Power dynamics in a transforming local authority-planning environment: the Tshwane experience

Johnny Coetzee & Mark Oranje

Submitted to *Town and Regional Planning* on 4 September 2005; Revised 24 November 2006.

Abstract

This article presents a perspective on the complex, dynamic and illusive power relations that are omnipresent in the local authority-planning environment. It specifically unpacks the fine grain of the power web or the so-called "micro physics of power" (Watson, 2001), the different types of power, the ways in which the different powers traverse and change in the web, how they impact on each other (the general matrix of force relations), and lastly its impact on people and systems. This article presents a discussion on the inseparable relationship between power relations (see Foucault, 1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) and social relations — and a perspective on how power relations are affected by social alignments, effective communication and communicative action — i.e. "the force of the better argument" (Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987). Based on the work of, amongst others, Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) and Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), the article foregrounds new insight and counter-arguments on the debates regarding the relationship between power and rationality as captured in the work of Flyvbjerg (1998a; 1998b); Watson (2001); Allmendinger (2001) and Hillier (2002).

MAGSDINAMIKA IN 'N TRANSFORMERENDE PLAASLIKE BESTUURS BEPLANNING OMGEWING — DIE TSHWANE ERVARING

Hierdie artikel bied 'n oorsig van die komplekse, dinamiese en bedrieglike magsverhoudings wat alomteenwoordig is in die beplanningsomgewing van plaaslike besture. Die artikel is hoofsaaklik daarop gemik om die fyn weefsel en mikro strukture van die komplekse web of matriks van magsvehoudings en gesag te ontrafel (Watson, 2001). Dit bied verder 'n blik op die verskillende magte en tipes gesag (strukture) en die maniere waarop hulle verander en fluktueer binne die web van magte, die wedersydse impak van die magte op mekaar, en laastens die impak wat mag en gesagstrukture op mense en sosiale stelsels het. In die lig van die werk van Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) bied die artikel ook 'n oorsig van die integrale verband tussen magsverhoudings (struktuur) en sosiale verhoudings (struktuur), sowel as 'n perspektief op die manier waarop magsverhoudings en strukture deur sosiale alliansies, effektiewe kommunikasie en "kommunikatiewe aksie" — dit is die "die krag van die beter argument" (Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987) beinvloed word.[1] Die artikel, onder andere gebaseer op die werk van Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) en Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), verskaf verder ook nuwe insigte en argumente ten opsigte van die hedendaagse debatte oor die verhouding tussen "mag/gesag en rasionaliteit" ("power and rationality"), soos vervat in die werk van Flyvbjerg (1998a; 1998b); Watson (2001); Allmendinger (2001) en Hillier (2002).

[1] Hierdie begrippe (in aanhalings) is direkte vertalings van onderskeidelik, die begrippe "communicative action" en "the force of the better argument" wat deur die werk van Ha berm as (1983; 1984; 1987) bevorder word.

1. SOME THOUGHTS ON POWER, PLANNING (THEORY) AND PEOPLE

Throughout history, experiences and stories of transformation, be it the transformation of governments, institutions, organisations or systems, have been associated with conflict, resistance, protest, power, power-relations, power-structures and power-struggles (Foucault, 1975; 1994a; 1994b).

Although, as Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) argues, power is omnipresent in all spheres of society, the various forms and levels of power and the dynamics of power relations are specifically active (and often highly visible) in public and political institutions such as local governments. In view of these institutions' setting within the public realm and their relationship with political systems and influences, they are an arena for intense and often heated power struggles and power games (see Forester, 1982; Mc Cloughlin, 1992; Mc Clendon & Quay, 1992; Hoch, 1984; Flyvbjerg, 1996; 1998a; 1998b; Watson, 2001; Allmendinger, 2001; Lapin tie, 2002). Often when these institutions or government systems are challenged, changed or threatened by new or external influences and powers, e.g. new practices or transformation, the volatile power relations come under siege.

Following on from the groundbreaking work and new insights on power and power relations developed by Foucault during the mid 1900s, many scholars in various disciplines studied experiences of transformation in an attempt to unravel the complex dynamics of power relations. During the nineties and the early 2000s, a

Johnny Coetzee, PhD-student, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Pretoria, South Africa, 0002. Tel: 082 770 1408, Email: <johnnyc@tshwane.gov.za>

Professor Mark Oranje, Head of Department, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Pretoria, South Africa, 0002, Tel: +27(0)12 420 3531, Fax: +27 (0) 12 420 3537, Email:<mark.oranje@up.ac.za>

number of authors such as Healey (UK), Flyvbjerg (Denmark), Hillier (Australia), and Forester (USA), Hoch (USA), Innes (USA), Mandelbaum (USA) and Watson (South Africa) also explored the nature of power relations within the ambit of urban planning and the local authority-planning environment.[2] In spite of numerous studies into such power relations in local authorities and efforts to develop tactics and strategies to 'manage' power relations, there still is limited knowledge on this complex phenomenon with its hidden nuances, as is evident in the many power experiences, struggles and power-planning dilemmas in local authorities (see Flyvbjerg, 1996; 1998a; 1998b; Lapintie, 2002; Hillier, 2002). And, although the recent 'practice movement' and postmodern research methodologies exposed experiences, narratives and practice stories about power relations, few of these studies actually attempted and/or succeeded in exploring and unpacking the dynamics of the complex and illusive power structures and power relations. In addition to this, there also seems to be a gap in the knowledge base when it comes to the relationship between power relations on the one hand, and social structures and alliances, communication, communicative action, social behaviour, conflict, resistance, and transformation processes on the other. It is to be hoped that future studies and theorizing will focus more on these relationships, specifically within the context of the local authority-planning environments which are so closely related with the social nexus.

This study into the transformation of the Planning function in the City of Tshwane, which covers an extraordinary transformation experience over a period of ten years, provides valuable insights and a local example of the typical painstaking institutional and transformation process associated with the new emerging forms of urban planning and management, specifically within the context of the unfolding/transforming (developmental) local government system in South Africa. Although this transformation was influenced by power structures and power relations, it in turn also had a major impact on these power structures and power relations.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS

This article presents some of the findings and suppositions of a case study that was done into the transformation of urban planning in the municipalities of the Greater Pretoria region (now Tshwane) during the period 1992 — 2002. The study comprises a densely woven narrative and 'thick description' (Gillham, 2000: 19) of people and change in a specific local authority ('real life' situation) during a decade of transformation. The Tshwane case study is inherently a study of planning practice and power — hence the rationale for locating the study within the ambit of 'the practice movement'[3], phronesis or phronetic social science[4] and pragmatic phenomenology and hermeneutics[5] approaches — specifically within the context of naturalistic research and 'the postmodern'.[6]

Within the context of the communicative turn in planning and the emerging postmodern planning methodologies, it comes as no surprise that a new interest and focus would also develop in the study of planning practice, specifically within the web of social and power relations, as is evident in the work of Flyvbjerg (1998a; 1998b; 2001); Watson (2001); Allmendinger (2001); Hillier (2002) and Lapintie (2002). Furthermore, there seems to be some agreement in the work of these authors that any analysis of power must not be done from a specific, 'caged' context — it must proceed from the diversity and uniqueness of the social and political contexts under consideration (Kogler, 1996: 219; Flyvbjerg, 1998a; Watson, 2001; Hillier, 2002: 47).

Moving on to pragmatic phenomenology and hermeneutics as methodological approaches, these are primarily associated with the so-called 'participant observation methods'[7] and detailed ethnographic studies where the researcher is an integral and active part of the world of the subject being studied (see also Moore, 2000; Jorgenson, 1989; Yin, 1994; and Gillham, 2000). This type of social inquiry has also become popular in case study research, and specifically in the study of planning practice and power (see Flyvbjerg 1998a; 1998b; Allmendinger 2001; Watson 2001; Hillier 2002).

What makes this method more relevant and appropriate within the context of the Tshwane study, is the fact that one of the authors was a participant-observer and a role player in the transformation process that was studied and recorded. Throughout the research period, one of the authors (as a planner and manager in the planning department) was part of numerous discussion sessions, negotiations, workshops, meetings and debates related to urban planning and the Planning function in the City, and an integral part of the web of power (and social) relations. Through careful, purposeful, planned and structured observation and

2 For more information on power and planning, see McClendon & Quay (1992: 118); Hoch (1984); Forester (1982: 305); Mc Auslan (1992: 97); Thomas (1995: 5); Fainstein & Fainstein (1996: 269); Kogler (1996: 239); Flyvbjerg (1998a); Yiftachel & Huxley (2000); Allmendinger (2001: 221); Hillier (2002: 47); and Lapintie (2002).

3 See Flyvbjerg (1998a, 1998b; 2001); Watson (2001); Allmendinger (2001); and Hillier (2002) on the practice movement. A number of prominent planning theorists such as Forester, Healey, Watson, Hoch and Innes hold a dominant position within the practice movement.

4 According to Flyvbjerg (2001: 63), phronetic social science is associated with a focus on values; a closeness of authors to the object of their study; a focus on details of practices that "make up the basic concerns of life"; extensive use of case studies; the use of narrative as revelatory tool; and a dialogical slant that allows for other voices than that of the author to be heard. Flyvbjerg (2001: 56) further argues that phronesis is a "sense of the ethical practical", which implies that practice is interpreted historically and in terms of politics and ethics (and power).

5

6 See Hoch (1984: 32); and Allmendinger (2001: 213).

7 See also Allmendinger (2001: 211-212) and Watson (2001).

See also Gillham (2000); and Moore (2000).

recording, the author was able to conduct what could be called an *in sito* type of participant observation (see also Gillham, 2000: 11; Jorgenson, 1989: 12; Yin, 1994: 87).

This form of 'active participation' by an insider is of course very dangerous as the researcher is both observer and 'the observed' (Yin, 1994: 56, 59, 87). Culler (in Moore, 2000) for instance refers to the potential problems of "unreliable or self conscious narrators" which could undermine their authority to tell a story in such a way that they manipulate the story. In addition to this the observations could be affected by bias and insider, non-empirically determined knowledge. In order to counter this, the researcher was led by what Gillham (2000: 13-30) proposes as "ways for ensuring trustworthiness":

- be aware of prejudices and preferences;
- constantly challenge and scrutinise what is recorded;
- seek out and be open to contradictory evidence or evidence that qualifies or complicates the emerging understanding;
- ensure that all the sides of the picture are covered; and
- be on the look-out for supporting evidence.

In order to further ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the research, the findings were 'triangulated'[8] by making use of a number of research methods, which ensured that the findings were backed up by 'multiple forms of evidence' (Gillham, 2000: 19). In addition to the use of documented information, contributions, comments and critiques were obtained from prominent role players in the process of transformation of Planning in the City of Pretoria/Tshwane through questionnaires, interviews and perception studies (see Coetzee, 2005 for more detail in this regard).

As for the way of presenting the data, the choice fell on a narrative, or story. Not only has narrative writing become a popular way of presenting case studies, but it has also become an accepted research tool in the social sciences (Gillham, 2000: 22; Polkinghorne, 1998: 21). Flyvbjerg (2001: 18), for instance, in his plea for a new phronetic social science, makes a compelling argument for the use of the narrative as a tool for research and states that: "Where science does not reach, art, literature and narrative often help us to comprehend the reality in which we live."

The narrative as a story is also a valuable method of presenting and sharing research with others. Stories expose readers to the experience of the planners/actors — how they learn, how they deal with conflict, how they develop good judgement, how power and power relations interact, specifically in the complex political world planners work in. Based on Dewey's pragmatic perspective, Yiftachel & Huxley (2000) argue that experience (as presented by stories) not only provides a context for learning, but actually becomes the medium through which we learn. Likewise, and in conclusion of this section, Hoch (1984: 43) argues that 'telling stories' of planning and power in a context of ongoing inquiry and debate not only provides rich reflections to learn from in the pursuit of the improvement of practice, but can also assist in establishing and sustaining a community of planners.

3. CONTEXTUALISING THE SOCIAL FABRIC IN 'THE LIFEWORLD'

A study of power relations cannot be done in isolation from the broader social context or 'the lifeworld' with its many social alignments, processes, relations (and powers) — hence the focus on these social determinants.

Healey (1997: 29) refers to "the communicative turn" in planning and the new intellectual wave in planning theory that had been on the rise since the middle-1970s and which was labeled as argumentative, communicative or interpretative. By the 1990s it had become mainstream planning theory, with a growing number of established planning theorists, such as Forester, Healey, Hoch, Innes, Mandelbaum (and more recently Hillier), professing to have taken a communicative turn in their analysis, description and theorising of urban planning. This communicative turn in planning liberated planning theorists from the restrictive instrumental rationality, as it engaged them in poststructuralist and multicultural discourses on the nature of knowledge, ethics, and justice (and power). This in turn led to a considerable number of planning theorists engaging in the communicative-pragmatic logic, accumulating evidence about speech, narratives, professional profiles, consensus building and negotiation (and power) (see Yiftachel & Huxley, 2000). Theorists increasingly acknowledged the need to listen and register the daily interactive work of planning professionals (see Watson, 2001). This realisation led to a new interest and focus on the study of practice, the study of human action and behaviour, specifically within the complex web of social and power relations, as is evident in the work of Flyvbjerg (1998a; 2001); Watson (2001); Allmendinger (2001); Hillier (2002) and Lapintie (2002). This new focus on the study of practice grew in popularity to such an extent in recent years that reference is now made to 'practice writing' or the so-called 'practice movement' (Watson, 2001). The study of planning practice and power incidentally also spurred a new interest in phronesis or phronetic social research[9] (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 56), and pragmatic phenomenology and hermeneutics.

Within the context of social/power relations, Ha berm as (1983; 1984; 1987) distinguishes between "communication" (which is associated with 'normal talk') and

[8] Triangulation is a method which implies the multiple observations of the same phenomenon, or the convergence of different kinds of evidence, gathered in different ways but bearing on the same point (see Gillham, 2000: 13; Yin, 1994: 91-92).

[9] According to Flyvbjerg (2001: 63), this phronetic social science is associated with a focus on values; a closeness of authors to the object of their study; a focus on details of practices that "make up the basic concerns of life"; extensive use of case studies; the use of narrative as revelatory tool; and a dialogical slant that allows for other voices than that of the author to be heard. This type of research (similar to the practice movement) is unequivocally practice-oriented as it primarily focuses on practical activity and practical knowledge in everyday situations (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134).

"communicative action" which is an action "oriented to reach common understanding" — an action associated with influences, strategic action and therefore power relations. In addition to this Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987) also refers to the two concepts of "lifeworld" and "systems". According to him, "the lifeworld" is the real situation and the realm of personal relations; while "the systems" could be an entity such as a bureaucratic administration (or a local authority). According to Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), these systems, which provide the context in which the lifeworld operates, can suppress the lifeworld, creating conflict, distorting communication or communicative action, and result in a power-clash between the lifeworld and systems.

The interactive flow of knowledge, process of communication, and communicative (inter) action, negotiation, speech act, consensus building and negotiations, narratives at all levels, discourses and relations between "different actors in the lifeworld" (Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987) provides a new/another perspective on the complex social nexus and the complex web of social relations in which we live our lives (Healey, 1997: 57-58). According to Healey (1997: 58), these webs (similar to the Foucauldian power webs discussed in later paragraphs), have points of intersection or nodes which are normally the common spaces of the institutions, associations etc. or "the arenas where systems of meaning, ways of acting and ways of valuing are learned, transmitted and sometimes transformed." It is the dynamics within these social webs that 'create' different forms of power and power relations.

Thomas Wartenburg (in Foucault, 1994a) refers to the concept of a "social alignment" that "provides a way of understanding the 'field' that constitutes a situated power relationship as a power relationship". According to Wartenburg, this social alignment (within the context of power relations) can only be created if the coordinated practice of the social agents (which form the alignment) is so comprehensive that the social agents facing the alignment encounter it as having control over certain "things" they might need or desire (see Foucault, 1994a). This argument further holds that power is distributed through a complex social web and mediated by social alignments (Foucault, 1994a). In support of the above, Kogler (1996: 235) also argues that power is a system of social networks that are founded as such within the "social and historical lifeworld".

This relationship between social relations and power is also underscored by Antony Giddens' so-called "structuration theory" (Giddens, 1982), which amongst others states that we as humans or social beings live through culturally bound structures of rules and resource flows, and through dense and diffuse sets of relational webs, each one of which presents an active context of our lives. According to Giddens, these webs are continuously shaped by structuring forces, also referred to as the forces of power that surround and engulf us (see Foucault, 1994a).

Based on the foregoing discussion and the work of Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), Healey (1997; 1998), Wartenburg (in Foucault, 1994a), Kogler (1996), and Giddens (1982), it is evident that power and power relations (Foucault, 1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) are directly related to social relations and communicative action (Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987) — hence the reference to the inter-related and complex web of social/power relations. During the late-nineties and early-2000s, various planners in academia, such as Forester (1982), Hoch (1984), Healey (1997), Flyvbjerg (1998a; 1998b), Lapintie (2002), Hillier (2002), Allmendinger (2001), and Watson (2001) explored these integrated social/power relations (or the "tug of war" between the "lifeworld" and "the systems" as described by Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), in an attempt to present new insights (and theories) on these illusive subjects and relationships. Although Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987) was 'somewhat silent' on the issues of power, Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) provided 'power (full)' viewpoints on the social nexus within which Habermas' communicative action is exercised.

4. DECONSTRUCTING POWERS IN THE LIFEWORLD

Allmendinger (2001: 221) argues that if we take the theme of the postmodern to include issues such as diversity, difference and opposition, then the question of power is central. Although there has been considerable "theorising about power", there seems to be little agreement on the definition on the complex phenomenon of power (Hillier, 2002: 47).

The question of the exercise of power has for many years played a central role in human sciences (Allmendinger, 2001: 221). Way back in the early 1500s Machiavelli presented a useful (and somewhat shocking and evil) discussion on power in his classic work *The Prince* (Machiavelli, 1961). Machiavelli argued that the aspiration to acquire (more) power is a natural and common phenomenon. He presented various (aggressive) tactics and strategies, based on his combat experiences on how power could be obtained (at all cost), how to maintain and hold on to it through prowess and fortune, and how to exercise power, by fighting, or by using the law or (brute) force.

For many years power was seen as part of the juridical or authoritarian arena — an isolated and centered entity, and something that is acquired, maintained, or exercised (enforced) by authority, similar to the powers held and exercised by Machiavelli's Prince. Power in western Capitalism was denounced by the Marxists as class or production-domination, while proponents of Soviet Social power referred to it as totalitarianism (Foucault, 1994b). It took many years for the Western world to realise that power is more than juridical and negative, and that it could also be technical and positive (see also Allmendinger, 2001; Foucault, 1994b: 122).

It was, however, only during the 1960s that Foucault began to reformulate the concept of power. During this time he studied the mechanics of power in their own right "on the basis of daily struggles at grass — roots levels, among those whose fight was located in the fine meshes of power" (Foucault, 1994b: 122).[10] Drawing on the theories of Nietzsche, Foucault also linked power with the flow of knowledge

[10] Foucault's book *Discipline and Punish* (1975) presented an opportunity for inquiry and new kinds of knowledge of human beings — even as they created new forms of control. This book specifically highlighted the scale and continuity of the exercise of power.

(and communication) (Allmendinger, 2001: 26 and see also Forester, 1982; Hillier, 2002: 49). Foucault's involvement with hermeneutic sociology and the study of people and institutions furthermore resulted in a major reconceptualisation of strategic power relations in support of Habermas' theory of communicative action (Foucault, 1994a: 236-237).

Foucault largely redirected the focus on power away from the centre, the nodes (in the social web), the locus, institutions and juridical structures. He argued that power was something that flows from the centre to the peripheries, that it circulates through individuals and binds them together in a net or web of relationships (Foucault, 1994a; 1994b). This web (which was also referred to by Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) as the general matrix of force relations at a given time in a given society) is loosely structured into disciplines within which power and knowledge are linked (Hillier, 2002: 49). Foucault specifically stated that power relations are rooted deeply in the social nexus (Foucault, 1994a) and are embodied within local discourse and institutions (such as planning) (Foucault in Allmendinger, 2001: 219-220). Foucault (1994b: 340) however argues that power only exists when exercised by some on others — it is not simply a relationship between partners, but a way (the communicative action) in which some act on others. It is the type of behaviour between individuals and groups that creates power (see also Foucault, 1994: 34). In terms of this understanding as offered by Foucault's theory on power relations (see Foucault, 1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b), it is clear that these views strongly coincide with the 'social web' referred to by Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987). These viewpoints of Foucault further highlight the inter-relationship between power and communicative action as discussed by Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), Healey (1997; 1998), Allmendinger (2001), Kogler (1996), Hillier (2002), and Wartenburg (in Foucault, 1994a). This shows how strategic and communicative action, mutually condition one another, and secondly how a certain kind of power accompanies any speech action (Foucault, 1994a: 237).

Based on this premise of the social/power-relations web a number of other Foucauldian power arguments and theories were developed.[11] Foucault (1994a; 1994b), for one, argues that power is not some or other supplementary structure hovering above society — it can only operate on already existing power relations — the so-called metapower. Foucault (1994b) refers to "the whole set of little powers" or "little institutions" at the lowest level. Unlike Machiavelli's viewpoint on the power of 'The Prince,' Foucault (1994a) argues that power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away. Instead power is a matter of subtle and meticulous control of bodies. According to Foucault (1994b) power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere. This aspect is further supported by Wartenburg's discussion on power, within the context of the social alignment discussed previously (see Foucault, 1994a). Foucault argues that power is not only disposed by agents (in the social alignment), but also through the so-called "instruments of power" such as buildings, documents, tools, *etc.* (Foucault, 1994a: 106). Power must be understood as a "multiplicity of force relations" that is "produced from one moment to the next in all points and all relations" (see also Flyvbjerg, 2001: 120). Foucault further argues that resistance is intrinsic to all power relations — "where there is power there is resistance". These characteristics and dynamics of Foucault's 'powers' are typical and reminiscent of the powers and power relations found in most planning environments (see Mc Cloughlin, 1992; McClendon & Quay, 1992; Brooks, 1996: 118-131; Marris, 1998: 16; Flyvbjerg, 1996; 1998a; 1998b; 2001; Allmendinger, 2001; Lapintie, 2002; Watson, 2001; Hillier, 2002).

As a result of the dispersed nature of power, and the different types of power relations in different parts and levels of the power web, this power web has the inherent potential to erupt (see Hoch, 1984). Allmendinger (2001: 39) argues that, as a result of the power web that has no centre, micro-political resistance to (increasingly) centralised forms of power, or the type of power possessed by 'The Prince' is found throughout the web. Foucault (1994b) gives a central position to the concept of resistance by linking his power theory with that of localised forms of power struggles. He argues that resistance sets itself against every form of external determination that makes self- realisation impossible (Kogler, 1996: 239). While Foucault was studying power (see Foucault, 1994b: 329), he also studied anti-power and examples of resistance and opposition to power, anti-authority struggles, opposition of power over women, administration over people, etc. From these studies Foucault identified three common types of struggles — struggles against domination, exploitation and subjection (Foucault, 1994b: 329).

Although emphasis is placed on the dominatory types of infra power [*sous — pouvoir*] such as juridical, economic and political power and panopticism[12] (Foucault, 1994b), there are many other types of powers present and active in the power web such as professional power, [13] community/ neighbourhood power[14] (See Forester, 1982; Hoch, 1984; and Hillier, 2002), and community and

[11] These arguments are derived from various readings and discussions on the works of Foucault, see Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b); Flyvbjerg (1998a; 1998b; Lapintie (2002); Hillier (2002); Allmendinger (2001); Watson (2001); and Kogler (1996).

[12] According to Foucault (1994b) panopticism is one of the fundamental characteristics of power relations in our society. It is a type of power that is applied to individuals in the form of continuous individual supervision, in the form of control, punishment and compensation and in the form of correction. It implies the molding and transformation of individuals in terms of certain norms.

[13] Professional power relates to the power of e.g. planners — to influence developments, processes, procedures decisions, communities *etc.* (Forester, 1982: 303). Planners' information and knowledge is a strong source of power. It can be used to influence groups *etc*, it legitimises and rationalises the maintenance of existing power, control and ownership (watchdog). The information provides planners with the advantage of knowing where and how to find things and do things *etc.* (Forester, 1982; Hoch, 1984).

social power Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987). These different types of power (within Foucault's web of power) each with its own strengths and weaknesses can result in unbalanced power relations (Forester, 1982: 305). The weaker party normally loses, because the type of mediation/negotiation is normally a political strategy applied in such a way to favour the 'power at hand' (Forester, 1982: 305). This creates a range of power-relations that are contingent and fragile (Allmendinger, 2001: 26-39) and relationships that are marked by power struggles and conflict (Kogler, 1996: 235). Again, these power relations, struggles and conflict are typical of the planning environment, specifically in the local authority environment with its political influences and powers (see Forester, 1982; Hoch, 1984; Mc Cloughlin, 1992; McClendon & Quay, 1992; Brooks, 1996: 118-131; Marris, 1998: 16; Flyvbjerg, 1996; 1998a; 1998b; 2001; Allmendinger, 2001; Lapintie, 2002; Watson, 2001; Hillier, 2002; Homann, 2005). Planners often work in imbalances of power and with conflicting political goals and a 'communicative infrastructure' which is shaped by power structures (Forester, 1982: 303). In the light of the foregoing it has become increasingly important for planners (and those professions working with power and politics) to better understand the dynamics of power and power relations. As argued by (Allmendinger, 2001: 219-221) planners need to resist a 'bad' concentration of power or dominatory centres of power and address the negative types of communicative action that can in fact become weapons in a continuous power struggle (Lapintie, 2002 and see also Flyvbjerg, 1998a; Watson, 2001).

Not only do Foucault's theories presents a comparative view of the power relations in the planning environment as discussed earlier on, but his work also has significant value for planning, and more specifically the democratic and argumentative types of planning which seem to be dominating the planning praxis. His work enables us to better understand power in the multiplicity of micro practices that comprise everyday life, and to appreciate that power is a relational process rather than a single force operating from the top down (Hillier, 2002: 49). Watson (2001) states that the value in terms of Foucault's concept of power lies in alerting us to its diffuse form, while the idea of the 'micro- physics' of power suggests its location in everyday practices. Foucault helps us to understand that power is omnipresent and that there are various different types of power on different levels, unlike the old perception that power is only a 'bad', evil and domineering force, or something in the hands of The Prince, as presented by the classic work of Machiavelli. Foucault not only provides an understanding of the complex web of power relations, but his theories also help us to understand relationships and struggles between people in the lifeworld, including the planning domain. It shows, how different powers work with, and against each other, and how power clashes can result in conflict. Foucault's work further helps us to understand certain types of behaviour and actions of individuals and groups, why they do or do not do certain things and why they react or resist certain influences, e.g. institutional change.

By having an understanding of power relations, individuals and groups, planners working within such a power web could develop strategies to exploit 'good' powers and to combat 'bad' powers. This could also help planners to deal more effectively with resistance, struggle and conflict. There seems to be little doubt that future planning theory will have to focus more on the Foucauldian concepts of power and knowledge (Lapintie, 2002), as was done in the analysis of power relations in the City of Tshwane.

5. POWER AND RATIONALITY[15] ... AND 'THE POWER OF RATIONALITY'

Various studies, specifically in the field of planning have focused on the relationship and conflict between power and rationality and the role of politics in planning (specifically in the local authority planning environment) (see Forester, 1982; Hoch, 1984; Mc Cloughlin, 1992; McClendon & Quay, 1992; Brooks, 1996: 118-131; Marris, 1998: 16; Flyvbjerg, 1996; 1998a; 1998b; 2001); Allmendinger, 2001; Lapintie, 2002; Watson, 2001; Hillier, 2002). These studies amongst others present an example of the social relations, the dynamic process of communicative action (or the lack thereof), as well as the power struggles, conflict and resistance associated with it.

When it comes to the volatile role of the planner in the web of power relations and the planner's 'contingent and fragile' relation with other powers in the web (specifically within the context of the "lifeworld" and the "realpolitik") it is imperative to focus on the contributions by Bent Flyvbjerg on power (relations). Flyvbjerg who drew on the work of Foucault (Flyvbjerg, 1998b) developed a new insight on the conflict between power and rationality. Based on his study in the City of Aalborg (Flyvbjerg, 1998a), he came to the conclusion that "power defines rationality, and the greater the power, the less the rationality." Flyvbjerg specifically emphasised the power of realpolitik 'over' that of rational, planning actions, i.e. "the force of deliberate distortion of documentation, behind-the-scenes negotiations, undemocratic coalitions, and the dominance of rhetorical persuasion" (Flyvbjerg); *vis a vis* "the force of the better argument" of Habermas (Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987).

This 'revelation' not only spurred a new interest among planning theorists into power, but also provided a new insight on the planner's role within the political arena, including the local authority (Flyvbjerg, 1996; 1998a; 1998b; 2001; Lapintie, 2002). Lapintie (2002) states that Flyvbjerg's arguments are relevant in view of the fact that they provide a comprehensive and painstaking example of planning in a local political context, and that provide an anti-thesis to the utopianism of both the rational and communicative approaches to planning. Flyvbjerg's

[14] Neighbourhood/Community power is a type of power that is created through democratic rights, "the voice" of individuals and groups and social expression (Forester, 1982; Hoch, 1984).

[15] This title is borrowed from the highly acclaimed work of Flyvbjerg titled *Power and Rationality* (Flyvbjerg 1998a).

spearhead (according to Lapintie, 2002) is largely directed at planning theory that backs this naivety: the idea of common objectives and evaluation of alternatives based on scientific documentation and the communicative idea of "the force of the better argument". Forester also views Flyvbjerg's work as "superb and compelling", but agrees with Lapintie (2002) that the theoretical perspectives and analysis are over-generalised (see also critique on Flyvbjerg in Homann, 2005). Hoch (1984: 342), based on numerous empirical studies which were done during the last thirty years on the dominance of power relations in the conception, development and implementation of plans, in support of Flyvbjerg argues that the practical implementation of plans, allocation of resources are still mostly guided by "the force of politics" and less so by "the force of the better argument" as required by communicative action (Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987).

Although the contribution by Flyvbjerg is recognised and highly valued in many planning circles, it can also be criticised (also from a Habermasian/Foucauldian perspective) for not effectively focussing on "the power of (communicative) rationality". Firstly, if one accepts the "power-web relations theory" of Foucault and the notion that power is omnipresent and active on all levels, then we must also accept the power of other less important structures in the web e.g. the planners, communities, officials (Foucault's "whole set of little powers" or "little institutions" at the lowest level [see Foucault, 1994a; 1994b]). Secondly, as discussed earlier, power can be created or disposed through communicative action, speech, argumentation, etc. — the more effective these actions the stronger the power. Thirdly, when the omnipresent little institutions and little powers or agents are aligned and combined in a "proper social alignment" (as defined by Wartenburg, in Foucault 1994a), exercising effective communicative action, new and stronger powers and power relations are created. Not only does this support Foucault's viewpoint that power is not "something over another" but rather "something in relation to others", it also supports Habermas' argument relating to "the force of the better argument." It further highlights the fact that good arguments and effective communicative action, specifically within a proper social alignment, do not have to be dominated by a power structure; on the contrary, such communicative actions, if exercised properly, have "the power" and potential to challenge the so-called dominant central power structures, political powers or the powers of 'The Prince.'

Again, taking a Habermasian perspecitve on Foucault, and including the viewpoints of Healey (1997) and Hillier (2002), on communicative action, it is imperative to recognise the role that effective and appropriate communicative action can play in combating 'power-conflict', specifically in the planning environment. Hillier (2002: 32) states that communicative action can assist actors to express defense reactions to colonisation of the lifeworld, e.g. through local protests against certain power actions or institutions, such as anti-nuclear movement. Lapintie (2002) also supports the notion that communicative action, if applied successfully, could be used to solve problems of traditional planning and the related power/authority dominance. Flyvbjerg (1998a) further states that the works of both Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) and Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987) highlight an essential tension between conflict and consensus as they emphasise the need for planners to think more in terms of conflict and power and to seek consensus (see also Forester, 1982: 67; Brooks, 1996: 118-31; Harrison, 1998: 40; Marris, 1998: 16; Lapintie, 2002; Hillier, 2002).

In view of the above, it is argued that Flyvbjerg underestimated the power of these structures and more so, the potential (and combined effect) of these social powers (and communicative action). Lapintie (2002) also questions Flyvbjerg's definition of rationality specifically in view of the post-Habermasian and post-Foucaultian world. She argues that Flyvbjerg's statement of 'power defines rationality' could be widely criticised if this rationality is construed as "communicative rationality". This aspect relating to 'the power of (communicative) rationality' has become specifically relevant in the argumentative and democratic forms of planning which followed the communicative turn in planning as discussed earlier on.

Allmendinger (2001: 201-202), based on a case study of a redevelopment scheme in the city centre of Frome (Mendip District Council), also examined the phenomenon of power relations within a planning environment. He refers to the "micro politics" of planning practice which resulted from the conflict and friction between the various role players in the planning and decision making process, e.g. the planners, the politicians and the developers. Like Flyvbjerg, Allmendinger (2001) also highlights the power (domination) of the politicians and the CEO in the planning process, and the way in which planners were marginalised. Allmendinger (2001), however unlike Flyvbjerg, also recognised the rational power of the planners and how the planners exercised their knowledge and professional power in enforcing their ideas on the design and layout of the proposed development (the typical modernist rational process). Watson (2001: 130 — 131), based on her case study of spatial planning in the Cape Town Metropolitan Council (which also draws on the works of Foucault and Flyvbjerg), refers to the "micro-physics of power", which shaped the planning process in that City. She goes on further to emphasise the powerful and central role, which "discourse-coalition building" played in shaping the planning process and helping the spatial planners to exercise their power within the metropolitan authority — yet another example of the power of communicative action and combined social/power relations.

Lapintie (2002: 13) argues that it is difficult to maintain the clear dichotomies between rationality, power and knowledge. Instead of a struggle between rationality and power, "the realm of planning consists of a multitude of smaller and larger power struggles, where the possible roles and agencies of different actors are in fact constituted." This not only highlights the confusion and different opinions on the relationship between power, rationality and communication, but it also highlights the need to better understand power relations and the dynamics of power in the complex and volatile planning

environment. It is this complexity of power relations that have become so important in the study of planning practice.

Based on the work of Healey (1997), Hillier (2002), and Forester (1982: 306-310), a wide range of strategies could be used to address the conflict and the power planning dilemmas and to reach common ground or consensus. This aim of balancing power relations (and struggles) largely resonates with Healey's concept of achieving a "shared language" through a process of interactive imagining and consensus building (Healey, 1997). In this regard Hillier (2002) very accurately captured the essence of the challenge facing planners in local authorities with her theory on "discursive democracy." This theory which is largely based on the work of Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987) and Foucault promotes: "a process of open discussion in which all points of view can be heard and that the policy outcome/s which result/s is/ are legitimate when they reflect the mutual understandings (through reciprocity, reflexivity, respect, cooperation, *etc*.)" (Hillier, 2002: 77).

6. REFLECTING ON THE PRACTICE, POLITICS AND POWERS IN THE CITY OF TSHWANE

Based on the theoretical framework presented in the first section of this paper (with special reference to the work of Foucault (1969; 1975; 1994a; 1994b) and Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), and within the context of the integrated power and social webs which characterise the lifeworld, a number of thematic discussions around power were extracted from the Tshwane study and presented below. These discussions specifically relate to:

- the dynamics of power structures and power relations (how powers and power relations change, develop, emerge, how they/it move/s around/in the web);
- the different types and combinations of powers and their effects;
- the relationship between power relations and the power struggles, conflict and resistance associated with it; and
- the relationship between the (Tshwane) transformation processes and power relations.

6.1 Questioning and challenging the powers of 'The Prince'

In contrast to the findings of work by amongst others Foucault to redefine the concept of power, the Tshwane experience clearly demonstrated that there are cases in municipalities where power is still centralised, 'at the top', and in the hands of 'The Prince.' Although much was done during the last ten years in the City of Tshwane to establish and develop democratic ways of consulting and communicating, numerous examples were still evident of strong autocratic and dominatory powers. These powers, as well as the use/abuse of such powers (over the other weaker powers) were specifically evident in the Tshwane transformation and organisational restructuring processes during the early 2000s. This continued power control and domination from 'the central and the top' often created frustration and friction amongst the other 'less powerful entities' that desired and wanted to consult, engage and share ideas.

In addition to the prevalence of strong dominatory powers, the Tshwane-experience also showed how such autocratic and dominatory powers can in a web-like fashion infiltrate all levels of the organisation. In support of Foucault's theory, the Tshwane experience therefore clearly showed that power is not something that can be ring-fenced or defined.

Unlike the old perceptions about the untouchable status of certain powers (infra-power or the power of 'The Prince'), the Tshwane case study also exposed the vulnerability of such powers and presented examples of how easily power can be seized, manipulated and/or threatened by other powers and combinations of power. This vulnerability and sensitivity of strong powers is particularly evident in the ease with which certain top management officials and senior politicians were 'removed' or replaced by others during the recent transformation processes.

6.2 The unpredictable and illusive dynamics of power

The Tshwane-study, in support of Foucault, has clearly shown the dynamics and complexity of power — how it moves around, how it changes over time and adapts to different situations, what the different types of powers are, at which levels they function, and the particular relationship between them. These dynamics are specifically evident when looking at the way in which the different power structures (and their powers), e.g. political parties, departmental managers and support basis changed and fluctuated during the decade of study. The Tshwane-case further illustrates that power(s) can emerge or manifest at any time and in any place — even when and where it is least expected. This proposition highlights the need to understand and accept the complexity and the unpredictability of power relations and to search for appropriate ways to manage, 'control' and balance these powers. This, in itself requires a certain kind of power — a power with its own characteristics and inherent dangers.

6.3 Aspiration(s) for power

As in the case of 'the Prince', the Tshwane case study presents numerous examples of how people act and behave in order to acquire more power — at any cost — to become 'a/the Prince', and what people would do to defend, protect and maintain these begotten powers. These aspirations and actions were frequently on display during the organisational restructuring processes, and the 'sometimes extraordinary' ways in which different officials and managers (on all levels) acted and behaved in order to protect their domains and positions, or to move to a higher position/'the top'. The Tshwane experience further illustrated how these aspirations can dominate and influence, and how they can create conflict, unleash resistance and result in a clash of different (aspiring) powers. These forms of conflict and resistance were not only demonstrated between officials and politicians, but also in struggles between IDP forums (including community-driven bodies) and the Pretoria/Tshwane local authority (during the late 1990s), specifically

with regard to the respective decision making powers of these entities.

6.4 Managing and balancing the different types of power relations

Throughout the transformation processes various examples were presented of the different types of power which constitute the power web, such as:

- the community/social power exhibited by some community forums;
- the social group power presented by the various planning sections and factions within the planning sections;
- the professional powers exercised by the professional planners and other related professions;
- the autocratic powers of the old style managers who resisted the emerging democratic processes and management styles;
- the different types of ('good and bad') political power; and 'the power of instruments' with specific reference to the power of the old structure plan and the 'aspiring power' of the IDP.

The study indicated how some of these powers had a negative influence on the system, while others had positive impacts. The study also demonstrated that power can be 'good' and productive, specifically within the context of the social nexus. One of the most important powers, and one that is often most neglected, was the power of communication and communicative action as reflected in the communicative actions of community forums and stakeholder groups. This form of productive power was specifically exhibited by the way in which certain community groups and forums exercised their social/community power (over the political power of 'The Prince') in order to obtain funds for certain programmes and projects in their wards.

It was however the specific relationships (or clashes) between certain types of conflicting powers, e.g. the professional and political powers that created the most conflict and problems. In other instances, certain combinations of "compatible" powers (e.g. the combination of social power and communicative power), had a positive effect on the overall power/ organisational structure. Within this realm, the Tshwane structure presents a particular power web with unique power relations. This emphasises the need to understand the different types of powers and the different types of relations, as well as the effect of these powers and power relations, specifically in a volatile political environment such as a local authority, specifically during the turbulent times of transformation. It further emphasises the need to promote and exploit good relationships and to manage bad ones — to balance the relationships in order to establish and maintain a sound and balanced power web, and ultimately good and productive power relations and organisational stability.

6.5 Struggles and conflict associated with power relations

When considering the complex power web with its different and often conflicting power relations, it is obvious that these relations will in all likelihood be associated with conflict, resistance and struggle. This particular study which, through the "practice movement methodology" and practice-writing and narrating, presents practice-based stories of real life experiences, exposed many struggles, conflict and even battles typically found in planning systems and local authorities. These include the struggles between politicians and planners and the municipal managers and planners. Many of these struggles (which are intrinsically associated with "Foucault's powers") were associated with, and amplified by, the Tshwane local government transformation and the transformation of the urban planning and local government system (1992-2002), as well as the power/s of/in this system.

6.6 The impact of power relations on the transformation in the City of Tshwane

These power structures and power relations found in Foucault's power web and the City of Tshwane had a positive and negative "impact on the transformation of the urban planning system" in this City during the past decade. It was positive, in the sense that the transformation process was largely inspired, propelled and facilitated and directed by these different types of powers as well as a combination of these powers, viz: professional powers; the power of knowledge; the power and force of the better argument; the power of effective communicative action; the power of communities and pressure groups; and also the 'good' infra power of politicians who used their powers to change the system to the better. Without these powers the transformation would not have been possible. In the City of Tshwane, these powers referred to above, in some instances, e.g. the organisational process, had a negative impact on the transformation as they were used to stop or slow down the transformation process, to defend the old system and to protect and maintain the old practices and powers in the City of Tshwane. In many cases these powers were also used to manipulate the transformation process as is evident by some of the restructuring efforts in the former council. These hindering forces or powers, unlike the facilitating forces or powers, were ultimately responsible for the resistance, struggles and conflict associated with the transformation process in the City of Tshwane. Foucault also referred to the concepts of promoting or constraining powers. In the City of Tshwane, it was however, primarily the combination(s) of the different powers (good and bad combinations) that had the largest impact on the transformation process.

6.7 The impact of the Tshwane transformation processes on power relations

The transformation processes in the City of Tshwane, or the introduction of new urban planning and urban management processes and practices, although influenced by the various forms of powers, in turn also had a positive and negative 'impact on power, power structures and powers relations.' It was positive in the sense that it resulted in the establishment and emergence of many new forms of 'good' power such as the formation of the

community/IDP forums with its management committees, new forms of community power and social power in the form of the democratic processes and the community involvement, and also new forms of 'good' political power as a result of the emergence of the democratic dispensation. This also presents a shift from the so-called dominatory power (and the bad power of 'The Prince') towards a more democratic and communicative type of power. Although some people saw these new power structures as negative and threatening, the transformation process impacted positively on power structures and power relations in the sense that it disrupted the old power web and power balances. In some instances old power structures ('good and bad') were dissolved or replaced by new power structures ('good and bad'). This ultimately created conflict, resistance and uncertainty in a volatile transforming local authority, and hence a new form of opposition power and group power, against any forms of change and domination.

The transformation process and the associated new urban planning process in local government processes and structures similarly had a major impact on power structures in the rest of the municipality. The new 'IDP-system' for instance resulted in new local authority powers specifically in the top management, the office of the Municipal Manager and the Treasury department, as well as a new set of power relations in the various council departments. Although this IDP system in some ways enhanced the power of the Municipal Manager, making the position more strategic, it in other cases diluted the power and influence of the City Treasurer and the Departmental Managers who no longer had the power to control and manipulate the system, projects, processes and the budget. This resulted in conflict, resistance and frustration, specifically amongst the old school (patriarchal) managers and politicians. In a similar fashion the newly transforming urban planning system with its developmental, strategic and democratic nature not only affected (positively and negatively) the roles and powers of the managers and councilors, but it also had a major impact on the roles and powers of the urban planners as it made them more relevant and important in the new local government dispensation. This provided an avenue for the emergence of new professional powers that in many cases threatened other power structures (old and new) within and outside the organisation.

The Tshwane case study not only emphasises the need to understand the different power and power relations and the relationship between transformation processes and power relations, but it also provides a perspective on the transformational issues, struggles, conflict, resistance and power play associated with change. It highlights the sensitivity and complexity of power relations as described by Foucault, and also the need to structure and manage power relations so as to manage inevitable conflict and seek to maximise the benefits of power. It has specifically become important in the local authority-planning environment with its political nature to manage power-plays and domination, to devise strategies and tactics to exploit 'good powers' and to mediate 'bad powers' and to direct beneficial power(s) for the common good. One such strategy that needs to be emphasised relates to effective and appropriate communicative action, negotiation, argumentation and "the force of the better argument", as promoted by Habermas (1983; 1984; 1987), Healey (1997), Hillier (2002) and Watson (2001).

7. ENDING THIS DISCOURSE WITH THE POWER OF (COMMUNICATIVE) RATIONALITY

The Tshwane case study unravelled many examples as to how political power was used and abused in defining and dominating rationality, which lend support for the work of Flyvbjerg (1996; 1998a; 1998b; 2001). The study, however, also presented numerous examples and evidence that challenge and contradict his work. In support of Lapintie (2002), as discussed earlier on, the study claims that Flyvbjerg's theory is too simplistic in that it over-emphasises the "power of (political) power" and that it under-plays/emphasises "the power of rationality" and more specifically the power of communicative rationality or action. The study provides evidence that rationality is not always inversely proportional to power, as argued by Flyvbjerg.

The study also presents evidence as to how the power of rationality was strengthened and supported by social powers working though effective communication, communicative action and effective speech acts (Habermas, 1983; 1984; 1987; Healey, 1997; Hillier, 2002) and the power of coalitions (Watson, 2001; Wartenburg in Foucault, 1994a; Kogler, 1996). On the strength of this it can be argued that the more active, omnipresent and powerful these social powers became, "the more the rationality, the less the power" (the inversion of Flyvbjerg). This supposition is supported by a number of events in the Tshwane-transformation process, *viz.*

- the sustained pressure and power of certain community groups to obtain funds for social projects;
- the efforts made by planners to implement new systems in spite of much resistance; and
- the many ways in which grand plans and presentations (and good arguments) were used to approve and implement certain projects.

In essence thus, these findings suggest in support of Watson (2001) and Homann (2005) that the force of the better communicatively constructed argument and social power can be more powerful and influential than what some scholars tend to believe. If social rationality/ arguments are applied/presented properly they have the potential to overshadow or at least challenge the political powers, ultimately providing a more balanced relationship between political power and rationality.

The Tshwane case study further shows that unbalanced relationships between power and rationality result in domination, conflict and the neglect of good rational arguments ('the better argument'). This again emphasises the need to devise strategies to ensure a more balanced relationship between power and rationality, or to limit or mitigate dominance or bad power, from whichever arena/realm. Within the

context of these strategies, Watson (2001) argues for the need to identify and counter relations of domination wherever they may occur and to be alert to power and its dynamics through rationality and knowledge, giving support to its production and positive forms and monitoring and revealing its negative forms. As demonstrated in the Tshwane case, communicative actions can be applied to manage such power dynamics. The Tshwane experiences further show that even if the power/social web is highly unstable, it can be counter-balanced and even stabilised through 'powerful rationality' and communicative action. These communicative actions cannot only ensure a more balanced relationship between power and rationality and a more balanced power and social web, but also a more effective organisation, a better organisational culture, less conflict and resistance and the more effective provision of services to communities.

REFERENCES

ALLMENDINGER, P. 2001. *Planning in Postmodern Times*. Routledge: London and New York.

BROOKS, M.P. 1996. Planning and Political Power: Towards a Strategy for Coping. In: Mandelbaum, S.J., Mazza, L. & Burchell, R.W. (eds.). *Explorations in Planning Theory*. USA: Rutgers, State University of New Jersey, pp.116—133.

COETZEE, P.J. van V. 2005. A reading of power relations in the transformation of urban planning in the municipalities of the Greater Pretoria region (now Tshwane): 1992 — 2002. PhD Thesis. University of Pretoria.

FAINSTEIN, S.S. & FAINSTEIN, N. 1996. City Planning and Political Values: An Updated View. In: Campbell, S. & Fainstein, S. (eds.). *Readings in Planning Theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc., pp. 265-287.

FLYVBJERG, B. 1996. The Dark Side of Planning: Rationality and 'Realrationalitat'. In: Mandelbaum, S. J. Mazza, L. & Burchell, R.W. (eds.). *Explorations in Planning Theory*. Edited by USA: Rutgers, State University of New Jersey.

FLYVBJERG, B. 1998a. *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago.

FLYVBJERG, B. 1998b. Empowering Civil Society: Habermas, Foucault and the question of conflict. In: Douglass, M. and Friedman, J. (eds.). *Cities for Citizens*. England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd., pp. 185-211.

FLYVBJERG, B. 2001. *Making Social Science Matter*. Cambridge University Press.

FORESTER, J. 1982. *Planning in the Face of Power*. Journal of the American Planning Association. Winter 1982.

FOUCAULT, M. 1969. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1972.

FOUCAULT, M. 1975. *Discipline and Punish*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1975.

FOUCAULT, M. 1994a. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. (Edited by Gutting G). Cambridge University Press.

FOUCAULT, M. 1994b. *Michel Foucault: Power. Essential works of Foucault 1954 — 1984*. Volume 3. Edited by James Faubian. Penguin Books.

GIDDENS, A. 1982. The Theory of Structuration: a Critique. University of California Press: Los Angeles.

GILLHAM, B. 2000. Case *Study Research Methods*. Continuum. London. New York.

HABERMAS, J. 1983. *Modernity versus postmodernity. New German Critique*, no.22, p. 3-14, Winter.

HABERMAS, J. 1984. *The theory of communicative action, Volume 1. Reason and the Rationalisation of society*, Boston: Beacon Press.

HABERMAS, J. 1987. *The theory of communicative action, Volume 2. Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason*. Boston: Beacon Press.

HARRISON, P 1998. *Re- imagining planning: an engagement with postmodernism and pragmatism*. Doctoral Thesis. Department of Town and Regional Planning. University of Natal.

HEALEY, P. 1997. *Collaborative planning. Shaping places in fragmented Societies*. London: Macmillan.

HEALEY, P. 1998. Collaborative planning in a stakeholder society. *Town Planning Review*, 69(1), pp: 1-22. Paper first submitted at a conference "Shaping places" held at Newcastle in October 1996.

HILLIER, J. 2002. *Shadows of power: An Allegory of Prudence in Land Use Planning*. London: Routledge.

HOCH, C. 1984. Doing Good and Being Right. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Summer.

HOMANN, D. 2005. *A critical analysis of the transformation of the city planning function in the city of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality*. Unpublished Masters Thesis. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

JORGENSON, D.L. 1989. *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies*. London: Sage Publications.

KOGLER, H. 1996. *The Power of Dialogue*. London: Mit Press.

LAPINTIE, K. 2002. *Rationality Revisited. From Human Growth to Argumentation*. Helsinki University of Technology: Department of Architecture.

MACHIAVELLI, N. 1961. *The Prince*. Translated by George Bull in 1961. Penguin Books. The Prince was first published in the early 1500s (exact date unknown).

MARRIS, P. 1998. Planning and Civil Society in the Twenty — First Century: An Introduction. In: Douglass, M. & Friedman, J. (eds.) *Cities for Citizens*. England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

McAUSLAN, P. 1992. Issues of Urban Management. In: Harris, N. (ed.) *Cities in the 1990's. The challenge for Developing Countries*. London: UCL Press.

McCLENDON, B.W. & Quay, R. 1992. *Mastering Change. Winning Strategies for Effective City Planning*. Washington, Chicago, Illinois: American Planning Association, Planners Press.

Mc CLOUGHLIN, J.B. 1992. Shaping Melbourne's Future. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MOORE, N. 2000. *How to do research. The complete guide to designing and managing research projects*. Third edition. London: Library Association Publishing.

POLKINGHORNE. D.E. 1998. *Narrative Knowing and the Human sciences*. State University of New York Press.

THOMAS, J. 1995. *Public Participation in Public Decisions. New Skills and Strategies for Public Managers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

WATSON, V. 2001. *Change and Continuity in Spatial Planning: Metropolitan Planning in Cape Town under Political Transition*. PhD Thesis. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand, Town and Regional Planning.

YIFTACHEL, O. & HUXLEY, M. 2000. Debating Dominance and Relevance: Notes on the 'Communicative Turn in Planning Theory'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional research*. Vol. 24, December.

YIN, R.K. 1994. *Case study research: design and methods*. 2nd ed. Sage Publications.