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WORK IN PROGRESS
Chairman's Note

At the end of a year one is always tempted both to look back over events and to look forward to new developments.

1982 has seen three Bulletins under new editorship. An expanded and revised format has consolidated the progress made in Volumes 1-3, and I think we can be well satisfied with the more substantial Volume 4. Our Editor, John Sheail, is grateful for your many contributions and anticipates that the flow will increase.

Financially the Group is sound, though with no great reserves. We have been helped by income derived from advertisement mailing, and as the Treasurer, Philip Booth, remarks, at £4 a year PHG is good value for money. But do be prompt with your annual subscriptions; and if you can possibly pay by Bankers Order this is helpful to us, and I am sure to you. Payments are due on the 1st January.

Group meetings and conferences have been held during the year; these and other related gatherings have been fully reported in the Bulletin. Those events provide some measure of cohesion amongst our membership. In addition there is the periodic reporting of our work and interests, all of which contribute to a wider appreciation of the developing field of study of which we are part.

You will know that my secretary acts as Distribution Secretary. In effect this means that Sue Elias assembles copy from the Editor and prepares and distributes the Bulletin, a thrice-yearly activity which galvanises us all into action. From the presentation of PHG you will know the great care with which all this is done. Sue and I also receive your subscriptions which we then record and pass on to the Treasurer.

Beyond these activities connected with the Bulletin, the workings of the Planning History Group are regular, ongoing concerns: correspondence with members, encouraging new membership, the entrepreneurial work of the Meetings Secretary, Tony Sutcliffe, business matters related to the Executive Committee and so on. All I can say is that at a time of extraordinary difficulty in British Universities, when spirits have been low, the affairs of the Planning History Group and the PHG have served to provide necessary spice.

All of which must mean that as a Group we can look forward to 1983 with some confidence and not a little enjoyment. All good seasonal greetings.

Gordon E. Cherry

Treasurer's Note

Subscriptions fall due on 1 January 1983. Please pay promptly. The subscription rate for the coming year is still only £4.00, and with an enlarged and improved Bulletin represents even better value for money.

Payment may be by any one of the methods outlined on the enclosed sheet. Do think about subscribing by Bankers Order if you do not already do so. That way you can be sure of continuing to receive your copies of the Bulletin.

Philip Booth
A NEW THRESHOLD FOR URBAN HISTORY: REFLECTIONS ON CANADIAN-AMERICAN URBAN DEVELOPMENT AT THE GUELPH CONFERENCE

A conference with 130 participants, 30 sessions and a roster of historians, geographers, planners and sociologists from Canada, England and the United States promises to generate a wide-ranging exchange. Add the difficult-to-defne topic of urban history as the focus of concern, and you are bound to create a patchwork, academic environment of scintillating insight and drab mediocrity; an environment not dissimilar from the metropolitan region itself. Such was the case at the Canadian-American Urban Development Conference held at the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada, 23-29 August 1982. The purpose were twofold: to study the relationship between power and the evolution of urban society, and to view that relationship through a comparative framework based on divergent urban experiences in Canada and the United States.(1)

These overarching themes represented the current redirection in urban history from the social concerns of the 1960s (questions of urban ethnicity, mobility and race) to the emerging concerns of the 1980s (questions of the impact that institutionalized political, economic and administrative power has upon a city's physical landscape and the people who live and work there). If urban historians primarily addressed their research questions from the 'bottom up' in the 1960s, they have begun to recuit their inquiries from the 'top down' in the 1980s.(2) But the conference illustrated that this turn-around is by no means complete, or as Anthony Sutcliffe so ably put it, the gods of Manuel Castells and David Harvey did not shine on the conference as brightly as one might have expected. Topics and approaches associated with the 'new' urban history of the previous decades were found in sessions devoted to working class communities, urban education, family structure, and the impact of technology on urban form.(3)

What the Guelph Conference revealed - to the surprise of no one alive in the field for the past five years - is that the study of urban history is in a period of transition. As Michael Frisch brilliantly described in his remarks at the closing session, the new social and urban history of the 1960s was born in the turbulent atmosphere of that decade and from a distrust of established political institutions that at their best seemed to ignore critical social issues, and at their worst appeared to be responsible for them. If the government suppressed the reformist spirit of the present then certainly it had done the same to the past. Careers and social activism coalesced for many American graduate students and young professors of the 1960s in an effort to 'liberate' past and present from 'established political institutions'.

The methods were as refreshing as the topics: oral history, quantification, the study of women, ethnic populations, mobility and demographic change.(4) Amid this dramatic alteration in the interests of professional historians, the city emerged as a container where social processes were played out; places that possessed analytical value only to the extent that they housed the people under study. This was not an unreasonable approach, but critics argued that it added limited knowledge to our understanding of urbanization because it failed to deal with the
city as a whole and rarely viewed its process of growth and change as a unique and definable entity. The city was ethnic; women; the consequence of technological change; the product of industrialization; but never the physical embodiment of the process of urbanization itself. (1) If the urban biographies of the 1940s were vehicles for the study of institutional change, mostly in the form of improved public utilities, then the new urban histories of the 1960s were simply devices for the analysis of social change. (4) Neither approach provided a clear path to a discussion of urbanization or the 'city building process'. (7) And because of a preoccupation with non-elite, the invisible people of the past, rarely did one study political power in relationship to a city's growth and development. Thus ironically the politically charged atmosphere of the 1960s often produced a historical literature devoid of direct political analysis of the urban process - or perhaps more precisely, a literature that celebrated the struggles of common folk in their efforts to survive and then arrive against the dangerous whirlpool of urban industrialization.

As Frisch described at the conference, all the variables comprising the professional equation of less than two decades ago have changed. In the United States, the fervor for reform in urban policy has subsided, as programs instituted during Lyndon Johnson's Great Society years have been discredited by a public that has grown cynical toward government initiatives and by the most conservative administration since Calvin Coolidge. In Canada, although policy change has not been as abrupt, the liberal government of Pierre Trudeau has been shaken by persistent problems of unemployment, inflation and skyrocketing budget deficits. A job famine among young history PhDs has increased their desire to research relevant topics with a direct applicability to (or more accurately with a chance to provide a perspective on) contemporary urban issues. Concern over institutionalized public policy has increased among professional urban historians as their commitment to social reform has waned, a situation that may not be as paradoxical as it first seems. To study the established bases of urban political power is to recognize their primacy in the urban experience, a point of view that is at once less expansive and romantic, yet perhaps more sophisticated than that of the 1960s. If graduate students perhaps expressed their political viewpoints more forcefully in the streets of Chicago than they did in their dissertations or monographs, we now find their dwindling number of counterparts as members of zoning boards or planning councils with much less divergence between their studies and actions.

There is another important element to consider when assessing the redirection of urban history: the mobility studies of the 1960s did not deliver as promised. Yes, new fiefs of inquiry were opened and the masses of common people largely neglected by historians were finally given their due. But just as some activists believed that they could reassert society, so too was there a belief among the new social and urban historians that they could rewrite history. And to a large extent they did. However, as this new subfield advanced and monographs on ethnicity, mobility and technological change became abundant, the methodology and conclusions grew stale. A preoccupation with statistical manipulation rather than a concern for what the numbers could reveal soon seeped into the historical research process. And when conclusions were drawn they often appeared to be self-evident; economic novelty from one generation to another, historians reasoned, was indeed part of the American experience, but advancement was not as rapid as suggested by the nation's Horatio Alger mythology: the harsh realities of the industrial work place, social realities of the industrial and technology - although an enormous force in shaping the urban landscape - was not an independent variable, since the implementation of new methods of transportation and industrial production were often the result of economic and social conditions, now else could one explain, for example, the resistance to the electric trolley prior to 1893 (as Clay McShane did in his conference paper) despite the earlier availability of the technology. Why this disparity between invention and innovation? The need for new transportation, McShane illustrated, would become pressing only when suburban realtors were looking for a 'technological fix' to bring undeveloped land at the city's edge closer to the downtown. (8) These conclusions serve as useful reminders, but they hardly constitute a radical re-interpretation in our understanding of the urban past. Perhaps most importantly, the new methods of history created a terminology that no only subdivided the discipline into different specialties but also set up language barriers that inhibited urban historians from communicating with the public, students and even each other. Eric S. Lampard captured the bewildering self-destructive quality of the new social and urban history when he called on his fellow-historians to stop 'quantifying'.

If Lampard's criticism went unheeded as a call for intellectual reason, then certainly by the late 1970s the accumulated effect of more tangible internal and external pressures was exerting an impact on the profession. The consequences of those changes could be found in the Guelph Conference where the two new directions of urban history were prominently on display: a growing interest in urban form and society as a product of political and economic forces, with special attention to the role played by government and corporate institutions in the creation of the urban environment; and wide-spread professional interest in urban architecture not only as an artistic expression, but also as a language form that conveys a region's or nation's social values. Accompanying this changed direction is a heightened concern for the planning profession's relationship to twentieth-century urban development, another indication of the recent move to the institutionalization of urban systems; 'The Politics of Planning'; 'Entrepreneurship and Government in Urban Development'; 'Builders and Architecture'; 'Elites and Community Power Structures'; 'Planning Resource-Based Communities'; 'Home and Housing'; 'American City-Center Planning'; and 'Canadian Provincial Planning Legislation'.

If one needs further proof of this new trend in urban history, you need look no further than the Canadian experience in historical research. Spared the social and political upheaval of the 1960s and vigorously concerned about the urban past only since the mid-1970s (thanks largely to the pioneering editorial work of Gilbert A. Stelter and Alan J. Artibise, who were responsible for organizing this most recent conference), Canada's urban historiography displays only vague signs of the dichotomy that seemingly has split urban historical thought in the United States into two distinct periods. North of the 49th Parallel, institutionalized political, economic and administrative forces shaping Canadian cities have always had a dominant interpretive role among their historians - a reflection of the dif-
different historical conditions present at the time of urban history's development in Canada during the 1970s. (5)

With a different course of analysis taking hold among North American urban historians, what lies ahead? Interpreting the past (despite the decided advantages of hindsight) is a difficult enough chore; predicting the future can be an exercise in futility, different from that of envisioning or reinterpreting urban history. Yet, the near future in urban history promises to produce a literature that is more policy- and public-oriented than in the past, a literature that will be produced in part in non-academic settings. Writing in this environment will create serious questions for urban scholars not because contemporary issues will colour the questions they ask (despite contrary claims that has always been the case for historians), but rather because political and corporate officials understand the power of history and may prefer to overlook or reinterpret unpleasant aspects of the past. Will the racial attitudes behind federal housing policies, described by Kenneth T. Jackson in a recent article in the *Journal of Urban History* article, find their way into a historical report prepared by a government historian? (10) Will the deliberate attempts to deny immigrants access to the political process be discussed in historical biographies distributed to local communities? (11) Will the preoccupation with historical structures now found among preservationists create a popular historical literature that is quaint and pleasing but lacking a critical perspective? Now that professional urban historians are replacing 'old men and women in tennis shoes' and information officers, the question arises as to whether they have won these positions at the cost of independent analysis.

I do not mean to imply that this dilemma is pervasive or inevitable; nor am I willing to conclude that the risks are too great to prevent historians from engaging in this kind of activity (if such is the case, as a historian for the Tennessee Valley Authority, I stand guilty). But I possess a nagging reservation that the integrity of historical inquiry concerning the city will be compromised without a concomitant improvement in public perception or policy. This is a critical issue that the new wave of public urban historians will have to confront; a battle in the bureaucratic trenches less stimulating than, but of equal importance to, the substantive matter that they will be researching in the archives, because it will determine ultimately how that research material is interpreted. This may be the price for relevancy (and to be more blunt, the price for jobs) that social and urban historians during the 1960s could ignore and those of the 1980s cannot. On one level, the profession can no longer afford the luxury of detachment. On another level, it is a challenge and opportunity that deserves strict attention, not only from those on the job hunt, but scholars ensconced in academe as well.

And what of those urban scholars who find themselves in university teaching positions? What are we to make of their recent interest in the politics and economics of urban development? It is certainly a reasonable approach that promises to tell us much about the process of urbanization. But will it be the core concept that unites the discipline, the issue that serves as a focal point of debate and gives urban history a distinctiveness which has eluded the subfield until now? Two questions arise: (1) If the political economy has determined the shape of cities (a statement with which I agree), what is it about the urban building process that makes it unique? For example, the political economy also has been a prime factor in understanding diplomatic and social history. And certainly the forces of politics and economics extend beyond a city's boundaries, at least to the region which surrounds it. This approach could take urban history a vehicle for analyzing political and economic change over time. The city would emerge as a large and complex stage where the political economy of twentieth-century industrialized nations was most dramatically discussed and debated. Although this approach provides a greater independent framework for understanding city building, it still does not create a state of autonomy for urban history. If, in the 1960s, the city was people, in the 1980s the city has become a reflection of economic process. (2) Even if we forego a discussion about the distinctiveness of urban history, how are we to respond to conclusions that capitalism and planning are incompatible, a conclusion found in a number of conference papers, including my own on the greenbelt town programme in the United States, and J. David Hulchanski's discussion of the trials and tribulations of Thomas Adams in Canada during the early part of this century. (12) However accurate they may be, are these conclusions not as self-evident as those made in the 1960s? Perhaps the question should be recast: instead of drawing macro-political conclusions about the limitations of planning in capitalist countries, we should acknowledge this as a given and focus our discussion on the micro-political level. The planning experience in capitalist Canada has been different than that of capitalist Great Britain or capitalist United States. What accounts for these differences? Urban historians, and more specifically historians of urban and regional planning should emphasize the differences within economic systems, using political antipathy toward planning as a point of departure rather than designation. Prentice's conference paper, 'The Americanization of the Alberta Planning System in the 1920s' hints of the possibilities opened to historians who move in this direction.

Such an approach would not only find more utility among policy-makers and thus conform to the new direction among urban historians, but also would provide a suitable point for launching comparative studies. One of the major objectives of the Guich conference was to compare the urban experience in Canada and the United States, or as succinctly stated in the brochure to determine 'to what extent does the border make a difference?' This proved the most difficult conference goal to attain: commentators struggled to relate themes that often vaguely fitted together; or wisely decided, as Patricia Hoy did in the session on 'Urban Utilities and Services', that three excellent papers could stand on their own merits without having to establish historical links that did not exist. (13) Presenting these problems does not constitute an indictment of comparative urban studies. Nor do I mean to suggest that attempts of this kind should be abandoned. Like public urban history, it is worth the risk. Yet, the discussion in many sessions revealed the difficulty of lining up papers in a comparative framework based on working titles and one page abstracts. The comparative analysis might have worked better if the research and writing was done by one person, but even then no substitute exists for imagination and wide-ranging conceptualization - ingredients not found in those required for any good historical monograph. The fact that you need greater doses of these ingredients for comparative urban history makes it more difficult, not qualitatively different from the rest of the profession. And however simplistic it may seem, it is not comparative analysis per se, but how and why the comparison is made which determines the quality of the outcome.
There may be one subject area where comparisons are likely to consistently enlighten the discussion; that is, in an analysis of planning history. Here you have a ready-made comparison found in the archives where a rich international dialogue has existed since the time of nineteenth-century utopian socialists (and even before as the colonial New England towns may be seen as products of European ideas and American environmental conditions).

At the Guelph conference, one of the liveliest sessions was 'Planning Resource-Based Communities' where Oiva Saarinen and John Gardner compared the history of single enterprises (of what in the United States are commonly referred to as company-towns). With common historical roots and economic goals, these unique communities provide an excellent historical laboratory for comparing the Canadian-American urban experience. Although virtually absent from the conference (except for the session on Canadian Provincial Planning Legislation, which ironically was one of the few without an comparative framework), the noted twentieth-century planner Thomas Adams provides an excellent opportunity for exploring planning history in Great Britain, Canada and the United States. Adams began his career in 1904 as secretary of the English Garden Cities Association; then in 1914 moved across the Atlantic to work as Town Planning Advisor to the Canadian Commission of Conservation; and reached the apex of his career as the Director of the Russell Sage Foundation's Regional Plan of New York between 1922 and 1932. Throughout his transcontinental career, Adams maintained a constant dialogue with other planning theorists and practitioners; his life's work intersected with that of Ebenezer Howard, Raymond Unwin, Lewis Mumford, Catherine Bauer, Frederic A. Delano and many others.

It is within the professional planning community, whether in the 1930s or 1960s, that a comparative analysis holds the greatest promise simply because the comparison is found within the historical record and not imposed on the past as 'afterfacts' by the historian. International research may prove as fruitful in studies on the cultural and social history of architecture since here again we are dealing with intellectual cross-currents and even a transnational language that forms an integral part of the development of architecture as both artistry and the physical embodiment of social ideals. Comparisons in ethnicity, demography and other historical elements popular within the profession during the late 1960s will prove, I believe, much less productive. The variables are too numerous, research requirements too broad and the linkages too vague for consistently insightful conclusions. The same may be true of historical works that interpret the differences in urban form and values as an expression of cultural preference.

The most provocative session at the conference was one appropriately titled 'Comparing Recent Canadian-American Urban Development'. Here presenters John Morier and Michael A. Goldberg posited the intriguing hypothesis that the differences in the Canadian-American urban experience could be best understood by comparing the value structure upon which the constitution of each nation was built: 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness' for the United States; 'life, liberty and security' for Canada. A tour of Toronto during the last day of the conference lent credence to this argument. The city's efficiency and tidiness contrast vividly with the chaos and decay found in urban centres south of the border. Yet, how are we to account for class and racial differences within this sweeping generalization? And are we to assume that these national values are eternal and therefore outside the forces of historical change? The very boldness of the idea makes it intriguing but to assign a shorthand cultural description to a nation of 25 million like Canada or 225 million like the United States may unjustifiably level the broad range of regional and social differences found within each nation. Toronto may be different from New York City but their points of similarity—despite the international border between them—may be greater than the similarities between New York City and Houston, or Los Angeles. This cultural preference approach may fall prey to the same problems that plague American studies of cultural history programs. The broad generalizations about national character, starting at first, lose their glimmer upon close scrutiny and often cannot withstand the inspection of scholarly analysis.

Whether urban history? was the opening statement in a recent article evaluating trends within the field. Whether intended or not, the double-header suggests a sharp black comedy quality for a historical profession suffering from declining student enrollments and an ageing faculty. (At least in the United States, where denying younger faculty members tenure, not buying out those approaching retirement, has been the common practice for reducing faculty size.) Yet, the Guelph conference displayed a vitality and diversity that indicated a healthy intellectual field for the subfield of urban history, which enjoys certain distinct advantages over more traditional historical inquiries. It is a relatively new field where much of the intellectual terrain awaits exploration and cultivation. Other disciplines, notably urban geographers, planners and sociologists have a direct interest not only in reviewing the historical literature, but also in contributing to an understanding of the urban past. Urban studies also have a direct public applicability both in terms of citizen interest in housing and community development, and the perspective it can provide on contemporary urban policy.

But whether urban historians nurture these advantages — and to what end — remains to be seen.

To view urbanization as a unique process, which has been a central question within the internal professional debate since the 1940s, will divorce the city from the political and economic forces that have given the urban environment its physical and social form. It leads to the assumption that urbanization is a natural process, although ironically manmade, which moves outside the forces of the political economy. Urbanism, as David Harvey has noted, is not an end in itself; rather it provides a vantage point from which to capture some salient features in the social processes operating in society as a whole — it becomes, as it were, a mirror in which other aspects of society can be reflected! Or to paraphrase Manuel Castells, the city is a stage where social classes and forces determine how urban resources are divided.

If urban historians choose to view the city in other ways then they will do a disservice to both the public and policymakers, as well as to themselves. The study of cities will not reach an intellectual col-de-sac where the inevitability of natural process will dominate the scholarly discussion as it does much of the public dialogue. The field will be flooded by narratives that describe, but fail to analyze, urban development. Or we will be left with a preservationist preoccupation of quaint historic neighbourhoods and genteel social exchanges that cast a veil over the city's historic role as an arena of social conflict.

Thus the Guelph conference revealed that the new social and urban history of the 1960s was not so much misdirected as incomplete. To see the city as a container...
where various social classes cope with a rapidly changing environment is a useful endeavour, but to complete the historical picture and analysis one must add the dimension of power, economic and political power that sets the rules through which the various urban players operate. The subfield of urban history has not been completely devoid of this approach the work of Herbert Gutman, Sam Bass Warner, Jr., and most recently Alan Dawley, point in this direction; and David Harvey and Manuel Castells have studied urbanism from an explicit Marxist paradigm where politics, economics and class are inseparable from the process of urban growth. (19) There was a sense among the historians, however, that the urban history of the 1960s was now being eclipsed by the new professional concerns of this decade, as if one scholarly approach could only exist at the expense of the other. Let us hope not.

The urban history of the 1980s calls for an analysis of institutionalized urban political and economic power in all of its facets - not only as it is expressed and implemented by those who rule, but also how it is interpreted by the powerless who must live with or combat these rules. The city is both individuals and institutions that vie for a share of limited urban resources. The agenda for urban historians in the 1980s is to analyse these personalities and organizations within the context of the political economy, a direction that would encompass questions of power and authority, form and process. It would wield the concerns of urban historians of the 1960s with those of the 1980s. It would enlarge the urban arena to include all issues that fall within its boundaries and transform the study of the city into an approach that embodies the social and political processes operating in the whole of society. It would combine questions of theory with history's greatest asset - narrative, empirical studies. The agenda is an imposing one, but if urban history is to fulfill its promise, the process must begin under these assumptions. Although the conference at Guelph did not do so explicitly, its disparate components called for such an intellectual scaffolding. Indeed, the variety found in urban historical studies could prove its greatest asset, instead of its most discussed liability. (20)

DANIEL SCHAFER
Historian
Tennessee Valley Authority

For a complete listing of the participants and papers, see the conference brochure 'Canadian-American Urban Development: A Comparative Urban History Conference', University of Guelph, Ontario.

The term "bottom up" is derived from Jesse Lemisch, 'The American Revolution Seen from the Bottom Up', in Barton J. Bernstein (ed.) Toward a New Past: Emerging Essays in American History (N.Y., 1958). Although applied to his analysis of the American Revolution, the term soon became associated with the full sweep of new social history monographs produced during the 1960s.

3. Discussions on the nature of American urban history are almost as voluminous as the topical monographs themselves. For the earliest discussions on urban history's methodology and approach, see William Diamond, 'On the Dangers of an Interpretation of History', in Eric Goldman (ed.) Methodology and Interpretation of American History in Honor of W. Hall Silver (Baltimore, 1941). This was Diamond's influential critique of Arthur Schlesinger Jr.'s path-breaking article, 'The City in American History', Mississippi Valley Historical Review (June 1940). For the past twenty years, Eric F. Lampard has been a trenchant observer of trends in urban history, forcing urban historians to lift their heads from the archives and to think about where they are going.
Meetings and Conferences

URBAN MORPHOLOGY AND URBAN DESIGN

An eclectic group of nearly forty historical geographers, architects, planners and historians of various persuasions gathered at Lake Hall in the University of Birmingham for the summer meeting of the I.B.G. Urban Geography Study Group on 5-6 July 1982. The growing literature of English urban morphological studies of the past twenty years has recently come to the attention of urban designers in Britain whose approaches have until now been dominated by the artistic/townscape approach of authors such as Thomas Sharp and Gordon Cullen, and the behavioural tradition of Kevin Lynch, Donald Appleyard and Jane Jacobs. This interest of planners and architects in urban morphology springs from an appreciation that the practice of urban design in other parts of Europe, particularly in Italy, France and Belgium, has a different and much more 'morphological' basis. The conference was intended to explore the links, parallels and divides between these two morphological approaches and pre-circulated papers ensured that a substantial amount of time was given over to discussion.

The conference opened with two papers by George Gordon (Strathclyde) and Tony Sutcliffe (Sheffield) which presented an outline of the geographical and historical contributions to urban morphological studies.

Michael Conzen (Chicago) presented a preliminary outline of his investigation into the morphology of the North American city before 1914. The study concentrated upon the cities of Boston and Omaha. Boston is the most irregular city in the US in terms of its plan and has a developmental history of more than three centuries before 1914. By contrast Omaha was founded only in 1854 and was subject to a period of explosive growth reaching a population of 100,000 in only 37 years.

Three papers followed on urban conservation which served to raise many of the issues with which the conference was concerned in practical form. David Lowenthal (UCL) discussed the necessary balance between preservation and change in urban conservation; Deryck Holdsworth (Toronto) gave an eloquent demonstration of the way in which physical conservation in late nineteenth century areas of Toronto had intensified 'gentrification' of these areas to the detriment of their social conservation, and Robert Fennell (Chichester District Council) analysed the effects of a planning scheme in the northwest sector of Chichester city centre upon its morphology and townscape.

A group of papers from staff and students of the Oxford Polytechnic Joint Centre for Urban Design introduced participants to the morphological interests of planners and architects. Georgia Green-Butina detailed a research methodology for studying the development of urban form in an urban design context, applying the method to a number of Yugoslavian historic cities. David Whiteman described recent developments in the techniques of housing-quality surveys and how these could be applied in historic towns, and Ivor Samuels summarised the work of a school of urban design architects in Italy who are largely unknown in the English-speaking world. Italy has consistently ignored the townscape techniques of English practitioners.
with its emphasis on facadism and instead has followed the ideas of the 'Scuola Muratoriana', a group of architects trained in Venice under the late Saverio Muratori in the 1950s.

The conference concluded with two papers by Jeff Bishop (Bristol) and Brian Goodey (Oxford Polytechnic). Bishop described the results of recent research into the divergent perceptions of residents and professional architects and planners as to the urban design of Milton Keynes. Whereas the designers were convinced that divergence from the Master Plan had resulted in a poorer town, the residents conceived Milton Keynes as a series of discrete and highly incoherent villages which worked out standingly well. Goodey explored the possibilities of bringing the geographical techniques of plan analysis into compatibility with the requirements of urban design and of how people experience the plans of places in which they live and work. It was agreed that urban morphology was not yet able to tell planners and architects how to exercise a socially responsible design service to the community but that the need was pressing as ever since historic towns were full of the visiting cards of individual architects passing through. The conference had opened new and useful contacts and all agreed that these should be maintained.

TERRY SLATER
University of Birmingham

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF IRISH PLANNING

Planning history in Ireland is alive and well. Despite a small Group membership there, this must be the conclusion from the Dublin Conference which took place in September 1982. Dr Michael Bannom had brought together a clutch of good papers and is to be congratulated for making the overall arrangements, so satisfactorily faced with typical Irish hospitality. The following notes do not pretend to be an adequate summary of all that transpired, merely a brief indication of the main thrust of the papers and a reminder of the ground covered. Copies of individual papers may be obtained from Dr Bannom at the cost of copying and surface mail.

Dr Arnold Hornor began by describing the main features of urban growth in the Dublin region since the late 19th century, referring particularly to population change, and the expansion of the built-up area. Against this background he examined some of the main features of planning during the same period, commenting on trends, problems and themes in the development of the Dublin city region. He noted the great length of time which may elapse between the emergence of an idea and its acceptance and implementation. It took 50 years for the administrative reforms advocated in 1881 to be put into effect. It took 20 years after the first regional planning legislation before a regional plan was actually commissioned. Twenty years elapsed after the housing enquiry of 1914 before any appreciable campaign was mounted to tackle the housing problem. Abercrombie's plan was prepared in 1914, but a city planning section was not established until over 20 years later. Similar observations could not doubt be offered in respect of the planning of most cities, and Dublin seems to be no exception. During this long lead time Dublin is also characterised by a continuing conflict between the central city and its periphery. In 1880 the struggle was between Dublin Corporation and the vested interests in the townships which surrounded it. Even today there is sharp opposition between the Corporation and the County Council. The nature of the institutional framework for city planning was to emerge on a number of occasions during the Conference as a major constraint.

Dr Mary Daly examined housing conditions in Dublin between 1880-1920, and described the genesis of housing reform. She remarked that the administrative structure and the financial basis for city housing policy at that time was virtually identical with that in England and Wales; the impetus behind philanthropic housing schemes was also similar. However, Dublin's socio-economic structure then differed considerably from most British cities, and its local administration concentrated on the assertion of Ireland's right to self-determination at the expense of local municipal interests. This provides an important context for the evaluation of the Dublin housing question. Of the existence of a serious housing problem there can be no doubt: the city's occupation and income structure was the basis of both poor housing and ill-health. Yet until 1913/14 there was little evidence of urgency, either from the general public or the Corporation, or from the Corporation, or for housing reform. This lack of political commitment contrasts markedly with the attention given to the social and economic problems of rural Ireland. Irish cities were politically weak, and even the Roman Catholic clergy gave more attention to the land question than bad urban housing. Dr Daly's paper is a high quality one, and was delivered with great panache.

Another paper on Dublin housing was given by Fred Aalen, who described the working class housing movement in the city between the mid 19th century and 1920, and again a paper going into great detail which repays close reading. It gives a very thorough examination of the problems of the Dublin Artisans' Dwellings Company, the Inverness Trust and other associations, together with the contributions of Dublin Corporation in its housing estates between 1883 and 1913. Aalen broadly confirms Mary Daly's thesis, namely that the urban housing problem did not become an important political issue until the eve of the First World War, when it was to find a place in Nationalist political campaigns.

Dublin's poor environmental conditions were repeated elsewhere, and Michael Gough's paper examined socio-economic conditions and the genesis of planning in Cork. At the end of the last century Cork faced the most serious problems of unsatisfactory housing and sanitary conditions, confirmed by alarming statistics of fatal contagious diseases. Unemployment was high and abject poverty widespread. These shadows extended deep into the 20th century. The principal slum areas were not cleared before the 1930s and 1940s, and were not redeveloped until the 1960s. There was a continued reluctance to build in the low-lying parts of the city, and a continued aversion to high density living has meant that even today the only scheme of four-storey flats in Cork city and no tower blocks of any kind. The fear of disease haunted Cork for many years and has coloured official housing and planning policy to the present day.

The Conference then turned its attention to influences on planning and related development from outside Ireland. Dr Mervyn Miller, in a typically authoritative paper, reminded
Ken Mawhinney's paper considered the development of planning, in particular ideals, movements and initiatives formerly originated in Westminster and now reached Ireland only after a considerable time lag, or sometimes not at all. Environmental societies which developed in Britain in the '20s and '30s did not enjoy the same success in Ireland. After 1945, however, the protection of areas of scenic landscape was a theme that was taken up. What has been called that period of somnolence known as the emergency was at an end. Finally, between 1960 and 1970, ideas for the protection of physical environment gathered momentum, thus making the last decade stand in sharp contrast to the preceding years.

Turning to Northern Ireland, John Hendry considered the development of planning for housing, industry and amenity in the postwar period, looking particularly at the factors which led to the adoption of the 1963 Act. It is striking to reflect on the rudimentary nature of planning in the Province, the absence of any notable contribution to planning, and, from the outset, the dependence on British experience. Planning in Northern Ireland has been undertaken largely without the guidance of a wider national policy framework. Once again, the importance of the institutional framework is revealed: Hendry observed that the major impediment to planning in Northern Ireland was the continued failure to realise that British planning practice could only operate in the context of the British political system. To regard planning simply as a technical activity is to fail to recognise that planning is essentially a part of the political process itself.

Dr Michael Bannon, in giving the final paper, considered the changing context for Irish development planning between 1960 and 1980. Some very familiar observations unfolded: in spite of major developments, the planning legislation, the dream of an integrated hierarchy of plans has been forgotten and the grand strategy largely abandoned. There is now a growing disenchantment with all forms of planning. Some aspects of planning are viewed as disincentives rather than as catalysts to development. In the early '60s, Irish planning was inspired by the American approach with its focus on industrial development and business planning. Regional planning became a mechanism to disaggregate national plans. However, this new movement lacked any sound theoretical or philosophical base and there was little of relevance to the needs of Ireland. In this context, Bannon highlighted the experiences of the 1963 Act. Initial enthusiasm for its implementation, followed by a realisation of failure and lost opportunities, in particular the omission of any reform of administrative structures as essential for the successful implementation of planning.

All in all, this was a conference that confirmed two things: first, the close association between housing reform and the town planning movement at the turn of the century; and second the importance of the socio-political and institutional framework within which planning took root and developed. Irish planning was demanded by a range of urban and rural questions; it was stimulated, but then abandoned by Britain; finally, it has been the unintended victim of national politics.
the end of the Spanish colonial era cities and towns were focal points of the far-flung American possessions of Spain. The number of these communities is staggering. Their geographical and chronological extent covers the region from southern South America to northern New Spain, Louisiana, and Florida, and spans the course of over three centuries. Types of communities ranged from the smallest pueblos, parishes, and poblaciones to chartered cities and estancias. The geographical extent of these communities even reached the far northern frontiers of New Spain, Florida, and the Mississippi Valleys.

With all this diversity over time, space, and environment, it is remarkable that the Spanish Crown early recognized the need for some urban planning and establishment of guidelines for the location and founding of settlements, as well as regulations for living conditions among the settlers (ordinances). With an urban tradition itself dating from Roman times, Spain adopted various regulations for the establishment of settlements in America. Beginning with the well-known royal ordinances of King Philip II in 1573, these guidelines were supplemented by the Repeticion de Leyes de los regios de las Indias (1681) for the whole empire and special requirements such as the "Instructions for the Establishment of the New Villa of Picio in the Province of Sonora".

Spanish City Planning in North America is an important introduction to the study of an urban experience that has lasted more than five hundred years. It is an effort to bring together historians and urban planners, two professions often having little awareness of each other. Doris Crouch is an architectural historian; Daniel Garr is a planner and historian; and Axel Mundigo is an urban sociologist in Mexico City. Each brings a special expertise to the part he or she has written, but as expected each reflects limitations of his or her field and area of specialization.

The apparent thesis of the work, as stated in the overview, is that Renaissance principles of legal, social, and physical order through hierarchical organization were essential for the expansion and stability of the Spanish empire. Spanish communities responded to the needs of the conquests and diversity of settlements, but order and predictability were necessary for both settlers and the Spanish Crown. While this seems to be the central thrust of Mundigo's examination of the royal ordinances of Philip II, it is less so with the three city examples of Crouch and Garr, and is hardly evident in Garr's study of Alta California.

There are three major parts within the text. The first is an intensive study of and commentary upon the royal ordinances of Philip II, treating city planning, site selection, and political organization in a group of ordinances (148 in all) that is called the "most complete such set of instructions ever issued for the founding and building of towns in the Americas. . . ." (p.2). Mundigo, with Crouch's assistance, provides the reader with background concerning Maria Nussi's articles from the Hispanic American Historical Review (1921-2), corrects minor errors of that work which dealt with only the first 109 ordinances, and then extends beyond that to cover the entire 148 ordinances in summary form. The translation is based upon a Mexican reprint of the original manuscript in Spain's Archivo General de Indias, which the author also examined. It is his conclusion that these ordinances were based upon Roman principles, especially the ideas of Vitruvius including the grid system of city planning. Mundigo is well aware of the fact that these ordinances served only as guidelines since Spanish communities varied from one to another. However, he seems unaware of the dynamic, ever-changing nature of New Spain's social structure in the colonial period, as noted by Lyle McAllister and other historians.

In the second part authors Crouch and Garr examine three cities established by Spain in the present United States: Santa Fe, St. Louis, and Los Angeles. They contend that since all three were founded after Philip II's royal ordinances, the communities reveal in physical form the influence of the city planning provisions of the "Laws of the Indies" by looking at how each city corresponded to and differed from the ordinances themselves. Certainly the traces are very faint in the St. Louis example and the reader wonders why the authors chose it while ignoring San Antonio, the only urban community north of the Rio Grande to attain "casa" (city) status. Since the portion devoted to Santa Fe is based largely upon selected secondary works and some published documents, it is the most questionable. Spanish influence "north of the Rio Grande" was not "relatively short-lived" (p.66) and there are contradictory statements concerning the founding date of Santa Fe (see page 72 and note 1, page 112, for example). Whereas the authors are familiar with monographs of the California Historical Quarterly (i.e. Harry Kelsey on the founding of Los Angeles), they have not consulted scholarship in the Nuevo Historical Review on the founding of Santa Fe, documents in the Spanish Archives of New Mexico, studies of genisas by Angelico Chavez, or urban research of New Mexico communities and presidios by Simmons, Moorhead, Adams, and others. There was no presidio in New Mexico before 1680, Mexican Indians who may have lived in Santa Fe were never called genisas, and the province was recolonized in 1693, not during Diego de Vargas's reconnaissance expedition of the previous year.

The third part of the text "Disintegration in California" deals with the planlessness of Monterey, a sketchy chapter erroneously purporting to treat "The Presidio and the Spanish Borderlands Frontier" since it examines only the California presidios, and two previously published studies of Church-State boundary disputes and population and race in Spanish California extending beyond the period of Spanish occupation. While these are informative and interesting topics and the two chapters reprinted from historical journals are soundly based upon primary sources, the reader is left wondering how all this fits into Spanish urban planning. Why didn't the author (Garr) concentrate upon the Spanish founding of the two pueblos of San Jose and Los Angeles along with the villa of Branciforte? Why were such major works as those of Winther, Chapman, Temple and Kelsey, and the unpublished M.A. thesis of Ruth Staf at the University of California ignored?

Overall the three studies presented in this book provide a contribution to-
ward an understanding of Spain's urban planning experience in America. They concentrate upon subjects too often ignored in the Spanish colonial period and bring perspectives from both historians and urban planners. The 65 illustrations of manuscripts, maps, and drawings of communities are excellent and add notably to the general value of the book. However, the work is too expensive and it is regrettable that for such a high price better editing could not have reduced the haphazard accretion of Spanish words and misrendering of Spanish names (i.e., Costans on p. 208 and p. 210; Castile on p. 46; Dominguez in many places; Lamy and Cleve Hallenbeck on p. 287; and Benavides on p. 88). Although the work serves as an introduction to the study of Spanish urban planning and an important reference on the royal ordinances of 1573, it must be read with caution and in conjunction with others on the same general topic.

This is especially necessary in view of some of the controversial sweeping generalizations that are made while ignoring the scholarship of others on the same or related topics.

ORAN L. JONES
Department of History
Purdue University

Tom Wolfe, from brakewells to our house,

'...has there ever been another place on earth where so many people of wealth and power have paid for and put up with so much architecture they detested as within thy 'blessed borders today'.'

This is a hugely entertaining book. It has much to say that is germane to the current debate on the social role of building and the crisis which has overtaken architecture on both sides of the Atlantic. Those readers who have revelled in the fun and excitement of Wolfe's earlier books will not be disappointed in this. It is an object lesson in how to enjoy writing and how to be outrageously partisan, without being boring or pompous. The flyleaf text is to the point:

'Today everyone is looking at the past fifty years of architecture with a new pair of eyes. The phenomenal Tom Wolfe is our guide back to Weimar Germany at the inception of the permissive Bauhaus school of architecture, where we meet its genius, Walter Gropius, who was crazed with 'starting from zero' his Bauhaus featured pure things, clean things and a health food diet to which only fishings of garlic could lend any 'taste.'

In fact, Wolfe is our irreverent and opinionated guide back to much more than the Bauhaus. His polemic against the foreign importations of an international style to the United States of Franklin Lloyd Wright, Sullivan and those other native born geniuses, could lead one to believe that Wolfe is some kind of freak cultural materialist. He argues in effect that the leading architects of the day were the purveyors of alien doctrines in the market place of the nation, ever ready to abandon personal vision and originality for the sake of the latest social and intellectual fashions. The central proposition is that such fashions shaped aesthetic forms at the expense of clients and the users of buildings.

He sees post-modernism as the style in good currency, the fashion of the moment. It represents no more than tactical retreat from the strict functionalism of the modern movement's doctrines. It represents an attempt to appease the critics and is further evidence of the way architects trim and whack. He is now au courant with the apocalyptic games being played by Philip Johnson on Madison Avenue than he is of Miles Van der Rohe ('Mies to the faithful') or Le Corbusier ('Corb' to the worshippers'). He has little stomach for an 'expensive summer house in the modern manner', and cannot understand why it looks like an insecticide refinery, driving the owners to the edge of sensory deprivation by the whiteness and lightness and cleanliness and bareness and sparseness of it all'. He claims 'they became desperate for an antidote such as coziness and colour'.

In a sense the book is about this widespread desperation'. Hence the title, from brakewells to our house. The demon king is Walter Gropius, the Silver Prince, 'White God No. 1', at whose feet young architects went to study. 'Some, like Philip Johnson, didn't get up until decades later', distinctly wasty'. European notions were fashionable. Yale and Harvard men cultivated the 'isms' of Europe. The inferiority complex of so many aspiring American intellectuals made them vulnerable to craft socialism, rational pretention and radical chic. The epithet 'bourgeois' meant whatever you didn't like in the lives of people above the level of hod carrier. The avant-garde with their esoteric tendencies are the target for Wolfe's barbs. He sees their problems. The architects that do not build have to declare and declaim. They have to re-educate the workers to love modern architecture. Those that build have to accommodate themselves to fashion and market conditions. Thus according to this version of the intellectual history of twentieth century architecture was Frank Lloyd Wright upsetted by the Europeans and especially that unspeakable man that thought homes were machines. The most important and undeveloped idea in the book, which with this reviewer is in sympathy, is that Wright's vision of a totally new and totally American architecture arising from the American land and the spirit of the middle west, was somehow lost in the rush to embrace the false prophets and their half-baked social theories. If Harvard was pure Bauhaus, Yale at least might have experimented. But the inspiration had to be provided by Europeans. In retrospect, the question is why?

Wolfe's flair for the fine phrase disguises the ruthlessness with which he pursues his quarry.

'... the reigning architectural style in this, the very Babylon of capitalism, became worker housing. Worker housing, as developed by a handful of architects, inside the compounds amid the rubble of Europe in the early 1920s was now pitched up high and wide, in the form of Ivy League art gallery annexes, museums for art patrons, apartments for the rich, corporate headquarters, city halls, country estates. It was made to solve every purpose, in fact, except housing for workers.'

And so to the bottom line. The Apostates, Ed Stone, Baarsmen, the real Americans - too parochial - too bourgeois; the work of Morris Lapidus or Portman; the live-wire act of Robert Venturi equally against 'bourgeois' values but for the middle-class suburbanites of Levittown. Wolfe follows Vincent Scully's estimate that Venturi had been the first to bring about change within the 'compound'. But in an important sense it was plus ça change.
And that is about it. The book's weakness is that it comes to no conclusions; it falls off with anecdotal references. It fails to confront the dilemma of an architecture that needs to re-establish its links with the quintessential America, with RLW, Saarinen, Sullivan and a handful of lesser known Americans, but also close to terms with a city structure and form which articulates the practical and social pluralism of this great continent, expressing its democratic spirit in the process. There is still no social theory worth the name, not even from Wolfe.

It is a splendid inexcuse account of a movement that has apparently run out of steam. But beneath the sophistication and the wit, there remain many unanswered questions and perhaps a sneaking suspicion that it is not too difficult to go for the jugular where architects and city planners are concerned. A book to be read, whether you are bourgeois or not.

EDGAR A. ROSE
Department of Environmental Planning and Policy Studies
University of Aston

Felix Barker and Ralph Hyde, London as it might have been. London, John Murray, 1982.

This book appears to have been written for the general reader - or at least for the serious amateur. It is a valuable and extremely entertaining reminder that there was nothing inevitable about the fabric of the city which has been bequeathed to us. Choices and decisions were almost always required in assigning functions to significant places, and making designs for important buildings. On the evidence here, we can lament that some were never taken up - why not a glass-clad Tower Bridge? We can thank our lucky stars that others never left the drawing board. As one might expect from the authors, a Keeper of Prints and Maps at the Guildhall Library and an ex-drama critic of the Evening Standard, the book is well researched, well written and handsomely illustrated. Even so, it barely scratches the surface of the wealth of meaning behind the title London as it might have been.

'Might have been' are the 'discarded designs and rejected plans lurking like unhappy ghosts behind every important building in London'. In just over 200 pages, the authors offer a selection of the last four centuries' worth. They are grouped under headings like 'Whitehall Pleasure Domes', 'Experiments to the Glory of God', 'Palaces in the Air', 'Monuments to Genius', 'Pyramids, Mausoleums, and Anti-Vampire Architecture', and the inevitably left-over category, 'The Awkward Squad'. The penultimate of these includes a scheme for a Greek-Roman Grand National Cemetery at Primrose Hill or Kilburn, Thomas Hillon's Great Pyramidal mausoleum with room for no more (and no less) than 5,197,105 dead Londoners, and the 'Scoylops of London' to receive the monuments to illustrious men, designed by Samuel Smirke and intended for the north bank of a Styxian Serpentine.

There are many, many more in less legible vein. It is no surprise that so many were architectural exercises in sucking up to the great-and-the-good. There are designs for a huge royal palace in Whitehall, and a selection is reproduced of the 97 schemes for re-building the Houses of Parliament after the fire of 1834. There is one proposal for a Thames Viaduct Railway running down the centre-line of the river and for a direct - but naturally much taller - crib of the Eiffel Tower. Building actually started and the foundations now lie somewhere beneath the sacred turf of Wembley Stadium. Among this reviewer's favourites are a marvellously apt fantasy for a West end club by the appropriately named Arthur Beresford Pite, and several examples of the works of the doughty-persistent Colonel Sir Frederick William Trench, who was in 19th century urban design what Commander Boakes is to modern by-elections. It is disappointing that the treatment of the County of London and Greater London plans in so sketchy, and is intended only to breach the fable of discarded road proposals. There is but a short summary of 'the Great Piccadilly Circus Rumpus', arguably a prototype victory for environmental protest.

Although this is all very good fun and should not be missed, the notion of a 'might have been' is a significant one to the planning historian. It raises issues which, had they been more squarely faced and expanded upon by the authors, could have lent a clearer purpose and greater coherency to the book. One such is the nature of the criteria for selecting and analysing the vast and growing number of 'might have beens'. The ULC, the London Boroughs, and private architectural practices are adding to them all the time. By definition a 'might have been' is a design that was not built, or a plan that was not adopted, but the criterion might also take account of the degree of likelihood of its being realized, the subsequent importance of any technical or design innovations it embodied, or its value to the career of the architect or planner concerned. Beresford Pite could not have been serious about his fairy-tale gentleman's club but the stir it created established him as an architect. Should the wider social and political significance of the 'might have been' be the guiding principle? All or any of these criteria and others could be used to guide discussion of London as it might have been. They could provide a more deeply satisfying basis for planning history than curiosity value alone. Whether it would turn out to be as entertaining is quite another matter.

JOHN SHEPHERD
Department of Geography
Birkbeck College, London


Surely, the authors could not have known just how timely their work would prove to be; as it was published, the air was thick with rumour about the impending dissolution - or at very least castration - of the Greater London Council. But perhaps in the larger advantage is a timeless one: this magisterial study of the thorny problem of local government reform in London, from the Municipal Corporations Act to the present day, makes startlingly clear both the permanence and the intractability of the basic political considerations. The calculations of party advantage are essentially the same in the 1880s as they are in the 1980s. Only the basic social and political geography, to which those calculations are applied, has changed.

In the 150-year period of this study, two great upheavals occurred in London local government. The first, in 1888-1901, created first the London County
Council and then the 38 Metropolitan Boroughs; the second, in 1963, replaced them by the Greater London Council and the 32 London Boroughs. Young and Garside show that in both, exactly the same political forces were at work. In the 1960s, bitter Conservative opposition to the new London Government led to a proportion of its progressive tendencies — brought about the creation of the Boroughs as counterweight. Yet in the following decade, viewing with alarm the LCC's pioneer efforts to build suburban estates for working-class voters outside its boundaries, Conservatives were already calling for a Greater London Council.

The second time around, in the 1950s, it was exactly the same Conservative body, the London Municipal Society, that reopened the whole question with a pamphlet calling for replacement of the LCC by a set of powerful boroughs covering Greater London, plus a general coordinating council. The author of that pamphlet, an ambitious if obscure politician named Enoch Powell, clearly viewed the latter as a strictly subordinate body: so did most Conservative opinion at the time of the Herbert Commission on London Local Government in 1957-60. It was a surprise, then, when a Conservative Government under Macmillan gave the GLC equal weight with the six other boroughs as a directly elected authority. The Conservatives in 1962, it seems, may rescind that error; thus does history, in London, come full circle.

The two basic questions, always intertwined, thus concern the size of the top level authority, and the relationship between it and the boroughs. Labour, particularly under Morrison in the 1930s, preferred a tightly drawn authority with plenty of direct power over areas of concern to its electorate, above all housing; thus its policy of withdrawing from out-county housing estates, like Brentford, and concentrating on high-density flat building within its own boundaries. Conservatives, in contrast, favoured an extension of the boundaries (though their enthusiasm on this count tended to come in bursts) and strong borough control, above all on housing. Thus the GLC under the Conservatives pursued a strategy of a no-go area for public housing in the outer boroughs.

The final irony in this story concerns the boundaries drawn in 1963. Because of political pressure from powerful interests in Surrey and Hertfordshire the GLC area was cut back in comparison with the original proposals of the Herbert Commission. Thus, instead of the permanent Conservative majority that had been the original dream, there was a delicate political balance that in practice has produced a change of control at every election. And, in the process, several outer London boroughs have become solid areas of Labour support. It is just this new balance that evidently now so alarms Conservative ministers.

There is an unresolved question. What, logically, would take the place of the GLC? The book provides an unambiguous answer: an indirectly elected authority, with very restricted powers (fire engines, refuse disposal, roads) covering a wider area than the present GLC. But even this, on past form, would meet a lot of opposition from Conservative interests in the Home Counties, as well as a Labour storm. Anyone with an interest in the future of London government should immediately read this scholarly, intelligent and genuinely enthralling account of its past.

PETER HALL  
Department of Geography  
University of Reading


The Egyptian Revival has received much attention of late. James Stevens Curl's The Egyptian Revival is the third study on the subject to appear in the last four years. (The others were Richard A. Parkinson: The Egyptian Revival in Britain, 1830-1868, published in 1978 and Peter A. Clayton's recent work on The Revival of Ancient Egypt: Artists and Antiquaries in the Nineteenth Century.)

To a greater or lesser extent all these works owe a debt to Percier and Fontaine's pioneering essay on the Egyptian Revival, but only Dr Curl has attempted to flesh out fully their skeletal framework in the Architectural Review of 1956.

Dr Curl's new study is the most comprehensive account of the Egyptian Revival to appear in print so far. In this work he traces the history of the revival from the period of the Roman Empire through to the present. Unlike most earlier accounts, he illustrates how Egyptianism gained ground at various points in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In particular, he explores the Egyptianising elements in Art Deco and in more recent design work.

It is one of the special features of this book that it covers theatre design and the decorative arts as well as art and architecture. Dr Curl is altogether too modest when claiming that his book is merely 'an introductory study of a recurring theme in the history of taste'. This is a thoroughly researched and wide-ranging work that draws on an impressive range of sources. It is slightly marred, however, by a certain repetitiveness and by a tendency to move from the speculative 'say' to the authoritative 'must' when tracing possible influences, connections and visual sources.

A work of such immense scope is bound to leave the specialist in one field or another slightly disconsolate. The Egyptian Revival is essentially about the recurrent but partial use of Egyptian or Egyptianising motifs by artists, architects and designers, and consequently is of relatively limited use to the historian of planning.

There are a number of references to civic design schemes, such as those of Sixtus V for Rome and Valadier's remodelling of the Plaza del Popolo, and to unfilled projects like Filarete's plans for Sforzinda and Sir Frank Baines' 1920 National War Memorial Plan for Hyde Park Corner — but these references are few and far between.

Although Dr Curl's book lacks the sharpness of focus which Professor Carroli brought to his study of the shorter period of 1830 to 1858 in America, architectural and design historians will find a rich quarry in this well-illustrated work — especially in view of its substantial and impressive bibliography. They may, however, baulk at the price.

MICHAEL HARRISON
School of History of Art
Complementary Studies
City of Birmingham Polytechnic

Publications

It is beyond the scope of PM to provide a comprehensive abstracting service, but it is the aim to provide abstracts or brief comments on a selection of publications falling wholly or in part within the field
of planning history. To be of value, this section of the book will depend on readers keeping an eye out for these publications, and letting the editor know of them.


In the Walter Gratwick Memorial Lecture, given in 1978 at the Science Museum in London, the author commemorated the centenary of electric traction by emphasizing the importance of the electric tram in the general and social and economic activity in a traditional conurbation and the new towns of Regional problems and policy in Britain: a case for reappraisal, PETER LANEGICK

The report traces the changing patterns of fuel consumption and energy use in relation to levels and distribution of major urban activities between 1951 and 1974 in the West Midlands Standard Region of the UK, focussed on the central conurbation and the new towns of Telford and Redditch. The aim was to discover whether there were simple, measurable and useful relationships between energy consumption and levels of social and economic activity in a developed society, and whether such relationships might be relevant to the regional resource planning process.

Develop Environment, Vol. 7 (2), 1981. THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANNING HISTORY.

Planning history has been around for as long as there has been planning. Like all great makers of the future, C. S. Evans and Abercrombie had a refined awareness of the past. As guest editor of this special issue of Develop Environment, ANTHONY SUCTILFFE has brought together six papers which serve to illustrate the new wave of self-conscious planning history. These are:

Looking forward JAMES READ
The legacy of Sir Corbusier and highrise housing, ALEXI FERNSTER MARKOT
Interwar Britain: a study of government spending, planning, and uneven economic development, STEVENS WARD
The history of planning methodology: a preliminary sketch, M. J. BRANDRETH and P. W. J. BATEY
British planning policy: three historical perspectives, R. J. MARSHALL and I. MASSER
Regional problems and policy in Britain: a case for reappraisal, PETER LANEGICK

In addition to the editor's introduction, 'Why planning history?', ALISON RAVETZ reviews the trilogy of planning histories published by Mansell in 1980.

Modern industrial cities: history, policy and survival, edited by BRUCE M. STAVE

The volume brings together the papers given at a conference on 'The dynamics of modern industrial cities: comparative perspectives on order and disorder'. Together with extensive commentaries, they are organized under the headings of the role of family and neighbourhood; class tension and the mechanisms of social control; the economy of cities; the survival of commercial centres; and the problems of the old city. The papers are written by well-known authors and the volume will be of interest to both scholars and policy makers concerned with industrial cities. Two papers have previously been published in the Journal of Urban History, namely: 'The street in the structure and life of the city: reflections on twentieth-century London and Paris' by Francis Beddard and Anthony Suctiliffs, and an essay on 'cultural activity in nineteenth-century France' by Lutz Niethammer.

PETER J. HUGILL, Good roads and the automobile in the United States, 1880-1929, (Geographical Review, 72(3), 1982, pp. 327-49)

The automobile, good roads and automobile-oriented culture pervaded American life by 1929. No part of American life was untouched. The paper outlines the major technical and socioeconomic elements that brought about this change.

Introduction of the foreign building line system and understanding of its functions, TORIFUSA ISHIIDA and TAKAYUKI IKEEDA, Gogo Tsukitenku (Comprehensive Urban Studies), 15, March 1982. (Japanese text with English abstract.)

The imposition of building or street lines followed the Urban Building Law of 1919, which was largely based on the Prussian concept of Fluchtliniengebote (Law of street lines), as enacted in 1875. The authors investigate the circumstances in which the Law of 1919 was promulgated in Japan, and the extent to which it varied from the Prussian model in failing to provide for compensation payments or compulsory purchase. The first lecture on building lines was given in Japan by a Prussian
police captain in 1886. Two years later, a full translation of the Prussian law was published by the Ministry of Home Affairs. It made little immediate impact on the thinking of Japanese planners and architects. In the years leading up to 1919, local ordinances were made, affecting the height of, and distance between, buildings. Planners, and particularly architects, found it much more difficult to comprehend the need to impose building lines ahead of urban growth and the laying out of streets.

Historical background and evaluation of the Town Planning Act 1968, YORIFUSA ISHIDA, Shokugakka (City Planning Review), 119, April 1982. (Japanese text with English abstract.)

Investigates the historical background to the Act which transferred town planning from central to local government, involved the public more closely, drew a distinction between areas of urban growth and rural preservation, and introduced a system of planning consents. In a study of the post-war period, the author describes how the need to transfer powers to the municipality was first mooted in 1949 in the author’s doctorate thesis of 1978, and that the so-called Shoup Recommendation, and in particular the so-called planning theories and ideologies that exerted so strong an influence on the planning process, namely the physical structures, site plans, and the housing-assistance programmes.


The paper examines the crucial role played by the London County Council in the development of housing policies in late Victorian England, focussing on the two distinct phases of the period of Progressive rule between 1889-1907. The policy fluctuations are examined in detail, and the status of slum clearance as a social reform is reviewed.

Notes and News

WORKING PARTY ON HISTORIC PLANNING RECORDS

After extensive correspondence between members of the Working Party and interested parties, steps are being taken to apply for a substantial grant to fund a research project to establish and record the present situation with regard to both public and private records. A discussion has taken place on the publication of a guide to records in the British Isles and soundings have been made on the possibility of reproducing historic planning records on microfilm or microfiche. Further reports on the Working Party’s progress will be given in future numbers of the Bulletin. The convenor of the Working Party is Michael Simpson, Department of History, University College, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP.

JOURNAL OF URBAN HISTORY

This journal publishes articles on a wide variety of urban history topics, including the history of planning. The Associate Editor for Britain and Europe is Michael Simpson, Department of History, University College, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, Wales. He will be pleased to receive manuscripts or suggestions for articles.

VISITORS

Dr Richard Rodger of the Department of Economic and Social History in the University of Leicester is Visiting Professor of History in the Department of History at Kansas University until August 1983. His research interests are centred on housing history and related aspects of 19th century urban development in Britain.

SEEN IN PASSING

The Kent Archives Office in Maidstone, Kent, England, received and catalogued in 1980 records deposited by the South Eastern Gas Board. These included the minute books, accounts and miscellaneous material of all the gas companies that had existed in the area of the Board up to the time of nationalisation.

Surely a cue for asking whether anyone would like to write an article on ‘Planning history and the gas works’ – or the ‘power station’ for that matter?

THOMAS OLIVER LARKIN

Dr Harlan Hague, of the Department of History, San Joaquin Delta College, Stockton, California 95207, USA, has written to say that he is working on a biography of T.O. Larkin. John Hargood edited a selection of letters entitled First and last Glimpses: Thomas Oliver Larkin and the Americanisation of California (First ed. Henry E. Huntington Library, 1962; second ed., Pacific Books, 1970) and it is possible that he might have still been working on Larkin at the time of his death. Dr Hague asks whether anyone knows whether this was so, and would be interested to hear from anyone who may
have custody of his research material.
He would be glad to receive any unpublished research notes made during the preparation of First and Last Consul.

New Members

UK
Professor Michael Barry, Department of Town Planning, SW1, King Edward VII Avenue, Cardiff CF1 1NU.
Mr G.S. Carlisle, Glenwood, Comtotn, Near Bridgend, Mid Glamorgan, South Wales CF37 9BB.
Mr Brian Cobby, 51 Ashley Close, Edgbaston, Birmingham B1 2ZL.
Professor T.H. Eikins, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton, Sussex BN1 9QH.
Mr Peter C. Gould, 407 Mansage Road, Grimsby, South Humberside DN12 9NG.

Dr Lynn Pearson, 138 Salisbury Road, Rotton Park, Birmingham B16 9HN.
Mr Keith J. Skilliter, 42 High Kingsdown, Bristol, Avon BS2 8EM.
Mr G.C. Steele, County Planning Officer, Planning Department, County Hall, Hartford, Hertfordshire SG13 8DN.
Mr A.B. Walker, Barhill Cottage, Erakine, Herefordshire P5A 6AB.
Professor U.A. Wannop, 41 Lomond Street, Holehund, Strathclyde G44 7EZ.
Dr J.A. Yelling, Department of Geography, Birkenhead College, University of London, T5-6 Gresse Street, London WIP 3PA.

Non-UK
Mr Kohei Alcasaki, 1-256, 22 Kami-Ninomiya, Hirono-ku, Osaka, Japan.
Miss J.M. Sirto, School of Architecture, University of Natal, King George V Avenue, Durban, South Africa.
Mr I.G. Bootman, 25 Sandford Avenue, South Circular Road, Dublin 8.
Ms Claire Caiffery, 90 Georgian Village, Castle Knock, Co. Dublin, Ireland.
Mr Jonathan Cooperstsmith, 9201 Fox Meadow Lane, Potomac, MD 20854, USA.
Mr John P. Beatrice, 1237 Martin Drive, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, USA.
Dr Yonifuna Ishida, 227 25-7 Me-gino, Midori-ku, Yokohama-shi, Kanagawa, Japan.
Dr Norioki Itoh, 8-17 Asahi 1-chome, Minami-ku, Hiroshima 734, Japan.
Mr Hidenobu Jinnai, 4-13-10 Koriyamagashi, Surumami-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
Mr D.E. Kellet, Resource Centre, Environmental Design, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4.
Mr Kazu Shira Yosaka, 211 1937 Megumi, Miyamae-ku, Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa-ken, Japan.
Mr Shuho Narazaki, 1-35-15 Kyodo, Setazakuro, Tokyo 156, Japan.
Mr K.L. Howlan, Brownsbarn House, Kingsclrlde, Clondalkin, Co. Dublin, Ireland.
Mr Owen F.Aircheallbigh, Planning Officer, Westminster Council, County Building, Mellingar, Co. Westmeath, Ireland.
Professor Norman Fressman, School of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1.
Ms Gill Radford, 7001 McCallum Street, Philadelphia, PA 19119, USA.
Mr Yycoi Sakurai, 152 Champole-grikugel/DAIGU 51, Takaban 3-13-5, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
Mr Peretz Wittman, Habib Street 40, Flat 2, Jewish Quarter 97500, Jerusalem, Israel.

Notes and Articles

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING IN 19th CENTURY JERUSALEM - THE TAKANOT

from the middle of the 19th century Jerusalem experienced a rapid rate of physical development, outside the old city walls, initiated by members of the different communities (Muslims, Jews and Christians). It arose from a desire to overcome such problems as poverty, overcrowding, epidemics and the deterioration of the infrastructure in the old core. (1)

Parallel to this process, the reform and political changes in the Ottoman Empire contributed to an improvement in the general and personal level of security in Palestine. Thus city walls and gates became less important, allowing for the development of new suburbs outside the old cities. The character of the new suburbs was an indication of changes in cultural norms, and a wish to modernise and improve the standard of living. At the same time, such traditional traits as the segregation on a religious, ethnic or communal basis were preserved. These features were expressed both in the general layout and architectural style of the suburbs.

Within this general process of urban growth, there was a great difference between Jewish and non-Jewish neighbourhoods in the realm of preliminary planning and character of the new Jewish neighbourhoods. A physical, economic and especially social plan for each neighbourhood was published in booklets called Takanot (By Laws, Regulations). About 80 of these books or forms of the Jewish neighbourhoods of Jerusalem have been found covering the period of the late Ottoman rule and the Mandate (1855-1948). There may be as many as 100 in existence.

In a more general framework, these plans were quite advanced compared to European and American and, no doubt, Ottoman towns of the same period in terms of physical, economic and social planning on a neighbourhood scale. (2) On the other hand, they were an innovative continuation of the legal custom of community Takanot, common in Jewish tradition since ancient times. (3)

A preliminary analysis of these Takanot raises many questions, and no doubt the topic requires a profound and extensive investigation. Among the important subjects to be investigated we might mention the sources, ideological and practical motivations for their publication, their origins and the influence of other Takanot (not always connected with the founding of neighbourhoods), in the Jewish and non-Jewish world, and the amount of idealisation they express. We might ask whether the publishing of neighbourhood books is a unique phenomenon which occurred at a certain place and time and started parallel to the emergence of the Jewish neighbourhoods from the old city walls, or are other comparable procedures to be found elsewhere?

The first step should be a chronological examination of the Takanot of this type. This could aid in examining the evolution of the thinking expressed in the published Takanot. Are any significant differences evident between different time spans, such as the Ottoman period (up to 1917) versus the Mandate period (1917-1948), or any sub-periods within the two? It would also be interesting to compare
different editions published by the same suburb or association (sometimes up to four editions). It would be possible to discover how original each Takanot was, and how far the approach adopted in one neighbourhood was copied in part or entirely by another. Was there a diffusion of ideas to other places such as Jaffa, Tiberias and also the Jewish agricultural colonies, which adopted the custom and published their own Takanot? We might cite the three regulation forms of three of the first Jewish neighbourhoods that were built outside the old city walls - Miskenot flows (A Hundred Gates, 1874), Evron Israel (The Stone of Israel, 1875) and Mishkenot Israel (Israel's Dwelling, 1876), which show a great similarity in form and content. An explanation for this may be the fact that some of the founders were the same people, but this needs to be examined more systematically.

Another line of comparison may be that of Takanot or suburbs that were built by different initiatives. Were the By Laws adopted by commercial companies selling houses to any Jewish buyer different in character and emphasis from those of public building societies or Collals (communal organisations), that were formed on the basis of country, area, or town of origin? Were the company regulations more concerned with the order of payments and physical layout, and less with social order and management?

Another question to be investigated relates to the legal and judicial validity of the regulations. Were they based on the Jewish Halakha (legal part of Jewish traditional literature)? Did they have any statutory validity in the eyes of the Ottoman rulers? Were they a substitute for the non-existence of regulatory planning under the Ottomans? We know, for example, that during the Mandate period the suburbs were registered as 'Mutual Associations', in accordance with the Cooperative Company Ordinance, published in the years 1920 and 1933. We should check the Ordinance and its influence on the regulations and the status of neighbourhoods as public bodies.

This brings us to the much wider subject of 'vision versus reality'. We might carry out a content analysis of the regulations - as reflecting certain social and physical concepts, and then examine the extent of their realisation in terms of spatial expression or in social frameworks of institutions, organizations and management.

The Takanot of the Jewish building societies and the neighbourhoods of Jerusalem are an excellent research source for the study of the exodus of residential neighbourhoods outside the old city walls. Topics of interest include reasons for leaving the old city (these are often mentioned - such as health and sanitation problems, and crowding), the purchasing of the land, land prices and previous owners, the prices of building houses of different types and standards, the rate of interest in those days, and the architectural planning (the general layout of suburbs, apartments, courtyards and public grounds and institutions).

As most of the neighbourhoods continue to exist, it is feasible, through field study, records and maps from earlier periods, to examine the extent to which the plans were realised, as well as investigating the evolution of changes and additions. They provide valuable insights into the initiators, founders and members of the different suburban frameworks.

Taking account of the history of modern town planning in Europe and America, it is apparent that such an extensive scale of neighbourhood planning (that includes physical, economic and social planning) during the second half of the 19th century, must be regarded as a most avant-garde phenomenon. My aim has been to present the reader with preliminary thoughts relating to 19th century urban and neighbourhood planning in a possibly unexpected area of the world, and to suggest comparisons with European planning of the same period.
WORK IN PROGRESS

Many members completed the questionnaires circulated with the last two issues of JSAS. The information provided is reproduced below. If you have not returned your questionnaire yet, please do so. Your reply, together with the questionnaires completed by new members of the Group, will be published later. Some members have told us that they have not filled in their forms because they are not actively engaged in planning history at the moment. It has been revealing to discover how many fall into this category.

Within each entry, 'A' represents recent publications and activities, and 'B' work in progress.

We hope readers will find the returns valuable as a guide to the activities of fellow-members, the different aspects of planning history being investigated, and an aide-memoire to recent books and papers published. Each member will draw his/ her own conclusions about how well planning history is being covered by the membership. Some might think the subject has been rather narrowly defined. If so, does this reflect the limited perception of planning history generally, or does it mean the Planning History Group has still to recruit those looking more widely at the field of planning history?

Professor Alan F.J. Artibise, Department of History, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C. V8W 2Y2, Canada.


Mr Nick Bailey. Planning Unit, Polytechnic of Central London, 35 Marylebone Road, London W1.

B1. A study of the legal, administrative and political factors affecting development control practice in South Cndon, London, from 1947 to the present. In a small part of London's central area, examines the way changes in development control practice are reflected in changes in the built form and socio-economic patterns.

Mr Philip Booth, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield, 6 Clarence Place, Sheffield S10 2TB.

A1. Development control and design quality. Six reports, Sheffield Centre for Environmental Research, 1981. (With A.K. Beer)
Mrs Christiane C. Collins, 448 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027.

A1 Presented paper, 'The Ringstrasse: boulevard, place, monument', at two-day symposium, 'Vienna since 1955'. Austrian Center, Minneapolis. (Proceedings to be published.)


B1 The involvement of Camillo Sitte (1843-1903) in the arts and crafts.


B3 Functionism in landscape planning Leberecht Minge (1881-1935).

Ms H.M.T. Conway, 115 Palewell Park, London, SW14 8JZ.


B1 The design and development of the municipal park, 1840-1880. For M.Phil./Ph.D.

Professor Doris P. Crouch, School of Architecture, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y. 12181, U.S.A.

A1 American city planning in North America, with Daniel Garb and Axel Mundigo.

A2 Creation of architecture, section of art and architecture textbook (includes city planning and cities and towns).

B1 The water system of Morgantina, Sicily, American Journal of Archaeology, (in press).

Professor J.B. Cullingworth, Department of Geography, University of Toronto, 100 St. George Street, Toronto, Canada M5S 1A1.

A1 A bibliography on rent control, Research Paper 117, University of Toronto, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, 1980.


B1 Rent control in Ontario.

B2 Land policies in Canada.

B3 Urban and regional planning in Canada.

Dr James Stevens Curl, 5 Clifton Terrace, Winchester, Hants 022 5BZ.

A1 The introduction to a facsimile edition of John Claudius Loudon's On the laying out, planting and managing of ornament, and on the improvement of landscapes, originally published in 1831. Inwood Books Ltd., 18 Fairlawn Drive, Redhill, Surrey RH1 6JN.

A2 The history, architecture and planning of the estates of the Phoenix, Company in Oliver.

B1 A British Heritage Society, 15A St. Andrews Road, Belfast BT9 6DU.


B1 Research continues on the estates of all the London Livery Companies in Ireland.

Dr Michael Outhart, Department of Town Planning, Edinburgh College of Art, Lauriston Place, Edinburgh.


B1 Book on Patrick Geddes and the Outlook Tower.


Dr Richard Dennis, Department of Geography, University College London, 26 Bedford Way, London WC1H 9AP.


B2 Research on housing trusts and 'five per cent' companies in London, 1850-1980, particularly site selection and the social characteristics of tenants (see report on conference in RMH, 4(1) 1982.

Professor Gerhard Föhl, Schinkelstrasse 1, D 51 Aachen.


B2 Research under way (research grant by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) on the history of urban development control in Germany and Italy; joint project with Professor G. Piccinato, Venice.

Dr P.L. Garside, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Salford, Salford M5 4WT.


B2 Social history of London 1750 to present. For CUP New social history of Britain editor Professor F.M.W. Thompson.

Dr S.N. Garnett, The City of Liverpool College of Higher Education, Liverpool Road, Prescot. Merseyside L34 IND.


A2 The Development of a model village, in Local History, to be published in 1983.

B1 A century of model housing: the Great Exhibition to the Festival of Britain, to be published for Design History Series, Penmbroch Press, 1983.

Mr Andrew Gibb, Department of Geography, The University, Glasgow G12 8QQ.

A1 The development of public sector housing in Glasgow. Centre for Urban and Regional
Research, University of Glasgow, Discussion Paper No.6, 1982.


B1 Housing conditions in Glasgow: 1750-1914. This will be a chapter in R.A. Caile and A. Gibb, (eds.), The experience of the working classes in Glasgow, 1750-1914. Probable publication date December 1984.


Mr John R. Gold, Department of Social Studies, Oxford Polytechnic, Headington, Oxford OX1 3BP.


B1 With reference primarily to Great Britain, a study of 20th century images of the future city. The study will show how particular constellations of imagery were developed and propagated. Considerable use is made of mass communicated material, both printed and visual, in order to (a) indicate the climate of opinion at particular times; (b) examine the views of opinion leaders; (c) study the relationship between avant-garde ideas about the future city and 'popular' culture. The primary place of publication will be the open market: twenty-century images of the future city, London, Croon Helm.

Mr Brian Gooday, 14 Queen Street, Middleton Cheney, Banbury, Oxford.

A1 Directing and reporting of Council of Europe's '21 Towns Project', a comparative study of the cultural planning process in 21 towns in 18 countries.

Reports and monographs obtainable from the Council of Europe.

B1 From September 1982 a study of the first 10 years of application of the 'Essex Design Guide' in the County of Essex, involving resident and market evaluation of private and public housing areas which, to varying degrees, have adopted the 'Design Guide' approach.

Mr P.C. Gould, 407 Henneage Road, Grimsby, South Humberside DN32 9RG.


B1 Back to Nature Ideas in the Clarion Movement.

Dr F. Gray, CCF, EHR, University of Sussex, Brighton, BN1 9AR.

A1 An examination of land use and planning in the Crawley area of West Sussex, particularly concentrating on the origins and implementation of the Crawley New Town planning proposals.

Mr Derek S. Gunby, 2 Dale End, Danby, Whitby, North Yorkshire YO21 2JH.


Mr Dennis Hardy, Middlesex Polytechnic, Queensway, Enfield, Middlesex EN3 4SF.


A2 Plots of freedom, Wills Bookscopics, forthcoming publication 1982. (Joint authorship with Colin Ward)

B1 Historical Adviser for BBC Radio series, 'Utopias' (1982).

B2 Completion of manuscript, A bridge for all the legacy of a workshift landscape for publication as a book by Mansell-Alexandrine Press. (Joint authorship with Colin Ward)

B3 Visit to United States to investigate comparative plotland developments in the U.S.

B4 Further articles arising from SSRC research project, 'The development of plotlands in South-East England'.
Professor Carol H. Kinsey, Fine Arts Department, 103 Main Building, New York University, Washington Square, New York N.Y. 10003.


A3 First Vice-President, Society of Architectural Historians, USA.

A4 Book: Synagogues of Europe: architecture and history.

A5 Preliminary work on a proposed exhibition on relations in architecture and city planning in New York and Chicago, mid-19th century to the present.

Mr Brian Ladd, Department of History, Yale University, Box 2116, Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.

B1 I am beginning work on a dissertation on reform movements in selected German cities during the Imperial era (1871-1914), insofar as they sought relief in city government and hence became (or failed to become) components of the comprehensive city planning whose origins are traced to this period. This would include traffic planning, public health, housing and aesthetic reform. My interest is above all in intellectual history and therefore in the various attitudes toward the city and urbanisation.

Professor Andrew Leos, Rutgers University, Camden, New Jersey 08102.

B1 The city in European and American thought, 1820-1945.

Mr Mark Long, Department of Civic Design, University of Liverpool, Aberscromby Square, P.O. Box 147, Liverpool L69 3RS.


B1 Ph.D. - 'Modernisation' of the planning process in the 1960s: a survey and a case study. The historical survey has given rise to one paper: 'Town planning and political agreement in the 1940s, mineo, 1982. The work will describe the particular alliance of political and professional forces that pushed for a 'modernised' planning process in the 1960s, and the development of a methodology appropriate to the task. The case study will follow this movement in the context of a midlands/northern industrial town (Coventry?).

Professor John Muller, Department of Town & Regional Planning, University of Witwatersrand, 1 Jan Smuts Avenue, Johannesburg 2006, South Africa.


B1 Field of work: social reform in urban planning theory - its application in South Africa. The work investigates the concept of social reform - taken as an incipient element of modern urban planning theory - through an analysis of reform movements which developed out of tangible concern with the conditions of deprived classes in Great Britain and America in the 19th century, and proceeds to subsequent reform-based theoretical positions during the 20th century. A comparative assessment of the above with historical and present theoretical planning stances in South Africa is made.

Professor P. J. Manolius, Ronda Oral. Mtra 921, Barcelona 17, Spain.


A2 Una introduccion a la historia urbana: Barcelona siglos X-XX. (Programa de curso 3º). (Adms on collaboration).


Dr Helen E. Moller, Department of Economic and Social History, The University, Nottingham NG7 2RD.


A3 Several articles on Patrick Geddes, including: Cities in evolution; Patrick Geddes as an international prophet of town planning before 1914, in A.R. Sutcliffe, (ed.) The rise of modern town planning 1850-1910; Patrick Geddes; in G.R. Cherry, (ed.) Planners in British planning.

B1 More work on Geddes - including a paper on his Indian reports, and a paper on his career and development in Edinburgh; completing a manuscript of book on Geddes. Collaborative project with Dr D.E.C. Eversley - to place planning concepts in their historical context. (Edward Arnold, Studies in Urban History).

Dr Stefan Muthesius, Fine Arts, UEA, Norwich NR4 7DX.


Miss Heather E. Norris, 12 Richmond Road, The Bots, Frome, Somerset.


B1 A thesis on the influence of urban defences on town-extension planning in Northern France, 1858-1914.
Mr J.L. Penny, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham, P O Box 363, Birmingham B15 2TT.

B1 The life and work of W.G. Holford; two-year research project, funded by the Leverhulme Trust. Working as research associate in the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, with Professor Gordon E. Cherry, who is in charge of the project.

B2 The British town planning movement, 1909-1939. Ph.D. in progress, under the supervision of Professor Gordon Cherry.

Professor Giorgio Piccinato, 10 via del Collegio Capranica, 00186 Roma, Italy.


A4Recent changes in the urbanization process: the case of Venetia, field research at the Dipartimento di Urbanistica (since 1982).

B2 Town planning and the construction of cities in Europe, historical research on the forms and the processes of urbanization in the urban1zation stages (19th-20th centuries), in Alan Baker and Robert Purves (eds.) 

Mr Hugh Prince, Department of Geography, University College London, 26 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AP.

A1 Currently editor of Journal of Historical Geography.


B1 The preservation, restoration and alteration of gardens in England from the sixteenth century to the present day. The research represents a broad interest in the maintenance of historic landscapes and attitudes towards the past, expressed in gardening, architecture, planning, art and literature.

Mr Graeme Purves, Department of Town and Country Planning, Edinburgh College of Art, Lauriston Place, Edinburgh EH3 9HA.

B1 I am currently in receipt of a Robert Hurd scholarship from the Saltire Society to allow me to research into the life and work of Sir Frank Hears, the pioneer Scottish planner.

Dr Alison Ravetz, 14 Rokey Gardens, Leeds LS6 3JL.

A1 Review article on the trilogy 'Planning and the Environment in the modern world' (Mansell, 1980) for Built Environment; sundry other reviews.

A2 Contribution to BSA Conference, Manchester, April 1982, on 'Space and gender'.

B1 (Early stages) book on women in the city, during the period of urbanisation.

Dr Dieter Rebentisch, Georg-Speyer-Straße 19, D-6000 Frankfurt 90, West Germany.

B1 A book which will include chapters on National-Socialist planning and "Heimgliederung". The provisional title is: German government and administration during the Second World War.

Professor Mark H. Rose, Program in Science, Technology and Society, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan 49931.


B1 I am at work on energy choices and the social-spatial development of five cities (Denver, Kansas City, Wichita, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City), 1900-1940. I am seeking (a) to explain the role of central gas and electric utilities in facilitating the outmigration process; and (b) to explain the significance of urban change for gas and electric operations in terms of engineering and organization.

Mr A.J. Scrase, Department of Town and Country Planning, Bristol Polytechnic, St Matthew's Site, Oldbury Court Road, Fishponds, Bristol.


A2 Three articles on Wells in the county journals over the next 18 months.

A3 Institutional ownership and leasehold tenure in the city.

B1 Research on the development of the town of Wells (Somerset), in order to assess continuity hypothesis in relation to Wells and examine a town which has declined in status since the Middle Ages. It is also intended to assess the performance of existing methods of identifying and preserving the historic legacy.

Ms Elizabeth G. Sharp, 92 Coronation Avenue, East Tilbury, Essex RM18 8SW.

A1 Read paper entitled 'Land-use policy formulation and implementation in the urban fringe - the north Middlesex green belt estates, 1920-1950' at Anglo-Dutch Symposium on living conditions in remote and peri-urban areas in North West Europe, held at UEA, 2-5 September 1982, run by Rural Geography Study Group, IBG and Rural-Geografisch Overleg.

B1 Completing Ph.D. thesis (University College London) on the acquisition of the London green belt estates - a study of inter-authority relations.

Dr John Sheail, Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, Monk's Wood Experimental Station, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire PE17 2LD.


A2 Wild plants and the perception of land-use change: an historical perspective, Biological Conservation, 24, 1982, pp 129-46.


B1 Planning history and water management.
Mr M. A. Simpson, Department of History, University College, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP.

B1 Thomas Adams (full length biography)
B2 Planning in Massachusetts, 1900-1940.

Professor J.R. Smallwood, Jr., Department of History, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203, U.S.A.

A1 An American way to conservation: comments on Federal river basin development.
B1 A history of river basin development in the United States.
B2 Texas water politics.

Professor Marcel Smets, Institute of Urban and Regional Planning, Celestijnenslaan 131, B-1930 Leuven-Heverlee, Belgium.

A2 De recente stedebouwkundige geschiedschrijving in Belgie enment negentiende en twintigste eeuw (The recent urban historiography in Belgium on 19th and 20th century) B.F.G.O., 3, 1982, to be published September 1982, 37, typewriter copy (and notes) (with R. de Meyer).
B1 Guest editor of special double issue on the reconstruction of Belgian towns after the First World War to be published in *Vorm-en-Daan*, Amsterdam, November 1982, with contributions on the reconstruction of Ypres (M. Elijn), Roosloore (M. Smets, J. Maes), Leuven (P. Uttenhove), Dendermond (M. Smets, K. Verbruggen).
B2 Guest editor of special issue of *Storis urbana* on the Belgian urban historiography on 19th and 20th century to be published January 1983, with contributions by M. Smets and R. de Meyer (critical overview), G. Loe (housing in Antwerp: 19th century), M. Smets (the planning of the Rue Blaes around 1850), R. de Meyer (the planning of the Antwerp south quarter 1860-1885), P. Uttenhove (the reconstruction of Leuven: 1914-1920) and P. Lombaerde (the extension of Ostend around 1860).

Dr Roger Smith, Department of Town Planning, Trent Polytechnic, Burton Street, Nottingham.

B1 Changing planning policies in Nottingham.

Professor Anthony Sutcliffe, Department of Economic and Social History, Sheffield University, Sheffield S10 2TN.

B1 The political economy of large British cities, 1870-1914.
B2 An economic survey of the Sheffield region since 1945.

Dr Iain C. Taylor, Athabasca University, 14505-122 Avenue, Edmonton, Canada.

A1 *Edmonton/Strathcona social history project, 1880-1906. An examination of data sources available for a comprehensive urban social history.*
Dr Adrian Minnett, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Bath, Bath BA2 7AY.

1. The political economy of British town planning 1820-1920 - a study of the views and influence of economists on planning. (Part of a larger study of the interaction of utilitarianism, romanticism, and idealism in the social criticism of economists during this period.)

Dr J.A. Yelling, Department of Geography, Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1.


Assistant Professor Teresa Zarebka, 03-473 Warszawa, Szymanskiego 4 m 30.


1. Storia dell'urbanistica in Polonia (History of town planning in Poland) - text prepared for Storia urbana.

Mr B. Synchur, School of Architecture, North East London Polytechnic, Forest Road, London E17.

1. Urbanism and institutional architecture: museums, the case of Switzerland (Urbanism and institutional architecture: museums, the case of Switzerland). Ex Libris, Zurich, 1981.
2. Nineteenth century sources of Le Corbusier's planning ideas. ETH Publications, Zurich, (late 1982).