

Gerald F. Vaughn, "Sheffield's Richard P. Wakefield: Advocate for Human Values, World Futures and the Environment" *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* Volume 32, No. 2 (Summer 2004).

Published by: Institute for Massachusetts Studies and Westfield State University

You may use content in this archive for your personal, non-commercial use. Please contact the *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* regarding any further use of this work:

masshistoryjournal@westfield.ma.edu

Funding for digitization of issues was provided through a generous grant from MassHumanities.



Some digitized versions of the articles have been reformatted from their original, published appearance. When citing, please give the original print source (volume/ number/ date) but add "retrieved from HJM's online archive at <http://www.westfield.ma.edu/mhj/>."

Editor, *Historical Journal of Massachusetts*
c/o Westfield State University
577 Western Ave. Westfield MA 01086



**Sheffield's Richard P. Wakefield:
Advocate for Human Values, World Futures, and the
Environment**

By

Gerald F. Vaughn

Sheffield's Richard P. Wakefield, an internationally-known urban planner with the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health, was a seminal thinker who stimulated others to think and undertake significant work. The foundation for much of what he accomplished was his early life, education, and work experiences in Massachusetts. A distinguished son of the Commonwealth who brought credit to the state of his birth, his career is best defined as advocacy for development of human values, discerning of alternative world futures, and improvement of the environment.

All of Wakefield's advocacy came together when he was instrumental in initiating what has become known as human ecological planning to improve human health and well-being. He did this in association with Ian L. McHarg, renowned chairman of the University of Pennsylvania's department of landscape architecture and regional planning. Wakefield and McHarg had been students together in the Harvard Graduate School of Design from 1947 through 1950. In 1973, at Wakefield's urging, McHarg established the University of Pennsylvania's academic program in human ecological planning, which was the first such program anywhere in the world.

What is known about Wakefield? What led Wakefield to persistently urge McHarg to add the human dimension to McHarg's

existing ecological planning? How did they make it happen? This article seeks to add insight into Wakefield's life and career and his instrumental role in establishing McHarg's pioneering program. McHarg is best remembered as author of the path-breaking book *Design with Nature*, which in 1969 revolutionized environmental or ecological planning. In McHarg's autobiography *A Quest for Life*, he discusses the phone call he received in 1973 from Wakefield:

He had a proposition. Ecological planning had developed very well and was efficacious, he said, but it concentrated on physical and biological science. Could it not be extended to include social science and people? Moreover, could it not focus on planning for human health and well-being? This seemed reasonable, but difficult. I had experienced several years of graduate social science at Harvard and concluded that most of it was oblivious to the environment, could not perform useful work and that much of it, notably economics, was antithetical to the ecological view. Wakefield persisted: surely there were compatible views within the social sciences that could transform ecology into human ecology and enrich planning.

The National Institute of Mental Health was the principal agency within the federal government focusing on behavioral science and cultural and social problems related to mental health. In 1969 the NIMH Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, in which Wakefield held a key position, had funded establishment of the Center for Urban Ethnography at the University of Pennsylvania.¹

After careful deliberation, McHarg wrote a grant proposal and received a half million dollars NIMH grant to employ faculty and establish a curriculum in human ecological planning. The new curriculum drew most heavily from the social science of cultural

¹ Ian L. McHarg, *Design with Nature* (Garden City, NY, 1969); Ian L. McHarg, *A Quest for Life: An Autobiography* (New York, 1996), 268-271; *United States Government Organization Manual 1972/73*, Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, revised July 1972, 218.

anthropology, applying especially ethnography and medical anthropology to the practice of landscape architecture and regional planning, with emphasis on studying man's values and processes in adapting to his environment. As John G. Bruhn states: "Perhaps the most relevant and useful ecological studies in anthropology are those concerned with the relation between cultural behavior and environmental phenomena. These studies show either how cultural behavior affects environmental phenomena or how environmental phenomena affect cultural behavior."²

Ethnographic history, to the extent that it can ascertain changing human values and attitudes toward changing land-use over time, was the core of McHarg's human ecological planning. As Jon Berger of the University of Pennsylvania later wrote in an article illustrating teamwork between ethnographers and regional planners: "The project, funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, involved explicit consideration of local diversity in land-use values, and of who would suffer and who would benefit if any particular set of values were used in landscape planning." Berger stated:

The minimum ethnographic information needed to answer the planners' questions included: who the local inhabitants were; what their views of class and economic stratification were; how they exchanged information and made land-use decisions; how they used local resources; what their various views of resource issues were; and what kinds of coalitions, conflicts, and cooperation were associated with these issues. The ethnographer suggested that the planners should spend time living on the site with different types of families in order to gather this sort of information.

Several years later, in another study, Berger and John W. Sinton combined historical and ethnographic information into an ethnographic history and concluded: "Our proposed synthesis would provide an understanding of long traditions of use and belief and their relationship

² John G. Bruhn, "Human Ecology: A Unifying Science?," *Human Ecology* 2 (1974), 112.

to the environment and to the quality of life -- the social and mental health of local communities.”³

Richard Parker Wakefield, the intellectual progenitor of human ecological planning, was born in Sheffield, Massachusetts, on July 20, 1921. Richard was one of the six children of Ernest Little Wakefield, longtime teacher of mathematics (1913-1940) at Berkshire School in Sheffield, and Veola Rowan Wakefield. Richard’s grandfather Albert Harold Wakefield was a physician in Sheffield. Among Richard’s siblings was his brother Rowan Albert Wakefield, who achieved distinction as a consultant in higher education. In 1956 Rowan, Richard, and family established a memorial fund at Berkshire School in honor of their father.

Richard prepared for college at Berkshire School under headmaster and Harvard alumnus Seaver Burton Buck, who had founded the school in 1907. The school’s location in a natural amphitheater on the eastern slope of Mt. Everett, overlooking the Housatonic Valley, doubtless instilled in young Mr. Wakefield a love of nature and scenic beauty and a concern for the environment that helped to shape his eventual understanding and appreciation of man’s relation to his environment. Wakefield graduated in 1940 and enrolled at Harvard, but his studies were interrupted from 1943 to 1945 by military service during World War II, including service as a radio operator in England for the Office of Strategic Services, U.S. Army. He received his A.B. degree in Romance Languages from Harvard College in 1947, and on December 18, 1948, he married Carolyn Strang (Radcliffe, ’48).

After the war, when completing his undergraduate studies, Wakefield’s interests began to shift, and in his senior year he took several courses in architectural sciences. Continuing his education in this direction, he next undertook the Master of City Planning program (chaired by the eminent G. Holmes Perkins) in the Harvard Graduate School of Design. The Harvard graduate city planning curriculum was broadly based in both physical and social planning, an advance upon previous planning curricula that emphasized physical planning almost exclusively. McHarg, in his autobiography, recalls:

³ Jon Berger, “Toward an Applied Human Ecology for Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning,” *Human Ecology* 6 (1978), 179, 181; Jonathan Berger and John W. Sinton, *Water, Earth, and Fire: Land Use and Environmental Planning in the New Jersey Pine Barrens* (Baltimore, 1985), 211.

The chairman of City and Regional Planning, G. Holmes Perkins...held the belief that planning is an applied social science and devised a curriculum that included anthropology with Carleton Coon, geography with Derwent Whittlesey and Edward Ullman, government with John Gaus, Maurice Lambie, and Arthur Maas, economics with John Black and Kenneth Galbraith, sociology with Oscar Handlin and Talcott Parsons, planning with Martin Wagner and Perkins, housing with Catherine Bauer and W. L. C. Wheaton, engineering with Walter Chambers, history of cities with Dean Hudnut, history of landscape architecture with Bremer Pond, and the dominant, powerful influence of Walter Gropius [architecture] himself.

Perkins aimed at producing practitioners who understood not only the city's need for functional and attractive physical development but equally understood the city's socio-economic problems and governmental processes.⁴

Anthony Alofsin indicates that Perkins involved members from many of Harvard's departments, and courses and seminars of those departments, in the city and regional planning curriculum to achieve multifaceted education. Alofsin explains: "According to Perkins, this interchange would establish a 'sense of comradeship between those students of the social sciences and of design who will be collaborating in the future in the development of public policy and plans.'" It did so for Wakefield, but not for McHarg.⁵

In his autobiography McHarg writes: "As I review the Graduate School of Design forty some years later, it is clear that the instincts were splendid and the energy and commitment admirable, but there was a notable absence of wisdom. Yet this quality existed in the person of Lewis Mumford. He came each year, gave marvelously thoughtful lectures, diagnostic and prescriptive, but he was seen as aberrant....He warned of the dangers of deifying technology, the necessity of giving

⁴ McHarg, *A Quest for Life*, 83.

⁵ Anthony Alofsin, *The Struggle for Modernism: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and City Planning at Harvard* (New York, 2002), 201.

primacy to human values.” McHarg was attracted to the physical and biological sciences as means by which to best assert human values.⁶

Wakefield inclined more toward the social and behavioral sciences as best addressing the primacy of human values. Among Harvard’s other early and penetrating influences on Wakefield’s thinking about human values and human (social or cultural) ecology was his exposure to the teaching of visiting lecturer, University of Texas sociologist Walter I. Firey, Jr., under whom Wakefield studied urban sociology at Harvard in 1949. Sociology at Harvard then was part of the Department of Social Relations, which in addition included social and clinical psychology and social anthropology. Firey had received his doctorate in sociology at Harvard in 1945, with a dissertation titled “The Role of Social Values in Land Use Patterns of Central Boston.” Firey’s book *Land Use in Central Boston*, an adaptation of his dissertation published two years later, had examined the influence of differences in cultural values and community sentiments on land-use patterns in central Boston.⁷

In his final term during 1949-50 Wakefield also took a course in land economics in the department of city and regional planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology under Lloyd Rodwin, in which he likely heard Rodwin’s well-publicized criticism of Firey’s study of urban land use as being too narrow while insightful. Rodwin was probably America’s best-trained professor of land economics teaching in the field of city and regional planning at that time. Prior to receiving his Ph.D. in regional planning from Harvard in 1949, Rodwin had received his master’s degree in land economics in 1945 at the University of Wisconsin, the nation’s leading center for study in land economics. There he studied under the outstanding land economists Richard U. Ratcliff, Leonard A. Salter, Jr., and George S. Wehrwein. At Wisconsin Rodwin also studied under one of the nation’s leading political scientists, John M. Gaus, who was closely associated with the land economists.

Rodwin felt that Firey had focused importantly but too narrowly on cultural values and community sentiments, to the virtual exclusion

⁶ McHarg, *A Quest for Life*, 83.

⁷ Walter Firey, *Land Use in Central Boston* (Cambridge, 1947).

of economic factors and opportunities for city planning programs. In a review of Firey's book, Rodwin observed that Firey concluded his analysis "by suggesting that only a cultural approach to ecology seems to offer any hope of a more systematic and embracing basis for generalization in this domain." Rodwin argued for a more inclusive conceptual system, most specifically: "Developments in welfare economics distinguishing social and individual costs may find significant applications here. Another unexplored frontier is the influence of planning programs in deflecting economic forces inimical to the development of socially desirable but low or non-revenue producing land uses."⁸

Additionally, Rodwin saw promise in psychology and was convinced that "the pioneer investigations of a team of psychologistshave opened new horizons concerning group relations in planned communities which will surely influence house, site and neighbourhood design in the future." Among the two teams he specifically identified was the Group Dynamics Research Center, formerly at MIT, which in 1948 had merged with the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center to form the latter university's Institute for Social Research.

The MIT Group Dynamics Research Center was founded by social psychology professor Kurt Lewin in 1945. Bruhn writes, "Lewin considered all psychological events to be a function of 'life space' wherein the individual and the environment are viewed as a single constellation of interdependent factors....He felt not only that the social scientist could contribute to the solution of social problems but also that the study of attempts to produce changes in social conditions would enable scientists to gain insight into social processes." When Lewin died in 1947 his associates reassessed their Center's existence within an institution mainly devoted to the natural sciences and engineering and they decided to seek a base of operations having stronger orientation toward the social sciences, resulting in relocation of the Center to the University of Michigan.⁹

The Center became part of the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research headed by Rensis Likert. The Institute had been

⁸ Lloyd Rodwin, review of Firey, *Journal of Land & Public Utility Economics* 23 (1947), 451.

⁹ Bruhn, 117.

established as “a logical development resulting from the broadening of interest in the scientific approach to problems of human behavior, from the emergence of improved scientific theory and research methods during the 1930s and 1940s, and from the urgency of the problems which may ultimately be resolved through a better understanding of human behavior.” By 1954 the Institute staff comprised roughly fifty research scientists, sixty home-office administrative workers and clerks, and more than two hundred part-time field interviewers throughout the nation. As will be seen, the research operation and findings of the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research helped to lead Wakefield toward the concept of human ecological planning.¹⁰

While a graduate student, Wakefield gained practical experience working four months fulltime and four months part-time in 1949-50 as research analyst for the Planning Board of the City of Cambridge, Massachusetts, under Mark Fortune, Director of Planning. Wakefield undertook socio-economic analyses and field surveys in major areas of the city, with emphasis on crime, delinquency, morbidity, and housing. He also coauthored a report on a master plan for the City of Beverly, Massachusetts, in 1950. Here he was intent on learning about the day to day life of the city as the basis of a realistic master plan.¹¹

Wakefield’s first job, following his graduation from Harvard with the Master of City Planning degree in 1950, was a quantum leap into group dynamics. From 1950 to 1953 Wakefield worked as, first, assistant planner and, next, principal planner in the Office of Planning for Arlington County, Virginia. Here he came into close contact with leading planning consultants such as Max S. Wehrly (editor of *Urban Land* and member and chairman of the Arlington County Planning

¹⁰ Lloyd Rodwin, “Land Economics in the United States,” *Town Planning Review* 21 (July, 1950), 177; Stanley E. Seashore, “The Institute for Social Research,” in *The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey*, edited by Walter A. Donnelly, Volume 4, Parts VIII and IX (Ann Arbor, MI, 1958), 1549-1558.

¹¹ Richard P. Wakefield, “Application for Federal Employment,” August 1, 1953, Wakefield’s Official Personnel Folder, National Personnel Records Center, 2; Richard P. Wakefield, “Social Science Background and Skills of Richard P. Wakefield,” c. 1965/66, Wakefield’s Official Personnel Folder, National Personnel Records Center, 1-2.

Commission) and Homer Hoyt (who conducted an economic survey of the land uses of Arlington County). Among Wakefield's responsibilities was formulation of the county's capital improvements program, during which he met frequently with a citizens committee and numerous subcommittees advising on the program. He describes this as "a major laboratory-type experience in group dynamics, social welfare, and community socio-political activity."¹²

From 1953 to 1956 Wakefield was chief of the planning section, Real Estate Division, Bureau of Facilities, U.S. Post Office Department. In this capacity, for assistance he drew upon the services of the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research to which Rodwin had referred. Wakefield was in charge of socio-economic analyses of communities regarding their needs for postal facilities, and he designed and produced an illustrated publication on the mail service area concept. He also was active in Post Office Department efforts to increase employee effectiveness and work satisfaction. This stimulated his interest in operations research.¹³

In 1956, and continuing through 1965, Wakefield entered the world of industrial management. He was employed by General Electric Company as project analyst in the Operations Research and Synthesis Section, Large Steam Turbine-Generator Department, at Schenectady, New York. In these years he became interested in general systems research and the process of business planning. He furthered his education in 1959-61 by studies in psychology and social sciences at the Russell Sage College. During his years working for General Electric Company, Wakefield's responsibilities brought him into contact with Clare W. Graves, a professor specializing in industrial psychology at Union College in Schenectady, and the two men developed a mutually beneficial working relationship that matured during Wakefield's years with the National Institute of Mental Health as will be discussed subsequently. During those General Electric years Wakefield also continued his contacts with other industrial psychologists working on management problems, including the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research and MIT's Douglas McGregor, the

¹² Wakefield, "Social Science Background..." 2.

¹³ Ibid., 3-4.

latter mentoring him on the human side of enterprise. All of this study of group dynamics, to which Rodwin had pointed in 1950, was leading Wakefield into deeper thought and involvement in work pertaining to human values and processes. It one day led to his calling Ian L. McHarg to suggest the field or discipline of human ecological planning.¹⁴

In 1965 Wakefield left industry and became plans and process analyst in the State Plans Section, Community Mental Health Facilities Branch, Extramural Research Programs, National Institute of Mental Health. In this position he reviewed, analyzed, and made recommendations on state plans submitted under the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963. Reading these plans and voluminous related materials gave him a broad overview of mental health resources and needs across the nation and detailed knowledge of approaches and processes utilized by states in planning for comprehensive community mental health services. In 1965-66, he increased his proficiency in the behavioral sciences, especially as applicable to communities and organizations, by studying human development education at the University of Maryland.

While in this capacity at NIMH, Wakefield also worked with and substituted for the acting chief of the newly established Center for Studies of Metropolitan and Regional Mental Health Problems [later renamed Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems], Technical Programs Assistance Branch, Division of Mental Health Service Programs, NIMH. As part of the establishment of programs of the Center, Wakefield assisted in preparing goals, objectives, policies, budget proposals, work programs; selection of nominees for the National Advisory Committee; setting the agenda for the fall conference; arrangement of meetings with public and private officials; and development of legislative proposals.¹⁵

The Center was established under the recent reorganization of NIMH to serve as the focal point for Institute activities in developing metropolitan mental health programs. The Center analyzed and

¹⁴ Ibid., 5-6.

¹⁵ Richard P. Wakefield, "Supplemental Experience and Qualifications Statement," 3/31/67, Wakefield's Official Personnel Folder, National Personnel Records Center.

evaluated research and program developments in metropolitan mental health care, and used means including basic and applied research grants, training grants, contracts, and conferences to further examine metropolitan mental health needs and promote programs to meet these needs. This involved extensive cooperation and collaboration with federal, state, and local agencies responsible for the mental health of the urban population.

Alan I. Levenson, Director of NIMH Mental Health Service Programs, wanted Wakefield as plans and process analyst (urban planner) in the new Center. In recommending Wakefield's transfer, which in effect had begun in 1966, Levenson wrote:

One of the more critical needs is for a person who by training and experience can combine a knowledge of mental health planning with knowledge of the whole urban planning field. Mr. Wakefield's qualifications well suit him for such a position....from his early days in this field he has held a basic interest in and concern for the social implications of urban planning.... Furthermore, Mr. Wakefield's already established liaison with many other Federal agencies which support state, regional and metropolitan area planning and development programs will be a tremendous asset in fulfilling the critical coordination function of the Center for Studies of Metropolitan and Regional Mental Health Problems.¹⁶

In his new post Wakefield was associated with notable colleagues such as Center chief Harry P. Cain II, assistant chief Matthew P. Dumont, and executive secretary Stephen S. Baratz. Soon after Wakefield's arrival, Dumont published a book titled *The Absurd Healer: Perspectives of a Community Psychiatrist*. Leonard J. Duhl, in the Foreword, wrote: "The model of ecology is extremely useful in looking at Doctor Dumont's concerns. As a model of an open system that is ever-changing and completely interrelated, it helps man to avoid seeing the world as one with simple cause-and-effect responses in which simple solutions suffice....It sees our society not as one so

¹⁶ Alan I. Levenson, letter to the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, April 10, 1967, Wakefield's Official Personnel Folder, National Personnel Records Center.

sick that it must be destroyed by revolution or other means but as a society capable of revitalizing and retooling itself.” Dumont, in his Preface, acknowledged Duhl as his “mentor and guide” and added: “I shall always marvel with gratitude at the noble, wise, and inscrutable forces that brought together as my co-workers Harry Cain, Richard Wakefield, and Stephen Baratz. This association has made many things possible.”¹⁷

Wakefield’s responsibilities were as follows:

Works with and substitutes for the Chief of the Center in the identification, preparation, and evaluation of objectives; goals; policies; budget proposals; work programs; membership and organization of review and advisory committees; grant and contract request subjects and applicants. Initiates and follows up on contacts with health and mental health organizations, governmental agencies, professional and trade organizations; university professionals; private individuals, industrial and development organizations to identify and to communicate areas of mutual concern. Participates in national and regional meetings and conferences concerned with the relationships of physical and social planning to the promotion of environmental and mental health.¹⁸

Wakefield’s professional interests at NIMH applied planning processes and general systems theory to program development, implementation, and organizational operations to improve environmental or preventive mental health. He became a specialist in general systems (elements, variables, relationships, alternatives, and values) and human

¹⁷ Matthew P. Dumont, *The Absurd Healer: Perspectives of a Community Psychiatrist* (New York, 1968), 15-16, 21.

¹⁸ Wakefield, “Supplemental Experience and Qualifications Statement,” Personnel Folder.

systems (social, organizational, communications, programs), with some emphasis on anticipatory processes.¹⁹

Around late 1967 or early 1968 Wakefield and a friend, psychology teacher William R. Lee, organized an informal Human Values Group comprised of fifteen to twenty-five professionals (sometimes more) working in public agencies and private organizations in and near Washington, DC, which met monthly until around 1979 with Wakefield serving as chairman. This was an outgrowth of a May 1967 NIMH seminar presented by psychology professor Clare W. Graves on his new “Theory of Values.” The group was particularly interested in the role of values in human life and Dr. Graves’s research and theory. Often the group was referred to as “the Graves Group.” Wakefield was personally interested in research needs concerning emergent forces in human values.

Graves elaborated on his still-developing theory of values in a 1970 journal article titled “Levels of Existence: An Open System Theory of Values.” His research had suggested the emergence of eight major value systems up to that time. He calls them the reactive, the traditionalistic, the exploitive, the sacrificial, the materialistic, the socio-cratic, the existential and the experiential. It is not necessary, for purposes of this treatment of Wakefield and his thought and actions, to address any value system other than the one characterizing Wakefield. One would say that existential best characterizes Wakefield. Graves writes of such a man:

He sees the world and all its things, all its beings, all its people, as truly interdependent....He values that which will enable all animals, all plants and things to be, and all mankind to become. His ethics are based on the best possible evidence as to what will benefit all....Yet the peripheral aspects of what he values today may change tomorrow because as he solves one set of problems he seeks another in its place.²⁰

¹⁹ *Who's Who in NIMH*, 3rd edition, National Institute of Mental Health (Washington, D.C., 1968), 12, 46, 73, 115, 371; World Future Society, *The Future: A Guide to Information Sources*, 2nd edition (Washington, D.C., 1979), 372.

²⁰ Clare W. Graves, “Levels of Existence: An Open System Theory of Values,” *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 10 (1970), 154; telephone conversations between Vaughn and Lee, October 2002.

In 1969 Wakefield had major responsibility for the NIMH metropolitan studies center's work on "Task Force for the Future" and related development of grant applications to focus research or training on the future of society. At the U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School, he completed a special in-service training course titled "The Future: Its Critical Relationship to Public and Private Policy Issues." This consisted of eleven sessions defining study of the future, why such study is important and how it is carried out. Participants explored future scientific and technological events and their relationships to social trends and human values. He then organized the Ad Hoc Interagency Committee on Futures Research, which he chaired for many years. This was an unofficial group, composed mainly of federal government civil servants in policy-related posts from almost all agencies of the Executive Branch, who met monthly to discuss futures research, technology assessment, social impact assessment, forecasting, and related subjects (including human values), all bearing on long-range governmental planning.²¹

In 1971 Wakefield took a special in-service training course titled "Human Effectiveness in Today's Organizations" at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This course dealt with motivation theory, levels of human existence, and the changing climate of organizations and management systems. Wakefield took the course to increase his awareness of psychosocial aspects of individual motivations and institutional change, to widen the scope of his capabilities in programming research and training grant applications. Clearly this contributed to his thought processes when he initiated the phone conversation with McHarg in 1973 and launched human ecological planning at the University of Pennsylvania.²²

Wakefield was personally interested in a future-creative and values-sensitive policy science paradigm, and in 1973 Alexander N. Christakis and he presented a paper on the subject at the Rome Special World

²¹ Richard P. Wakefield, "Training Request and Authorization," approved February 7, 1969, Wakefield's Official Personnel Folder, National Personnel Records Center; World Future Society, *The Future: A Guide to Information Sources*, 5.

²² Wakefield, "Training Request and Authorization," approved June 1, 1971, Personnel Folder.

Conference on Futures Research. They focused first on the United States and asserted: “The passage of the ‘National Environmental Policy Act of 1969’ represents a milestone in terms of National policy....When seen in an evolutionary context, this Act provides a fundamental change in Man’s perception of his role and interdependency with the natural environment.” After reviewing the situation worldwide and calling for similar policies in all nations, allowing for the cultural differences between nations, Christakis and Wakefield concluded: “It is our feeling that within the context of the proposed paradigm considerable research is needed: (1) to expand the notion of ecology to embrace the equilibria and the dynamics of all entities, and (2) to translate the candidate paradigm into operational terms by applying it continuously for decision-making purposes.”²³

In the 1970s, frequently recalled as America’s environmental decade, Wakefield began serving on the Subcommittee on Environmental Education of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education. He also began serving on the interagency discussion group on environmental design research. Marguerite Villecco and Michael Brill, in their book *Environmental Design Research: Concepts Methods and Values*, acknowledge Wakefield as among the federal observers interested in their work. Additionally, Wakefield was a consultant/respondent to the National Commission for Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research; a member of the organizing committee of the 1976 International Society for Technology Assessment Congress; and representative of NIMH and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the working group for the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements.²⁴

Meanwhile, McHarg and his associates at the University of Pennsylvania had been working on refining the theoretical framework and method of human ecological planning. McHarg’s definitive statement of the theory and method was published in 1981. As we

²³ Alexander N. Christakis and Richard P. Wakefield, “A Future-Creative and Values-Sensitive Policy Science Paradigm,” in *Human Needs, New Societies Supportive Technologies: Collected Documents Presented at the Rome Special World Conference on Futures Research 1973* (Rome, 1974), 158-159, 180.

²⁴ World Future Society, *The Future: A Guide to Information Sources*, 372; Marguerite Villecco and Michael Brill, *Environmental Design Research: Concepts, Methods and Values* (Washington, D.C., 1981), Foreword.

entered the twenty-first century two decades later, in a tribute published soon after McHarg's death, William J. Cohen could write, "The enduring triumph of Ian McHarg is this: the field of human ecological planning, to which he was so committed and which he so passionately advocated, will live on." McHarg's human ecological planning became the model for applied human ecology as an approach to ecological planning throughout the world.²⁵

Richard P. Wakefield of Sheffield, Massachusetts, an eminent urban planner, forward-looking social and behavioral scientist, and the man behind McHarg's human ecological planning, retired in 1981 and died in Bethesda, Maryland on January 13, 2000. In a senior policy post at the National Institute of Mental Health for many years, his vision and activities focusing on human values, world futures, and the environment were extraordinary and have proven to be enduring contributions. He was survived by his widow Carolyn, sons Eric and Douglas, and daughter Jill.

²⁵ Ian L. McHarg, "Human Ecological Planning at Pennsylvania," *Landscape Planning* 8 (1981), 109-120; William J. Cohen, "Ian McHarg's Triumph," *Planning* 67 (May 2001), 13.
