# REPLACING THE DINOSAUR:
## CHANGING ROLES FOR PLANNERS IN SOUTH AFRICA

**Catherine Laburn-Peart**
*Manuscript accepted September 1991*

*Planning theory and practice reflect the cultural and political context in which planning occurs. The purpose of this article is to examine the variety of planning contexts which have been described in the literature and to apply these to South Africa. For this purpose, five categories or perspectives were used, namely, technocratic, democratic, reformist, radical and liberal. As reform in South Africa is set to continue and to gather momentum in the next few years, these categories provide a useful framework for the analysis of the possible nature of change, and for consideration of possible roles which South African planners can adopt in changing contexts.*

*"Planning ... could be a truly innovative field in our epoch of crisis ... The current process of social change forces planning itself to change, if we want our discipline to be a guide for action instead of becoming an outdated bureaucratic routine" (Castells 1982:3).*

## INTRODUCTION

As South Africa undergoes processes of change in the 1990s, new challenges are likely to face planners and new contexts of planning will emerge. While the contexts in which planning takes place are often beyond their influence, planners themselves can and must respond to changing circumstances if they are to remain useful and effective (Alexander, 1979). Alexander has in mind the social or organisational contexts in which planning occurs, and examines in particular the role of planners as they work in bureaucracies, communities and organisations. Dykman (1978), on the other hand, observes that the political or ideological environment of the bureaucracy has a strong influence on the planner. The purpose of this article is to examine the changing contexts of planning in South Africa, and to construct a framework for the consideration of the roles which planners can adopt.

Hartman (1978) claims that since planning performs the classic task of politics when it decides who gets what, when, where and how, all planning is in fact inherently and deeply political. Many other authors have examined the way in which planners' roles are fashioned by the institutions in which they work, and it is common cause that political climate and context influence planning procedures and decisions. As Forester (1989:3) states, "planners do not work on a neutral stage, an ideally liberal setting in which all affected interests have voice; they work within political institutions, on political issues...". More recently, Baum's contribution to the literature on this subject examines what he calls the technical-political debate in planning, and his conclusion is that only by accepting the political world as our planning context can we as planners have a reasonable chance of "helping to create a diverse but more peaceful and fulfilling society" (Baum, 1990:66). In South Africa, this kind of chance presents itself to our profession in the 1990s.

Since the kinds of contexts in which planning occurs parallel closely and in fact reflect their corresponding political environments, it will be useful to examine the broad political perspectives in which planning occurs, and then to place within these perspectives or contexts, the appropriate role for planners. A number of authors have developed categories which can be used for this purpose. These include Fainstein and Fainstein (1971), Kirk (1980), Faludi (1982) and McCarthy and Smit (1984). The Fainsteins use the headings of Technocratic, Democratic, Socialist and Liberal political perspectives. Kirk uses as her categories, Bureaucratic, Pluralist, Reformist and Marxist, while McCarthy and Smit vary these slightly with their Managerialist, Pluralist, Advocacy and Radical perspectives. Faludi takes a different approach in his use of object-centred, decision-centred and control-centred categories, which correspond to technocratic planning, choice and control in planning respectively.

These categories have been drawn upon in the examination which follows, and five will be used to assess the planning environment in South Africa. This is done bearing in mind that "such labelling may give the impression that they apply to distinct, clearly articulated bodies of theory, though this is not the case in any strict sense. The purpose of the headings is merely to impose some structure within which different contributions can be discussed ... Between the various approaches there are areas of overlap and areas of divergence ..." (Kirk, 1980: 56)

## THE TECHNOCRATIC PERSPECTIVE

Technocratic political theory arose out of the perceived need to address the social problems which had resulted from the rapid, haphazard urbanisation accompanying the industrial revolution (Fainstein and Fainstein, 1971). The emphasis was on the utilitarian, sometimes utopian, establishment or re-establishment of social order in the context of capitalist technological progress. Indeed, the technocrats sought to harness the power of technology, reason and science to create a new society. According to Jakobson (1970), three types of planner fall into the technocratic category: utopian planners who aim to create their ideal society, scientific planners who seek a

predictable society; bureaucratic planners who hope to create an orderly society. This technocratic political culture presupposes an autocratic institutional style in which the state, controlled by the scientific and industrial classes, regulates the economy and engineers social change in what it holds to be the public interest. Social change, it is believed, is for the benefit of the whole society but needs to be initiated paternalistically by the upper or dominant classes.

There are parallels between the technocratic culture and that prevailing in South Africa for much of this century. The Grand Apartheid ideology was for some, a utopian ideal, implemented and executed with bureaucratic efficiency. However, the interests served have not been those of the general public, but rather those of the white group only. "For more than three decades the policy of apartheid has inverted a fundamental theoretical principle by promulgating and promoting a process in which planning for the disadvantaged black population is pursued on the basis of the protection of the interests of the white community". (Muller, 1983:18).

Another example is that of the system of migratory labour which has been autocratically and paternalistically imposed by the dominant class on the black community, depriving them of choice. While the utopian Apartheid Plan is currently under review and is set to change in the next decade, much remains in the present general form of the technocratic perspective, with the emphasis still on what Dykman (1978) calls bureaucracy and efficiency, which necessitate and emphasise formal, or procedural rationality.

The characteristic style of planning in a technocratic context is described by Fainstein and Fainstein (1971) as traditional, blueprint or physical planning. This style of planning had its origins in the early decades of this century, and focuses on physical or land use planning. The dominant model of planning in both Britain and the United States of America in the 1950s and 1960s, rational comprehensive planning, was also based on the "technocratic ideology (Alexander 1979:121). This model assumes that the planner knows or can discern the public's needs (and therefore that there

is an homogeneous public). It also assumes that the goal of "orderly development is in the general public interest and that planners are in the best position of any group to determine (the) plan's ... goals" (Catanese 1984:59).

Fainstein and Fainstein however criticize the public interest assumption by stating that planners adopting the technocratic role fail to see that the so-called apolitical planning process which they follow actually embodies values of the upper-middle class. South African planners have traditionally been white, male and from this social and economic class. Most have found employment in state or local government planning agencies, and the kind of planning which they have tended to engage in therefore has been largely in the interests of the state, and by extension, the dominant class of which they are part:

"The interface between the predominantly white planning fraternity and the black communities in South Africa has been distant and devoid of mutual discovery; it has been one of minimal contact and hence little reciprocal understanding. That plans for black communities have been produced, implemented and imposed under these circumstances is not only a consequence of the apartheid doctrine, but it is also an indictment of the planning discipline: (Muller 1982: 254).

This kind of planning is able to take place in the technocratic environment where the planner's role is that of technician-administrator. The planner is regarded and regards himself as a technical expert at the service of elected officials of the public institution. Indeed, Catanese is of the opinion that apolitical-technician planners actually try to avoid political involvement and attempt to perform technical functions "without invoking their political and social values" (Catanese 1984:59).

In theory, technician (or, by McCarthy and Smit's (1984) definition, managerialist) planners can exercise a great deal of power, if the organisational context in which they work accords them enough autonomy to make planning decisions, or if the decision-makers are dependent on the technical

expertise of the planners. In practise, however, and in particular in this country, the constraints placed on planners by central government through legislation, and the subordinate position of local authorities in relation to regional and central government, have severely restricted the independence of the planner in decision making:

"Urban planners at the local level in South Africa ... are constrained to work within the physical design provisions of the Group Areas Act, irrespective of their own feelings on apartheid. In other words, they do not have the power not to design urban areas in accordance with the Group Areas Act provisions which include the buffer zones, design of transport networks to minimize contact between races, and the sectorial organisation of race-specified areas ..." (McCarthy and Smit 1984:129).

Beauregard (1978) criticises the acceptance by technocratic planners of this kind of state intervention, as well as the orientation of such planners toward the preservation of the status quo of middle-class power and privilege. Kirk (1980) finds that the pre-occupation in the technocratic planning context is on competition for scarce resources: that rather than the emphasis being on choice – for both individuals and society as a whole – it is on constraint; the subtle constraining of those who do not have access to resources, thereby ensuring the maintenance of the status quo.

Planning in this kind of political context is therefore typically of a conservative nature. Indeed Marris (1982) writes of it as a reproducing or reinforcing social process, which has often contributed to the reinforcement of dominant ideologies. This has certainly occurred for much of the history of South African planning during the twentieth century.

## THE DEMOCRATIC PERSPECTIVE

"Democracy means that citizens have a significant influence over what happens, have equitable rights to exercise influence, and are entitled to know why policies have been adopted and that action is taken in line with these policies" (Healey 1990:14).

11

In contrast to the adherents of the technocratic perspective, democrats favour the retention of as much power as possible in the hands of the public by maintaining that society should control decision making, and therefore that political decision makers should be accountable to the public. The public interest thus generally becomes equated with the interests of the majority of the public and the function of the state is to ensure that democratic processes and principles are adhered to, thereby creating or contributing to what Jakobson (1970) calls the "better society".

Kirk finds, in her pluralist approach, an assumption that power is widely distributed and ultimately lies with 'the people', who should be allowed "to organise themselves to present their views, ideas and protests to government, which responds to the pressure brought to bear on it in this way". (Kirk 1980:55) In other words, there is implicit in this approach the idea of choice and egalitarianism, with a stress on the right and ability of people to organise themselves around issues that concern them. The increase in pressure group activity in the United Kingdom since the mid-1960s (including the rise of influential trade unions), is cited by Kirk as an example of this right.

In South Africa, while community based organisations serving the black majority have historically been excluded from decision-making, they are increasing in number and membership as people become aware of what democracy may be able to offer. However, very few planners and planning organisations are exploring more democratic planning approaches for this country.

For example, a study carried out jointly by the author and colleagues from the Department of Town and Regional Planning of the University of the Witwatersrand has shown that of the respondents to a questionnaire exploring inter alia the kinds of organisations employing town planning graduates, and the roles being played by planners in those organisations, 16% are employed in organisations such as the Urban Foundation, The South African Housing Trust and the Development Bank of Southern Africa. These organisations generally direct their efforts towards housing and development for disadvantaged groups within this country, but the kind of work being carried out by the respondents was more of a coordination and project management nature than community organisation and social or user-oriented planning. This is probably less a consequence of the attitude of the planners themselves than the general orientation of South African planning which is still generated and initiated by the privileged classes.

For the Fainsteins, the democratic political ideology is reflected in what they term 'user-oriented' planning. This term was coined by Gans, and is used to describe planning which takes as its goals the desires of the clients for whom planning is undertaken. Once the planner has discovered what the community's needs and desires are, it is his duty to "implement them in relation to the available resources" (Gans 1968:102). The democratic or user-oriented planner therefore relies on the public as his ultimate authority in the formulation of plans. "The planner does not recognise the interests or values of one particular segment of society as more important than any other, and he attempts to attain the general welfare through satisfying the individual needs of as many people as possible" (Fainstein and Fainstein 1971:344).

'Social planning' has also been located in a democratic political environment. It evolved in the 1960s, when planning's emphasis shifted from the physical environment to the social. Planning took on more of a social orientation than had been the case in the earlier technocratic period, when there had been an implicit assumption that social change could be induced by controlling the physical environment. Social planning is therefore a reaction to the functional and efficiency orientation of technocratic planning, and emphasises the needs and preferences of the consumer population (Burchell and Hughes 1978).

Social planning in the United States and elsewhere has developed within a democratic political environment in which people demand a role in decision-making. In response, planners have tried to define ways in which groups and individuals can participate in planning. Davidoff and Reiner's (1962) "Choice Theory of Planning" was formulated at this time. They define planning as a process for determining appropriate future actions through a sequence of choices, with the ultimate objective of widening both the individual choice and the efficiency of the urban system. But 'choice' implies that what is desired is in adequate supply and within reach financially. This clearly does not apply to the disadvantaged majority in this country. "'Choice' is only meaningful provided one can afford more than one type of housing, or if there are several equally convenient neighbourhoods to live in, and so on ... This is patently not the case for very many people" (Kirk 1980:142).

In a democratic planning context, the kinds of roles which planners can adopt vary widely. Kaufman's (1978) boundary spanner tries to reduce distances between conflicting parties. Berry (1978) talks of a change agent, while Catanese (1984) describes an overt activist as one who is convinced that planning requires political affiliation and action. As a mediator (Alexander, 1979, Roweis, 1983, Susskind and Ozawa, 1984, Forester 1987), the planner attempts to win acceptance of solutions from conflicting parties. The mediator tries to ensure that the interests of all parties are taken into account from the beginning of the planning process. One of his major roles is also to provide information – the planner is a communicator (Susskind and Ozawa 1984), who also requires negotiation skills. Kraushaar and Gardels (1982) propose that the planner adopts a role of facilitator of change – trying to develop a democratic-consensus mode of planning.

However, McCarthy and Smit have stated that "perhaps the most important contribution of the pluralist perspective is its recognition that urban planning is not necessarily a consensual process but that plans are often the outcome of conflict between competing groups with different interests in the built environment" (McCarthy and Smit 1984:134). It is extremely difficult for the planning process to be democratic: the costs in time and effort to individuals who become involved in the process could outweigh any vested

personal benefits. Most people do not participate, and the democratic planner usually has only a small minority to work with. "Democratic planning under these circumstances either becomes impossible, or the planner must take upon himself the task of divining the will of the majority, in which case the planning process can hardly be called democratic" (Fainstein and Fainstein 1971:353).

## THE REFORMIST PERSPECTIVE

The reformist perspective is characterised by humanitarian, egalitarian aims, and its strength, according to Kirk (1980) lies in its recognition of the basic structural inequalities of power, influence, income and wealth in society, and of the need to reform these persistent inequalities. It focuses on explanations of how the inequalities have arisen and how they are perpetuated within existing institutions in society.

Numerous writers have expressed concern with inequalities in urban areas, particularly under capitalism. One planning approach which would be appropriate for this perspective is compensatory planning. As stated earlier, Marris (1982) found that while traditionally planning had a reproducing or reinforcing function, it could, in other circumstances, be an influential means of counteracting or compensating for the negative effects of power. It has the potential for a reforming function if it can help people to "articulate and assert their own meanings" (Marris 1982:54), and it can help to resolve those meanings into a collective strategy of action to impose more constraints on the powerful.

The issue of power and its distribution in society is also taken up by those favouring the advocacy approach. Many have expanded on the ideas first proposed by Davidoff (1959, 1965). At the centre of this approach is the perception of a skewed distribution of power, and that even in a society with universal franchise, the political process does not necessarily lead to a democratic solution.

"Advocate planners accept the pluralist viewpoint that society is made up of many interest groups and that these interests are not always compatible. Conflict, then becomes very important in resolving these incompatibilities. But whereas the pluralists assert that the outcome of competition and conflict between groups is one which ultimately represents a fair balance between the groups and is hence the optimal or most democratic solution, advocate planners are most sceptical of the optimality of the *status quo*. For Advocate planners the 'equilibrium' of politics in capitalist society yields winners and losers ... Thus (they) see a land-use plan as the embodiment of *particular* group interests – interests which are usually those of the most powerful and articulate groups". (McCarthy and Smit 1984:134).

In the context of advocacy, Fainstein and Fainstein (1971) discuss a brand of socialism which is concerned entirely with the acquisition of power for the poor within the context of capitalism. The fundamental starting point for this socialism is from a conflict perspective of society, in which control over society's limited resources is held by a minority, capitalist elite. The advancement of the 'public interest' in this context becomes identified as the advancement of the deprived classes. In advocacy planning, the particular (disadvantaged) client group determines the goals of the plan, and in principle, the planner remains subservient to that particular group, rather than to the majority of the citizens. In other words, planning no longer needs to be justified as being in the *general* public interest, as is the case in a democratic planning context.

Using Kirk's (1980) terms, the emphasis of this perspective would be on choice in the planning environment, as opposed to constraint. In her classification, changes in the distribution of power in a reformist environment, (as opposed to revolutionary overthrow or radical change), come about by political activity on the part of disadvantaged groups, but are ultimately also dependent on the government's willingness to make changes.

Muller's promotive planning accepts "that planning has not in itself the power to create human liberty and dignity, but that it has the inherent capability to *promote* the attainment of these attributes of democracy by means of goal-oriented guidance" (Muller 1982:255). In South Africa, this would require that planners reassess their traditional technocratic orientation, and direct themselves instead towards enabling black communities to gain access to the planning processes from which they have traditionally been excluded. This would give the promotive planner a role as catalyst in the process of human development. To do this, Muller proposes that the "familiar proposition of public participation in the planning process" be changed to one of "planning participation in the public process" (Muller 1983:22). He sees this not as a form of advocacy planning, but rather as a transactive process of mutual learning on the one hand, and of progressive advancement of disadvantaged groups away from dependency on the other.

## THE RADICAL PERSPECTIVE

The radical or Marxist perspective stresses the interrelationship between urban development and the workings of the market economy. It takes into account how power is exercised on a daily basis within the capitalist economy and focuses on the fundamental structural contradictions in society: those between capital and labour; and those between the forces and relations of production. Urban planning is seen as representing a response to these structural contradictions, since it is regarded as part of the process of capital accumulation. Just as there are tensions and contradictions inherent in capitalism, there are similar tensions and contradictions in the capitalist city and land-use planning.

In particular, planning in capitalist societies is perceived as being less the pursuit of "some abstract image of the good city" and more the "management of the surface manifestation of deep-seated contradictions within the social formation" (McCarthy and Smit 1984: 144). In other words, the chief criticism of traditional planning is that it has been used as an instrument by the state to stabilize the economy or diminish social conflict in times of crises. In capitalist economies, planning is seen as a specific form of state intervention which has as its purpose the managing of land-use problems which result from the above-mentioned structural contradictions, and which receive more attention in times of crisis than in times of stability. Radical critics are

sceptical of the success potential of such planning: planning interventions too often exacerbate the problems which they aim to alleviate.

While South. Africa does not fit the classic capitalist model (since much of the intervention by the state is ideological), the principles of structural contradictions and urban managerialism may still apply, as does Beauregard's (1978: 249) radical critique that "by perpetuating the existing class structure through the application of their technical expertise, planners are implicated in the inequalities which pervade ... society". Among others Morris (1981) has, for example, documented the many laws and regulations which have governed housing for black people in South Africa. This legislative and administrative intervention by the state has not only influenced the location, size and residential mix of our cities, but has also determined the parameters of planning. That this managerialism has not achieved the ideological aim of creating utopian separatist states is evident in the reforms now being instituted by the Nationalist government and the repeal of some discriminatory legislation. Much which serves to constrain South African planners remains, however. In fact, radical planners in South Africa would hold the view that apartheid serves the interests of capital, and that only by replacing capitalism with socialism will it be possible to eradicate apartheid (Tomlinson and Addelson, 1987).

The core function of the state in a capitalist economy is the reproduction and management of existing class relationships through the various formal institutions of society. In terms of this perspective, therefore, South African planners would be seen as state agents, and planning decisions as serving white capitalist interests since these decisions would be a reflection of the strength of the dominant force in the class struggle. The state is seen as the servant of capital and white interests, and repressive of working people and their interests.

The desire to transform society into something other than what it is is taken up by radical planners. Kraushaar (1988) distinguishes between those who wish to transform society by using existing institutions, and those who work "outside the whale" to achieve more fundamental change. It is only the latter whom he terms radical planners (the former being called social reformers). Progressive planners constitute a particular class of radical planners in that they confront the basic structures of society and work towards their transformation. According to Kraushaar, among the choices they have to make are whether to align themselves with traditional capitalist organisations or to occupy a more marginal position. In the case of the former, planning is then social reform and is both legitimate and relevant to the status quo. In the transformation process, the challenge is to break down the artificial barriers that distort society's perceptions of urban problems, and which prevent people and communities from working together to resolve problems that they share. Progressive planners, according to Kraushaar, need to point out that the causes of the problems are not accidental, but are systematically related to the country's economic and cultural systems.

Planners are in a good position to act as links for various elements of the wider community, and to form networks within the planning profession to help overcome obstacles imposed by the bureaucratic structure and political ideology. "Progressive planners can no longer be satisfied merely to create alternative organisations, they must link those organisations to other working class institutions. The ultimate success cannot be the reform of government policies and programs, but the transformation of government and economic institutions". (Kraushaar, 1988: 98).

Radical planners of the late 1960s and 1970s in the United States and Britain were interested in the potential for radical change in cities, and proposed that planners become involved in social change processes outside established planning institutions and government agencies (Alexander 1986), or that they become actively opposed to planning as an instrument of regulation. Guerrilla planners (Kirk 1980, Alexander 1986), for example, work within the state bureaucracy. As officials within the state system, they can provide information that would otherwise not be available to organisations with which they sympathise, and which are in conflict with that system.

One of the major contributions made by radical planners has been their critique of traditional planning, and the attention they have drawn to conflict and power within the planning context of constraint. Radical planners condemn both the reproducing and reinforcing activities of traditional planning (Marris, 1982), and instead propose ways of disrupting the status quo, i.e. traditional planning hierarchies and structures. This could arguably be considered as unethical and unprofessional, but as John Turner aptly put it "what we see depends on where we stand. One person's problem is another person's solution". (Turner, 1987:13).

## THE LIBERAL PERSPECTIVE

The liberal perspective views men as rational actors who alone are the best judges of their own interests. The public interest is regarded as resulting from the "interplay of a multiplicity of private interests within the confines of the political marketplace" (Fainstein and Fainstein 1971: 356). A liberal government's obligation is therefore to guarantee choice and the rule of law, and to act as umpire in the event of a conflict of interests. In addition, emphasis is laid on the importance of the diffusion of power – no group or institution should be allowed to dominate, but at the same time, groups without political voice or power should receive special treatment. Social change, in terms of liberal theory, results from a large number of decisions, (only some of which are taken by government), involving the rational distribution or redistribution of political and other benefits.

In this environment, planning is not carried out by a single planning agency, nor in traditional or rational processes of planning. Instead, the incremental style of planning as formulated by Lindblom (1959) would be most appropriate. The incremental style arose in reaction to the rational comprehensive mode of planning, and is, according to Alexander (1986), based on a laissez-faire premise that people's decisions and behaviour will eventually produce socially optimal solutions

with a minimum of regulation.

The incremental decision model proposes therefore that policies should be developed by trial and error, instead of by deliberate planning. In incremental planning, the planner makes his decision by examining and comparing a limited number of alternatives, evaluating them not on the basis of formalized long-term objectives, but rather on how small, short term and marginal alterations to the current situation can be made. Incrementalism is therefore inherently conservative. The incrementalist or liberal planner recognises that there is a multitude of interests to satisfy, and that these need to be coordinated. Under these circumstances, "goal directed, logically-deductive, comprehensive methodologies are not rational ... because information requirements cannot be met and political circumstances will inhibit them" (Healey McDougal and Thomas 1982:8-. The incrementalist planner tries to demonstrate that his planning is problem-oriented, realistic and practical.

Healey et al (1982) note that incrementalism can be viewed as a development from procedural planning theory. It is anti-theoretical (in that it arose in reaction to procedural planning theory) and aims for visible results. Pragmatism, on the other hand, is viewed by these authors as oppositional to procedural planning theory, and emphasises "getting things done" in isolation from theoretical ideas of value. Meck carries the idea of pragmatism through when he criticises the reformist perspective as being "high-minded, idealistic" and "generally ineffectual", and claims that reform-oriented planning needs to be transformed into pragmatism – "an emphasis on producing results rather than more high-toned talk" (Meck 1990:11), or as Hoch (1984:335) puts it, "pragmatism is a philosophy of action, rather than knowing or being". Pragmatism emphasises short-term operational effectiveness, practical problem solving and the need to be relevant and useful.

It is argued that this kind of planning fails to meet the definition of planning, since policy outcomes are not reached through formal rationality, nor is there any specification of either ultimate goals or objectives for planning or development. Lindblom (1965, in Fainstein and Fainstein, 1971: 348), however, claims that the mechanism of "partisan mutual adjustment – the working out of different claims through compromise, adherence to procedural rules and the market process – results in rational decision-making", and that even though goals and objectives would not be formulated, decision-makers would be able to work out ways of reaching "socially desirable goals". The ultimate decision-makers, would, in fact, not be the planners or the politicians, or even a single group, since in terms of the liberal perspective, it would not be desirable for any one group or social interest to dominate.

## CONCLUSIONS

Planning theory and practice reflect the cultural and political context in which planning occurs (Grant, 1989). In South Africa these contexts are set to change. The "new South Africa" is likely to be more democratic than has been the case during this century as the majority of the population becomes enfranchised. The utopian ideology of apartheid is already being phased out, and this process is expected to continue. What will replace it is at this stage uncertain, but it is likely that the emphasis will shift from one dominated by the interests of the white capitalist minority to one which emphasises the redistribution of resources to the disadvantaged.

Technocratic planners will continue to find employment in bureaucracies and state organisations, but the developmental and economic objectives pursued by those bodies will change. Indeed, the traditionally technocratic organisations will need to become increasingly reformist as change in the country gathers momentum. In this atmosphere of change, as the planning context moves from one of control and constraint orientation to one favouring greater degrees of choice for all, it will be easier for the planner to adapt to and take on the role of reformist. As fundamental change occurs in this country, there should be less place for a leftist radical critique of South African planning. Ironically, the role of radical may be taken up by the white utopian right, whose traditional position of domination is being undermined by the processes of change.

To the extent that incrementalism can be equated with liberalism, in that it is problem oriented, realistic and practical, it may have relevance. However, inasmuch as it is felt to be anti-innovative and pro status quo, its application to planning in South Africa in the 1990s and beyond may well be limited.

Increasingly therefore, planners in this country will need to adopt more pragmatic roles. There will be a need for effectiveness, relevance, openness and practical problem-solving, particularly in the period of transition which we are entering. This period will be characterised not only by change, but also by conflict as society undergoes reform. Reformist planners, as described in the literature and reviewed here, may not be adequately prepared and equipped to deal with conflict situations. Our planners will need to be pragmatic reformers if we are to arrive at a situation not of constraint and conflict, but of choice. We cannot be certain of the precise nature of planning and planning contexts in South Africa in the future – but we can say, as did Eversley (1973: 174) in his examination of the changing role of planning in the United Kingdom in the 1970s, that "a new animal (will) one day soon emerge to replace the present dinosaur".

## REFERENCES

ALEXANDER, E.R. 1979. Planning Roles and Context. In Catanese, A.J. and Snyder, J.C. (Eds). *Introduction to Urban Planning*, New York. McGraw-Hill.

ALEXANDER, E.R. 1986. *Approaches to Planning: Introducing Current Planning Theories, Concepts and Issues* New York. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

BAUM, H.S. 1990. "Caring for Ourselves as a Community of Planners" *Journal of the American Planning Association.* Winter 1990: 64-66.

BEAUREGARD, R.A. 1978. Planning in anAdvanced Capitalist State. In Burchell, R W and Sternlieb, G (Eds). *Planning theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions.* New Brunswick, Centre for Policy Research.

BERRY, B.J.F. 1978. Notes on an Expedition to Planning. In Burchell. R W and Sternlieb G (Eds). *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions.* New Brunswick, Centre for Urban Policy Research.

BURCHELL, R.W. AND HUGHES, J.W. 1978. *Introduction: Planning Theory in the 1980s – A Search for Future Directions.* In Burchell RW and Sternlieb G (Eds). Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions. New Brunswick, Centre for Urban Policy Research.

BURCHELL, R.W. AND STERN LIEB, G. (EDS) 1978. *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions.* New Brunswick, Centre for Urban Policy Research.

CASTELLS, M. 1982. "Planning and Social Change". *Journal of Planning Education and Research.* Vol 2 3-5.

CATANESE, A.J. 1984. *The Politics of Planning and Development.* Beverly Hills. Sage.

CATANESE, A.J. and SNYDER, J.C. (Eds) 1979. *Introduction to Urban Planning.* New York. McGraw-Hill.

DAVIDOFF, P. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning". *Journal of the American Institute of Planners.* Vol 31: 331-338.

DAVIDOFF, P. AND REINER, T.A. 1962. "A Choice Theory of Planning" *Journal of the American Institute of Planners.* Vol 28(3): 103-115.

DYKMAN, J.W. 1978. Three Crises of American Planning. In Burchell, R W and Sternlieb, G (Eds). *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions.* New Brunswick. Centre for Urban Policy Research.

ERBER, E. (Ed) 1970. *Urban Planning in Transition.* New York. Grossman.

EVERSLEY, D. 1973. *The Planner in Society: The Changing Role of a Profession.* London. Faber and Faber.

EVERSLEY, D. 1990. "Inequality at the Spatial Level: Tasks for planners". *The Planner* Vol 76(12) 13-18.

FAINSTEIN, S.S. AND FAINSTEIN, N.I. 1971. "City Planning and Political Values". *Urban Affairs Quarterly.* 1971, March: 341-362.

FALUDI, A. 1982. Three Paradigms of Planning Theory. In Healey, P., McDougal, G. and Thomas, M.J. (Eds). *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s.* Oxford. Pergamon.

FORESTER, J. 1989. *Planning in the Face of Power.* Berkely. University of California Press.

GANS, H.G. 1968. *People and Plans.* New York. Basic Books.

GRANT, J. 1989. "From 'Human Values' to 'Human Resources': Planners' Perceptions of Public Role and Public Interest". *Plan Canada.* Vol 26(6): 1118.

HARTMAN, C.W. 1979. Social Planning and the Political Planner. In Burchell, R W and Sternleib G (Eds). *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions.* New Brunswick. Centre for Urban Policy Research.

HAR VEY, D. 1973. *Social Justice and the City.* London. Arnold.

HEALEY, P. 1990. "Democracy in the Planning System". *The Planner,* Vol 76(19): 14-15.

HEALEY, P., MCDOUGAL, G. AND THOMAS, M.J. (Eds) 1982. *Planning Theory, Prospects for the 1980s.* Oxford. Pergamon.

JAKOBSON, L. 1970. *Towards a Pluralistic ideology in Planning Education.* In Erber E, Urban Planning in Transition. New York. Grossman.

KAUFMAN, J.L. 1978. *The Planner as Interventionist in Public Policy Issues.* In Burchell, RW and Sternlieb, B (Eds). Planning Theory in the 1980s. New Brunswick. Centre for Policy Research.

KIRK, G. 1980. *Urban Planning in a Capitalist Society.* London. Croom Helm.

KRAUSHAAR, R. AND GARDELS, N. 1982. *Towards an Understanding of Crisis and transition: Planning in an Era of Limits.* In Paris, C (Ed). Critical Readings in Planning Theory. Oxford. Pergamon.

KRAUSHAAR, R. 1988. "Outside the Whale: Progressive Planning and the Dilemmas of Radical Reform" *American Planning Association Journal.* Winter 1988 91-98.

LINDBLOM, C. 1965. *The Intelligence of Democracry.* New York. Free Press.

MARRIS, P. 1982. "Social Change and Reintegration". *Journal of Planning Education and Research.* Vol 2: 54-61.

MCCARTHY, J.J. AND SMIT, D.P. 1984. *South African City: Theory in Analysis and Planning.* Cape Town. Juta.

MECK, S. 1990. "From High-minded Reformism to Hard-boiled Pragmatism: American City Planning Faces the Next Century". *The Planner.* Vol 76(6): 11-15.

MORRIS, P.1981. *A History of Black Housing in South Africa.* Johannesburg. South Africa Foundation.

MULLER, J. 1982. *Promotive Planning: Towards an Approach to Planning for the Disadvantaged.* In Healey, P, McDougal, G and Thomas MJ (Eds). Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s. Oxford. Pergamon Press.

MULLER, J. 1983. *Theory and Practice: The Janus Face of Planning.* Inaugural Lecture Department of Town and Regional Planning. Johannesburg. Witwatersrand University Press.

PARIS, C. 1982. *Critical Readings in Planning Theory.* Oxford. Pergamon.

ROWEISS, S.T. 1983. "Urban Planning as Professional Mediation of Territorial Politics". *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space.* Vol 1:139-162.

SUSSKIND, L. AND OZAWA, C. 1984. "Mediated Negotiation in the Public Sector: The Planner as Mediator". *Journal for Planning Education and Research.* Vol 4(1 ): 5-15.

TOMLINSON, R. AND ADDELSON, M. 1987. *Regional Restructuring Under Apartheid: Urban and Regional Policies in Contemporary South Africa.* Johannesburg. Ravan.

TURNER, B. (Ed) 1987. *Building Community: A Third World Casebook.* Berlin. Habitat Forum.

TURNER, J. 1987. *Introduction.* In Turner, B. (Ed). Building Community: A Third World Casebook. Berlin. Habitat Forum.