

**UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION
FOR LATIN AMERICA
AND THE CARIBBEAN - ECLAC**



Distr.
LIMITED
LC/L.355
31 July 1985
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



**PROCEDURES AND METHODS FOR REGIONAL PLANNING
IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN */**

*/ This document was prepared by the ECLAC/UNCHS Joint Unit on Human Settlements.

85-7-1138

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	iv
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
II. SEVEN CASE STUDIES	7
Brazil	7
Chile	11
Colombia	14
Mexico	17
Panama	25
Peru	28
Venezuela	31
III. PROCEDURES AND METHODS FOR DEALING WITH REGIONAL PLANNING IN THE ECLAC REGION	35
IV. CONCLUSIONS	43
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	48
VI. RESERVATIONS ABOUT THE CONCLUSIONS	51
Notes	52
Bibliography	62
Appendix	64

SUMMARY

This study is an analysis of the procedures and methods for regional planning in Latin America and the Caribbean region with emphasis on spatial problems.

The development of the seven case studies -Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela- was focused on the analysis of methods and criteria for resource allocation as well as on planning mechanisms and institutional structures for promoting balanced development in the countries of the region.

The study material analysed has shown how a variety of procedures and methods for dealing with regional planning have been used in the ECLAC región. However, as such procedures and method have a common theoretical background, they tend to be homogeneous in spite of diverse national realities. The study also points out that general planning practice in the area does not take much concern with spatial distribution of population and of public and private investments.

The document concludes that the idea of balanced development in the region has tended, in general, to continue to have an utopian connotation within national development plans while economic adjustments to the crisis have tended to reinforce centralization of economic investments in capital cities and metropolitan regions. The general conclusions of the study indicate three specific areas to which balanced development in the ECLAC region should be strongly related: a) human settlements; b) regional planning procedures, and c) institutional aspects.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The objectives of this study are two: i) collection of information and analysis of methods and criteria for resource allocation for balanced development in the ECLAC region; ii) analysis of current planning mechanisms and institutional structures in the Latin American and Caribbean countries. These two objectives will be considered within the context of national development with a view to the formulation of national policies integrating issues of spatial distribution of population and economic activities, and social improvement.

There are several case studies and analyses produced by the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) in the last five years, which deal with this matter. Thus, the information used for the development of this paper is basically drawn from ILPES literature, together with other papers and publications issued by ECLAC and other relevant bodies.^{1/}

The region is made up of 33 countries with a total population of about 320 million inhabitants, predominantly Spanish-speaking ^{2/} and ethnically of very heterogeneous origin (European, African, Asian and autochthonous ethnic groups). In spite of this heterogeneity, planning in the region has remained a privilege of an intellectual élite with little political --and societal-- support. As a consequence, models of development adopted in the region in the past were solely based on development patterns of Western developed societies, without any concern for the cultural and ethnic peculiarities of each one of the countries. These cultural and ethnic factors, however, have played and still play an important role in the region's development process as far as culture is concerned.^{3/}

Since the very beginning, generally accepted concepts of development ^{4/} for the region have been strongly related to industrialization and consumption based on Western --American or European-- sociocultural patterns.^{5/} As a result of this general trend, De Mattos (1980:721) points out that ^{6/} "many analyses done on the ... models of development adopted by the majority of Latin American countries have shown a remarkable tendency to concentration ..." which is reflected in three basic structures: "economic, social and geographic".^{7/}

The discovery of America and the conquest of the autochthonous empires (Aztecs, Mayas) was marked by a progressive decline in the number of Indians,^{8/} associated with the arrival of large groups of Europeans and African slaves, which also started a slow process of racial miscegenation (cf. Gutiérrez, 1977).^{9/}

"The social system that began to take shape in the early colonial cities exhibited some of the characteristics of the old social state system of feudal Europe, in which strata were defined by law and granted distinctive rights and privileges. In Spanish-American cities, the equivalent three-fold European system of noble, clergy, and commoner was represented by the three ethnic groups of Spaniards, Blacks and Indians. In Brazil, where Indians were much fewer in number and never a significant component of urban society, the principal division in the early years was simply between black slaves and free whites". (Butterworth and Chance, 1981: 12, 13).

The process of populating Latin America and the Caribbean is obviously peculiar and strongly differs from North America or Africa. On the one hand, the North American development process started in the eighteenth century, based on inward goals of self-help and progress, and was followed by early independence. In contrast, the Latin American and Caribbean countries were subject to colonialist exploitation which also influenced the kind of migration oriented to this area. Thus, male migration very much exceeded that of women, favouring inter-ethnic (and racial) breeding as well as intercultural exchange.

Historically, the Latin American societies established after the discovery of the continent were based upon a model of State enterprises, colonialist and mercantile. After independence they became States which kept strong ties with their former Metropolises and with the European nations as a whole, because the sponsors of these independence movements were, in general, the local aristocracy, made of an amalgam of intellectuals, merchants and military men belonging to the same social and ethnic group, mainly of Spanish or, in the Brazilian case, Portuguese, origin.

The historical background influenced very much the shaping of the countries of the region as well as their development as nations. As pointed out by Butterworth and Chance (1981:21) "by the middle seventeenth century the 'castas' had become too numerous to ignore and too necessary to the city's economic functions to be excluded; they were thus accorded a place in urban society, ranking in prestige between the whites and the black and Indian proletariat. The result was the 'sistema de castas' in its classic form: a prestige ranking of the entire population created by Spanish law and the white elite". Similar systems, although not official ones, were developed in Brazil and in the Caribbean areas, varying according to the predominant ethnic groups in each country.10/

This historical background gives rise to three basic characteristics:

a) State supersedes Nation, as a concept; it is the founder of the Nation, as it legitimates political, economic and social institutions and it structures all social relations;

b) Latin American and Caribbean nations tend to be more culturally heterogeneous and diverse than Western nations, whereas Latin American States tend to be culturally homogeneous and imitative of Western models of development;

c) The colonialist and mercantile model is reproduced on many different scales in each country, promoting centralization and concentration of economic investments in a small number of cities (mainly in capital cities) and, consequently, favouring metropolitanization and acute regional imbalance.11/

These three characteristics have strongly influenced national planning in the ECLAC region, as well as having had a noticeable influence on policies for resource allocation for balanced development, and on planning mechanisms and institutional structures for regional planning. Since the sense of State is stronger than the sense of Nation, political power, as well as economic power, tends to be manipulated by the State itself, through planning activities, to favour the maintenance of a stratified social structure which might be used to justify the precedence of State over Nation. At the same time, planning activities are carried out by an educated élite, used to Western customs and thus following a paradigm of development based on North American and European ways of life. As

a result, planning in the region often only partially reflects the countries' reality. Furthermore, because of its outside origin, planning ideology --as it has been adopted (not adapted) in some Latin American and Caribbean countries-- may run counter to the needs, desires and values of groups of the Nation's population which are culturally apart from the State political and economic apparatus. As pointed out by Riffka (1980:40), "the problem (of planning policies in the region) has deep political roots, although its understanding and manipulation might assume, apparently, a technical format ... Failure (in this field) cannot (only) be attributed to planning activity itself and might be charged to political models subjacent to planning and to the existing economic and social system".

At the International Conference on National Strategies for Regional Development, held in Bogotá in 1979, Sergio Boisier 12/ stressed in his statement that the general issue for Latin American countries is to convert their heterogeneous societies into a more homogeneous pattern. To him, this effort should be considered as a fundamental one in the process of building a Nation. "We have already recognized for some time --a couple of decades-- ... that some of the dimensions of social heterogeneity are related to geographical space, and thus the solution of the problem must necessarily consider the manipulation of variables territorially defined" (Boisier, 1980:47).

These statements made by Riffka and Boisier reinforce the point that, in general, planning theory and practice in the ECLAC region are still far removed from the Latin American and Caribbean reality, firstly because planners have taken very little account of political support,13/ and secondly because the historical background has allowed the reproduction of a "centre-periphery" model, derived from colonial sources, at the level of the countries of the region.14/

As regards the first point --political support-- it is interesting to analyse a survey on the state of the art of planning in the ECLAC region, carried out by ILPES in the late 1970s.15/ Of the total of 33 countries, 21 (63.6%) had the basic characteristics of their planning systems studied. Less than five years later, it was noted that 38% (eight) of the countries studied had undergone

political changes --some of them radical-- which invalidated many planning assertions made on the basis of the data available in 1978 and 1979 (e.g., Argentina, Bolivia, El Salvador, etc.).

The second point --centre-periphery models-- has its roots in the planning history of Latin America, which starts around the 1930s with economic planning. In the 1940s some references to regional planning were introduced by academics and professionals as an issue to be considered by governments. As Boisier (1980:53) points out: "In broad conceptual terms of 'centre' and 'periphery' categories, it may be asserted that the majority of plans, programmes, or projects of regional development made at this time were promoted by social and economic groups from the 'centre' with the purpose of controlling --economically and politically-- specific peripheral regions" (see table I). Another characteristic of those planning processes is that they departed from 'solution-oriented' approaches in the sense that perception of the problem was deeply rooted in the interests of the centre instead of being concerned with development of the affected region itself --the peripheral one.

A general characteristic of regional planning in this period might be defined as 'development from above' 16/ which, according to Boisier (ibid: 53, 65), may be reflected in the ECLAC region in two kinds of action:

- a) centrally-promoted action oriented towards exploitation of natural or energy resources (e.g., the Guayana region of Venezuela);
- b) centrally-promoted action oriented towards economic domination (e.g., the Northeast of Brazil).

In the 1960s there was a change in the focus of Latin American regional planning from projects located in specific problem areas --based on experience like the 'Tennessee Valley Authority' or the 'Cassa per il Mezzogiorno'-- to national programmes of regional development. This change coincided with a series of structural and technological changes in the industrial sector and also with changes in standards of consumption and in the pattern of market location (Boisier, ibid:56). Nevertheless, the process of development remained based on concentration: spatial, economic and demographic.

Table I

SHARE OF TOTAL NATIONAL INCOME RECEIVED BY THE 10% RICHEST FAMILIES
IN NINE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

Country	Year	%
Brazil	1972	50.6
Honduras	1967	50.0
Peru	1972	42.9
Mexico	1977	40.6
Costa Rica	1971	39.5
Venezuela	1970	35.7
Argentina	1970	35.2
Chile	1968	34.8
Trinidad and Tobago	1976	31.8

Source: IBRD, World Development Report 1981, p. 182.

The 1970s brought the social issue into the official speech of States --and governmental élites-- with emphasis being given to social development as part of national development policies, mainly based on income redistribution. Some countries of the region appeared to have undergone political change,^{17/} but the tendency merely heightened regional, economic and social inequalities, which kept growing in the region as a whole, and moreover the apparent 'political changes' proved not to have enough political support, as they did not last much longer.

Some achievements were made from the theoretical and methodological viewpoints. Some macroeconomic models were built and new designs of planning systems and processes were made. Statistical and data collecting systems were developed ^{18/} and, at the theoretical level, interesting proposals on decentralized interregional

planning models were put forward. Nevertheless, the basic change in planning theory and practice in the region between the 1940s and 1970s was one of focus: from isolated intra-regional planning, strongly centralized by the State, to national interregional planning also centralized by State technocracy.

The most significant examples of regionalized national planning --with the formal implementation of planning mechanisms and institutional structures for regional planning-- might be taken from the experiences of seven countries: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Venezuela.

II. SEVEN CASE STUDIES

Brazil

Brazil is the biggest country of the region. Its area is 8 511 965 km² (which corresponds to approximately 41.5% of the total areas of the ECLAC region) ^{19/} and according to the 1980 Census its population was of 119 070 865 inhabitants (67.6% urban and 32.4% rural). Between 1960 and 1980 the population density almost doubled --from 8 to 14 inhabitants per square kilometre. However, the spatial distribution of population did not change very much and the North and Central West regions are still underpopulated (see table II).

Table II

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF BRAZILIAN URBAN POPULATION
BY REGION. PERIOD 1940-1980

Region	% of Brazilian surface area	% urban population					Population density in 1980 per km ²
		01/09/40	01/07/50	01/09/60	01/09/70	01/09/80	
North	42.07	3.14	3.10	3.06	3.12	3.78	1.65
Northeast	18.20	26.5	25.26	24.01	22.56	21.85	22.51
Southeast	10.86	56.15	57.07	55.78	55.61	53.25	55.95
South	6.79	12.35	12.31	13.93	14.02	14.76	32.95
Central West	22.08	2.10	2.26	3.22	4.69	6.36	4.02

Source: FIBGE/S.P.P.R.

Such an unbalanced spatial distribution of population is also reflected in the process of metropolitanization of the country, where São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro remain the unrivalled metropolises among the other seven Metropolitan Regions.^{20/}

The first and best-known case of regional planning in Brazil is that of the North-East region. Accounting for almost 30% of the total Brazilian population, for the past hundred years the Northeast has been a typical 'problem region' and also one of the most underdeveloped of Latin America.

Many efforts to relieve the region's problems had been made since the last two decades of the nineteenth century. However, they were naively paternalistic and unorganized, or ill-adapted to the region's needs.

The 1940s brought to the Brazilian Northeast a few organized sectoral programmes and projects focused on the water problems of the region and also associated with the building of an infrastructure for the development of agriculture. This solution-oriented focus did not consider the social-structural problems of the Northeast and, as a result, land tenure remained the same as it was at the beginning of the century, that is to say: feudal. Only at the end of the 1950s, when central government set up the Working Group for the Development of the Northeast, co-ordinated by Celso Furtado, was something done to set in motion a strategy for regional development which considered the possibilities of structural changes in the social and economic fields. The result of this study was the creation of the first Regional Superintendency of Development in Brazil, called SUDENE.

Meanwhile, a National Development Policy was defined which provided for accelerated industrial development to substitute the importation of goods. Higher infrastructural investments (in energy, highways, ports, etc.) were made in the Central-South region, thus confounding the original purposes of the so-called "Northeast Development Policy".

The 1964 coup d'état was a response from the upper and middle classes to the proposed, but politically un-coordinated, acceleration of the process of social changes in the country sponsored under the Goulart presidency. This emergent middle class was already politically organized and gave its support to the military coup, which embodied conservative values with the purpose of slowing-down the social claims of low-income groups.

The result of this political movement of 1964 was a strong association between the middle class (including the military) and technocrats favouring the design of new development models based on the Western-developed paradigm. Import substitution and an accelerated process of industrialization, development of basic industries, rapid technological development, etc., were the keywords of the first, second and third National Development Plans (PNDs).

The conservative political tendency allowed the introduction of the concept of national security, related to the opening of new frontiers (Central West and Amazon regions) and to the lightening of social pressures in the North-East. The consequence of the convergence of these factors was the start of an official national policy of regional development. Until the end of the 1960s the country was formally divided in four sub-regions each having a Regional Development Superintendency: SUDAM (for the North and Amazon region); SUDENE (for the North-east region); SUDECO (for the Central West region); and SUDESUL (for the South region). In the late 1970s a special office was set up for the Southeast region.

All these Superintendencies were Federal organizations, administratively dependent on the Ministry of the Interior. Their basic organization was a technical one, 'subordinated' to councils formed by the State governors included in each macro-region. These governors were not necessarily politicians (until 1982 they were appointed by the Federal Government and elected by the local (State) House of Representatives). As a result, this political device lowered the status of State Governments and also served as a tool to strengthen the Federal Government centralized planning system.

The concept of resource allocation for balanced development, in Brazil, thus became a matter of concentration of economic and political power in the hands of the Federal Government which, almost simultaneously with the creation of the Regional Development Superintendencies, reorganized the banking system through the creation of regional banks such as the Banco do Nordeste do Brasil (Brazilian Northeast Bank), Banco do Amazonia (Amazon Bank), Banco de Desenvolvimento Economico da Região Sul (Southern Economic Development Bank), and also a related national banking network, mainly based on three sectoral areas: agricultural

development (Bank of Brazil), industrial development (Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Economico --National Economic Development Bank ---which at the beginning of the 1980s was transformed into the National Economic and Social Development Bank), and housing and sanitation (Banco Nacional de Habitação - National Housing Bank).

To the banking system and the regional development system, the Federal Government attached a series of sectoral and subregional special programmes such as PIN (National Integration Programme, focused on national highways integrating the Amazon Region to the Northeast and Southeast Regions); PROTERRA (a programme of agrarian reform and agricultural land-use rationalization); Decree 34/18, which was an effort to further the transfer of industries from more developed regions to the Northeast, aided by fiscal incentives; and POLONORDESTE (Development Programme for Integrated Areas of the Northeast); a rural development programme.

In spite of such an intricate system for balanced regional development, the social results were very much below those expected. There was a noticeable increase in industrial concentration at Recife and at Salvador in the Northeast Region, but because of its capital-intensive characteristics, very little effect on the regional employment situation was noticed. Social distress caused by the 1980s drought has shown how fragile the social results of national planning policy for balanced regional development for the Northeast have been.

Although in Brazil economic growth and industrialization are indubitable facts, this 'development' process kept a large number of the Brazilian population marginalized from the so-called 'economic miracle' of the 1970s.

It is obvious that in the last two decades the Brazilian State has become more efficient and modern than it was before. Gigantic sectoral subsystems, however, did not allow an effective decentralization process, while "The power of the regional superintendencies in Brazil has suffered from the basic contradictory pressures on their co-ordinating tasks: i) from the concentration of planning and budgeting power in the Secretariat of Planning of the Presidency of the Republic - SEPLAN; ii) from the sectoral subsystems; and iii) from a decentralizing reaction which comes from States and Municipalities, politically

revigorated by the recent redemocratization of the country" (Albuquerque, 1984:31). Thus, it is not surprising that contradictions between State and Nation became a sharp issue even among traditional supporters of the régime.^{21/}

Finally, as far as spatial distribution is concerned, Suarez-Villa points out:

"Three decades of import-substituting industrialization combined with higher tariffs on industrial products than on raw materials and foodstuffs helped shift the internal terms of trade in favour of the primate urban-industrial sector. The emphasis on capital goods industrialization without spatial directives, combined with an 'open door' policy towards multinationals and their strong preference for core-region locations, contributed greatly to the cumulative forces favouring spatial concentration. Finally, risk-averse lending by financial institutions based in the primate cities, combined with the housing policies' focus on and benefits to those cities, promoted greater contrasts between city and countryside and contributed to increase the flow of rural-urban migrants to the Southeast."

Chile

Chile is considered to have been the first Latin American country to adopt and institutionalize a national system of regional planning (in 1965). Its special geographic conformation, together with sharp environmental differences among its three natural regions (Central, North and South) and historical circumstances, made the regional problem in Chile a very critical one. As pointed out by Boisier (1980: 74, 75), the central third of the country (between La Serena and Puerto Montt) concentrates all the fertile land, 90% of the population, and the main industrial activities,

The three metropolitan areas of the country are located in this region, showing a high degree of urban concentration. In 1970, almost 45% of the total population of the country (8 884 768 inhabitants) was living in these metropolitan areas --Santiago, Valparaíso and Concepción.

According to the 1982 census, the tendency towards urban concentration continued unchecked. The three metropolitan areas presently have 50.8% of the total population of the country (11 275 440 inhabitants) (see table III).^{22/}

Table III
URBAN CONCENTRATION IN THE THREE METROPOLITAN
AREAS OF CHILE
(Urban and rural population)

Metropolitan areas	1970	1982	Increase (%)
Santiago	3 154 765	4 294 938	36.1
Valparaíso	570 053	715 779	25.6
Concepción	581 181	714 521	22.9
TOTAL	4 305 999	5 725 238	33.0

Source: Recuento Preliminar, XV Censo Nacional de Población y IV de Vivienda, Instituto Nacional de Estadística, May 1982.

In its first beginnings, regional planning in Chile tended to be focused on the solution of interregional problems and did not pay attention to interregional linkages. Its main effort was in the geopolitical sense of integration of the Northern and Southern Regions to the country as a whole. As pointed out by Boisier, Arica and Punta Arenas were made into free ports which were supposed to increase economic development rates in the surrounding areas. In 1965 the National Planning Office (ODEPLAN) was set up and simultaneously eleven Regional Planning Offices subordinated to it were created, each corresponding to one of the eleven macro-regions into which the country was divided, and including the Metropolitan Region of Santiago. The purpose of these actions was the implementation of a national policy of deconcentration of economic and industrial activities, looking forward to the establishment of an interregional integration system to allow the development of a process of balanced regional development. Four years later, however, Santiago and the Central Region again became the focus of government attention, since political and social pressures became stronger.

In the following years Chile moved quickly from a market-oriented style 23/ of planning to a "trial" of a centrally-oriented style and finally to the present free-market style, which is highly influenced by the Chicago school of economics.

In terms of national strategies for regional planning there were not many changes, at least as far as theory is concerned. Until 1974 the country was divided in eleven regions (called 'zonas'), but in that year, by Decree No. 575, 24/ such a division was modified and the national territory was divided into thirteen regions. 25/

In 1974 the national process of regional planning defined, as basic goals, the following:

- a) to create a decentralized administrative organization having adequate decision-making levels, related to defined territorial units;
- b) to give a hierarchical structure to such territorial units;
- c) to create authorities and organizations of the same level in each territorial unit, all of them with equivalent decision-making capacity at complementary levels;
- d) to integrate all sectoral actions, through special institutions designed to obviate isolated action.

In general, the framework of Chilean development policy, in the last ten years, has been based on free market policies which, it was claimed, led to the alleged 'economic boom' registered at the beginning of the 1980s. Such an 'economic boom', however, was actually the result of the opening of the internal market to unlimited importation and the removal of trade barriers, and this brought, as its sequel, a rise in per capita external indebtedness from US\$ 564 in 1978 to approximately US\$ 1 600 in 1984. Simultaneously, the evolution of per capita GDP moved from +8.2% and +8.3%, respectively, in 1978 and 1979, to -15.7% and -2.4% in 1982 and 1983. 26/ Unemployment soared from 13.3% in 1978 to 20.0% in 1982, and according to official data it is still about 18.6% today.

After the Indicative National Development Plan (1979-1984) and the 1983 programme for internal economic adjustment and renegotiation of external debts, Chile prepared a three-year plan ('Programa Trienal') covering the period 1984-1986.

This plan, like its predecessor, was also an indicative plan, with the basic purpose of co-ordinating the actions of the public and private sectors. The basic policy defined in this three-year plan is respect for private property and the free market system, in which the State will play a purely subsidiary role.

The main goals of the plan are the reduction of unemployment, economic reactivation, and recovery from the economic and social crisis. Although no specific mention is made in the three-year plan regarding regional development, the basic system of regional offices attached to ODEPLAN still remains as a basic tool for the national planning system.

Colombia

Unlike other South American countries, Colombia --because of its particular geographical and developmental features-- 27/ has a reasonably well-balanced spatial distribution of population (see table IV).

Until 1967, regional development in Colombia was not planned and the annual average growth rate of the GDP in the period 1950-1975 was about 5.2%. In the mid-1960s, the country adopted ECLAC's recommendations for industrialization, international trade and regional development.28/ From 1968 to 1975 there was a general improvement in the Colombian economy, and the annual average growth rate of the GDP rose to 6.3% in the period.

Based on the data available in 1979, Linn (1980: 580-600) discusses the possibility of the beginning of a process of inversion of polarization in Colombia. Based on inter-census data, he comes to the conclusion that the "four great departments (states)" --Antioquia, Atlántico, Cundinamarca and Valle-- and their cities (Medellín, Barranquilla, Bogotá and Cali), "kept increasing rates of population growth, migration, and participation in the RNP (Regional Net Product). However, within this group of departments, only Cundinamarca, and more precisely Bogotá, looks to play a more dynamic role". Medellín, Barranquilla and Cali, on the other hand, look to be slowing their process of economic and population

Table IV

COLOMBIA: URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION, 1973
(ACCORDING TO ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS OF JUNE 1983)

Capital <u>c/</u>	1973 <u>b/</u>		
	Total	Urban <u>a/</u> (Cabeceras)	Rural <u>a/</u> (Resto)
Medellín	1 163 868	1 122 099	41 769
Barranquilla	703 488	701 945	1 543
Bogotá, D.E.	2 861 913	2 845 361	16 552
Cartagena	348 961	311 664	37 297
Tunja	60 280	55 166	5 114
Manizales	239 140	207 607	31 533
Florencia	49 101	28 056	21 045
Popayán	95 828	77 884	17 944
Valledupar	156 156	98 669	57 487
Montería	178 016	104 129	73 887
Quibdó	53 199	29 423	23 776
Neiva	125 140	109 063	16 077
Riohacha	46 024	22 545	23 479
Santa Marta	152 325	110 161	42 164
Villavicencio	97 596	87 690	9 906
Pasto	162 656	130 222	32 434
Cúcuta	267 786	234 365	33 421
Armenia	159 792	149 078	10 714
Pereira	226 877	186 776	40 101
Bucaramanga	324 873	317 553	7 320
Sincelejo	82 547	71 946	10 601
Ibagué	230 014	202 850	27 164
Calí	991 549	971 891	19 658

Source: DANE.

a/ The concept of urban and rural population in this table is not a very precise one. DANE (National Department of Statistics) uses concepts such as "cabeceras" and "resto". "Cabecera" is the place where the municipal authority is located while the "resto" consists of the other human settlements, independently of their formal rural or urban status and, also, dispersed settlements.

b/ The last official census of Colombia was carried out in 1973, and gave a total population of 22 915 229.

c/ The territorial and administrative division of Colombia comprises 23 departments (equivalent to states) and 978 municipalities. This table shows the population of the capitals of each of the twenty-three departments.

growth as other departments, such as Cesar and Meta, have shown a noteworthy increase in their rates of economic and population growth. These conclusions reached by Linn led him to a further discussion on a process of centralism in which Bogotá endangers balanced regional development.

Looking at the "Plan de Integración Nacional - 1979-1982" (National Integration Plan), some contradictory positions between its focus and its goals are noticeable. The focus is defined as being on territorial, economic and social articulation, while the goals of the plan, broadly defined, are the following:

- a) economic decentralization and regional autonomy;
- b) development of transportation and communication systems;
- c) development of the energy and mineral sectors;
- d) development of a new social strategy.

To improve this National Plan, it was suggested that the existing regional administrative structure 29/ should be strengthened through the creation of a National Council for Decentralization, a Financial Fund for Urban Development, and Regional Autonomous Corporations.

In spite of its apparent drive towards decentralization, the National Integration Plan displayed a strong tendency to centralize sectoral actions. The special programmes cover such sectoral areas as the building of highways, modernization of communication systems, food and nutrition (PAN); among them, mention may also be made of the Programme for the Integration of Services and Community Participation (IPC), as an effort to induce public participation in planning.

In the chapter on Regional and Urban Development, the urban strategy proposed emphasizes the spatial balancing of industrial investments (avoiding location in metropolitan areas); reinforcement of the urban planning process associated with policies of land-use control; and strengthening of municipal financing structures.

Since the beginning of the 1980s, however, the Colombian economy has shown clear signs of recession. Thus, in 1983 Banguero suggested a three-point strategy to reactivate the country's economy: economic growth, income distribution, and social stability. The basic actions proposed by Banguero (1983: 21) were the following:

- i) to accelerate the growth rate of industrial production;
- ii) to avoid inflation;
- iii) to avoid deterioration of income distribution and, on the contrary, to further its improvement;
- iv) to avoid any increase in the present unemployment rates, and to generate new productive employment (cf. Banguero, ibid.).

Specific elements of this strategy were subsidized credits, technical assistance, and the creation of special marketing arrangements to support traditional agriculture in rural areas and small industries in urban areas. Simultaneously, it was suggested that the Government should invest in public housing because of its interrelationship with other economic sectors, its capacity to generate employment, and its low requirements of imported basic inputs.

Many of the above-mentioned recommendations may be reflected in the Colombian National Plan (1983-1986) --"change with equity"-- formulated by the National Planning Department. It has among its general goals the ordering of social changes in order to provide greater equity of distribution of social opportunities. Social welfare goals are to be supported by the improvement of the quality of urban life, promotion of rural welfare, balanced regional development, growing public participation, and protection of the national cultural identity. The basic instruments for implementing the National Plan 1983-1986 are tax reform, progressive adjustment of tariffs of public services, price controls, subsidized agricultural products, and employment generation through a national programme to support small-scale industry and commerce.

Mexico

Unbalanced spatial development is, perhaps, one of the most important features of Mexican regional development. With a total population of 67 382 600 inhabitants, Mexico is today a predominantly urban country. However, the Mexico City Metropolitan Region alone accounts for 25% of the national population and approximately 47.3% of the total urban population of the country.^{30/} The next two most heavily populated Metropolitan Regions in Mexico are Guadalajara and Monterrey, with 2 467 657 and 2 018 625 inhabitants, respectively (see table V).

Table V

MEXICO: POPULATION OF CAPITAL CITIES AND CITIES OF 100 000 AND MORE INHABITANTS

(At 30 June 1979)

City	City proper	Urban agglomeration
Acapulco	462 144	-
Aguascalientes	257 179	-
Apatzingan	100 259	-
Campeche	108 680	-
Celaya	118 665	-
Chihuahua	385 953	-
Ciudad Juárez	625 040	-
Ciudad Madero	141 571	-
Ciudad Obregon	181 733	-
Ciudad Victoria	126 817	-
Coatzacoalcos	128 115	-
Cordoba	121 723	-
Cuernavaca	241 337	-
Culiacán	324 292	-
Durango	228 686	-
Ensenada	139 317	-
Gómez Palacio	103 001	-
Guadalajara	1 906 145	2 467 657
Hermosillo	319 257	-
Irapuato	161 047	-
Jalapa	201 473	-
Leon	624 816	-
Los Mochis	118 631	-
Matamoros	193 305	-
Mazatlán	186 290	-
Mérida	269 582	-
Mexicali	348 528	-
Mexico City	9 191 295	14 750 182
Minatitlan	119 432	-
Monclova	139 257	-
Monterrey	1 064 629	2 018 625
Morelia	251 011	-
Netzahualcóyoti	2 331 351	-
Nuevo Laredo	223 606	-
Oaxaca	135 601	-
Orizaba	121 053	-
Pachuca	108 119	-
Poza Rica de Hidalgo	198 003	-
Puebla de Zaragoza	710 833	-
Querétano	185 821	-
Reynosa	231 082	-
Salamanca	105 543	-
San Luis Potosi	327 333	-
Saltillo	258 492	-
Tampico	248 369	389 940
Tepic	139 881	-
Tijuana	566 344	-
Toluca	241 920	-
Torreon	274 717	407 271
Tuxtla Gutiérrez	106 894	-
Uruapan	147 030	-
Veracruz Llave	306 843	-
Villa Hermosa	175 845	-
Zapopan	104 497	-

Source: United Nations, Demographic Yearbook 1982, New York, 1984.

As pointed out by Unikel (1978:67),^{31/} Mexico does not have an institutionalized form of regional division. Many public organizations, acting alone, have proposed and adopted some kind of regionalization of the country for their own sectoral action purposes. As a result, while unbalanced regional development is easy to see, its evaluation remains a difficult task. Confirmation of such unbalanced regional development is available in Unikel's analysis of the regional urbanization of Mexico (Ibid: 64-92, see also table VI).

In spite of the absence of an explicit regional development policy, there have been many sectoral efforts at resource allocation for balanced development. Actions on Mexican national economic development started with the Agrarian Reform Law (1915) and continued with the industrialization process initiated in the 1940s.

In the agricultural field, according to Unikel (1978), over the period 1915-1970 a total of 75 000 000 ha, of land were distributed among 3 000 000 peasants and 1 500 000 small landowners. Together with this policy of agrarian reform, some institutions were established, such as the Central Bank and the Nacional Financiera, the National Irrigation Commission, etc. Also, based on the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) experience, some special programmes were developed in the region of the Mexican Gulf and on the Pacific coast.

In 1953, the Mexican Government created a special Federal Fund to promote credit for small and medium-sized industries, and this has promoted some industrial decentralization, though its effectiveness on the deconcentration of the Metropolitan Region of Mexico City was not very evident.^{32/}

In contrast, since the 1940s the central government has established a series of interconnected policies to accelerate industrialization. Unikel points out that the principal mechanisms --laws and programmes-- of this policy were the following: i) laws of fiscal exemption for industries; ii) incentives for new and needed industries (Ley de Industrias Nuevas y Necesarias); iii) credit support to small and medium-sized industries; iv) National Frontier Programme; and v) programme of industrial parks and cities. The first two instruments did not produce regional impacts, since they tended to be more effectively applied

Table VI

PARTICIPATION OF THE REGIONS IN THE NATIONAL URBANIZATION INDEX AND PER CAPITA
REGIONAL GROSS PRODUCT FROM 1900 TO 1970
(Per capita RGP expressed in pesos of 1950)

Region	1900		1910		1921		1930		1940		1950		1960		1970	
	Urb.	RGP pc														
TOTAL	100	613	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	1 165	100	1 593	100	2 125	100	3 104
I	0.87	941	1.19	-	1.09	-	1.24	-	1.40	1 421	3.77	2 163	6.79	2 591	8.16	4 098
II <u>a/</u>	9.24	1 081	10.69	-	12.13	-	12.74	-	13.61	1 422	14.58	2 041	15.10	2 837	13.61	4 015
III	4.67	665	4.64	-	6.83	-	8.57	-	8.55	1 216	8.12	2 049	7.61	2 225	9.58	2 871
IV	8.24	581	7.27	-	4.62	-	4.91	-	4.58	660	3.74	983	3.19	902	2.81	1 130
V <u>b/</u>	24.11	421	19.50	-	16.18	-	13.57	-	12.45	607	12.02	887	13.70	1 080	13.78	1 693
VI	10.88	542	8.66	-	6.97	-	6.76	-	6.36	617	5.71	803	4.88	896	5.18	1 296
VII <u>c/</u>	37.47	887	42.43	-	16.86	-	47.52	-	49.33	2 869	47.94	3 141	45.02	4 512	42.09	5 965
VIII	4.52	395	5.62	-	5.32	-	4.69	-	3.72	507	4.12	769	3.71	927	4.76	1 247

Source: Luis Unikel, 1978 --tables II-7 and VI-1.

/ The Metropolitan Region of Monterrey is located in this region.

/ The Metropolitan Region of Guadalajara is located in this region.

/ The Metropolitan Region of Mexico City is located in this region.

in the Federal District and in the State of Mexico and thus helped industrial concentration in the Metropolitan Region of Mexico City (MRMC). Similarly, the programme of industrial parks and cities also contributed to industrial concentration in the MRMC, since, in 1972, 95% of the total area of such parks was installed in the Federal District.

Concomitantly, the city of Sabagún created under this same programme --and based on the models of TVA and the British new towns-- became an artificial city, extremely expensive and totally dependent on the public sector (cf. Unikel, ibid).

The Frontier National Programme, which was closed down in 1972, served as an incentive for the settlement of some United States assembly industries on the Mexican side of the border. At the time of its closing it had generated only 41 414 jobs (ibid:312).

The mid-1970s was marked by the clear concern of the Mexican Government with spatial distribution of population (General Law on Population - 1973; National Council on Population - 1974), human settlements (General Law on Human Settlements) - 1976, and regional planning (creation of the National Commission for Regional Development) - 1975.

Thus, in the next presidential term after this period it was possible to implement the institutionalization of a national regional and urban planning system. According to Garza (1983) 33/ the main mechanisms of this planning system were the following: i) joint co-ordination agreements (1976) signed by both Federal and State governments with the purpose of co-ordinating governmental action in the field of regional development; ii) the Secretariat of Human Settlements and Public Works (set up in 1976), which became the central element in the national system of urban planning; iii) the General Co-ordination Unit of the National Plan for Depressed Zones and Marginated Groups --COPLAMAR-- (1977), whose objective is to co-ordinate Federal and State programmes and actions directed to the subject of marginated groups; iv) the National Commission on Urban Development, which is an instrument to co-ordinate action by public agencies in the urban and regional fields and is also responsible for proposing

national urban development policies; v) the National Commission for the Development of Border Areas and Free Zones (CODEF); vi) the National Urban Development Plan; vii) the Programme for Joint Action on Urban Development; viii) the National Industrial Development Plan; ix) the Mexican Food Plan; and x) the Agricultural Development Promotion Law (1980).

Besides these mechanisms, there was also a series of specific sectoral programmes for administrative decentralization and the spatial distribution of economic activities and population. At present, under the administration of President De La Madrid, the National Development Plan for the period 1983-1988 defines Mexican decentralization and regional development policies as integral parts of the following national goals:

- a) Integral development of the State;
- b) Reinforcement of municipal autonomy;
- c) Spatial reorganization of economic activities in the national territory.

Four lines of action define the basic framework within which national and regional development should work towards common goals:^{34/}

1. Lines of Action for State Development. To accelerate a process of balanced regional development it is laid down that every Mexican State must propose a development plan providing for a better articulation between the rural and urban economies and the strengthening of local (municipal) government. The main tool of this development process will be the Unified Joint Development Agreement (Convenio Unico de Desarrollo) which is strategically supported by six special programmes (State Financial Investments; Integral Rural Development; Marginated Zones; Sectoral Integration; State Development, and Financial Support for States and Municipalities). A Committee for the Planning of State Development would be the institutional support of the system as a whole.

2. Lines of Action for the Integration of Regions into National Development. These lines of action are related to regions of the country which are strategic on account of their spatial location or their natural resources. The principal regions considered in this chapter of the Plan are: a) The Northern Region, because of its special characteristics as a border region. This choice also

considers the economic development of some subregional areas such as Chihuahua, Durango and Zacatecas and the Metropolitan Region of Monterrey, in order to rationalize the general process of urban development of the country; b) the Southeast Region, because of its natural resources and special ethnic and cultural conditions. For this area it is also proposed to develop programmes of appropriate technology and emphasis is given to environmental problems; c) the central part of the Pacific Coast, because of its touristic and industrial potential. Three main strategic actions are considered for this region. Firstly, integration of the coastal touristic network and intensification of the use of the existing industrial and port facilities by promoting exploitation of the mineral resources of the region. Secondly, promotion and rationalization of the agro-industrial development of the valleys of Tepalcatepec and mid-Balsas, with concentration of efforts on the integration of these areas with Guadalajara and Puebla in order to avoid still closer links with Mexico City. Thirdly, a common strategy will be established to support peasant communities in the Guerrero and Oaxaca mountains; d) the Gulf Coast region, because of its natural resources, its infrastructural facilities, and its traditional role in the industrial development of the country. This area should be considered as an alternative within the deconcentration strategy for the Metropolitan Region of Mexico City.

3. Lines of Action for the Metropolitan Region of Mexico City. This Metropolitan Region is considered to be the biggest problem for future balanced national development. Four strategic actions for economic spatial distribution were proposed: a) intensification of industrial deconcentration together with the opening of new alternatives for industrial location in other geographic areas; b) reduction of rates of migration to the metropolis through the strengthening of rural development in expulsion zones; c) consolidation of urban systems located in the Western region of the country and on the Gulf of Mexico as an alternative for the development of a network of medium-sized cities, interconnected with rural areas; rationalization and control of urban growth in the Metropolitan Region and its periphery. This strategy will be associated with

land-use controls and specific policies for rationalization of water consumption, urban transportation and industrial location. Special policies for self-financing of the Federal District will be adopted through tax reforms and selective systems of tariffs for public services.

4. Lines of Action for Mexico City. Because of its characteristics as the capital city, and also because of its strong tendency to concentrate economic and political power, Mexico City should be the central point of the whole process of national decentralization. The proposed strategy comprises action on housing, sanitation, the environment, urban transportation, health, social security, education, etc.

The analysis of Mexican policies and plans for regional development (since 1974) shows a high degree of consistency among them. However, in spite of serious efforts at national decentralization, balanced regional development is still far from being achieved. Mexican development, like that of other countries of the region, tenaciously tends towards the concentration of economic investments and population in one single region of the country, in this case the Metropolitan Region of Mexico City.

Because Mexico does not have a formal division of the country into regions,^{35/} Mexican spatial policies in general are based on urban planning and on specific "problem zones" (e.g., border zones, depressed zones, zones with agricultural or mining potential, etc.). The formalization of an urban/regional system of planning, at the national level, only took place in 1977 and, according to Garza (1983), the main goal of the National Development Plans of both 1977-1982 and 1983-1988 has been to reinforce a national urban network, together with regionalized programmes of industrial and population deconcentration.

In spite of the many changes noted in Mexican national planning in the last decade, there is still a persistent tendency to concentrate financial and administrative efforts in Mexico City, while sectoral efficiency remains the basic issue prevailing over spatial deconcentration.

Panama

Because of the Panama Canal, this country is of vital strategic importance to the American continent as a whole. In territorial area, Panama is among the smallest countries of the ECLAC region; according to the 1980 census its total population was 1 824 796 inhabitants,^{36/} (49.3% urban and 50.7% rural).^{37/} (The political-administrative division of the country comprises 9 provinces, 65 municipalities, one Indian community and 505 districts.)

Since 1975 the Panamanian economy had been growing steadily, at an average rate of 3.5% between 1975 and 1978; 9.7% in the period 1979-1980; 4.2% in 1981, and 5.5% in 1982, but in 1983 the growth rate decreased to 0.4% and in 1984 it fell to zero (according to ECLAC provisional estimates).^{38/}

Since the beginning of this century there has been a manifest tendency towards urban concentration in Panama City. After the construction of the Canal, however, this tendency became stronger and, without exception, all the other provinces have shown a remarkable relative loss of importance in relation to the capital city (see table VII).

National planning concerned with regional development and the spatial distribution of population and activities began in the 1970s in Panama. The National Development Strategy, 1970-1980, defined its goals as follows (cf. Boisier, 1980: 84-85):

- a) Spatial goals: integration of the physical, economic, social and political aspects of development as well as functional organization of the national space;
- b) Regionalized national goals: institutional development; reinforcement of national identity; reducing unemployment rates and marginated groups; promotion of equitable income distribution as well as strengthening of economic development;
- c) Long-range goals (by regions):
 - i) Eastern Region (Oriental): colonization and relocation of the population; environmental protection; incorporation of Indian groups;
 - ii) Central-Eastern Region: increasing agricultural and stock-raising activities; agrarian reform and ordering of rural spaces; improvement of rural-urban accessibility; industrialization;
 - iii) Metropolitan Region: lowering of spatial friction and complementing of urban functions.

Table VII

EVOLUTION OF POPULATION DISTRIBUTION IN PANAMA, BY PROVINCES

Provinces	Inhabitants							
	1920	%	1960	%	1970	%	1980	%
Total Panama	446 098	100	1 075 541	100	1 428 082	100	1 830 175	100
Bocas del Toro	27 239	6.1	32 600	3.0	43 531	2.9	53 579	2.9
Coclé	45 151	10.2	93 156	8.7	118 003	8.3	140 320	7.7
Colón	58 250	13.0	105 416	9.8	134 286	9.4	166 439	9.1
Chiriquí	76 470	17.1	188 350	17.5	236 154	16.6	287 801	15.7
Darién	10 728	2.4	19 715	1.8	22 685	1.8	26 497	1.4
Herrera	28 984	6.5	61 672	5.5	72 549	5.1	81 866	4.5
Los Santos	34 638	7.8	70 554	6.6	72 380	5.0	70 200	3.8
Panamá	98 035	22.0	372 393	34.7	576 645	40.8	830 278	45.4
Veraguas	66 603	14.9	131 685	12.2	151 498	10.6	173 195	9.5

Source: UNDP (Ligia Herrera): PAN/78/P01 and PAN/79/P03.

In terms of urban-regional development, the long-range objective of the proposed national development strategy was to promote radical changes in the spatial structure of Panama through five basic actions:

- a) creation of a transit axis between Panama City and Chorrera to support the national development pole of the Metropolitan Region;
- b) creation of a peninsular axis of development in the Central-West Region by articulating the industrial potential of Chitre-Los Santos to the tertiary centre of Las Tablas;
- c) improvement of a western development nucleus based on the industrial and tertiary potential of David and its articulation with other smaller centres;
- d) reinforcement of the three existing tertiary centres in the Central-Western region to support agricultural and stock-raising development; and
- e) creation of a tertiary centre in the Eastern Region, which is still not incorporated into the development process of the country.

Since 1980, no formal national planning has been promoted by the Panama Government, although some economic studies have been carried out under the guidance of the Ministry of Planning and Economic Policy.^{39/} There is also a document which defines "Strategic options for regional development, 1980-1990". Nevertheless, there is no formal instrument regulating governmental activities on either national or regional economic and social planning in the medium or long term.

Two projects on demography, financed by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities,^{40/} however, became associated with spatial planning in Panama. These projects evolved through the articulation of the Department of Population of the Ministry of Planning and Economic Policy, the Ministry of Health (through its Office for Population Studies), and the Department of Statistics and Censuses of the Comptroller-General of the Republic. Thus, in 1981 the Technical Committee on Population, including technical staff from almost all the Ministries of Panama, was set up.

The articulation of these bodies, as mentioned above, might be the beginning of the institutionalization of formal structures for the future regionalized development planning of Panama. Meanwhile, it is evident that the National Development Strategy, 1970-1980 has not yet been implemented and, as pointed out by Miró (1983: 14): "If we look at the whole system [Panama's economic, social and political systems] we will find that the critical point between development and demographic [spatial] tendencies is the national development model itself. Such a model tends to give priority to specific functions as an international corridor and financial and services centre, in such a way that the main concentration of national employment remains concentrated in the metropolitan region of Panama City".

Peru

In the mid-1960s, influenced by ECLAC recommendations, Peru started its first efforts at regionalized planning. Like Chile (and many other Latin American countries), as pointed out by Boisier (1980: 78), "Peru shows sharp geographic and ethnic differences among its natural regions, which have been a determinant factor both for diverse standards of territorial occupation and for handling of natural resources". According to the 1981 census, the total population of Peru was 17 005 210 inhabitants (64.9% urban and 35.1% rural). The Lima-Callao Metropolitan Region has 30.5% of the total national population, while its urban population corresponds to 45.2% of the national urban population. The political-administrative division of the country comprises 25 departments (equivalent to states), 153 provinces and 1 680 districts.41/

A comparative study of the last three censuses (1961, 1972 and 1981) (see table VIII) shows that in spite of urban concentration in the Lima-Callao Metropolitan Region, there is reasonable urban growth in other departments located along the coastline (from Piura to Arequipa) and in the central region of the country (Junín, Pasco, Huanco, Huancavelica, etc.). Puno, near the border with Chile, has two provinces, San Ramón and Azongaro, with an urban increase of respectively 7.7% and 5.2% (annual average rates) and the departments of Loreto and Ucayali, in the Amazon region, also show significant rates of urban growth. Ucayali belonged to the department of Loreto until 1980; its average annual growth rate was 7.0% (1961-1972) and 4.3% (1972-1981).42/

Table VIII

PERU: COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE GROWTH OF DEPARTMENTS WITH CITIES OVER 100 000 INHABITANTS,
ACCORDINGLY TO THE CENSUS OF 1961, 1972, 1981 - URBAN PERCENTAGE AND ANNUAL
AVERAGE GROWTH RATES

Department		Population						Annual average growth rates (per cent)			
		1961		1972		1981		Urban		Rural	
		Total	Urb.%	Total	Urb.%	Total	Urb.%	1961-1972	1972-1981	1961-1972	1972-1981
PERU	(38) [*]	9 706 746	47.4	13 538 208	59.5	17 005 210	64.9	5.1	3.6	.5	.9
Amazonas	(1)	118 439	38.8	194 472	34.6	256 460	32.4	3.6	2.3	5.3	3.5
Ancash**	(1)	582 598	33.2	126 215	47.2	815 646	52.8	5.4	2.5	-.1	.0
Apurimac	(1)	288 223	19.8	308 213	24.3	321 936	26.2	2.5	1.3	.1	.1
Arequipa**	(1)	388 881	64.5	529 566	79.5	702 308	83.1	4.9	3.7	-2.2	1.0
Ayacucho	(1)	410 772	25.3	457 441	32.9	500 732	36.4	3.5	2.1	.0	.4
Cajamarca	(4)	746 938	14.9	919 161	17.4	1 044 689	20.2	3.4	3.1	1.6	1.1
P.C. Callao**	(1)	213 540	96.0	321 231	97.5	446 730	98.8	4.0	3.8	-.7	-4.2
Cuzco	(2)	611 972	32.4	715 237	36.8	829 294	41.2	2.6	2.9	.8	.8
Huancavelica	(1)	302 817	19.1	331 629	24.0	346 460	28.5	3.0	2.4	.3	-.2
Huanuco	(1)	326 684	21.6	414 468	26.6	481 924	29.7	4.3	3.1	1.6	1.4
Ica**	(2)	255 930	53.8	357 247	71.5	431 442	78.4	5.8	3.1	-1.4	-1.0
Junin**	(2)	521 210	49.1	696 641	59.5	848 993	58.9	4.5	2.1	.6	2.7
Lambayeque	(2)	342 446	61.8	514 602	72.7	683 425	17.1	5.4	3.8	.7	1.2
Libertad	(2)	582 243	41.7	783 728	60.0	960 537	65.4	6.2	3.2	-.7	.6
Lima**	(4)	2 031 051	86.3	3 472 564	93.3	4 738 266	95.7	5.8	3.8	-1.7	-1.2
Loreto**	(1)	240 273	38.4	339 051	49.5	446 316	54.1	5.6	4.1	1.3	2.0
Pasco**	(1)	140 604	35.4	176 580	57.8	221 219	59.8	6.9	2.9	-1.9	2.0
Piura**	(4)	668 941	44.5	854 972	54.1	1 168 442	61.5	4.1	4.9	.5	1.5
Puno	(5)	686 260	18.1	776 173	24.0	896 586	31.3	3.8	4.6	.4	.4
Tacna**	(1)	66 024	69.6	95 444	81.1	133 240	85.6	4.9	4.4	-.9	.7

Source: INE (National Institute of Statistics).

* / Number of provinces. Inhabitants per department. ** / Index of urbanization over 50%.

The 1980s are marked by a strong concern with economic matters as well as social problems, caused by internal adjustments made in 1979 and 1980 in response to the economic crisis. Hence, in accordance with IBRD basic guidelines, a document was prepared entitled "Peru: Main questions and recommendations on development". The basic goals of this document, which served as support for government actions, were:

- i) raising of GDP and generation of employment;
- ii) reduction of inflation;
- iii) raising of real salaries, and better income distribution; and
- iv) expansion of government expenditure on social programmes, with priority attention to rural areas.

As regards the fourth item, on the one hand the basic goals of government investments were defined as education, health, and housing. On the other hand, priority attention to rural areas was related to agricultural development, increased funds for departmental development offices, and reorganization of systems of popular co-operation and co-operatives.

The basic elements of the proposed development strategy were: modification of the national pattern of economic accumulation associated to the opening-up of the national economy to external markets; liberal policies reinforcing the internal free-market system based on efficient national private enterprise, and significant investments of external funds. In terms of regional planning, the basic action lines proposed were related to the better spatial distribution of industrial activities, decentralization of public investments and administration, and rural development and colonization of peripheral areas.

Other lines of action worthy of mention were popular co-operation (based on the organization of local and neighbourhood associations) and sectoral actions in transportation, housing and energy.

The latest analysis of Peruvian development in this period (1980-1984) shows that few achievements have been made, since the effects of the international recession had strong repercussions on Peru's economy. As a result, short-term sectoral planning for economic adjustment was carried out, with weighty consequences for social as well as regional development. This same period,

1981-1984, shows a cumulative rate of decrease of per capita GDP of the order of -13.3%. According to the Ministry of Labour and Social Promotion, rates of unemployment (8.8%) and underemployment (53.9%) added up to 62.7%, while estimated 1984 inflation was about 118% (against 73% in 1981).

The series of economic, administrative and social difficulties suffered by Peruvian governments in the last decade did not allow progress to be made in balanced regional development. The National Planning Institute (INP), created in 1962, relegated its General Office for Regional Planning to a secondary role, while the whole planning system tended to centralization through a basic system for resource allocation supported by the Central Reserve Bank, the National Bank (Banco de la Nación), and the Financial Corporation for Development (COFIDE).

Venezuela

In general, the Venezuelan urban population is concentrated in the Northeast and the Zulia region, while the South and the Guayana region are underpopulated. According to the Census of 1981, the total population of the country is about 14 570 085 inhabitants (76.4% urban).

As shown in table IX, it is clear that the main urban concentration is settled in the Capital Region (almost a quarter of the total population), followed by the Zulia (7.54%) and Central (5.93%) regions. Altogether, 51.2% of the total population belongs to cities and urban agglomerates of over 100 000 inhabitants. This corresponds to 67.03% of the urban population of Venezuela.

The 1970s showed some tendency to a reversal of polarization as regards the relative distribution of the population. The Capital region and the Zulia region, respectively, changed from 17.3% to 14.2% and 12.1% to 11.5% in relative ranking of population distribution.^{43/}

National economic planning in Venezuela started with the establishment, in 1958, of the Central Office for Co-ordination and Planning of the Presidency of the Republic (CORDIPLAN). It was not until the end of 1960 that the first experiment in regional planning began: the Venezuelan Corporation for Guayana (CVG), responsible for the industrial development of this underpopulated region. As pointed out by Boisier (1980:21), the Guayana development was not motivated by

Table IX

PRINCIPAL CITIES AND URBAN AGGLOMERATES IN VENEZUELA, BY REGIONS

Region	City	Population	Relative share of total population (%)	
Central/West	Acarigua - Araure	122 000	0.85	
	Barquisimeto	489 000	3.42	5.11
	Punto Fijo	120 000	0.84	
North-East	Barcelona-Pto. La Cruz	275 000	1.92	
	Cumaná	168 000	1.17	4.31
	Maturin	176 000	1.22	
Capital	Departamento Vargas	246 000	1.72	
	Caracas (Metrop. Region)	2 944 000	20.57	22.29
Central	Maracay	344 000	2.40	
	Valencia	506 000	3.53	5.93
Guayana	Ciudad Bolívar	147 000	1.03	
	Ciudad Guayana	206 000	1.44	2.47
Los Andes	Lagunillas	125 000	0.87	
	San Cristóbal	272 000	1.90	3.55
	Valera	112 000	0.78	
Zulia	Cobimas	178 000	1.24	
	Maracaibo	901 000	6.30	7.54

problems or needs of the region itself. As a matter of fact, national economic problems were the main reason for the development of this project. By the end of the 1970s, however, some changes in the industrial structure of Venezuela were to be noted, and the Guayana region itself was already integrated into the national economic market. Nevertheless, such industrial development caused immigration levels to exceed the capacity of employment generation of the Guayana region, consequently leading to underemployment and unemployment.^{44/}

Subsequently, other similar institutions were created in Venezuela, such as the Andes Corporation (CORPO-ANDES), the Zulian Council for Planning and Development (CONZUPLAN) and the Centre/West Development Foundation (FUDECO), all established in 1964. Between 1966 and the beginning of 1970, the North-East Development Commission (NORORIENTE) was set up, while the Central Government, through Decree No. 72 (11 June 1969), institutionalized a regional process of planning designed to be under CORDIPLAN's co-ordination.^{45/}

In February 1980, through Decree No. 478, another regional division of the country was effected, given the following regions: 1) Guayana; 2) North-East; 3) Insular; 4) Llanos (flatlands); 5) Capital; 6) Central; 7) Los Andes; 8) Centre/West, and 9) Zulia.

Since the beginning of planning activities in Venezuela in 1958, regional planning has been a specific concern of National Development Plans. Regionalized national planning --economic and social--, however, is something new in Venezuelan planning. Public institutions have been under a continuous process of adaptation to decentralization, which was made more difficult because of frequent changes of regional boundaries. Nevertheless, CORDIPLAN institutionalized relevant mechanisms of public participation such as the Regional Councils for Development, the Regional Offices for Co-ordination and Planning (ORCOPLANES), and the National Council for Regional Development (CNDR).

Under the above-mentioned Decree No. 478, CORDIPLAN also became responsible for the Technical Secretariat of the CNDR as well as being put in charge of technical and administrative support to the Ministry of the Interior for the organization of National and Regional Conventions of Governors.

In terms of resource allocation for balanced development there are specific programmes for border areas and, in 1976 the Congress of Venezuela approved a bill creating a Fund for Regional Development Corporations (cf. CORDIPLAN, 1983).

The basic point of departure of the Sixth Venezuelan National Plan (1981-1985) is economic growth together with social development within a context of increasing land-use rationality and environmental protection. As for regional development matters, two action mechanisms were defined: a) political and institutional decentralization, and b) territorial organization. In spite of the Venezuelan Government's efforts, however, it had not been possible to implement this planning strategy fully. As mentioned before, economic adjustments to cope with the international situation paralysed the implementation of many sectoral projects (e.g., the Zulia metallurgical and energy project and the Yacambu dam), causing problems for national development as a whole.

Notwithstanding the fact that Venezuela is one of the countries of the region which has advanced furthest in planning mechanisms and institutional structures for regional planning, it is still considered as having a very centralized political, economic and planning system (cf. Boisier, 1983:10).^{46/} Economic benefits, in the last ten years, have remained concentrated in the Capital and Zulia regions, and 1984 data on employment rates show a national unemployment average of 13.1%.^{47/}

As regards the preparation of the Seventh National Plan (1985-1989), the newly created Venezuelan Planning Institute (IVEPLAN) has laid down guidelines in which the concept of "flexible planning" assumes definite importance. Such a concept, however, presumes a clear political concert, allowing periodical content reviews and focused on stable strategic criteria. The main objective of this methodological proposal is to permit the adaptation of planning to conjunctural changes.

Thus, within the constitutional framework of CORDIPLAN (Central Office for Co-ordination and Planning), the Seventh National Plan should have the following basic characteristics: continuity, flexibility, modularity, intertemporality, and dynamism. In addition, it should strengthen programme budgeting adapted to current national economic and social problems and opportunities. The global strategy of the Plan stresses the articulation of three interrelated strategies for economic growth, social development and the reinforcement of democratic political systems.

III. PROCEDURES AND METHODS FOR DEALING WITH REGIONAL PLANNING IN THE ECLAC REGION

The study material analysed in the previous chapter has shown how a variety of procedures and methods for dealing with regional planning have been used in Latin America and the Caribbean. As such procedures and methods have a common theoretical background, they tend to be homogeneous in spite of diverse national realities. Most planning in the region has generally been imitative of models developed in Western industrialized countries, and it has tended to point to what must be avoided rather than what must be done.

One of the characteristics of unbalanced development in the ECLAC region is the inordinate unplanned urban growth --and metropolitanization-- caused by both rural immigration to urban areas and by the concentration of public and private investments in capital cities and metropolitan regions. The result of such inordinate growth is the generation of large fringes of miserable slums surrounding the "islands of modernism" --the economically developed areas-- of those countries. In the last twenty years, however, such a state of social distress has assumed political and economic importance, leading the public authorities to try to formulate policies for resource allocation for balanced development. It follows that today, in spite of the region's heterogeneous political, socio-economic and development systems, there is a general planning framework, based on mixed economies, where the State plays an important regulating role.

Up until recent years, the word 'participation' (as in participative planning, public participation, etc.) was not even considered in the majority of the countries in the region. In fact, the 1970s witnessed the creation of strongly centralized ministries and secretariats of planning all over Latin America and the Caribbean (e.g., Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay). Hence, in general, participation was restricted to formal and

technical surveys of the available socio-economic data, and consultations with public institutions (sectoral, regional and local). Brazil and Colombia used to send their national development plans to the National Congress for approval,^{48/} as a means of inducing a sort of participation.

As a theoretical concept, national planning in the ECLAC region has tended to assume three basic forms: co-ordination between economic and social policies; support for governmental decision-making systems; and development of sectoral projects related to national development.

Control of economic development rather than social development, however, is noticeable in the majority of governmental actions, and also in the planning proposals. Substitution of imports, an accelerated process of industrialization, development of basic industries, capital formation and financing, rapid technological development, etc., are the key actions, while regionally unbalanced development, urban concentration, precarious human settlements, and social development as a whole are treated as secondary issues. It was felt in the past that these planning models, based on paradigms of Western developed countries, should provide a mechanical and automatic correlation between economic growth, generation of employment, and income distribution. The basic sectoral areas of governmental concern were defined, in general, as transport (goods transport, and mass public transport in metropolitan regions), energy, communications and housing. Therefore, almost all economic investments were concentrated on infrastructural projects directed towards industrialization and the modernization of existing industrial works.

Consequently, the 1970s in the ECLAC region were marked by a strong tendency to centralization of planning processes, with emphasis on sectoral development. Some countries like Brazil evidenced such a tendency through the creation of State companies, while other countries like Argentina and Chile tended to hand over the task to the private sector. Nevertheless, spatial concentration of investments remained the focal point of such diverse policies.

However, Latin American and Caribbean realities did not corroborate the supposed mechanical correlation between economic growth and social development.^{49/} As a result, unbalanced regional development became worse in many countries, while urban concentration and metropolitanization assumed disastrous proportions in social terms. On the one hand, spatial concentration of investments provoked interregional migration --mainly rural-urban migration-- and, on the other hand, public investments in health, education, sanitation, transport and housing were not in keeping with the new trend of urban growth caused by such migration.

An overview of this period shows that, in general, the region progressed in economic terms while the majority of its planning systems neglected balanced regional development and spatial distribution of investments and population, considering them not to be important issues for social development. Policies for regional development are present in many of the national plans of the region, but in general they are only paid official lip service and are incompatible with the national development models. Problems of inflation, stability of domestic prices and the balance of payments became relevant in the third part of the decade, inducing the adoption of short-term economic planning which tended to oppose deconcentration.

It is important to note, however, that on the one hand the region is still under the effects of a strong process of economic adjustment as a consequence of the international economic crisis. As pointed out by Iglesias in 1984,^{50/} "total Latin American GDP increased 2.6% after two years of constant decrease of the order of 1% in 1982 and 3% in 1981 ... thus, today's per capita GDP is in the same range as that of 1976". Consequently, such a kind of economic framework is reflected in national planning systems strongly marked by economic adjustments (see tables - appendix I).

On the other hand, "the most significant fact as regards regional matters in the ECLAC area is probably the societal pressures leading to higher levels of administrative decentralization and decision-making. Such pressures come from local demands for more autonomy as well as from growing consciousness by federal governments of the impossibility of efficient

management of complex centralized national administration" (E/CEPAL/ILPES/G.22:4). Political changes in many countries of the region (e.g., Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Uruguay) have also served to favour the beginning of a process of administrative decentralization.

a) Methods and criteria for resource allocation for balanced development

As mentioned before, the first efforts to develop methods and criteria for regional development in Latin America started in the 1960s in Chile, Venezuela and Brazil. They were highly influenced by a solution-oriented process of planning, tending to be based solely on the economic and technical efficiency of programmes and projects formulated in response to social, political and economic pressures.

From the 1960s to the 1980s these policies evolved from specific projects like Ciudad Guayana, in Venezuela, to complex banking systems associated to fiscal funds. Notwithstanding, this evolution did not represent any real advances in the field of balanced development in the region; on the contrary, twenty years after the beginning of the first experiments, centralization of public and private investments still persists as an insoluble issue in the region.

The study material analysed shows evidence that in the ECLAC region methods and criteria for locating investments for regional development remain strongly dependent on central government decision-making systems and are thus far removed from local and/or regional social and political needs. Short-term economic efficiency has been, indeed, the principal factor inspiring policies in this field, despite subsequent often negative consequences in the social and political fields.

The economic instruments used to promote resource allocation for balanced development in the ECLAC region may be grouped in three basic categories:

i) Fiscal Regional Development Funds, which were created for the direct transfer of financial resources from central governments to State and/or local governments or authorities (as in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, etc.).

ii) Tax policies designed to stimulate regional development in defined areas (by means of direct subsidies or tax reductions), and to restrict inordinate unplanned industrial and urban growth in metropolitan areas by raising local or state taxes (e.g., Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Peru, Venezuela);

iii) Direct sectoral public investments (through banking systems, sectoral programmes and projects, etc.), which have been the main tool for regional development in the ECLAC region. These mechanisms are used to improve local or State infrastructure (roads, energy supply, etc.) and to create public companies to act in areas requiring heavy investments that cannot be made by the national private sector (e.g., Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela).

The above-mentioned instruments, in general, do not look at human settlements as an essential component of national regional development policies. As a result, they tend to reinforce the general pattern of inordinate unplanned urban growth as well as favouring metropolitanization through concentration of a high proportion of industrial and services activities in capital cities and in a few other urban agglomerates.

b) Planning mechanisms and institutional structures for regional planning

In spite of general tendencies towards concentrated spatial development, the efforts made by some countries of the region in creating mechanisms for regional planning are worthy of note. According to ILPES,^{51/} Chile was one of the first countries of the region to adopt and institutionalize a national system of regional planning through the creation, in 1965, of the National Planning Office (ODEPLAN). Eleven Regional Planning Offices, subordinated to ODEPLAN, were created at the same time, corresponding to each of the eleven regions into which the country was divided (there are now thirteen regions). Another example of early regionalization of national planning is Venezuela, which formalized a regional division of the country into eight regions in 1969. In Brazil the first effort at regional development was the creation in 1960 of the Superintendency for Regional Development of the Northeast (SUDENE), a region of the country which suffered from many problems.

The Brazilian Third National Development Plan (1980-1985), like the plans of Colombia, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela, shows great concern with social equity, balanced regional development, and employment generation. However, Brazil's external indebtedness and high inflation rates are factors which dominate planning policies. Since 1974 the Brazilian planning system has been centralized in the Secretariat of the Presidency, which co-ordinates the action of all sectoral ministries. Regional planning is part of national planning, but regional planning agencies (i.e., SUDENE, SUDAM, SUDENSUL and SUDECO) are subordinated to the Ministry of the Interior. The institutional organization of such agencies defines as the highest level of regional decisions a regional council formed by the State governors of each region. Only recently, however, after the free elections for State governors carried out in 1982, did these agencies acquire some political representativeness. Previously, they were mere representatives of the federal government sectoral agencies and were totally subordinated to a centralized planning system from above.

The Brazilian urban development system, for its part, has also been attached to the Ministry of the Interior since the creation of the National Council for Urban Development (CNDU) in 1974. This agency, however, has had its influence reduced in the last six years partly because it does not have any political support and partly because of conjunctural events which led to the elimination of the National Fund for Urban Development and reduced the CNDU's options to bureaucratic activities. Nevertheless, at the end of 1983 CNDU formulated a bill to regulate Brazilian urban development.^{52/}

The result of this institutional organization, which strongly separated regional and urban development, tended to reinforce sectoral activities of the Ministry of the Interior, such as housing and sanitation, while leading to a noticeable reduction of the importance of regional development aspects.^{53/} Other Ministries also started significant sectoral actions which affected planning efforts for urban and regional balanced development. The Ministry of Transport, for instance, created in 1976 the EBTU (Brazilian Corporation for Urban Transportation) and, in 1984, the CBTU (Brazilian Corporation for Urban Railroad Transportation).

In other countries, in spite of the absence of a formal process of regionalization, national governments have tried to act in consonance with local and/or State governments, on the basis of regional development strategies. Panama, Colombia and Ecuador are good examples of this approach.

Mexico, too, does not have a consistent form of regional division. Since 1973, however, its planning system has shown specific concern for spatial distribution of the population (General Law on Population, 1973; National Council on Population, 1974; National Commission for Regional Development, 1975; and General Law on Human Settlements, 1976). More recently 54/ Nicaragua created a Ministry of Planning and Ecuador transformed its Planning Board (JUNAPLA) into a National Council for Development, presided by the Vice-President of the Republic.

The Ecuadorian Development Plan (1980-1984) showed great concern for economic adjustment in the definition of its goals. Nevertheless, through effective application of planning mechanisms such as annual operative plans, promotion of agroindustrial activities and a controlled wages policy, it was possible to avoid acute social distress. In general terms, planning policies were focused on the strengthening of the democratic system of government and social justice. The Development Plan therefore contemplated five specific structural actions and six strategic procedures. The structural actions referred to reforms in the fields of taxation, public administration, land use and ownership, education, and reinforcement of the democratic political system. The strategic procedures were focused on promoting agricultural production, interregional integration (through infrastructural projects) and regional development, 55/ modernization of public administration, technological development, and rationalization of energy production and consumption.

Peruvian concern with spatial distribution of the population and economic activities dates from 1968, when the National Planning Institute divided the country into five planning regions. The recent National Development Plan (1982-1983) was a short-term plan focused on reactivation

of the productive apparatus within a scenario of economic and social stability. Special significance was given to interregional integration and balanced development, stressing full utilization of the country's natural resources, and to employment generation. At the same time, the National Planning Institute (INP) prepared a medium-term plan (1982-1985) and a long-term plan (1982-2000) also based on the same principles. The INP has also prepared an investment programme for the period 1982-1983. Worthy of note is the prospective effort developed through the model PLANEX-90 "which is organized to produce normative projections and a set of macroeconomic levels and balances in order to forecast an integral overview of the country's desired future". There are two other planning models: the DIAT-II, looking for alternative mechanisms to provide a better distribution of income for the rural population, and the URRE, which was conceived as a normative instrument to orient the urban and rural tendencies of population distribution.

An evaluation of planning mechanisms and institutional structures in the ECLAC region over the last 20 years might be, in general, summed up in a five-step evolution:

- i) Isolated projects for the development of problem regions (and/or border regions) unrelated to national or interregional planning (e.g., North-east of Brazil, La Guayana);
- ii) Institutionalization of national planning systems focused on economic development, without concern for the spatial consequences of economic growth;
- iii) Creation of regional agencies and/or regionalization of the national territory;
- iv) Formalization of regionalized national planning, together with the creation of complex sectoral agencies and programmes centralized by the national government;
- v) Establishment of national urban and environmental policies, also centralized by national governments.

The political tendencies of the 1970s in the region favoured this leaning to centralization as well as inordinate unplanned urban growth and metropolitanization, while conversely noting the importance of effective action on regional and urban development planning. The economic adjustments to the crisis, however, did not allow tangible progress in the field of decentralization.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, the economic, social, and political structures in the ECLAC region are outcomes of its historical background. Dominant minority élites managed development based on Western --more developed-- models, without concern for marginated majority groups which, in some cases, also belonged to different ethnic groups and cultures.

As a result, development policies in the region tended until the 1960s to concentrate on the modernization of central areas (capital cities and a few other large cities). Up until that decade, no effort was made to reduce regional and social disparities. Only when social distress, associated with uncontrolled urban growth and metropolitanization, became a political threat to the élite, were some efforts at regionalization and decentralization made.

The last twenty years provide plenty of planning experiences all over the ECLAC region. Regionalization, decentralization, local autonomy, participation and social equity became commonplaces in printed development plans as well as in the official speech of government officials.

However, because of the extreme contradiction existing between the proposed development models and the announced equalitarian goals of the official speech, it is not surprising that long periods of political instability were often experienced by many countries of the region.

Although in several countries economic growth and industrialization are indubitable facts, this "development" process kept a large proportion of the region's population marginalized from the results of progress. Review of the available literature shows that at least six basic points were not seriously considered by Latin American and Caribbean national development plans:

- a) spatial distribution of population and investments;
- b) multisectorality and interdisciplinarity of planning activities;
- c) administrative and political decentralization;
- d) political support at all levels of government for its planning policies;
- e) cultural peculiarities of non-formal group associations which affect processes of social change (socio-cultural reality);
- f) human settlements and environmental protection.

The study material analysed in this paper shows that in spite of many institutional efforts (e.g., Venezuela, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Colombia) political, economic and population concentration still remain characteristics of the region's development. The results of economic development have not yet been equitably distributed, either in geographic or social terms. Basic planning mechanisms are still sophisticated imported macroeconomic models, unsuited to the socio-cultural and political structures of many countries of the region, and often poorly managed. Public participation and decentralized planning systems have not yet been consolidated, for economic,^{56/} political and cultural reasons.

Development models achieved through this kind of planning process still tend to reflect only the élite's needs and goals, and do not reflect the political climate or other social changes demanded by majority marginated groups.

On the other hand, much progress has been made in creating and organizing institutional structures for regional planning in various countries of the region. Since the 1960s Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia,

Costa Rica, Haiti, Mexico, Panama and Peru have been creating and structuring a number of regional planning agencies. Their size, complexity and political importance, however, have varied according to the political tendencies of the central governments. Nevertheless, such efforts have a very positive side, since they have led to the creation of permanent (and often quite well qualified) technical staff for these agencies. Simultaneously, such governmental structures, in spite of their administrative and/or financial subordination to the central government, have frequently become political instruments for regional pressures on the central government. Thus, on the one hand planning mechanisms have shown a degree of inefficiency, but on the other hand the institutional structures set up for regional planning have become useful political instruments of pressure in sectors of national development. This possible misinterpretation of the basic purposes of such institutional structures, however, does not invalidate their role as the basis for regionalized national planning in times to come.

Regional Development Corporations in Bolivia and Colombia, Regional Development Superintendencies in Brazil, Regional Development Councils in Costa Rica, Regional Planning Secretariats in Chile, and Regional Planning Offices in Haiti, Panama and Peru represent real advances over previous years in spite of the persistent centralization still promoted by central governments.

Methods and criteria for locating investments in infrastructure and social services still tend to be looked at from a sectoral viewpoint, without much concern for spatial matters. In this field, too, centralization remains a noteworthy feature in spite of the proliferation of institutional mechanisms to avoid this. As a matter of fact, such mechanisms -- banking systems, tax-return systems, national development funds, etc. -- have tended to generate many bureaucratic administrative structures, while they have also tended to deal with multisectoral issues as if they were sectoral ones. Thus, housing programmes were scarcely linked with public transportation or jobs, while

large infrastructural investments in such fields as water supply or sewerage have sometimes not been related to urban density parameters or social improvement of low-income groups. For instance, a four-year, one million dollar World Bank study of Bogotá 57/ shows that "nearly half of the new dwelling units built in Bogotá in recent years have been 'pirate constructions', that is to say, built outside the formal market and thus independent from formal official funds". Once again, it is noticeable here that the élite's approach to reality has tended to project their own needs and goals over the needs and goals of the common people, without concern for their socio-cultural framework.

Consequently, one point that must be stressed in the conclusions of this paper is the inadequacy of current procedures and methods for dealing with regional planning in the ECLAC region. In spite of efforts such as the creation of fiscal funds, free-zones, and sectoral investment funds, balanced development could not be achieved adequately in the last twenty years. Metropolitanization, centralization of public and private investments, and concentration of population are still outstanding features of the region's development.

The political changes (from autocratic to democratic systems --and vice-versa) which happened in these two decades did not change legislation and institutional instruments very much as far as regional development and human settlements are concerned. Old and new élites which shifted political and economic power in this period kept centralization as the prevailing form of organization, whatever their political tenets. Consequently, very little progress was made in political organization for regional development. Indeed from the 1960s to the beginning of the 1980s local and state governments tended to lose more economic and administrative autonomy than before, as well as political command itself. Concomitantly, the idea of balanced development in the region tended, in general, to continue to have a utopian connotation within national development plans, and within the élites' speech.

Short and mid-range planning were based on concepts of unreal patterns of income distribution and balanced economic growth usually reflecting the standards of consumption of Western developed countries. The cultural variables of the masses were of very little concern, as were their economic systems and customs; hence, the causes of recurrent failures of some development theory approaches to regional balanced growth in the area were overlooked. The basic principles guiding some planning procedures and methods applied in the countries of the ECLAC region were supposed to follow the scientific principle of trial and error in order to achieve the necessary degree of adaptation to national and regional realities. Fundamentals of this principle, however, were often disregarded: instead of a careful analysis of the reasons for the failure of the method used, it has been common to see plain substitution of one method for another --more advanced, more sophisticated-- which still does not pay attention to the factors that led to the previous error.

The fact is that regional development praxis in the region still remains far apart from the countries' reality. On the one hand, regional planning is overtaken by the process of economic adjustment to the international economic crisis, which gives rise to growing centralization of economic policies with the purpose of keeping up the pace of traditional development models put into effect since the 1960s. Little concern is therefore given to the role played by growing informal economic activities carried on within peripheral groups and regions which are kept apart from the islands of modernism already established in some favoured areas.

On the other hand, technological development associated with the growing internationalization of industrial activities, based on export trade to international markets, gives rise to the consolidation of ambiguous States which can hardly represent national needs and goals.

While it is true that balanced regional development cannot be achieved in short-range terms, it is also true that current national development models adopted in the ECLAC region are not consistent with the official speech of

governmental authorities and planners or with national realities. Firstly, because the economic and political centralization induced by these current development models has reduced local, municipal, state, and regional autonomy and the political representativeness of these divisions. Secondly, because true action to further balanced regional development cannot start without a general review of the theoretical framework which guides the prevalent standards of economic development adopted by the countries of the region.

Informal economic activities, not taken into account by official planning, represent today more than 40% of national production in many of the countries, thus showing the existence of a parallel development within national development, but set apart from official planning programmes and statistics. Furthermore, there is evidence that sectoral investment policies tend to neglect inter-sectoral selective criteria, whether associated with comparative opportunities or not. Hence, indiscriminate use of fiscal incentives for regional development has often misled well-meant projects and made them socially ineffective.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

As already noted, the study material available for the development of this paper does not make possible a great degree of detail in the description of the current state of regional planning in the ECLAC region. Within the scope of this paper, however, it provides a perspective on the dynamics of Latin American and Caribbean regional planning processes, and on the crucial role played in these processes by economic, political and cultural variables. The existing data about planning procedures and methods for regional planning in this area show that both the institutional apparatus and the intellectual resources available in several countries of the region are quite good. However, underdevelopment, imbalanced development, political instability, uncontrolled urban growth, and metropolitanization seem to be endemic diseases of the ECLAC region.

Since at the beginning of this paper heterogeneity was stressed as one of the fundamental characteristics of the area, it seems reasonable to begin any recommendations from this angle.

First of all, heterogeneity may be considered in regional terms: i.e., the high degree of dissimilarity among countries of the region is a concrete fact. It is therefore desirable to reappraise present concepts of subregional division which tend to lump together countries on the basis of purely geographic, economic and political characteristics.

Secondly, heterogeneity within the national boundaries of each country should also be considered. It will be noticed that many of the development problems of some nations are due to the sharp contrast between geographical regions, ethnic groups, and cultures inside those countries. Hence, it seems reasonable to assume that in these cases development cannot be only a matter of the formalistic employment of highly sophisticated theoretical models of some economic schools but must rather be a matter of autochthonous adaptation, as well as innovation, in the field of development theory.

The general conclusions of this study on procedures and methods for dealing with regional planning in the ECLAC region may be seen as related to three specific areas: a) human settlements; b) regional planning procedures, and c) institutional aspects.

a) Human settlements

In the last 20 years national regional planning policies in the ECLAC region did not pay much attention to spatial distribution of population, whether urban or rural. Countries like Brazil, Colombia, Mexico and Panama, notwithstanding explicit concern on the matter of human settlements shown in their national plans, did not make much progress in this field.

Specific joint action must therefore be taken by the United Nations community on the matter of human settlements and spatial distribution of population in the countries of the region. Human settlement demonstration projects should be tackled as inter-agency tasks, with co-ordinating action by the ECLAC/UNCHS Joint Unit on Human Settlements. Furthermore, experiences

such as Cali and Curitiba should be the focus of training programmes for professional regional planners. Projects like those financed by UNFPA for Panama (PAN/78/P01 and PAN/79/P03) might be articulated with the Joint Unit actions and programmes with a view to promoting wider multisectoral discussions on the subject of spatial distribution of population.

b) Planning procedures

In view of the substantial existing know-how on national and regional planning at ILPES, it seems advisable to strengthen technical ties with this Institute. Speculative and empirical joint research on the field of regional planning and its interrelationship with human settlements should be encouraged, as well as studies on the economic behaviour of marginated groups (informal economic activities -- production and consumption habits).

Joint training activities through formal courses (already promoted by ILPES), interregional and subregional seminars and workshops on the above-mentioned matters might also be stimulated by means of specific agreements.

c) Institutional aspects

In the institutional field, actions must be limited to those possible under the existing United Nations structure. Nevertheless, specific proceedings in this area should be considered. On the one hand, it would be desirable to disseminate successful experiences in local and regional administration which have resulted from some degree of decentralized planning and administration (e.g., Cali, Curitiba, Boa Esperança and Lages). As mentioned before, however, further studies are called for on the political and institutional causes which allowed such isolated development. On the other hand, efforts must be made through the Joint Unit to improve co-ordination, research and training programme for local administrations as well as for non-governmental organizations concerned with self-management and the development of informal social and economic activities.

In view of the foregoing, it would appear that a suitable response to the basic issue of regional planning in the ECLAC region might be the implementation of an intensive development research and training programme which recognizes national peculiarities as a starting point for any national regionalized development process.

VI. RESERVATIONS ABOUT THE CONCLUSIONS

Despite the amount of documentation produced by ECLAC on the subject of regional planning, as well as the amount of other available sources, e.g., statistical data, articles, and copies of printed development plans, there have been problems of method and objective. Almost all the sources were directly concerned with economic goals of national development as well as with urgent economic adjustments of national development models. Thus, none was explicitly related to the objective of this paper as far as regional development is concerned.

It is also necessary to stress here the difficulty of drawing a correct distinction between methods and criteria for resource allocation for balanced development, and planning mechanisms and institutional structures for regional planning in the Latin American and Caribbean area. Because of the evident economic, social and political tendency to concentrate power in the hands of central governments, the differences between such procedures and methods for dealing with regional planning have become diffuse and almost indistinguishable in the whole planning process of these countries.

Furthermore, the study material available for the preparation of this paper does not make possible a great degree of detail in the analysis of the above-mentioned procedures and methods, since the dynamic characteristics of the planning process in general, and the necessary conjunctural economic adjustments in Latin American and Caribbean planning in particular, demand permanent updating of such tools for regional planning. Therefore, because this paper is the result of a bibliographic survey (since no time for field-work was available), it may have overlooked some of the latest events.

Notes

1/ E/CEPAL/ILPES/L.5, 1980; E/CEPAL/ILPES/G.15, 1982; E/CEPAL/G.1282; E/CEPAL/G.1278, 1984; E/CEPAL/L.288, 1983; E/CEPAL/ILPES/G.22, 1984; LC/MEX/R.2, 1985.

2/ Percentage of official national languages in the region: Spanish (64.4%), Portuguese (33.4%), and English, Dutch and French (1.9%).

3/ "Culture is defined (here) as the accumulation of human events through time, directly experienced by members of a specific social group, from which the living members derive assumptions and create principles to guide their thinking and behaviour. Culture, then, is an ever-moving phenomenon with a high degree of constancy that, while uninterrupted, may continue to move and to build upon its own components and dynamics. As the members of a society procreate and new generations move through time (history), they cannot escape confrontation with events. These cause the testing and reevaluation of the principles formulated earlier that underlie culture ... The stage (ecology), the actors (people) and the action (activities) represent the overall features of a basic social setting that can be observed in the present, cannot be divorced from the roots of its past, and has the potential of surviving into the future." (Reina, 1973:xviii, xix.)

4/ "As a factor in economic development, housing bears a direct relationship to efficient production and industrialization: two of the central issues in all Latin American countries. Today, in an age of mass production, all urban and rural families are dependent on the products of industry for an adequate supply of good housing. Up-to-date dwellings require factory items which the individual working alone cannot fabricate. Consequently, where industries are relatively underdeveloped, as in many Latin American countries, modern low-cost housing cannot be supplied in sufficient quantities: Production of dwellings on a more efficient basis is imperative if Latin America is to develop a sound industrial economy" (Violich, 1949:1).

5/ See Keyfits (1982:651).

6/ See also Aníbal Pinto (as mentioned by De Mattos), "Concentración del progreso técnico y sus frutos en el desarrollo latinoamericano", El Trimestre Económico, Mexico City, No. 125, January-March 1965.

7/ Cf. De Mattos (1980:721).

8/ According to Gutiérrez (1977) there are two extreme hypotheses about the number of autochthonous inhabitants in the ECLAC region: Rosenblat estimates that there were 13.3 million Indians in 1492, and Dobyns estimates between 90 and 112 million Indians in the same year.

9/ In the eighteenth century and in the first half of the nineteenth century more than 4 000 000 black slaves come from Africa to Latin America, and, between 1870 and 1940, about 7 000 000 European immigrants arrived in the region.

10/ The essential characteristics of the Afro-American family ... could be summarized as:

- i) A variety of union types, embracing co-residence without registered marriage, and sexual union without co-residence.
- ii) A development sequence moving from sexual union without co-residence to one or other form of cohabitation, often with different partners (p. 79).

It comes as something of a surprise to realize that there are about as many people in the Caribbean who would describe themselves as "white" to a census enumerator as there are those who would identify themselves as "black", if the latter is taken to mean of African descent. There are approximately 10 000 000 of each, comprising together slightly less than four-fifths of the total. The remainder are mostly "mixed", being descendants of white/black unions, many of which originated with white planters and their black slave mistresses. After that, the picture is more exotic and less clear, ranging from the Asian or so-called "East" Indians of Guyana, Trinidad and Suriname to the remnants of aboriginal Indians in Belize, Guyana and Suriname, by way of Portuguese, Chinese and Syrians who are scattered widely but thinly throughout the region.

Table 6.1 gives the overall picture for the main countries of the Caribbean and is divided into figures that are recent and more likely to be accurate and those that are older and contain a higher element of estimation. We can look briefly at how each society came to comprise its present ethnic groupings.

Table 6.1

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION, BY ETHNIC GROUP

Country	Ethnic group						Total
	African	Mixed	White	Chinese	East Indian	Other	
(a)							
Jamaica (1970)	91	6	0.5	0.5	2	0	100
Barbados (1970)	91	4	4	0	0.5	0.5	100
Belize (1970)	31	33	4	0	2	30	100
Trinidad and Tobago (1970)	43	14	1	1	40	1	100
Guyana (1970)	31	10	0.5	0.5	52	6	100
Suriname (1971)	(31)*		0	0	37	32	100
(b)							
Cuba	13	14	73	0	0	0	100
Dominican Republic	12	60	28	0	0	0	100
Haiti	90	7	3	0	0	0	100
Puerto Rico	(20)**		80	0	0	0	100

Source: (a) Commonwealth Caribbean, 1970; Dew, 1976.

(b) Rodríguez, 1965: Table 3 (1958 Estimates).

Note: Percentages have been rounded so that zero does not necessarily indicate total absence. (Cross, 1979:103, 104.)

*/ Defined as "Creoles".

**/ Defined as "no blancos".

11/ "The overview of the Latin American and Caribbean region's historical background helps to explain the conditions leading to the frequently mentioned centralization and concentration of development and of human settlements ... The slow transformations undergone by the national human settlements systems up to the boom in urbanization and industrialization ... have resulted in national settlement structures with individual features ... characterized by markedly polarized distributions", E/CEPAL/G.1282, p. 31.

12/ See Boisier, 1980:47.

13/ Myrdal, quoted by Streeten: "For social scientists it is a sobering and useful exercise in self-understanding to attempt to see clearly how the direction of our scientific exertions, particularly in economics, is conditioned by the society in which we live, and most directly by the political climate (which, in turn, is related to all other changes in society). Rarely, if ever, has the development of economics by its own force blazed the way for new perspectives. The cue for the continual reorientation of our work has normally come from the sphere of politics: responding to that cue, studies are launched, data collected, and the literature on the 'new' problems expands. By its cumulative results, this research activity, which mirrors the political striving of the time, may eventually contribute to a rationalization of these strivings and even give them a different turn.

So it has always been. The major recastings of economic thought that we connect with the names of Adam Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, List, Marx, John Stuart Mill, Jevons and Walras, Wicksell and Keynes were all responses to changing political conditions and opportunities."

14/ See Boisier, op. cit.:53.

15/ E/CEPAL/ILPES/G.15, 1982:12-19.

16/ Stohr, W., and F. Taylor (eds.) Development from Above and Below, A Radical Reappraisal of Spatial Planning in Developing Countries, Wiley and Sons, London. Cited by Boisier, op. cit.:50.

17/ Cf. Boisier (1980:57): Chile (Frei), Bolivia (Torres), Peru (Velasco), Venezuela (Caldera) and Panama (Torrijos).

18/ See Boisier (1980:61).

19/ The total area of the ECLAC region is about 20 434 669 km².

20/ Population growth in Brazilian Metropolitan Regions in the period 1970-1980:

Metropolitan Region	1970	1980	Percentage increase
Sao Paulo	8 137 421	12 588 439	54.70
Rio de Janeiro	7 082 404	9 018 637	27.34
Belo Horizonte	1 605 663	2 541 788	58.30
Recife	1 792 688	2 348 362	31.00
Porto Alegre	1 531 168	2 232 370	45.80
Salvador	1 148 828	1 772 018	54.25
Fortaleza	1 038 041	1 581 588	52.36
Curitiba	820 766	1 441 743	75.66
Belem	656 351	1 000 349	52.41

Source: FIBGE.

21/ See Albuquerque, Roberto Cavalcanti de, 1984.

22/ Between 1970 and 1982 some changes took place in the criteria used for the political division of Chile. Today only Santiago is defined as a Metropolitan Region, while Valparaíso and Concepción are included in the V and VIII regions, respectively.

23/ See "Cuadernos del ILPES" series, No. 28, table 1, p. 9.

24/ See also Decrees 573, 1230 and 1317.

25/ Regional division of Chile:

1974		1985	
Zone I	- Antofagasta	Region I	- Tarapacá
Zone II	- La Serena	Region II	- Antofagasta
Zone III	- Valparaíso	Region III	- Atacama
Zone IV	- Santiago	Region IV	- Coquimbo
Zone V	- Rancagua	Region V	- Valparaíso
Zone VI	- Talca	Region VI	- Libertador Gen.B.O'Higgins
Zone VII	- Concepción	Region VII	- Maule
Zone VIII	- Temuco	Region VIII	- Bío-Bío
Zone IX	- Valdivia	Region IX	- Araucanía
Zone X	- Puerto Montt	Region X	- Los Lagos
Zone XI	- Magallanes	Region XI	- Aysén del Gen. Carlos Ibáñez del Campo
		Region XII	- Magallanes y de la Antártica Chilena
		Región Metropolitana	- de Santiago

26/ ECLAC's provisional estimates for 1984 consider an increase of the order of 3.4.

27/ See Kormet, Gerhard D., "La Política Exterior de Colombia", in Puig, Juan Carlos.

28/ See Documento CPRD - E/25:242.

29/ Since the mid-1960s Colombia has adopted strong birth control policies. According to Banguero (1983:24-25) the ratio of children born alive per thousand inhabitants fell from 40.2, in 1966, to 32.9, in 1973.

30/ These data were taken from the 1982 Demographic Yearbook and from the Preliminary Results for the Tenth General Census of Population and Housing, 1982. There are some inconsistencies between these two sources: the Census gives a total of 16 919 045 inhabitants (rural and urban) for the State of Mexico and the Federal District, while the Demographic Yearbook considers separately the population of the urban agglomeration of Mexico City (14 750 182) and the urban population of Netzahualcoyotl (2 333 351). Hence, total population of the Metropolitan Region of Mexico City, according to the Demographic Yearbook, becomes about 17 083 533 inhabitants.

31/ For evaluating purposes, Unikel proposes the following regional division for Mexico:

I Region (Northwest):	North Baja California, South Baja California, Nayarit, Sinaloa, and Sonora;
II Region (North):	Coahuila, Chihuahua, Durango and Nuevo León;
III Region (Gulf):	Tamaulipas and Veracruz;
IV Region (Central-North):	Aguascalientes, San Luis Potosí and Zacatecas;
V Region (Central-West):	Colima, Guanajuato, Jalisco and Michoacan;
VI Region (Central):	Hidalgo, Morelos, Puebla, Queretaro and Tlaxcala;
VII Region (Mexico Valley):	Federal District and State of Mexico;
VIII Region (South and Southeast):	Campeche, Chiapas, Guerrero, Oaxaca, Quintana Roo, Tabasco and Yucatán.

32/ As pointed out by Unikel, in the period 1953-1961 the Federal District absorbed 58% of the budgetary funds of this programme.

33/ For a detailed explanation of each one of these mechanisms and programmes see Garza, Gustavo, Desarrollo Económico, Urbanización y Políticas Urbano-Regionales en México (1900-1982).

34/ As noted below, the National Development Plan, 1983-1988 forecast a recession period between 1982 and 1984:

GROWTH OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT (CONSTANT VALUES OF 1970)

	1971-1976	1977-1982	1981	1982p	1984e	Mean 1985-1988e
GDP	6.2	6.1	7.9	(-0.2)	0.0-2.5	5.0-6.0
1. Agriculture, forestry and fishing	2.7	4.0	6.1	(-0.4)	0.0-2.0	3.5-4.5
2. Mining	6.1	14.0	15.3	9.6	2.8-3.5	3.7-4.7
3. Manufacturing	6.8	6.0	7.0	(-2.4)	1.0-4.0	6.7-7.9
4. Construction	6.7	6.7	11.8	(-4.2)	(-3.0)-2.0	7.0-9.0
5. Electricity	10.3	7.9	8.4	6.8	2.0-4.0	6.2-7.2
6. Commerce, restaurants and hotels	6.0	6.1	8.5	(-1.6)	0.0-1.5	4.3-5.4
7. Transport, storage and communications	11.0	9.5	10.7	(-2.3)	(-0.6)-2.0	6.5-7.0
8. Services and real estate	5.4	4.3	4.3	2.9	0.8-2.0	3.2-4.0
9. Community, social and personal services	6.6	6.4	7.7	4.7	(-0.5)-1.5	4.1-4.5

Source: INEGI.S.P.P. Sistema de Cuentas Nacionales de México (1971-1981).
(1982 preliminary).
(1984-1988) Plan
estimates.

Published in: El Mercado de Valores, Año XLIII, Suplemento al Num. 24,
junio 13 de 1983.

35/ Some theoretical attempts at a regional division of Mexico were made by Unikel (1976) and Scott (1983).

36/ Panama is one of a few countries in the ECLAC region which makes separate statistics for the general population (ethnically heterogeneous) and the Indian population living on Indian reserves (a total of 94 045 Indians).

37/ It is interesting to note that the concepts of rural and urban areas adopted in the Panama census are quite different from international standards. Thus, based on Herrera (1983), it is possible to assert that 57.0% of the population live in settlements with less than 10 000 inhabitants, while 10.9% live in settlements with less than 25 000 inhabitants:

POPULATION DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO SETTLEMENT SIZE - 1980

	Number of settlements	%	Population size	%
Total	9 625	100	1 778 063	100
Less than 50 inhabitants	5 990	62.2	110 887	6.2
50-99	1 570	16.3	110 685	6.2
100-499	1 711	17.8	351 191	19.8
500-999	205	2.1	138 540	7.8
1 000-4 999	125	1.3	246 367	13.9
5 000-9 999	8	0.08	54 360	3.1
10 000-24 999	12	0.12	194 369	10.9
25 000-99 999	3	0.03	181 695	10.2
More than 100 000	1	0.01	389 969	21.9

38/ Estimated per capita GDP in 1984 was US\$ 1 188 00.

39/ Programme of Economic Studies for the Economic Reactivation of Panama.

40/ PAN/78/P01 and PAN/79/P03 - UNFPA/UNDP.

41/ Peru: number of provinces and districts by Department:

DEPARTMENTS	PROVINCES	DISTRICTS
TOTAL	<u>153</u>	<u>1 680</u>
Amazonas	5	78
Ancash	16	154
Apurimac	6	69
Arequipa	8	105
Ayacucho	7	102
Cajamarca	11	109
Callao	1	6
Cuzco	13	101
Huancavelica	5	90
Huánuco	7	68
Ica	5	39
Junín	8	122
La Libertad	7	72
Lambayeque	3	32
Lima	8	166
Loreto	5	37
Madre de Dios	3	9
Moquegua	3	20
Pasco	3	27
Piura	7	61
Puno	9	95
San Martín	6	69
Tacna	2	23
Tumbes	3	11
Ucayali	2	15

Source: Instituto Nacional de Estadística de Perú.

42/ In the 1970s the Peruvian Amazon region was subject to a series of colonization projects with financial and technical aid from IBRD, IDB and FAO.

43/ Evolution of population distribution in Venezuela, by States (1950, 1961, 1971 and 1981):

	Inhabitants							
	1950	%	1961	%	1971	%	1981	%
VENEZUELA	5 034 838	100	7 523 999	100	10 721 522	100	14 570 085	100
Federal District	709 602	14.09	1 257 515	16.71	1 860 637	17.35	2 070 742	14.21
Anzoátegui	242 058	4.80	382 002	5.08	506 297	4.7	684 451	4.70
Apure	88 939	1.76	117 577	1.56	164 705	1.54	193 248	1.33
Aragua	189 891	3.77	313 274	4.16	543 170	5.07	891 623	6.12
Barinas	79 944	1.59	139 271	1.86	231 046	2.15	326 166	2.24
Bolívar	127 436	2.53	213 543	2.84	391 665	3.65	681 607	4.68
Carabobo	242 923	4.82	381 636	5.07	659 339	6.16	1 062 268	7.29
Cojedes	52 111	1.03	72 652	0.97	94 351	0.88	133 991	0.92
Falcon	258 759	5.14	340 450	4.52	407 957	3.80	503 896	3.46
Guarico	164 523	3.27	244 966	3.26	318 905	2.98	393 467	2.70
Lara	368 169	7.32	489 140	6.50	671 410	6.26	945 064	6.49
Mérida	211 110	4.19	270 668	3.60	347 095	3.24	459 361	3.15
Miranda	276 273	5.49	492 349	6.55	856 272	7.99	1 421 442	9.75
Monagas	175 560	3.48	246 217	3.27	298 239	2.78	390 071	2.68
Nueva Esparta	75 899	1.50	89 492	1.19	118 830	1.12	197 198	1.35
Portuguesa	122 153	2.43	203 707	2.71	297 047	2.77	424 964	2.92
Sucre	333 607	6.63	401 992	5.34	460 004	4.37	586 018	4.02
Tachira	304 181	6.05	399 163	5.30	511 346	4.77	660 234	4.53
Trujillo	273 919	5.44	326 634	4.34	381 334	3.56	433 735	2.98
Yaracuy	132 436	2.64	175 291	2.35	223 545	2.08	300 597	2.06
Zulia	560 336	11.14	919 863	12.22	1 299 030	12.12	1 676 468	11.51
Federal territories:								
Amazonas	10 582	0.21	11 757	0.16	21 696	0.20	63 942	0.44
Delta Amacuro	33 648	0.67	33 979	0.45	48 139	0.45	68 662	0.47
Federal dependencies	779	0.01	861	0.01	463	-	850	-

Source: Oficina Central de Estadística e Informática - Presidencia de la República - XI Censo General de Población y Vivienda (1981), December 1983, Caracas, Venezuela.

44/ See Boisier (1980:74).

45/ In the 1970s other regional organizations were established: Southern Development Commission (CODESUR); North-East Regional Planning and Co-ordinating Unit (ORCOPLAN), and the North-East and the Central-West Regional Development Corporations - CORPORIENTAL and CORPOOCCIDENTE. Under Decree 72, the country was divided into eight administrative regions.

46/ Boisier, Sergio, Un difícil equilibrio: centralización y descentralización en planificación regional, CPRD-D/85, ILPES, CEPAL, 1983, Santiago, Chile.

47/ CORDIPLAN, Encuesta de Hogares por Muestreo: resultados mensuales, July 1984, Caracas, Venezuela.

48/ In the Brazilian case, the representativity of the National Congress was limited since the Executive used the so-called "revolutionary instruments" to subject its members until 1979. In spite of its revocation at the end of the Geisel period, the Government party retained its majority until 1982.

49/ See E/CEPAL/ILPES/G.22, 1984, p. 6.

50/ Iglesias, Enrique V., Press conference on 20 December 1984 - Preliminary Overview of the Latin American Economy during 1984, Santiago, Chile, 1985.

51/ See E/CEPAL/ILPES/G.15, 1982.

52/ Such a bill has not yet been approved by Congress.

53/ Just recently, in March 1985, the Brazilian Government underwent a ministerial reform creating the Ministry of Urbanization and Environment. Regional planning and development programmes remained under the Ministry of the Interior.

54/ See E/CEPAL/ILPES/G.22, 1984, p. 4.

55/ Some specific plans were prepared in the field of regional development, such as the Southern Ecuador Development Plan (PRODESUR); Guayas River Valley Plan (CEDEGE); Manabi Development Plan; and Galápagos Master Plan.

56/ The economic crisis in the ECLAC region is indeed a real fact. It is reflected by high levels of external indebtedness and strong dependency on external markets, aggravated by a feeble internal market shrunk by inflation.

57/ See Latin America Weekly Report, 22 March 1985, p. 6.

Bibliography

- Abu-Lughor, Janet and Richard Ray, Jr. (eds.), Third World Urbanization, Methuen, 1979, New York, U.S.A.
- Albuquerque, Roberto Cavalcanti de, O Estado como Superinstituição e O Poder Regional: as Razoes do Descentralismo, Pool Editorial, 1984, Brasília, D.F., Brazil.
- Banguero, Harold, "Disminución del crecimiento de la población, distribución de ingresos y recesión económica", Desarrollo y Sociedad, # 11, May 1983, Bogotá, Colombia.
- Butterworth, Douglas and John K. Chance, Latin American Urbanization, Cambridge University Press, 1981, New York, U.S.A.
- CORDIPLAN, Algunos aspectos relevantes de la experiencia de planificación en Venezuela, Colloquium on planning yesterday, today and tomorrow; working paper (mimeo), November 1983, Caracas, Venezuela.
- Cross, Malcom, Urbanization and Urban Growth in the Caribbean, Cambridge University Press, 1979, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
- DANE (Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística), XIV Censo Nacional de Población y III de Vivienda, October 1973, Bogotá, Colombia.
- United Nations Demographic Yearbook, 1982 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.R/12), United Nations, 1984, New York, U.S.A.
- Dirección de Estadística y del Censo, Panamá en Cifras, Contraloría General de la República, 1983, Panama City, Panama.
- FIBGE (Fundação Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística), Crescimento e Distribuição da população brasileira: 1940-1980, Secretaria de Planejamento da Presidência da República, 198 , Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Garza, Gustavo, "Desarrollo económico, urbanización y políticas urbano-regionales en México (1900-1982)", Demografía y Economía, vol. XVIII, #1(54), 1983, Mexico City.
- Gutiérrez, Héctor R., "Evolution de la population en Amérique latine", Population, #2, March-April 1977, Paris, France.
- Herrera, Ligia, "Distribución espacial y migraciones internas en Panamá", Segundo Seminario Nacional sobre Población y Desarrollo, Republic of Panama and United Nations Fund for Population Activities (mimeo), May 1983, Panama City, Panama.
- INE, Censos Nacionales - VIII de Población y III de Vivienda, Instituto Nacional de Estadística, December 1982, Lima, Peru.

- Miró, Carmen, "Puntos críticos de interrelaciones entre las tendencias demográficas y los aspectos socioeconómicos de Panamá", Segundo Seminario Nacional sobre Población y Desarrollo, Republic of Panama and United Nations Fund for Population Activities (mimeo), May 1983, Panama City, Panama.
- DNP, Plan de Integración Nacional 1979-1982, Departamento Nacional de Planeación, March 1980, 2 v., Bogotá, Colombia.
- Preston, David A. (ed.), Environment, Society, and Rural Change in Latin America, 1980, John Wiley and Sons, New York, U.S.A.
- Reina, Benjamin, Parana, University of Texas Press, 1973, Arizona, Texas, U.S.A.
- SPP, X Censo General de Población y Vivienda, 1980 - Resultados preliminares a nivel nacional y por entidad federativa, Secretaría de Programación y Presupuesto, Coordinación General de los Servicios Nacionales de Estadística, Geografía e Informática, August 1981, Mexico City, Mexico.
- Scott, Ian, Urban and Spatial Development in Mexico, published for the World Bank by the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982, Baltimore, U.S.A.
- Streeten, Paul P., "Development Ideas in Historical Perspective", Economic Impact, April 1982, U.S.A.
- Suárez-Villa, Luiz, "Polarization reversal and the conflict between spatial needs and sectoral policies in Brazilian urban development", Regional Development Dialogue, v. 4, # 2, 1983, U.S.A.
- UDRU (Unidad de desarrollo regional y urbano), Departamento Nacional de Planeación, "La política de Desarrollo Regional en Colombia", EURE, v. VIII, # 22, September 1981, Santiago, Chile.
- Unikel, Ruiz, et al., El desarrollo urbano en México, Colegio de México, 1976 (2nd ed.), Mexico City, Mexico.
- Violich, Francis, Low-Cost Housing in Latin America, Pan American Union, 1949, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

APPENDIX

Table I

LATIN AMERICA: EVOLUTION OF TOTAL GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT

Country	Growth rates						Cumulative rate
	1975-1978	1979-1980	1981	1982	1983	1984 ^d	1981-1984 ^e
Argentina	4.8	3.7	-6.2	-5.1	3.1	2.5	-6.0
Bolivia	5.1	1.2	-0.9	-8.7	-7.6	0.5	-16.1
Brazil	6.5	6.8	-1.6	0.9	-3.2	3.5	-0.3
Colombia	4.9	4.7	2.3	0.9	0.8	3.0	7.4
Costa Rica	5.7	2.8	-2.3	-7.3	2.3	3.0	-4.5
Cuba ^b	6.0 ^c	2.9	15.6	2.6	5.2	...	24.8 ^d
Chile	1.7	8.0	5.7	-14.3	-0.8	5.5	-5.4
Ecuador	7.0	5.1	3.9	1.8	-3.3	2.0	4.5
El Salvador	5.5	-5.3	-8.3	-5.6	0.0	1.5	-12.2
Guatemala	5.5	4.2	0.7	-3.5	-2.7	0.0	-5.5
Haiti	3.7	7.5	-2.8	-2.5	-0.6	3.0	-3.0
Honduras	5.8	4.7	1.2	-1.8	-0.5	2.0	0.9
Mexico	5.3	8.8	7.9	-0.5	-5.3	2.5	4.0
Nicaragua	1.2	-10.0	5.3	-1.2	4.0	0.5	8.8
Panama	3.5	9.7	4.2	5.5	0.4	0.0	10.3
Paraguay	9.2	11.4	8.7	-1.0	-3.0	3.0	7.4
Peru	1.5	4.0	3.9	0.4	-10.8	3.5	-3.8
Dominican Republic	4.7	5.3	4.0	1.7	3.9	1.5	11.6
Uruguay	4.1	6.0	1.9	-9.7	-4.7	-2.0	-13.9
Venezuela	5.9	-3.4	-0.3	0.7	-4.8	-1.5	-6.1
Total ^f	4.8	6.1	1.7	-1.0	-3.1	2.6	0.0

Source: ECLAC, on the basis of official figures.

^aProvisional estimates subject to revision.

^bRelates to total social product.

^cRelates to the period 1976-1978.

^dRelates to the period 1981-1983.

^eAverage excluding Cuba.

Table II

LATIN AMERICA: EVOLUTION OF PER CAPITA GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT^a

Country	Dollars at 1970 prices				Growth rates					Cumulative rate
	1970	1980	1983	1984 ^b	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984 ^b	1981-1984 ^b
Argentina	1 241	1 334	1 166	1 177	-0.9	-7.7	-6.6	1.4	0.9	-11.8
Bolivia	317	382	295	288	-2.1	-3.5	-11.1	-10.0	-2.2	-24.6
Brazil	494	887	798	809	4.8	-3.8	-1.3	-5.3	1.3	-8.9
Colombia	598	824	804	812	1.9	0.1	-1.2	-1.4	1.0	-1.5
Costa Rica	740	974	834	837	-2.1	-4.9	-9.7	-0.3	0.4	-14.1
Cuba ^c	-1.9	14.9	2.0	4.6	...	22.6 ^d
Chile	958	1 045	895	928	6.2	4.1	-15.7	-2.4	3.6	-11.2
Ecuador	413	723	678	673	1.9	1.0	-1.1	-6.1	-0.7	-6.9
El Salvador	422	433	344	339	-11.3	-10.9	-8.3	-2.9	-1.4	-21.8
Guatemala	448	589	512	497	0.9	-2.1	-6.2	-5.4	-2.8	-15.5
Haiti	90	114	99	100	5.1	-5.2	-4.9	-3.1	0.4	-12.2
Honduras	313	356	318	314	-0.8	-2.3	-5.1	-3.8	-1.4	-12.0
Mexico	978	1 366	1 284	1 280	5.5	5.1	-3.1	-7.7	-0.3	-6.3
Nicaragua	418	337	331	322	6.7	2.0	-4.4	0.5	-2.8	-4.7
Panama	904	1 174	1 214	1 188	10.5	1.9	3.2	-1.8	-2.2	1.1
Paraguay	383	642	612	611	7.9	5.4	-3.9	-5.9	-0.1	-4.8
Peru	659	690	593	598	1.2	1.2	-2.2	-13.2	0.9	-13.3
Dominican Republic	398	601	615	611	3.6	1.6	-0.7	1.5	-0.7	1.7
Uruguay	1 097	1 426	1 226	1 195	5.3	1.2	-10.3	-5.3	-3.5	-16.2
Venezuela	1 239	1 310	1 147	1 097	-5.1	-3.3	-2.2	-7.4	-4.4	-16.2
Total ^e	709	982	893	895	3.1	-0.7	-3.3	-5.3	0.2	-8.9

Source: ECLAC, on the basis of official figures.

^aAt market prices.

^bProvisional estimates subject to revision.

^cRefers to total social product.

^dRefers to 1981-1983.

^eAverage, excluding Cuba.

Table III

LATIN AMERICA: BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(Millions of dollars)

Country	Net services payments ^a			Net payments of profits and interest			Balance on current account ^c			Net movement of capital ^e			Total balance ^f		
	1982	1983	1984 ^b	1982	1983	1984 ^b	1982	1983	1984 ^b	1982	1983	1984 ^b	1982	1983	1984 ^g
Latin America	12 745	6 596	4 030	37 641	34 465	37 330	-40 613	-8 957	-3 090	19 200	4 435	10 615	-21 413	-4 522	7 525
Oil-exporting countries	8 182	3 062	1 050	15 097	13 609	16 090	-13 257	7 185	6 590	533	-4 947	-2 300	-12 724	2 238	4 290
Bolivia	122	141	150	415	424	490	-121	-271	-340	153	252	220	32	-19	-120
Ecuador	530	367	260	847	718	950	-1 215	-128	-300	875	274	240	-340	146	-60
Mexico	2 390	549	-1 000	11 271	9 108	10 100	-5 922	4 968	4 500	1 812	-2 946	-1 000	-4 110	2 022	3 500
Peru	315	254	200	1 034	1 133	1 320	-1 777	-1 093	-940	1 637	1 027	870	-140	-66	-70
Venezuela	4 825	1 751	1 440	1 530	2 226	3 230	-4 222	3 709	3 670	-3 944	-3 554	-2 630	-8 166	155	1 040
Non-oil-exporting countries	4 563	3 534	2 980	22 544	20 856	21 240	-27 356	-16 142	-9 680	18 667	9 382	12 915	-8 689	-6 760	3 235
Argentina	434	761	1 150	4 716	5 409	5 430	-2 354	-2 436	-2 150	1 686	-13	2 550	-668	-2 449	400
Brazil	3 589	2 407	1 900	13 495	11 012	11 400	-16 314	-6 812	-5 550	11 120	4 946	5 220	-5 194	-1 896	4 670
Colombia	87	317	40	787	839	650	-2 897	-2 739	-2 260	2 021	829	640	-876	-1 910	-1 620
Costa Rica	-21	-5	-70	345	415	370	-206	-383	-360	331	401	330	125	18	-30
Chile	555	471	540	1 921	1 703	1 840	-2 372	-1 116	-1 930	1 026	587	1 990	-1 346	-529	60
El Salvador	72	32	50	129	196	220	-271	-239	-330	242	418	330	-29	179	0
Guatemala	231	177	260	122	114	40	-376	-225	-240	338	276	240	-38	51	0
Haiti	87	83	80	14	12	20	-182	-208	-200	137	175	220	-45	-33	20
Honduras	52	54	40	202	149	200	-249	-260	-240	204	213	240	-45	-47	0
Nicaragua	65	112	90	140	61	90	-514	-519	-530	580	588	420	66	69	-110
Panama	-849	-886	-820	236	306	240	-538	-409	-330	524	440	350	-14	31	20
Paraguay	92	-25	10	-14	53	70	-391	-252	-270	329	257	135	-62	5	-135
Dominican Republic	-97	-164	-230	254	299	330	-457	-454	-230	311	276	230	-146	-178	0
Uruguay	266	200	-60	197	288	340	-235	-60	-60	-182	-11	20	-417	-71	-40

Source: 1982, 1983: International Monetary Fund, the figures for 1984 for Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador and the Dominican Republic are ECLAC estimates subject to revision. Figures for Chile, 1982, 1983 and 1984: Central Bank of Chile.

^aExcluding net payments of profits and interest.

^b1984: ECLAC, provisional estimates subject to revision. Figures rounded to the nearest tenth.

^cIncluding net private unrequited transfer payments.

^dIncluding long- and short-term capital, official unrequited transfer payments and errors and omissions.

^eVariation in international reserves (with inverse sign) plus counterpart entries.

Table IV

LATIN AMERICA: TOTAL EXTERNAL DEBT DISBURSED

(End-of-year balance in billions of dollars)

Country	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984 ^e
Latin America	150 893	181 978	221 059	275 422	315 336 ^b	340 937 ^b	360 170 ^b
Oil-exporting							
countries	64 390	77 585	92 324	118 963	135 657 ^b	145 672 ^b	153 460 ^b
Bolivia ^f	1 762	1 941	2 220	2 450	2 373	3 065	3 200
Ecuador	2 975	3 554	4 652	5 868	6 187	6 689	6 860
Mexico	33 946	39 685	49 349	72 007	85 000 ^{bd}	90 000 ^{bd}	95 900 ^{bd}
Peru	9 324	9 334	9 594	9 638	11 097	12 418	13 500
Venezuela ^f	16 383	23 071	26 509	29 000	31 000	33 500	34 000
Non-oil-exporting							
countries	86 503	104 393	128 735	156 459	179 679	195 265	206 710
Argentina	12 496	19 034	27 162	35 671	43 634	45 500	48 000
Brazil ^f	52 285	58 907	68 354	78 580	87 580	96 500	101 800
Colombia	4 247	5 117	6 277	7 930	9 421	10 405	10 800
Costa Rica	1 870	2 333	3 183	3 360	3 497	3 848	4 050
Chile ^g	6 664	8 484	11 084	15 542	17 153	17 431	18 440 ^h
El Salvador	986	939	1 176	1 471	1 683	2 000	2 300
Guatemala	821	934	1 053	1 409	1 504	1 766	1 910
Haiti ^f	210	248	290	372	410	446	600
Honduras	971	1 280	1 510	1 708	1 800	2 079	2 250
Nicaragua ^f	961	1 131	1 579	2 163	2 797	3 385	3 900
Panama ^f	1 774	2 009	2 211	2 338	2 820	3 275	3 550
Paraguay	669	733	861	949	1 204	1 469	1 560
Dominican Republic	1 309	1 565	1 839	1 837	1 921	2 572	2 850
Uruguay	1 240	1 679	2 156	3 129	4 255	4 589	4 700

Source: ECLAC, on the basis of official information; Brazil and Venezuela: ECLAC, on the basis of data from the Bank for International Settlements.

^aProvisional figures. ^bFigures not comparable with those previous to 1982, owing to the inclusion of the Mexican commercial banks' debt. ^cPublic debt. ^dIncluding commercial banks' debt. Estimates on the basis of data supplied by the Secretariat of Finance and Public Credit. ^eIncluding the public debt plus the non-guaranteed long- and short-term debt with financial institutions reporting to the Bank for International Settlements. ^fIncluding the total medium- and long-term debt plus the short-term debt with financial institutions reporting to the Bank for International Settlements. ^gShort-, medium- and long-term debt, excluding the debt with IMF and short-term credits for foreign trade operations. ^hIn the month of September.

1