Chapter VI
The Future of The Planning Profession

By Lawrence E. Susskind

There are a number of factors that account for the changing scope and style of planning practice in the United States. Among these are shifts in public perceptions about the responsibilities of government; fluctuating economic conditions and increased competition for scarce resources; the augmentation, adaptation, and diffusion of new technologies; and rising expectations about the required level and appropriate distribution of public goods and services. Although many of the issues currently facing urban and regional planners are not unlike those that confronted their counterparts fifteen and twenty years ago, it would be wrong to assume that planning has not changed or that the profession will not continue to evolve in interesting and important ways.

The future directions of the planning profession are partially a matter of choice. By creating a more powerful metaphor to describe what planners do or what planning can accomplish, it might be possible to heighten the demand for more and better planning.[1] This would force the profession to develop more powerful analytic tools and implementation strategies, and perhaps enhance the importance of key professionals in various policy-making activities. Even if the profession merely responds to broader societal pressures and does not create a demand for more effective planning, the market for skilled practitioners is not likely to diminish.[2]

I will try to (1) analyze the factors that have helped reshape planning roles over the past ten years; (2) identify the emerging public policy issues likely to influence the practice of planning in the years ahead; (3) describe the short-range manpower demands implied by these shifts; and (4) comment on the implications that these changes have for planning education. I will also attempt to formulate

a new metaphor that planning educators and members of the profession might use to present a more compelling picture of themselves to the public.

Factors that Account for Change

The range, locus, and content of planning has broadened considerably over the past several decades. Perhaps, as Herbert Gans has suggested, these changes can be explained by the dominant backgrounds or "class interests" of members of the profession (and in turn by their attitudes toward their clients' needs). (Gans, 1969) Yet, despite the extent to which these sociological factors account for the changing outlines of accepted planning practice, there can be little doubt that evolving notions of government's responsibility for the poor and disadvantaged, ups and downs in the national economy, fear about the long-range supply of natural resources, and the ready availability of more powerful communications and transportation technologies, have had a more noticeable, and perhaps a more important, impact on the definition of planning roles and responsibilities.

Land use controllers, urban designers, policy and program administrators, housing and redevelopment specialists, local grantsmen, and planners in other sub-specialties now operate in startlingly different ways from practitioners who held similar positions only five or ten years ago. Many now operate in agencies or settings that can best be described as "competitive" (working toward conflicting goals under multiple leadership), or "fragmented" (without clear goals or recognized leadership). (Rabinovitz, 1967) They no longer function as technicians limited to certain information-gathering and administrative roles. Only in "cohesive" situations, where all the components of the political and service delivery system are operating in harmony can the planner survive merely by "doing factual studies on noncontroversial subjects." (Rabinovitz, 1967, p. 112) The locus of planning has moved from cohesive settings to competitive and fragmented organizational environments.[3]

In a competitive system, one in which municipal department heads have one set of objectives, members of the city council another, and contending neighborhood groups still a third and fourth, the planner must operate as a "broker." This requires special skills in the design, synthesis, and implementation of policy options and strategies for mobilizing political support. In such situations the planner must help to specify alternatives, create additional "slack" in the system, spot unanticipated resources, build coalitions, engage in public education and media manipulation, referee endless negotiation and bargaining sessions, and carry out other extradepartmental activities.

In a totally fragmented system, and I believe that this is the kind of setting in which many planners find themselves today, routine decision-making is relatively unimportant. To provoke action in a

fragmented system the planner must be able to mobilize resources and sustain sufficient energy to support change. This is true for planners operating in line agencies as well as in central staff positions.

The shifting character of land use planning over the past ten to fifteen years may help to illustrate how a sub-group of planning professionals has been forced into more competitive and fragmented situations and how in the process they have been compelled to develop new skills and different "theories of action."[4] Land use planning, which at one time involved little more than population projections, the preparation of zoning and subdivision ordinances, and the making of master plans now encompasses a vast array of social policy concerns, environmental management issues, and sophisticated modeling and analytical techniques.

A concern for social policy inputs into land use planning was prompted initially by shifts in federal housing policy. Housing legislation in the 1960's emphasized provision of housing for special groups such as the poor. (HUD, 1973) Instead of merely revising various financial mechanisms, as in the 1950's, the government embarked on a program of direct and indirect subsidies. It also added new emphasis to the goal spelled out in the 1949 Housing Act of providing a "decent home and a suitable living environment" for all Americans. The various subsidy programs enacted in the 1960's — 221 d (2), d (3) and d (4); operating subsidies; aid to families displaced by urban renewal projects; rent supplements; leased housing; turnkey; and homeownership subsidies — served to erase a growing stigma communities had begun to attach to the concentration of public housing and low-income families in their areas. These programs helped to encourage dispersal of the poor among varied income groups and introduced a "wild card" into the land use planning process. Land use plans, especially in metropolitan areas, could no longer reflect only market pressures and local decisions, they had to take account of regional housing needs and the availability of federal subsidies. This meant that the "social mix" of a community became an issue in land use planning and that planners had to decide who *should* live in a community or a neighborhood rather than who was likely to be living there in the future given market pressures. Of course, decisions about social mix have consequences for the design of public services and the organization of transportation facilities. Thus, a redefinition of federal (governmental) responsibility for the needs of the poor and the disadvantaged helped to broaden the content of land use planning. Normative issues were raised and non-controversial planning decisions now took on highly charged social and political overtones. The planner found that he/she had to be responsive to various groups with competing interests. The making of land use plans could no longer be considered merely a technical problem.

Fear about the long-range supply of natural resources — expressed simply as a concern for the environment — has radically altered the

practice of land use planning and rearranged the lines of authority concerning the use of land resources. The 1971 passage of the National Environmental Protection Act signaled a halt in the unchecked development of suburban areas that began in earnest at the close of World War II. The environmental "movement" helped to push through a Coastal Zone Management bill and generated support for a National Land Use Policy and an emerging redefinition of private property rights. (Riley, 1973) In California, for example, environmental groups successfully lobbied for the creation of a strong state-controlled coastal management program. In other states, environmental groups have taken the lead in pressing for significantly greater state and regional control over local land use decisions. (Bosselman, 1973) Environmental impact statements have become a critical element in the land use planning process over the last three years. (Cardinal, 1973: Roberts, 1973) The image of "spaceship earth" and of a nation faced with dwindling natural resources has added a new dimension to land use planning. In part, this includes the rise of "slow growth" or "no growth" strategies. (Mishava, 1973) Critics of headlong suburban sprawl and opponents of continued industrial development in sensitive ecological areas have been able to band together to stop, or at least influence, a number of projects including a major jetport in the Everglades, the Alaskan pipeline, and various off-shore oil refineries in the northeastern United States. In the same vein, numerous efforts have been made to limit the growth and size of communities — most notably Ramapo, New York; Boulder, Colorado; San Jose, California; Petaluma, California; and Fairfax, Virginia.[5]

New planning tools have been created including land banks, development right transfers, moratoria, point systems, floating zones, and other non-Euclidian zoning techniques. (Marcus and Groves, 1970) In conjunction with permit procedures adopted by state governments (aimed at protecting inland water ways, salt water marshes, flood plains, and other sensitive ecological areas), these new planning tools represent a substantial advance over the relatively crude land use controls used until just a few years ago. The application of these tools, however, is complicated by layers of intergovernmental review, constitutional considerations, and by the fragmentation and diffusion of political leadership in many, if not all, communities.[6]

The proliferation of land use policies and coordinating mechanisms at the sub-state, regional, state, and multi-state levels has added a new dimension to land use planning and has had profound implications for the types of knowledge and skills required for professional success. Familiarity with sophisticated legal concepts and evolving growth controls is the contemporary land use planner's stock-in-trade. Infrared and air photo interpretation are other necessary land use planning tools in today's job market. Most of all, the land use planner now must deal with the politics of policy formulation, the

implementation of growth strategies, and citizen participation in the planning process. Many communities are unwilling to settle for long-range master plans that are not operational.

It is not just land use planning that has taken on new and different dimensions over the past decade as a result of such things as shifts in federal policy and concern for environmental protection. Urban designers are now less involved with small scale efforts to patch up rundown areas and more concerned with massive new-town-in-town development and regional growth strategies involving complex interactions between the public and the private sectors.[7] In Boston, New York, and a great many other cities, planners are involved in highly sophisticated efforts to simulate the probable outcome of alternative public policies and to involve client groups in the decision process through interactive computer-aided gaming devices.[8] In the past, few planners took a special interest in the problems of the poor and the disadvantaged, now instead of merely trying to balance these interests along with other public interests, advocacy planning groups are actively engaged in the thick of local politics, championing the needs of specific groups.[9]

Some of these changes have not yet taken hold throughout the country. There are still a great many practitioners performing traditional roles in the "old" style. By and large, however, the shape of the planning profession has indeed changed. Moreover, the rate at which new and different roles will continue to emerge is likely to increase as more than 750 additional members enter the guild each year. (Corby and So, 1974) These newcomers include blacks, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and Puerto Ricans who have long been without a voice in the professional community.

Assuming that many of the younger members of the profession are anxious to carve out more activist roles for themselves and that various factors, such as those outlined above, will continue to force changes in the nature and style of planning practice, it would be helpful to have a more accurate picture of the knowledge and skills that planners are likely to need in order to be effective during the next ten to fifteen years.

Emerging Public Policy Issues

When the federal government decided that it was important to correct structural imbalances in regional economic growth, the Area Redevelopment Authority and the Economic Development Administration were created. Regional planning flourished. When the Congress proclaimed an all-out "war on poverty," planners moved into Model City agencies and OEO-funded neighborhood organizations. When Congress passed the Safe Streets and Law Enforcement Assistance Act, criminal justice planning was born. And when the Partnership for Health was enacted, comprehensive health planners

began to emerge from federally funded programs in almost two dozen universities.

Public policy shifts, represented by the ebb and flow of federal, state, regional, and local spending patterns, are reflected in certain non-governmental and private decisions. During the 1960's, private foundations financed the creation of community development corporations and decentralization experiments in the fields of health and education. These, in turn, led to the founding of advocacy planning organizations. The universities reponded to the call for more highly trained professionals in emerging fields when foundations and the government provided sufficient stimulation in the form of scholarship or institutional development funds. Although the process is much more complex, the chain reaction works in approximately the following manner. Fluctuations occur in the overarching balance of forces holding the country together: the economic well-being of the nation is threatened; social issues (sometimes through the media's prodding) are rediscovered and prick the national conscience; the balance of political power suddenly shifts touching off ideological debates; the private sector discovers a way to produce or market a more inexpensive or profitable version of some existing piece of technology; or the supply of an important natural resource appears to reach a dangerously low level. Any of these can create a *policy vacuum:* a demand for a more specific definition of "the problem" and an approach to solving it. Decisionmakers move to fill the vacuum, drawing on past experience as well as on prevailing diagnoses of threats or opportunities involved.

Incentive and control systems are activated. One level or unit of government offers financial or political inducements aimed at encouraging the private sector to expand or modify its activities, attempts to alter the role of another governmental unit, tries to create a public-private partnership around a specific task, or offers sufficient justification for ignoring the problem or opportunity. The appropriate organizations, groups, and portions of the institutional network twist and turn in an effort to accommodate these pressures. Finally, it becomes clear what the additional chores are that need to be done and what it will "cost" to do them. If the incentives and controls are sufficiently strong, new professionals may emerge or adjacent professionals may seek to expand their legitimate domain. This expansion may involve the invention of new methods or techniques, the redefinition of client groups, or the reformulation of organizational objectives.

As public policy shifts, so must the planner's loyalties. ("He who pays the piper, calls the tune.") More often than not, innovative planning techniques emerge in response to the unmet needs of new client groups or the failure of old methods to provide satisfactory responses to present conditions. The emergence of new techniques or the invention of new roles (which may or may not imply a shift in

the locus of planning) often provokes a search for more appropriate theories and implementation strategies. As experience accumulates, old theories are proven to be inadequate and new research is encouraged.

To frame my speculations about the future of the planning profession in the United States, I have chosen six public policy issues that I think will dominate the public agenda over the next decade. Each issue grows out of an alternative interpretation of how emerging policy vacuums ought to be filled. The six issues I have selected are: (1) the reprivatization of public service delivery systems; (2) the adoption of a national income redistribution strategy; (3) the decentralization of resource allocation decisions (from the federal to state and local levels via revenue sharing); (4) regionalization of property taxation, land use controls, and environmental resource management; (5) the redefinition of private property rights; and (6) the imposition of controls on population growth and migration.

My aim is to outline these six issue areas and to amplify the latest thinking about the probable effects that contemplated actions in each area might have on traditional planning roles: comprehensive/land use planner, grantsman/public program administrator, urban designer/transportation planner, social services planner, housing and redevelopment specialist, and others. In particular, I will try to suggest the ways in which certain policy options stand to redefine the locus of planning activity (How will the settings change?); to deflect the planner's traditional loyalties (Who is the client and who pays the planner's salary?); to create a need for new or improved techniques (What are the changing skill requirements?); and to spur the development of more powerful planning theories (What new areas of knowledge need to be explored?).

Reprivatization

If public systems cannot provide critically important services in a cost-effective manner, there is always the possibility of transferring responsibility for service provision to the private sector through vouchers, allowances, or through performance contracting. This line of thinking is particularly attractive in a time of tight money and municipal financial stress. The most recent discussions of housing policy, for example, suggest the need for a "housing allowance." (Solomon, 1974) Instead of subsidizing the producers of housing (through tax writeoffs, depreciation allowances, or incentive grants), those who advocate the housing allowance want to subsidize consumers so that they can compete more effectively in the private market. (Whether the market will indeed respond by filtering down more acceptable units to those at the bottom of the income-scale remains to be seen.)

In the field of education, the voucher concept is designed to maximize consumer sovereignty. Families would receive vouchers equivalent to the amount that would otherwise be spent by the community to educate their children. Whether or not the value of the vouchers would be adjusted to reflect the partial redistribution of income currently achieved by internalizing costs within state boundaries has not been decided. Again, the assumption is that the consumers of education (in this case parents, not children) would create a market for the type of education they wanted. A less radical departure is already underway. Many communities contract out sanitation and other municipal services. The bidding and contracting process helps a community to know what it is getting for its money. If groups of communities band together, they can achieve significant economies. At the very least, they can escape from the stranglehold of municipal employee unions whose ultimate bargaining weapon — the strike — has been so convincing that many municipalities have had no choice but to submit to inflated contract demands and painfully expensive pension plans.

What does the trend toward reprivatization mean for the planning profession? It is difficult to trace all the implications, but perhaps a caricature would be suggestive. For the comprehensive planner working in a city planning agency, reprivatization means that various subcomponents of the market will be racing off in all directions. This will put the planner in a more fragmented situation. The level of professional energy needed to mobilize and maintain alliances will escalate substantially. In effect, many more actions that shape urban areas will go unplanned. The search for a monolithic public interest will be abandoned, since each segment of the community will (theoretically) be able to define and express its needs through market mechanisms. Grantsmen/public program administrators will not be in great demand since many public agencies will have very little to do and the bargaining that does have to go on will undoubtedly be handled by elected officials and their lawyers. The loyalties of the urban designer will shift since more city design activities will be handled by the private sector. Social services planning will become more decentralized as neighborhood groups pool their resources and hire their own planners and advocates. Housing and redevelopment specialists as we know them would cease to exist since the only call for go-betweens in public and private agencies would be to exchange information. Reprivatization of a variety of service delivery systems would shift much of the locus of planning to the private sector. The planner's loyalties would be to his/her clients — in this case coalitions of consumers, and not to governments or elected officials. It is not clear what array of skills would be required in a more market oriented situation (except perhaps more familiarity with nose-to-nose bargaining techniques). The ability to plan effectively for service delivery

might hinge on a familiarity with business school and management science techniques.

Redistribution

One way to resolve the current problems in service delivery and to rectify gross social inequalities is to redistribute income. Income redistribution is related in some ways to reprivatization since giving people more money obviously gives them more power in the marketplace, but the distinction between reprivatization and redistribution is important. The former is aimed at enhancing the choices available to certain groups not presently served by the private market but does not necessarily seek to equalize the range of choices available to them; the latter is aimed at achieving "more equality." Income redistribution might take the form of a negative income tax, a guaranteed annual income, or a more variegated assistance package. (Boulding, 1972)

A move in this direction would alter some of our conceptions about the helping professions, including planning. The demand for managers of publicly supported social services as we know them — welfare departments, health clinics, and child care centers — would probably diminish. The main effect of redistribution would be to enlarge the middle class, traditionally the major consumer of certain types of public services. The difficult social dilemmas in land use planning would disappear since problems of class interaction would probably be minimized. Grantsmen would no longer be required since funds would be distributed directly to individuals and families and not involve the design of new intergovernmental programs. The creation of an expanded middle class would probably have significant demographic effects. Those with the funds might want to move to the suburbs in search of better schools and new homes. The job of managing accelerated pressures for new development would fall squarely on state, regional, and local land use planners. Housing and redevelopment specialists would be likely to find work in the private real estate market since redistribution would certainly create a significant demand for new housing — but not public housing. The demands on social service planners would increase dramatically, but pressures for metropolitanization and statewide coordination would diminish since the needs of each community would become more similar (as those previously trapped in the central city filtered into the suburbs). Some of the conflicts that presently exist in neighborhoods containing very poor and very rich residents would be minimized, and the context in which planning takes place might return to a more coherent state. This would mean that redistribution would tend to enhance the technical functions of planning practitioners and minimize the mobilizing, brokering, and politically activist roles that planners are currently playing.

Decategorization

Another approach to resolving current difficulties in the delivery of public services and meeting the needs of various low-income groups is through intergovernmental fiscal transfers. These serve to spotlight certain national problems and encourage appropriate corrective action. They are also used to redress fiscal imbalances caused by the peculiarities of our tax system. Decategorization — the switch from categorical grants-in-aid with stiff guidelines and matching provisions to unrestricted block grants and revenue sharing — has seriously undermined traditional municipal planning functions. Although everyone complained about the paperwork, red tape, and inefficiency involved in managing federal grants for urban renewal, Model Cities, open space acquisition, and water and sewer development, these were very much the private preserve of the planning profession. The continuous flow of categorical aid assured continued planning for key services and facilities. Once grant stipulations (which single-handedly created the rudiments of a planning and management capability at the local level) are lifted, both the planners' role as federal grant coordinator and the leverage that planners were able to gain by using federal requirements as a stick will be lost. This changeover will affect the entire planning profession. Social service planners will be hurt most since communities are not likely to initiate new programs or use unrestricted block grants to pick up social programs jeopardized by the cutback in categorical grants. (Susskind, 1974)

Decategorization will create a demand for more public management specialists at the city and state levels. Local officials are unable to cope with rising pressure from citizen groups demanding a voice in the once sacrosanct budgetary process. City council and mayoral staff have a great deal to learn from planning veterans of the "maximum feasible participation" wars of the 1960's. Thus, decategorization will shift the locus of state and local planning activities from line agencies to executive staff slots. The budgetary process will provide a new and important arena in which long-range planning and development battles will be fought. The planners had best equip themselves with more powerful management tools and a finely tuned sense of local politics if they want to play to win. Once again, the loyalties of the planner are likely to shift. Planning department budgets, fattened over the past ten years on the overhead from categorical grants, are likely to be cut sharply. In the era of the New Federalism, the battle of the budget will become a battle of survival for long-range planning. It is possible, under the circumstances, that city planning agencies as we know them will wither away. Planning and management functions will be combined under chief executives at the city, county, and state levels and a new and demanding series of planner-as-manager roles may develop.

Regionalization

Sub-state planning agencies have proliferated rapidly during the past few years. In part, this is a response to the need for coordination among the vast array of government agencies involved in the design and delivery of public services. Regionalization is also an approach to decentralizing big government and bringing the bureaucracy into closer contact with the client groups it is supposed to serve. Councils of government have been formed and other clusters of communities have banded together because: (1) they feel obliged to do so in order to qualify for federal funds, and (2) collaboration provides additional protection from state-imposed policies. Regionalization also involves the decentralization of state administrative units. This is another shift in the locus of planning that is creating a substantial number of new positions. Planners in these new slots, however, are removed from day-to-day interaction with local problems and political battles. Regional planning agencies and sub-state bodies have few, if any, implementation powers. They are advisory, and as such they involve a great deal of paperwork and telephone communication.

Many of the activities of sub-state planning agencies parallel those of old-line city planning departments. There are, however, some new responsibilities such as A-95 review and analysis of environmental impact statements, requiring skills different from those taught in planning schools just a few years ago. The science (art?) of environmental impact review is still in its infancy. Moreover, the A-95 process has created a situation in which areawide planning bodies find that they need professional staff conversant with the highly sophisticated aspects of airport expansion, nuclear power, secondary and tertiary waste treatment plants, and mass transportation systems. The thrust toward regionalism has pushed comprehensive planning beyond its already overstretched boundaries and has created a demand for more technical experts especially in the areas of transportation planning, market analysis, facilities planning, and environmental management. Regionalization has created a new level of discourse for grantsmen and social service administrators (such as health and criminal justice planners) and raised explosive questions about the imposition of regional "fair share" housing plans and growth restrictions built around the notion of environmental carrying capacity.

We may see still another strong push toward regionalization if and when the service equalization questions raised by the *Serrano* and *Rodriguez* cases are settled. (ACIR, 1973) The recent *Shaw* decision suggests that the courts may decide that all citizens are entitled to equal access to quality municipal services. (Shapiro, 1974) Efforts to pool property taxes to achieve a more equitable distribution of services may help to strengthen the hand of "middle-level" governments and create an additional demand for planners at the sub-state level. Planners charged with designing and implementing service equaliza-

tion strategies will have to know about operating and constructing a wide assortment of public services and facilities. In general, then, the forces likely to sustain a push toward regionalization will also create a demand for planners with more specialized skills and knowledge.

Redefinition of Private Property Rights

Efforts to implement a national land use policy have been stalled momentarily, but the trend toward more effective public control over the use of land is probably unstoppable. In part this is a response to emerging conflicts between environmental preservationists and economic growth proponents. Both groups have sufficient clout to make themselves heard. The prospects for hammering out a satisfactory compromise appear to depend on a redefinition of the right to own and develop land. Several recent publications have tried to lay the foundation for a redefinition of private property rights, and it is only a matter of time before state governments will be expected to designate and perhaps take charge of critical environmental impact areas in which further development would have totally unacceptable consequences. (Bosselman, 1974) At the very least, this calls for a fundamental rethinking of the terms of private landownership. The traditional notion of aiming for the "highest and best use" of land — maximizing the dollar value of each parcel of property — seems to be eroding. This is clear in California, for example, where the Coastal Zone Management Commission has decided that, under certain circumstances, the "highest and best use" of certain land parcels may be no use at all.

This may be the most important (and controversial) of the six trends where planners are concerned. A redefinition of private property rights will enable state and sub-state governments to control land use patterns and employ the powers needed to implement the long-range growth strategies that emerge. The locus of land use planning will obviously move from the local to the regional and state levels where it is assumed that more effective coordination of public investments, capital improvements programming, and economic development activities will yield an integrated network of urban settlements. Hiking planning responsibilities up to the state level may enhance the prospects for successfully meshing economic and physical development policies. Urban designers will finally be able to think in terms of regional landscapes and the management of vast chains of open space. Housing and development specialists will have to develop an ability to think in terms of urban growth strategies that consider interrelated economic, environmental, political, and social needs. Information management and graphic display techniques to handle statewide land use information will add a new string to the planner's bow.

If nothing else, the eventual adoption of a National Land Use Policy that requires states to develop overall land use plans will create many new planning positions. In fact, land use planning might well re-emerge as the prime activity of most members of the profession. To be successful, the new breed of land use planners would have to know the design and management of complex information systems, natural resource management and ecological analysis, administrative and basic property law, and regional modeling and simulation. Since many of the new land use jobs would be at the state level, planners would have to learn more about state politics and complex bureaucratic structures (which state agencies are, but many local departments are not).

Population and Migration Controls

General dissatisfaction with the notion that "bigger is better" has taken root in many small towns and communities. Undoubtedly there are some no-growth advocates who have other than the purest of motives. Moratoria and exclusionary zoning have been used by racist suburbanites who wanted to "pull up the drawbridge" once they have reached the "promised land," but it would be wrong to tar all those who seek to achieve more rational growth patterns with the same brush. To the extent that communities succeed in imposing growth quotas and phasing new development through carefully sequenced public infrastructure investments, the pressures of urbanization will become somewhat less severe. This, of course, will be possible only as long as the country as a whole sustains a zero population growth rate. National population and migration policies seem to represent a possible response to the emerging emphasis on "quality of life" issues in this country. (Singer, 1971)

As the pressures of population growth subside, one of the main impediments of successful long-range planning will be eliminated. Land use planners will be able to turn their attention to more careful environmental programming and the redevelopment of sorely neglected gray areas and core neighborhoods. Managed growth will undoubtedly mean an upgrading of local planning capabilities. Efforts to integrate public service delivery systems will accelerate once it becomes clear that greater stability is in sight. More attention will have to be given to capital improvements programming — something with which planners have long been familiar. This will become one of the most important tools for phasing local development. A "no-growth" society is something we barely understand. Entirely new theories of metropolitan growth and development will have to be constructed. Even the short-term consequences of artificially limiting growth in one portion of a burgeoning metropolitan area are unclear. This is a policy issue that will require huge investments of planning's intellectual capital.

It is unlikely that the United States will ever adopt strict population controls or curbs on internal migration. There are, however, many indirect means of achieving the same objectives. (The National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972) If population growth really does stabilize and it becomes possible through various incentives and controls to direct migration patterns, the planning profession will find itself in a very different position. One of the few generally accepted arguments in favor of planning is that we have to think ahead to provide for future generations. The point at which zero population growth is a fact and the population of most metropolitan areas tends to remain stable may be the point at which the planning profession needs to redefine its basic rationale. Clearly, there will always be "quality of life" questions that remain to be addressed — problems of achieving greater efficiency, for instance, but it may be that planners have no special contribution to make in this regard. In order to evaluate the impact of overall population stabilization on the planning profession, we must first decide if the problems that planners are currently equipped to deal with are a consequence of continued growth and urbanization or merely an inevitable byproduct of normal community life.

It should be obvious that the policy options described above are neither mutually exclusive nor internally consistent. It is quite possible to have reprivatization of some service systems at the same time as others are being regionalized. It is possible to reconcile national land use policies and migration controls (that would be administered in a highly centralized fashion) with decategorization (which in effect involves decentralization of government decision-making).

Each of the policy alternatives presented above can be viewed as a plausible response to emerging national and international concerns. As political, economic, and social perturbations ripple through our system of government, new policy vacuums will be created. Without predicting exactly which fluctuations in the overarching balance of forces are likely to occur and without knowing precisely in which directions certain ideological debates are going to turn, it is still possible to perceive the silhouettes of mid-range public policy options. Reprivatization is not an unlikely response to the inefficiency that characterizes present efforts to provide high quality public services. Income redistribution appears to be an effective response to pressing social needs and inter-group conflicts. Decategorization is a likely reaction to the perceived aloofness of big government, and, perhaps more to the point, it represents a not unexpected ideological shift in a country that is no longer dominated by big-city interests. Regionalization presents an approach to the mounting problems of intergovernmental coordination as well as a framework for resolving urban/suburban disparities. The effort to redefine private property rights is (largely due to the environmentalists) aimed at underscoring the fact that land is a scarce resource needing more protection.

Finally, proposed controls on population growth and migration may well be linked to efforts to enhance the "quality of community life" by putting a halt to haphazard and unchecked metropolitan sprawl and its unpleasant side effects — smog, congestion, and social isolation.

These public policy thrusts are not irreversible. The institutional modifications they imply will take some time to unfold. To the extent that it is possible to perceive the impact that a move in these six policy directions might have on the future of the planning profession, I think it most appropriate to focus on the "structural certainties": the extent to which these policies imply shifts in planning that are certain to deflect the planner's traditional loyalities, create a need for new or improved techniques, and spur the development of more powerful planning theories. These actions, in turn, might give rise to new criteria for admission to the profession, attract a new mix of members, modify the public's image of the profession thus enhancing or detracting from the prestige associated with the planner's role, and perhaps bring about a redefinition of the legitimate domain of planning activities. (MacLoughlin, 1973)

My previous characterizations are only meant to be suggestive. My goal is to demonstrate a method of pre-evaluation that will allow members of the profession — particularly those involved in education — to anticipate the direction of rapid change in accepted professional knowledge and skill, and perhaps to lead in reorienting their programs to meet new conditions.

Manpower Needs

Several years ago, a number of studies were undertaken in an effort to anticipate the demand for planning professionals. One forecast a need for 14,000 planners by 1980, the other a demand for 15,000 planners by 2015.[10] They were both wrong since there are already more than 16,000 planners employed in the United States. As pointed out by Kaufman in his state of the art review of planning practice in this book, there are 13,000 planners who belong to either the American Society of Planning Officials, the American Institute of Planners, or both, plus an additional 3,500 who work for government planning agencies but belong to neither professional organization. The problem of sorting out professionally trained planners from those with planning-like skills is an almost impossible task and may not be worth the effort. If we are that far ahead of all earlier projections (even though many traditional planning jobs are being phased out), then obviously the question is not how many more planners will be needed in the next decade, but rather what are the specific changes in scope, style, and locus of planning practice that will have implications for those entering the field.

In an effort to forecast the demand for planning practitioners implied by the shifts in public policy suggested earlier, it might be

possible to count the number of planners currently working in traditional and emerging roles, guesstimate the number of additional planning slots (of each kind) that might be created if these trends continue, guesstimate the number of planners or individuals in related professions who will be able to make the necessary transitions, and thus develop a better picture of long-term need. Unfortunately, this does not address the prevailing confusion between need and demand. Every community may need a team of professionally trained planners, but not every community can afford such an investment given other pressures on scarce resources. It would require a terribly sensitive and elaborate model to produce a reliable projection of the actual demand for skilled manpower in the planning field. No such model exists. Moreover, the professional planning societies need not worry as long as they can be assured that their membership will continue to grow or at least remain constant.

From the university point of view, a hard and fast measure of the demand for planning professionals is also not particularly helpful. For one thing, planning schools have other roles to play besides filling current or projected job slots. Continuing education has been sorely neglected. Under the right circumstances, it might be possible to double planning school enrollments merely by offering on-going refresher courses. At the doctoral level, planning schools are turning out graduates who have options other than teaching planning to another generation of students. Many of the brightest doctoral candidates are interested in teaching at the undergraduate level in one of the growing number of urban studies programs. (At the present time, there are almost twice as many undergraduate urban studies programs in the United States as there are graduate planning departments.) Doctoral as well as master's candidates enrolled in planning schools might wish to pursue research careers with independent institutes such as the RAND Corporation, the Urban Institute, the Brookings Institution, or one of the many university-affiliated research centers. More and more students enrolled in planning schools are engaged in double degree programs coupling urban and regional planning with law, public health, business, and other professional fields. These students comprise an important segment of those in planning school, although planning is often their second field. All in all, it's not clear that either the professional societies or the planning schools would be able to make better decisions if a full-fledged manpower study in the planning field were available. The best schools do not try to fit their graduates to the job market, but rather to turn out especially talented individuals who will create a demand for their services.

If the public policy trends suggested above do continue unabated, substantial shifts in the *scope* and *style* of planning are likely to occur. The qualitative aspects of these shifts outweigh their quantitative

aspects. For example, the *locus of planning activity* can be expected to change in a number of ways:

New jobs will open up in the private sector for planners capable of managing various public service systems under contract to local governments. The design of more efficient public service systems will be turned over to operations researchers who can discover more cost-effective strategies for service delivery.

New positions in private land development and real estate firms are likely to emerge in response to pressures for housing renovation and new construction stimulated by a massive housing allowance program.

New staff positions in local government, not in traditional line agencies, will open up for planners with sophisticated financial management skills and the ability to manage citizen participation in the budgetary process.

Neighborhood groups will be hiring planners to package various community development proposals and social improvement projects financed via voucher programs and revenue sharing.

Regional planning departments will continue to proliferate. They will be looking for planners with highly technical backgrounds in economic development, transportation planning, and environmental impact analysis.

State land use planning agencies will increase in number. They will be seeking planners with sophisticated backgrounds in resource management, information systems design, and graphic display techniques.

Environmental programmers with skills in describing and evaluating regional landscapes will be much in demand in both the public and private sectors. Those with project management skills will be sought after by developers and public agencies trying to package large-scale developments, such as new towns that are viewed as part of national and regional growth strategies.

In filling the new jobs, planners will be expected to have new combinations of *specialized skills,* including those of:

1. social research design and statistical analysis;

2. project management;
3. financial planning, program budgeting;
4. environmental programming;
5. regional resource inventory;
6. real estate development;
7. administration law and contract negotiations;
8. public finance and capital improvements programming;
9. air photo interpretation and graphic display techniques;
10. information systems design;
11. cost-benefit/cost-effectiveness analysis;
12. input-output analysis; and
13. urban growth strategy formulation — construction of large-scale simulation models.

If these suppositions are correct, there are a number of questions that need to be asked about the current organization of professional degree programs. Are there enough departments at present? How do we know? Are they admitting the right number of students/students with appropriate backgrounds and aptitudes? How do we know? Are these students being prepared adequately? How do we know? What career paths will these students and other professionals follow? Do they have the training necessary to continue learning on the job? Should there be continuing opportunities for professional training? What kind?

The Implications for Planning Education

To answer these questions and to gauge the impact that forseeable shifts in public policy are likely to have on the nature and content of planning education, it is necessary to understand that urban and regional planning is one of a series of "minor professions" and suffers from certain inevitable strains. Glazer (1974) has identified four characteristic conflicts that arise again and again in schools that prepare practitioners in the minor professions. First, we characteristically find a situation in which a faculty drawn from scholars and researchers, with a base in the academic disciplines, teaches students who will become practitioners. Second, the major role for which students are being taught and trained is itself of inferior status to some ancillary professional roles that are also part of the curriculum. Third, the status of the academic disciplines which provide material for much of the curriculum and the training of much of the faculty outranks that of the profession for which students are being taught. Finally, the content of accepted professional knowledge and training is continually undergoing rapid and upsetting change. Glazer suggests that all of these sources of conflict may be reduced to one: the

minor professions are not in some sense "true" professions; that they presume more than they should; and that the base of knowledge and competence with which students enter practice does not really qualify as professional knowledge.

> Professional status is based both on knowledge that is not generally held by or available to the layman, a certain kind of technical knowledge, and on a special code of conduct based on professionals' access to the intimate and usually secret aspects of individuals' lives, an access which entitles professionals to the privilege of maintaining secrecy over the professional services. (Glazer, 1974, p. 18)

The extent to which this analysis fits the situation in planning is well documented. (Kain, 1969; Mann, 1970; Mann, 1973; Nutt and Susskind, 1969; Susskind, 1970) These conflicts have taken the form of endless debates about the merits of general vs. more specialized curricula; core requirements vs. unstructured or open-ended programs; field-linked vs. classroom-based training; and quantitative vs. qualitative modes of problem assessment. Given the endemic conflicts in planning (and the other minor professions), of what help can it be to know in advance how the demands on the profession are likely to change? More specifically, even if it were clear which new planning roles are likely to emerge or how traditional roles are likely to change, would this pre-knowledge aid in the design of planning curricula and professional degree programs?

One wing of the planning profession argues that role definition does not have important consequences for the content of planning. These planners are generally the practitioners who feel that they are dealing with a set of problems that cut across specific roles. This wing also includes academicians who feel that specialized knowledge will soon become obsolete and that future practitioners would be better off with a broad understanding of underlying problems and the structure of urban areas. They offer training mostly in the area of problem definition. Another segment of the profession argues that role redefinition implies a need for highly technical knowledge keyed to different sub-specializations (health planning, criminal justice planning, housing, and the like). This group includes practitioners and academicians who are solution-oriented. The first group defines competence in terms of general understandings derived from models produced by the disciplines. The skills that they value are those which emphasize analysis and problem-assessment. The second group tends to define competence in terms of situational sophistication and familiarity with the most up-to-date solutions or approaches to specific problems. The skills they value are those which involve the art of giving advice, gaining political advantage, and applying certain technical methods for problem-solving.

Those who feel that role requirements should not dictate the content and style of planning education may find my pre-evaluation of the impact of public policy trends of little interest. A planning curriculum, from their standpoint, ought to build mostly on what the disciplines have to offer in the way of analytic methods and models for understanding the nature of urban problems. However, those who feel that an ability to forecast shifting role requirements provides important criteria for evaluating which knowledge and skills are most likely to be "useful" over the next generation may find my approach somewhat more helpful. They would probably agree with me that a planning curriculum should, at the very least, produce graduates who are solution oriented and equipped with the most potent technical skills and an assortment of views about what ought to be done. Of course, these approaches are not mutually exclusive. The issue of emphasis, however, is important. A solution oriented curriculum stresses the operational problems of working in complex and fragmented situations and focuses on the development of specialized competence. (This, of course, has consequences for faculty hiring and admissions policy.) A problem oriented curriculum assumes that planners will be working in coherent settings and seeks to build generalized analytic capabilities.

The recently published *Guide to Graduate Education in Urban and Regional Planning* includes fairly lengthy descriptions of course offerings in every planning department in the United States and Canada. (Susskind, 1974) It indicates that there are several types of professional degree programs. *Problem-oriented* curricula offer an introduction to various analytic techniques and stress the contributions that the disciplines can make to understanding urban problems. These programs do not impose a required core curriculum. They emphasize qualitative modes of problem assessment and classroom based learning. There are also *solution-oriented* programs that offer preparation for specialized roles, often built around a required core curriculum that attempts to identify the generic processes by which planners can "get things done." Fieldwork or internships tend to be given special weight in these programs. Third, there are *hybrid* departments that are large enough to encompass both orientations. Still others have developed their own peculiar problem oriented approach or their own special solution oriented curricula that reflect either the idiosyncracies of the department head or a regionalized interpretation of the sort of planners needed.

Aaron Fleisher has described planners as those individuals without specialized competence who are prepared to take on any problem while a cadre of skilled professionals with specialized competence in the particular problem area is trained. When this new group, armed with more explicit theories and more powerful methods, reaches the battlefront, the planners move on to other skirmishes. I think this is partly right, but it really misses the most important point. The

specialized competence that planners bring to a situation is their familiarity with the dilemmas of linking analysis, design, and implementation. Planning is a synthetic skill, requiring a synthetic theory of action. At the present time, the planning world is dominated by problem oriented types. Much as they like to think of themselves as action oriented, most practitioners have had little success in bringing about badly needed improvements in the community. They generally attribute their lack of success to the inadequacies of existing models, the complexity of problem networks, or the fundamental difficulty of identifying "root problems." Eventually they may realize that our fundamental inadequacy as a profession stems not from our inability to comprehend the problems with which we are faced but from our lack of sophisticated theories of action that account for the problems of implementing solutions in complex and fragmented settings. Improvement in this area may require understanding more about role specialization and knowing how to match various professional protocols to certain situational requirements.

When we reach that point, instead of categorizing planners as "generalists with a speciality," we might want to identify ourselves as *implementation specialists*. We will not want to be known as policy-analysts or program evaluators because these are, for the most part, passive roles. The idea of calling ourselves "change agents" is presumptuous; moreover, it suggests a kind of bureaucratic guerrilla warfare that seems entirely inappropriate to long-term success in fragmented and complex settings. The term "expert-on-experts" is unsatisfactory — probably because it seems so unlikely that such a creature could really exist. When planners work in complex or fragmented settings, whatever tools they happen to use regularly, they always fall back on a process of goal-assessment, future-casting, and strategizing that builds on a special sensitivity to institutional constraints, client needs, and situational potentials. The more skilled we become in these situations and the more knowledge we have about how to adapt to specific roles, the more able we will be to claim the title *implementation specialists*.

The changes I foresee in the demand for planning professionals dovetail nicely with this concept of competence in planning. The recent accumulation of role-specific, skill oriented courses in most planning departments is probably a desirable trend. So is the effort to design a solution oriented core curriculum that attempts to impart synthetic skills and that helps each student internalize his/her theory of action. The future of the planning profession rests primarily on our ability to formulate and transmit to our students more effective implementation theories and methods. Their success in practice will ensure the success of the profession.

Notes

[1]In his discussion of the future of planning theory in this book, Donald Michael

suggests that the primary task of the planner may be "changing society so planning can be more effective in it."

[2]Fran Piven (1970) points out that there are limits on the extent to which the profession is likely to respond to broader societal demands. She asserts that "curricular change is not going to work toward serving the interests of the have-nots in terms of the fundamental issues of political and economic equity. That will depend on idiosyncracies, severe institutional dislocations that produce political turbulence and realignment, and an upsurge of reformist zeal."

[3]For extensive and detailed illustrations of this shift, see *Planning*, the monthly publication of the American Society of Planning Officials, or *Planner's Notebook*, published periodically by the American Institute of Planners.

[4]Basically a theory of action attempts or organize an interlocking set of propositions that describes the sorts of interventions, protocols of client-professional and client-bureaucratic interactions, and manipulations of organization incentives and controls that will produce given ends with forseeable consequences.

[5]The May, 1974 issue of *Public Management* (Vol. 56, No. 5) presents a series of case studies describing efforts to control growth in Petaluma, Ramapo, Coon Rapids, Prince George's County, Dade County, Walnut Creek, the Mid Willamette Valley, and Albermarle County. In addition, see Finkler (1972), and *ASPO Zoning Digest* (1972).

[6]One description of the intergovernmental review process is presented by Myhra (1973). Another more intricate review is provided in the American Law Institute's *Model Land Development Code*.

[7]One example of the escalating concerns of urban designers is the Plan for Urban Growth produced by the American Institute of Architect's National Policy Task Force. (*Newsletter* of the American Institute of Architects, January/1972/Special Issue.)

[8]For a discussion of simulation methods that can be used to involve citizen groups in the planning process, see Robinson (1972).

[9]Case studies of advocacy planning are presented in Earl Blecher, (1971). Another advocacy approach is discussed in Paul and Linda Davidoff and Neil Gold, (1970).

[10]Meltzer (1968) calculated that "using conservative census estimates, the application of the existing ratio of .56 full-time professional planners to each 10,000 persons" living in metropolitan urban areas would result in a "demand" for over twice as many full-time professional planners by the year 2015 as in 1968 (an increase from approximately 7,000 to over, 14,000). A study by the U.S. Department of Labor in 1970 estimated that there would be a "need" for 15,000 trained planners by 1980.

References

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. (1973) *Financing Schools and Property Tax Relief—A State Responsibility*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Blecher, Earl. (1971) *Advocacy Planning for Urban Development, with Analysis of Six Demonstration Programs*. New York: Praeger.

Bosselman, Fred and David Callies. (1971) *The Quiet Revolution in Land Use Control*. Washington, DC: Council on Environmental Quality.

Bosselman, Fred, *et al*. (1973) *The Taking Issue: An Analysis of the Constitutional Limits of Land Use Control*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Boulding, Kenneth and Martin Pfaff. (1972) *Redistribution to the Rich and the Poor*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.

Cardinal, Thomas. (1973) "The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Its Implementation: A Socio-Political-Legal Look at the New Environmental Planning." *Journal of Urban Law* 30:3.

Corby, Linda and Frank S. So. (1974) "Annual ASPO School Survey," *Planning: The ASPO Magazine* XL (January).

Davidoff, Paul and Linda, and Neil Gold. (1970) "Suburban Action: Advocate Planning for an Open Society." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36 (January).

Finkler, Earl. (1972) "Nongrowth as a Planning Alternative: A Preliminary Examination of an Emerging Issue." Planning Advisory Service Report No. 283. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials.

Friedmann, John. (1973) *Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press.

Gans, Herbert. (1968) "City Planning in America." In *People and Plans.* New York: Basic Books, pp. 57-77.

Glazer, Nathan. (1974) "Conflicts in Schools for the Minor Professions." *Minerva: A Review of Science, Learning, and Policy* (July).

Kain, John. (1970), "Rampant Schizophrenia: The Case of City and Regional Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36 (July).

Mann, Lawrence. (1972) "Education for Urban Planning: A More Focused Future." Paper presented at the 1972 National Planning Conference, American Society of Planning Officials, Detroit, Michigan.

Mann, Lawrence. (1970) "The Fuzzy Future of Planning Education." In Ernest Erber (ed.), *Urban Planning in Transition.* New York: Grossman.

Marcus, Norman and Marilyn Groves. (1970), *The New Zoning: Legal, Administrative, and Economic Concepts and Techniques.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Meltzer, Jack. (1968) "Manpower Needs for Planning for the Next Fifty Years." In William R. Ewald, Jr. (ed.), *Environment and Policy: The Next Fifty Years.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Michael, Donald. (1974) *Learning to Plan — Planning to Learn.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mishava, E.J. (1973) "Ills, Bads, and Disamenities: The Wages of Growth." In *Daedalus* (Fall).

Myhra, David. "A-95 Review and the Urban Planning Process." *Journal of Urban Law* (February).

McLoughlin, Brian. (1973) "The Future of the Planning Profession." In Peter Cowan (ed.), *The Future of Planning.* Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Nutt, Thomas and Lawrence Susskind. (1970) "The Prospects for Planning Education." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36 (May).

Piven, Frances F. (1970) "Comprehensive Social Planning: Curriculum Reform or Professional Imperialism." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36 (July).

Rabinovitz, Francine. (1970) *City Politics and Planning.* New York: Atherton.

Reilly, William K. (ed.) (1973) *The Use of Land: A Citizen's Policy Guide to Urban Growth.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Roberts, James A. (1973) "Just What Is An Environmental Impact Statement." *Urban Land* (May).

Robinson, Ira. (1972) *Decision-Making in Urban Planning: An Introduction to New Methodologies.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Sarason, Seymour R. (1972) *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, Donald A. (1971) *Beyond the Stable State.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Shapiro, Jonathan. (1974) *A Manual for Lawyers on Litigation for Equalization of Municipal Services.* New York: NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

Singer, Fred. (ed.) (1971) *Is There An Optimum Population?* New York: McGraw Hill.

Solomon, Arthur. (1974) *Housing the Urban Poor.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Susskind, Lawrence. (1974a) "Revenue Sharing and the Lessons of the New Federalism." *Urban Law Annual* (August).

Susskind, Lawrence. (ed.) (1974b) *Guide to Graduate Education in Urban and Regional Planning.* East Lansing, Michigan: Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

Susskind, Lawrence. (1971) "The Objectives of Planning Education Reexamined." In *Planning 1971.* Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (1974) *Housing in the 1970's.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.