical research program”. Popperian theory, focusing on the logic of science, based on hypothetico-deductive reasoning and discourses (Rosenberg, 2001; Gürler, 2001; Tekeli, 2000; Carnap, 1995). Due to the theory, there are three mechanisms in the progress: generic adaptation, adaptive behavioral learning and scientific discovery. ‘Critical Rationalist Theory and Evolutionary Approach’ in Popperian debate both initiated the notion of theory production as scientific discovery in the philosophy of science and influenced the planning philosophy and theory by the construction of falsifiable ideas. “In the Popperian tradition, Planning is not seen as an operation separated from other forms of social action, but rather as a process embedded in continual evolution of ideas validated through action” (Mahtre in UrbanPlanningBlog, 2010; Friedmann, 1998). Therefore, falsifiability thesis put emphasis on social action whereas metaphysical research program approach supported the Weberian development of structure-agency relationship in urban planning. Popperian debate formulated a challenge on utilizing ‘disjointed incremental planning approach, method of falsification and piecemeal social engineering’ instead of ‘rational comprehensive planning approach and method of verification’ in planning theory and practice (Camhis, 1979; Faludi, 1973).

Kuhn -who published Structure of Scientific Revolutions in 1962- uses empirical methods of (post) positivism in order to explain progress in science via “paradigm shift” approach by considering Physics as a model science (Kuhn, 1962). Kuhnian model for the explanation consists of a series of crisis in segmented phases in a cyclical nature. Kuhn initiated a structure for explaining scientific progress. Kuhnian theory, focusing on the history of science, based on inductive reasoning and process analysis in order to respond to paradigmatic progress in science (Rosenberg, 2001; Gürler, 2001; Tekeli, 2000; Carnap, 1995). Due to the theory, there are three levels of the process in order to reach a new paradigm: puzzle-solving in the dominant paradigm, emergence of anomalies in the dominant paradigm and paradigm shift as a result of developing a new theory for an anomaly. ‘Analytic Theory and Process Approach’ in the Kuhnian debate both emphasized the

URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges

notion of paradigm shift as scientific revolution in the philosophy of science and influenced the planning philosophy and theory by the development of incommensurable ideas. In the Kuhnian tradition, Planning is not seen as operation departed from a scientific progress, but rather as a process based on decision-making in a recurring crisis and revolution of ideas by paradigm shifts. Therefore, incommensurability thesis put emphasis on (structural) contingency whereas paradigm shift approach supported the Marxist development of structure-agency relationship and decision-making process in urban planning. Kuhnian debate created a challenge on planning ideology by the development of progressive ideas in planning theory and practice (Camhis, 1979; Galloway&Mahayni, 1977; Faludi, 1973).

Feyerabend, -who published Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge in 1975- uses empirical methods of critical rationalism in order to explain scientific progress via incommensurability thesis by considering Sociology as a model science. Feyerabendian model for the explanation consisted of epistemological anarchism and pluralistic methodology in a cumulative nature. Feyerabend initiated "the anarchistic theory of knowledge". Feyerabendian theory, focusing on history and philosophy of science, based on hypothetico-deductive reasoning and alternative theories in order to respond to accumulation of the multi-paradigmatic scientific knowledge (Rosenberg, 2001; Gürler, 2001; Tekeli, 2000; Carnap, 1995). 'Critical Theory and Pluralistic Approach' in the Feyerabendian debate contributed to conflict between multi-paradigmatic theories in Popperian approach and incommensurability thesis in Kuhnian approach as well as influenced the planning philosophy and theory by the anarchistic ideas. In the Feyerabendian tradition, Planning is not seen as a mono-centric operation, but rather a process based on alternative methods in a cumulative progress by multi-paradigmatic knowledge. Therefore, anarchistic theory put emphasis on alternatives whereas pluralistic approach supported the neo-Weberian development of structure-agency relationship in urban planning. Feyerabendian debate created a challenge on utilizing 'transactive and advocacy planning approaches and radical methodology' instead of 'rational comprehensive planning approach and method of verification' in planning theory and practice (Camhis, 1979; Faludi, 1973)

Lakatos -who published Proofs and Refutations in 1976- utilizes empirical methods of post-positivism in order to explain scientific progress via continuous establishment of new research programmes by considering History as a model science. Lakatos initiated "the methodology of scientific research programmes". Lakatosian theory depends on the explanation of internal history rather than external history in order to respond to the scientific progress. Therefore, continuous scientific research programmes are used as an instrument of the logic of inquiry for understanding scientific ideology and for proposing ideological explanations as well as inductive empirical observation, conventionalism and method of falsification (Rosenberg, 2001; Gürler, 2001; Tekeli, 2000; Carnap, 1995). 'Post-Positivist Theory and Empirical Approach' in the Lakatosian debate contributed to resolve the conflict between method of falsification in Popperian approach and progress via paradigm shifts in Kuhnian approaches as well as influenced the planning philosophy and theory by instrumental ideas. In the Lakatosian tradition, Planning is not seen as mono-centric operation, but rather a process based on multiple methods in a poly-centric process by multi-paradigmatic researches. Therefore, critical theory put

14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

emphasis on ideologies whereas scientific research program approach supported the neo-Marxist development of structure-agency relationship in urban planning. Lakatosian debate formulated a challenge on problem solving by 'communicative and collaborative planning, and heuristic method' (Camhis, 1979; Faludi, 1973).

Similarities and Differences in the Debates:

Both Khun and Popper, as the leading figures in the contemporary philosophy of science, put emphasis on progress in science by different methods of reasoning. Khunian debate is based on inductive reasoning by a positivist and analytic nature whereas Popperian debate is based on hypothetico-deductive reasoning by a critical rationalist and synthetic nature. Both Feyerabend and Lakatos, as the contributive figures in the contemporary philosophy of science, put emphasis on scientific progress by critical methods. Feyerabendian debate has a critical rationalist and mono-centric reasoning in cumulative nature whereas Lakatosian debate has a post-positivist and poly-centric reasoning in continuous nature. Both of the Khunian and Lakatosian theories utilize positivism that is operated by either classical or liberal technique of empiricism as methodology for explaining developments in science. In other words, both of the theories function on epistemological dimension of science by departing from the empiricist ontology. Khunian model utilizes positivist methods whereas Lakatosian model utilizes scientific research programmes. Both the Khunian and Feyerabendian theories utilize critical rationalism as a result of drawing a route for incommensurability of scientific theories. Both of the Popperian and Feyerabendian theories utilize critical rationalism that is operating either critical or anarchistic technique of empiricism as methodology for explaining progress in science. In other words, both of the theories function on epistemological dimension of science departing from rationalist ontology. Popperian model utilizes method of falsification whereas Feyerabendian model utilize anarchistic theory of knowledge (Gürler, 2001).

All of these contradictions have important role in scientific progress which allowed philosophy of science to have a poly-centric structure. Multi-paradigmatic character of scientific progress embraced almost each problem in order to resolve them in urban science. Paradigm shifts in planning philosophy produced opportunities as well as challenges both in theory and practice in contemporary urban planning.

DOMINATING PARADIGMS IN PLANNING THEORY AND PRACTICE

Dominating paradigms before 19th century created 'a basis for integrating philosophy of science and urbanization'. In this period, there are two major phases by paradigm shifts in Planning History. From Antiquity to Middle Ages, rational metaphysical philosophy evolved into rational ideal philosophy. This paradigmatic shift created conceptual ground in Planning Philosophy. Accordingly, urban formation and urban growth started to be managed as concepts in Planning Theory and urban models focused on physical form and function in Planning Practice. From Renaissance to Enlightenment, rational ideal philosophy evolved into rational critical philosophy. This paradigmatic shift created theoretical ground in Planning Philosophy. Accordingly, urban growth and urban development became as urban issues in Planning Theory and urban models focused on structure and systems in Planning Practice. As a result, 'the interaction between Philosophy and Planning on the issue of urbanization' had been endorsed before the 19th century.

URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges

Dominating paradigms in the 19th century created 'a basis for multiplicity in philosophy of science and classical urban planning'. There are varied phases by paradigm shifts in the 19th century Planning History. Rational, positivist and materialist philosophies constructed rational positivist planning philosophy and comprehensive planning approach. Accordingly, urban growth and development started to be hypothesized in Planning Theory and urban models focused on processes and structure-agency relationship in Planning Practice. As a result, 'institutionalization of urban planning' had been achieved and 'the theory of urban growth' had been systematized in the 19th century.

Dominating paradigms in the 20th century created 'a basis for poly-centric philosophy of science and contemporary urban planning'. There are progressive phases by paradigm shifts in 20th century Planning History. Pragmatist, materialist and phenomenological philosophies constructed neo-positivist and post-positivist Planning Philosophy and multiplicity of Planning Approaches as comprehensive, advocacy, communicative, participatory in character. From 1960s to 1980s, liberal rational philosophy and post-modern movement gave rise to Neo-Positivist Planning Philosophy as well as logical atomism, contextualism and functionalism in Planning Theory. From 1980s to 2000s, radical rational philosophy and globalization gave rise to post-positivist planning philosophy as well as contextualism, pragmatic strategy and process in Planning Theory. Accordingly, different types of urban change -including renewal, rehabilitation, conservation, revitalization, renaissance and regeneration- started to be hypothesized in Planning Theory and urban models focused on processes and structure-agency relationship in Planning Practice. As a result, 'institutionalization of planning philosophy' had been achieved and 'the issue of urban change' had been theorized and systematized in the 20th century.

Dominating paradigms in the 21st century has created 'a challenging basis for developing poly-centric philosophy of science and contemporary urban planning'. It is assumed to have consecutive and progressive phases by paradigm shifts in the 21st century Planning History. Materialist and critical realist philosophies have been constructing neo-liberal and post-liberal Planning Philosophy and differences in the Planning Approaches. From 2000s to 2010s, liberal radical philosophy and neo-liberal movement gave rise to post-positivist planning philosophy and strategic planning approach as well as competitiveness, managerialism, hedonic regulation and process in Planning Theory. Accordingly, different types of urban change-including urban regeneration and sustainable urbanism- have started to be hypothesized in Planning Theory and urban models focused on processes and structure-agency relationship in Planning Practice. In consequence, 'development of planning philosophy' has been in progress and 'the issue of urban change' has been managed challengingly in the 21st century.

DEVELOPMENT OF THEORY AND PRACTICE IN URBAN REGENERATION PROCESS

Critical development of rationalism and empiricism in the philosophy of science after the 1960s provoked the multi-paradigmatic development of materialism in (Urban) Planning Theory and Practice. There are three main paradigmatic periods in Urban Planning. (1) Planning Philosophy from 1960s to 1980s -which is characterized as supporting the liberal rationalism and empiricism by the method of

14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

falsification in the Popperian and Lakatosian approaches– underlined Neo-positivist approaches in Post-Modern Movement and put emphasis on logical atomism, contextualism and functionalism in (urban) planning theory and practice. (2) Planning Philosophy from 1980s to 2000s –which is characterized as supporting radical rationalism and empiricism by the method of paradigm shifts in the Khunian and Lakatosian Feyerabendian approaches– underlined Post-Positivist approaches in Globalization Movement and put emphasis on contextualism, pragmatic strategy and process in (urban) planning theory and practice. (3) Planning Philosophy from 2000s to present –which is characterized as supporting Popperian and Khunian approaches– underlines Post-Liberal approaches in Competitiveness and puts emphasis on managerialism, hedonic regulation and process in (urban) planning theory and practice.

In 1960s, Fordist agenda as well as Marxian and Weberian frameworks formed a conjecture based on redevelopment-led liberal politico-economy (Gurler, 2009, 2002). Socio-cultural motives in modern movement opened a path for formation of consumption society. Philosophy of science focused on content in a law-giving character. Monopolistic theoretical methods of positivism started to be questioned as a result of debates generated by Popper and Khun. Positivist and (ir)rationalist Planning Philosophy produced outlines for neo-classical urban theories. Rational and Incremental Planning Theory, focusing on urban life, supported a basis for investment-based and social benefit-oriented Communicative Planning Approach (Fainstein & Campbell, 1996; Faludi, 1973). Therefore, the crisis in Modernism supported the rise of theories on urban land-use and urban form in the planning conjecture of 1960s (Gulersoy, 2005). Concentrating on structure-side factors and society-based redevelopment strategies in urban regeneration process provided historic preservation and urban conservation programs for inner-city areas; i.e: UN-ICOMOS (1965). Therefore, urban regeneration has been identified as the model-cities oriented Urban Revitalization Approach (Gurler, 2009, 2002). As a result of concerning the effects of criticism to modern movement and character of urban space, new planning principles and methodology for urban revitalization within a social and cultural ideology emerged in an innovative manner (Gulersoy, 2005).

In 1970s, Relevancy crisis in science, planning and architecture (1969-1970) formed a conjecture dealing with transition (Gurler, 2009, 2002). Socio-cultural motives in the 1969 grassroots movement opened a path for embracing differences and multiplicity in the society. Philosophy of science focused on context in a law-explaining character. Pluralistic theoretical methods of interdisciplinary programs started to be proliferated as a result of debates generated by Feyerabend and Lakatos. Neo-Positivist Planning Philosophy produced outlines for mixed-scanning in urban theories. Transactive Planning Theory, focusing on collective consumption, supported a basis for negotiation-based and pluralistic benefit-oriented Advocacy Planning Approach. Therefore, decline of Modernism in 1972 supported the rise of Regionalism by concentrating on traditional city and urban experience in the planning conjecture of 1970s. Critical analysis of basic principles and ad-hoc design policies (i.e.: UDG) substantiated an interdisciplinary approach for explaining urban change. In this period, physical integration of urban land-use planning on local scale was achieved (Gulersoy, 2005). Concentrating on agency-side factors and regime-based redevelopment strategies in the urban regeneration process provided heritage conservation for the post-industrial inner-city areas; i.e.:

URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges

UNESCO-World Heritage Program (1972) and UN-Habitat (1978). Therefore, urban regeneration has been identified as the heritage-oriented Urban Conservation Approach (Gurler, 2009, 2002). As a result of concerning the effects of time on character and identity of urban space in historic preservation and conservation, new urban policies for urban conservation within a politic and economic ideology emerged in an autonomous manner (Gulersoy, 2005).

In 1980s, Post-Fordist agenda as well as Neo-Marxist and Neo-Weberian frameworks formed a conjecture based on capital-led integrated political economy (Gurler, 2009, 2002). Socio-cultural motives in post-modern movement opened a path for formation of a network society. Therefore, rise of Post-Modernism supported the development of Critical Regionalism by concentrating on social integration of regional scale urban form in the planning conjecture of 1980s. Critical analysis of architectural principles and community design policies substantiated an interdisciplinary approach for explaining urban growth and change (Gulersoy, 2005). Philosophy of science focused on system and policy in law-explaining character. Materialist and Pragmatist Planning Philosophy produced outlines for liberal urban theories which put emphasis on market. Collaborative Planning Theory, focusing on urban social movements, supported a basis for mediation-based and public interest-oriented Equity Planning Approach (Fainstein & Campbell, 1996; Paris, 1982; Faludi, 1973). Concentrating on the issue of urban inequalities in urban regeneration process provided heritage conservation and global-scaled restructuring of declined industrial (historic) inner-city areas; i.e: EU-European Heritage Program (1985). Therefore, urban regeneration has been identified as the post-industrial market-oriented Urban Renaissance Approach (Gurler, 2009; 2002). As a result of the effects of post-industrial society on urban change by concerning urban form and image in urban renaissance, new urban strategies, principles and partnership models emerged within a social and economic ideology in a liberal manner (Gulersoy, 2005).

In 1990s, Globalization agenda as well as restructuring-oriented framework developed a conjecture based on globally integrated political economy (Gurler, 2009, 2002). Socio-cultural motives in globalization movement opened a path for a knowledge society. Therefore, rise of Globalization supported the development of Sustainable Regionalism as well as Neo-Classicism and New Urbanism by concentrating on ecological and socio-economical integration of local scale urban form in the planning conjecture of 1990s. Critical analysis of urban principles and environmental design policies substantiated for an interdisciplinary approach systematizing urban growth and change (Gulersoy, 2005). Philosophy of science focused on knowledge and policy in law-explaining character. Post-positivist Planning Philosophy produced outlines for neo-liberal urban theories which put emphasis on rent. Radical Planning Theory, focusing on urban processes, supported a basis for policy-based and partnership benefit-oriented Strategic Planning Approach (Fainstein & Campbell, 1996; Allmendinger, 2002; Friedmann, 1998; Healey, McDougall, Davoudi & Madanipour, 1995). Concentrating on the issue of restructuring and programmatic tasks in urban regeneration process provided heritage conservation and local-scaled restructuring of cultural (historic) inner-city areas; i.e.: UN-Habitat Istanbul Declaration (1996). Therefore, urban regeneration has been identified as the post-industrial rent-oriented Urban Renaissance Approach (Gurler, 2009, 2002). As a result of the effects of post-

14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

industrial society on urban change by concerning public space and contextual history in urban regeneration, strategic plans and sustainable principles emerged within a politic and economic ideology in a neo-liberal manner (Gulersoy, 2005).

In 2000s, Competitive agenda as well as sustainability-oriented framework developed a conjecture based on globally integrated political economy (Gurler, 2009, 2002). Socio-cultural motives in globalization movement opened a path for an informational society. Therefore, progression of Globalization movement supported the development of Sustainable Urbanism and Smart Cities as well as Heritage Management by concentrating on ecological and historical protection of urban environment in the planning conjecture of 2000s. (Gulersoy, 2005). Philosophy of science focused on information and policy in law-explaining character. Materialist and Hedonic Planning Philosophy produced outlines for post-liberal urban theories which put emphasis on competitiveness. Radical Planning Theory, focusing on urban processes, supported a basis for regulation-based and managerial interest-oriented Management Planning Approach (Allmendinger, 2002; Healey, McDougall, Davoudi & Madanipour, 1995). Concentrating on the issue of regulative tasks in urban regeneration process provided restructuring of potential urban spaces. Therefore, urban regeneration has been identified as the neo-liberal market oriented Urban Regeneration Approach (Gurler, 2009, 2002). As a result of the effects of informational society on urban change by concerning quality of urban life and ecology in urban regeneration, management plans and smart principles emerged within a politic and economic ideology in a post-liberal manner (Gulersoy, 2005).

CHALLENGES AND DEBATES IN URBAN AGENDA AND PROPOSAL OF A MODEL FOR URBAN REGENERATION PROCESS

Multi-paradigmatic nature of planning philosophy has produced poly-centric structure both in planning theory and practice. The models for urban change have diversified cumulatively and methods in those models reflected paradigm shifts on the issue of urban regeneration. Accordingly, neo-liberal challenges have created new debates on the issue of urban regeneration in the contemporary urban agenda.

The conceptual challenges underline problems in planning theory and practice in the agenda of urban planning (Hillier&Healey, 2010). First of all, the normative values in Planning Theory for global restructuring, competitiveness and urban regeneration create a contradiction on the issues of priority and values. Consequently, the Planning Practice becomes contradictory within itself as a result of urban policies and urban governance structure for sustainable urban development, economic policies and urban management. Thus, the relationship that requires "reciprocal feedback between theory and practice, knowledge and action, conceptual models and the real world" rises as a main challenge for planning and management of the urban regeneration processes (Hudson in Hillier and Healey, 2010: 17). Therefore, structure-agency relationship, decision making and conflict management in the urban regeneration process strengthen a contradiction on the issues of power and ethics in Urban Planning.

The contemporary debates on planning of urban processes and management of urban places become important as a result of development of the urban regeneration concept in planning theory and practice (Diamond & Liddle, 2005; Ward, 2004; Healey, Madanipour & Hull, 2001). These debates in the urban agenda

URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges

put emphasis on 'planning of urban regeneration processes' as a main controversy by considering conceptual developments in planning theory, formation of new political processes in planning practice and socio-economical effects of those progresses (Ward, 2004; Hutchinson, 2001; Roberts & Sykes, 2000). Moreover, 'management of urban regeneration process' becomes a central concern in this context by determining strategic processes on local, regional and (inter)national scales (Diamond & Liddle, 2005; Hutchinson, 2001; Roberts & Sykes, 2000). From a hierarchical system framework, strategic processes and agent-based approaches are identified for managing the urban regeneration process (Diamond & Liddle, 2005; Roberts & Sykes, 2000). Therefore, agent-based strategic approaches in spatial planning systems and actors in urban (re)development process as well as theories and practices of urban design are increased in debates as a result of changing politico-economic conjunctures by the globalization process.

In these debates, the concept of urban regeneration highlights an integrated process comprised of practices for (re)developing economic, spatial, social and environmental status of an urban space (Couch, Fraser & Percy, 2003; Roberts & Sykes, 2000). There is a need for specific strategic approaches in the domains of process, content and context of urban regeneration resulting from increasing roles of actors in the process. These strategic approaches are emphasized to be assembled in the process as a series of multi-disciplinary strategies both targeted to identify organizational context and oriented to problem solving in spatial context, instead of being a single strategic document (Hutchinson, 2001). This emphasis could be accepted as an evidence for utilizing urban design guidelines as a strategic tool for planning management and sustainability of urban regeneration process. Moreover, planning, management and sustainability of urban regeneration process is achieved by strategic approaches and partnership models in the contemporary period (Marchettini, 2004; Roberts & Sykes, 2000).

The Proposal of a Model for Urban Regeneration Process:

Contemporary challenges and debates confirm "a need for systematizing a multi-agent, strategic and integrated model unifying theory, practice and method in its framework in order to achieve the planning, management and sustainability of urban regeneration process". Therefore, "urban design guidelines as an integrated and strategic tool for planning the urban regeneration process might be a leading factor on organizational and spatial levels for different and distinctive process models (urban conservation-historic preservation, urban (re)development and hybrid models)" is hypothesized. Accordingly, a model combining an analytic decision-making framework for preparing urban design guidelines (UDG) and a game-theoretic framework for planning and managing the process is proposed.

In this Model, "Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)" that is a multi-attribute decision making method is used both for determining the preparation phases of UDG and selecting the basic principles and strategies for UDG. "N-person, non-zero-sum, cooperative game" that is a characteristic function form game is used both for identifying actors, their strategies and partnership models, evaluating the alternative scenarios, and selecting the strategic model for the process. This model contains two groups of process-oriented criteria for analyzing data and evaluating results on organizational and spatial levels. Organizational criteria for planning and managing the process focus on "structure, agency, and system". Spatial criteria for managing

14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

and sustaining the process focus on “strategy, principles, and tools”. The Model provides a system that based on theory, practice and method for the urban regeneration process.

CONCLUSION

“Nothing endures but change”

Heraclitus (540 BC-480BC).

There is a relationship between poly-centric philosophy of science and contemporary urban planning as a result of multi-nuclei differentiation in the formation of philosophy of science system and urban change approaches from 20th century. Critical development of rationalism and empiricism in the philosophy of science after the 1960s, provoked the multi-paradigmatic development of materialism in (Urban) Planning Theory. Contemporary planning theory is a spatial response of planning approaches in the framework of paradigm shifts. Therefore, the conjecture produces contemporary challenges based on multi-paradigmatic structure of planning theory and practice.

It would not be thought that planning theories and approaches –which are diversified by the paradigm shifts based on the interaction between philosophy of science and (urban) planning philosophy–, have been developing separately from each other. Because, consecutive paradigm shifts are progressive developments. These shifts both provide differentiation in theory and practice of the dominating paradigm from the previous one and manifest the problem to be resolved in the following one.

Paradigm shifts in terms of development in planning theory produces contradictory debates. All of these contradictions have important role in scientific progress which allowed philosophy of science a poly-centric structure. Multi-paradigmatic character of scientific progress embraced almost each problem in order to resolve them in urban science. Paradigm shifts in urban planning produced opportunities as well as challenges both in theory and practice in contemporary urban planning. Contemporary approaches and strategies in urban regeneration process produce substantive and procedural challenges both in theory and practice.

If the new paradigm for urban regeneration is identified as the post-liberal rent oriented Urban Regeneration approach in 2010s, then what will be the consequences? The response highlights the neo-liberal challenges that put emphasis on the sustainability of historic environment and the balance between structure and agency relationships in the process. This response requires a feedback between planning theory and practice for planning, managing and sustaining the urban regeneration process. Now, It is time to initiate a debate on spatial response of a relationship between philosophy of science and urban planning in order to rethink the future of our cities in the framework of paradigm shifts and contemporary neo-liberal challenges.

REFERENCES

- Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning*, London; New York: Routledge.
- Camhis, M. (1979) *Planning Theory and Philosophy*, London: Tavistock.
- Carnap, R. (1995) *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*, Ed. by M. Gardner, New York: Dover.
- Couch, C.; Fraser, C. and Percy, S. (2003) *Urban Regeneration in Europe, Series in Real Estate Issues*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Diamond, J. and Liddle, J. (2005) *Management of Regeneration: Choices, Challenges, and Dilemmas*, London; New York: Routledge.
- Ersoy, M. (2007) *Kentsel Planlama Kuramları*, Ankara: İmge.
- Fainstein, S.S. and Campbell, S. (1996) *Readings in Planning Theory: Studies in Urban and Social Change* (edited book), Oxford-UK and Massachusetts-USA: Blackwell.
- Fainstein, S.S. and Campbell, S. (1996) *Readings in Urban Theory* (edited book), Oxford-UK and Massachusetts-USA: Blackwell.
- Faludi, A. (1973) *A Reader in Planning Theory, Urban and Regional Planning Series*, v.5, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Friedmann, J. (1998) "Planning Theory Revisited", *European Planning Studies* 6, 3, 245-253
- Galloway, T.D. and Mahayni, R.G. (1977) "Planning Theory in Retrospect: The Process of Paradigm Change", *JAPA*, 43, 1, 62-71.
- Gulersoy, N.Z. (2008) *Istanbul Project: Istanbul Historic Peninsula Conservation Study*, UNESCO World Heritage Project, Istanbul: ITU Rectorate.
- Gulersoy, N.Z. (2005) *Lecture Notes of "UD 518–Contemporary Approaches to Urban Design"*, Dept. of URP, Fac. of Architecture, ITU, Istanbul.
- Gurler, E. and Gulersoy, N.Z. (2009) "Paradigm Shifts in Urban Planning: Poly-Centric Philosophy of Science and Contemporary Urban Planning after 1960s", *Unpublished Paper*, 'Track-1: Planning Theory' of 'AESOP 2009: Why can't the Future be more like the Past?', 15-18 July 2009, Liverpool, UK.
- Gurler, E. (2009) *A Comparative Study in Urban Regeneration Process: The Case of Istanbul*, Saarbrücken: Verlag Dr. Müller-VDM.
- Gürler, E. (2002) *A Comparative Study in Urban Regeneration Process: The Case of Istanbul*, *MSc. Dissertation*, Dept. of CRP, Fac. of Architecture, METU, Ankara.
- Gürler, E. (2001) "Critical Realism as a Meta-Theory in Social Sciences: Philosophy and Methodology of Critical Realism for the Explanation of Geography / Urban Space", *Unpublished Research Paper* for "CP 522–Methods in Urban Planning and Research" at Dept. of CRP, Fac. of Architecture, METU, Ankara.
- Hall, P.G. (1988) *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford/UK; New York/US: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, New York: Oxford UP.

14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

- Healey, P., Madanipour, A. and Hull, A. (2001) *The Governance of Place: Space and Planning Processes*, Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Healey, P.; Cameron, S.; Davoudi, S.; Graham, S. and Madanipour, A. (1995) *Managing Cities: The New Urban Context*, Chichester; New York: Wiley.
- Healey, P.; McDougall, G. and Thomas, M.J. (1982) *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Hillier, J. and Healey, P. (2010) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Planning Theory: Conceptual Challenges for Spatial Planning* (edited book) Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate.
- Hillier, J. and Healey, P. (2008) *Critical Essays in Planning Theory: vol.1-Foundation of the Planning Enterprise, vol.2-Political Economy, Diversity and Pragmatism, vol.3-Contemporary Movements in Planning Theory* (edited book in 3 volume-set) Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Hutchinson, J. (2001) *The Meaning of "Strategy" for Area Regeneration: A Review*, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 14, 3, 265-276.
- Khun, T.S. (c1962, 1996) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levy, J.M. (1997) *Contemporary Urban Planning*, 4th Ed., New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Marchettini, N. (2004) *The Sustainable City III: Urban Regeneration and Sustainability*, *International Conference on Urban Regeneration and Sustainable City*, Sienna, Italy.
- Paris, C. (1982) *Critical Reading in Planning Theory*, Pergamon International Library of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Social Studies, Urban and Regional Planning Series, v. 27. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Roberts, P. and Sykes, H. (2000) *Urban Regeneration: A Handbook*, London: SAGE.
- Rosenberg, A. (2001) *Philosophy of Science: A Contemporary Introduction*, Routledge Contemporary Introductions to Philosophy. London; New York: Routledge.
- Russel, B. (1961) *History of Western Philosophy*, Çeviren M. Sencer (1996) *Batı Felsefesi Tarihi* (c.1: İlkçağ, c.2: Ortaçağ, c.3: Yeniçağ), 5. Basım, İstanbul: SAY.
- Taylor, N. (1998) *Urban Planning Theory since 1945*, London: SAGE.
- Tekeli, İ. (2000) *Lecture Notes of "CP 522-Methods in Urban Planning Research"*, Dept.of CRP, Fac.of Architecture, METU, Ankara.
- Ward, S. V. (2004) *Planning and Urban Change*, London: Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Zeren, N. (1984) *Tarihsel ve Kültürel Çevre Korunması, Türkiye'de Tarihsel Mimari Değer Koruma Anlayışının Gelişimi, Tarihsel Çevre Korunmasında Yaklaşımlar, Tarihsel Çevre Korunması Seminer Dizisi*, İstanbul: İTÜ.

URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges