COMMENT

Jan F. Beekman

Profesor Beekman began by suggesting that, although the theme of the Conference was Southern Africa, the lack of data pertaining to some areas, and mainly to the Portuguese territories, hampered discussions of development planning in the Southern African region.

Regarding Professor Knall's paper, he pointed out that while it was both an admirable and a concise summary of the theory of development planning, he felt that it placed too much emphasis upon economic rather than social development, i.e. social planning *per se* and the by-products of social planning. He also pointed out that Professor Knall's paper tended to suggest that the roles of those involved in development planning were clear-cut; this was not necessarily so.

Turning to the sources of developmental aid, Professor Beekman mentioned his preference for multilateral vis-à-vis bilateral aid, especially since the latter was often affected by political considerations or by psychological factors in terms of which planners tended to orient their programmes in the direction of the expected reactions of financial donors.

He endorsed the speakers' emphasis on the importance of elements of continuity and flexibility in development planning, and explicitly suggested that long-term plans be recurrently revised in terms of new realities, on the one hand, and that plans be established for a period slightly longer than government tenure, if possible, on the other. The latter would tend to bind succeeding governments and thus preserve some continuity over periods of governmental change.

Concluding with reference to the centralisation-decentralisation problem, Professor Beekman pointed out that resolution of this problem was related in the ultimate instance to the size of the country with which development planning was concerned.