

THE SEARCH FOR A NEW DEVELOPMENT PLANNING/POLICY MODE: PROBLEMS OF EXPERTISE IN THE TRANSITION PERIOD

Miodrag Vujošević

The former system and practice of planning in Yugoslavia collapsed as early as towards the end of 1980s, not to be substituted for in the sequel by a new and legitimate development planning mode that has been compatible with the key processes and factors of the post-socialist transition, i.e., political pluralisation, privatisation, marketisation, and so forth. Under the recent circumstances, a number of new 'ideologies of planning' came to the surface, thereby rendering the current practice a peculiar mix of various concepts of 'quasi/pseudo planning' exercises, imbued with new biases, partisanship dominating the public scene, the notion of public interests almost lost, low transparency regarding the value and interest background of planning, etc. In effect, two general practices have been dominating the planning area, i.e., 'crisis management', and 'planning-supporting-the-wild-privatisation-and-marketisation'. To a large extent, this has been caused by a poor experience, i.e., a lack of planners/experts to work under the new circumstances ('transition'), paralleled by a lack of critical mass of social and economic actors interested in the sustainable development matters and supportive to them, and a wide spread anti-planning stance among the political and economic elites ('architects of the transitional reforms'). A more modernising and emancipatory model, e.g., 'planning-supporting-complex-transformation of society', seems to be still out of sight for some time to come. As the new coherent planning theory might not be expected for a longer period, preferably a preliminary planning heuristics would have to be elaborated, to more or less 'safely' direct the practice within the strategic framework defined. In this context, a number of specific issues of expertise would also have to be resolved, ranging from general theoretical and methodological issues, via practical methodologies, to the key issues within the triangle power – knowledge – action.

Specifically, this should also apply to the majority of development planning policy documents that have been worked out in the recent period.

Key words: *planning legitimacy lost; disputed public interests; insufficient expertise; institutional and organisational arrangements; new development planning/policy heuristics*

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

A radical change has taken place in the formerly established balance within the state (power) - market - planning - privatisation quadrangle as from the very beginning of the post-socialist transition. In this context, a new balance has also been searched for, thus influencing each and every segment of development planning/policy. Especially, planning approach and methodology would have to be radically changed, to cope with the respective impacts of the key factors in question.

Most likely, this will involve setting in motion a number of adjustments regarding many planning elements, viz.:

- Legitimising a new role of planning.
- A search for new, legitimate public interests.
- Planning evaluation.
- Balancing the planning-cum-market-interventions syndrome.
- Balancing the visions-versus-implementation syndrome.
- Search for a workable model of sustainable development.

On the other hand, there is a lack of both

theoretical and methodological knowledge on the veritable options of future planning modes and arrangements, in large part as a result of insufficient research. This is manifested as a 'crisis of expertise' in planning theory and practice.

In this contribution, a number of characteristics of the current planning system and practice in Yugoslavia (Serbia&Montenegro) is presented first, followed by a short critical review of the work on the preparation of a selected number of spatial and urban plans and other develop-

ment policy documents that have been worked out in the more recent period.¹

The paper concludes with a number of suggestions pertaining to a new planning heuristics and concomitant institutional and organizational arrangements.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM AND A SEARCH FOR NEW INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Already in the second half of 1980s, the system and practice of planning in the former Yugoslavia (now: Serbia&Montenegro) were both in a deep crisis and grossly hypertrophied. A new system was sought, based on appropriate market-cum-planning / planning-cum-market approaches. The claims were then still formulated within the socialist ideological 'narrative', with the aim of introducing more rigour into the over-regulated self-management 'p(l)andemonium'. At that time, Yugoslavia was still ranked among the planned-most, the participative-most, and the decentralised-most countries in the world (after Simmie, 1989).

The later course of events happened to be disappointing vis-à-vis the early expectations. It posed the key problem on the other track, that of 'deregulation-cum-de-etatisation'. A fairly unhappy experience with the former planning fuelled a wide spread rejecting of planning. Such an attitude is especially mani-

festated among the architects of the transition reforms, mostly the so-called 'econocrats' of the neo-liberal ideological provenance. In general, the majority of them tend to completely discard any more ambitious notion of planning, thereby reducing its role to the so-called 'project-led cum market-based' planning approach and concomitant methodologies.

As elsewhere in the ex-socialist countries (cf. Nedovic-Budic, 2001), the former planning system in Yugoslavia was dismantled as from the beginning of 1990s, and the planning practice has from then onwards been steered by a peculiar mixture of old habits, few institutional innovations and the social, economic and political turbulence of the transition period.² The previous system and practices of socio-economic planning collapsed, not to be replaced for so far by new arrangements, to match the impact of the key factors of the transition period, i.e., political pluralisation/democratisation, privatisation and marketisation. On the other hand, although the system of spatial/urban and environmental planning was 'touched-up' in the 1990s, and additional legal changes introduced in 2002-2003, the adjustments undertaken have not been harmonised with the factors mentioned above.

At present, both the system and practice seem not to have developed to a genuine planning mode. Instead, they resemble more the so-called quasi/pseudo-planning. Three heuristic modes dominate the planning landscape of Serbia and Montenegro (and another one emerging only recently):

- Planning as crisis management.
- Planning supporting and enabling wild privatisation and marketisation of public goods.
- Planning as a means of political pluralisation and democratisation.
- Planning as supporting complex societal transformation and modernization.

In terms of their respective political functions, the majority of spatial, urban and other development plans, which were prepared over the recent decade or so, seem to have been following other purposes than those conventionally attached to the 'true' plans. They have thus more manifested themselves by what was 'beneath the surface' (Sillince, 1986:184-9), than through the declared (nominal) values, aims and objectives, viz.: (1) Creating confidence. (2) Providing symbolic reassurance. (3) (Merely) countering criticisms. (4) Simple monitoring. (5) Generating commitment by others. (6) Back covering. (7) Bidding for resources. (8) Making everything legal and above-board. (9) Establishing arena for debate; etc.

To sum up, the existing situation in the planning system and practice reads as follows (Vujosevic, 2003).

- The system has almost lost its legitimacy, partly because the majority of the former public interests collapsed, and new, indisputable public interests have not been established. Now, planners face the basic dilemma of what is to be denoted as new public interests: 'general public opinion?'; the 'sum of the most numerous interests at some point of time?'; the 'bundle of current particular compromises?'; the 'interests of the most vociferous-and-powerful actors?'/would-be-winners?'; the 'veritable democratic interests of the overwhelming majority of actors?'; the 'potential interests of the disadvantaged-and-disempowered-and-deprived' (the now prevalingly apathetic and dormant public)?; etc. Under such circumstances, new planning are hardly known to the public at large, in part as a consequence of an overall anti-planning stance among the majority of political, economic and expert elites.

- Inertia rules the professional landscape, since there has been a lack of new approaches and methodologies to match the impact of new dominant factors and the miserable social and economic conditions in the country. Regarding the approaches and methodologies applied, the traditional *ex ante* planning evaluation still prevails, and more *ex post* and *ex continuo* evaluation is still missing.

- The planning system is too centralised, since the radical re-centralisation of

¹ The following plans and other development documents have been scrutinized for this purpose: (1) *Prostorni plan Republike Srbije/The Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia* (1996). (2) *Prostorni plan područja eksploatacije Kolubarskog lignitskog basena/Spatial Plan for the Kolubara Lignite Basin* (2000-2003). (3) *Prostorni plan područja eksploatacije Kostolačko-kovinskog lignitskog basena/Spatial Plan for the Kostolac – Kovin Lignite Basin* (2002-2003). (4) *Prostorni plan područja infrastrukturnog koridora Niš - granica BJR Makedonije/Spatial Plan for the Infrastructure Belt from Niš to the Border of FYROM* (2002). (5) *Regionalni prostorni plan Administrativnog područja Beograda/Regional Spatial Plan of the Belgrade Administrative Area* (2002-2003). (6) *Generalni plan Beograda 2021 /Master Plan of Belgrade 2021* (2001-2003). (7) *Generalni urbanistički plan Budve/Master Urban Plan for Budva* (1995; 2001-2003). (8) *Pravci razvoja Crne Gore ekološke države/Development Directions of the Montenegro Ecological State* (1996-2002). (9) *Strategija privrednog razvoja Srbije do 2010. godine/Economic Development Strategy of Serbia till 2010.*

² In terms of new institutional and organisational arrangements for planning, a similar situation in six Balkan countries (Albania, Bulgaria, FR Yugoslavia, FYROM, Greece, and Romania) is reported on in Vujošević (2001). Of particular relevance here are: poor 'social mobilization' for planning; and a lack of a critical mass of actors supporting the case of development planning/policy. Greece represents only a slight exception to this regional pattern.

Serbia and was undertaken in 1990, and subsequently the sub-national tiers were deprived of almost all effective planning instruments. In addition to this, the majority of regional entities ('districts') and communes lack competent administrative machinery and expertise, as well as other support (e.g., research, planning information support, etc.) for effecting autonomous planning policies.

- There has been no more ambitious strategic planning (which is, however, somehow understandable vis-à-vis only recently terminated international sanctions and isolation of the country).³ On the other hand, the majority of the development documents that have been passed in the meantime, grossly lack elaborated implementation devices (policies and instruments). Especially in the field of urban planning, detailed ('regulatory') schemes prevail over more strategic development schemes for larger urban and regional areas. Specific development projects (and, only sometimes, more harmonised programmes) by far outnumber other planning schemes.

- The integration and harmonisation of various aspects of planning and policy, i.e., social, economic, spatial/urban, environmental, is very poor. In effect, physicalism still dominates the scene in spatial and urban planning, and the elements of implementable socio-economic development and environmental policy concepts are scarce within this block.

- The stipulated legal propositions pertaining to the openness, participativeness and transparency of the planning/policy procedures easily fall by the wayside in the planning practice, resulting in very poor content in this regard.

- There has been a lack of planners and other experts experienced and knowledgeable in practicing planning under the new circumstance of political pluralism and radically changed structure of stakeholders and concomitant institutional arrangements.

³ The most notable manifestation pertains to a complete abandonment of the former legislation on the socio-economic development policy and planning. In effect, as from the 1990s there have been no specific legal documents (i.e., laws, by-laws, etc.) pertaining to this issue (apart from few constitutional provisions).

This also applies to 'educators' in general, since the prolonged international isolation of the FR Yugoslavia has made the gross of their knowledge and capabilities irrelevant. In sum, it seems that many planners would not be able to assume new roles expected of them on the part of the society at large.

- The planning/policy information, research, institutional and other support provided by the state and other public agencies often does not satisfy even the barest needs, partly for a general scarcity of resources concomitant to the overall and deep social, economic and political crisis the society found itself in as from the beginning of the 1990s, and apparently even more for a still poor institutional culture in the public sector.

- Worst of all, manipulation, paternalism and clientism still represent dominant forms of power, which is a problem in itself, Serbia & Montenegro being one of the most corrupted countries in the world. What is now most missing is a non-manipulative persuasion, as well as the authority of rational professional values, as the forms of communication and interaction that seem to provide the only hope for the development of a democratic, emancipatory and transformative planning mode.

A Brief Assessment of Nine Spatial and Urban Plans and Other Development Policy Documents – The Key Problems of Expertise

In the terms of the approach applied, the steps undertaken so far do not seem to match the new expectations, as they failed either to satisfy a number of methodological and other standards, or to introduce necessary innovations. In what follows, a brief assessment of the work done so far is presented:

- The roles of the documents scrutinized are poorly defined, which is strange in relation to the pronounced thesis on the 'supreme role of market', which raises questions as to their veritable social and political mission.⁴ In addition to this, physicalism

⁴ The Act was assessed as a 'blunt retrogression', well below the already established standards of planning theory and practice in Serbia. In addition to this, the legislators have been found almost completely non-flexible upon the impact of the key

features as the key characteristic of the majority of these documents.⁵ The strategic spatial and urban plans will however have to assume a part of socio-economic development planning and policy as well, because the latter is not likely to get replaced in some time to come. Furthermore, the social, economic and environmental problems of the pertaining cities and areas are so grave, that they must not be ignored in the development documents like those in question.

- There has been no sound concept on the public interests developed within the exercise, particularly under the circumstances of a large number of legitimate individual interests fast emerging on the political scene, some of which also persist in imposing themselves as new and legitimate public interests.

factors of the transition period, i.e., political pluralisation/democratisation, marketisation and privatization (Vujosević, 2002b). The role of a regional plan is defined by the Planning and Construction Act (article no. 22, par two) as 'working out of the spatial organization principles, and defining the objectives of spatial development, organization, protection and utilization of space, as well as of other relevant elements.' The content is stipulated for in very broad terms (article no. 22, par three), a plan to be comprised of text and graphical interpretation. Similarly, the *Planning and Construction Act* defines the role of a master plan as 'defining a long term perspective of settlement development and spatial organization' (article no. 36). In terms of its contents, the *Act* stipulates for the following key issues/themes, viz.: defining building areas; dominant planned destinations therein; defining the key spatial parameters for various types of technical infrastructure (i.e., transportation, energy, water supply, utilities, etc.); and zoning for specific urban plans. Within the legal framework indicated to, all spatial and urban master plans effectively act as strategic physical plans, also comprising some elements of socio-economic development and environmental policy.

⁵ Two spatial plans, namely, *Spatial Plan for the Kolubara Lignite Basin*, and *Spatial Plan for the Kostolac-Kovin Lignite Basin*, represent an exemption to this pattern. They contain, *inter alia*, a number of elaborate schemes concerning various aspects of social, economic, and cultural development, as well as of environmental policy. They are also comprised of many propositions for the implementation, including a number of support schemes (e.g., institutional, research, information, and so forth). However, it is still to be seen whether the responsible authorities would accept such documents, i.e. documents containing a large number of obligatory commitments in terms of their implementation.

This results in a feeble notion of the **existing and predictable future conflicts**, as well as of the planning mechanisms and instruments that will be used in their control and management. Thus, a **power/interests map** (i.e., an elaborated account of the 'power geometry') of the planned area is still missing in each and every document commented on here.

- The **concept of sustainable development** has been only 'flirted with' in the plans under scrutiny, whereby a sound doctrine upon which development is to be directed and articulated is also missing (i.e., that which is of relevance for a territorial entity with the GDP of not more than some US \$ 1,500 per capita). In this context, no system of operational and analytical concept of sustainable development indicators, applicable to a concrete city/area has been worked out.⁶

- No efforts have been made to introduce more relevant methodological approach, i.e., one which would contrast the miserable socio-economic and environmental fixities, viz.: (1) A more rigorous *ex post* evaluation of past decisions has not been performed, implying that future steps will be undertaken upon rather anecdotal insights into the existing power structure, institutional and organisational arrangements and dominant communication and interaction modes in planning.⁷ In the same context, the most significant problem of the areas or cities in question, i.e., how to approach the economic and ecological renewal and rehabilitation of its economy, has hardly been paid sufficient attention to. (2) Although

⁶ This particularly applies to the most ambitious document of the kind, namely, to *Pravci razvoja Crne Gore ekološke države/Development Directions of the Montenegro Ecological State* (2002). The document in question does not contain a single notion of the general principles and criteria of sustainability operationalized in accord with the development fixities of Montenegro.

⁷ For example, Gilg and Kelly (1996) suggest that a solid and rigorous *ex post* analysis of past planning decisions should preferably be comprised of four levels ('ways') of assessment, viz.: (1) Simple statistical and cartographic analysis. (2) Technical analysis of the decision-making process as a source or information, or as a way of testing hypotheses about the effectiveness of planning policies ('logical positivism'). (3) Examining the decision-making process as a power struggle. (4) Examining the planning process in a 'post-modern' way, i.e., as a sequence of events.

the intention of the whole exercise is to work out a 'hard product', i.e., an urban development plan, no *ex ante* evaluation scheme has been produced so far, implying that the job is not being performed *lege artis*. Apart from other implications, this failure is particularly handicapping regarding the criteria of *ex ante* evaluation, leaving the professional audience and the public at large without sound answers to key questions: What are the criteria upon which the evaluation has been undertaken? Whose are they? What interests stand behind them? Who decides on the criteria that will be applied? Apart from softening the rigour of the expertise, this flaw also allows for too ample a 'manoeuvring space' for the subsequent arbitrating to be performed by the politicians.

- A trend-based extrapolation has been used as the **key prognostic technique**, which is absolutely unacceptable, keeping in mind the poor predictive power (1), unstable institutional arrangements in planning and elsewhere (2), and missing period (3).⁸ Instead, the political community would necessitate a number of **veritable and/or plausible alternative scenarios of possible/desirable future development** elaborated and presented for discussion, deliberation and decision-making in expert arenas and public forums.

- Perhaps the weakest parts of the majority of the documents assessed refer to the issue of **implementation of planning decisions**, giving way to 'visioning' (in effect, to another planning 'phantasmagoria'), which is again unacceptable *vis-à-vis* the pressing and burning development realities.⁹ Even in the

⁸ Namely, the 1980s were a decade of economic stagnation, while in the 1990s the country (then FR Yugoslavia) experienced almost complete collapse of all key social, economic, health, cultural and other development parameters.

⁹ Vujošević and Filipović (2002) report on more than 15 key problems of development in Yugoslavia (S&M), which would have to be addressed by a new generation of development policy documents. Among others, the most burning/pressing are the following problems: very low level of GDP per capita (ca. 1,500 USD); extremely high unemployment (ranging from 30% to even 50% of the labor force, depending on the estimate); the extremely high total foreign debt; largely insufficient capital and other investments; poor social, health and cultural indicators; poor economic growth; a large number of refugees; obsolete economic structure; pauperi-

case of the plans that carry a more elaborated part for the implementation of the key development objective, the implementation most often fail for the lack of political will to undertake necessary steps to that end.¹⁰ Consequently, there has been a **sharp discrepancy between 'is' and 'should'** in the majority of the documents examined. For example, no corroboration has been extended, in terms of the available resources and implementation instruments, as to how to bridge the gap between the grave existing situation and veritably poor development prospects, on the one hand, and the extremely optimistic and enthusiastic future growth path, on the other.¹¹

- Finally, an open, transparent and publicly verified **'offer to strategic partners'** will also be needed, as the cities and regions of Serbia and Montenegro simply do not possess enough indigenous resources to cope with the problems of their economic, social, physical and environmental renewal and rehabilitation.

In sum, **major improvements are needed regarding the planning approach and methodology** applied in the preparation of the strategic development documents evaluated here. As most of these projects are likely to carry considerable demonstrational effects throughout the planning scene in Serbia and Montenegro, their highly professional execution is a necessity. However, as the majority of

zation of the majority of population and concomitant social polarization; structural crisis of public finances; devastating 'brain drain'; extremely high environmental pollution, in comparison to the socioeconomic development attained; large housing deficit in cities; etc.

¹⁰ This most notably applies to the Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia (1996).

¹¹ For example, in the Master Plan of Belgrade 2021 (p. 905), the GDP per capita is predicted to grow at an annual growth rate of 5.3% over the period of 18 years (!). In the same period (p. 904), the total number of employed would increase from 430,000 (in 2003) to 545,000 (in 2021). According to the same forecast (p. 906), the gross capital investment would reach 21 billion euros (!) in total. Similar exaggeration may be detected in the *Economic Development Strategy of Serbia till 2010* (pp. 83-90). The GDP till 2010 is predicted to grow the average annual rate of 8.55%, the total GDP to reach 22.7 billion US \$, mostly as a consequence of gross capital investment over the same period of some 24.5 billion US \$ (!).

so far demonstrated fallacies stem from the contextual settings, the action should preferably focus on the **improvement of those most influential extra-planning factors**. These are briefly indicated in the concluding part of this contribution.

CONCLUDING FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

General

Almost 15 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Serbia still finds itself in a post-socialist proto-democracy ('post-socialist proto-capitalist *laissez-faire*'), yet without developed institutions of representative democracy, civil society and market economy. On the one hand, the better parts of the former self-management system of the ideological and political monopoly have been in the meantime time abandoned and almost forgotten, most prominently, for example, territorial and work participation. On the other, its bad parts have been kept and transferred via the retrogressive misfortunes of the 1990s, e.g., paternalism, manipulation, clientism, and so forth. 'Wild capitalism' and concomitant privatisation have taken place without a veritable social and political dialogue and consensus on the strategic issues of the transition reforms.

The problems of planning system and practice were concomitant with the overall institutional developments mentioned above. Namely, although comfortable institutional and other certainties for planning from the previous period have simply evaporated in the 1990s, most planners seem to have avoided fundamental debates and concerns of the theoretical and institutional underpinnings of the existing planning system with regard to the key issues of its legitimacy, role, mission, political background, contents, procedures, etc. Instead, they seem to have inclined to discussing 'safer' issues of development policy/planning, narrowed down primarily to technical problems. Now, after a decade or so of such a professional myopia, there is an absolute need to switch to a more rigorous assessment of the existing practice and future options. The now almost lost legitimacy of planning and environmental policy will not be repaired, unless these disciplines clearly demonstrate

that they are able to improve on the existing practice. In addition to this, it is of crucial importance for the future of planning to demarcate its role in relation to other mechanisms of overall societal guidance and control. Should planners not succeed in their endeavours, the role of planning is likely to be reduced to a 'junior partner' within the emerging institutional arrangements. Planning should serve democratic pluralism and participative democracy. It should also be modernising and emancipatory, i.e., supportive to the actions of those actors who attempt to change the material (i.e., social, economic, and spatio-environmental) conditions, as well as the established power relations (i.e., the existing socio-political hybrid).

Particularly, there has been a **lack of theoretical and general methodological research** regarding the alternative planning modes in the transition period.¹² In this respect, the situation in Serbia&Montenegro sharply contrasts with that in the Western planning.¹³ There has been neither systematic study of the 'dark side of planning – the domain of power' (after Yiftachel, 1998), nor on the transferred and newly generated distortions in the triangle power – knowledge – action (after Friedmann, 1987), these aspects being most relevant for the reform of planning in the post-socialist transition. The planning academia, students and practitioners would all rather subscribe to preaching new politically and professionally fashionable mantras (e.g., 'more market, less planning', 'the minimum of state, the maximum of private initiative', etc.), than they would undertake research within the more laborious formulas. Although the notion of public interests as the key legitimising base of planning has been widely disputed, the overwhelming majority of planners have grossly demonstrated power-blindness and power-free attitude when discussing various development concepts in the pertinent planning documents. The notable search in the Western theory for a rescue from the discourse on the

¹² The examples of the kind, however modest, are rare. Cf., for example, Vujošević (2002a) and Vujošević (2003a).

¹³ For example, Allmendinger and Tewdrw-Jones (2002) speak of an 'explosion of new texts in planning theory' over the period of recent decade or so.

modern – post-modern impasse has had no parallel in Serbia, as the vast majority of planners tend to bluntly avoid contemplating the impact of the key transition factors on the new planning concepts, viz., political pluralisation and democratisation, marketisation and privatisation. Therefore, we may well sum up **our view of the current situation** in the following way: (1) In Serbia&Montenegro planning theory is currently in a confused state, as a consequence of a number of changes over the last ten years ('post-socialist transition'). (2) The planning practice is grossly non-reflexive of the impact of contextual factors, whereby the conundrums of the *Realpolitik* of planning are neglected, and a veritable social and political inquiry and practice is seldom reached (cf. Flyvberg, 2003). (3) Notwithstanding this, the majority of planners have kept demonstrating an evangelical and bureaucratic zeal and arrogance against the criticisms of the 'non-consecrated' (i.e., the proponents of 'frames' and 'narratives' other than planners').

An Urge to Work on a New Planning Heuristics and Planning Arrangements

In searching for a 'third way' between, on the one hand, the impossibility of a 'general theory of planning' (Mandelbaum, 1979), and the necessity to work out a new 'ideology/philosophy of planning for the transition period' (after Harvey, 1982), on the other, we are here opting for a new planning heuristics (in the sense of the 'philosophy brought down to the earth', after Ulrich, 1994). It is to serve at least two purposes: first, to provide for a number of general methodological principles and criteria to direct the preparation of planning decisions; and, second, to define a broad strategic framework for the planning practice. Its cornerstones are two-fold, the institutional-organisational, and the methodological proper.

Institutional and organisational changes needed

- First, number of **expert and political fora** ought to be institutionalised, in order to establish a broad societal dialogue on the open issues of the future development. Apart from other aspects, the dialogue should address the key issues of the reconstitution of development

planning policy, vis-à-vis the key factors of the post-communist/post-socialist transition (i.e., privatisation, marketisation, political pluralisation and democratisation, strengthening of the institutions of civil society, etc.).

- More research is needed on the new heuristic modes of development planning policy in the period of post-socialist transition. In this context, alternative theoretical and general methodological patterns ought to be elaborated and evaluated, from the standpoint of their (in)compatibility with the key factors of the transition period.

- Systematic research will also have to be undertaken on related practical matters, upon a series of projects and programmes. The research should focus on the alternative scenarios of future development, investigating into their respective pros and cons (1), as well as on the pertinent presentation of the research results to the public at large (2).

- A national focal point in the field of sustainable development will have to be established urgently, and its work coordinated with the *ESDP*, *INTERREG III* and related initiatives, programmes and projects in the pan-European and European regional schemes. This segment ought preferably to be institutionalised as a part of overall institutional arrangements for the integration of Yugoslavia into the European institutions and schemes.

- The existing procedural arrangements in planning/policy will have to be radically changed, to care for the harmonisation of the newly emerging interests and concomitant conflicts. In additions to this, new lanes for a more open, transparent and participative planning should also be introduced.

- In administrative institutional and organisational terms, new arrangements would also be needed. Of priority is to establish a number of supra-ministerial and/or supra-departmental modes of planning/policy coordination, within each administrative tier.

- The priority also goes to the re-assessment the recently produced *Planning and Construction Act of Serbia* (2003), as well as to those specific tasks that will be formulated in the imminent by-laws.

- There is also a need to work out and adopt a national document (consensus) on the cooperation with the strategic foreign and other partners in restructuring the economy, elaborated in necessary details with regard to the spatio-ecological, urban and social demands. This is likely to specify and to delimit the 'manoeuvring space' of the Yugoslav representative in the pertinent deliberations and bargains, on the one hand, and also provide for better legitimacy and democratic control of their mission, on the other.

- Developing more open, transparent and participative/democratic planning, based on the principles of balanced division of governance and planning power, decentralization and subsidiarity. New arrangements in development planning/policy would also have to encompass a fair balance between the centralizing and decentralizing momentums. Particularly, a completely new institutional segment of strategic socio-economic development policy is needed, to be harmonized with the spatial and urban planning, and with the environmental policy.

- Satisfying the urge to develop a new ('post-communist') system of governance, preferably based on societal activism and consensus (e.g., in the tradition of German *Steuerung*), and balanced with other key mechanisms of overall societal management and control (i.e., market, administrative regulations, social rules, norms and habits, etc.).

- Developing a new institutional and organizational architecture within the realm of spatial, urban and environmental planning, so that they may assume a supportive role to the processes of societal modernization and transformation (including emancipation from the outdated social practices).

- Establishing 'coalitions for planning', i.e., locating and motivating those actors whose strategic interest is to provide a democratic planning support for their endeavours and purposes.

- Democratizing planning communication and interaction, which to a large extent equals: (1) Developing partnership between the 'first', 'second' and 'third' sector. (2) Developing the institutions of civil society. (3) Departing from the now predominant force, manipu-

lation and false authorities, alongside with paternalism and clientism (as general characteristics of the current public life), towards non-manipulative persuasion and the authority of independent and unbiased expertise (as the power relations needed for developing a civil society). (4) Developing new planning communicative arrangements, to provide for an appropriate balance between the expert rationality and non-manipulative persuasion.

Priority changes needed in terms of planning approaches and methodologies

- The now prevailing 'minimalist' approach in development planning/policy should be removed, vis-à-vis dominating 'wild-market-based-decisions' and, consequently, more pro-active approaches will have to be developed.

- A new generation of appropriate approaches and methodologies would have to be developed, in order to: (1) Provide methodological base for a new generation development planning policy documents in Serbia and Montenegro. (2) Establish a necessary correspondence between them and the current pan-European and European regional development initiatives and schemes.

- Literally all existing key strategic development planning/policy documents should be scrutinised and, most probably, thoroughly reworked, to match the more recent changes. Particular effort should be put into the elaboration of new priorities, given the overall pauperisation of the society at large, the state and the overwhelming majority of social groups (1), as well as the overall scarcity of internal and external resources for development (2).

- The existing, grossly insufficient knowledge base of development planning/policy ('planning/policy information support'), ought to be considerably improved. Of priority are the following issues: (1) To 'green' the statistical system. (2) To develop, at various planning/policy levels and in particular circumstances, corresponding systems of indicators of veritably sustainable development. (3) To elaborate, at each level of governance, a number of veritable development scenarios. (4) To radically improve the existing education: (a) Of 'educators'. (b) Of political and eco-

nomic elites. (c) Of lay people and the public at large. (d) Of planners and other professionals engaged in development planning/policy, so that they will be able to perform their activities in accord with the concomitant processes of pluralisation, marketisation and privatisation. In sum, new educational programmes are needed, to urgently improve on the lack of the existing skills of planners and other actors engaged in planning. (5) Particular emphasis is to be paid to the 'education for Europe', denoting all those notions needed for a better and faster acquainting of the public at large with the common body of 'European matters'. (6) Improving on the existing land registers (cadastres).

- **More integration is needed regarding various aspects/dimensions of development planning/policy**, e.g., social, economic, spatial, urban, environmental, etc. To that end, many other aspects may well be subsumed under the institutional 'umbrella' of strategic spatial and urban planning, given the fairly well preserved institutional and organisational infrastructure of the latter. However, this is not likely, by itself, to solve the problem of inter-sectoral coordination (1), as well as that of integrating the key development projects and programmes in the overall planning/policy framework (2). Consequently, special arrangements would also be needed in this respect.

- Planning evaluation being a particularly weak segment of planning, a **wholly new generation of planning approaches and methodologies is needed**, to foster all dimensions of planning evaluation, i.e.: (1) *Ex ante*. (2) *Ex post*. (3) *Ex continuo*. Particularly, the conundrum of differing criteria will have to be at least rudimentary resolved, given the emerging clash between the urge to provide for a economic growth 'at any price', on the one hand, and the spatio-environmental protection, on the other.

REFERENCES

- Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*, Palgrave, New York.
- Allmendinger, P., Tewdwr-Jones, M. (eds.) (2002) *Planning Futures. New Directions for Planning Theory*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2003) *Making Social Science Matter. Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Generalni plan Beograda 2021/Master Plan of Belgrade 2021*, Službeni list Grada Beograda, 27/2003.
- Generalni urbanistički plan Budve/Master urban Plan of Budva*, Radni dokumenti, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Zavod za izgradnju Budve, 1994-2003.
- Gilg, A., Kelly, M. (1996) 'The Analysis of Development Control Decisions: a Position Statement and Some New Insights from Recent Research in Southwest England', *Town Planning Review*, 67 (2), pp. 203-228.
- Harvey, D. (1982) 'On Planning of the Ideology of Planning', in Burchell, R.W., Sternlieb, G. (eds.), *Planning Theory in 1980s*, pp. 213-233, The Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.
- Mandelbaum, S. (1979) 'A Complete General Theory of Planning is Impossible', *Policy Sciences*, (11), 1979, pp. 59-71.
- Nedović-Budić, Z. (2001) 'Adjustment of Planning Practice to the New Eastern and Central European Context', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 67 (1), pp. 38-52.
- Pravci razvoja Crne Gore ekološke države/Development Directions of the Montenegro Ecological State (1996-2002)*, Evropski centar za mir i razvoj, Univerzitet za mir Ujedinjenih nacija, Podgorica, 2002.
- Prostorni plan Republike Srbije/The Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia*, Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, Beograd, 1996.
- Prostorni plan područja eksploatacije Kolubarskog lignitskog basena/Spatial Plan for the Kolubara Lignite Basin*, Radni materijali, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd, 2000-2003.
- Prostorni plan područja eksploatacije Kostolačkovinskog lignitskog basena/Spatial Plan for the Kostolac - Kavin Lignite Basin*, Radni materijali, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam, Beograd, 2002-2003.
- Prostorni plan područja infrastrukturnog koridora Niš - granica Republike Makedonije | Spatial Plan for the Infrastructure Belt from Niš to the Border of FYROM*, Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 77/2002.
- Regionalni prostorni plan Administrativnog područja Beograda, 3 faza, Nacrt Plana/Regional Spatial Plan of the Belgrade Administrative Area, Phase 3, Draft*, Javno urbanističko preduzeće, Urbanistički zavod Beograda, Beograd, mart 2003.
- Sillince, J. (1986) *A Theory of Planning*, Gower, Aldershot.
- Simmie, J. (1989) 'Self-management and town planning in Yugoslavia', *Town Planning Review*, 60 (3), pp. 271-286.
- Strategija privrednog razvoja Srbije do 2010. godine/Economic Development Strategy of Serbia till 2010*, Knjiga I, Knjiga II, Ministarstvo za nauku, tehnologiju i razvoj Republike Srbije, Beograd, 2003.
- Ulrich, W. (1994) *Critical Heuristics of Social Planning, A New Approach to Practical Philosophy*, Wiley&Sons, Chichester.
- Vujošević, M. (2003a) *Planiranje u postsocijalističkoj političkoj i ekonomskoj tranziciji/Planning in the Post-socialist Political and Economic Transition*, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd.
- Vujošević, M. (2003b) 'National Priorities in the Regional Development Context. Findings on the Co-projects ESTIA/OSPE (CADSES/VISION PLANET) and Common Priorities for the Future - An Independent View', in *Consequences of the EU Enlargement, Proceedings of the International Seminar, CEMAT*, pp. 65-77, Maribor, The Ministry of the Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy of the Republic of Slovenia.
- Vujošević, M. (2002a) *Novije promene u teoriji i praksi planiranja na Zapadu i njihove pouke za planiranje u Srbiji-Jugoslaviji/Recent Changes in the Western Planning Theory and Practice and the Lessons for Planning in Serbia-Yugoslavia*, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd.
- Vujošević, M. (2002b) 'Komentari Nacrta Zakona o planiranju i izgradnji/Comments on the Draft of the Planning and Construction Act', unpublished paper, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd.
- Vujošević, M. (2002c) 'O novim metodološkim i drugim standardima u planiranju. Povodom Generalnog plana Beograda 2021', *Arhitektura i urbanizam*, pp. 1-28.
- Vujošević, M. (2001) 'Geography lost and Found' - Integrating Six Balkan Countries through the Co-projects ESTIA and OSPE, Early experience, Institute of Architecture and Urban&Spatial Planning of Serbia, Belgrade.
- Vujošević, M., Filipović, M. (2002) 'Serbia at the Turn of the XXI Century - The Spatial and Urban Development Planning Policies of the 1990s Failed and a 'New Beginning'?', EURA Conference 'Urban and Spatial European Policies: Levels of Territorial Government', Torino.
- Yiftachel, O. (1998) 'Planning and social control: exploring the dark sides', *Journal of Planning Literature*, 12 (4), pp. 395-406.
- Zakon o planiranju i izgradnji/The Planning and Construction Act*, Ministarstvo urbanizma i gradjevina Republike Srbije, Beograd, 2003.