

Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Planning, space and power: (Dis)Ordering Cities in Zimbabwe

Kamete, Amini

Award date:
2010

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

PLANNING, SPACE AND POWER: (Dis)Ordering Cities in Zimbabwe

AMINI KAMETE

MSc, BSc (HONS)

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENT, NATURAL RESOURCES & GEOGRAPHY

BANGOR UNIVERSITY

June 2010



Abstract

Notwithstanding its progressive and reformist pretensions, modernist planning has two central problems: (1) some of its concepts and ideals turn out to be hollow; and (2) it has a sinister "dark side". Because of (1) and in spite of (2), the official order imposed by planning is sometimes subverted by people whose livelihoods are not catered for in the exclusionary urban spaces that planning produces. I develop these themes through systematic studies of planning, planners and youth in urban Zimbabwe in four strands. The first strand entails peering into the nature of urban planning. I critique the progressive and reformist pretensions of planning through a rigorous engagement with contemporary planning theory. In the second strand, I explore the first central problem of planning practice. I critique planning concepts and ideals at the point where planning attempts to connect knowledge to action. I unravel the rationalities, attitude and behaviour of planners, critiquing their view of themselves as 'means-end' specialists. I uncover the strategic rationality of the youth whom planners try to 'hang out' with. I expose the dishonesty and deception on both sides in the poisoned interactive space. The dark side of planning is the subject of the third strand. I reveal this side by peering into planning's response to 'spatial unruliness'. I expose how the planning system is able to mobilise the state's repressive apparatus to 'restore order' by cleansing spaces that have been 'contaminated' by informal livelihood practices. I discuss the extreme version of this side in Operation Murambatsvina/Restore Order. In the final strand, I scrutinise the youth's resistance tactics. I analyse resistance in its three manifestations: resistance to deceptive and/or authoritarian and domineering planning styles; resistance to planning's urban orders and exclusionary urban spaces; and resistance to spatialised repression.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
List of Publications	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
List of abbreviations	vii
Plan of the work.....	2
PART I: INTRODUCTION	3
Situating the Papers.....	4
Thesis and Strands	4
The Thesis.....	4
The Strands	5
The Context	7
A Crisis of Governance	7
Is Zimbabwe a Typical Case?	7
Situating the Work within the Sub-Saharan Context.....	9
Methodology.....	13
Highlight of Key Findings.....	15
PART II: EVALUATING THE FIELD.....	19
The Dominant Traditions of Planning Thought in the Papers.....	20
The Influences.....	20
The Challenges.....	23
The Contested Terrain of Planning Theory	26
Contested Typology	26
The Nature, Focus and Processes of Planning.....	26
Some Problems with Contemporary Planning Theory.....	31

Underemphasized: Space and Planning As a Spatial Technology of Domination	31
Under-Researched and Under-Represented: Planning In the Global South.....	33
Conclusion	34
PART III: CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND SCHOLARSHIP.....	35
Overview of the Papers	36
The Journals.....	36
Developing the Theme	36
Theorizing and Conceptualising Planning.....	37
Engaging With and Deploying Key Concepts.....	37
Space, Place and Planning As a Spatial Technology of the State.....	41
Unravelling Planners' Rationalities, Practices, Attitude and Behaviour.....	42
Analysing the Response of Planning To Spatial Impropriety	43
Unravelling the Resistance Tactics of Marginalised Groups	43
Conclusion	44
References	45

List of Publications

This thesis consists of an introduction and seven published papers. I am the sole author of all papers and have also done all work described in the thesis. The papers are:

- Paper I:** Kamete, A.Y. (2006) Participatory farce: youth and the making of urban places in Zimbabwe. *International Development Planning Review*, 28(3): 359–380. DOI: 10.3828/idpr.28.3.4
- Paper II:** Kamete, A.Y. (2007) Youth in urban governance: rationalities, encounters and interaction in Zimbabwe. *Africa Insight*, 37(3): 327–343.
- Paper III:** Kamete, A.Y. (2007) Cold-hearted, negligent and spineless?—Planning, planners and the (r)ejection of ‘filth’ in urban Zimbabwe. *International Planning Studies*, 12(2): 153–171. DOI:10.1080/13563470701477959
- Paper IV:** Kamete, A.Y. (2008) Planning versus youth: stamping out spatial unruliness in Harare. *Geoforum*, 39(5): 1721–1733. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2008.06.001
- Paper V:** Kamete, A.Y. (2009) Hanging out with ‘trouble-causers’: planning and governance in urban Zimbabwe. *Planning theory and Practice*, 10(1): 85–103. DOI: 10.1080/14649350802661675.
- Paper VI:** Kamete, A.Y. (2009) In the service of tyranny: debating the role of planning in Zimbabwe’s urban ‘clean-up’ operation. *Urban Studies*, 46(4): 897–922. DOI: 10.1177/0042098009102134
- Paper VII:** Kamete, A.Y. (2010) Defending illicit livelihoods: youth resistance in Harare’s contested spaces. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(1): 55–75. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2009.00854.x

Acknowledgements

This work is largely a result of the enabling environment and collegial support at three institutions in three countries. Bangor University provided the opportunity and enabling environment where I was able to reflect on the work and compile the thesis. As the internal committee, Dr Rob Brooks and Dr Tom Yarrow offered constructive criticism. Dr Christine Cahalan gave me encouragement, direction and practical advice. Dr David Wright made sure that the viva happened in my lifetime. Dr Eifiona Thomas-Lane, Dr Cledwyn Hughes and Ms Sian Pierce made me believe that I could do this. *Diolch yn fawr!*

Most of the papers were written while I was at the Nordic Africa Institute (NAI). The wonderful working atmosphere at NAI made all sorts of things possible. I owe Dr Henning Melber, the then research director the very soul of this work. The Director, Dr Lennart Wohlgenuth made the research happen by helping me access research funds from Sida. As the programme administrator, Ingrid Andersson was the logistical hub of the work. Dr Ilda Lindell, my intellectual companion, provided the intellectual support I needed, pointed me to valuable readings, and made me believe I actually knew something. *Tack så mycket.*

The Department of Rural and Urban Planning at the University of Zimbabwe is my intellectual birthplace. It was also here that I launched my pretensions as an academic. Various colleagues among the academic and support staff contributed to my growth as an academic. Takawira Mubvami will never know how much his mentorship meant to me. My colleagues Gaynor Paradza and Lovemore Chipungu were always supportive, always believing. *Ndinotenda.*

Throughout my tenure in the three institutions there has been one constant feature: the consistent support of one person. Chanda deserves special thanks. Through all the multiple tragedies that have hit the family, she has been a pillar of strength and a reservoir of fortitude. Again and again, amidst the endless calamity, she has helped me to replenish my strength to recover, to find the reason to endure, and to rediscover the will to continue. *Zikomo Mai Denzie.*

List of abbreviations

BCC	Bulawayo City Council
DRUP	Department of Rural and Urban Planning
FGD	Focus group discussion
GoZ	Government of Zimbabwe
HCC	Harare City Council
MDC	Movement for Democratic Change
OM/RO	Operation <i>Murambatsvina</i> /Restore Order
POSA	Public Order and Security Act
RUPSEA	Association of Rural and Urban Planners in East and Southern Africa
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
ZANU-PF	Zimbabwe Africa National Union – Patriotic Front

SECTION 1: CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Plan of the work

In line with paragraph 18 of Regulation 05 2009 Version 1, this critical analysis has three parts. In Part I, I make my work 'visible' by showcasing it. I articulate the thesis and theme and provide information on the methodology and processes adopted in the papers. I also explain the context and highlight some key findings. Part II is, as the regulation stipulates, "an evaluation of the field". It consists of a critical survey of planning thought and the contested terrain of planning theory. I critically analyse, not only the landscape of planning thought, but also the key debates in contemporary planning theory. In addition, I identify and discuss what I consider to be gaps and omissions in modern-day planning thought and theory. In Part III, I evaluate the published works submitted "indicating the original contribution to learning" which the work has made in the field. I critically evaluate the principal themes in the papers, indicating the nature of my contribution in each case.

PART I: INTRODUCTION

SITUATING THE PAPERS

In the papers, I do not unbendingly subscribe to particular intellectual traditions, theories and ideologies. I use these as heuristic devices to interrogate, understand and interpret planning practice in a particular system of governance that I have labelled “an authoritarian democracy” (Paper V, page 91).¹ Rather than propagating any of the dominant intellectual traditions, theories and ideologies, my concern has been with unravelling planning as it actually takes place in Zimbabwe’s authoritarian governance system. Increasingly, though, I have been deploying post-positivist approaches, as these have become a substantial component of my analytical toolkit.

Broadly speaking, the field covered by the papers is *planning theory and practice*. I am concerned with those moments when the planning system seeks “to connect [its] forms of knowledge with forms of action in the public domain” (Friedmann, 1993:482). Specifically, the field can be summarised as *planning, space and power* in the context of two opposing impulses: order and disorder. The first impulse, which I associate with planning, planners and the state explicitly, seeks to *order* urban spaces under the banner of, among other things, betterment, wellbeing and progress. The second impulse, which I associate with youth, *disorders* urban spaces by engaging in livelihood practices that violate the diktats of the state-directed urban planning system.

THESIS AND STRANDS

THE THESIS

My main thesis is that notwithstanding its progressive and reformist pretensions, in practice modernist planning has two central problems: (1) some of its concepts and ideals turn out to be hollow; and (2) it has a sinister “dark side”. Consequently, because of (1) and in spite of (2), the official urban order imposed by planning is sometimes subverted by people whose livelihoods are not catered for in the exclusionary urban spaces that planning produces.

¹ See page v for paper identification.

I conceptualise *planning* as the public production and regulation of space. It is the state-directed activity concerned with the “the formulation, content and implementation of spatial policies” (Yiftachel, 2002, p. 535). Planning is an ‘applied science’ that relies on, among other things, specialised and approved knowledge, modes of thinking and techniques. That is why I use the term *planning system* to encompass this ‘whole’ which I argue is an “incoherent amalgam” (Paper VII, page 56). I define the urban planning system as consisting of discourses, ideologies, techniques, rationalities and technologies for ordering urban space (Paper VII, page 56). In this system, *planners* are professional ‘operatives’, technocrats whose role is to implement ‘planning’ decisions made by the political policymaking arm of local and national government.

THE STRANDS

I develop the thesis through systematic studies of planning, planners and youth in urban Zimbabwe. This is accomplished in four strands. The first strand, which is a crosscutting one, entails peering into planning thought and theory to frame issues such as the scope, nature and processes of urban planning. In framing the issues, I critique the progressive and reformist pretensions of planning through a rigorous engagement with contemporary planning thought and theory.

In the second strand, I explore the first central problem of planning, namely, that its cherished ideas and concepts sometimes turn out to be hollow. Some concepts and ideals that I critically examine are participation, governance and rationality. I meticulously examine these at the point where planning attempts to make the transition from knowledge to action (cf. Friedmann, 1987) by operationalising its treasured concepts through unbending adherence to ideals such as value neutrality, scientism, and the public interest. It is here that I unravel the rationalities, attitude and behaviour of planners as they interact with youth. I explore how and why planners prefer to regard themselves as ‘means-end’ specialists, clinging onto instrumental rationalism, and refusing to be contaminated by the irrationalities of politics and values. In accomplishing this I also uncover the strategic rationality of the youth whom planners try to interact with in

problematic attempts at ‘public participation’ and ‘participatory governance’ (Papers I, II and V). Not only do I expose the dishonesty and deception on both sides in the ‘poisoned’ interactive space; I also reveal how and why the concepts and ideals, as espoused in planning thought and theory, turn out to be hollow.

The “more sinister accompanying ‘dark side’” (Yiftachel, 1998:395) of planning is the subject of the third strand. I reveal this side when I peer into planning’s reaction to what I have called “spatial unruliness” (Paper IV), that is, the illegal occupation and use of urban spaces by young men and women in Harare. I reflect on the propensity of the planning system to mobilise the state’s repressive apparatus—the various security and law enforcement arms of government—to ‘restore order’ by ‘cleansing’ spaces that have been ‘contaminated’ by informal and illicit livelihood practices. The more chilling side of this dark side is laid bare when I interrogate the role of planning and the attitude, behaviour and role of planners in the world-(in)famous *Operation Murambatsvina/Restore Order* (OM/RO). In my assessment of the ‘clean-up’ operation, I arrive at two conclusions: (1) through their behaviour and attitude, planners can rightly be accused of having been ‘cold-hearted, negligent and spineless’ (Paper III); and (2) the planning system did not initiate or author OM/RO, but the system was certainly ‘in the service of tyranny’ (Paper VI) once OM/RO got under way when planning was commandeered to articulate the techno-legal face of the operation. In this strand, I am careful to distinguish planning, planners and the planning system (see above).

In the final strand, I scrutinise the resistance tactics of the youth, who, together with professional planners are the protagonists in my studies. I conceptualise resistance as “oppositional practice” (Aggleton and Whitty, 1985:62), that is, “collective, directed actions taken by a subordinate group towards a dominant one” (Raby, 2005:151). I show that resistance is manifested through oppositional, conflicting or contesting actions, attitudes and behaviours (see Fernandes, 1988) against “oppressive or threatening situations, structural arrangements, and ideologies” (Abowitz, 2000:878). I study this resistance in its three manifestations: (1) resistance to deceptive and/or authoritarian

planning processes and domineering styles of planning (Papers II and V); (2) resistance to the urban orders imposed by planning and the exclusionary urban spaces that planning produces (Papers IV and VII); and (3) resistance to spatialised repression unleashed by the planning system—always backed by the state’s infrastructure of repression—under the banner of ‘restoring order’ (Paper VII). I observe three types of resistance, namely docility, outright violence, and what I innovatively label ‘resistance at the margins’ (Paper VII).

THE CONTEXT

A CRISIS OF GOVERNANCE

My work is based in urban Zimbabwe. Most of it is in Harare, with some forays into other urban centres, specifically Banket and one city I have, for ethical reasons, called *The City* (Paper V). Since it grapples with planning in ‘post-2000’ Zimbabwe (see below), this work transpires against the backdrop of authoritarianism accentuated by multiple crises: economic, social and political (Papers II and III). As shown in all the papers, it is a context characterised by a severe crisis of governance (Chikuhwa, 2007) that has resulted in an economic meltdown, unprecedented poverty, political polarisation and state repression.

IS ZIMBABWE A TYPICAL CASE?

The works are based in what I term ‘post-2000’ Zimbabwe — the period after Zimbabwe began the descent into unprecedented social, political and economic mayhem. This has seen the country plunging to the bottom of all kinds of global indices including economic growth, governance, human rights, democracy, press freedom, and human development indicators. During this period, Zimbabwe cannot be said to be typical of sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), let alone the global South.

In addition to the turmoil, certain features make Zimbabwe seemingly atypical. One of them is Zimbabwe’s no-nonsense planning system. As I say in one of the papers “the system is uncompromisingly technocratic, strongly bureaucratized, and manifestly modernist” (Paper III, page 154). In fact, Zimbabwe is among the very few sub-Saharan

African countries where planning controls and regulations are made and consistently enforced (Paper IV, see Wekwete, 1989; Rakodi 1995).

Is Zimbabwe really atypical? I argue that what seems atypical about 'post-2000' Zimbabwe include: the crisis-ridden context in which planning takes place; the authorities' unerring upholding *and* enforcement of modernist planning ideals; and the planners insistence on technicist planning untainted by politics. However, I aver that with respect to the context, in a way, Zimbabwe is only an extreme version of SSA. The region is plagued by the same political, social and economic problems that have recently hit Zimbabwe. In fact for some time, African cities have been characterised as cities in crisis (Stren, 1989). Zimbabwe was late in 'catching up' with the rest of SSA; and when it did, it did so in an extreme way. Thus, with regards to socio-economic problems, political turmoil and repression, Zimbabwe does not stand alone. In fact, as late as 2009, economic downturns, autocratic tendencies and repression were noted in much of SSA, including Zimbabwe's southern African neighbours (Mehler et al, 2010; Melber 2010). In view of the foregoing, I argue that Zimbabwe's uniqueness lies in three respects: manifesting the crises in an extreme version; being among the few countries that actually enforce planning regulations; and having planners who openly keep a safe distance from politics.

This is not to say that all of Zimbabwe's urban areas are the same. To be sure, Harare's situation, characterised by a disjunction in power structures between local and national government has been replicated throughout Zimbabwe. Beginning in 2000, the ruling political party (ZANU-PF) lost virtually all major urban constituencies to the opposition Movement for Democratic Change (MDC). In this respect all major urban centres in the country are similar in having opposition-controlled councils. The same can be said of the multiple crises and the enforcement of planning regulations. However, there are some subtle variations among the cities. Whereas there is a clear division of labour between bureaucrats and politicians in Harare City Council (HCC) and a good number of urban centres, in some cities, especially Bulawayo, with its tradition of heavily politicised residents' organisations, such a division of labour is not rigidly adhered to (Kamete et al,

2000). My studies showed that Bulawayo's bureaucrats, including planners, are not afraid of thinking and acting politically (Paper IV). This might explain why it has been noted that political interference is remarkably low in Bulawayo (Pasteur, 1992; Zaaijer, 1998) and why service delivery and participatory programmes are more successful in Bulawayo than Harare (Batley 1996a, 1996b). It also sheds light on why during OM/RO, Bulawayo City Council (BCC) went against the grain. BCC frantically tried to save vendors from eviction and actually publicly protested against the evictions (Bracking, 2005), when HCC zealously implemented the state-authored cleanup operation. In this case Bulawayo can be said to be a 'dissident' city (Musemwa, 2006).

SITUATING THE WORK WITHIN THE SUB-SAHARAN CONTEXT

My work focuses on planning, planners and youth in urban Zimbabwe. Most of the influential planning scholars have concentrated their studies and commentaries in western democracies. Unsurprisingly, by far the majority of publications in the discipline are concerned with planning theory and practice under pluralism and democracy. In contemporary planning debates very little space is devoted to planning in the global South. My work is among the few published works on planning in non-western contexts.

I am not the only scholar to reflect on planning in SSA and critique its progressive and reformist pretensions through a rigorous engagement with contemporary planning thought and theory. A few scholars have produced important works on planning or planning-related issues in SSA. However, most of the publications revolve around the work of a few South African scholars, notably, Vanessa Watson, Philip Harrison, Mark Oranje, Alan Mabin, Alison Todes and Edgar Pieterse. These scholars have explicitly engaged with planning theory and thought and in some cases have reached conclusions which are not very different from mine. Significantly, they agree that South African planning is modernist and bottom up (see Ambert & Feldman, 2002; Watson, 2002; Oranje 2003). These are conclusions that form the core of my own arguments. Outside South Africa, there has not been much critical engagement with urban planning theory and practice. The exception is Tumsifu Nnkya (2008; Diaw et al, 2002) whose work in

Tanzania directly addresses planning practice as a subject, not as an addendum to general urban studies.

As regards urban studies in Zimbabwe, my work complements the long-running work of Debby Potts and Carole Rakodi. The two have written extensively on informality, housing and urban livelihoods in Zimbabwe (see Rakodi, 1995; Potts, 2006). There are issues that I have studied through the lenses of urban planning. Less related to planning—but still relevant to my work—are sporadic publications by scholars from other disciplines mainly political science (Bratton and Masunungure, 2006); anthropology (Fontein, 2009), and urban history (Musemwa, 2010). Though not concerned with planning per se, these works provide a fuller picture of urban Zimbabwe that I have drawn on in my work.

In terms of planning scholarship in Zimbabwe, my work builds on work that was carried out by a dynamic group of researchers at the University of Zimbabwe's Department of Rural and Urban Planning (DRUP) in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The group included Kadmiel Wekwete, the late Chris Rambanapasi, Beacon Mbiba and Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza. They directly addressed urban planning and development issues in Zimbabwe (see Wekwete and Rambanapasi, 1994) and were instrumental in setting up the short-lived Association of Rural and Urban Planners in East and Southern Africa (RUPSEA). RUPSEA was instrumental in mobilising planning scholars from the sub-region, resulting in publications that added to our knowledge of planning systems and planning practice in post-colonial eastern and southern Africa (Wekwete and Rambanapasi, 1994; de Valk and Wekwete, 1992). With RUPSEA's demise in the mid-1990s, the flow of planning studies declined, with post-apartheid South Africa dominating the planning scholarship.

In contemporary SSA, my work on planning complements the work of South African planning academics mentioned above who are just about the only scholars who have been consistently publishing on urban planning in their part of the world continuously for decades. In view of the above, I can say that my work in Zimbabwe carries on a tradition of urban planning research that had stopped after the DRUP group, and complements planning scholarship going on in South Africa. Together with Tumsifu Nnkya's work in

Tanzania, I provide an Anglophone sub-Saharan African view of planning theory and practice from outside South Africa.

My conclusions and arguments sometimes resonate with and sometimes differ from other scholars working in SSA. For example, I am not the only scholar to observe that notwithstanding official proclamations of support for the 'informal sector', the grafting of Western city planning principles and practices onto urban African has created a hostile environment for livelihood practices that do not fit into the official framework of 'order'. Studies in Anglophone SSA have noted similar trends in Malawi (Jimu, 2005), Zambia (Mutale, 2005), Tanzania (Tripp, 1997, Nnkya, 2008); and Lesotho, (Setšabi, 2006). For years Simone has been making similar arguments from Francophone Africa in his work in Senegal and Cameroon (Simone, 2004, 2005). The same conclusions have been reached by scholars whose works are based in Lusophone Africa. Among them are Jenkins (2006), Grest (1995) and Lindell (2008) on Mozambique, and Lindell-Lourenço (2003) on Guinea Bissau. In fact, in an effort to carry out comparative planning studies in Anglophone and Lusophone contexts, I have since co-authored a paper with Ilda Lindell that appeared in a leading journal as this thesis was being finalised (Kamete and Lindell, 2010).

In my works I note that the transplanting of western models of urban planning onto African cities has had a dual adversity on urban Africa: marginalising people who cannot meet the stringent requirements, and, simultaneously spawning subterranean livelihood practices. This confirms findings by leading urbanists. It is estimated that informality accounts for the provision of three quarters of basic needs in the majority of African cities (Simone, 2005:3). Hence, it is not without basis that Simone (2004:163) laments that in the postcolonial African city "the bulk of...social reproduction [remains] the purview of social orders denied official recognition". While my work is amongst many that are critical of the response of authorities to the dominant mode of livelihood in SSA, its 'difference' lies in my explicitly framing these issues in planning thought and linking them to practice.

My work is not insular. I draw from similar works from different parts of SSA. For example, using examples from different parts of SSA, I note that though there is no standard official response to urban informality in Africa, there are some commonalities. Like other scholars, I note the dominance of what I have termed *eradication* as the dominant response to informality (Paper IV). I argue that what differs is the scale and intensity, not substance. That is why I argue that Zimbabwe's OM/RO is only an extreme example of eradication, when the "planned city sweeps the poor away" (Watson, 2009). Eradication is a violent reaction characterised by the demolition of informal settlements and the eviction of informal sector practitioners. Many scholars that I cite have noted the prevalence of eradication in situations as diverse as apartheid South Africa (Dierwechter, 2004), post-colonial 'humanist' Zambia (Mulenga, 2004), post-conflict Lusophone Mozambique (Lindell, 2008); socialist Tanzania (Tripp, 1997) and crisis-ridden Zimbabwe (Potts, 2006).

The distinctiveness of my work lies in the fact that it blends general urban studies with planning studies, thereby building a bridge between works by planning scholars and other urbanists who have studied urban conditions and processes in SSA. My work focuses on the intersection of the two fields. Thus, I examine urban conditions (poverty, informality, housing, etc) *and* frame them in planning thought and theory. In addition, I deploy theories and concepts from cognate disciplines—including social science theory and philosophy—to illuminate and explicate the issues. This is something which only a few scholars such as Watson, Simone, Lindell and Harrison have done. Although my work straddles issues such as urban planning, politics, governance, policy and development, I have always peered into these issues from a specialist planning perspective, always examining that point at which planning connects its forms of knowledge with forms of action. My work may be based in Zimbabwe, but it does touch on issues that are pertinent to and have been researched on in the rest of Africa. This is confirmed by the fact that the conclusions and findings resonate with some major works in other parts of SSA—Anglophone, Lusophone or Francophone—despite their different colonial and postcolonial histories.

METHODOLOGY

The papers are based on studies of youth in contested urban spaces in Harare from 2003 to 2006. They focused on youth aged between 14 and 25 years, whose livelihoods are rooted in informality and/or illegality. The series of studies was part of a larger research project entitled “Unemployed Youth in Contested Spaces in African Cities”, which itself was a component of the research programme *Gender and Age in African Cities* that I coordinated at the Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala, Sweden between 2003 and 2009. The research project was funded by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida).

There were mixed methods for these studies. The first consisted of semi-structured interviews. There were one-to-one interviews with the youth and professional planners. Other interviews were held with key informants (bureaucrats, residents, youth workers, activists, police and security officers). For this group, the semi-structured interviews were carried out on a one-to-one basis, by telephone and through e-mail. In each case semi-structured interview schedules were used to initiate discussion and develop probing questions to the issues raised. Second, I conducted focus group discussions with the youth. The focus groups consisted of four to ten young people in various locations. Third, I observed the youth, planners and other key stakeholders (youth workers, activists, and the security apparatus) at work in their ‘natural’ settings. Despite the mixed methods the papers still constitute a coherent body. This is evident from the data overlaps in some papers.

As can be seen, this was a multi-actor qualitative research. This methodology, as indicated in all the papers allowed for valuable triangulation of events and processes which are key in the qualitative interpretative approach adopted for the research. Talking to both youth and professional planners helped illuminate issues from opposing perspectives, namely the people concerned with *ordering* urban space (planners) and those accused of *disordering* it (youth). This allowed me to go beyond numbers to understandings, interpretations and feelings from the standpoint of the stakeholders. Discussions with a multiplicity of other actors, besides youth and planners, ensured

further triangulation, explication and enrichment of the information. The information I obtained from bureaucrats, residents, businesspeople, youth workers, activists, police and security officers qualitatively strengthened the works and enabled me to go beyond the standpoint of the protagonists and incorporate the explanations, interpretations, meanings and perspectives of other interested and/or informed actors in the social, economic and political landscape of urban Zimbabwe. In contrast to the many technical reports that are concerned with getting statistical information by focusing on the present (through, for example measures of central tendency and dispersion) sometimes with a view to predicting the future, my work sought to understand what is going on and the meanings the actors attach to practices, events and processes in their lives. Since I scrutinise the point at which knowledge connects to action, the qualitative multi-actor approach helped me get a fuller picture without overlooking some of its subtle nuances.

There were some challenges in the research. The political and socio-economic turmoil in the country ensured that the ambitious project was not problem-free. To be sure, there were some positives. First, as a Zimbabwean citizen, I did not need an official research permit. Second, coming from the same culture as the people I studied, speaking the same language they do, and having worked with the youth before, I had access to and the trust of this suspicious and sometimes dangerous group. Thirdly, I had access to planners all over the country. I attended the same planning school as most of the senior planners in the public or private sector; some of the junior to middle-ranking planners had been my students. Fourthly, access to other actors, including the security services was not difficult. I had useful 'connections' in civil society, local and central government departments, as well as the state security and law enforcement apparatus. I knew a lot of my informants and could easily be introduced to others through my existing connections.

The challenges arose from the volatile political situation. While it was easy to talk to key informants and planners on a one-to-one basis in their offices or other venues, it was a challenge organising and conducting the focus group discussions (FGDs) with the youth. This is because Zimbabwe's notoriously draconian Public Order and Security Act (POSA)

restricts public gatherings of a 'political' nature (GoZ, 2002). I agreed with the police on the inadvisability of having ostensibly 'political meetings' in 'public places'² —'political meetings' and 'public places' being highly malleable terms in the state's enforcement of POSA. To avoid meetings in 'public places', I conducted the FGDs at private premises, courtesy of civil society organisations, householders and businesspeople. Subsequently, I did not have problems with the police or security agents who no doubt knew where I was and what I was up to. The political situation being volatile, there were days when it was dangerous to go out because of scuffles between the security forces and protestors. The effect of these did not go beyond the inconvenience of rearranging meetings and interviews. As noted in one of the papers (Paper V), there were times when a state security operative was present during some meetings that I was allowed to observe. As I argue in the paper, this appears not to have affected the proceedings, as things unflattering to the state were said and recorded (Paper V, page 92). Incidentally, through this operative, I secured one more 'connection' in the state security corridors.

HIGHLIGHT OF KEY FINDINGS

The papers bring to the fore salient issues in the opposing impulses of order and disorder in urban spaces. They particularly illuminate those moments when planning seeks "to connect [its] forms of knowledge with forms of action in the public domain" (Friedmann, 1993:482). My accomplishment in this is that not only do I expose the actions, reactions and strategies of the protagonists, but also I unravel the *rationalities* at work on the two sides. The papers go 'behind the scenes' into planning theory and further into social science theory and philosophy to frame and analyse the issues. They expose a collision of rationalities. On the one hand, planners unashamedly fetishize *instrumental* rationality, while on the other hand youth counter this by brazenly resorting to *strategic* rationality. I argue that the conflict in rationalities amounts to interacting in 'bad faith' and that this

² POSA aims to 'make provision for the maintenance of public order and security.' It requires four days' advance notice to the police for any public gathering, which is a public meeting 'held for the purpose of the discussion of matters of public interest or for the purpose of the expression of views on such matters.' It gives the police power to prohibit any public gathering they reasonably believe will result in public violence, to disperse such a gathering, and to cordon and search any area at any time (GOZ, 2002).

explains why the interaction between the two groups is 'poisoned' and has born no results despite efforts by the authorities to reach out through 'participatory' governance. I deploy the concept of *power* not as a thing possessed and exercised by the dominant groups over subordinate ones, but in the sense of Foucault's 'power analytics' (Foucault, 1998:82). Instead of attempting to say what power is, I probe into "how it operates in concrete...frameworks" (Deacon, 2002:91). As I have consistently shown in the papers, this conceptualisation helps explain why seemingly 'power-less' youth are able to throw spanners in the technocratic works of 'power-full' scientific planners. Based on this analysis, I suggest that in a way the dark side of planning is inevitable, especially where an authoritarian regime is obsessed with attaining modern cities, planners have lost patience with spatial unruliness, and the state becomes paranoid because people have turned against the ruling elites.

In my analysis of the resistance tactics of the beleaguered youth, I came up with the concept of '*resistance at the margins*' to describe the observed myriad of localised, sometimes individualised, tactics that youth used to 'defend' their precarious and illicit livelihoods against the dark side of planning that was bent on rehabilitating or eradicating informality. I noted that in contrast to full-frontal confrontation or extreme docility the youth had developed "forms of resistance that, without challenging the authority of an increasingly repressive state apparatus, minimized damage, while at the same time bringing some gains, albeit marginal" (Paper VII, page 67; cf. Scott, 1985: 299). This form of resistance entailed a proactive approach. It was an amalgam of several tactics. The tactics included negotiating with the authorities; building clientelistic relationships with key personalities; developing an alternative 'anti-technicist' discourse to challenge the state's techno-legal rationalisations of spatialised repression; and engaging in downright underhand dealings that included infiltration of central and local government agencies and departments. All of these tactics were geared towards securing marginal gains without overtly challenging the authority of the state or its planning system.

My other key finding is the unrelenting exposure of *planning as the state's spatial technology of domination*. Innovatively combining planning, space, power and spatialised repression, I show that planning does have a sinister dark side. I use the concept of 'technology' in the Foucauldian sense. It is akin to the early Greek word *techne* meaning an art, skill, trade, applied science. As shown in the papers, I conceptualise a spatial technology of domination as the *practice* of achieving the control and subjection of people through the production, mediation, and policing of space "under the banner of betterment, order or progress" (Cupers, 2005:737). I show that planning fits this label because a spatial technology of domination involves the arrangement of people and things in space in order to govern them through techniques such as surveillance, control and repression. Significantly, especially in the papers on OM/RO, I show that this technology of domination is made possible by the exercise of power, which itself produces and is in turn legitimated by officially approved discourses that constitute 'truth' or 'knowledge'. As far as I am aware, I am the only scholar to have accomplished this based on studies in the global South.

I am the first and so far the only scholar to have subjected OM/RO to a sustained and robust analysis using planning thought and practice as an analytical framework. This is significant because the state rationalised the operation in planning terms. As I argue in the two papers devoted to OM/RO (Papers III and VI) the state's rationalisations suggested that planning was the reason for OM/RO, that "planning is what made OM/RO necessary and possible" (Paper VI, page 917). In my work I subject the state's case to a rigorous and impartial analysis. After considering the evidence, I conclude that the positions and actions of all actors and institutions involved on each side of OM/RO are problematic. I show that the state's case was not as airtight as it made it appear. In addition to arguing that planners were cold-hearted, negligent spineless, and demonstrating that the planning system was a handmaiden of tyranny, I systematically expose how defective the oppositional discourse was. I explain that opponents of the state and its critics failed to detect fundamental flaws in the state's case, but instead resorted to defective arguments and misinterpretations of the important issues at stake. So far, mine

is the only rigorous academic critique of OM/RO from a planning perspective. It illuminate important issues in an historic event where analyses—including academic works—are often one-sided and/or patently politicised.

PART II: EVALUATING THE FIELD

THE DOMINANT TRADITIONS OF PLANNING THOUGHT IN THE PAPERS

In the papers I constantly reflect on the history of modern-day planning which spans a century and a half (Hall, 2002). It is from this long history that I take the conceptual and theoretical tools that I deploy in my work. I believe that digging into traditions of planning thought is a way of gaining useful insight into the historical context of contemporary planning thought and practice. It provides understandings of the socio-spatial and spatiotemporal contexts which shaped the emergence and development of “planning as a mode of thought” (Perry, 2003). It also unravels how planning evolved from a simplistic physicalist tradition based on “naïve environmental determinism” (Goudie, 2000:7) into a multifaceted field riddled with seemingly irresolvable debates, contested theories, and competing paradigms. The question then would be why I use western concepts in a non-western context such as Zimbabwe. What I am doing is not imposing foreign concepts, but testing them as they have been utilised by professionals. In the process, I inevitably frame my analysis using these concepts and theories. Below I provide a synopsis of the main traditions of planning thought that have been influential in my papers and the ideological, intellectual and epistemological challenges they have faced.

THE INFLUENCES

The Reformist and Design Traditions

The oldest tradition of planning is rooted in the reform movements that were spurred on by ‘planning’ problems that came with the Industrial Revolution and the attendant urbanisation. Accordingly, planning thought mirrors concern with the problems arising from unregulated urban growth (Levy, 2009:35). Among these problems were sanitation, housing quality, overcrowding, mobility, aesthetics, and public health. The nascent field of planning was highly normative. Its espousal of Semple’s doctrine of environmental determinism (Semple, 1911) was evident. This reduced planning to “essentially an exercise in [physical] planning and design” (Taylor, 1998:5). The idea was that all problems

associated with urban growth could be addressed by 'fixing' the built environment. As Klosterman (1978:38, emphasis added) points out, planning was "a rather naive form of environmental determinism [in which] planners assumed a professional responsibility for improving society through *changes in the physical environment*".

Unsurprisingly, this brand of planning was spearheaded by the established built environment professions such as engineering, architecture and public health (Webber, 1969). Despite the shortfalls of environmental determinism (Harvey, 1996; 2001), this approach did pinpoint some root causes of the appalling conditions in the burgeoning urban settlements of the industrialising western world. Its central problem, which was acutely reflected in planning education, lay in an obsession with utopian plans. As a result, analytical planning methods and social science theory were neglected (Klosterman, 1978).

The Planner as an Applied Scientist

This tradition has been influential in the last five decades. Its epistemological roots lie in positivism with its emphasis on the application of the methods of natural science to social phenomena. Reflecting this scientism, one of the most influential planning theorists of our time defined planning as "the application of scientific method—however crude—to policy-making" (Faludi, 1973:1). This was a widely shared perspective. This is reflected in John Friedmann's *Planning in the Public Domain* (1987)—one of the most influential planning books of all time—where he sees planning as a "a self-conscious application of scientific technique" to decision making (Friedmann, 1987:5). In this tradition planners are technocrats, "specialists, experts in mediating knowledge and action" (Friedmann, 1987:4).

In the post-war period, this technicist view of planning called for increased use of social science theories and models that employed the methods of the natural sciences. This was greatly helped by the quantitative and information technology revolutions which changed the face of planning. With the increased theoretical and methodological sophistication, planning has neglected its reformist heritage. There was an emphasis on separating facts

from values, with the latter being dismissed as irrational impediments to 'the scientific method'. In the 1960s and 1970s, there was an explosion of analytic techniques and social science theory that gave the planner the image of a "value-free means technician who collects and analyses factual data concerning the means for achieving public policy objectives but avoids the value questions of defining these objectives" (Klosterman, 1978:38).

According to this tradition, planners are technocrats. They should focus on procedures and processes, that is, the *means*. Politicians and others set the *ends*. As Friedmann (1987:4) stressed, the original idea was that "politicians...should concern themselves primarily with goals of policy ('values'), leaving the choice of the appropriate means ('facts') to specially trained experts." This gave the impression that planners knew "more of the situation...than their clients" (Chadwick, 1971:121), which, according to Allmendinger (2009:31) "inevitably led to a paternalistic and patronising idea of 'them' (the public) and us (the planners)."

The Influence of the Public Interest

The public interest has had a major effect on planning thought and practice. Early planners saw planning as a fourth power responsible for implementing the general interest. The public interest was "what man [*sic*] would choose if they saw clearly, thought rationally, [and] acted disinterestedly and benevolently" (Lippman, 1955:40). Planners felt that they alone possessed the special skills and unique training required to protect the collective best interest of the community. They "saw themselves protecting the public interest from the self-centred uninformed actions of politicians and private individuals" (Klosterman, 1978:38). In line with the scientism that had taken root, the public interest could be identified only through an informed, apolitical analysis. Through the combination of "technical analysis with the reasoned discussion of ethical issues the [public interest] criterion [would] help planners defend their inevitable ethical decisions on firm rational and empirical grounds" (Klosterman, 1980:323).

An “enduring question” in planning theory (Campbell and Fainstein, 2003:12), the public interest criterion, while still being defended by some scholars, has come under heavy criticism in planning, academia, policy analysis and practical politics. Critics view it with suspicion, because, among other things, it can be used to override the equally valid interests of others, it lacks empiricism and quantification, and there can be no unitary public interest that is universally applicable. Though it still has some adherents (Heywood, 1990) some of whom have tried to refine it (Alexander, 2002), in contemporary planning thought, the public interest is dismissed by others as “a vague criterion whose application cannot be rationally defended or empirically verified” (Klosterman, 1980:323).

THE CHALLENGES

The reformist, interventionist, scientific traditions of planning thought and their associated practices have met with some ideological, epistemological and intellectual challenges. I develop some of these challenges in my papers. The main ones are from (1) liberalism and globalisation and (2) post-positivism.

Liberalism, Neoliberalism and Globalisation

Planning’s predilection for intervention, control and regulation has put it on a collision course with liberalism and neoliberalism. Liberalism’s interpretation of individual freedom as “freedom from the state” (Dunleavy and O’Leary, 1987:5) and its rejection of any design or plan for society suggest that liberalism is hardly compatible with statutory planning, especially in the latter’s emphasis on public control over private property. As an ideology based on economic liberalism, neoliberalism is equally at odds with planning. Unsurprisingly, among the principal features of neoliberalism that have had a strong impact on planning theory and practice are deregulation and privatization. Also important have been neoliberalism’s preference for efficient government, the primacy of the market, and the reduction of public expenditure (Taylor, 1998; Allmendinger, 2009). Significantly, Hayek, one of the strongest defenders of classical liberalism who is

commonly viewed as being 'anti-planning', contends that "the more the state 'plans' the more difficult planning becomes for the individual" (Hayek, 1999:35).

Another challenge for planning has been economic globalisation, particularly the reduction and removal of barriers between national borders that facilitates the flow of goods, capital, services and labour. In cities across the world, the responses of planning to the forces of globalisation have been diverse. While some cities have "accommodated [globalisation] enthusiastically", others have "steered, moderated or even confronted [it]" (Newman and Thornley, 2005: 1). Because cities and regions have to be competitive at a global scale, controls and regulations such as those that characterize planning are seen as retrogressive since they erode the advantage of a place, making it less attractive to mobile international capital.

Planning in the traditional sense of "public control over private property" (Levy, 2009:44)—pejoratively caricatured by Hayek (1999:39) as "the enthusiasm for 'organization' of everything"—does not sit very well with neoliberalism and its form of economic globalisation. Among neoliberal conservatives, planning has been accused of preventing or delaying economic development by frustrating private investors. In the 1980s, this perception resulted in planning being marginalised in some strongly neoliberal conservative political systems such as Thatcherite Britain (Thornley, 1993). The seeming assault on planning continues with attempts to restructure it so that it can work with the market by helping, not hindering, the promotion of competitiveness, profitability, efficiency and growth. This it can accomplish by being enabling, speedy and cost-effective.

By their nature, convictions and demands liberalism, neoliberalism and globalisation have profound effects on planning. The precise effects are mediated by the dominant politics and ideologies within which planning operates. Broadly, planning may be undermined and/or it may be reconfigured as happened in Thatcherite Britain.

Post-Positivism

Post-positivism emphasises the social and political context of theories. It challenges the positivist assertion that knowledge should be based on universal foundations. It rejects “a positivist epistemology that privileges scientific and technical knowledge over an array of equally important alternatives” (Sandercock, 1998:5). Allmendinger (2002; 2009) claims that planning has turned towards post-positivism. There is some substance in this assertion. The problem of separating facts from values, as prescribed by the scientific method of positivism, has precipitated a search for alternative approaches that seek not to suppress values, but to recognise and expose them.

Unsurprisingly, features of post-positivism have found their way into planning thought. They include (Allmendinger, 2009:33): a rejection of positivist understandings and methodologies; the embracing of approaches that contextualise theories and disciplines in larger social and historical contexts; the development of normative criteria for deciding between competing theories; the ubiquity of variance in explanations and theories; an understanding of individuals as self-interpreting, autonomous subjects. In urban planning, post-positivism sits very well with those who believe that we are now experiencing what Dear (2000) has labelled “the postmodern urban condition” (cf. Harvey, 1989). In planning scholarship, Leonie Sandercock and Jean Hillier must rank among the most incisive and insightful—if not controversial—of the lot (Sandercock, 2003; Hillier 2007).

THE CONTESTED TERRAIN OF PLANNING THEORY

In this section I provide an overview of contemporary planning theory. This will shed light on the analytical frameworks I have used in the papers. It helps show where I am 'coming from' and explicates the major debates that I have either engaged with and/or deployed in the seven papers. This is important because, as explained in Part I, at the heart of the papers is a scrutiny of those moments when the planning system seeks "to connect [its] forms of knowledge with forms of action in the public domain" (Friedmann, 1993:482). This consolidated overview puts these 'forms of knowledge' in context by highlighting the theories, critiques and debates. I also highlight what I perceive to be 'holes' that I have tried to 'plug'.

CONTESTED TYPOLOGY

Planning thought is riddled with debates. The debates start right from questions about typology. There is no consensus on a suitable typology for planning theory. Faludi's distinction of planning theory into procedural and substantive theory (Faludi, 1973) still has some influence mainly because of its simplicity. There have been rival typologies from Taylor (1980), Cooke (1983), Yiftachel (1989) Fainstein (2000) and Allmendinger (2009). Disagreement on basic issues like typology has predictably spilled onto the actual theory. Be that as it may, it can be argued that most planning theories have concentrated on the *process* of planning. However, while still being concerned about the *how* of planning, quite a few of the contemporary theories and critiques draw heavily from interdisciplinary knowledge (Allmendinger, 2009:35).

THE NATURE, FOCUS AND PROCESSES OF PLANNING

About a century since planning became an organized profession, the most common planning intervention strategies the world over are those that have a 'physicalist' character (Taylor, 1998:6). This is in keeping with the classical definition of town planning as "the art and science of ordering the use of land and the character and siting of building and communicative roots" (Keeble, 1952:1). Foley (1960:216) explained that the thrust of this main task of planning was "to reconcile competing claims for the use of

limited land so as to provide a consistent, balanced and orderly arrangement of land uses." About half-a century later, this mandate has hardly changed (Miles, 2008:321).

As noted above, this most traditional of the purposes of planning is rooted in physical or environmental determinism, which is based on the thesis that "the physical form of the urban environment could *determine* the quality of social or economic life' (Taylor, 1998:7, emphasis in original). So strong is this thesis that it has found expression in land use, building and public health statutes and regulations all over the world. Early planners felt strongly about this physical character of planning that they sought to single it out as *the* identifying mark of planning. Thus, Keeble (1952:1) boldly stated that planning "deals primarily with land, and is not economic, social or political planning..."

Physical planning was based on the "scientific method of empiricism" (Sandercock, 1998:59), the driving force behind the rational process view of planning that dominated planning theory in the 1960s and 1970s. This synoptic model of decision-making found expression in the rational comprehensive planning model. The model and its variants (disjointed incrementalism, bounded rationality, and mixed scanning) "share a faith in instrumental rationality" (Sandercock, 1998:87). Untainted by politics and buoyed by scientific reason, this model of planning was seen as giving planners the ability to "discern and implement the public interest" (Sandercock, 1998:88). This mode of planning got a serious challenge from the advocacy planning model (Davidoff, 1965) which explicitly recognised planning under pluralism as a political process and sought to promote adversarial processes in planning. Further challenges came in the late 1970s and 1980s, when Marxist and critical theory unsettled planning's role in the capitalist system (Low, 1991). However, notwithstanding pronouncements about its demise (Innes, 1995; Harris, 2002), the rational process view of planning "still has a stranglehold on the way contemporary planning is approached" (Allmendinger, 2009).

However, in some parts of the world, planning has been experiencing seismic shifts. First, its scope has broadened from simplistic physical planning to more complex spatial planning. In western democracies, particularly in the European Union, the narrow

physicalist notion of planning has been replaced by the broader concept of *spatial planning*, which, according to CEMAT (1983:13) “gives geographical expression to the economic, social, cultural and ecological policies of society.” Second, fierce debates on “planning styles” (Innes and Gruber, 2005) have destabilised the technicist and instrumentalist rational comprehensive model that has for long been *the* planning paradigm. Some scholars have proclaimed a paradigm shift (Innes, 1995; Healey, 1992). ‘Communicative’ or ‘collaborative’ planning, which consists of several strands partly rooted in Habermasian communicative theory (Habermas, 1984; 1985) and deliberative democracy (Dryzek, 2002), has for some scholars, become *the* planning paradigm (Allmendinger and Tewdwr-Jones, 2002; Harris, 2005; Sager 1993; Healey, 2005). Notably, Healey, a key proponent of collaborative planning, has proposed new relational and institutionalist approaches to policy analysis and planning that take into account urban complexity and recognise the importance of spatial strategies for quality of life, distributive justice, environmental well-being and economic vitality (Healey, 2006).

The ascendancy of communicative planning theory has been contested by others who argue that it is not better than rational comprehensive planning, especially in its insistence on consensus and its uncritical treatment of power and dominance (Yiftachel and Huxley, 2000; Huxley and Yiftachel, 2000; Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002; Hillier 2003). Particularly powerful in this respect is the Foucauldian critique of the ‘new paradigm’ (Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002; Fischler, 2000).

While not explicitly criticising the communicative model, some planning scholars, notably Sandercock (1998; 2003), have developed a more radical approach to planning, a form of ‘insurgent planning’ that counters and destabilises existing hegemonic ways of making and managing places (Holston, 1999; see Amin and Thrift, 2002). More than any other, Sandercock has analysed and dissected planning in the context of difference, particularly multiculturalism. She proposes a “radical post-modern planning practice” (Sandercock, 2003:34) that can bring about “a truly democratic pluralistic city” (Bäcklund, 1998) that appreciates and accommodates difference. This cannot be achieved by the

failed planning project that upholds “modernist notions of technical rationality providing order, coherence, regulation [and] homogeneity” (Sandercock, 1998:4). Significantly, while talking about “the difference that theory makes” (Sandercock, 1998:85), Sandercock also appeals to “the theory that difference makes” (Sandercock, 1998:108).

The question of power has led some leading planning theorists to propose the concept of *phronesis* (‘practical wisdom’ or ‘prudence’) into planning. This emphasis on practical judgment in planning has been advocated by, among others, Flyvbjerg (2004) and Hillier (2002a). Using the work of Machiavelli, Nietzsche, and Foucault, “who have all written canonical texts on power” (Flyvbjerg, 2004:284), as a point of departure, Flyvbjerg deploys *phronesis* to develop “*phronetic* planning research”, a theoretical and methodological device in research in planning and social science in general (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Hillier (2002:14) combines prudence with Bourdieu’s concept of habitus to make a plea for connecting “technical knowledge and practical wisdom” in order to “imbue planning practice with opportunities for leverage in engaging the power of other actors”. Despite its practical appeal, *phronesis* has never really carved a niche in contemporary debates in planning.

Still on the search for practical planning theory, John Forester, one of the most cited planning scholars, and the first to systematically discuss power in planning practice (Forester 1989) has developed a brand of Habermasian-inspired planning that he prefers to label ‘critical pragmatism’ (Forester, 1993). He has complemented the efforts of Hoch (1984; 1996; 2002) “the foremost advocate and interpreter of pragmatic ideas and planning” (Allmendinger, 2009:135), in developing a practical planning theory that is concerned with ‘getting things done’. Hoch himself has recently come up with an interesting ‘pragmatic communicative action theory’ that combines “structural and intentional concepts to revise and integrate the apparent antagonism between comprehensiveness and compromise for planning practice” (Hoch 2007:272). If fully developed, this could provide “a useful and critical theory for planning practice that remains open to future challenge and debate” (Hoch 2007:272). However, Hoch’s cursory

and insufficient treatment of power leaves him susceptible to criticism from scholars who have undertaken a more critical analysis of power based principally on Foucault's 'power analytics' (Foucault, 1995; 1998; Hillier, 2002a; Flyvbjerg, 1998; Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002). Nowhere is this more vividly accomplished than in Flyvbjerg's seminal *Rationality and Power* (1998).

In the search for the 'perfect' planning theory, some scholars have deployed various theories from key thinkers of the 20th century including Foucault, Deleuze and Lacan, to persistently question communicative planning as the 'ascending' paradigm. Unsurprisingly, Foucauldian concepts have been used widely by scholars grappling with the problems of power, governmentality and knowledge (Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002; Hillier, 2002a; Huxley, 2002). Hillier and Gunder have used a Lacanian framework to understand and explain aspects of planning (Gunder and Moat, 2002; Hillier 2002b; Hillier and Gunder, 2003; Gunder 2005). They usefully remind us of the role of some key planning concepts, including planning itself, as empty signifiers (Gunder, 2006; Gunder and Hillier, 2009). Hillier has developed a detailed—if not complicated—post-structuralist planning theory based mainly on the thinking of Deleuze and Guattari (Hillier, 2007). She passionately argues for the need for dynamic, relational approaches in planning and innovatively develops concepts such as transcendence, immanence and 'becoming' in planning (Hillier 2005; 2007).

Some scholars have gone beyond the progressive pretensions of planning to expose its 'dark side' (Yiftachel, 1998; Allmendinger and Gunder, 2005) which has been manipulated to serve the interest of dominant sections of society through social control and repression. They directly link planning to the dark side of modernism (Yiftachel, 2002). This not-so-progressive side helps explain the role of planning in spatialised repression, usually characterised, by among other features, eviction, demolition, displacement, and dislocations through, for example, megaprojects, urban renewal and gentrification (Fried, 2000; Anderson and Lee, 2005; Partridge, 1989).

In western democracies, the seismic shifts in planning thought have resulted in planning practice becoming more diversified in methods, democratic in approach, and broader in scope. Planning's image of a technical, apolitical activity—untainted by values—has lost credence. So has its claim that its primary concern is with protecting *the* public interest. Having been thus 'exposed', destabilised and challenged by competing perspectives, planning is now widely accepted as a value-laden, historically situated, deeply political, and inherently interested practice. What this has resulted in is a deeply contested terrain of planning theory. Notwithstanding assertions by its adherents that communicative planning is the new planning paradigm, alternative theories and frameworks keep cropping up to suit specific situations and contexts and address identified weaknesses in existing theories and frameworks. To emphasise this multiplicity and diversity Healey (2000:918) sees the "the project of planning theory" as being

to provide conceptual resources for political communities concerned with the quality of life and environment in places...to help in imagining futures, imagining how to move from here to there, and imagining how to evaluate and critique what is going on.

Needless to say, planning is now barely recognisable from its formative years as a reformist ideal and its glory days as a purely scientific practice.

SOME PROBLEMS WITH CONTEMPORARY PLANNING THEORY

Planning theory is now a lot richer and more informed than it was as late as the 1980s. However, it is still incomplete. Two of the problems that I grapple with in my papers are the lack of emphasis on space and planning as a spatial technology of domination and the scanty attention given to planning in global South.

UNDEREMPHASIZED: SPACE AND PLANNING AS A SPATIAL TECHNOLOGY OF DOMINATION

Space has been proclaimed as "the everywhere of modern thought" that has become a representational strategy in all disciplines (Crang and Thrift, 2000a:1). From its beginnings, planning has had space as its object. It is not surprising that some leading scholars have defined planning as "the public production of space" (Yiftachel and Huxley, 2000:907) and "making space" (Perry, 2003:151). Planning provides "systems for regulating

and promoting particular patterns of space organization” (2000:917). Planning is thus a spatial technology of the state (Pile 1997:3). However, in planning theory the critical treatment of space is conspicuous by its absence. It seems, just as Lefebvre (1991) complained, planners, like the capitalist mode of production they are accused of serving (Scott and Rowles, 1977; Dear and Scott, 1981) by what Low (1991) terms ‘dissenting theory’, treat space as an ahistorical container in which human activities take place (Janzen, 2002).

Despite the “reassertion of the significance of space in social thought” (Dear, 2000:2; Soja 1989) precipitated by the putative ‘spatial turn’ making its way across the social sciences (Thrift, 2006:139; Gieryn, 2000), in contemporary planning thought, space largely still features as “a milieu, ...a kind of neutral setting” (Molotch, 1993:888), “a practico-inert container of action” (Crang and Thrift, 2000a:2) in which the practice of planning transpires. Planning has not moved away from the Kantian perspective on space as an absolute category (Crang and Thrift, 2000a). This accounts for planners’ much-maligned “representations of space” (Lefebvre, 1991:38–39), which is “the dominant space in society and is a conceptualised space constructed out of symbols, codifications and abstract representations” (Watkins, 2005:209). As I have often argued (Papers IV and VII), the resultant “conceived space” (Lefebvre, 1991:361) of technocrats puts it on a collision course with “representational spaces”, the “directly lived...space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’” (Lefebvre, 1991:39).

Among planning scholars, Patsy Healey, more than anybody else, has brought out the centrality of *place* in planning in the United Kingdom in particular and in the European Union in general (Healey, 2005; 2006). However, her treatment of place lacks a critical flavour. Consequently, she does not fully engage with some important and groundbreaking studies of space, particularly those in critical theory and ‘post-structuralist geographies’ (Doel, 1999; Murdoch, 2005). Edward Soja, an urban planner better known as a postmodern political geographer has made a strong case for the centrality of space, but his work has not been in sources normally used by planners (Soja,

1989; 1996; 2000). To find critical analyses of space, planning scholars have to look into human and cultural geography, sociology and social theory where ideas of key critical thinkers on space and spatiality (see Crang and Thrift, 2000b) such as Michel Foucault, Michel de Certeau, Henri Lefebvre, David Harvey, Edward Soja and Doreen Massey are deployed to critically theorise and conceptualise space and spatiality in ways that could be useful for planning thought and practice. Consequently, contemporary planning theory, for all its extensive, innovative, and helpful appropriation of social theory and philosophy, has not systematically integrated space, spatiality and spatial practices into planning thought. As a result in contemporary planning thought, planning is not treated as a spatial technology of domination (Pile, 1997:3; Paper VII). As I will show below, this is one area where I have made a contribution to planning research, theory and practice.

UNDER-RESEARCHED AND UNDER-REPRESENTED: PLANNING IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH

Most of the influential planning scholars have concentrated their studies and commentaries in developed countries. Little wonder, by far the majority of the work in planning is concerned with planning thought, research and practice in western democracies. Accordingly, in contemporary planning debates very little space is devoted to planning in the global South. As regards SSA, most of the contribution revolves around the commendable work of a few scholars. The most notable are South African scholars with Vanessa Watson leading the way. Others include Philip Harrison, Mark Oranje, Alan Mabin, Alison Todes and Edgar Pieterse. Vanessa Watson must rank as the leading light of the pack. She has published important works on South Africa (Watson, 2002; 2003, Harrison et al, 2008) and the global South (Watson, 2009) on important issues in planning theory and practice. In the process she has come up with concepts such as 'conflicting rationalities' (Watson 2003) and 'deep difference' (Watson, 2007; Diaw et al, 2002) some of which have found their way into the work of influential planning scholars such as Jean Hillier (2007) and Philip Allmendinger (2009). Outside South Africa, there is very little going on, except in Tanzania in the work of Nnkya (2008; Diaw et al, 2002) and

Zimbabwe where I have done most of my work.³ It is hardly an exaggeration to claim that planning in SSA is generally under-researched and under-theorised. This is another area where I consider myself as having made a contribution.

CONCLUSION

The preceding summary shows a planning as a practice that has its genesis as a noble crusade against the vagaries of industrialisation and urbanisation. We see an activity that began as a progressive movement with the mandate to improve lives and blossomed into a technicist profession. In over a century of its existence, modern planning has grown from a simplistic tradition of environmental determinism with consensus around its purpose and methods to one that is riddled with controversy from without and disagreement from within. From a profession that snuggled comfortably with reformism and the interventionism of the western welfarist state, planning has grown to an evangelical and bureaucratic activity that has collided head-on with neoliberalism and its economic brand of globalisation.

In the process, planning has grown in sophistication (confusion?). It is no longer identified by its progressive or scientific pretensions. It is barely recognisable from the profession that was inspired solely by the positivist epistemology and the philosophy of science and openly idolised the scientific method. Planning now unashamedly feeds on social science theory, heavily deploys social science philosophy and routinely invokes some of the most influential classical and modern thinkers. Significantly, there is no consensus on a single dominant theoretical philosophical, methodological, and epistemological strand. There is no universally recognised planning paradigm. This, perhaps, sits well with 'planning in postmodern times' (Allmendinger, 2002) in which a palpable incredulity of metanarratives leads to an espousal of diversity and difference (Sandercock, 2003).

³ Outside planning thought and practice, there are some important works in urban studies that occasionally discuss planning issues in SSA. Notable among these are works by, among others, Carole Rakodi, Deborah Potts, Ann Schlyter, Clement Leduka, Jo Beal, Graham Tipple, AbdouMaliq Simone, Ilda Lindell, Yonn Dierwechter and Sue Parnell.

PART III: CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND SCHOLARSHIP

PART III: CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND SCHOLARSHIP

OVERVIEW OF THE PAPERS

THE JOURNALS

All the papers were published in international peer reviewed journals. Three of the journals (*International Development Planning Review*; *Planning Theory and Practice*; and *International Planning Studies*) are specialist planning journals. This is where some of the latest planning scholarship makes its debut. *Urban Studies* has been consistently among the highest ISI-ranked journals in urban studies and environmental studies. It has published prominent and influential scholars in the field, including Erik Swyngedouw, David Clark, John Punter and Peter Newman. The top ISI-ranked *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* is a leader in geography, urban studies and planning and development. It has published some of the world's prominent planning scholars including Patsy Healey, John Friedmann, and Oren Yiftachel. *Africa Insight* is a peer reviewed multidisciplinary journal. It is among the leading journals for scholarship on SSA. *Geoforum* is a leading ISI-ranked geography journal. Among the top scholars to have published in *Geoforum* are Eugene McCann, Robert Potter and Deborah Potts. The papers will be referred to by their 'Paper IDs' as shown on page v.

DEVELOPING THE THEME

As noted in Part 1, the theme running through the papers can be crudely summarised as 'planning, space and power'. I logically develop this in five related tasks spread across the seven papers.

1. Theorising and conceptualising planning.
2. Engaging with and deploying key concepts in contemporary planning thought.
3. Unravelling the rationalities, attitude and behaviour of planners.
4. Analysing the response of planning systems to spatial impropriety.
5. Unravelling the rationalities and resistance tactics of youth to spatialised repression.

THEORIZING AND CONCEPTUALISING PLANNING

Each of the papers contains substantial sections which grapple with contemporary debates in planning thought. Each of the papers wades into the debates, not merely to summarise but to critique and apply. Running through the papers is the theme that, in contrast to a putative 'paradigm shift' and enrichment of theory and the democratisation of planning practice in western democracies, planning in SSA is still a modernist project that still clings to the rational comprehensive model. Paper IV provides a tour de force of planning thought. It critically surveys and contextualises planning theory, exposes planning as a modernist project, and applies this to SSA in general and Zimbabwe in particular. I conclude that in parts of Africa, "modernist planning, characterised by bottom-up approaches, an attempt at comprehensiveness, rational decision-making and technical instrumentalism, still dominates planning practice" (Paper IV, page 1722). Paper V takes on communicative planning theory, widely accepted as the new planning paradigm. While acknowledging its efficacy in pluralist democracies, I doubt its application in authoritarian systems, where, as the study shows planners refuse to accept "planning as a political practice" (Low, 1991:1). I show that, finding refuge in instrumental rationality, planners still try to maintain a safe distance from politics and values. Based on my research I aver that "sovereign power, based on the authority of central government...legitimizes, upholds, and sustains the instrumental rationalism cherished by planners" (Paper V, page 100). This point is vividly demonstrated by planners at work in Papers I and II. My contribution to scholarship lies, first, in adding a global South perspective to contemporary thought, and second, in providing an empirically based critique to current planning thought.

ENGAGING WITH AND DEPLOYING KEY CONCEPTS

In the papers, I engage with key concepts in planning thought and practice. Going beyond acknowledgment, description and appreciation, I have cautiously deployed these concepts in my work in the contested urban spaces of Zimbabwe. But, as I will show, I have not done so uncritically. There are some planning concepts that I have been highly critical of, simply because, as my research has demonstrated, they cannot work in the

systems of authoritarian governance that I have worked in. Traditional conceptions of power, participation and participatory governance are some of the concepts I have taken to task. My contribution here can be summarised as: *testing the efficacy of Western concepts in non-Western contexts*.

To this end, I have extensively engaged with concepts and ideals developed in and for Western pluralist democracies (Healey, 1997:222) and used them to frame my analysis of planning, cities, space and power in Zimbabwe's authoritarian governance system. I have described this system as an "authoritarian or 'guided democracy'" (Paper V, page 9), which is basically "a tyranny of the elite [that] borders on authoritarianism [leaving] the governed with only limited control over the government" (Pinkney, 2003:11–12). Below I discuss the concepts that I have engaged with. I will show how, in each of the papers, I deploy these key concepts to scrutinise, explain, understand, and interpret planning practice in SSA.

Participation and Participatory Planning

In Paper I, I critique 'community (or public) participation', one of the most enduring ideals in planning (Arnstein, 1969). I expose it as a monumental deception in spatial planning, hence the term 'participatory farce'. I demonstrate how this pointless 'participation' is in stark contrast to the prescriptions of radical and communicative planning which "encompass debate and argument" (Taylor, 1998:123), as the basis for a new 'inclusionary politics' of planning (Sandercock, 1998:174; Healey, 1997). In Paper V, I critique communicative planning—generally seen as being more inclusive, participatory and democratic—again doubting its efficacy in the contexts I have worked in.

Power

The other key concept that I grapple with is *power*. As Flyvbjerg and Richardson (2002:44) point out "power [is] the acid test of planning theory". It is when using power as a framework of analysis that I explicitly engage with Foucault's 'power analytics' (Foucault, 1995). In Papers IV and V, I deploy Foucault's analytics because of my dissatisfaction with the treatment of power in mainstream planning theory which uses understandings of

power based on some contemporary thinkers. I argue and demonstrate that Foucault's analytics probes deeper into the workings of power than Weber's and Dahl's views of 'power over' someone (Weber, 1978:53; Dahl, 1957:201), or Giddens' conception of power as "the capability to 'make a difference'" (Giddens, 1984:14), all of which reduce power to a mere "generalized capacity to act" (Hindess, 1996:1).

Governance

Governance is another key concept that I deploy as an analytical framework, mostly in Papers II and V. Planning scholars, especially Patsy Healey and Judith Innes have brought to our attention the centrality of governance, especially, the governance of place (Healey, 1997; Innes and Booher, 1999) to planning. In Paper V, I frame governance as a relational concept, and use this to study one city's governance outreach programme. I link this to the wider debates on planning theory and power. After empirically observing planners at work, I conclude that "the contribution of planners to participatory governance is problematic because it requires planners to act in ways that conflict with their preferred role as technical experts" (Paper V, page 101). In Papers I and II, I reach the same conclusion after studying the interaction between planners and youth in the making and managing of urban places.

Rationality

My attempt to understand behaviours and attitudes in planning practice is the reasons behind my peering into *rationality*, another contentious concept in planning. My analyses and conclusions in Papers II and V supplement Vanessa Watson's discussion on conflicting rationalities (Watson, 2003) in South Africa. In Paper II, I go further than Watson in explicitly using rationality as an analytical concept in studying the encounters between planners and marginalised groups. I conclude that whereas planners resorted to instrumental rationality, the youth resorted to strategic rationality to get their way, a conclusion that is also reached and amplified in Paper V. In these studies I invoke Foucault and Habermas. My research complements a useful analysis of rationalities in the

'post-communicative practice' by Alexander (2001), one of the most cited planning scholars.

The 'Dark Side' of Planning

In studying planning in the global South, I have found myself taking the '*dark side*' of planning seriously. The dark side of planning looks at the sinister side of planning which is manifested in spatialised repression and social control. This other side of planning, which is characteristic of "authoritarian high modernism" (Scott, 1998:125) has been exposed and deployed extensively by Yiftachel (1998; 2002), and Flyvbjerg and Richardson (2002); it has also been rigorously unpacked by Allmendinger and Gunder (2005). In my work, the dark side of planning features in Papers III, IV and VI. In Paper IV, I explore this sinister side of planning as Zimbabwe's planning system sets out to stamp out spatial unruliness by mobilising and unleashing the state's repressive apparatus. As I show in these writings (Papers I, IV, V, and VII), the high point of dark side was the world (in)famous OM/RO. My contribution in this respect lies in the fact that so far I am the only one to have subjected OM/RO to scholarly, rigorous and critical analyses from a planning perspective by assessing the role and complicity of the planning system (Paper VI) as well as the attitude and behaviour of planners (Paper III).

Resistance

In Paper VII, I deploy the concept of *resistance* to empirically study the response of marginalised groups to the 'dark side' of planning. I had previously alluded to *resistance* in Papers I, IV and V, but it is in Paper VII that I explicitly use the concept as a framework of analysis. Based on the same research as the Paper IV, Paper VII reveals resistance as the flip side of spatialised repression. I frame repression as an expression of what Sharp et al (2000:2, 3) term "dominating power", which is "that power which attempts to control or coerce others, impose its will upon others, or manipulate the consent of others". I dig deep into critical and post-structuralist geography and social theory. I bring into planning scholarship a critical analysis of a phenomenon that is given only cursory attention in mainstream planning analysis in western democracies which do not experience the 'dark

side' of planning in its extreme and violent forms. In the process I also bring attention to important texts such as Pile and Keith (1997), Sharp et al (2000), and Allen (2003).

SPACE, PLACE AND PLANNING AS A SPATIAL TECHNOLOGY OF THE STATE

As noted above, despite the importance of space to planning, space has not had centre stage in planning thought. It seems to appear and disappear at the fringes without serious integration into planning thought. Interestingly, space and place feature prominently in one of the world's most established professional planning bodies. The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) proclaims its mandate as "Mediating Space — Creating Place" (RTPI, 2001). According to the RTPI (2001:2) "planning involves twin activities: the management of the competing uses for space; and the making of places that are valued and have identity." In recognition of the importance of space to planning, I have made it a key theme in my work. Finding little critical engagement with space in the core planning literature, I have had to forage in cognate disciplines for deeper conceptual and theoretical understandings. In all my papers I have used work on space by key spatial thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Michel de Certeau and Henri Lefebvre. I have engaged with the work of scholars who have deployed critical theory to the analysis of space and cities. They include David Harvey, Nigel Thrift, Phil Hubbard, John Rennie Short, Tim Cresswell, Edward Soja and Doreen Massey.

It is in this light that I have consistently used the concept of *contested spaces* in my analysis of planning in urban Zimbabwe. I have shown how the contestation arises as "different social groups endow space with amalgams of different meanings, uses and values" (Routledge, 1997:70). I have examined the protagonists in these contestations: the state and marginalised groups, mainly unemployed youth. Paper I analyses how planners engage youth in tokenistic participation to inscribe their order on urban space. Paper IV brings the contest to the fore as the state invokes its authority and dominating power to uphold its own spatial order and resorts to brute force to 'restore' that order when it is subverted by the youth. Paper VII shows how, having subverted the urban orders and become targets of spatialised repression, youth engage in various forms of resistance to

defend their illicit livelihoods. Taking the contestation as a point of departure, Papers III and VI assess the attitude of planners and the complicity of planning systems 'in the service of tyranny' in what should count as one of the most extreme forms of spatialised repression in modern times when the state violently reclaimed the contested spaces.

As can be seen, I have engaged with spatial concepts from outside planning, deployed them in understanding planners and planning, and brought the resultant product into mainstream planning thought through my publications in top planning and urban studies journals. As regards space, place and planning as a spatial technology, my contribution to the field are threefold. First, in my work, relevant 'foreign' concepts are critically engaged with through the lenses of planning thought and practice; second, they are spiced with extensive reference to core planning texts; and thirdly, they are applied in the study of spatial practices in the global South. In a way, this makes my contribution unique.

UNRAVELLING PLANNERS' RATIONALITIES, PRACTICES, ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOUR

Papers II and IV are based on studies of planners in action. I examine the planners' rationalities in their interaction with marginalised groups (in this case, formally unemployed youth). In both papers I note the reliance of planners on the rational comprehensive model with its insistence on instrumental rationalism. It is in this regard that I conclude that "it is pointless for technical experts to interact with the public when the attitude, means, behaviour and style of the participants all betray their lack of belief in a participatory framework" (paper V, page 101). This attitude of planners is similar to that of planners in the West, where "Enlightenment faith in progress through scientific and technical reason" (Sandercock, 1998:22) still holds sway. I however, proffer another explanation for this in the global South: that in a situation where they can still be held accountable, technical experts feel safe in the familiar and are averse to dabbling with the unknown, especially where collective responsibility is not clearly spelt out. This understanding and interpretation of instrumental rationality as not being solely motivated by instrumental reasons forms part of my contribution to the understanding of current planning practice in the global South.

ANALYSING THE RESPONSE OF PLANNING TO SPATIAL IMPROPRIETY

In some of the papers, I have shed light on what exactly happens when the state's spatial orders are contested and subverted by informality. I link this to the dark side of planning. I demonstrate that "from the repressive to the paternalistic, [state] responses [through planning] bespeak the conviction that informality is something planned modern African cities cannot live with" (Paper IV, page 1723). In Paper IV, I analyse determined attempts by the state, through the planning system, to forcibly eradicate deleterious (mis)appropriation and (mis)use of urban spaces by youth. I reveal how planning ropes in militarised aspects of the state to stamp out spatial unruliness. This adds to our understanding of planning in the global South, which is different from western democracies that have legal and democratic means of resolving spatial contestations. As noted above, the high point of this spatialised repression where "the planned city sweeps the poor away" (Watson, 2009), with modernist planning playing the lead role, is Zimbabwe's 2005 urban cleansing campaign.

UNRAVELLING THE RESISTANCE TACTICS OF MARGINALISED GROUPS

Unlike mainstream planning theory, I also closely study some spatial tactics of marginalised people who are deemed to be in violation of spatial planning statutes and regulations. Thus, I bring into planning, perspectives that are deployed in social theory and the social sciences. Taking as a point of departure Foucault's power/resistance couplet (Foucault, 1998) my work resonates with Michel de Certeau's revelation that in the face of strategies of dominating power, marginalised and excluded groups have developed their own tactics, "innumerable ways of playing and foiling the [authorities'] game" (De Certeau, 2005:18). I shed light on how planning as a totalizing project cannot be a *totalization* (Amin and Thrift, 2002:108). In Paper VII, I show how youth have made other geographies possible by adopting tactics that have enabled them to "occupy, deploy and create alternative spatialities from those defined through [planning]" (Pile, 1997:3). The other contribution I make is by critically examining specific modes of resistance to planning's dark side. I identify three modes: 'docility', 'fighting fire with fire', and 'resistance at the margins'. I feel that given time, this paper will make a mark in planning

studies because it examines the agency of groups that planning, as the prime spatial technology of domination (Pile, 1997:3), has identified as the '*dangerous Other*' (Hammar, 2001:566) whose harmful spatial practices stand in the way of the planned city and should therefore be eradicated.

CONCLUSION

If I were to summarise my work and its contribution to planning thought and practice, I would mention three key points. Firstly, the papers show a bold and critical engagement with current planning thought and practice in SSA under an authoritarian system of governance. This region is under-represented in planning scholarship. Small wonder that there is very little going on by way of research and publication in planning in this part of the world. Consequently, SSA does not feature prominently in contemporary planning debates. By researching in this region and disseminating my findings in top international journals, I have contributed different perspectives, insight and experiences to planning scholarship, which is dominated by research and publications that are fixated with western pluralist democracies.

Secondly, the papers demonstrate my keen awareness of and competence in handling essential concepts and contemporary themes in planning thought and practice. The papers show me, not only critically engaging central concepts such as governance, rationality and power, but also innovatively deploying them in non-western contexts. My contribution in this respect is a rigorous critique of key concepts from a 'global South' perspective.

Thirdly, the papers demonstrate how I have transgressed disciplinary boundaries to gain insight and at the same time use this insight to illuminate discussion of important planning issues. I have veered off into cognate disciplines and beyond to bring into planning thought relevant understandings and concepts that are not afforded serious treatment in mainstream planning literature. The fact that I have used the insight gained

from these forages to understand and explain planning issues in an under-researched part of the world, stands as testimony to my contribution to current scholarship.

REFERENCES

Abowitz, K.K. (2000) A pragmatic revisioning of resistance theory. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(4): 877-907.

Aggleton, P.J. and G. Whitty (1985) Rebels without a cause? Socialization and subcultural style among the children of the new middle classes. *Sociology of Education*, 58(1): 60-72.

Alexander, E.R. (2001) The planner-prince: interdependence, rationalities and post-communicative practice. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 2(3): 311-324.

Alexander, E.R. (2002) The public interest in planning: from legitimation to substantive plan evaluation. *Planning Theory* 2002 1(3): 226-249.

Allen, J. (2003) *Lost geographies of power*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning in postmodern times*. London: Routledge.

Allmendinger, P. (2002) The post-positivist landscape of planning theory. In P. Allmendinger and M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds) *Planning futures: new directions for planning theory*, pp. 3-17. London: Routledge.

Allmendinger, P. (2009) *Planning theory* (Second edition). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Allmendinger, P. and M. Gunder, (2005) Applying Lacanian insight and a dash of Derridean deconstruction to planning's 'dark side'. *Planning Theory*, (4)1: 87-112.

Allmendinger, P. and M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds) (2002) *Planning futures: new directions for planning theory*. London: Routledge.

Amin, A. and N. Thrift (2002) *Cities: reimagining the urban*. Cambridge: Polity.

Anderson, W.W. and R.G. Lee (2005) Asian American displacements. In W.W. Anderson, and R.G. Lee (Eds) *Displacements and Diasporas: Asians in the Americas*, pp 3–22. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Arnstein, S.R. (1969) A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4): 216–224.

Batley, R. (1996a). Cooperation with private and community organisations. In K. Davey (Ed.), *Urban management: the challenge of growth*, pp. 5–45. Aldershot: Avebury.

Batley, R. (1996b) Public-Private relationships and performance in service provision. *Urban Studies*, 33(4-5): 723–751.

Bracking, S. (2005). Development denied: autocratic militarism in post-election Zimbabwe. *Review of African Political Economy*, 32(104/105): 341–347.

Bratton, M. and Masunungure, E. (2006) Popular reactions to state repression: operation Murambatsvina in Zimbabwe. *African Affairs*, 106(422): 21–45.

Bäcklund, A.-K. (1998) Towards cosmopolis: planning for multicultural cities (Book Review). *Geografisk Tidsskrift* 98: 100.

Campbell, S. and S.S. Fainstein (2003) The structure and debates of planning theory. In S. Campbell and S.S. Fainstein (Eds) *Readings in Planning Theory*, pp. 1–16. Oxford: Blackwell.

CEMAT, (1983) *European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Chadwick, G.F. (1971) *A systems view of planning: towards a theory of the urban and regional planning process*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Chikuhwa, J. (2004) *A crisis of governance: Zimbabwe*. New York: Algora Publishing.

- Cooke, P. (1983) *Theories of planning and spatial development*. London: Hutchinson.
- Crang, M. and N.J. Thrift (2000a) Introduction. In M. Crang and N.J. Thrift (Eds) *Thinking space*, pp. 1–30. London: Routledge.
- Crang, M. and N. J. Thrift (Eds) (2000b) *Thinking space*. London: Routledge.
- Cupers, K. (2005) Towards a nomadic geography: rethinking space and identity for the potentials of progressive politics in the contemporary city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4): 729–739.
- Dahl, R.A. (1957) The concept of power. *Behavioural Sciences*, 2(3): 201–215.
- Deacon, R. (2002) An analytics of power relations: Foucault on the history of discipline. *History of the Human Sciences*, 15(1): 89–117.
- Dear, M.J. (2000) *The postmodern urban condition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dear, M.J. and A.J. Scott (1981) *Urbanization and urban planning in capitalist society*. New York: Methuen.
- De Certeau, M. (1984) *The practice of everyday life* (Trans. S. Randall). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Valk, P. and Wekwete, K.H. (Eds.) (1990) *Decentralizing for participatory planning?* Avebury: Gower.
- Diaw, K., T. Nnkyia and V. Watson (2002) Planning Education in sub-Saharan Africa: responding to the demands of a changing context. *Planning Practice & Research*, 17(3): 337–348.
- Dierwechter, Y. (2004) Dreams, bricks and bodies: mapping ‘neglected spatialities’ in African Cape Town. *Environment and Planning A*, 36(6): 959–981.

- Doel, M. (1999) *Poststructuralist geographies: the diabolical art of spatial science*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2002) *Deliberative democracy and beyond: liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunleavy, P. and O'Leary (1987) *Theories of the state: the politics of liberal democracy*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Fainstein, S.S. (2000) New directions in planning theory. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(4): 451-478.
- Faludi, A. (1973) *A reader in planning theory*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Fernandes, J.V. (1988) From the theories of social and cultural reproduction to the theory of resistance. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 9(1): 169-80.
- Fischler, R. (2000) Communicative planning theory: a Foucauldian assessment. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(4): 358-368.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (1998) *Rationality and power: democracy in practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making social science matter: why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2004) Phronetic planning research: theoretical and methodological reflections. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5(3): 283-306.
- Flyvbjerg, B. and T. Richardson (2002) Planning and Foucault: in search of the dark side of planning theory. In P. Allmendinger and M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds) *Planning Futures: new directions for planning theory*, pp. 44-62. London: Routledge.

- Foley, D. (1960) British town planning: one ideology or three? *British Journal of Sociology*, 11(3): 211–231.
- Forester, J. (1989) *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Forester, J. (1993) *Critical theory, public policy, and planning practice: toward a critical pragmatism*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Fontein, J. (2009) Anticipating the Tsunami: rumours, planning and the arbitrary state in Zimbabwe. *Africa*, 79(3): 369–397.
- Foucault, M. (1995) *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison* (Trans. A. Sheridan). New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1998) *The history of sexuality 1: the will to knowledge*. (Trans. R. Hurley). London: Penguin.
- Fried, M. (2000) Continuities and discontinuities of place. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 20(1): 193–205.
- Friedmann, J. (1987) *Planning in the public domain: from knowledge to action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, J. (1993) Toward a non-Euclidean mode of planning. *American Planners Association Journal*, 59(4): 482–85.
- Giddens, A. (1984) *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gieryn, T.F. (2000) A space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1): 463–496.
- Goudie, A. (2000) *The human impact on the natural environment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

GoZ, (Government of Zimbabwe) (2002) *Public Order and Security Act* (No 1 of 2002, Chapter 1:17). Harare: Government Printer.

Grest, J. (1995) Urban management, local government reform and the democratisation process in Mozambique: Maputo City 1975-1990. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 21(1): 147-164.

Gunder, M. (2005) Lacan, planning and urban policy formation. *Urban Policy and Research*, 23(1): 87-107.

Gunder, M. and C. Mouat (2002) Symbolic Violence and Victimization in Planning Processes: a reconnoitre of the New Zealand Resource Management Act. *Planning Theory*, 1(2): 124-145.

Gunder, M. and J. Hillier (2009). *Planning in ten words or less*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hammar, A. (2001) 'The Day of Burning': eviction and reinvention in the margins of northwest Zimbabwe. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 1(4): 550-574.

Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of communicative action. Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society* (Trans. T. McCarthy). Boston: Beacon.

Habermas, J. (1985) *The Theory of communicative action. Volume 2: Lifeworld and system: a critique of functionalist reason* (Trans. T. McCarthy). Boston: Beacon.

Hall, P.G. (2002) *Cities of tomorrow: an intellectual history of urban planning and design in the twentieth century*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Harris, N. (2002) Collaborative planning: from theoretical foundations to practical forms. In P. Allmendinger and M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds) *Planning futures: new directions for planning theory*, pp. 22-43. London: Routledge.

Harrison P, A. Todes, and V. Watson (2008) *Planning and transformation: learning from the post-apartheid experience*. Routledge: London.

Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1996) *Justice, nature and the geography of difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (2001) *Spaces of capital: towards a critical geography*. New York: Routledge.

Hayek, F.A. (1999) *The road to serfdom*. London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.

Healey, P. (1992) Planning through debate: The communicative turn in planning theory. *Town Planning Review*, 63(2): 143–62.

Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning: shaping places in fragmented societies*. London: Macmillan.

Healey, P. (2000) Planning theory and urban and regional dynamics: a comment on Yiftachel and Huxley. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(4): 917–921.

Healey, P. (2005) *Collaborative planning: shaping places in fragmented societies* (Second Edition). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Healey, P. (2006) *Urban complexity and spatial strategies: towards a relational planning for our times*. London: Routledge.

Heywood, P. (1990) Social justice and planning for the public interest. *Urban Policy and Research*, (8)2: 60–68

Hillier, J. (2002a) *Shadows of power: an allegory of prudence in land-use planning*. New York: Routledge.

Hillier, J. (2002b) Mind the gap. In J. Hillier and E. Rooksby (Eds) *Habitus: a sense of place* (Second Edition), 161–188. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hillier, J. (2003) 'Agon'izing over consensus: why Habermasian ideals cannot be 'Real'. *Planning Theory*, 2(1): 37-59.

Hillier, J. (2005) Straddling the post-structuralist abyss: between transcendence and immanence? *Planning Theory*, 4(3): 271-299.

Hillier, J. (2007) *Stretching beyond the horizon: a multiplanar theory of spatial planning and governance*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hillier, J. and M. Gunder (2003) Planning fantasies? An exploration of a potential Lacanian framework for understanding development assessment planning. *Planning Theory*, 2(3): 225-248.

Hindess, B. (1996) *Discourses of power: from Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hoch, C.J. (1984) Doing good and being right: the pragmatic connection to planning theory. *American Planning Association Journal*, 4(1): 335-345.

Hoch, C.J. (1996) A pragmatic enquiry about planning and power. In S.J. Mandelbaum, L. Mazza and R. Burchell (Eds) *Explorations in planning theory*, pp. 30-44. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Hoch, C.J. (2002) Evaluating plans pragmatically. *Planning Theory*, 1(1): 53-75.

Hoch, C.J. (2007) Pragmatic communicative action theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(2): 272-283.

Holston, J. (1999). Spaces of insurgent citizenship. In J. Holston (Ed) *Cities and citizenship*, pp. 155-173. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Huxley, M. (2002) Governmentality, gender and planning: a Foucauldian perspective. In P. Allmendinger and M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds) *Planning Futures: new directions for planning theory*. London: Routledge.

Huxley, M. and Yiftachel, O. (2000) New paradigm or old myopia? Unsettling the communicative turn in planning theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(4): 333-342.

Innes, J.E. and D.E. Booher (1999) Consensus building as role playing and bricolage: towards a theory of collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65(1): 9-26.

Innes, J.E. (1995) Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(3): 183-189.

Innes, J.E. and J. Gruber (2005) Planning styles in conflict. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 71(2): 177-188.

Janzen, R. (2002) Reconsidering the politics of nature: Henri Lefebvre and 'The Production of Space'. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 13(2): 96-116.

Jenkins, P. (2006) Image of the city in Mozambique: civilization, parasite, engine of growth or place of opportunity. In D. Bryceson & D. Potts (Eds.) *African urban economies: viability, vitality or vitiation?* pp. 107-130. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jimu, I.M. (2005) Negotiated economic opportunity and power: perspectives and perceptions of street vending in urban Malawi. *Africa Development*, 30(4): 35-51.

Kamete, A.Y., M. Sidambe and M.M. Ndubiwa (2000) *Managing the interface between Urban Councils and surrounding Rural District Councils in Zimbabwe: The case of the City of Bulawayo and Umguza Rural District Council*. Harare: Municipal Development Programme.

Kamete, A.Y. (2006) Participatory farce: youth and the making of urban places in Zimbabwe. *International Development Planning Review*, 28(3): 359-380.

- Kamete, A.Y. (2007a) Youth in urban governance: rationalities, encounters and interaction in Zimbabwe. *Africa Insight*, 37(3): 327-343.
- Kamete, A.Y. (2007b) Cold-hearted, negligent and spineless?: Planning, planners and the (r)ejection of "filth" in urban Zimbabwe. *International Planning Studies*, 12(2): 153-171.
- Kamete, A.Y. (2008) Planning versus youth: stamping out spatial unruliness in Harare. *Geoforum*, 39(5): 1721-1733.
- Kamete, A.Y. (2009a) Hanging out with 'trouble-causers': planning and governance in urban Zimbabwe. *Planning theory and Practice*, 10(1): 85-103.
- Kamete, A.Y. (2009b) In the service of tyranny: debating the role of planning in Zimbabwe's urban 'clean-up' operation. *Urban Studies*, 46(4): 897-922.
- Kamete, A.Y. (2010) Defending illicit livelihoods: youth resistance in Harare's contested spaces. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(1): 55-75.
- Kamete, A.Y. and Lindell, I. (2010) The politics of "non-planning" interventions in African cities: unravelling the international and local dimensions in Harare and Maputo. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 36(4): 889-912.
- Keeble, L. (1952) *Principles and practice of town and country planning*. London: The Estates Gazette.
- Klosterman, R.E. (1978) Foundations for normative planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 44(1): 37-46.
- Klosterman, R.E. (1980) A public interest criterion. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 46(3): 323-333.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The production of space* (Trans. D. Nicholson-Smith). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Levy, J.M. (2009) *Contemporary urban planning* (Eighth Edition). Eaglewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Lindell, I. (2008). The multiple sites of urban governance: insights from an African city. *Urban Studies*, 45(9): 1879–1901.

Lippmann, W. (1955) *The public philosophy*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Lourenço-Lindell, I. (2002) *Walking the tight rope: informal livelihoods and social networks in a West African city*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Low, N. (1991) *Planning, politics and the state: the political foundations of planning thought*. London: Routledge.

Mehler, A., Melber, H., & Walraven, K. v. (2010) Sub-Saharan Africa. In A. Mehler, H. Melber & K. v. Walraven (Eds.) *Africa Yearbook 6: Politics, economy and society south of the Sahara in 2009*, pp. 1–15. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Melber, H. (2010). Southern Africa. In A. Mehler, H. Melber & K. v. Walraven (Eds.) *Africa Yearbook 6: Politics, economy and society south of the Sahara in 2009*, pp. 421–430. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Miles, M. (2008). Planning and conflict. In T. Hall, P. Hubbard and J.R. Short (Eds) *The Sage Companion to the City*, pp. 318–333. London: Sage.

Molotch, H. (1993) The space of Lefebvre. *Theory and Society*, 22(6): 887–895.

Murdoch, J. (2005) *Post-structuralist geography: a guide to relational space*. London: Sage.

Musemwa, M. (2006) Disciplining a “dissident” city: hydropolitics in the city of Bulawayo, Matabeleland, Zimbabwe, 1980–1994. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 32(2): 239–254.

Musemwa, M. (2010) From “Sunshine City” to a landscape of disaster. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 26(2): 165–206.

- Mutale, E. (2004) *The management of urban development in Zambia*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Newman, P. and A. Thornley (2004) *Planning world cities: globalization and urban politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nnkya, T. (2008) *Why planning does not work: land-use planning and residents' rights in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- Oranje, M. (2003) A time and a space for African identities in planning in South Africa. In P. Harrison, M. Huchzemeyer & M. Mayekiso (Eds.) *Confronting fragmentation: housing and urban development in a democratising society*, pp. 175–189. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Partridge, W.L. (1989) Involuntary resettlement in development projects. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 2(3): 373–384.
- Pasteur, D. (1992) *Good local government in Zimbabwe: a case study of Bulawayo and Mutare City Councils 1980–1991*. Birmingham: Development Administration Group, University of Birmingham.
- Perry, D.C. (2003) Making space: planning as a mode of thought. In S. Campbell and S.S. Fainstein (Eds) *Readings in planning theory* (Second edition), pp. 142–165. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pile, S. (1997) Introduction: Opposition, political identities and spaces of resistance. In S. Pile and M. Keith (Eds) *Geographies of resistance*, pp. 1–32. London: Routledge.
- Pile, S. and M. Keith (1997) *Geographies of resistance*. London: Routledge.
- Pinkney, R. (2003) *Democracy in the Third World*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Potts, D. (2006). “Restoring Order”? Operation Murambatsvina and the urban crisis in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 32(2): 273–291.

- Raby, R. (2005) What is resistance? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 8(2): 151–71.
- Rakodi, C. (1995) *Harare: inheriting a colonial city: continuity or change?* Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Routledge, P. (1997) A spatiality of resistances: theory and practice in Nepal's revolution of 1990. In S. Pile and M. Keith (Eds.) *Geographies of resistance*, pp. 68–86. London: Routledge.
- RTPI (The Royal Town Planning Institute) (2001) *A new vision for planning*. London: RTPI.
- Sager, T. (1994) *Communicative planning theory*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Sandercock, L. (1998) *Towards cosmopolis: planning for multicultural cities*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Sandercock, L. (2003) *Cosmopolis II: mongrel cities in the 21st century*. London: Continuum.
- Scott, J. C. (1985) *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scott, A.J. and S.T. Roweis (1977) Urban planning theory and practice: a reappraisal. *Environment and Planning A*, 9(10): 1097–119.
- Semple, E.C. (1911) *Influences of geographic environment*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Setšabi, S. (2006) Contest and conflict: governance and street livelihoods in Maseru, Lesotho. In A. Brown (Ed.) *Contested spaces: street trading, public space and livelihoods in developing countries*, pp. 131–152. Rugby: ITDG.

Sharp, J.P., P. Routledge, C. Philo and R. Paddison (2000) Entanglements of power: geographies of domination/resistance. In J.P. Sharp, P. Routledge, C. Philo and R. Paddison (Eds) *Entanglements of power: geographies of domination/resistance*, pp. 1–42. London: Routledge.

Simone, AM (2004) *For the city yet to come: changing African life in four cities*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Simone, AM (2005) Introduction: urban processes and change. In A. M. Simone & A. Abouhani (Eds.) *Urban Africa: changing contours of survival in the city*, pp. 1–26. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Soja, E.W. (1980) The socio-spatial dialectic. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 70(2): 207–225.

Soja, E.W. (1989) *Postmodern geographies: the reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London: Verso.

Soja, E.W. (1996) *Thirdspace: journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Soja, E.W. (2000) *Postmetropolis: critical studies of cities and regions*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Stren, R. and White, R.R. (1989) *African cities in crisis: managing rapid urban growth*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Taylor, N. (1980) Planning theory and the philosophy of planning. *Urban Studies*, 17(2): 159–172.

Taylor, N. (1998) *Urban planning theory since 1945*. Oxford: Sage.

Thornley, A. (1993) *Planning under Thatcherism: the challenge of the market* (Second Edition). London: Routledge.

- Thrift, N. (2006) Space. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23(2-3): 139-146.
- Tripp, A.M. (1997) *Changing the rules: the politics of liberalization and the urban informal economy in Tanzania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Watkins, C. (2005) Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: an application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. *Culture and Organization*, 11(3): 209-220.
- Watson, V. (2002) *Change and continuity in spatial planning: metropolitan planning in Cape Town under political transition*. London: Routledge.
- Watson, V. (2003) Conflicting rationalities: implications for planning theory and ethics. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(4): 395-407.
- Watson, V. (2006) Deep difference: diversity, planning and ethics. *Planning Theory*, 5(1): 31-50.
- Watson, V. (2009) 'The planned city sweeps the poor away...': urban planning and 21st century urbanisation. *Progress in Planning*, 72(3): 151-193.
- Wekwete, K. H. (1989). Physical planning in Zimbabwe: a review of legislative, administrative and operational framework. *Third World Planning Review*, 11(1): 49-69.
- Wekwete, K. H. (1994) Urbanisation, urban development and management in Zimbabwe. In K.H. Wekwete & C.O. Rambanapasi (Eds.) *Planning urban economies in eastern and southern Africa*, pp. 31-54. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Webber, M.M. (1969) Planning in an environment of change. Part II: Permissive planning. *Town Planning Review* 20(1): 277-295.
- Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology* (Trans. G. Roth and C. Wittich). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yiftachel, O. (1989) Towards a new typology of urban planning theories. *Environment and Planning B-Planning and Design*, 16(1): 23-39.

Yiftachel, O. (1998) Planning and social control: exploring the dark side. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 12(4): 395-406.

Yiftachel, O. (2002) The dark side of modernism: planning as control of an ethnic minority. In G. Bridge and S. Watson (Eds) *The Blackwell city reader*, pp. 535-541. Malden, MA, Blackwell.

Yiftachel, O. and M. Huxley (2000) Debating dominance and relevance: notes on the "communicative turn" in planning theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(4): 907-913.

Zaaijer, M. (1998) *Urban economic restructuring and local institutional responses: the case of Bulawayo, Zimbabwe*. Rotterdam: Institute of Housing Studies.