PLANNING: PROBLEMS, PRIORITIES AND PROSPECTS

R. T. McCARTHY
Economist/Planner

Die probleme en prioriteite wat die beplanningsberoep in Suid-Afrika in die gesig staar, word vanuit drie gesigspunte oorweeg. Eerstens word die aard van ontwikkeling bespreek, om vas te stel wat bepaal: (i) ontwikkeling: (ii) verskillende sosio-ekonomiese stelsels; en (iii) die beperkings op ontwikkeling in die derde wêreld.

Tweedens word die basiese beplannings-voorkeure in oorsig geneem m.b.t.: (i) die oorsprong van stadsbeplanning in die Verenigde Koninkryk en die V.S.A.; (ii) probleme wat ontstaan weens die wantoepassing van prioriteite; en (iii) die funksie van die beplanningsberoep.

Derdens word die toestand in Suid-Afrika bespreek, met betrekking tot die vernaamste ontwikkelingsprobleme op: (i) nasionale; (ii) streek-; en (iii) stedelike vlakke. 'n Nuwe raamwerk vir die toekoms is noodsaaklik, voordat wesenlike ontwikkeling 'n aanvang kan neem.

INTRODUCTION

Problems, priorities and prospects regarding the planning profession in South Africa can be viewed as comprising three broad areas of concern.

The first area relates to the problem of development in the third world, of which we form a part. Here, the emphasis falls on such questions as: what constitutes development? what types of development? and how certain factors can impede, or constrain development?

The second area concerns the identification of the basic priorities in planning. By surveying the origin and progress of planning in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, the basic problems and priorities can be identified, with respect to the role of the profession.

The third relates to the problems and priorities for the planning profession in South Africa. Here the focus falls on the main problems and priorities, at national, regional and urban levels, which will confront the profession in the years ahead.

1. THE PROBLEM OF DEVELOPMENT

Looking at the problem of development in the third world it is important to understand:- (i) the nature of development; (ii) the characteristics of different socio-economic systems and (iii) the particular constraints which inhibit development.

It is important to note that the principles governing development are universal and political. Consequently, they apply to all countries. Accordingly, the rate and diffusion of development depends on the success with which the principles are perceived and implemented. This is true for both the first and third worlds, the rich and poor countries.

Development is the accelerated transformation from one socio-economic system to another. This recognises that the structure of a society is so interwoven with the economy that it is possible to speak of a socio-economic system. (For example, one may identify Feudal, Colonial or Modern systems). In the major part of the world today, development involves the socio-economic transformation from a colonial system to a modern system.

Looking back across the field of human development, one can perceive specific milestones along the way. A very early landmark was the agricultural revolution, which transformed the nomadic society and pastoral economy into a settled society, which in turn relied on a subsistance agricultural economy, for its existence. From these humble beginnings, villages and towns developed. In more recent times, that is during the past few centuries, both trade and industry grew in prominance, and provided the means of supporting an expanding urban society. In many third world countries today, it is still possible to see a range of socio-economic systems, which may range from the nomadic to the industrial.

The development from one form of economy to another was accompanied by considerable social changes. Each era, or phase of development, was built on a particular socio-economic system. For example, in the Feudal system, the primary productive asset (land), wealth and position were exclusively concentrated in the hands of Royalty and the nobility. The common man played a servile and secondary role, soldiering for his lord, labouring in his lord's fields, or occasionally working as a craftsman. It should be noted, however, that the feudal system, by its nature supported and perpetuated a particular pattern of human settlement, (viz the manorial farms, defensive castles, market towns and courtly cities).

Before the modern era could effectively form the setting on the stage of European affairs, considerable changes were required in order to end the feudal system in France and Europe. At the turn of the 18th Century, the break from Feudalism was consolidated by Napoleon, who introduced various reforms in the form of new socio-economic relationships (viz a new framework for law, local government, public finance, education, etc). The subsequent industrialisation in Europe dramatically changed the nature of the society, economy and settlement pattern. Although urbanisation is often perceived only in demographic terms, it was an integral part of the socio-economic transformation, which produced the modern socio-economic system in Europe.

To repeat the first point, development is the accelerated transformation from one socio-economic system to another.

Further, each system possesses its own characteristic, society, economy and corresponding pattern of population settlement. In other words, development requires a new framework if the transformation of the society and the economy is to occur.

The second point is the different, or even *divergent, characteristics* of the colonial and modern systems. Hence, the need for a complete transformation from one system to the other.

The colonial system was the particular form of society and economy, which was imposed on the colonies in Latin America, Africa and Asia and which together form the poor countries, or today's third world. Through colonisation, the European settlers transformed a traditional society and economy by superimposing new values, institutions, form of government and type of economy. (This was usually based on plantation agriculture, with mining and commerce as secondary activities). Spatially, colonisation produced a new characteristic pattern of land distribution between the colonists and the indigenous population. The traditional pattern of settlement was replaced by productive farms; mining and commercial towns, to produce and sell the commodities; with administrative and military centres to run and hold the territories. Socially and economically, the colonies depended on the metropolitan, or mother countries, for their very existence.

In short, the colonial system was characterised by a duality in the spatial, social and economic spheres. It is this division between the traditional and modern sectors, or between the natives and the colonists, which is both a characteristic, and a consequence, of colonisation.

In contrast, the modern system, which evolved out of the Feudal system in Europe, possesses quite different characteristics. The growth of trade and industrialisation was accompanied by the urbanisation of the rural population. The towns initially provided labour and subsequently a market for the industrial goods. In short, the modernisation was characterised by a new form of economy, social organisation and settlement pattern. A modern western country today is characterised by such aspects as: a free enterprise economy which together with a substantial public sector forms a system of welfare Capitalism; democratic government, which relies on the rule of law and the rights of man and a relatively wealthy population in the large urban concentrations.

In short, the modern system evolved for the benefit of the whole population and was not imposed for the benefit of the few. The result is that the modern system is socially more desirable and economically more productive than the colonial system. Accordingly, the poor countries of the modern third world perceive the basic problem of development, as how to attain those characteristics, which will accelerate their transformation into a modern society and economy. Yet this is neither simple nor easy.

The third point on development is that there are *inherent constraints which impede, or prevent development.* Like most systems, the colonial system is selfperpetuating. In other words, the inherent characteristics of the colonial system can impede development and, thus, constrain the necessary transformation to a modern system.

During its day the colonial system was perceived as being inherently good and beneficial (as it introduced civilisation and Christianity to the natives). After the second world war, when the colonies were granted their independence, the disadvantages and constraints became more apparent. In essence, the colonial system meant three things to the indigenous population:-
(i) the thorough exploitation of the natural resources, the native labour and the captive colonial market;
(ii) the total supression and control of the indigenous population and thus
(iii) the complete absence of any significant development of the indigenous population.

Various colonial characteristics ensured that the social and economic system functioned: (a) exclusively for the benefit of the colonists and (b) to the disadvantage of the natives, who were excluded, wherever possible, from the benefits of the colonial economy and society. A cardinal characteristic of the colonial society was the differentiation between European and Native with the result that inferior, or negligible public benefits were extended to the poor inhabitants. This in turn resulted in: poor health, minimal education, and thus, negligible prospects for economic advancement (due to a lack of skills and the presence of various socioeconomic barriers). In fact, these characteristics comprise the well known cycle of poverty. Similarly, the settlement pattern and the distribution of land reflected the colonial priorities, by invariably allowing the colonists excessive and exclusive rights to property ownership in the more productive countryside and towns.

Socially, an authoritarian administration constrained development in a number of ways. The administrative structure was "alien" in that it executed the commands from the distant imperial capitals of the world, instead of the wishes of the local people. It was "inappropriate" in that it was superimposed, as opposed to developing the indigenous structure. It was suppressive in that it institutionalised the norm of authoritarian government, as opposed to introducing a democratic framework.

Economically the colonial system reflected similar constraints. The economic structure is "alien" in that it was derived from, and for, the benefit of, a distant mother economy. Similarly, the imported technology was 'inappropriate' in terms of the modern view of developing appropriate goods and forms of production. Finally, the economic development was largely "restricted" to the single crop or mineral required by the mother country, as opposed to a broad based economy.

Accordingly, it is recognised today that many of the extreme problems of the third world (poverty, illhealth, ignorance, under and unemployment, etc) are the direct result of the particular constraints which characterise the colonial system, and its particular form of development. This is also true for the international level where the terms of trade and economic relationships were structured so as to benefit the European countries. Despite the mirage of political independance after the second world war, the perpetuation of the economic framework (with its inherent constraints to the development of the third world) has led to the call for a "new economic order" at the international level.

In a nutshell, before the development

and transformation can begin to be effective, the inherent constraints and destructive characteristics of the colonial system must be reformed, in terms of a new, modern framework, at international and national levels.

With respect to the problems of development three main points emerge:

(i) Development is an accelerated and comprehensive transformation from a colonial system to the inter-, nationally desired, modern society and economy,

(ii) this implies that the characteristics of, and differences between, the colonial and modern systems must be carefully identified, so that,

(iii) the constraints which impede development and perpetuate the *status quo* may be eradicated. Consequently, it is necessary to formulate and introduce a new framework which will actively promote proper development. In short, the problems of underdevelopment are invariably related to the inherent constraints and characteristics of the colonial system.

In common with the rest of the world, South Africa has not escaped these disadvantages, divisions and constraints. Yet, interestingly enough, it was South Africa's independence in 1910, which was the turning point for the British Empire: Ireland followed suit in the 1920's, India in the 1940's, and virtually all the remaining colonies received their independence in the 1950's and 60's. Is it possible, that during the 1980's, South Africa, once again may provide a turning point for the tide of colonialism, by initiating a new socio-economic framework to resolve its inherent colonial problems and structure?

2. PLANNING PRIORITIES:

The second aspect for consideration is the identification of basic town planning priorities. Three points are relevant:

(i) the original and historical function of town planning,

(ii) the relationship between problems and priorities, and

(iii) the role of the planning profession.

Two views of town planning immediately come to mind. Benevelo (1967) suggested that town planning is usually little more than a belated response to an existing crisis. Although cynical in content, it is true that the urban crisis was the mother of planning. On the other hand, Sir Desmond Heap (1973) said that the function of planning is to ensure a healthy, pleasant and orderly urban environment in order to make the town a fit and decent place in which to live. In short, the continual improvement of the town for the benefit of the community is the essence of town planning.

The first step in identifying the fundamental planning priorities is to briefly review the *original function of town planning in Britain and the U.S.A.* Such a review is of particular relevance, as British legislation served as the model for much of the planning legislation in South Africa.

In his inaugural lecture at the University of the Witwatersrand last year, Professor Muller showed that in both Britain and America, town planning arose out of the need to reform the appalling living conditions of the people. There were two streams of thought as to how this should be achieved:-

(i) the social planning movement, which emphasised social reform, was directed towards improving the urban condition (e.g. housing, land use, labour conditions, etc.) and,

(ii) the physical planning movement, which concentrated on the urban form. Both streams of thought influenced what planners perceive as priorities.

The origin of town planning in *Britain* lay in the general response to the appalling conditions created by the industrial revolution. Many of the thinkers and philosophers of the time questioned the cause, necessity and desirability of the "cleavage of the nation". Accordingly, John Stuart-Mill (1848) in his "Principles of Political Economy" stressed the duty and responsibility of the higher classes to improve the conditions of the lower classes. Similarly; the philosopher Jeremy Blentham, whose effigy is still encased at London University, inspired and contributed to the intellectual and moral framework for social reform.

From the thinkers, the torch of progress passed to the activists, like Lord Shaftsbury and Edwin Chadwick. An ally of anyone who could introduce reform, Chadwick supported the government of the day, whatever it was. He strove to promote social reform through legislative reform. Chadwick's report, in 1848, on "The Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain" was so startling and irrefutable that it was followed by the Public Health Acts of 1848 and 1875, the Housing Act of 1890, and the first Housing and Town Planning Act of 1905.

Four conclusions may be drawn from these events:

(i) the need and desire to improve the health, housing and living conditions of the working class, underpinned town planning legislation in the U.K.,

(ii) the acts recognise that it was the responsibility of the authorities to establish and maintain minimum standards,

(iii) the planning act recognised the need to protect the residential areas, through zoning, from the ravages of the filthy industry of the time, and

(iv) these functions are still exercised by local authorities throughout the world today.

With the passing of time, however, for many planners in Britain the prime priority moved, from social reform, to physical form. The focus fell on the creation of a pleasant urban environment and the integration of nature with the built form. Howard's Garden City Association, formed in 1899, had an international impact, as planners throughout the world strove to create garden cities, or new towns, in green fields. The recent environmental movement of the 1960's and 1970's reawakened the public's awareness of the importance of the environment in our lives.

Looking at the U.S.A., one can perceive a similar pattern. The initial planning priority in the U.S.A. was the need to reform the terrible conditions, which accompanied urbanisation and industrialisation, during the last century. The appalling housing conditions were the result of the imperfect working of the inequitable market system. In the 1860's, in New York, the American activists achieved legislation to control minimum housing and building standards. The New York State Housing Code of 1901 controlled building construction by:

(i) reducing coverage,

(ii) increasing interior court space, and

(iii) improving building standards. Further, in 1916, New York was the first of a series of cities to introduce zoning. Today, the first priority of the authorities is to maintain and improve the living conditions of the people. In fact, it is difficult to justify the existence of government without this function.

The importance of the physical form in America grew through the "City Beautiful" and "Park Movements". Often led by landscape planners, the movements stressed beauty and the improvement of the physical environment to the point of neglecting the basic social and economic priorities. The movements also promoted the comprehensive view, or "Grand Plan". In the past, town planning has varied from the rigid and detailed Master Plan of the pre-war era, to the recent, flexible, broad brush, Structure Plan.

Regional planning in America received a firm foundation, with the Tennessee Valley Authority. Motivated by the spirit of reform which swept America after the Great Depression, the TVA is an international milestone for comprehensive regional planning and development.

This brief review of the origin and function of planning highlights firstly three priorities:-

(i) In both the U.K. and U.S.A. the origin, and primary priority, underlying town planning was social reform. The chosen instruments were administrative regulations to control building construction and land use. The improvement of the urban conditions complemented the principle of equity in social relationships, which characterises the modern system.

(ii) A second priority was physical form, in particular the beautification and greening of the towns. (Today, this aspect is often neglected by planners and left to others to implement);

(iii) A third priority was overall planning to guide the development and structure of the city through the "Development Plan".

Secondly, *many planning problems are the result of misperceived priorities*. This is true for both the social and physical schools of town planning. By way of illustration:

(i) Although the social reformers introduced zoning as a tool to improve living conditions, zoning often created the problem of large monotonous and homogeneous areas (central city, flatland, suburbia etc.) As Jane Jacobs showed, the administration of blanket regulations has effectively killed the diversity and life of the "Great American Cities", by producing dead CBD's and long commuting times to the suburban refuge.

(ii) Conversely, neglect of the priority for socio-economic reform, in the poor parts of the town, resulted in the urban riots of the 1950's and 60's in America, and 70's in South Africa.

(iii) The overemphasis on urban form encouraged the urban renewal schemes, which blithely ignored the devastating consequences for the poor residents. Greer, an American psychologist, showed that the grief suffered at the loss of one's home is comparable to that experienced at the loss of a close relative.

(iv) Similarly, the overemphasis on physical form, spawned the inhuman tower blocks, which have created immense social problems. The demolition of these high-rise blocks is a recognition of a basic human need to be close to the ground, in medium density layouts.

(v) The neglect of the natural environment, and the consequent pollution of the air and water and spread of disease, has been at considerable cost to the individual and society. Common examples from abroad and South Africa are the cars in the city, the industrial effluent in the rivers, the foul emmissions from steelworks, etc.

(vi) Similarly, the inattention to the greening of the cities, implies a less desirable city with the consequent social and economic problems.

(vii) Examples abound in regional planning, where the priorities of social improvement and integration with nature were ignored or overridden in favour of engineering or economic priorities. For example the large Aswan Dam, which spread bilharzia; interrupted the silt needed for farming and the sardine shoals; created unemployment; provided inadequate water to drive all the turbines, or even irrigate $\frac{3}{4}$ of the planned reclamation area.

With regard to the problems and priorities, there are three thoughts that are of particular importance.

(i) Problems do not disappear if the planners ignore them or distort the priorities. Rather, ignorance will exacerbate the problems.

(ii) As planning is a distinctive approach, it must achieve its objectives. *Achievement and not the plan* must be the final arbiter of planning.

(iii) Accordingly, the planners' preoccupation with the mechanisms of planning should be replaced by a return to the basic priority of reform.

Finally, the third point on planning priorities is that the *type of society*, will effectively determine the priorities, the type of planning and the role of the private sector planners, within that society. Planning is a formal means of using, or distributing, private and public resources. Accordingly, it is essential to identify the bias in planning and the consequences arising therefrom. For example, the priorities and bias of a colonial society differ markedly from those of a modern society, where the principle of equity and equality come to the fore.

Similarly, the type, or form, of social organisation will influence the form of planning. For example a rigid, hierarchical society is likely to require a rigid, deterministic form of planning. On the other hand, a flexible, open society with a free enterprise economy is likely to require a flexible, indicative form of planning.

The nature of the society will shape the role of both, the town planning profession and private planner. As a society changes so a change in the planner's role may be expected. In South Africa it is likely that in future both the general public and the private sector planner will play a greater role in preparing and executing the plans. In a developing country, it is essential to tap the expertise of both the private and public sectors, in order to ensure that all the limited resources and expertise are utilised.

To conclude this section on the primary planning priorities, three main points merit highlighting:-

(i) Historically, the *raison d'être* for planning was to reform urban conditions: it is important to continually redirect the planner to this priority.

(ii) The misinterpretation of this basic priority, together with improper planning, has produced serious urban problems and man-made disasters throughout the world.

(iii) The type, or structure, of society will determine the planning priorities, the form of planning, and the role that the profession fulfils.

It is, thus, essential that the planning profession in South Africa returns to the primary priority of "planning for people". It is only by reviewing its function, and defining its role within a new framework, that the profession can fulfil its vital role in guiding the development of the country.

3. SOUTH AFRICA

As South Africa is not an island unto itself, there is much that we can learn from the outside world. Accordingly, the points and principles discussed in the preceeding two parts are developed and applied to the South African situation, with reference to the problems and priorities which confront South African planners at national, regional and urban levels.

3.1 The National Level:

At the national level there are five points of note. The most important is that, the developmental problems prevailing in the third world, or poor countries, also are present in South Africa. Accordingly, the *problem of development* is concerned with how to successfully accelerate a transformation to a modern socio-economic system. It is apparent that the government recognises the essential characteristics of the modern system, for in the foreword to the Carlton Conference Report of 1980, the Prime Minister noted that "the success of western civilisation rests upon the twin pillars of free enterprise and democratic government."

How is this transformation to be achieved? In the earlier review of de-velopment problems, it was shown that the major socio-economic constraints impeding development must be reformed and removed. This approach is recognised by the President's Council, which recently undertook an enquiry into the impediments to economic growth. In order to remove the constraints, or impediments, inherent in the colonial framework, it is necessary to firstly, formulate and secondly, introduce a "modern framework": comprising a series of complementary frameworks, covering the gamut of relationships, which form a modern society and economy.

This *modern framework* must, of necessity, incorporate *modern priorities and principles* (such as equity and equality). In practice, each dimension of the socio-economic system has its own particular set of modern characteristics, values and priorities. As a general rule, the new framework should aim at:-

(i) the removal of the barriers to development;

(ii) the extension of the boundaries of the modern system, and

(iii) the introduction of common standards, criteria, procedures, institutions, etc.

The fourth point is that at the end of the day, the *purpose* of the new framework is to introduce a modern socio-economic system, as exists in such countries as Holland or Britain. [Such a system is, of course, the basis for those modern values and characteristics, which already exist in our economy and society.]

The *raison d'être* for the transformation, or extension of the modern system, is to produce the type of socio-economic system, which is desired, cherished and emulated throughout the western world.

It is important to recognise that the *pattern of human settlement, or spatial framework* is merely the *spatial dimension of a particular system.* The colonial and modern systems, thus, possess their own particular spatial patterns. Consequently, one cannot force a colonial pattern onto a modern system, or vice versa. When planning for development it is essential to look beyond the immediate physical features in order to comprehend the underlying system.

In a nutshell, the major problem that South Africa faces is how to formulate and implement a new framework, for the modernisation of the society and the economy. This in turn will produce a new spatial framework. For convenience the spatial dimension is subdivided into regional and urban elements which are here considered in more detail.

3.2 The Regional Level:

At the regional level there are four points that deserve particular attention, in view of the stress placed on regional development at the recent Cape Town Conference.

First, the influence of the socio-economic system on the spatial pattern of development is clearly discernable at the regional level. As stated in Part, I, while the colonial system was designed to benefit the settlers, it also penalised the natives. Accordingly, under a colonial system, development will occur in the settled, European areas and not in the traditional, native areas. The absence of development in, or the under-development-of, certain areas is a direct result of the various structural constraints within the colonial system, which prevent the natural development from occurring. The result of the constraints is a sustained inability of an area, and its inhabitants, to develop. The constraints, thus effectively perpetuate a state of under-development. This under-development has an accumulated impact on the region. For example the consequence of the constraints is discernable in the accumulated backlog in infrastructure (which can only be remedied through an enormous inflow of public funds).

Second, an examination of the pattern of regional development and underdevelopment in South Africa, clearly reflects the *colonial pattern of constraints* and priorities. For example, an inspection of the eight development regions proposed by Lombard in 1980, and thereafter defined by the government, clearly depicts a startling pattern of imbalanced regional growth in South Africa. The regions, or areas, which have developed are those, which were of benefit to the colonial economy (e.g. mining in the primate region, or agriculture in the settled colonist areas). The under-developed and overpopulated (sub)-regions (e.g. the Transkei or Kwazulu) are the reciprocal side of the

colonial system (which is characterised by duality, differentiation and a distinctive spatial pattern, of development and under-development). Accordingly, it is not surprising that at the Carlton Conference the Prime Minister recognised the "Development" of the National States' as a first priority. The major regional problem in South Africa is, thus, balanced development. This is clearly visible in the enormous disparity in development (e.g. the presence, or absence of: employment, physical infrastructure, social facilities, disease and ill health, etc.)

Third, the question thus arises, as to how an accelerated balanced regional development can be initiated. As indicated before, the answer lies in the formulation of a modern socio-economic framework, with its corresponding spatial pattern of development. An essential component of the new framework is the formulation of a new, institutional framework, which is designed to stimulate, and not constrain, regional development. The modern, spatial framework should, therefore, firstly accelerate the advancement of the under-developed and overpopulated areas, and secondly accommodate the growing urbanisation of the population.

Finally, *the two popular proposals* for balanced regional development will fail to produce the desired results, simply because they do not comply with the requirements for a modern framework. For example, in terms of the requirement to concentrate development within the under-developed sub-regions, the border industry approach has misplaced the growth, thus, perpetuating the underdevelopment of the underdeveloped subregions. Similarly, the Regional Development Bank will be severely constrained in its ability to promote balanced regional development, merely because of the inequitable composition of the body and the inequitable distribution of public funds and benefits.

In conclusion, the severe problem of imbalanced regional development can only be resolved through modernisation. In short, development must equitably benefit, and be seen to benefit, all the members of the society and economy. The creation of a new socio-economic framework, with the eradication of the constraints, will in turn introduce a modern, spatial framework, which will

promote, and not impede, balanced regional development.

3.3 The Urban Level:

At the urban level four points may be highlighted. First, the Urban Foundation has played a prominent role in publicising the seriousness of the urban problems in South Africa. (For example, by promoting the realisation of, both, the desirability and inevitability of urbanisation in a modern society). As Dr. Otto Koenigsberger, of the D.P.U. in London showed, urbanisation is a universal process. It occurs even in Russia (which attempted to stop the process through drastic regulations). The inevitability of urbanisation lies in two processes, modernisation and economic development, for which urbanisation is a prerequisite.

In addition, the Urban Foundation also showed how to accommodate the necessary urbanisation, by addressing the basic questions of housing, education, employment, or those factors which form decent urban living conditions.

Second, the urban and regional "levels" are merely two parts, or perspectives, of a *single spatial system*. Although it is common practice to think in hierarchical terms, it can be misleading as it distracts one away from the underlying processes in the socio-economic system. In other words, the basic characteristics of the colonial framework are present in both regional and urban dimensions. For example, like other overseas countries, the colonial character of the South African city is clearly visible in the enormous disparities between the rich and the poor; and in particular, the appalling conditions of the urban poor. Using the planners' terminology, the disparities are revealed in such characteristics as: population densities; housing shortages; commuter time; the possession or absence of social facilities, physical services; the forms of land tenure and home ownership; etc. Too often the poor are denied the most elementary form of town planning and the most basic of services.

This is a situation which is most unhealthy for the country and particularly disturbing for the profession. The accumulated backlog of infrastructure, social facilities and housing, requires the rapid introduction of policies which will

counteract the historical neglect and urban under-development. Those policies and measures (e.g. self-help and special assistance for the poor) should complement the new, urban framework.

One might ask: what contribution has the *profession* made in recognising and resolving these problems? The fact that this sad state of affairs has occurred, and is allowed to continue, is a serious reflection on the profession. As town planners wish to be a socially accepted profession, legally responsible for both urban and regional development, it is very clear from the present situation that the profession must re-evaluate its role and priorities as a matter of urgency. Having done this, the profession has a particular responsibility and duty to:-

(i) participate in the formulation of a new, spatial framework;
(ii) advise the public sector on: the drafting of legislation, the identification of priorities and the review of procedures;
(iii) educate its own members and the public, on the subject of urban and regional development.

In short, professional status carries certain responsibilities, which clearly transcend the mercenary benefits of a legalised closed shop. Although a professional cannot be determined by decree, the professional body can, and must, promote, or encourage, the necessary attitudes and attributes, (e.g. public concern, social responsibility, proper conduct, etc.). For example, the Code of Professional Responsibility of the A.I.C.P. specifically states in its cannons for the profession that, "the planner shall serve the public interest" and thereby "recognise a special responsibility to plan for the disadvantaged groups and persons". We may ask ourselves, as a profession, do we recognise our responsibilities and are they clearly set out in the proposed legislation?

Finally, the primary challenge facing the town and regional planning profession is the abolition of the appalling living conditions in, both, the towns and the rural slums. Accordingly, to fulfil its historical priority of social reform, the professional must strive for the reinstatement of universal priorities and common standards. The introduction of basic town planning for the whole community in South Africa, re-

quires the preparation of proper town plans, which will guide, and ensure, proper urban development. In elementary terms this implies:-
  (i) Establishing the natural and likely rate of urbanisation, so that adequate land is provided for medium density development, for the urban poor;
 (ii) The provision of the necessary: public services (e.g. roads, water, sewage, electricity, etc.); social facilities (viz. schools, crèches, hospitals, post offices, etc.); transport facilities; and the creation of an attractive environment (e.g. trees, parks, sport fields, etc.) within the impoverished areas;
(iii) Gaining access to the necessary public funding and private initiative to ensure an adequate supply of housing for the whole urban population;
 (iv) The application and use of common criteria and standards; so as to ensure, the creation of decent living conditions and a pleasant urban environment, that Sir Desmond Heap identified, as the *raison d'être* of town planning.

To achieve these urban objectives, it is necessary to formulate a new urban and regional framework, which recognises new goals and priorities. Accordingly it is clear that the formulation, and implementation of the framework is a prime responsibility of the town planning profession.

4. CONCLUSION

With respect to the major problems and priorities, which confront the planning profession, it is clear that the nature of development, the characteristics of the different socio-economic systems and the constraints to development must be clearly understood.

Development was defined as the accelerated transformation from one socio-economic system to another. (e.g. traditional, feudal, colonial or modern). One can speak of a system, as the society and the economy are so inter-dependent. Accordingly, each socio-economic system has distinctive, new and often divergent characteristics (e.g. a colonial socio-economic framework versus a modern framework). As each system is self-perpetuating, it is to be expected that the system contains characteristics, or constraints, which will impede development, by constraining the necessary socio-economic transformation, and, thereby, perpetuating under-development.

In both Britain and the United States of America, planning arose out of the movement to improve the housing and living conditions of the urban poor. From social reform the focus moved to physical form. This involved the overall development of the city, its beautification, and the enhancement of the natural environment. It is important that the planning profession, today, reassess its role in terms of its basic priority – namely, the provision of decent living conditions and a proper environment for the whole community, particularly the urban poor. This overview indicates the problems that can arise when misinterpreting the priorities and the way ahead for the profession.

Unfortunately, planners have often misperceived, or ignored, these basic priorities, with the result that development plans have produced various undesirable consequences and problems. Ultimately, planning must achieve its objectives. *Achievement*, and not the plan, *must be the final arbiter of planning*.

In considering the role of the planner it is important to note that, planning is a formal bias for using, and distributing, private and public resources. The type of planning and the priorities adopted largely depend on the prevailing socio-economic system. In this context, it is most important that the planning profession in South Africa should review its role, if the profession is to lead and guide the development of the country.

The South African situation, with regard to both the major developmental problems and planning priorities, at the national, regional and urban levels, reveals a number of shortcomings.

At the national level, real development depends on an accelerated transformation. This, in turn, depends on the formulation of a new framework for the society and the economy (with its corresponding spatial pattern of development and settlement). For example, the various regions in South Africa have historically contained factors which actively constrain the advancement of the under-developed and over-populated subregions. A pre-requisite to balanced regional development is the reform of the various social, economic, and institutional frameworks (in order to remove the constraints, which prevent balanced regional development).

Similarly, at the urban level, the basic problem is to plan for urbanisation (viz. the provision of adequate housing, clear water, sewage removal, decent living conditions, an attractive environment, efficient transport, proper schools and clinics, etc.). Proper urban planning and development is likely to occur only with a reorientation of priorities and procedures. This requires a review of the profession's role. In a developing country with limited resources and expertise, it is essential that planners in the private sector are encouraged to contribute to the planning and development of South Africa.

In conclusion, the many self-evident achievements in South Africa have not been addressed: a gigantic economy in African terms, its military prowess, its dynamic cities, nor its productive agriculture. Instead, the focus has fallen on the problems, which result from our colonial pattern of development: imbalanced regional development and the underdeveloped, impoverished and over-populated areas, in the regions and the towns.

The problem of underdevelopment is the other side, the less attractive side of the developmental coin. The solution to these problems requires the introduction of a modern framework with new priorities for development. These are the fundamental challenges which confront us all. For ultimately, the planning profession is responsible for resolving the problems and guiding the development, in towns and regions throughout the country.

REFERENCES

BENEVOLO, L. 1967. *The Origins of Modern Town Planning.* M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

BOTHA, Hon. P. W. 1980. Towards a Constellation of States in Southern Africa: *Report on the Address given at the Carlton Conference.* The Information Service of South Africa, Pretoria.

HEAP, Sir Desmond 1973. Address given to the Royal Town Planning Conference, Amsterdam.

LOMBARD, J. S. 1980. Focus on Key Economic Issues, No. 26 July 1980. *Merca-bank*, Johannesburg.

MULLER, J. G. 1982. *Theory and Practice: The Zanus Face of Planning.* Inaugural lecture delivered at the Univ. of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

OFFICIAL 1981. *Republic of South Africa: 20 years of Progress.* Dept. of Foreign Affairs and Information, Pretoria.