Chairman's Note

The Planning History Bulletin is both growing in size and extending its circulation. Hopefully this mirrors the emergent importance of the Planning History Group in its attempts to develop the field of environmental and planning history. Our fully 'paid-up' members now total 242 (131 UK; 111 non-UK) and institutional subscriptions are now being received (please help us to increase these standing orders because they have a financial return and they help to extend our 'visibility' to a wider audience).

I have two important matters to draw to your attention. FIRST, YOUR ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION. The Treasurer has to announce the 1981 rate as £4.00, payable as from 1st January. Any increase is regrettable, but duplicating and international postage costs have risen appreciably. Your Executive believed that you would not wish us to reduce material, rather increase it if anything, because the very essence of the Group is to exchange information. We hope, however, that the whole business of annual subscriptions will be helped by a Banker's Order system, and you are encouraged to make your payments this way. Please complete the form and return it to us without delay; this will avoid all the embarrassment of having to delete your name from membership.

SECOND, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. Members are elected for a two-year period and the annual election system will commence in 1981. Our Constitution determines that half the Executive retire annually (half UK members, half non-UK; those retiring to be in alphabetical order, beginning with A). This procedure is complicated by the fact that Officers of the Executive are elected for three years, and the present Officers do not fall due for re-election until 1982.

The Executive have agreed the following arrangements. The present Bulletin names those members of the Executive due to retire in 1981 (they may of course offer themselves for re-election). It invites the submission of new names for the 1981-83 Executive. If there are more than a required number there will be an election, and slips for a postal ballot will be included in the April 1981 Bulletin. The next Bulletin (August 1981) will announce the result of the election and the new Executive will assume its duties.

The composition of the present Executive is:

UK

Mr P.A. Booth, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield (Treasurer)
Professor G.E. Cherry, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham (Chairman)
Dr M. Cuthbert, Department of Town and Country Planning, Heriot-Watt University
Dr P. Dickens, School of Cultural and Community Studies, University of Sussex
Dr S.M. Gaskell, Council for National Academic Awards, London
Dr R.J.P. Kain, Department of Geography, University of Exeter
Mr A.D. King, Department of Sociology/Building Technology, Brunel University
Dr M. Naslas, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield (Editor of the Bulletin)
Dr Helen Meller, Department of Economic and Social History, University of Nottingham
Dr A.R. Sutcliffe, Department of Economic and Social History, University of Sheffield (Meetings Secretary)

Non-UK
Dr M.J. Bannon, Department of Town Planning, University College Dublin
Professor S. Buder, City University of New York, Department of History
Mrs Christiane Collins, Parsons School of Design, New York
Professor Dora Crouch, School of Architecture, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, New York
Professor J.B. Cullingworth, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto
Dr P.G. Gerosa, Lugano, Switzerland
Professor P. Marcus, Columbia University, Graduate School of Architecture and Planning, New York
Professor M. Rose, Centre for the History of American Technology, Franklin Institute, Philadelphia
Miss Lorette Russenberger, Wisconsin, USA
Professor J. Salazar, Architectural School of San Sebastian, Spain
Mr T.C. Taylor, Athabasca University, Alberta
Dr S. Watanabe, Building Research Institute, Tokyo
Professor W.H. Wilson, Department of History, North Texas State University

The following members are to retire in 1981 (but may offer themselves for re-election):

UK
Dr M. Cuthbert
Dr P. Dickens
Mr S.M. Gaskell
Dr R.J.P. Kain

Non-UK
Dr M.J. Bannon
Professor S. Buder
Mrs Christiane Collins
Professor Dora Crouch
Professor J.B. Cullingworth
Dr P.G. Gerosa

WILL THOSE PHG MEMBERS WISHING TO OFFER THEMSELVES FOR ELECTION TO THE EXECUTIVE, 1981-83, PLEASE INDICATE THIS IN WRITING TO ME NOT LATER THAN 1 MARCH 1981. THERE ARE NO REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSERS OR SECONCERS, SIMPLY A STATEMENT THAT YOU ARE WILLING TO SERVE, IF ELECTED. UP TO FOUR UK MEMBERS AND SIX NON-UK MEMBERS ARE REQUIRED TO FILL THE VACANCIES. IF MORE THAN 4 OR 6 NAMES RESPECTIVELY ARE RECEIVED, A POSTAL BALLOT OF ALL MEMBERS WILL BE CONDUCTED.

The occasions to meet as an Executive are obviously infrequent, but it is surprising what business can be conducted by post! This is not to be frivolous, for the Executive is important; there will be important policy decisions to take, and it is necessary to have an enthusiastic, well-informed, collective wisdom guiding our deliberations.

Finally: all good seasonal greetings. It is so nice to receive all your correspondence, and I hope your support will continue throughout 1981.

Gordon E. Cherry
Chairman

p.s. This Bulletin goes out with leaflet mailing. This is a modest commercial enterprise on our part, designed to bolster Group income.
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Editor's Note

With the last number of Volume Two, and on the basis of a considerable number of positive comments received so far, it is appropriate to say that our Bulletin has succeeded in establishing itself as an articulate organ of the Planning History Group and a proper general forum for the exchange of information and ideas. A regular format is emerging which has met with approval of our members. We have been able to carry out our promise to have three issues per year. Furthermore, the decision to extend the bulk of each issue has proved to be a worthwhile venture. In terms of the volume of information contained, the Bulletin has grown into a publication of definite importance in the field of environmental planning history.

Martin Gaskell's and Robert Thorne's note, as well as Gerhard Fehl's letter illustrate the extent to which PHB has become informative about our interests and our activities. On the other hand, the three articles, Gordon Cherry's, Edward Gouge's, and Leith Penny's, show each in its specific way the influx of material and the degree of the response to the appeal for contributions. In addition, the length of the reports dealing with PHG meetings is also increased: both Martin Gaskell's report on the International Meeting Metropolis 1890-1940 and Michael Harrison's on the most recent meeting held in Cambridge are highly informative and of great interest in terms of their respective observations.

Nevertheless, it must be repeatedly emphasised that PHB depends above all on the support and contributions it receives. It is of great importance that the Bulletin continues to be fed with proper information and adequate material in order to continue to successfully spread news of research, publications, meetings and seminars, as well as ideas and comments.
Announcements

**TREASURER’S REPORT**

This issue of the Bulletin is the last of the year and brings with it a reminder that the subscriptions are due for renewal from 1 January 1981. Your Executive have unwillingly felt obliged to raise subscriptions this year from £3 to £4 in order to meet the estimated costs of producing the Bulletin in 1981. They did so, however, in the hope that the subscription rate might be held constant for the next three years, and we shall be trying hard to meet that objective.

Keeping subscriptions constant has the added advantage of allowing us to introduce a system of payment by Banker’s Order. If you sign the form this year, it means your subscription can be renewed automatically thereafter, so ensuring you continue to receive copies of the Bulletin until you choose to cancel the order. The system benefits the Group as a whole by assuring us of our income at the start of each year. We hope that as many of you as possible will take advantage of the system, and thus improve our financial stability.

In addition to payment by Banker’s Order, it is still possible to subscribe by sterling draft on a British bank, in local currency at the rates quoted on the enclosed form or direct transfer to our Giro Account. Unfortunately, our bank has had some difficulty with Japanese cheques, and I very much regret that I must ask Japanese members to pay either by sterling draft or by direct transfer to our Giro account.

Whatever method you choose, please pay promptly and help us to keep the Group going.

Philip Booth
Treasurer

**Planning History Group Meetings**

**METROPOLIS 1890-1940**

Report by Martin Gaskell

The second International Conference of the Planning History Group was held at the University of Sussex in August 1980, and the theme was arguably the ultimate challenge for modern planning - the metropolis. Concentrating on the period 1890-1940, Dr A. Lees (Rutgers University) argued that in the literature of thematic papers on aspects of world urbanisation was dominated by the great urban areas, the conference sought to examine on an internationally comparative basis the nature and dynamic of the metropolis, and at the same time to investigate the roots of urban and regional change. This was the world today. The colloquium concentrated on the four largest urban agglomerations in inter-war Europe, London, Paris, Berlin and the Ruhr, along with New York and Tokyo.

Detailed papers on each of these centres were discussed in the context of thematic papers on aspects of the metropolitan phenomenon.

The problems posed by the metropolis for both intellectuals and planners were tackled at the outset. Dr A. Lees (Rutgers University) argued that in the literature of urban analysis and description that was produced in steadily growing abundance during the 19th century (first in Britain and the United States, then in France and Germany), there was more and more emphasis on the cities; also an increasing identification of the ‘modern big city of international importance’, preferably with a population in excess of one million - the Welt Stadt. Problems which could be discovered in most large cities in contrast to small towns and villages became more and more evident as one moved up the population scale. Professor Peter Hall (University of Reading), examined the challenges and responses to the metropolis, putting forward what he saw as two stages of perception distinguishing such problems: recovering from the raw facts of poverty in the congested metropolis of the first industrial revolution; the second coming of age, when the terms of the first stage began to be overcome in the 1920s and 1930s and taking the form of a reaction against the physical spread of the metropolis. As a consequence, by 1940 the great metropolitan cities were still at very different stages of evolution.

By way of illustration of this theme, one of the period’s more unusual developments was the unheard papers from Dr John Shepherd (University of London) and Dr Norma Evenson (University of California) in London and Paris respectively, which allowed for comparison of alternative approaches to metropolitan planning in terms of their impact on the built-up area. The metaphorical approach, as described in these papers, has a clear parallel in the work of Stockholm, Dr Peter Keating (University of Edinburgh) and Dr Anthony Sutcliffe (University of Sheffield). Clearly the metropolis as it developed during the last decades of the 19th century was by most critics regarded as something negative: an unhealthy, disordered and overcrowded place; an ambience creating social misery, alienation and political unrest. The metropolis was a manifestation of a generally observable pattern of urban development, which the result of the fundamental question of which of these characteristics were the manifestation of a generally observable pattern of urban development, which the result of the societal conditions arising from the political and economic structure of the world. Problems which could be discovered in most large cities in contrast to small towns and villages became more and more evident as one moved up the population scale. Professor Peter Hall (University of Reading), examined the challenges and responses to the metropolis, putting forward what he saw as two stages of perception distinguishing such problems: recovering from the raw facts of poverty in the congested metropolis of the first industrial revolution; the second coming of age, when the terms of the first stage began to be overcome in the 1920s and 1930s and taking the form of a reaction against the physical spread of the metropolis. As a consequence, by 1940 the great metropolitan cities were still at very different stages of evolution.

By way of illustration of this theme, one of the period’s more unusual developments was the unheard papers from Dr John Shepherd (University of London) and Dr Norma Evenson (University of California) in London and Paris respectively, which allowed for comparison of alternative approaches to metropolitan planning in terms of their impact on the built-up area. The metaphorical approach, as described in these papers, has a clear parallel in the work of Stockholm, Dr Peter Keating (University of Edinburgh) and Dr Anthony Sutcliffe (University of Sheffield). Clearly the metropolis as it developed during the last decades of the 19th century was by most critics regarded as something negative: an unhealthy, disordered and overcrowded place; an ambience creating social misery, alienation and political unrest. The metropolis was a manifestation of a generally observable pattern of urban development, which the result of the societal conditions arising from the political and economic structure of the world. Problems which could be discovered in most large cities in contrast to small towns and villages became more and more evident as one moved up the population scale. Professor Peter Hall (University of Reading), examined the challenges and responses to the metropolis, putting forward what he saw as two stages of perception distinguishing such problems: recovering from the raw facts of poverty in the congested metropolis of the first industrial revolution; the second coming of age, when the terms of the first stage began to be overcome in the 1920s and 1930s and taking the form of a reaction against the physical spread of the metropolis. As a consequence, by 1940 the great metropolitan cities were still at very different stages of evolution.

By way of illustration of this theme, one of the period’s more unusual developments was the unheard papers from Dr John Shepherd (University of London) and Dr Norma Evenson (University of California) in London and Paris respectively, which allowed for comparison of alternative approaches to metropolitan planning in terms of their impact on the built-up area. The metaphorical approach, as described in these papers, has a clear parallel in the work of Stockholm, Dr Peter Keating (University of Edinburgh) and Dr Anthony Sutcliffe (University of Sheffield). Clearly the metropolis as it developed during the last decades of the 19th century was by most critics regarded as something negative: an unhealthy, disordered and overcrowded place; an ambience creating social misery, alienation and political unrest. The metropolis was a manifestation of a generally observable pattern of urban development, which the result of the societal conditions arising from the political and economic structure of the world. Problems which could be discovered in most large cities in contrast to small towns and villages became more and more evident as one moved up the population scale. Professor Peter Hall (University of Reading), examined the challenges and responses to the metropolis, putting forward what he saw as two stages of perception distinguishing such problems: recovering from the raw facts of poverty in the congested metropolis of the first industrial revolution; the second coming of age, when the terms of the first stage began to be overcome in the 1920s and 1930s and taking the form of a reaction against the physical spread of the metropolis. As a consequence, by 1940 the great metropolitan cities were still at very different stages of evolution.

By way of illustration of this theme, one of the period’s more unusual developments was the unheard papers from Dr John Shepherd (University of London) and Dr Norma Evenson (University of California) in London and Paris respectively, which allowed for comparison of alternative approaches to metropolitan planning in terms of their impact on the built-up area. The metaphorical approach, as described in these papers, has a clear parallel in the work of Stockholm, Dr Peter Keating (University of Edinburgh) and Dr Anthony Sutcliffe (University of Sheffield). Clearly the metropolis as it developed during the last decades of the 19th century was by most critics regarded as something negative: an unhealthy, disordered and overcrowded place; an ambience creating social misery, alienation and political unrest. The metropolis was a manifestation of a generally observable pattern of urban development, which the result of the societal conditions arising from the political and economic structure of the world. Problems which could be discovered in most large cities in contrast to small towns and villages became more and more evident as one moved up the population scale. Professor Peter Hall (University of Reading), examined the challenges and responses to the metropolis, putting forward what he saw as two stages of perception distinguishing such problems: recovering from the raw facts of poverty in the congested metropolis of the first industrial revolution; the second coming of age, when the terms of the first stage began to be overcome in the 1920s and 1930s and taking the form of a reaction against the physical spread of the metropolis. As a consequence, by 1940 the great metropolitan cities were still at very different stages of evolution.

By way of illustration of this theme, one of the period’s more unusual developments was the unheard papers from Dr John Shepherd (University of London) and Dr Norma Evenson (University of California) in London and Paris respectively, which allowed for comparison of alternative approaches to metropolitan planning in terms of their impact on the built-up area. The metaphorical approach, as described in these papers, has a clear parallel in the work of Stockholm, Dr Peter Keating (University of Edinburgh) and Dr Anthony Sutcliffe (University of Sheffield). Clearly the metropolis as it developed during the last decades of the 19th century was by most critics regarded as something negative: an unhealthy, disordered and overcrowded place; an ambience creating social misery, alienation and political unrest. The metropolis was a manifestation of a generally observable pattern of urban development, which the result of the societal conditions arising from the political and economic structure of the world. Problems which could be discovered in most large cities in contrast to small towns and villages became more and more evident as one moved up the population scale. Professor Peter Hall (University of Reading), examined the challenges and responses to the metropolis, putting forward what he saw as two stages of perception distinguishing such problems: recovering from the raw facts of poverty in the congested metropolis of the first industrial revolution; the second coming of age, when the terms of the first stage began to be overcome in the 1920s and 1930s and taking the form of a reaction against the physical spread of the metropolis. As a consequence, by 1940 the great metropolitan cities were still at very different stages of evolution.
The Autumn Conference of the Planning History Group was held at King's College, Cambridge on 8 November 1980. The theme of the seminar was the Example of Germany, and the meeting was poorly attended: the papers given rise to a number of important questions about international links and the appropriate methodology for studying the problem of foreign influences.

The morning session was given over to achievements in Germany before 1914. Nicholas Bullock in his talk on The Act, Landmarks in Frankfurt 1871-1914 stressed the wide range of powers enjoyed by the city and the possibilities inherent in which the expert permanent officials, especially when they were of the calibre of Adickes. With the expansion of the city a policy of municipal land purchase, favourable tramway tariffs and incorporation of outlying districts was followed. Demolishing and the consolidation of land were also introduced by Adickes. As a result, Frankfurt became the classic German example, because housing conditions in the city were less bad than in the east, although there was some of the Prussian Fluchtliniengesetz. Several speakers stressed the fact that many significant developments in urban administration in the late 19th century were a product of local autonomy not central direction.

In his discussion of Planning in Cologne, Graham Hallett commented, in particular, on the city's active land policy. From 1871 when Cologne had some 8,000 acres of charitable land, the city used its holdings as a land bank - land either being sold for funds or retained as open space. From 1881 the city of Cologne also undertook the great despoilment of its fortifications. The policy proved profitable but the results on the ground were disappointing. Some improvement did become apparent. The overall size of the city did take place after 1907. To accommodate the expanding population, the City Boundaries were reorganised in 1914, and three years before a modified version of the Lex Adicken had been obtained. It enabled the city to point to the rising value of land in these areas of centrifugal growth.

In a quite different paper, Stefan Muthesius took an art historical approach to the work of Camillo Sitte. Muthesius pointed to the fact that Sitte had drawn attention to the formal elements in town planning, and, above all, to the importance of enclosed spaces. In tracing the development of influences on Sitte, Muthesius stressed Heinrich Wolfflin's Renaissance und Barock (1898), which emphasised similar formal concepts to those enunciated by Sitte. Muthesius also drew attention to the work of the Munich School of Architecture with their emphasis on quiet plain surfaces and evenness of light in their interiors. In indicating the influence of the latter on Sitte, Muthesius stressed the comparison made by Sitte himself about the parallels between enclosed spaces in towns and interiors.

Michael Harrison began the afternoon session on the English response to the Example of Germany by looking at the career of T.C. Horsfall. The latter's interest in German local government and planning was stimulated by his experience of the problems of Manchester. Although some of Horsfall's ideas on environmental reform had been enunciated in the 1880s, Harrison pointed out that Horsfall did not stress the German example until the early 1900s. In the mood of national uncertainty after the Boer War the German example, as optimistically preached by Horsfall, was enthusiastically received. This was followed, from about 1907, by increased criticism from those fearful of German despotism (and, as was made clear in discussion, German Dreadnoughts) and those, including Horsfall, who were concerned about the one-sidedness of the German achievement. Not least because of John Burns (the meaning of whom the 1909 Act showed little sign of being 'made in Germany'), although it is a measure of the growing interest in Germany that the Parliamentary Debates were framed with reference to that country. Harrison concluded by stressing that all the key activists admitted to coming under the influence of Horsfall, even if they disagreed with him over details.

In his discussion of the role of Nettlefold and Birmingham, Gordon Burns pointed to the extent by which German ideas were transferred to England, and stressed the modification of these ideas on their transfer. Beginning with Nettlefold's analysis of the British problem, Cherry went on to analyse Nettleford's limited response to German ideas. Stimulated by Horsfall's book, a depot from the Birmingham Housing Committee, led by Nettlefold, visited Germany in 1905. From this time Nettlefold became interested in boundary extension, improved communications and Town Extension Plans and pushed his ideas in Birmingham and in the Association of Municipal Councils. Cherry stressed that Nettlefold was deeply rooted in the English tradition of local government and strongly influenced by the Bournville experiment, and clearly showed that Nettleford felt that the Local Authority's main role in planning was the controlled release of land for planned suburban developments. Unlike Horsfall, Nettlefold was opposed to municipal land purchase and municipal housing.

In his illustrated review of the career of Raymond Unwin in the period 1900-1914 Mervyn Miller brought the discussion back to questions of design and theory. After outlining Unwin's Arts and Crafts background, he acknowledged the influence of Wren and Inigo Jones, the impact of Letchworth of 1903. Miller maintained that Unwin had developed a conception of the scope and nature of new planning before the publication of Horsfall's Example of Germany or his study of Sitte (in French). In his Hampstead plan of 1910, Unwin drew in the enthusiasm for Sitte, Unwin, however, seemed to abandon the formal framework he adopted at Letchworth. Realising that, like some of the German followers, he had given too far, Unwin in the 'definitive plan' of 1907 sought to strike a balance between formal and informal elements in his plan. Miller argued that these changes were not just the result of the appointment of Lutyens and Unwin's increased confidence resulting from the endorsements inserted by Unwin were to be found in the plan.

Despite the obvious Germanic details of some of the buildings in Hampstead Garden Suburb, after 1910 Unwin's professional career largely reasserted itself. Unwin's admiration for Sitte and the German example, Miller argued, was great but never uncritical, and did not include the contrived informality of Site's followers. Similarly, although he expressed a preference for German methods and ideas inserted by Unwin were to be found in the plan.

In a review of the International Aspects of a Prophetic Movement, Tony Sutcliffe stressed that the study of the influence of just one country on another was only part of the picture. He emphasised the need for a wider international interaction. Sutcliffe suggested that between 1890 and 1914 there was a process of international exchange over time, a process both dynamic and one which transcended national boundaries. For the analysis of this international net-
work, Sutcliffe posited a three-fold theoretical approach. Firstly, the skills of the architectural historian should be used to trace the diffusion of artistic imagery. Secondly, the diffusion of technical or institutional innovations, adumbrated by the economic historian, could be used to trace the application of technical or institutional innovations. Lastly, the techniques of the social psychologist could be utilised to analyse the modes of persuasion used by advocates of the foreign example.

To a certain extent, the papers presented at the seminar reflected the different modes of approach outlined in Tony Sutcliffe's paper. Several speakers also took up Sutcliffe's first point and stressed that Anglo-German interaction was a two-way process. In discussion there was some agreement that planning was a statutory process in both England and Germany, but each country (and sometimes each city) felt it had developed its own approach. There was a common belief that the promoters of the Example of Germany were selective in their approach. Both sides were argued, simply took what they wanted from the other, and no one argued that the process was wholesale. With such an outlook it did not matter, Tony Sutcliffe asserted, whether the intermediaries were two-sided or one-sided. It was not their intention, after all, to supply information to their opponents.

David Eversley and Tony Sutcliffe both pointed out that the two-way transmission of ideas between the two countries only lasted for a relatively short honeymoon period. Although several papers touched on some of the differences between the English and German systems (and therefore on some of the reasons why the foreign example was rejected), David Eversley argued that the wider social and political issues be explored. With these characteristic and recurrent (if not always complementary) demands for a wider perspective on the subject, the session ended.

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS

Planning History Group in Association with the Board of Planning Studies, University College of Swansea:

Spring Meeting, Saturday 28 March, 1981, in the Senior Common Room Library, College House, University College of Swansea.

North America: South Wales

There are two themes in the conference. In the morning, attention will focus on the history of North American planning and the afternoon will be devoted to the history of planning in South Wales. Michael Simpson will open the meeting with a paper entitled "False Dawn: The Birth and Premature Death of Canadian Planning, 1910-50." Josephine Reynolds: Paper on "The Metropolitan System in the Nineteenth Century." Canada has a curious planning history in many respects, not least the fact that it has borrowed extensively from both British and American practice. Josephine Reynolds (Department of Civic Design, Liverpool University) will contribute a paper on an aspect of American planning history in the past fifty years.

After lunch, Martin Daunton will talk about planning in Cardiff between the "Wars." Following tea, Michael Simpson will lead a coach tour of historic planning sites in Swansea: a Pepler and Allen garden suburb, a housing estate plan by Unwin, the South Wales Cheap Cottages Exhibition of 1910, a Swansea Corporation housing estate of 1905, and the BP Refinery garden village of 1920. The coach will be at the railway station at 5.30 for the London train at 5.45.

Provisionally, the inclusive charge for the day will be £5.00 for members and £6.00 for non-members. Overnight accommodation can be arranged. Swansea is easily accessible by road and rail from the Midlands, South-West and London.

Forthcoming meeting, September, 1981, Birmingham.

PHB Vol.2, No.2, included a proposal for a seminar by Professor Neville Borg on "The Origins and Development of High Density Housing Policies, 1945-70." This will take place, and further details will be announced in PHB Vol.3, No.1, April 1981.

Advance notice: Proposed meeting of the Planning History Group in Dublin, Easter or Autumn, 1982

Possible topics include:

1. The Wide Street Commissioners and their legacy.
3. The Pembroke Estate; centuries of estate planning and management.
4. Public housing; The Dublin experience.
5. Voluntary housing agencies up to 1900 and the role of the Building Societies.
7. Abercrombie's two plans; lack of continuity.
8. Playing with the Green Belt concept.
10. The Irish Managerial System.
11. The Semi State Corporation; a unique achievement. Field Excursion.

Comments will be welcomed by the organiser of the meeting, Dr Michael J. Bannock, Department of Regional and Urban Planning, University College, Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2.

Further details and confirmation forthcoming during 1981.

Planning History Group International Conferences: New Proposals

Tony Sutcliffe writes: Among our Second International Conference, 'Metropolis 1890-1940', various
plans for further international meetings were discussed. Two ideas have since crystallised. The first is for a conference on the history of planning reactions to disasters. Tentatively planned to take place in Hamburg in 1982, it would investigate a number of disaster episodes, including (and hence the venue) the Hamburg fire of 1842 and the renewed destruction of the city a hundred years later. Advance planning and feasibility investigations are being undertaken by Herman Diede- riks, who would be pleased to hear from anyone interested in commenting on the proposal, in offering advice, or in taking part. His address is: 32 Her- engracht, Amsterdam.

The second scheme is for a full international conference to take place in Amsterdam in 1984. The organisers, Peter de Ruiter and Gerard Koopmans, have sent a considered proposal on which they invite comment. They may be contacted at: Subfakulteit Planologie en Demografie, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Jodenbreestraat 21, 1011 NH Amsterdam. Their first thoughts are as follows:

Introduction

This paper is a first proposal aimed at exploring the possibilities of organising an International Planning History Conference in Amsterdam in 1984. Possible themes are discussed and reasons are given for choosing them as well as for organising this conference in Amsterdam. Some thought is given to sources of finance and a first sketch is given of a possible programme. It will transpire that a choice can be made between two congress themes. A combination of both these themes leading to two successive conferences also seems possible. Finally, the question is raised as to who could concern himself with the organisation of these conferences.

What should the conference be about and why should it be held in Amsterdam?

The history of planning is full of possible themes for conferences (and, more generally speaking, for research). The question is which one to choose. It seems appropriate to answer this question in the light of the following considerations.

- It is useful for the conference organisers to be reasonably familiar with the theme or themes of the conference. To put it more strongly, the theme or themes should be of great interest to them. This increases their motivation to organise a conference and can mean that the host country can offer something valuable to its visitors.

- The topics must already form part of the international agenda for discussion, in order to allow people coming from abroad to make their contributions.

- Even if the latter does not seem feasible, the theme must still be attractive to people coming from abroad.

- Financially speaking, i.e. from the point of view of obtaining subsidies, it can be attractive to choose themes which also seem interesting from the point of view of potential grant-giving bodies.

Two possible themes for the conference to be held in Amsterdam in 1984 seem to meet these conditions.

In the first place, the development in the field of planning from local planning via regional planning to national planning which has occurred in the first part of the 20th century in many countries must be mentioned, even if this development has only occurred in the theoretical field and not so much in official policy.

The same development has also taken place in the Netherlands and, here the years of 1901 and 1941 mark the beginning and the end of a very important period. The holding of an International Planning Conference in 1924 — thus 50 years before 1984 — under the auspices of the International and Garden Cities and Town Planning Association has been of great importance in this development. During this conference, the regional plan formed one of the most important topics of discussion.

In the second place, the urban expansion plans of the thirties and the influence of, on the one hand, new planning approaches — the rise of the survey — thereafter and, on the other hand, the importance and implications of the CIAM-ideas come to mind. In this respect, attention must be drawn to the General Expansion Plan of Amsterdam published in 1934 — 50 years before the date of the proposed conference. This plan has already sparked considerable attention, internationally speaking, amongst others because the material on which it is based and the approach it took formed the basis of the Charter of Athens, and also because of the work of C. van Eesteren on this plan.

Evidently, both themes are different in character, and this will have implications for the organisation of the conference. As far as the first theme is concerned, it is to be expected that the various countries participating would have an equal contribution to make. Apart from papers covering certain theoretical topics, there would be room for review of developments in the various countries. The second proposal will put the emphasis on the Amsterdam plan and the CIAM-movement and will perhaps include fewer cases coming from other countries.

Is it possible to implement this proposal?

Above, four points were made concerning the apparent chances of organising an international con-
Conference. In what follows a sketch is given of a possible structure. However, the possibility emerges of combining these themes. Taking into consideration the fact that 1984 is a double jubilee, and assuming that it should be relatively simple to obtain the necessary funds, it seems worthwhile to think in terms of this combination.

Such a combination could be realised by organising two successive conferences. Both could be organised relatively independently of each other but should provide in particular people coming from abroad with the opportunity of visiting both conferences one after the other.

For example: two to three days might be spent on the first theme and the two or three days following on from these to the second theme. It should be possible to visit just one of the two conferences, but also to attend both of them for a reduced price. Parts of both conferences, for example, exhibitions, or one or the other main session, could be made open to a larger public.

Evidently, this demands a large organisation. With some effort and coordination, it seems possible though to subdivide the organisation into four parts.

- conference regional and national planning
- conference on the General Expansion Plan
- exhibition on regional planning
- exhibition on the General Expansion Plan of Amsterdam.

Meetings and Conferences

Carol Krinsky of New York University has written to the Bulletin to turn the attention of EAH mem-

bers to the International Meeting at the Politechnika Lodzka Instytut Architektury i Urbanistyki, Lodz, Poland. The Institute of Architecture – Section of Historical Research of the Technical University in Lodz will be holding a symposium in September 1981 on the architecture of industrial towns of the second half of the XIX c. (historical aspects and contemporary problems). The reports (40 mins.) and communications (20 mins.) of Foreign and Polish participants (in English, French, German, Polish) will concern the main branches of architecture of an industrial town between 1850 and 1914 as town-planning, factory-building, settlements of working class, factory-owners' residential houses, office buildings, town-halls, churches, cemeteries etc. Also the accompanying branches of art as: sculpture, painting, stained glass, carved work, etc. will be considered.

On this substantial canvas some more general problems can be developed: for example, historical revival and modern tendencies, influence of new materials, new iconography, etc.

Parallel to the 'historico current' of the symposium, the contributions will deal with the actual problems of an industrial town coming from XIX c., especially tendencies in the protection and adaptation of old factories to new destinations, revalorisation of habitations units and quarters, problems of inventarisation.

Chairman of the Symposium: Professor Dr Zygmunt Swiechowski. Secretary of the Symposium: Dr Henryk Jaworowski.

Address: Politechnika Lodzka, Instytut Architektury i Urbanistyki, Al. Politechniki 6, 90-924 Lodz, Poland.

Publications

The third volume in the trilogy 'Planning and the Environment in the Modern World' has now published: Roger Kain, Planning for Conserva-

tion: an international perspective, Mansell, 1980.

Notification of this and the other two volumes (Sutcliffe, The Rise of Modern Urban Planning, 1850-1914: Making an Urban World: planning in the twentieth century) was given in PHB Vol.2, No.2. It will be recalled that special discounted prices are offered by the publishers, Mansell Publishing, 3 Bloomsbury Place, London, WCIA 2QH.


This book is the outcome of one of the series of Jubilee Symposia organised by the University of Stockholm to mark the occasion of its centenary year in 1978. Organised around the theme 'Stockholm - Growth and Transformation of a City', by members of an interdisciplinary research team from the University, the object of the Symposium was 'to discuss the development and physical growth of Stockholm during the past 100 years in comparison with other big cities and city development in general'. Contributions were drawn from Scandinavian countries, Britain and the USA. Edited. Edited by Ingrid Hammarstrom and Thomas Hall, the papers are arranged in six sections: Stockholm before Industrialisation; Nordic Capitals - Growth and Change in the Nineteenth Century; European City Development in the Nineteenth Century; the Modern Metropolis; the Centre and the City in Modern Town Planning; and Problems in Planning.

That there is rather less coherence in the contributions than this listing of contents suggests is no more than one would expect given that this is the published record (albeit, an enlarged and edited version) of a symposium which included 18 individual contributions and given the diversely rich field of research which the study of the modern city presents. The papers, for example, contributed by the British and American participants include two by Dr Anthony Sutcliffe on Haussman's Paris and by Dr Michael Miller on monumentality in European architectural style in the period 1850-1914 to develop effective environmental policies compared with some of their predecessors. Professor Barbara Miller Lane on the role of the building cycle in the growth and transformation of Scottish towns, 1860-1914, papers by Professor Peter Hall on 'Great Planning Disasters' and on a comparative study of urbanisation trends in Europe in the recent past and their implications for the development of the city. Professor Sam Bass Warner on 'A Research Strategy for Urban History' and on the ambiguity which develops in American cities between public and private space, and Dr Alison Ravetz on British Town Planning with particular reference to the inner city.

The papers on Scandinavian city development do provide a linking thread and, in particular, make available to English language readers some of the research findings of the Stockholm project. What is lacking, given the objectives defined by the symposium organisers, are fully comparative studies which relate the Scandinavian experience to developments elsewhere. The exception is the paper by Dr David Goldfield which compares suburban development in Stockholm and the United States. This, however, only serves to underscore the fact that comparative urban analysis, which, particularly in the European context, has been a relatively neglected field of research, will receive a welcome stimulus by the International of the kind organised at Stockholm.

Robert Marshall
University of Sheffield
Notes and Articles

Our readers might be interested in Martin Gaskell's and Robert Thorne's research work based on the idea to index The Builder periodical. As late as July, they noted: Following discussions on the costing of the project and its location and organisation, we prepared a revised version of the project proposal for submission to the SSRC. However, after further consultation with the Officers of the Council, we decided not to proceed with the full application at that stage in view of the economic climate facing the research councils. We were subsequently very fortunate to secure the support of Building and the Building Centre Trust, who together were willing to finance a short feasibility study. This is now being carried out by an information scientist whom we have appointed. The objective of this study is to produce an analysis of the workable options and their related costs. This analysis will include an examination of the items to be indexed and their characterised format; procedures for indexing and methods of production. We expect to receive the report from this feasibility study by July 31st.

In the meantime a steering group has been formed at the Institute of Historical Research under the chairmanship of Professor F.M.L. Thompson, and this will meet together in July in order to prepare for the future organisation and management of the project. We are also investigating other possible funding in order to ensure the continuance of this project.

Professor Gerhard Fehl, Lehrstuhl fur Planungstheorie, Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen, has recently written to PHR. His valuable notes and suggestions are of considerable interest to PHR members:

After return from my tour of the USA I found the PHR No. 2 on my table. I think it is a most valuable issue. Thank you very much for including in our new book and our issue of Stadtbauwelt on Planning History. Since one of the most valuable functions of the PHR to me is exchange of research results and information on ongoing research, I will shortly describe what is going on in my Institute presently (Zentrum fur Planungstheorie). The main line of teaching and research is 'methodology of urban planning and urban design' - 'methodology' in the widest sense of the word covering the administrative set up as well as the political process of planning. Within this we are from the viewpoint of present problems - interested in planning history, our basic hypothesis being that urban planning in its course of evolution since the second half of the 19th century has been guided by the continuum of its achievements and solutions, but rather by the continuity of unsuccessful experimental and the claim of urban planners to be social reformers.

From this point of view we are interested in longitudinal studies i.e. taking up lines of evolution and their disappearing; taking up lines of social reform which have been forgotten in the course of evolution and analysing them; why they were doomed to failure and oblivion. And at the same time analysing what has remained of proposals of social reform in the field of urban planning, and why the original concepts of social reformers have been changed and modified by the practitioners of urban planning.

There are presently three research projects in progress:

- a comprehensive bibliography of 'Urban Planning in Germany before World War I' is presently compiled. Its focus is directed on the theoretical and practical aspect of urban planning and design. The core of this bibliography will be finished by about August 1981. We will welcome any assistance and hints from other researchers in this field and will furnish them in return with a copy of the bibliography.

- a research project of urban planning theory and methodology in the second half of the 19th century in Germany: the line of methodological reform of the social conditions of the growing cities. Concentrating on the theory mainly of Bauamter, Stubben, Adickes and Roscher about building byelaws, zoning master planning and expropriation. A seminar on the very early theory and methodology of urban planning in Germany will be held in connection with this research project in Autumn 1981 at Aachen. We would greatly welcome any cooperation and advice.
The usual town planning portrait given to the two decades in Britain between the Wars is one of a period of cautious consolidation. The profession was finding its feet, the Ministry of Health patiently allowing authorities to engage in Scheme preparation, there was persistent effort to convert public and political opinion to town planning object to propositions and the methods and techniques of the planning operation were borrowed, exchanged and rehearsed in Scheme after Scheme. It was indeed in Scheme preparation that we have at least one measuring rod against which the progress of planning can be measured. By April 1933 (when the Town and Country Planning Act 1932 came into operation) more than 9 million acres in England and Wales were covered by Town Planning Schemes. Moreover, only 94 Schemes had by then been approved, submitted by 50 local authorities, and recorded progress in Scotland was even slower. One was then trying to elicit reluctant authorities into either Scheme preparation or some sort of recognition of the principles of land planning for the agency of Joint Regional Planning Committees, and by 1938 there were 138 such Joint Committees in England and Wales, responsible for the preparation of Schemes covering about two-thirds of the total acreage under planning. In Scotland the Clyde Valley Regional Advisory Committee was prominent amongst those then active.

A large number of consultants' and other regional reports were published. These today make fascinating reading and offer a mine of information, which I am in the process of quarrying. They provide the opportunity to add important flesh to the bones of the general lines of understanding about the development of inter war planning in Britain. We can look again at the extent (or lack) of methodology used, and we can assess the relative qualities of the consultants (though surely Abercrombie stands out in the fertility of his work). We can see the speedy emergence of a common ideology about land planning and its consistent (if not tedious) promulgation throughout the period. But above all we can see a measure of stagnation in the planning movement. Certainly many of the high hopes of the 1940s lay dormant in the 1930s, frustrated in their full potential.

Frequently the initiative for setting up a Regional Advisory Committee came from the Ministry of Health, where George Pepler proved a respected advocate for a new device and a most able link between central and local government. Some Regional Committees were large in that they covered extensive areas, truly regional in scale, such as that for the West Midlands. Many of the others were simply convenient collaborations between a handful of local authorities, in no way justifying the term regional.

Many of the Advisory Reports were documents which urged the preparation of subsequent town planning schemes on authorities concerned. They were therefore fairly 'low key', concerning themselves with the main requirements of the planning process: zoning, buildings, open space and communications. Common, repetitive elements underpinned the reports, articulating the emergent planning ideology, notably in terms of preservation, conservation, good design, the best use of land and investment of roads and other lines of communications. The value of open space allocations was constantly stressed, as for example with Unwin's Greater London Report (1929). An initial assessment, however, suggests three features worthy of attention at this stage: countryside preservation, population distribution, and the weight of argument that has increasingly been given to land planning in the face of chaotic private development.

Countryside preservation in certainly a dominant theme. 'There is still time to prevent the desecration of the countryside' declared Davidge in the West Kent Report (1927) and for Hortfordshire (1930). Exemplifying this concern for permanent preservation of a belt of open country, establishing a definite limit to continuous urban growth. These objectives, repeatedly put forward, echoing that of Unwin's Greater London Report to come, and in later years the classic (albeit often termed 'ribbon') development is denounced. These rural objectives become conventional wisdom as, for example, for the Berdychew Scheme (Adams, Thompson and Fry, 1930): 'no phase of regional planning is more important than that which has to do with the preservation of amenity and no amenity is more important to preserve than that of the countryside'.

The principle of a planned distribution of population, commonplace in the 1940s, had a number of important forerunners. The 'suburbanisation' of Sheffield's villages was proposed by Abercrombie (1924) and reflects the idea contained in the development of a dozen self-contained towns around Doncaster, by Abercrombie and Johnson (1922). But it was with East Kent that the grouping of new populations found its most striking development, in respect of the anticipated coal mining population. At the same time Adshead suggested a new colliery development for Chesterfield (1927). A planned regional distribution of population is implicit in the South West Lancashire Plan of 1930, and satellite villages for Bristol appear in Abercrombie and Unwin's Scheme for Bristol and Bath (1930). The principle of decentralisation is of course paramount in Unwin's work for the Greater London Regional Planning Committee (1929 and 1933), see particularly his Second Interim Report in 1931. Davidge encouraged the idea of new communities or 'garden cities beyond the suburbs of Reading (Berks, 1930) and he also proposed a ring of villages around Cambridge on garden city lines (1934).

The expressed need for land planning...
becomes more and more insistent as the years unfold. Davidge in 1918, for example, in respect of South Buckinghamshire and Thames-side declared that 'a definite regional policy is essential, so that localities and individuals alike may work together in securing the common weal'. An even firmer note comes in the South West Lancashire Plan (1930) (surely drafted by the Committee's assistant, T.W. Sharp?): 'It is obvious that without a regional plan of utilisation is / ... Development by individual selection is entirely inadequate for securing the best possible conditions of health, economy, convenience and amenity. Development according to a preconceived plan for a whole regional area is the only way in which they may be secured.' But the primacy of state direction, which the 1940s accepted, was kept at arm's length. As Adams, Thompson and Fry said in the Brighton, Hove and District Joint Committee (1932) observed, it was necessary for the authorities, estate developers and all concerned to 'cordially cooperate' in carrying out the plans and proposals that had been prepared.

A fuller review of the inter war regional reports will add to these observations and offer additional perspectives. However, one abiding impression is the intimacy with which British town planning developed in relation to statutory provisions; the consultants' reports were heavily directed to achieving an effective operation for town planning at local government level, and within local government competence. There were advantages and disadvantages in this. On the one hand British town planning became securely rooted in professional practice; on the other it lacked the vitality of a wider imagination that could be released outside local government procedures. For example, some well worn themes became part and parcel of local authority policy but there were some surprising omissions. There was virtually nothing to be said, for instance, on economic problems. Abercrombie and Kelly's Cumbrian Regional Planning Scheme (1932) concentrated on the preservation of the Lakeland and measures for avoiding disfigurement, and could offer little more than the palliative of zoning for the acute problems of the industrial coastal strip.

The Plans are remarkably static in their feel. There is little acknowledgement of any process of development pressure over time, although certainly Reports for parts of the London Region came close to this. But if the facts of change were recognised (usually in terms of encroachment of urban upon rural) the methods for dealing with them were at first defensive and fixed, rather than adaptive and fluid. A different approach came with the West Surrey Scheme (1931) by Adams, Thompson and Fry who suggested three zones: a development zone, a rural zone where intensive development was undesirable, and a special rural zone which it was desirable to retain unspoilt.

But there is obviously much more to extract. For now, it is clear that the inter war Regional Reports can shed important light on the development of British planning thought and practice in that period.

The solution to which the majority of socialists in 1909 was to set up a system of heavy land taxation or public ownership of land. Land was seen as the most important communal asset. Land had been inherited. The state in the way that the enterprise of industrialists had created factories and worn away the productivity of their farms, but instead had been inherited. The arguments about the monopoly power of landlords and the need to return to the community the increment in land values created by the community were argued more strongly during the period than any other before. The belief by radicals in the public control of land should not be interpreted as part of a socialist view of society. The State would continue to set a market rent and the normal processes of market competition would continue to operate in industry and agriculture. Indeed, it was felt that the revenue from rent would pay for the social programmes, and it was the idea that the Liberal Party proposals for collective security by means of old age pensions and unemployment and sickness insurance follow directly from these precepts. The way was open for new ideas for communal solutions to land use problems as well.

The Origins of Planning Ideas in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

Edward Gouge, Chelmer Institute of Higher Education, Chelmsford

The need to see town planning ideas within the context of the general ideas of the historical period in which they developed is now established. The problem, however, that this causes for planning historians is formidable. It is not possible to interpret the social, economic and political character of a slice of history and use this broad understanding to pick out themes relevant to planning ideas.

The last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth century mark a steady shift in Britain about the nature of the problems of urban and rural areas and how they were to be solved. The view of society which had dominated during the period in which social problems were argued more strongly during the period than any other before. The belief by radicals in the public control of land should not be interpreted as part of a socialist view of society. The State would continue to set a market rent and the normal processes of market competition would continue to operate in industry and agriculture. Indeed, it was felt that the revenue from rent would pay for the social programmes, and it was the idea that the Liberal Party proposals for collective security by means of old age pensions and unemployment and sickness insurance follow directly from these precepts. The way was open for new ideas for communal solutions to land use problems as well.

Public opinion from at least the 1880s was concerned with the decline of agriculture, the fact of rural depopulation and the effect of migration from rural areas in continuous processes. It was believed, the development of a large unemploy labour force and overcrowded housing conditions in the cities. In 1908 was looking for a means to "dry up, or rather cut off, at their sources some of the streams which are constantly swelling the volume of casual and unemployed labour. But seeking to check the constant and ever-growing influx of population from the country to the town ...."

The solution to which the majority of socialists in 1909 was to set up a system of heavy land taxation or public ownership of land. Land was seen as the most important communal asset. Land had been inherited. The state in the way that the enterprise of industrialists had created factories and worn away the productivity of their farms, but instead had been inherited. The arguments about the monopoly power of landlords and the need to return to the community the increment in land values created by the community were argued more strongly during the period than any other before. The belief by radicals in the public control of land should not be interpreted as part of a socialist view of society. The State would continue to set a market rent and the normal processes of market competition would continue to operate in industry and agriculture. Indeed, it was felt that the revenue from rent would pay for the social programmes, and it was the idea that the Liberal Party proposals for collective security by means of old age pensions and unemployment and sickness insurance follow directly from these precepts. The way was open for new ideas for communal solutions to land use problems as well.
steps to carrying these ideas out. Land reform ideas, however, have a special significance for planning ideas, because radical thought sees them not just as a means of promoting social justice, but also as a major solution to contemporary land use problems. Rural and urban problems were seen as linked and both related to the existing system of land tenure. The assumption was that because agriculture, industry and commerce were paying above economic rent (by paying landlord's rent and in addition rates) for their land then this was a major drag on the enterprise of industry, which prevented it from creating more jobs, and a major reason for the agricultural depression and so rural decline. State control would thus lower farmers' rents, and so agricultural prices, and also allow the return of part of the urban population to the land by breaking up the monopoly control of the large landed estates. Finally, overcrowded housing conditions and urban poverty were also seen as related to high rents. Landlords were holding on to land on the fringes of the city in order to push up land prices and so were preventing the city decentralising at the rate at which it should be. Decentralisation would create the improvements in environment that middle class opinion prized and thought would have beneficial effects on the working class. The ability of landlords to put up the rents of working class housing was also a burden on the income of the working class and prevented them from affording better housing.

These broad changes in social philosophy underpin the planning ideas which developed during and after this period. First, they provide the foundation for the belief that government action can produce a pattern of rural and urban development which would benefit all groups in society, (except of course, the parasitic landlord class) as part of the right social framework within which individuals could develop. The idea of community, in which all groups would find a common interest, has been fundamental to planning ideas ever since. Secondly, land reform would be the means by which decentralisation of the big cities would be carried out in an efficient and satisfactory manner to provide a low density environment. Howard gives these ideas an extra sharpness by suggesting the garden city as the place where the 'New Liberal' community would be created at the local level.
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Foreign Policy as an Influence upon the Introduction of Town Planning Legislation in Britain

Leith Penny, CURS, Birmingham

At the PHG meeting in Sheffield last year, a paper given by Patricia Garside provoked some argument over the importance of the link between German expansionism and the introduction of town planning legislation. (See PHB Vol.1, No.2, p.3) Briefly, her case was that urban conditions had so far improved by 1900 that public awareness of the need for reform cannot explain the introduction of statutory planning and that planning's impetus was by the 1930s insufficient to "carry it through" to the position of 1947. The principal factor in creating a climate conducive to the legislative growth of town planning before both World Wars came, it was argued, from the sense of national military threat. The following notes attempt an appraisal of the evidence for and against such an interpretation, as applied to the

Housing, Town Planning etc. Act of 1909.

The case for attributing general reforms of 1909 to Britain's declining world role has been put by Steadman Jones (1971) and Hennock (1976). What evidence is there of the dichotomy of the development of statutory town planning in particular to fears regarding such decline, and regarding the ambitions of Germany?

The main evidence usually quoted in this connection is the interest exhibited by the British town planning movement in German planning, especially as presented by Horstfall and the considerable publicity given to the findings of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration and the consequent evidence regarding the health and vitality of the urban population.

It may be noted that although German planning attracted most interest, other European countries, notably Italy, and Sweden, had planning movements. No special German interest, if not because of the implications of comparisons between two imperial powers, could therefore be attributed to the Parliamentary debates showed, 20 years of experiment and propaganda had by 1908 seen many of the main elements of the town planning movement's suburban prescriptions accepted by educated opinion, Conservative and Liberal alike. It is therefore hardly surprising that a limited measure for the application of foresight and common sense (as it was then perceived) in matters of suburban development should be introduced by the government in an era of increasing state intervention.

Regarding the attention given to German practice in the literature of the time; Germany's own planning-related literature was both larger and more accessible than that of any other European nation, and was therefore a natural focus of interest. Furthermore, as a large industrial and military power, German planning, Germany presented the obvious - indeed the only - European yardstick against which British planners could measure their own progress.

In addition, it should be noted that the theme of racial development, although no doubt stimulated by international tension, and sometimes dramatised by Anglo-German comparisons, had an existence intellectually independent of imperial conflicts: eugenics theory was among the influences upon the intellectual milieu. E. B. Gifford, Swinton, Geddes, Vivian and Howard all exhibit this influence in various pronouncements. (Its extent of course is unquantifiable as far as I am aware, yet been examined in the study of the town planning movement's early development.)
To conclude: there is obvious substance in the view that concern about German industrial and military expansion contributed to a climate favourable to reform at home, stimulated interest in that country's social organisation, and that this interest was reflected in the treatment of German town planning and municipal administration in the literature of the time. Advocates of town planning took advantage of the widespread feelings of rivalry and apprehension regarding Germany to stress the importance of maintaining 'parity' in health and housing (although this was hardly a dominant theme).

However, arguments which accord primacy to fears of German economic and military strength among the influences upon the adoption of statutory town planning neglect other factors which are prominent in the evidence from which they are drawn. The variety of other interests in German practice, the much wider context within planning was advocated and supported, the insignificance of German comparisons in the Parliamentary debates preceding the passing of the 1909 Act, and the failure of German practice to exercise any appreciable influence upon the substantive content of British planning must lead to the conclusion that German-British comparisons were not of major importance in determining the character of either planning thought or statutory provision in this country.
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