Chairman's Note

So far the Bulletin has not offered much by way of book reviews. This issue includes two, and it may well be that members will value the introduction of authoritative reviews. The Editor will be glad to have your recommendations as to titles which he might select.

You will find enclosed an up-to-date list of members. (Some are still having their memories jogged on payment of subscription: do please let us have your remittance as this does help the administration.) Do check the list and invite those whom you feel should be members, to take out a subscription. You may find you are part of a recognizable national or regional grouping; you may find it convenient to get together in your own meetings. We shall always be glad to have a report of these in PHB.

The arrangements for electing your Executive Committee for 1981-83 were given in PHB Vol.2, No.3 (December 1980).

The composition of the present Executive is given below, the starred names retiring this year (though available for re-election should they so wish).

U.K.

P.A. Booth
Professor G.E. Cherry
*Dr M. Cuthbert
*Dr P. Dickens
*Dr S.M. Gaskell
*Dr R.J.P. Kain
Mr A.D. King
Dr M. Naslas
Dr Helen Meller
Dr A.R. Sutcliffe

Non-U.K.

*Dr M.J. Bannon
*Professor S. Buder
*Christiane Collins
*Professor Dora Crouch
*Professor J.B. Cullingworth
*Dr P.G. Gerosa
Professor P. Marcuse
Professor M. Rose
Lorette Russenberger
Professor J. Salazar
I.C. Taylor
Dr S. Watanabe
Professor W.H. Wilson
There are therefore four UK and six non-UK vacancies on the Executive. The following names have been communicated to me:

**U.K.**

*Dr M. Cuthbert, Department of Town and Country Planning, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh.*

*Dr P. Dickens, School of Cultural and Community Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.*

*Dr S.M. Gaskell, Assistant Principal, City of Liverpool College of Higher Education, Liverpool.*

Dr M. Hebbert, London School of Economics and Political Science, London.

*Dr R. Kain, Department of Geography, University of Exeter, Exeter.*

Mr D. Whitham, Department of Urban Design, Oxford Polytechnic, Oxford.

*Offered for re-election.*

There are six names put forward for four places, and you are invited to vote on the enclosed voting slip.

**Non-U.K.**

*Dr M.J. Bannon, Department of Regional and Urban Planning, University College, Dublin.*


Professor B.A. Brownell, Department of Urban Studies, University of Alabama, Alabama.

*Christiane Collins, Parsons School of Design, New York.*

Joan Draper, History of Architecture and Art Department, University of Illinois, Chicago.

D. Hulchanski, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto, Canada.

P. Kauffman, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York.

Professor D.A. Kreuckeberg, Department of Urban Planning and Policy Development, Livingston College, New Jersey.

*Offered for re-election.*

There are eight names put forward for six places, and you are invited to vote on the enclosed voting slip.

Voting is open to all members of PHG. Voting slips returned by those who, at the time of the return, have not yet paid their 1981 membership subscription, will be discounted.

Each vote has a single value, and the four names (UK) and six names (non-UK) receiving the largest total of votes will be declared elected. In the event of a tie between 4th, 5th and 6th place (UK) and 6th, 7th and 8th place (non-UK) election will be decided on the basis of alphabetical order.

Gordon E. Cherry

Chairman

---

**Planning History Group**

**Balance Sheet, 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencing balance</td>
<td>371.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions for 1979</td>
<td>279.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions for 1980</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on deposit a/c</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£735.85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning History Bulletin 1 (printing costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership mailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative costs (postage, bank charges, honorarium, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bank accounts at 27.12.1979:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Deposit</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>50.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>351.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£402.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance Sheet, 1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>402.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions for 1980</td>
<td>677.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions for other years</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on deposit a/c</td>
<td>76.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus on March seminar</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet distribution</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,209.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing costs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHB 2 Dec. 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHB 2/1 Mar. 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing costs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHB 2 Dec. 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHB 3/1 Apr. 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHB 2/2 Aug. 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpayment to Univ. of B'ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative costs (bank and giro account charges, xeroxing, honorarium, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bank accounts at 27.12.1980:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Deposit</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>114.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>608.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held for General Fund in Seminar a/c</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giro a/c</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£740.32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have checked the figures in this balance sheet and I confirm that they represent a true and fair summary of the books of the Group.

(signed) N.P. Cookson
Assistant Manager
Williams & Glyn's Bank Ltd
Sheffield
Treasurer's Note

I am pleased to be able to report that 1980 ended on a rather firmer financial footing than I had expected, due largely to the interest in the Group that the summer's International Conference generated. The apparently very healthy balance in December does, however, have to cover the printing costs of two, and the mailing costs of one, of 1980's Bulletins, which had not been charged by the end of the year.

In 1981 membership subscriptions have still been slow to come in although 40 members have so far opted to use the standing order arrangements which will be a significant aid to the Group's cash flow in 1982. I would urge all last year's members who have not yet rejoined to do so as soon as possible, and preferably to think about paying by standing order. Subscriptions will remain by far our largest source of income, which makes prompt payment vital to the Group's continuing success.

Philip Booth
Treasurer

Announcements

ITHACA, N.Y. - John W. Reps, professor of city and regional planning at Cornell University, has been cited by the American Historical Association as the author of the best book in English on American History for 1980.

His book, Cities of the American West: A History of Frontier Urban Planning, published by the Princeton University Press, was given the Albert J. Beveridge Award at the annual meeting of the AHA in Washington, D.C. on December 28th. It carries with it a $1,000 cash prize and is considered the AHA's
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Planning History Group Meetings

Notice of a Meeting to be held on 18th September, 1981, at the University of Birmingham. The topic will be "The origins and development of high-density housing policies in the U.K., 1945-1970". The programme will begin at 9.30 a.m. and will proceed as follows:

Looking forward - an early film.

The general historical context, Dr Anthony Sutcliffe, University of Sheffield.

Looking back - a later film.

Greater London: development of policies, Dr Patricia Garside, North London Polytechnic.

Technical influences on general policy, George Atkinson, OBE, formerly Head of Design Division, Building Research Establishment.

Birmingham: problems and responses, Alan Gieson, formerly Deputy, Planning Department, Birmingham, and Michael Ryan, Planning Department, Borough of Milton Keynes.

Opening of discussion: William Ogden, formerly Chief Regional Planner, West Midlands.

Summary and Conclusions: Professor Gordon E. Cherry, University of Birmingham.

Finish 4.30 to 5.00 p.m.

Full details and booking form are circulated with this Bulletin. Reservations, enquiries or correspondence to:

Hon. Prof. N. Burt, Department of Transportation and Environmental Planning, University of Birmingham, P O Box 363, Birmingham, B15 2TT.

PHG Spring Seminar

North American Planning in the Twentieth Century

University College of Swansea, 28 March 1981

Report by Anthony Sutcliffe

The Group's long-running series of British seminars continued with an ambitious programme on Canadian and U.S. planning, organised by Michael Simpson in association with the Board of Planning Studies, U.K. Swansea. Whereas the Cambridge seminar in autumn 1980 had concentrated on the impact of the German example on British planning (see PHB 2(3) 1980, pp 4-6), much time was spent in the Swansea proceedings on detecting what North American planning owed, or did not owe, to Britain. Coincidentally, the discussions threw much light on that perennial question: how far planning is led by a few great seers, and how far it is the product of anonymous processes grounded in economic, social, and mentalities. The whole day thus acquired a satisfying coherence whirled by the concluding event, a tour of planning sites in the Swansea area. As usual, the tour brought out the regional and physical context in which all realised planning schemes must take their place.

In 'False Dawn: the Birth and Premature Death of Canadian Planning, 1910-32', Michael Simpson (UC Swansea) painted a picture of seed falling on stony ground. British North America had lain very much in the shadow of the United States until the end of the 19th century, but a new economic upturn, beginning in 1896 and coinciding with the closure of the Frontier in the USA, brought spectacular demographic and economic growth to Canada. On the map, the most impressive feature was the spread of settlement west of Toronto as almost limitless agricultural and mineral resources were opened up. However, this expansion of the primary sector was organized through towns, and, with the older, eastern centre benefiting from the boom, Canada's urban population grew faster than that of its countryside. By 1921, half of Canada's population lived in urban districts. This urban growth, argued Simpson, conformed to the long-established, exploitative character of Canadian settlement, with quick returns as the primary objective. Speculation flourished and the whole picture was one of frenetic urbanization with its attendant waste and suffering.

Economic growth stimulated thought as well as profits, however. Almost for the first time, concern grew up about waste of Canadian resources. In 1909 the federal and provincial governments combined in setting up a Commission of Conservation with the task of examining all aspects of the use and enhancement of Canadian resources. Meanwhile, the environmental debate had extended from the countryside to the towns. Simpson (echoing the interpretation put forward recently in Artibise and Stelter, The Usable Urban Past) detected two main strands of thought, both borrowed from abroad. One was the City Beautiful approach, imported from the USA, while the other was housing criticism and reform on British lines. The Canadian version of the City Beautiful was grounded in a broader tendency of urban progressivism, also imported from the USA. Progressivism, however, proved to be a less sturdy plant than its fellow import, rural populism. Most of the City Beautiful schemes were expensive and the whole idea collapsed with the slump of 1913. Only in Mackenzie King's Ottawa, in the 1920s and 1930s, were City Beautiful transformations to be carried out.

Housing reform, meanwhile, established firmer roots. The British approach was antipode to a tendency in Canadian thinking to detect
working for the adoption of a scientific approach. He was able in the early 1920s to develop new planning schemes for entire regions, based on central cities. He produced a number of outline schemes but his most ambitious venture was a 1,000 square-mile plan for the Niagara region, in 1919. This must lay claim to being the world's first international regional plan, for it included part of New York State as well as Ontario. After the war, Adams proposed that a Federal government be set up to coordinate planning between the provinces and the cities. He also joined in the war effort for better housing after the war. Here again, as a firm opponent of subsidised, municipal housing he fitted in well with Canadian ideology of individualism, materialism and competition. Adams fitted in with it at first, but the longer he stayed, the more frustrations he encountered. From as early as 1920 Adams started to withdraw from his work for the Commission of Conservation, and in 1921 the Commission was disbanded. Adams' conservation government lasted until 1923, but for the last couple of years his main work was for the National Parks Commission. Thereafter, he divided his time between regional planning in the USA, and his British practice.

By the later 1920s most Canadian planning legislation was a dead letter, and public support for planning Canadian planning education, after its precocious childhood, never reached adolescence, and most planning posts were filled by half-formed individuals who were unable to stand out against the renewal of individualism and materialism which afflicted city politics in the 1920s. Bleached clean of its social reform ideology, Canadian planning was reduced to two crude elements: zoning (often of a socially discriminating kind), and the layout of suburban subdivisions. Indeed, the emaciated body of Canadian planning was no match for the Depression of 1930, which utterly destroyed it. It was not seen again until it revived, in altered form, in 1945.

Simpson concluded that, for all the charismatic efforts of Thomas Adams, planning was too far removed from Canadian economic realities, and the mentalities built on them, to have a realistic chance of taking root.

Mark Swenarton (University College, London) adopted a different approach to British influence. He is 'Anglophilia and Utopia: English Garden Suburbs' Built by the U.S. Federal Government During the First World War'. He set out the 'accepted' history of the planned settlements built for war workers in 1917-18 and then pointed out its inconsistency on the basis of site analysis of three of those settlements. Anyone reading the Journal of the American Institute of Architects in the middle of the 1940s, he said, Swenarton, is bound to notice the extensive coverage of the housing built for British war workers, at which the Ministry of Munitions. These articles were the product of a visit to Britain by the architect, F.L. Ackerman, at the instigation of the editor of the Journal. In 1931 Edith C. Wood wrote that, without this British example, the housing built for American war workers would have taken the form of temporary barracks. But was she right?
and rented out its own houses. Ackerman, with an interest in British housing, was among those appointed to these agencies. In all, 15,000 family units were built under their aegis.

However, other aspects of the story are more a matter of judgement. It is to the 'accepted' view, these American schemes were modelled on British garden suburbs and villages. Moreover, Ackerman building after the war and sought to discredit the more socialist of the two agencies, the U.S. Housing Corporation. Even in Britain, the British example continued to inspire U.S. planning and housing reform into the 1930s and even beyond. In looking at three of the American developments - Hilton, near Newport News, Virginia; Yorkship, near Camden, New Jersey; and Quincy, Wisch, Ackerman, and associated reports, Swenarton argued that the similarities to British practice were largely overlooked differences. At Hilton, a monotonous grid pattern set the tone. At Yorkship, the decision of roads, onto which all the houses fronted, suggested disregard for Winn's basic principles. In these two examples, at least, the design of the housing differed from that of privately built residential areas nearby, so that a transformation of the residential area occurred. Further, the influence of a wartime Atlantic to investigate the British example - and villains, the Washington politicians and bureaucrats. In this case, the myth was built up to galvanise American reformers during their dark days in the 1930s and 1940s. It had its hero figures - Ackerman and the others. The search for a purposeful direction of a wartime Atlantic to investigate the British example - and villains, the Washington politicians and bureaucrats. In this case, the myth was built up to galvanise American reformers during their dark days in the 1930s and 1940s. It had its hero figures - Ackerman and the others. The search for a purposeful direction of a wartime Atlantic to investigate the British example - and villains, the Washington politicians and bureaucrats. In this case, the myth was built up to galvanise American reformers during their dark days in the 1930s and 1940s. It had its hero figures - Ackerman and the others. The search for a purposeful direction of a wartime Atlantic to investigate the British example - and villains, the Washington politicians and bureaucrats. In this case, the myth was built up to galvanise American reformers during their dark days in the 1930s and 1940s. It had its hero figures - Ackerman and the others. The search for a purposeful direction. Floor plan fair to reveal her highly perceptive work on Hegemann already published by Donatella. The Royal; with Collins working on a full-length study of Hegemann, it would be unfair to reveal her discoveries here, but members of the Group, including me, were left with a sense of the work after the official publication of the paper which had thrown light on Hegemann's career, with Hegemann's widow, had thrown new light on his work and ideas, although she paid tribute to the highly perceptive work on Hegemann already published by Donatella.
an internationalist he threw in the pre-1914 world and even under Weimar after his return to Germany in 1922. But his opposition to Hitler forced him out of Germany in 1933 and from then until his premature death in 1936 he never retrieved his old mastery of the American scene. International planners, it would seem, may well begin their careers like Odysseus but they run a serious risk of ending them like the Flying Dutchman.

Education

Architectural History and Theory - The Bartlett School of Architecture

New Masters course at the Bartlett.

Students and those who advise them may be interested to know that the Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning, University College London, is launching a new MSc course in October 1981. Entitled Architectural History and Theory - The History of Modern Architecture, it will reflect at Masters level some of the innovative tendencies in the teaching of architectural history which have been developed at the Bartlett in recent years. Rej ecting the traditional approach in which architecture is seen as the creation of individual designers and the evolution of design is interpreted as a succession of styles, the Bartlett's historians emphasise the interaction between architectural and social change. As well as transforming architectural history, this new methodology creates a more effective link between history and current architectural practice, for both can be understood in terms of a unified, coherent system of social analysis.

The new course is intended for three main categories of student: architects who wish to pursue historical study as part of their professional training; those with a background in architecture, the arts or the social sciences who wish to go on to do research in architectural history; and those who wish to make a career in architectural criticism, teaching or journalism. It consists of a 10,000 word report on a subject of the student's choice and four taught units:

i) The literature of architectural history

ii) Architecture in 19th and 20th century Britain

iii) The history of architectural practice

iv) Theory and practice of housing in Europe and North America, 1918-32.

The second and fourth units reflect the main emphasis of the course, namely the relationship of architectural production and the realities of mass, industrialised society. The first and third units range more widely, showing how the methodologies applied to the study of the architecture of industrial society affect the interpretation of architectural history as a whole. In the History of Architectural Practice, for instance, the work of sixteenth-century Italian and eighteenth-century French architects is considered along with that of nineteenth- and twentieth-century British and American architects.

Further information on the course, which is normally taken over one year full-time or two years part-time, may be obtained from:

The Tutor to MSc Students

Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning

University College London

Wates House

22 Gordon Street

London WC1H 0QB

Meetings and Conferences

Michigan Technological University is hosting a symposium focused on Power, Transport, and Public Policy in Modern America. The session titles are: The Ideology and Culture of Energy Production: Communities, Energy and Transport; Economic Growth and Decline; Energy, Transport and the Social Organisation of Communities; Government and Policy; and a Panel, which will provide an overview. The date for the symposium is September 25-27, 1981. For additional information and local arrangements contact:

George H. Daniels and Mark H. Rose, Department of Social Sciences, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan 49931, U.S.A. (Tel. (906) 487-2113).

Publications

Our members will be interested in the series of illustrated histories of Canadian Cities, being a necessary part of the development of the other. The fifteen original papers, collected and edited by Alan Artibise, were prepared by a variety of authors; from established senior scholars to younger less well-known researchers. They write of communities ranging from Victoria to Carmangay, from Calgary to Minnedosa. While each paper focuses on specific centres, each is far more than a local history. For the emphasis throughout is on the broad framework of which each example is but a part.

It is anticipated that the book will prove to be a popular teaching tool as well as a stimulus to future researchers.

Alan Artibise and Gilbert Stelter have compiled a bibliography and guide concerning Urban Canada to be published in April 1981 by the University of British Columbia Press. It is, to quote again,
The first comprehensive bibliography prepared for Canadian urban studies. It is designed as a resource guide for students, teachers, researchers, and the general public and includes material from a broad range of the social sciences - history, economics, geography, political science, architecture, sociology, and public administration.

Members of our Group will already be aware of Urban History Review published by the National Museum of Man, Ottawa, in cooperation with the Urban History Committee of the Canadian Historical Association. It appears three times a year under Alan Artibise's editorship and contains items in either of the two official languages.

Urban History Review presents monographs, articles, notes and book reviews from all disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Its objective is to record trends in the study of the historical evolution of urban Canada; what researchers are doing; what they think needs to be done; how it can best be done, and what sort of materials are available to do it.

Urban History Review strives to be a vehicle for information, debate, and enquiry.

Manuscripts and other material for Urban History Review should be directed to: Professor Alan F.J. Artibise, Department of History, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada V8W 2Y2.

---

Book Reviews

**Homes fit for Heroes, Mark Swenarton, Heinemann, 1981.**

£14.50. ISBN 0 435 32994 4

Lucky Dr Swenarton! A thesis on the housing programme between 1919 and 1921, on which he presumably embarked around the mid-term of the last Labour government, now shows history repeating itself (though not quite as farce) in a way he can hardly have anticipated. Describing the curtailment of housebuilding in 1921, he writes:

"In the changed economic and political conditions, the social reforms so readily promised in the wake of the Armistice took on the appearance of unnecessary and unjustifiable extravagance.... the Beaverbrook and Northcliffe press launched an 'anti-waste' campaign, attacking 'squandermania'.... Lloyd George wrote: ... middle-class people might insist upon a drastic cut-down.... nothing will satisfy them next year except an actual reduction in taxation." His political considerations had led the Cabinet to lavish expenditure on housing, but now - with squandermania, not the danger of revolution, as the cabinet noted that 'now that the coal dispute was settled... (there was) not much danger of active unrest in Great Britain'. The danger against which the insurance had been taken out had disappeared."

This is the nub of the thesis, and locates the explanation for the state housing programme firmly at the political rather than the economic level. Swenarton is thus attempting to refute Castells and his school - although this seems a somewhat opportunist response to a current intellectual fashion; Castells is mentioned in the blurb but otherwise only in the Conclusion, where he is consigned to the status of a closet liberal along with Marian Bowley.

In fact the study stands as an excellent and enjoyable work of English empiricism, and usefully contributes to various debates: the ideological role of architecture, the 'meanings' of different built forms, the influence of such non-ideological factors as shortages of certain building materials on housing design, and so on. The 'insurance policy' against the perceived post-war danger of revolution was to build estates which in their layout, appearance and space standards resembled a Garden City ideal previously unattainable by the majority of poor working class. Along the way there are debates between 'picturesque' architects and their opponents, one of whom wrote: "The standard cottage will depend for any attraction that it may possess, not upon... its individuality, but upon more general characteristics such as suitability to purpose and excellence of design. It will not be the home of an individual, of an anarchist; but the home of a member of a certain class, of a communist."

A criticism is that the study has little to say of the labour movement's demands: was the threat of revolution real? Were the demands centred on housing at this merely the most convenient currency for buying them off? The whole issue is seen from the perspective of the makers and implementers of policy, with the masses as mere 'noises off'. Reiss's pamphlet 'The Home I Want' appears on the dustjacket and nowhere else, and mentions of the Workmen's National Housing Council tell us frustratingly little about this issue. Nonetheless, a useful and delightful book on an important subject.

Jane Darke
University of Sheffield


This book will be of particular interest to members of the Planning History Group because its objective lies are so relevant to those for which the Group has been striving since 1974. Sheail maintains that 'first, the inter-war years are worth studying for their own intrinsic fascination and, secondly, the skills and experiences gained during that period still influence the perceptions of today. Here we have, therefore, a writer who as a planning historian is attempting to advance the field of knowledge about a particular period and in respect of a sector of planning activity, and who at the same time aims to show the importance and relevance of planning subsequently to the emergence and development of planning thought and practice. The Planning History Group itself has had this sort of basic remit: to establish the bones of a particular period or issue, to add flesh to it through more detailed research, and to establish relationships with later periods and other questions.

Let it be said at once that Sheail succeeds admirably. His book is a most welcome addition to our inter-war literature and a new benchmark in our understanding of rural planning in Britain between the two wars. We have far too long ignored the inter-war years in our appreciation of developments in British planning; Sheail does much to rectify this and his work could well lead to a new mini fashion. An inter-war Britain cannot be written off in planning history; the planners of the 1920s and 30s drew on their earlier experience, while their work contributed to the developments of the 1940s.

A strength of Sheail's work is his research from Public Record Office and County Record Office files whereby fascinating illustrative material gives good examples in case study form of some of the issues of the day. Over 20 years a gradualist approach by local and central Government made British planning in 1939 stronger and much more comprehensive than had seemed likely in 1919. The actual course of events was never more than un-
Notes and Articles

PLANNERS - LET'S NOT BURY OUR HISTORY

Eugenie Ladner Birch

Note: This article is reprinted with permission from Planning magazine, September 1980, pg 12-15, copyright 1980 by the American Planning Association, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.

Practicing planners lay claim to their title by possessing a certification of theoretical and technical knowledge, which they use to promote the public interest. What sets them apart is their altruism, their mastery of professional skills, their wisdom, and their ability to exercise good judgment.

Where do planners learn these things? Graduate school gives them a share of theoretical and mechanical skills, and, for its members, the American Institute of Certified Planners provides a code of ethics. But do these institutions instil wisdom and judgement?

In practice, planners tend to operate in an ad hoc fashion, interpreting public interest on a case-by-case basis. That's what Elizabeth Howe and Jerome Kaufman reported in a recent article in the Journal of the APA ("The Ethics of Contemporary Planners", July 1979). Howe and Kaufman call for a revamping of the AICP code of ethics and for a code of conduct to deal with ethical dilemmas in the classroom. But this is only a partial solution. For how can students, and later practitioners, be qualified to judge the relative wisdom of any action if they do not have the ability to distinguish among the cultural and institutional issues embedded in American society? To do this they need exposure to the experiences of the profession, and failures of their professional forebears.

This idea is neither unique nor new. But do planning schools truly appreciate the value of historical study? From my own limited experience as a planning student in master's and Ph.D. programs and as a teacher in various planning departments, I have long suspected that they do not. Curious to learn whether my suspicion was correct, and if so, why, I sought the counsel of John Reps of Cornell University, dean of American planning history and author of such classic works as The Making of Urban America. I caught up with him in Savannah, Georgia, at an annual association meeting, but, significantly, at the annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians.

Knowing of Reps' commitment to the union of the past and the future in planning, I asked whether history should be included in the professional curriculum, and, if it should, why educators should give so little attention to it. His response was a challenge: "There's really no need to be defensive about planning history. It obviously has merit. I just write about it. But if you are as concerned as I am, why don't you survey planning schools and find out what they are doing?"

With that challenge in mind, I returned home and began contacting various people. The most outspoken was Laurence Gercken, who teaches at the University of Illinois, and who is known for his lively appearances at national planning conferences. Fifteen years of teaching "American Planning Since 1900 AD" lectures at numerous planning schools besides his own, and recent presentations on state and local APA chapters have given him a broad view of the field. He minced no words about his opinion of what type of programs that don't give students a sense of the roots of the profession: "When you don't know who your forefathers were, you're ignorant. When somebody who claims to be a master or Ph.D. in planning can't identify the name of Bettman, it's very much like a doctor saying 'Hippocrates who?'"

Gercken admits that his colleagues probably consider him 'something of an oddball' for his commitment to history. "If you've spent the last two years or so teaching a small piece of the whole package, you develop curricula that are accumulations of finite, small pieces", he observes.

History, says Gercken, is a much needed antidote to the current pressure to keep planning curricula as narrow and specialized as possible. Educators in planning schools, and their profession is marginal in today's society. "Before you say that planners have had no impact on society, look outside at the dedicated streets and parks, the land-use controls, the subway systems, and the National Parks, and you'll see planners doing it. Tell me that planners have had no impact." Jerome Kaufman, in a panel entitled "The Image of the Planner" at this year's APA conference in San Francisco, seconded Gercken's idea, calling for the publication of additional sober accounts of planning accomplishments.

Others that I talked to pointed out that realizing the value of history in the curriculum and convincing students of that value are two different things. David Goldfield teaches history in a master's program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. "Students in a professional curriculum today don't feel they are learning something unless you provide them with a tangible, technical tool they can use on the job", he observes. "The irony is that historical skills may be even more important. Few students understand that today's cities are the accumulation of thousands of decisions made over decades, or even centuries, and that the actions that are being considered today is circumscribed by this accumulation. To ignore it or misunderstand it is an invitation to irrelevance or worse."

Surprises

After my initial, informal survey,
I decided to send questionnaires to all of the 99 planning schools in the United States listed in the membership roster of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, for the most part return- ing more than 85 per cent of the questionnaires were returned. The most illuminating aspect of the whole survey is the incred- ible range of opinion about what constitutes sufficient historical background for master's degree candidates.

I was surprised to learn that nearly all the institutions that replied designed some courses which should be aware of the planning of the past. Most schools, 54 per cent, tucked a few history lectures into their core courses; 29 per cent required a semester's study of either the history of urban form or the history of urban development. Most of the others offered history electives. In all, 83 per cent of the respondents required some planning history. Yet I was left with the suspicion that many of the courses cited were not giving history enough weight for the professional development of planners. That thought led me to an analysis of the course outlines.

The schools that integrate history into introductory or theory courses - the most common approach - place an emphasis on teaching the history of the planning profession. Thomas Galloway's 'Planning Theory' at the University of Kansas, Edward Bergman's 'Theories of Planning' at the University of North Carolina and Charles Dek- nel's 'Urbanism and Planning in the United States' at the University of Nebraska are typical of these courses. In each of them, the instructor presents an overview of the contemporary scene, then works his way to the background issues, usually devoting four to eight hours to historical topics. The reading list is nearly always the same, to be assigned include Planning Theory in Retrospect: The Process of Paradigm Change, by Thomas Galloway and Riad Mayayi (Journal of the AIP, January 1977) and Archdeacon's Planners in the Changing American City (JAF, September 1967); Roy Lubove's The House of Urban Planning (in Allen M. and Samuel Waksenstein, eds., Makings of America, 1970); and Mel Scott's encyclopedia American City Planning Since 1800.

Means to an end

In these courses, history is viewed as a means to an end in Galloway's words, these are courses designed "to assist the student in formulating an individual world view of planning, and its teaching goals. Deknel reports that "the faculty identified planning history as an essential element in the core curriculum", and Bergman notes that "planning history is a vehicle through which the emergence of planning theory and its recent developments are traced". I was left wondering how students can gain insights into planning philosophy when less than one working day is spent on historical issues.

The programs requiring semester courses in urban planning history gave more weight to understanding the past as an aid to making decisions for the future. But there seems to be confusion about the proper content of such offerings. Some schools insist on a survey of urbanism from antiquity to the present; others concentrate on the urban heritage of the United States. The former tend to ask global questions about urbanisation and seek solutions in urban design, while the latter tend to concentrate on social themes. Bernard Boyle's course on the 'History of the City' at Arizona State University and Komas Balkus's 'History in Urban Form' at Florida State illustrate the urban design approach. Such courses rely heavily on the writings of Lewis Mumford (particularly his City in History and Stones and Stones) and Arthur Gallion (The Urban Pattern) and the Planning and Cities series edited by George Collins, a collection of volumes tracing the history of urbanisation (published by Brasiller in the 1960s and early 1970s).

The larger group of courses has an American focus. These courses seem to break down into two categories: courses emphasizing the development of planning as one of the outgrowths of American urbanism, and courses concentrating on the history of planning profession and the growth of the idea of planning in American society. 'Historical Analysis of Urban Development', David Hamon's course at Princeton, and 'Evolution of Cities', Barry Checkoway's course at the University of Illinois, represent the first type.

Purely professional themes are developed in such courses as John Hancock's elective seminar, 'History of Planning in the United States', at the University of Washington and Albert S. Guten­ berg's 'Domesticating the Nineteenth Century Planning Thought', at the University of Illinois. Hancock focuses his lecture in 1915 quote from the Scottish planner Patrick Geddes: "a little reflection will show that the one and only business of city building is constructed from measurements and financial estimates alone, independently of living use, is a coffin". Hancock insists that his students recognise the "importance of culture in shaping planning processes and outcomes". Gutenberg agrees; he emphasises the "institutional environment" as well as the physical environment and stresses the link between planning history, architecture and social history. Gutenberg focusses on Progressive and New Deal reform periods, while Hancock ranges from the colonial period to the present.

Some courses with an American focus use different approaches. Charles Barr of Michigan State University offers 'Background of Urban Development', which concentrates on functional development. Barr's unusual reading list - with material ranging from Smith to use to health, energy, transportation, and urban renewal - is one of the few to recommend primary planning documents in an effort to show historical linkages. For example, his discussion of central business districts draws on urban renewal - is one of the few to recommend primary planning documents in an effort to show historical linkages. For example, his discussion of central business districts draws on the writings of Lewis Mumford (particularly his City in History and Stones and Stones) and Arthur Gallion (The Urban Pattern) and the Planning and Cities series edited by George Collins, a collection of volumes tracing the history of urbanisation (published by Brasiller in the 1960s and early 1970s).

At UCLA, Dolores Hayden has created 'Case Studies in the History of Planning' and 'Architectural and Urban Innovation', which pays special attention to women's contributions to early reform movements. Her reading list includes: Calvin Beecher's American Woman's Home; Jane Addams' Twenty Years at Hull House; and Marlene Stein Worman's Inclusive analysis of the role of women in 'Domesticating the Nineteenth Century American City' (in the 1977 issue of Prospects, an annual journal of American cultural studies).

Many instructors design courses on the history of planning in their own regions. Robert Mer, who teaches 'History and Theory of Urban Planning and Policy' at the University of Illinois and Chicago planning director, asks his students to laboratory and blend local materials (Chicago, Growth of a Metropolis, by Harold Meyer and Richard Eastman; The City, by Robert Park and Ernest Burgess; Louis Wirth's The Ghetto; Daniel Burnham's Plan of Chicago) with broader studies (Mel Scott's American City Planning, Alan Altshuler's The City Planning Process). Kenneth Corey, formerly at the University of Chicago, offers a course on 'Community Inventory', in which he asked students to assess the effects of planning interventions in the Cincinnati area. At Cornell, John Reps requires students to take field trips to historic planning sites.

Some courses stress the relationship between city growth and public policy. Martin Gellen, who teaches 'History of Urban Social Policy' at the University of California, Berkeley, feels that legislative back- ground is of great value, "because many planners do not understand the history of federal and state inter-
vention in urban development". Gellen also notes that, except for Scott's book and Mark Gel­fand's A Nation of Cities, materia­ls are scarce.

The divergence in American-ori­ented courses reflects two phen­omena. The first is the great variety of planning curricula. Different programs have different needs for history courses. Sec­ond and more important is the fact that there is a rich body of material on American planning, which only a few programs are using in an intelligent and re­sourceful manner.

On another note - anticipated by David Goldfield in our inter­view - many respondents reported that planning students were unreceptive to historical data. Some teachers attributed the lack of interest to the person­ality type attracted to the profes­sion. Others viewed the short­age of textbooks as an impedi­ment to effective presentation. Many instructors have organised their own, innovative curricula. An example is Lewis Labka at North Dakota State University, who has taught 'History of Com­munity and Regional Planning' for six years. "I started with a chronological approach but found the students didn't get too excited by Hippodamus of Milet­us. After discussing the situ­ation with various colleagues at planning conferences, I decided to start with current things and work back. A problem that I keep on trying to deal with is the relationship between form and function in various evolu­tionary, revolutionary and other­transformations of planning and society. Why does one soci­ety take on a particular urban form at a particular stage in its development?"

Laurence Gerckens is, of course, another innovator. He has de­veloped a massive documentary history manual for his course on twentieth century American city planning. The manual is divided into nine modules and includes essays linking planning milestones with current events, quotations from land­mark court decisions and contem­porary books, reprints of newspaper pages commemorating such important occasions as Truman's signing of the 1949 Housing Act; a bibliography; and study guides.

A new enthusiasm

My survey offers strong evidence in support of Gercken's assertion of a new enthusiasm for planning history. In addition to documenting the courses that already exist, some respondents, such as Robert Gras­weller at the University of Minnes­ota and Peter Morris at UCLA indicated that their programs would be initiating new history offerings in the near future.

Many respondents added a plea for information about planning history. They noted the lack of a forum for discussing current research in the field. Traditionally, news of planning history projects has spread either by word of mouth or through such vehicles as the Society of Architectural Historians, the Amer­ican Historical Association, and the Columbia University Seminar on the History of the City. In recent years, the Association of Colleg­iate Schools of Planning has in­cluded a history session at its an­nual meeting, and the last APA conference-attended session called 'Perspectives on Plan­ning Pioneers'. But the United States has no equivalent of the Planning History Group in Great Britain, which publishes its own journal and sponsors regular national and international conferences (the second annual conference was held in Brighton in August).

Clearly there is a need for liter­ature based on the American experi­ence. Some new works will soon become available (including books by Jon Peterson of Queens College, Stanley Schultz of the University of Wisconsin, Clay McShane of North-eastern University, and Don­ald Krueckeborg of Rutgers University). Meanwhile, such resources as the unparalleled planning his­tory collection at Cornell Univ­ersity remain scarcely tapped.

As I ended my survey, I reached these conclusions. First, most planning programs have placed some history in their curricula, although for the most part their coverage is minimal. Second, this shortcoming can be attri­buted to a variety of causes ranging from faculty indiffer­ence and student antipathy, to the absence of good textbooks, to the time constraints of a two­year program. Third, a few of the general courses (particularly those given by Hancock, Gutten­berg, and Gerckens) and some of the specialised seminars (like those offered by Hayden and Barr) could serve as models for wide­spread adoption. And finally, the heritage of American planning is relatively undocumented. It awaits the hand of scholars who can blend historical perspective with knowledge of contemporary planning questions. New insights and new materials are needed if the education of planning prac­tioners is to include the cul­tivation of judgement and wis­dom.

Research Register

Joan Draper, Assistant Professor of Architectural History, of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, is currently studying the career of Edward H. Bennett, an archi­tect-planner, who among other activities guided the exec­ution of the 1909 Plan of Chicago.