

Van die redakteur

Prof. Das Steyn 2018

Om die hede te verstaan, is dit nodig om die verlede te verstaan. Ongelukkig het ons dikwels ook te doen met fopnuus en die verdraaiing van die verlede. Geen wonder dat George Orwell gewaarsku het dat "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past." Dus moet beplanners hul feite kontroleer, aangesien foutiewe inligting die toekoms in 'n verkeerde rigting kan stuur.¹ Verder moet onthou word dat inligting/gebeure deur 'n ideologiese bril bekyk word. Die geskiedenis word dus deur 'n waardebril beoordeel. Mense met verskillende waardes sal dus die geskiedenis verskillend beoordeel. Dit is hier waar beplanners koelkop ideologiese stellings met feite moet konfronteer. 'n Mens kan die mooiste ideologiese planne hê, maar dit moet aan die werklikheid (feite) getoets word. Ons leef egter in 'n tydperk waar feite nie meer deur sommige politieke rolspelers as belangrik beskou word nie, maar eerder die politieke steun wat deur populistiese praatjies verkry kan word (sien derde tydvak hieronder).

Die aanloop hiertoe is te verstane as J.H. van den Berg (1977) twee geestesomwentelinge wat die Westerse geskiedenis in drie tydvakke deel, onderskei. Die eerste omwenteling vind kort voor 1700 en die tweede omstreeks 1900 plaas.

- Die eerste tydvak is die van vóór 1700 wat deur geloof in God gekenmerk is. Toe word algemeen aanvaar dat alle mag deur God gegee is met die teokrasie as regeringswyse (Van den Berg, 1977: 150).
- Die tweede tydvak strek van ±1700 tot ±1900 en dit word gekenmerk deur die mens wat op rasonale wyse die natuurwetenskappe beoefen, maar alles in die geesteswetenskappe ook só wil bedryf. In hierdie tydvak van die wetenskap word die

¹ In 'n artikel "Planning in the face of power", in die *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48(1), pp. 67-80, het Forester, J. daarop gewys dat inligting (information) verskillende tipes mag vir beplanners kan inhou, maar dat hul dikwels deur vals inligting (misinformation) gekonfronteer word.

From the editor

Prof. Das Steyn 2018

To understand the present, it is necessary to understand the past. Unfortunately, we often also deal with foul news and the distortion of the past. No wonder George Orwell warned that, "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past." Therefore, planners must check their facts, as incorrect information can send the future in a wrong direction.¹ It should also be remembered that information/events are viewed through ideological glasses. History is thus judged by value glasses/goggles. People with different values will thus judge history differently. This is where planners should cool-mindedly confront ideological statements with facts. One can have the most beautiful ideological plans, but they must be tested on the reality (facts). However, we live in an age where some political role players no longer consider facts, but rather the political support that can be obtained from populist talks (see third period below).

J.H. van den Berg (1977) distinguishes two intellectual revolutions that divide Western thought into three periods. The first occurred shortly before 1700 and the second in approximately 1900.

- The first era is that before 1700, characterized by belief in God. It was generally accepted that all power was granted by God, with theocracy as the mode of government (Van den Berg, 1977: 150).
- The second lasted from approximately 1700 to 1900 and was characterized by mankind practising the natural sciences rationally and desiring to practise the humanities in the same way. During this period, parliamentary democracy was considered the ideal form of government.
- In the third, supremacy goes to politics, an era in which everything is discussed and all is relative. Van den Berg

¹ In an article "Planning in the face of power", in the *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 48(1): pp. 67-80, Forester, J. shows that (information) may contain different types of power for planners, but they are often confronted by false information (misinformation).

Ho tswa ho Mohlophisi oa baeti

Prof. Das Steyn 2018

Bakeng sa ho utlwisisa tsa hajwale, ho bohlokwa ho utlwisisa tse fetileng. Ka bomadimabe, hangata re tlameha ho sebetsana le ditaba tseo e seng tsa nnete le tse fanang ka moelelo o fosahetseng ka tse fetileng. Ha ho makatse ha George Orwell a re lemohisitse hore "Ya laolang tse fetileng, o laola bokamoso. Ya laolang tsa hajwale, o laola tse fetileng". Ka lebaka leo, bahlophisi ba tlameha ho hlahloba dintlha tsa bona, kaha tlhahisoleseding e fosahetseng e ka isa bokamoso tseleng e sa nepahalang.¹ Ho tlamehile ho hopolwe hore tlhahisoleseding / diketsahalo di shejwa ka diborele tsa kgopolo. Ka hoo, histori/nalane e ahlolwa ho ya kamoo motho a ananelang diketsahalo ka teng; histori/nalane e ahlolwa ka diborele tsa boleng/kananelo ya diketsahalo. Ha ho le jwalo, batho ba ananelang diketsahalo ka mekgwa e fapaneng, ba tla ahlola histori/nalane ka ho se tshwane. Mona ke moo bahlophisi ka monahano o phodileng, ba tlemehileng ho tobana le ditlhaloso/ diphelelo tsa mehopolo ho ya ka dintlha tse netefaditsweng. Motho a ka ba le meralo e metle ka ho fetisisa mehopolong, empa e tlamehile ho hlahlojwa hodima nnete (dintlha tsa nnete). Le ha ho le jwalo, re phela nakong eo dintlha tsa nnete di seng di sa nkellwe hloohong ke ba bang ba nkang karolo ho tsa dipolotiki; empa tshetso ya polotiki e ka fumanwang ho tswa dibuing tse tummeng (sheba pakathuto ya boraro ka tlase).

J.H. van den Berg (1977) O arohanya diphelelo tse kgolo tlhalefong, tse pedi, tse arolang menahano ya sejwalejwale/ya Bophirima nakong tse tharo. Ya pele e etsahetse nakonyana pele ho 1700, ya bobedi ka 1900.

- Nakong ya pele nalaneng/ historing pele ho 1700, e ikgethile ka tumelo ho Modimo. Ka kakaretso, ho ne ho amohetswe hore matla kaofela a tswa ho Modimo ka mofuta

¹ In an article "Planning in the face of power", in the *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 48(1): pp. 67-80, Forester, J. shows that (information) may contain different types of power for planners, but they are often confronted by false information (misinformation).

parlementêre demokrasie as die ideale staatsvorm geag.

- Die derde tydvak is dié van die politiek waaroor alles gepraat word en alles relatief is. Van den Berg (1977: 157) noem hierdie staatsvorm “psythokrasie” wat afkomstig is van die Griekse woord “*psythos*” wat volgens hom “oorbabbeling” beteken oftewel die heerskappy van die babbelaars in die tyd van demokratisering waar die mening van die medemens die maatstaf is. In wetenskaplike terme val dit saam met die post-modernisme.

Godsdiens, en meer spesifiek die Christendom het ’n leidende rol gespeel in die ontwikkeling van die boublokke van die Westerse beskawing. Dit het die reëls van die samelewing, die regspraak asook die klem op individuele vryheid met gepaardgaande verantwoordelikheid, die rede asook kapitalisme en deelnemende regering tot stand gebring. Ongelukkig het die nuttigheidsleer asook die sosialisme in die vorige eeu, nuwe filosofiese benaderings tot probleme beklemtoon. Hoewel die Europese beskawing hoogs suksesvol was, is dit na die Tweede Wêreldoorlog en die student-opstande van 1968/1969, deur die kulturele Marxisme² bevraagteken en in die beskuldigde bank geplaas.

Dit is dus nodig om te verstaan wie Karl Marx is en wat sy begrip van die geskiedenis behels. Hy karakteriseer die geskiedenis as negatief; elke historiese tydperk word as ’n proses van vervreemding beskou, waarin mense deur hul afhanklikheidsverhoudings ingedeel word as slagoffers of onderdrukkers. Dit wat met jou gebeur, is iemand anders se skuld en die staatsmag moet nou gebruik word om dit reg te stel. In hierdie era van die babbelaars is selfs die waarheid nie ’n faktor

2 “The standard definition of cultural Marxism is that, unlike classical Marxism, it is an ideology preoccupied with the transformation of Western culture generally rather than the replacement of Capitalism with Communism. Cultural Marxists are dedicated to gender equality through the abolition of male and female traditional roles in society; to sexual equality through the downgrading of heterosexuality and the celebration of polymorphous sexual relations; to the replacement of Christian morals with politically correct morals.” (Duchesne, R. 2017. *Faustian man in a multicultural age*. London, Arktos).

(1977: 157) calls this form of government “psythocracy” from the Greek word “*psythos*” which, according to him, means “babbling over”. In other words, the rule of babblers in a time of democratization in which the opinion of fellow human beings is the measure of all things. In scientific terms, this coincides with post-modernism.

Religion and, more specifically, Christianity played a leading role in the development of the building blocks of Western civilization. They introduced the rules of society, the rule of law as well as the emphasis on individual freedom with associated responsibility, reason as well as capitalism and participatory government. Unfortunately, usefulness as well as socialism in the past century highlighted new philosophical approaches to problems. Although European civilization was highly successful after the Second World War and the student uprisings of 1968/1969, it was questioned by cultural Marxism² and placed in the accused’s bench.

It is, therefore, necessary to understand who Karl Marx is and what his understanding of history entails. He characterizes history as negative; each historical period is considered a process of alienation, in which people are classified as victims or oppressors through their dependency relationships. What happens to you is someone else’s fault and the state power must now be used to correct it. In this era of babblers, even the truth is not a factor, because the truth is what the majority decides³ and the struggle is now to address the heart and reason of the babblers.

The slogan in planning that solves all problems is ‘social justice’, but people

2 “The standard definition of cultural Marxism is that, unlike classical Marxism, it is an ideology preoccupied with the transformation of Western culture generally rather than the replacement of Capitalism with Communism. Cultural Marxists are dedicated to gender equality through the abolition of male and female traditional roles in society; to sexual equality through the downgrading of heterosexuality and the celebration of polymorphous sexual relations; to the replacement of Christian morals with politically correct morals.” (Duchesne, R. 2017. *Faustian man in a multicultural age*. London, Arktos).

3 If the majority decides that $1 + 1 = 3$, then it is three.

wa tsamaiso ya mmuso moo baruti ba etellang pele ka lebitso la Modimo (theocracy) jwaloka mokgwa wa mmuso (Van den Berg 1700:150).

- Ya bobedi e bile teng ho tloha 1700 ho fihlela 1900, mme e ne e kgethehile ka tsela ya hore batho ba sebedise thuto ya mahlale a tlhaho ka kelohloko le ho lakatsa ho sebedisa tsa botho ka tsela e tshwanang. Nakong ena, demokrasie ya palamente e ne e shejwa jwaloka mofuta o lokileng wa mmuso.
- Ho ya boraro, maemo a ka hodimodimo a ya dipolotiking, nakong ena ya nalane/histori; ke moo teng dintho kaofela di sekasekwang, mme tsohle di amohetswe/amohelohile. Van den Berg (1977:156) o bitsa mofuta ona wa mmuso “*psythocracy*”, ho tswa lentsweng la Segerike “*psythos*”; leo ho ya ka ena le bolelang ho buwa ka tsela e botho botho ho fetelletseng (blabbing over), ka mantswe a mang, taolo ya ba buwang ka tsela e botho botho (blabbers) nakong ya ho etsa demokrasie moo teng kgopolo ya batho ba bang e leng tekanyo ya dintho tsohle. Ka puo ya saense, sena se etsahala ka nako e le nngwe le nako e tlieng ka mora tsa sejwalejwale.

Bodumedi, haholoholo Bokreste, bo bapetse karolo ya boetapele tlhahisong ya kaho ya ntshetsopele ya sejwalejwale. Bo tlisitse melao ya setjhaba, ho busa ka molao, hammoho le ho hatisa bolokolohi ba motho ka mong, bo nang le maikarabelo a bona; lebaka hammoho le bokapitale “capitalism” le mmuso o kopanetsweng. Ka bomadimabe, molemo hammoho le bososhiale “socialism” dilemong tse lekgolo tse fetileng, di hlahisitse mokgwa o motjha wa kgopolo bakeng sa ho tobana le mathata. Lehoja ntshetsopele ya Seyurope e ile ya atleha haholo, ka mora ntwana ya bobedi ya lefatshe le boipelaetso ba baithuti ba 1968/69, e ile ya

nie want die waarheid is wat die meerderheid besluit³ en die stryd is dus nou om die hart en rede van die babbelaars aan te spreek.

Die slagspreuk in beplanning wat alle probleme moet oplos is 'sosiale geregtigheid', maar mense besef nie dat geregtigheid 'n etiese vraag is nie. Die oorsprong is normaalweg vanuit waardebegrippe of godsdienstige standpunte of filosofiese benaderings tot die lewe en gemeenskap waar dit afspeel. Dit het te make met die verhouding tussen individue asook die verhouding met die gemeenskap, ook tussen verskillende gemeenskappe en teenoor die groter wêreld. Dit is geen waardevrye begrip nie maar 'n Marxistiese siening van die geregtigheid. Nou moet afstand gedoen word van onreg van die verlede om te toon dat jy in pas is met die hede. Hoe meer afstand jy kan doen, wys dat jy deugdelik is. Wie dus die verste verwyder is van die onderdrukker en die minste na hom lyk, praat die waarheid!

Geregtigheid beteken dat alle mense voor die wet as gelyk geag word en so behandel moet word. Die reg moet nie oorboord gegooi word om multikulturalisme te bevorder en die individu aan bande te lê deur selektiewe vryspraak en wetgewing om sogenaamde gelykheid af te dwing nie. In beplanning moet populistiese uitsprake deur politici deur feite gekonfronteer word. Goeie bedoelings of die herverdeling van rykdom gaan nie in Suid-Afrika die werkseleenthede skep om die armoede vraagstuk op te los nie. In alle lande waar die resep gevolg is, het dit gelei tot groter armoede en agteruitgang.

Die Nobelpryswenner Friedrich von Hayek waarsku in sy boek *The road to serfdom* dat vryheid beteken dat die individu beide die geleentheid asook die verantwoordelikheid van keuse het, want elke aksie het gevolge – vryheid en verantwoordelikheid is onlosmaaklik verbind.

From the fact that people are very different it follows that, if we treat them equally, the result must be inequality in their actual

do not realise that justice is an ethical question. The origin is usually from value concepts or religious views or philosophical approaches to the life and community where it plays off. It has to do with the relationship between individuals as well as the relationship with the community, also that between different communities and world at large. It is not a value-free concept, but a Marxist view of justice. Now one must be removed from the injustices of the past in order to show that one is in line with the present. The more distance one can do, shows that one is solid. Whoever is the furthest removed from that oppressor, and the least look alike speaks the truth!

Righteousness means that all people are equal before the law, and should be treated as such. The law should not be overtaken to promote multiculturalism and to impede the individual by selective acquittal and legislation to enforce so-called equality. In planning, populist statements must be politically confronted by politicians. Good intentions or the redistribution of wealth will not work in South Africa to create job opportunities and to solve the poverty issue. In all those countries where the recipe was followed, this led to greater poverty and deterioration. Nobel laureate Friedrich von Hayek warns in his book *The road to serfdom* that freedom means that the individual has both the opportunity and the burden (responsibility) of choice, because every action has consequences – freedom and responsibility are inextricably linked.

From the fact that people are very different it follows that, if we treat them equally, the result must be inequality in their actual position, and that the only way to place them in an equal position would be to treat them differently. Equality before the law and material equality are therefore not only different but are in conflict with each other; and we can achieve either one or the other, but not both at the same time (Friedrich August von Hayek).

botsolotswa ke dirutehi tsa Marxism² ya pele, mme tsa bewa bankeng ya ba qositsweng.

Ka hoo, ho bohlokwa ho utlwisisa hore Karl Marx ke mang le seo kutlwisiso ya hae ya nalane/histori e se hloakang/kenyelletsang. O bona nalane/histori e le ntho e seng hantle, nako e nngwe le e nngwe ya nalane/histori e nkilwe jwalo ka mokgwa wa tsamaiso wa kgethollo; moo teng batho ba bonwang jwaloka diphofu kapa batubi ka dikamano tsa bophediswa/boitshetleho. Se etsahalang ho wena ke maikarabelo a motho e mong, mme jwale matla a puso a tshwanela ho sebediswa ho lokisa seo. Nakong ena ya batho buwang ka tsela e botho (blabbers), nnete le yona hase lebaka hobane nnete ke seo boholo ba batho bo dumellanang ka sona; mme jwale tshokolo ke ho tobana/bua le pelo le lebaka la batho ba buwang ka tsela e botho (blabbers)³.

Lepetjo "the slogan" la ditlhophiso/merero, le lokisang mathata ohle ke "toka ya botho", empa batho ha ba lemohe hore toka ke potso ya botho. Motheo hangata o tswa ho kgopolotaba e nang le boleng, mehopollo ya bodumedi kapa mokgwa wa tsebo e phahameng ya mahlale a lefatshe bakeng sa bophelo le lefatshe. Moo teng e sebetlang hantle. E amahana le kamano pakeng tsa batho, hammoho le kamano le setjhaba; le dipakeng tsa ditjhaba tse fapaneng le lefatshe ka bophara. Hase kgopolotaba e se nang boleng, empa ke tsela eo dirutehi tsa Marxist di shebang toka ka yona. Jwale o tlamehile ho tloswa dinthong tsa kgale tse nang le leeme, ho bontsha hore o tsamaya tseleng ya tsa hajwale. Ha feela o ntse o ya thokwana, seo se bontsha hore o thata. Ka hoo, motho ya tlositsweng ka hohlehohle pela motubi eo, mme a sa tshwane le yena hakaalo; o buwa nnete!

2 "The standard definition of cultural Marxism is that, unlike classical Marxism, it is an ideology preoccupied with the transformation of Western culture generally rather than the replacement of Capitalism with Communism. Cultural Marxists are dedicated to gender equality through the abolition of male and female traditional roles in society; to sexual equality through the downgrading of heterosexuality and the celebration of polymorphous sexual relations; to the replacement of Christian morals with politically correct morals." (Duchesne, R. 2017. *Faustian man in a multicultural age*. London, Arktos).

3 If the majority decides that 1+1 = 3, then it is three.

3 As die meerderheid sou besluit dat 1 + 1 = 3, dan is dit drie.

position, and that the only way to place them in an equal position would be to treat them differently. Equality before the law and material equality are therefore not only different but are in conflict with each other; and we can achieve either one or the other, but not both at the same time. (Friedrich August von Hayek).

Bokgabane kapa toka di bolela hore batho kaofela ba a lekana ka pele ho molao, mme ba tlamehile ho tshwarwa ka tsela e jwalo. Molao ha o a tlameha ho tlolela bakeng sa ho kgothalletsa semorabe "multiculturalism" le ho thibela motho ka ho lokollwa ho ikgethileng kapa molao bakeng sa ho etsahatsa ntho e bitswang tekatekano. Mererong/ditlhophisong, ditlaleho tse tsebahalang di tlamehile ho tobuwa ka tsela ya polotiki ke boradipolotiki. Maikemisetso a matle kapa ho arolelana leroo hape, di ka se sebetse Afrika Borwa, e le ho etsa mesebetsi bakeng sa ho lokisa bothata ba bofuma. Dinaheng tsohle moo mohlala ona o ileng wa latelwa, ho bile le bofuma bo eketsehileng le ho mpefala/ho senyeha ho ya pele. Nobel laureate Friedrich von Hayek o fane ka temoso bukeng ya hae "*The Road to Serfdom*" ya hore bolokolohi bo bolela hore motho o na le bobedi: monyetla le boima (boikarabelo) ba kgetho, hobane ketso e nngwe le e nngwe e na le ditlamorao - bolokolohi le maikarabelo di na le kopano e kekeng ya arohanywa.

Ho tswa tabeng ya hore batho ba fapane haholo, ho latela taba ya hore; haeba re ba tshwara ka ho lekana, ditlamorao di tlamehile ho ba ho se lekane boemong ba bona, le hore tsela e le nngwe feela ya ho ba beya boemong bo lekanang, e ka ba ho ba tshwara ka tsela e sa tshwaneng. Tekatekano pela molao le tekatekano ya disebediswa ha di a fapana feela, empa di a lwantshana; mme re ka kgona ho fumana e le nngwe ya tsona - empa e seng bobedi ba tsona ka nako e le nngwe (Friedrich August von Hayek).