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Peter Hall spent the years 1980 to 1992 on the faculty of the University of California at Berkeley. He arrived at a moment when a group of progressive young faculty and graduate students were collaborating on the development of new ways of analyzing and planning urban and regional development. Peter was a trusted friend and mentor to this group. This paper describes the work of what we called the Western Urban Regional Collective and links it to Peter’s intellectual evolution. We focus on four key pillars: urban/regional development, inclusiveness, sustainability and innovation. After Peter returned to London in 1992, he remained closely involved with these themes and many of the same people. He co-founded Global Urban Development (GUD) in 2001 as an international non-profit research and policy organization that adopted these four pillars as its core mission. GUD’s strategic policy and action framework – Metropolitan Economic Strategy, Sustainable Innovation, and Inclusive Prosperity – is based on ideas originally developed at Berkeley in the 1970s and 1980s. We describe the activities of GUD to bring this aspect of Peter’s work to a broader audience.

When Peter Hall joined the faculty of the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley in 1980, he already was an internationally recognized expert on urban and regional planning in the UK and in Europe, serving as Professor of Geography and Dean of Urban and Regional Studies at the University of Reading during the 1970s. By the time Peter left Berkeley in 1992 for University College London, he had also become a leading authority on the role of technological innovation and industry networks in urban and regional economic development.

Peter Hall’s academic and policy leadership within the rapidly emerging field of economic innovation was shaped in part by his active involvement as a colleague and mentor with an innovative group of faculty and graduate students in Berkeley, including an inter-disciplinary group of progressive young scholars and activists called the Western Urban and Regional Collective.

A key event in this intellectual evolution was the publication in 1983 of a special issue of Built Environment entitled ‘Silicon Landscapes’, edited by Ann Markusen with an introduction by Peter Hall, which two years later became a book, Silicon Landscapes, co-edited by Peter and Ann (Markusen, 1983a; Hall and Markusen, 1985a). These publications demonstrated the results of a pioneering approach to understanding urban and regional development through analyzing firms and industries.

Some Background

The Department of City and Regional Planning at University of California, Berkeley
was a leader during the 1960s in the transition from the traditional land-use planning perspective derived from the architecture, landscape design, and civil engineering fields, to a focus on social science and public policy, especially geography and economics, that was emerging in a few major universities beginning in the 1940s and 1950s. Berkeley had become a national magnet for faculty and students interested in this new approach, and by the late 1970s, a new generation of graduate students and junior faculty, strongly influenced by the politics and culture of the New Left, were drawn to Berkeley as the dynamic centre of a paradigm shift. Similarly, Berkeley attracted new senior faculty in pursuit of innovative ideas, most notably Manuel Castells in 1979 and Peter Hall in 1980 (Castells, 1983, 1989; Castells and Hall, 1994).

In the field of urban planning, the traditional focus had been on accommodating and guiding urban and regional economic growth through coordinated land-use plans and regulations combined with strategic transportation and infrastructure investments. By the 1970s, when urban economic growth throughout the US could no longer be assumed, younger planners wanted to rebuild older cities and reshape metropolitan spatial patterns by promoting dynamic economic growth, both broad-based and targeted, that was more innovative, sustainable, and inclusive than the typical approach. To accomplish these goals, urban land-use planning needed to become more proactively linked with economic development policy, strongly emphasizing the three-way interaction between: (1) people, (2) places, and (3) industries, in order to achieve the best overall results.

This new generation of scholars and activists wanted to deeply understand the factors that enabled businesses and industries to thrive, and then use this knowledge to promote greater prosperity and quality of life everywhere, especially for communities, cities, and regions facing deindustrialization, poverty, unemployment, disinvestment, pollution, racial and ethnic discrimination, and many other difficult economic, social, and environmental challenges.

Starting in January 1978, in response to President Carter’s initiative to develop a national urban policy (HUD, 1978), a group of faculty and graduate students at UC Berkeley decided to create a research and discussion group to analyze the Carter Administration initiative and propose alternative policies. Until March 1979 the group was called the National Urban Policy Collective (NUPC), at which point it was renamed the Western Urban and Regional Collective (WURC), broadening its scope of work and continuing its activities to 1984. Peter Hall arrived during the peak of this activity, and he immediately became one of WURC’s trusted friends and mentors.

The Western Urban and Regional Collective (WURC)

The WURC group consisted of four faculty, two from UC Berkeley: Ann Markusen (City and Regional Planning) and Richard Walker (Geography), and two visiting professors, Bennett Harrison (Urban Studies and Planning) from MIT, and Doreen Massey (Geography) from the Open University in the UK. It also included many UC Berkeley graduate students, primarily from City and Regional Planning (Barbara Baran, Meric Gertler, Amy Glasmeier, Cynthia Kroll, Nancey Green Leigh, Vivian Lin, Daniel Lindheim, Michael Luger, Flavia Martinelli; Helzi Noponen, Paul Ong, Annalee Saxenian, Erica Schoenberger, Philip Shapira, Suzanne Teegarden, Marc Weiss, and David Wilmoth), plus Geography (Susan Christopherson, Susanna Hecht, Michael Heiman, and Michael Storper), Anthropology (Madeline Landau), and Economics (Candace Howes). Finally, Marshall Feldman, a UCLA graduate student teaching at San Francisco State University, Neil Mayer, an Urban Institute community development researcher, Rebecca O’Malley, a journalist at Pacific News Service, and Ellen Widess,
Everyone involved with NUPC and WURC were ‘urbanists’ with a collective passion for neighbourhoods, cities, and urban regions (Weiss, 1987; Schoenberger, 2015). Within that broad range of interests, there was a common fascination for how the economy shaped urban/regional development and planning, and in turn how urban/regional spatial patterns contributed to economic growth and development. Peter Hall, as the author of The Industries of London, The World Cities, and Urban and Regional Planning, naturally understood this fascination, and he was able to provide wise and experienced advice to the WURC group on a wide range of issues and concerns, from research methodology and analysis, to planning and policy considerations (Hall, 1962, 1966, 1974).

The original NUPC group efforts concentrated on understanding recent urban policy in the US, in order to reshape future policy in ways that would be more innovative, sustainable, and inclusive. It included research by Ann Markusen, Analee Saxenian, and David Wilmoth on Federal programmes such as Urban Renewal, Revenue Sharing, and Community Development Block Grants (Weiss, 1980; Markusen, Saxenian, and Weiss, 1981; Markusen and Wilmoth, 1982). It also included work by Ann Markusen, Michael Teitz, and Marc Weiss on the Carter Administration’s proposed new policy of Urban Impact Analysis (Teitz and Weiss, 1979; Markusen, 1979).

Numerous UC Berkeley faculty members served as informal advisers to the NUPC/WURC group and related activities of its various members between 1978 and 1984, including, from City and Regional Planning: Edward Blakely, Manuel Castells, Stephen Cohen, Judith Innes, David Dowall, Leonard Duhl, Martin Gellen, Peter Hall, Roger Montgomery, Janice Perlman, Michael Teitz, and Melvin Webber; from other UC Berkeley departments: Allan Pred and James Vance (Geography), Clair Brown and Laura Tyson (Economics), David Vogel and John Zysman (Political Science), Troy Duster and David Matza (Sociology), and John Holdren (Energy and Resources), among others. In addition, Barry Bluestone from Boston College, Sandra Kanter from the University of Massachusetts-Boston, and John Mollenkopf from Stanford University were involved.

Four Pillars: Urban/Regional Development, Inclusiveness, Sustainability and Innovation

The NUPC/WURC group shared a common interest in four key intellectual and public policy areas: Urban and Regional Development, Inclusiveness, Sustainability, and Innovation, both as academic scholars and as progressive political activists. Peter Hall’s passions and interests were closely aligned, and he served as a vital supporter and key adviser for the group’s collective work and for many individuals who participated in the WURC group’s activities.
significant understanding of what was happening beneath the macroeconomic surface, and that focusing on industry interrelationships would make possible more strategically effective urban/regional economic development planning and policies.

The WURC group drew ideas and inspiration from industry sector analysis being conducted by Bennett Harrison, Barry Bluestone, Sandra Kanter, and their faculty and graduate student colleagues working on the New England Economy Project through the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, beginning in 1978. When Bennett Harrison came to Berkeley in 1979 as a visiting professor in City and Regional Planning, he shared with the WURC group his experiences working on the New England Economy Project. A few of their industry studies were later published, including *Aircraft Industry Dynamics*, and *The Retail Revolution* (Blustone et al., 1981a, 1981b). Bennett Harrison also shared with us the fascinating challenges that he and Barry Bluestone were experiencing in working on national plant closing policy in Washington with trade union leaders, elected officials, and citizen activists (Bluestone and Harrison, 1980).

WURC’s focus on industry sectors coincided with the growth of the information technology and biotechnology industries in the San Francisco Bay Area, especially computer hardware and software in Silicon Valley. Understanding the economic, business, and spatial trends of these new and rapidly growing industries would soon become a major research topic of the WURC group, leading directly to substantial path-breaking research during the 1980s and 1990s.

Inclusiveness

Everyone involved with NUPC/WURC was committed to a more equitable society, with greater opportunity and better results for all, and without discrimination against anyone. Most of us had been, or currently were, activists and advocates for economic and social change. Many of us were actively working with low-and-moderate income urban neighbourhoods and with racial and ethnic minority groups in Berkeley, Oakland, San Francisco, and other cities, as well as in rural areas, such as with the California farmworkers’ movement. Promoting greater inclusiveness, ranging from democratic participation in decision-making at all levels of government, business, and civil society, to open opportunity for education and advancement at all levels of employment and entrepreneurship, and much more, was a vital part of the WURC agenda.

For example, in 1982 many members of WURC participated in the statewide plant closings movement. Huge factories were being shuttered in California back then, including General Electric in Ontario, General Motors in Fremont and South Gate, and Colgate-Palmolive in Berkeley. In response, a statewide coalition of trade unionists, church groups, and community leaders actively campaigned for California State Assemblywoman Maxine Waters’s proposed Employment Stabilization Act. This legislation would have required all large corporations in California to provide six-months advance notice before permanently closing a plant, pay severance benefits to workers, support retraining, and give workers and community members an opportunity to purchase the factories (Weiss and Shapira, 1982).

Many of the NUPC/WURC participants from UC Berkeley’s Department of City and Regional Planning worked with the Planners Network, an informal national group of progressive urban planning professionals, academics, students, and others. The Planners Network (PN) was founded in 1975 as a communications network for 300 planners and activists who had belonged to a previous US group called Planners for Equal Opportunity. Led by Chester Hartman in San Francisco (Hartman, 2002), PN published a bimonthly newsletter containing notes from members about their work, together with information about conferences and events, publications,
job opportunities, funding availability, and other useful resources. In short, the Planners Network Newsletter was a vital information-clearinghouse for practicing planners across the country. WURC helped Chester Hartman edit the newsletter, and when he moved to Washington, DC in 1980, the WURC group took over editorial responsibilities for several years. In those days, besides collecting the information and writing it up, running the newsletter involved a lot of maintaining and updating index card files, typing, printing out mailing labels, folding and stapling. Younger generations of planners have no idea. But the great thing was, we spent many evenings and weekends in someone’s kitchen, where there were some good cooks among us. We had the sense of a shared mission, and it wouldn’t be an exaggeration to say it was an exhilarating experience.

The Planners Network organized a national conference on Progressive Planning in May 1979, hosted by Cornell University’s Department of City and Regional Planning. Many people from the NUPC/WURC group in Berkeley helped organize and participate in this landmark event. After the conference, three Cornell professors – Pierre Clavel, John Forester, and William Goldsmith – edited some of the papers into a book, Urban and Regional Planning in an Age of Austerity (Clavel, Forester, and Goldsmith, 1980; Markusen, 1980; Weiss, 1980).

Many people in the NUPC/WURC group were actively involved in Berkeley politics, working with the progressive caucus, Berkeley Citizen Action. In the 1979 municipal elections, the BCA elected Mayor Gus Newport and obtained a voting majority on the City Council. The WURC group and the Planners Network offered to produce a progressive economic development strategy for the city government. Thus was born the Berkeley Economic Development Project at UC Berkeley’s Institute of Urban and Regional Development, with funding provided by the City of Berkeley. The project, coordinated by Ann Markusen and Marc Weiss, included Marjorie Bennett, Daniele Farber, Linda Gardner, Jay Jones, Joyce Klemperer, Nancy Green Leigh, Neil Mayer, Michael Peltz, Amy Skewes-Cox, Matthew Steinle, Paul Sussman, and Linda Wheaton (Weiss and Markusen, 1981). Major aspects of the Berkeley Strategy were explored in a graduate course on Economic Development Planning taught by Michael Teitz and Marc Weiss in the spring of 1980.

A key focus of the Berkeley Economic Development Project was on generating business and job opportunities, income growth, and community development for Berkeley’s low- and moderate-income minority neighbourhoods (Weiss and Markusen, 1981). This spirit of inclusiveness was best captured in the title of a 1984 Berkeley Planning Journal article summarizing the project – ’Beyond Shopping Malls: Planning for Jobs and for People in Berkeley, California’ (Markusen and Weiss, 1984). The project had a major impact on the future of economic development policy and planning in Berkeley. In 1985, a member of our project, Neil Mayer, became Berkeley’s Director of Economic Development, Housing, and Community Development, a position he held 10 years (Mayer, 1985).

In 1982 many people from the WURC group collaborated with other innovative entrepreneurs (ranging from Sierra Designs to La Peña Cultural Center), community leaders, urban professionals, and environmental activists to organize a non-profit community development corporation called Builders, Inc. At that time Colgate-Palmolive was closing its huge factory in west Berkeley near the San Francisco Bay. It was the largest factory in Berkeley and Colgate-Palmolive’s biggest industrial facility in California.

We organized Builders, Inc. to enable Colgate-Palmolive to donate its factory to our non-profit corporation, which would then coordinate the reinvestment process through a public-private-community partnership approach. Builders, Inc. planned to redevelop the Colgate-Palmolive plant into a world-class Sustainable Innovation business incubator/accelerator and technology park, pro-
motivating energy and resource efficiency, renewable energy and clean technology, and biotechnology, together with spaces for the creative arts and cultural activities (Builders, Inc., 1982; Weiss, 1983b). Amazingly, this vision nearly happened. Colgate-Palmolive eventually agreed to donate the closed factory to Builders, Inc., but at the last moment they changed their minds and sold it instead.

Builders, Inc., would have been the first state-of-the-art Sustainable Innovation business incubator/accelerator and technology park in the US. Peter Hall enthusiastically advised and supported the Builders, Inc. initiative, together with many of his faculty colleagues, including Manuel Castells, David Dowall, Ann Markusen, Roger Montgomery, and Michael Teitz. It was a very ‘green’ cutting-edge version of the type of ‘Technopole’ that Peter would research and write about together with Manuel Castells a decade later (Castells and Hall, 1994).

Peter Hall was very supportive of WURC’s commitment to inclusiveness in general, and the Berkeley Economic Development Project and Builders, Inc. in particular. Before arriving in Berkeley and for the first few years after his arrival, he was deeply involved in searching for solutions to inner-city poverty and unemployment through more innovative and dynamic business growth and job creation. This was the intended purpose of the Enterprise Zone ideas he proposed in the 1970s (Hall, 1977, 1982a, 1982b).

Sustainability

The WURC group included numerous environmental activists. For example, Amy Glasmeier, Michael Heiman, Erica Schoenberger, Michael Storper, Richard Walker, and Ellen Widess were deeply involved in California environmental politics and policy, and Michael Storper was an occasional lobbyist for Friends of the Earth with the State government in Sacramento (Walker et al, 1979; Walker, 2007). Erica Schoenberger and Amy Glasmeier wrote a detailed environmental critique of the Air Force’s proposed MX Missile project, which would have occupied large swathes of land in Nevada and Utah, in The Progressive, a weekly national magazine (Schoenberger and Glasmeier, 1980).

WURC’s main involvement with sustainability was through the Berkeley Economic Development Project. The project’s June 1981 report, Economic Development: An Implementation Strategy for the City of Berkeley, was the first Sustainable Economic Development Strategy in the US (Weiss and Markusen, 1981; Markusen and Weiss, 1984). A centrepiece of the strategy was for Berkeley to become a centre of ideas, products, and services related to the production, distribution, storage, and consumption of energy conservation and efficiency, and of renewable energy, especially from solar and wind, as highlighted in the overall strategy, and especially in one of the key background reports, Creating Jobs in Berkeley by Alternative Energy Strategies (Skewes–Cox, 1981).

Many of the ‘alternative energy’ ideas in our 1981 Berkeley Economic Development Strategy were later implemented by the city government. One of the members of our project, Neil Mayer, who served as Berkeley’s Director of Economic Development, Housing, and Community Development from 1985 to 1995, played a key role working with city leadership and community stakeholders to help Berkeley become a national leader in promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy. During the past decade, Berkeley created an innovative method of financing clean energy investments in commercial and residential properties, called the PACE (Property Assessed Clean Energy) programme, which quickly became a national model and best practice. As Peter Hall recently reminded us in his important book, Good Cités, Better Lives, he was a lifelong champion for improving environmental quality, and in the early 1980s, Peter strongly encouraged the sustainability agenda of WURC and the Berkeley Economic Development Project (Hall, 2014; Hall et al., 1995).
The San Francisco Bay Area in the 1960s and 1970s was experiencing dramatic cultural ferment, in which the Whole Earth Catalog (Brand, 1970) became one of many potent symbols of change. Walter Isaacson in The Innovators (2014) and John Markoff in What the Dormouse Said (2005) have described the social impacts on the information technology-related industries centred around Silicon Valley, and similar impacts were being felt closer to Berkeley and San Francisco. Innovation was in the air, manifested in biotechnology and holistic community health clinics, music and film, solar energy and recycling, production of outdoor clothing and recreational gear, consumer and producer cooperatives, venture capital and socially responsible investing, experimental education, healthy food, sustainable design, public interest law, and much more.

In the mid-1970s, this spirit of innovation was reflected in politics through the Economic Democracy movement, and in business by a new generation of progressive entrepreneurs oriented towards sustainability and inclusiveness (Carnoy and Shearer, 1980). Governor Jerry Brown brought this spirit to California State Government, creating new entities such as the SolarCal Council, Office of Appropriate Technology, Office of Economic Policy, and Pension Investment Unit, and appointing innovators in existing agencies including the Energy Commission, the Office of Planning and Research, State Architect, and many other agencies. For example, the Pension Investment Unit encouraged the two huge statewide public employee pension funds, CalPERS and CalSTRS, to invest in job creation, business growth, and economic development in California, including sustainable innovation (Weiss, 1978).

One of Governor Brown’s most important initiatives was the California Commission on Industrial Innovation. In 1979, the Silicon Valley and California high-tech business community, particularly manufacturers of computers and semiconductors, became increasingly concerned about competitive challenges from Japanese firms who were receiving considerable government support through MITI and other industrial policy agencies. Led by David Packard, co-founder of Hewlett Packard, this California technology business group wanted the US Government to adopt an industrial policy similar to Japan’s. In 1980 Governor Brown proposed creating a state-level industrial policy, and the following year he established the California Commission on Industrial Innovation (CCII), based on strategic advice from Regis McKenna, a Silicon Valley entrepreneur, Professors Laura Tyson and John Zysman from UC Berkeley, and Michael Kieschnick, Director of the Governor’s Office of Economic Policy, among others (Cano, et al., 1982).

The CCII’s Co-Chairs were David Packard and Steve Jobs, Apple’s co-founder. Its members included Regis McKenna, CEOs from National Semiconductor, Bank of America, and The Foothill Group, plus several government officials, university administrators, and labour union leaders. Allison Thomas was the CCII’s Director, and Marc Weiss served as Deputy Director (CCII, 1982; NGA, 1983; Weiss, 1983a, 1986; Peltz and Weiss, 1984; Weiss and Metzger, 1987).

One of the CCII’s key initiatives in 1981 was to provide research grants to support the first major studies of emerging technology industries in California. These studies included an analysis by John Zysman, Michael Borrus and James Millstein of California’s semiconductor industry; a report by Eugene Coyle on the State’s solar photovoltaics industry; a report by Richard Dorf on the robotics and automated manufacturing industry in California; plus two reports by members of the WURC group: Peter Hall and Ann Markusen (with UC Berkeley graduate students Richard Osborn and Barbara Wachsman) on California’s software industry; and Marshall Feldman and Rebecca O’Malley on the State’s biotechnology industry (Borrus et al., 1982;
Coyle, 1982; Dorf, 1982; Hall et al., 1982; Feldman and O’Malley, 1982).

Peter Hall and Ann Markusen’s July 1982 report for the California Commission on Industrial Innovation (CCII), The California Software Industry: Problems and Prospects, was the first major academic economic development study of the computer software industry in the US. The following year, as mentioned above, Peter and Ann teamed up on the special issue of *Built Environment* – ‘Silicon Landscapes: High Technology and Job Creation’ (Volume 9, no 1) – which included an article, drawn from their CCII report, on ‘The American Computer Software Industry: Economic Development Prospects’. It also included an introduction by Peter Hall on ‘Silicon Landscapes High Technology Job Growth’, an article by Ann Markusen on ‘High Tech Jobs, Markets, and Economic Development Prospects; Evidence from California’, an article by Marshall Feldman on ‘Biotechnology and Local Economic Growth’ adapted from his 1982 CCII biotechnology report, an article by Marc Weiss on ‘High Technology Industries and the Future of Employment’ and an article by Analee Saxenian on ‘The Genesis of Silicon Valley’ which became part of the framework for her widely read 1994 book, Regional Advantage (Hall et al., 1983; Hall, 1983; Markusen, 1983b; Feldman, 1983; Weiss, 1983a; Saxenian, 1983, 1994).

In 1985 *Silicon Landscapes* was published as a book, with the same articles from *Built Environment*, plus some additional material, including Peter’s new introductory essay on ‘The Geography of the Fifth Kondratieff’ and a concluding chapter by Peter and Ann on ‘High Technology and Regional-Urban Policy’ (Hall, 1985; Hall and Markusen, 1985b). Peter and Ann then continued to collaborate on two more books, High Tech America: The What, How, Where and Why of...
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than 600 leaders and experts in 60 countries, including 30 people from Berkeley in the 1980s. Peter was GUD’s founding Vice Chair for nearly 14 years (Weiss, 2014a).

GUD was created to develop and disseminate strategic ideas and actions that can enable all people and communities, everywhere in the world, to live and thrive in peace with each other and in peace with nature. This idealistic goal was combined with a realistic focus on designing and implementing practical strategies and initiatives that accelerate economic prosperity and enhance quality of life for people and places worldwide.

We would like to provide considerable detail about GUD’s activities, because we believe this is an aspect of Peter Hall’s work that few academics are aware of. It is also something he was closely connected to until the end of his life.

GUD’s strategic approach grew directly out of the ideas that animated the Berkeley scholar/activists from Peter’s time. The same four pillars – urban and regional development, inclusiveness, sustainability and innovation – support GUD’s strategic policy and action framework for Metropolitan Economic Strategy, Sustainable Innovation, and Inclusive Prosperity which is currently being implemented in a number of cities, regions, and states/provinces around the world (Weiss, 2005). Peter Hall served for many years as Co-Chair of GUD’s programme committee on Metropolitan Economic Strategy: Advancing Innovation, Prosperity, and Quality of Life.

Peter Hall left Berkeley in 1992, but continued to be involved in many of the same issues and with many of the same people. For example, his excellent 2014 book, Good Cities, Better Lives: How Europe Discovered the Lost Art of Urbanism, includes detailed and insightful case studies of sustainable innovation and dynamic economic development of communities, cities, and urban regions in Germany, France, the Netherlands and Sweden, with a very special and inspiring chapter about Freiburg (Hall, 2014).

With his usual combination of energy, enthusiasm and generosity, Peter co-founded Global Urban Development (GUD, originally called the Prague Institute for Global Urban Development) in September 2001 as an international non-profit research and policy organization and professional network of more than 600 leaders and experts in 60 countries, including 30 people from Berkeley in the 1980s. Peter was GUD’s founding Vice Chair for nearly 14 years (Weiss, 2014a).

GUD was created to develop and disseminate strategic ideas and actions that can enable all people and communities, everywhere in the world, to live and thrive in peace with each other and in peace with nature. This idealistic goal was combined with a realistic focus on designing and implementing practical strategies and initiatives that accelerate economic prosperity and enhance quality of life for people and places worldwide.

We would like to provide considerable detail about GUD’s activities, because we believe this is an aspect of Peter Hall’s work that few academics are aware of. It is also something he was closely connected to until the end of his life.

GUD’s strategic approach grew directly out of the ideas that animated the Berkeley scholar/activists from Peter’s time. The same four pillars – urban and regional development, inclusiveness, sustainability and innovation – support GUD’s strategic policy and action framework for Metropolitan Economic Strategy, Sustainable Innovation, and Inclusive Prosperity which is currently being implemented in a number of cities, regions, and states/provinces around the world (Weiss, 2005). Peter Hall served for many years as Co-Chair of GUD’s programme committee on Metropolitan Economic Strategy: Advancing Innovation, Prosperity, and Quality of Life.

As a senior official in the Clinton Administration during the 1990s, Marc Weiss coordinated the development of Metropolitan Economic Strategy as a US national policy, working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (especially HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros and HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo), President’s Council on Sustainable Development, Economic Development Administration, White House National Economic Council, and many other public, private, and academic entities (Cisneros, 1993;


Nine months later, Peter Hall played a vital leadership role in launching Global Urban Development, with Metropolitan Economic Strategy as one of GUD’s key initiatives. In late 2001 and early 2002, GUD began spreading the Metropolitan Economic Strategy framework to the UK and to continental Europe, including the Czech Republic, Spain, and Sweden, as well as to Brazil, China, Singapore, South Africa, and elsewhere (Weiss 2001b, 2002b, 2003a, 2003b; Yang 2002; Fazzano and Weiss, 2004; Cahyadi et al., 2004).

Under Peter Hall’s leadership, GUD participated in the European Union’s European Spatial Planning Observation Network (since renamed the European Observation Network...
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for Territorial Development and Cohesion). During 13–14 June 2003, GUD hosted a major two-day meeting in Prague for our affiliated ESPON research consortium, which included University College London and the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm (ESPON, 2006). Peter Hall gave a brilliant lecture, attended by more than 100 distinguished guests, on ‘The World’s Urban Systems: A European Perspective’. In 2005 we inaugurated GUID Magazine online (www.globalurban.org) by publishing Peter’s ESPON lecture as a lead article under the Metropolitan Economic Strategy theme (Hall, 2005). Peter’s 2003 Prague speech was an early summary of ideas from the landmark POLYNET transnational study he directed at University College London, which culminated in the 2006 book The Polycentric Metropolis. (Hall and Pain, 2006).

In 2007 Peter Hall contributed another lead article – entitled ‘Urban Land, Housing, and Transportation: The Global Challenge’ – for a special issue of GUID Magazine co-published with the World Bank (Hall, 2007). This special issue emerged from a 2005 World Bank Urban Research Symposium, held in Brasilia, focusing on innovative, sustainable, and inclusive urban development solutions for emerging economies and markets in developing countries (Freire et al., 2007).

Recently GUD has concentrated on applying Metropolitan Economic Strategy, Sustainable Innovation, and Inclusive Prosperity in Brazil. Working with the Brazil and US governments through the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas, GUD helped organize an international conference on Sustainable Economic Development held in Curitiba during 7–8 June 2011 (ECPA, 2011). At the invitation of Brazil’s Federal Ministry of Development, Industry, and Trade, and its national innovation policy agency, the Brazilian Agency for Industrial Development (ABDI), GUD has been working since 2011 in two states, Minas Gerais and Rio Grande do Sul, with the Federations of Industries (FIEMG and FIERGS) and the State Governments (UN World Urban Forum, 2012; Weiss, Sedmak-Weiss, and Bromley, 2012; Weiss, Sedmak-Weiss, and Rodriguez, 2012).

Currently GUD is developing a strategy, funded by the World Bank, for Rio Grande do Sul to become the most sustainable and innovative place in Latin America by 2030 (Weiss, 2014b). As always, Peter Hall provided wise and experienced strategic advice for GUD’s recent work in Brazil.

Peter’s inspiring spirit of blending utopian vision with concrete results informed this entire history, from the Western Urban and Regional Collective to Global Urban Development. The people who were taught by him and worked with him then and later have remained committed to the vision and reality of innovative, sustainable, and inclusive cities and regions. The wide range of Peter Hall’s encyclopaedic global knowledge and lifelong involvement with practical urban and regional planning and economic development policy was a vital resource for the WURC group at UC Berkeley in the 1980s, and for GUD during the past 14 years.
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