

MR. TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNER, I PRESUME?

VIC THEUNISSEN AND FRANCOIS THEUNISSEN

The divergence of views within the town and regional planning profession as to the future function of the profession within society, is becoming more and more distinctly polarised. There will be differences of opinion as to exactly what the opposing viewpoints are, but all members of the profession will agree that a wide dichotomy (in whatever way the two opposing positions that constitute the dichotomy, are defined) is in the process of emerging with regard to the issue of the profession's function.

As mentioned above, the opposing viewpoints can be defined in various ways and it may even be possible to identify more than two broad viewpoints. For the purpose of this article, the dichotomy will be defined as a two-way *Generalist vs. Specialist* split. In brief this would mean that one group within the profession (the Generalists) considers the profession's role in society as being not only of a physical nature but also of a social or socio-economic or social/economic/political nature, while the other group (the Specialists) considers the purely physical objectives of forward and detailed planning as the sole function of the profession. Basically the same split will be defined if the Generalists are regarded as those members of the profession who see the profession's role as that which the profession itself considers to be its role, and the Specialists as those members of the profession who see the profession's role as only that which is specifically assigned to it by society.

In the rest of this article the generalist viewpoint and the specialists viewpoint will each be expounded in the form of a position statement, and the conclusions that need to be reached, will be left to the reader himself.

POSITION 1

Judging from even the most recent seminars and discussions it would seem that the role of the town and re-

gional planner remains a belaboured but unresolved issue. This paper offers a few thoughts on the subject, no doubt biased by the writer's own academic training and professional experience, but then we all accept some measure of bias as a fact of life.

A fundamental assumption started out with here is that there is a need for planning in general. We plan our day, finances, indoor furniture and numerous other aspects of our lives, in order to achieve a kind of optimal arrangement with the least effort or resources. In the literature there is frequent allusions to the fundamental role of the planner as being the allocation of the available but scarce resources, but the kind of planner is not specified, perhaps implying that all planners are involved in the allocational problem. The fact remains, there is a role for planning, albeit different kinds of planning.

A further assumption, worthy of explicit statement, is that this role is changing all the time. When one speaks of *the* role of planning, one cannot possibly mean yesterday, today and to-morrow all at the same time, because society itself undergoes continual changes. In order to properly serve society, planning must also evolve.

In assessing the role of the planner, as opposed to the role of planning, the problem becomes that much more complex. Among the more popular notions is the one that views town and regional planning as generalist, and planners as generalists. An alternative approach regards town and regional planning as generalist, but planners as specialists: the whole is greater than the parts. Yet another group even regards town and regional planning as a specialist profession and within which all members are the same kind of experts. One is in doubt which, or whether any, of the above is true, or are these merely what the proponents of these views would like to see? De-

pending on which is nearer the truth or the ideal, one could speculate on whether the role of the planner is not likely to change even more, over time, than the role of planning.

Those in the profession of town and regional planning are of course concerned with their role at present, and to what extent one may speak of professionalism in this case. Since there are no universal yardsticks for determining when an occupation is a profession, in the final analysis it is social acceptance that is the crucial factor. At the moment it appears that society has not yet made up its mind about so-called town and regional planning, partly because of controversy within as well as outside the profession. Perhaps the choice of the epithet "town and regional" has been most unfortunate, and we must look for less confusing names.

Concern for gaining recognition as professionals is leading to a drive among some planners towards some kind of specialism, their argument being that:

- (i) the present heterogeneity in supposed skills and attitudes would be eliminated,
- (ii) specialism breeds unique expertise that provides the key to social acceptance, and
- (iii) a presumption of roles already performed by others, even the country's political masters, should be avoided.

In other words, the prevailing generalist approach in planning is seen by some as the fundamental obstacle to unquestionable professional status.

The stand taken in seeking a sharper definition of roles is of course a worthy one, that surely every planner would subscribe to. The differences of opinion, however, come in when the scope of activity is deliberated upon. At the one extreme there is the seemingly play-safe approach that seeks a very limited role, and at the other, a wider and perhaps more ambitious role that

synthesizes parts, with the aim of creating a better whole.

Towards the former end of the spectrum of attitudes there is a group who claims so-called physical planning as their particular forté: towards the latter end are the generalist planners who see themselves in a "gestalt" role, bringing parts together, and who see enormous gaps between present planning and human needs at large.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the specialism-generalism controversy, brief elaboration on three previously mentioned problems in planning at present should be given viz. diversity of skills and approach, the questionable degree of specialism, and the question of role-giving and role-taking.

The reasons for the somewhat great diversity (or lack of homogeneity) within the profession have to do with the diversity in the background of students entering planning schools and who are bound to carry their particular training and bias through their academic years and indeed their careers. In addition, the planning schools themselves by no means share the same emphasis, which is all very exciting to the academist but hardly provides a foundation for professional credibility. Apparently we have not quite got there yet.

The second issue, the questionable degree of specialism, is related to the first viz. at what point is a generalist transformed into a specialist? Here again no definition can satisfactorily take the place of society's judgement in the matter. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines a specialist as "one who devotes himself to (a) particular branch of a profession, science etc...." which of course begs the whole question. It is also a matter that changes over time, as new specialisms evolve. Generalism-specialism is a continuum rather than a dichotomy, and the town and regional planner's position on this scale is somewhat indeterminate at present, and bound to shift in future.

The third issue, concerning roles and who assigns them, is one that is particularly interesting when one speaks of the process in planning. Some have argued that no planner could feasibly

operate beyond the brief or framework laid down by society. This is surely a somewhat simplistic if not incorrect view where proposal and response from both professionals and decision-makers are essential: dialogue is better than monologue. From the input nature of planning, planners themselves can play a greater part in carving out a role than most other professionals, however undecided that role may be at present.

As implied earlier, there is some agitation within the profession to choose a field of endeavour in which town and regional planners can perform well, or at any rate, better than anyone else, and a number of these proponents appear to be claiming physical planning as a speciality. It is the contention of the writer that however meritorious the efforts in breaking away from undue generalism may be, this particular claim represents a most dubious choice that does not really help matters much.

The physical world we perceive around us, whether man-made or otherwise, is, at the present state of knowledge, created or understood in terms of certain established disciplines — geology, physics, engineering, economics, the law, to name a few. To speak of physical planning cuts across all of these, and is hardly less general than the generalism it is trying to escape from. Not a single line can be drawn on a plan without invoking a few principles that are aphysically or aspatially orientated.

The choice of physical planning seems doubly ironic because physical planning, if properly performed, is to produce documents that are the synthesis of abstract principles, expressed in physical form. If "synthesis" can be taken to be synonymous with "co-ordination", the irony arises from the denial of any co-ordinating role by some of the professed physical planners. No physical plan, except perhaps at the architectural scale, can expect credibility in the absence of a multi-disciplinary base, and even if town and regional planning is conceived of only in physical terms, no wonder the confusion in trying to assign this enormous task to one man. The very use of the epithet "*town and regional*" seems

to fall not far short of delusions of grandeur, the very accusation that is often directed at generalists planning. What in any case seems to be lacking is a body of theory making for a core of expertise that physical planning can call its own, and this is probably at the heart of the problem. For if the physical planner merely translates to the plan what the economist, the engineer or conservationist tells him, then one is hardly speaking of a professional with post-graduate training as a prerequisite for the post he occupies. In this connection the question has been asked more than once how a person starting off with a generalist qualification becomes transformed magically into a specialist planner by attending a short conversion course in town and regional planning.

For the sake of clear discussion one could perhaps recapitulate at this stage as to what has been contended thus far. We started out by acknowledging a role for planning and suggested that this role changes over time, depending on the particular type of planning one is speaking of. There is no certainty as to how specialized town and regional planning is at present. The quest for role definition is of obvious importance, though the choice of physical planning still does not seem to take us out of the morass of generalism.

This introduces a new point of discussion viz. whether generalism is all that bad. After all, as was pointed out earlier, new specialism keep forming in the long term, and throughout this process someone has to perform the obvious important function of relating the parts (specialism) to certain overall aims of society. Some would argue that this co-ordination is the role of government and certainly not the planners. This is, however, an oversimplified view because co-ordination can be performed at many levels, so perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the central government is the ultimate co-ordinating generalist though the planner can also play such a part, albeit at a lower, technical level.

If planners are supposed to be specialists, it is not as specialists that they perform their function. Here one might quote John Dyckmann: "... at

the worst, the city planner is a kind of institutionally protected charlatan; at the best, he is a truly valuable synthesizer ...”

Generalist planning in fact seems to be advocated in Clause 35 of the Townships Ordinance No. 33 of 1934, where reference is made to the promotion of “general welfare” and the “public interest”. In a recent paper, Prof. Roy Kantorowich refers to instances in the United Kingdom where officials originally appointed as town and regional planners have reached top posts on account of their planning education and experience in handling multiple and complex relationships. If one may quote the above Ordinance as an instance, it seems that what society requires of the profession is usually stated in general terms. As for the “top posts” that some have reached, it is arguable that the opportunities of real power in decision-making is more likely to be wielded by people with *inter alia* a wide view of society, a view which enables them to play the role of arbiter between conflicting groups.

An apology ought now to be made in anticipation of an irate response particularly from planners engaged in the private sector, where the objectives, tasks assigned and kinds of working situations may differ markedly from the control work in government with which the writers are more familiar. Planners in private practice in particular may adamantly defend their role as specialist, and if they can present a basis for this, the above discussion stands corrected.

This paper is submitted in the spirit of resolving issues that have to be settled before professional protection can validly be expected. In calling ourselves town and regional planners, a label seems to have been adopted before we know what the bottle is to hold. If a bold prediction may be ventured here, the epithet “town and regional” will in due course have to give way to a new generation of specialist planners, each undergoing different academic training and performing roles different from the others. For reasons already mentioned, society will also need its generalists, but who they are going to be is less certain. Through force of circumstance, however, we will

continue to be generalists for some time yet.

POSITION II

Many town and regional planners, if confronted with a choice between the generalist nor the specialist school, preferring to regard themselves as combining the advantages and avoiding the disadvantages of both generalism and specialism. In fact this best-of-both-world approach is fashionable in most fields of life today. We hang labels round other people’s necks but seldom round our own, because we ourselves are usually the only ones who are clever enough to combine the best aspects of various conflicting viewpoints into one (presumably ideal) solution.

However, the above approach is inappropriate as far as the feud over the future role of the town and regional planning profession is concerned. It will be impossible to establish an optimal future course of action for the profession if a large middle group of town and regional planners remain on the fence, avoiding the labels which the self-confessed generalists and specialists hang on themselves and on each other. Our profession cannot afford the luxury of perpetuating the existing feud between generalism and specialism; it is imperative that a clear choice be made and that the profession as a whole move in the one or the other direction. If such a choice is not made soon, the profession will surely lose its right to exist, because if the profession itself is not sure what its own function is, how must society know, and if society does not know what the profession’s function is, how long will society tolerate the profession’s existence?

Therefore the generalist/specialists controversy should not be regarded as a feud between extremists; every town and regional planner should hang one or the other of the two labels round his neck — thereby identifying himself with either the generalist or the specialist cause. Depending on which cause wins, the profession will either have a role to play in society or go under. If neither cause wins and the feud remains unresolved for much longer, the profession will go under anyway, for

society will not indefinitely continue to pay for the services of a profession which does not know what its own function is.

It is therefore clearly imperative that the profession make a choice between the generalist approach and the specialist approach. Before proceeding to the question as to which of the two approaches the profession should choose, it is necessary that a distinction be made between two concepts that are often confused when the question of our role and function is debated. The two concepts are firstly, *what planning as a function in society entails*, and secondly, *what the function of our profession in society should be*. These two concepts are not necessarily the same thing (although they may be). The first concept refers to the broad function of planning for the future development of society, and has an inter-disciplinary nature with a mosaic of interwoven component parts (as is evident from the definition of planning of eminent writers like Friedman and Alonso, Glasson, Cowan and McLoughlin). The second concept can, as stated above, correspond to the first under particular circumstances, but on the other hand there can conceivably also be a significant difference between the two concepts. What is meant by this is that it does not at all necessarily follow that the function of our profession will correspond to the broad function of planning in society. It is quite possible that, whereas society cannot function without the broad application of planning, society *can* function without our profession, or alternatively give us a diminished role within the broad function of planning. Therefore it must be made clear to all participators in the debate concerning the role and function of our *profession*, that we must not confuse the issue by aiming the debate at the determination of the role and function of planning *as an activity in society*. The accent must fall on our profession’s role in that activity (in other words, whether our role should be total or only partial and, if only partial, what exactly it should be).

As far as a choice between the two broad viewpoints (generalism or specialism) is concerned, it is contended

that a victory for the generalist cause will lead to our profession going under, as surely as night follows day. The reason being that the generalist viewpoint is based on what we think our role in society should be, irrespective of what society *wants* our role to be. No other significant occupational group has had the right to determine its own function in society (or had had such right in its early years). For instance, a health enthusiast cannot start manufacturing millions of running shoes simply because he believes that it is in everyone's interest to improve their health through running. There will be no place in the sun for our health enthusiast unless he perceives a negative gap between the existing supply of, and demand for, running shoes, and aims his efforts at filling that gap. In other words, he cannot manufacture as many running shoes as *he* considers appropriate for the good of society — he must manufacture that number of running shoes that society has shown (through the demand revealed) that it *wants*. Even more important is the price that society is prepared to pay for a particular product or service. Our health enthusiast may be convinced that everyone should, for their own good, wear his superior quality running shoe, whereas society may not be willing to pay the bill for the increased quality offered.

The point is simply that *what we in the profession consider our role in society to be, is totally irrelevant if it does not conform to the role that society wants us to fulfil*. This role must be determined by establishing what gap or gaps are revealed by the professions already offering their services to, and (very important) are *tolerated and accepted* by society. The words "tolerated and accepted by" are accentuated in order to shoot down the cliché-type argument that we can make a better job of already-allocated functions (such as, for example, the function of coordination) than the professions to which those functions have been allocated by society (such as administrators in the case of the coordination function). The fact that the continuous fulfilling of certain functions by certain professions are tolerated and accepted by society, is reason enough for us to refrain from trying to

take over those particular functions for ourselves (even though we might be convinced that we can do a better job). Our criterion should therefore not be the question of what we consider to be good for society, but *what society reveals that it considers to be good for itself*. Converted into the terminology of our running-shoe example, our criterion should be nothing more and nothing less than the actual relationship between the existing supply of, and the existing demand for, planning-related services currently being offered to (and accepted by) society.

It may be counter-argued that the supply-and-demand argument and the running-shoe example are simplistic and not appropriate to the sensitive issues involved when the role of the town and regional planner in society is considered. For instance, it may be said that town and regional planning is not a production-line commodity that can be evaluated in terms of supply and demand, as it is a social service which is for the common good of all in society and therefore cannot be priced. (I hope that private planners who support this latter argument also realise that by implication they are arguing themselves out of a job, because by definition a social service that cannot be priced should also not be provided by private practitioners but should be fully provided by public authorities.) Most of us, however, support the growth and continued existence of a strong private sector in our profession. This means, by implication, that the service that we provide *can* be priced and that, therefore, the supply-and-demand argument regarding our function *is* relevant and is in fact critical. If the supply-and-demand argument is relevant, the running-shoe example cannot be regarded as over-simplistic, because simplified production-consumption examples can be used to illustrate the supply-and-demand aspect of any situation where supply and demand is relevant (no matter how complex the situation is).

Therefore the supply-and-demand argument and the running-shoe example *are* relevant to an analysis of the function of the town and regional planning profession in society. The relevance of

the supply-and-demand principle lies in the fact that, as already stated, we cannot claim the right to *supply* a service that society does not *demand*. We cannot expect (and this applies to town and regional planners in private practice as well as those in the service of the State or of other public authorities) to be paid fees or salaries by clients or employers unless we fulfil the function that our clients or employers *want* us to fulfil (in contrast with what we consider our function to be).

If the principle that the role of the town and regional planning profession in society must be established in terms of the *demand* for our services (and not in terms of *our conception* of our role) is accepted, the following must be determined: firstly for which (if any) of the various types of service that we claim to be able to offer, does society have a demand, and secondly to what extent do related professions already supply these services? This second question, as stated previously, is highly relevant because it would be suicidal for us to claim that we can do a better job than certain other professions of fulfilling their existing functions (no matter how convinced we may be that we can do a better job).

By a process of elimination and, more importantly, by looking at the type of work for which society is prepared to pay town and regional planners (in the private as well as the public sectors), it seems clear to me that the law of supply and demand would dictate that our role be confined to physical or spatial or land use planning (henceforth the term "physical planning" will be used). By this term is meant, for the purpose of this paper, *all planning that consists of the spatial arrangement and rearrangement of land usage, with the determination of the future physical structure of society as sole end result*.

In contrast with physical planning as defined here, there are other types of planning that are related to physical planning, such as economic planning (e.g. the formulation of decentralisation incentives) and social planning (e.g. the drafting of educational policy). These other types of planning are not physical planning, because

they do not consist of the arrangement or rearrangement of land usage (they do not have land use *inputs* and/or *implications* — however, their *primary goals* are not physical but economic or sociological as the case may be). In contrast, physical planning can (and usually does) have socio-economic or other *inputs* and/or *implications*, but *primarily consists of*, and is *primarily aimed at*, the arrangement of the physical or land use structure of society. It is to physical planning in this sense (i.e. as distinct from other forms of planning such as economic and social planning) that I refer when I say that, as manifested through public sector employment and private sector commissioning, society is generally willing to pay our profession to do physical planning but not economic, social or other forms of planning.

This statement needs to be qualified to the effect that it does not necessarily apply in the case of a town and regional planner with dual professional expertise. An obvious example of this would be a town and regional planner who is also a land surveyor and does land surveying work in his capacity as a land surveyor. A further (more subtle) example would be that of a town and regional planner who is also suitably qualified (and has the necessary expertise) to practice a profession such as property development, economic planning or public administration. Such a person can quite conceivably hold a job or conduct a practice in which he, either solely or in addition to physical planning, does work that is related to what may be termed his alternate profession (property development, economic planning, public administration or whatever else). Therefore, when we state that society is willing to pay the town and regional planner to do physical planning only, we refer to the town and regional planner with one profession only or, in the case of the town and regional planner with dual professional qualifications and expertise, to him in this capacity as town and regional planner and not in his capacity as a practitioner in his alternate profession.

Having made this point that the town and regional planning profession (as

distinct from related alternate professions of individuals with dual qualifications and expertise) should be limited to physical planning in the narrow sense, as dictated by society's demand for the profession's services, one can point out a major reason why society manifests only this narrow demand for our services. The broader role propagated by the generalists can, when one gets down to brass tacks, be equated with *nothing less than the function of government*. In other words, what the generalists basically want is for our profession to fulfil broad functions of government: social planning, economic development, planning coordination, etc. Seeing that there already are established institutions and individuals fulfilling these broad functions of government, it follows by definition that society does not manifest a demand for a new profession to step in and take over.

The only demand that society manifests is that created by a relatively small gap in the broad structure of functions related to development — the gap resulting from a relative lack of expertise concerning the purely physical or land use aspects of forward and detailed planning.

Therefore we as town and regional planners will have to stop trying to take over the role of government if we wish to survive and to continue enjoying a place in the sun. Those members of our profession who propagate a broader role for the profession than a purely physical or land use function, violate the critical principle that our role in society should be established in terms of society's demand for our services and not in terms of our own conception of what our role should be. Another flagrant violation of this principle results from the opinion of many members of our profession that the town and regional planner is excellently suited to the role of coordinator of related professions. *We* may think that our qualifications and experience make our profession the best one to fulfil the coordinating function, but *society* most definitely does not think so. Among the functions that our profession generally claims to be suited to, that of coordination is probably the one that is to the largest extent al-

ready fulfilled by other professions (mostly the profession of Administration). It will not help for us to claim that we can do the job better than (for instance) administrators; in fact, as said before, such an approach would be suicidal for our profession. If we wish to establish ourselves, we would ruin all our best efforts if we tread on other people's toes (even though their toes may, in the opinion of some, have corns on them). People generally don't like to be coordinated by others who claim some sort of inherent right to be coordinators; the real and actual coordinators will be those upon whom the function of coordination has fallen in a natural way over the years. Mostly these people are administrators and this should and will remain so irrespective of what we may want. Therefore, if the often-heard statement that "the planner is primarily a coordinator" is intended to be a serious statement of our abilities, we may as well give up our fight for recognition as a profession right now, as there cannot possibly be a place in the sun for us as coordinators.

In view of all the above, it is of critical importance that we as a hopeful profession identify a concrete and clearly-identifiable function for us in society if we wish to survive. The function of (purely) physical planning is the only one that can serve this purpose, because it is the only one of the various aspects of our expertise for which society is willing to pay (discounting the alternate professions of those town and regional planners with dual professional expertise). Any attempt to broaden our role beyond that of physical planning would eventually kill our profession because, firstly, society is not willing to pay us for rendering services which society already considers to be adequately rendered by other professions and, secondly, particular (powerful) groups within society will resent (and fight) what they would consider to be an upstart profession trying to take over their role. In particular any attempt to establish a coordination function for ourselves would lead to our profession becoming completely redundant.

One often hears (and resents) cliches like "a planner is a jack-of-all-trades-

and-master-of-none" and "planning is a matter of opinion." Those in our midst who propagate a broader socio-economic (as distinct from a narrower physical) role for our profession, should realise that they are by implication increasing the truth of cliches such as the above. And if these cliches should become (or already are!) true, we surely cannot claim professional status at all, as a jack-of-all-trades cannot be called a professional and something that is merely a matter of opinion cannot be regarded as professional expertise. The generalist or broader-role-advocates among us are playing into the hands of those who are keen to see the demise of our profession, and are therefore acting against the interests of our survival, by increasing the credibility of accusations that the town and regional planner is no more than a jack-of-all-trades and that the planning that he does is merely a matter of opinion.

In conclusion therefore, all the above arguments point to a clear path that our profession must follow in defining itself and thereby establishing its function. The path we must follow is determined by two critical principles:

Firstly, that our function must be established in terms of what *society* wants from us and not in terms of what *we* consider to be in the best interest of society.

Secondly, that society has made it clear that it is prepared to pay the

town and regional planner (whether he holds a salaried job or whether he is a consultant) primarily to do physical or spatial or land use planning in the narrow sense only (with the exception of work done by the dual-expertise professional in the field of his alternate profession).

The exact nature of the function allocated to us by society (which, as said before, should be the only function that we must fulfil) can be made more clear, for the purpose of this paper, if the term "physical planning" is defined as the *spatial arrangement and rearrangement of land usage in order to determine the future physical structure of society*. More specifically it can be stated that physical planning has socio-economic and other *inputs* but it is aimed at physical or land use *goals*. In contrast social, economic and other forms of planning may have *physical inputs* but are not specifically aimed at *physical goals*. The relationship between physical planning and broader planning or public action should be as follows: on the grounds of physical, socio-economic, land-use-theoretical and other *inputs* the physical planner produces a physical end result, which in turn becomes the *physical input* into the broader planning or other action. Our role is therefore purely of an input-nature — the coordination and decisionmaking is done by others (usually administrators and politicians respectively). Only if this limited (physical) nature of the role of our

profession is accepted, defined and propagated by our profession as its sole function in society, will we have a chance of survival as a profession.

The town and regional planning profession is currently at the crossroads and needs to make a choice with regard to the road it should follow: should it try to take over all aspects of the planning function in society, or should it accept the narrower field of (purely) physical or spatial or land use planning as its function and then concentrate on serving society by fulfilling that function well? If we choose the first path, which would mean telling society that we know what's good for it and that we can fulfil certain functions better than those people who currently fulfil them, we are convinced that our profession will become redundant (and violently resented!) and will eventually disappear. If, on the other hand, we determine our role in society on the basis of the demand that *society manifests* with regard to our services (and not on the basis of *our conception* of what society needs), we can corner the market as far as the physical or spatial or land use aspects of forward and detail planning is concerned, and thereby guarantee a continued demand for the services of our profession.

Which road should we choose? The holier-than-thou path leading to self-destruction, or the pragmatic, limited-role path resulting in our survival as a profession?

RESEARCH REPORT ON URBAN GROWTH

The research unit for sociology of development of the Department of Sociology at the University of Stellenbosch recently released a report entitled *Urban Growth in South Africa 1936-2000: A Demographic Overview* by Prof. S.P. Cilliers and C.J. Groenewald.

In the report a distinction is made between the different components of population growth in urban areas, viz. natural increase of urbanites, and urbanisation, i.e., accession of new urban dwellers. It was found that as far as

the major urban areas of the country are concerned, natural increase has become the more important factor in urban growth. This finding is of special importance in the light of the current focus on urbanisation in public debates.

The report estimates that the urban population of South Africa (including independent Black States) will increase from 13,63 million in 1980 to an expected 24,05 million by the year 2000. Special attention is given to the position of Blacks, of which 14,89 million are expected to be located in urban areas by the year 2000.

Natural increase is expected to contribute 71% of the increase in the urban Black population. The impact of state intervention on the movement and settlement of Black people is discussed. Against the background of the findings of the report specific guidelines are suggested for a national strategy on urbanisation.

The report is available at a cost of R2 per copy from the Director, Research Unit for Sociology of Development, Department of Sociology, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch 7600. (Phone (02231) 71140 x 2098).