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Editorial

A trip to the capital city of a neighbouring country always provides opportunities for interesting reflections and insights. When that city is Paris, the opportunities are particularly rich for anyone interested in planning and its history. Taking a group of students on a field trip to see the city at the end of March proved even more thought provoking than usual, not least because we travelled on the day France decisively elected a new right wing government and returned on the day that British rail workers staged a one day national strike.

The actual journey, by what is still, rather quaintly, called the boat train, will soon be consigned to history when the Channel Tunnel is opened next year. Even allowing for the inevitable run down in boat train facilities on both sides of the Channel, the consequences of the French belief in investment in a publicly-owned railway system and the British obsession with short term pursuit of profits, produced starkly contrasting experiences. Paris itself is also the very model of a superb and, despite a devalued pound, cheap metropolitan transport system, far superior to anything currently found in Britain. One wonders of course whether the new government of Prime Minister Balladur, appointed on the second and third day of our visit, will be tempted to follow the road of anti-interventionism pioneered across the Channel by Mrs Thatcher. It would clearly take huge redirection of political effort to undo the all-party commitment to planning and massive public investment which has characterised post-war France under governments of all persuasions.

Visiting La Defense, the vast, bustling, off-centre office park to the west of the City of Paris proper, I was struck by the contrast between London's equally ambitious, but largely empty, Docklands office centre at Canary Wharf. La Defense was a product of planning, underpinned by massive public infrastructural investment and accompanied by tight controls of new office developments in the City of Paris. Canary Wharf by contrast was a product of the deregulated British planning system of the 1980s. A creation of the market, it failed because major new developments were allowed to proceed elsewhere in London which had eroded its initial rental advantage, especially when the recession of the early 1990s began to bite. And, quite simply, its transport links to the rest of London were woefully inadequate and depended for their improvement on contributions from developers profits that have so far failed to materialise.

There are many other lessons of the same type, but not all the insights of this Parisian trip were quite so simple. One day, having set the students working on various projects, I took myself off to the north eastern suburb of Drancy to track down a late 1930s housing scheme which had had a great impact on British planners and architects through its exciting use of a mixture of horizontal and tower blocks. Known as the Cite de la Muette, images of it appeared in many important planning, architecture and housing books published in Britain in the late 1930s and 1940s. In general the suburbs of Paris, especially this very working class part of Paris, are remarkably dreary - the other side of the coin to the charms of the central city. Yet I half expected to find this model estate of the 1930s still shining out from its unremarkable surroundings just as it had done.

And it actually did stand out, though not in the way I expected. The line of towers that had been such a striking feature had gone, as indeed had much of the rest of the cité. What I found instead was a memorial. A few years after its completion, the area had evidently become a Nazi deportation camp, whence thousands were deported to death or labour camps. These horrific events were commemorated by a sculpture, whose inscription told the stark truth, and a small railway wagon, bearing the words '40 homes'. Given the circumstances in which I came upon it, it served as a particularly poignant reminder of the inherent corruptibility of planning and design ideals.

Remote though they are from the routine of most planning activity, we can detect some echoes of this theme in the present issue of Planning History. The most explicit connection is of course with Rob Home's piece on barrack camps for unwanted people. However Stwomir Czeif's article addresses the question of how planning ventures become monuments, highlighting the critical issue of keeping faith with the original, even when it is tainted with political ideologies that have become discredited. Mike Lang's contribution gives another, less chilling, example of the diversion of ideals, William Morris' guild socialism, into warlike ends, the creation of housing for munitions workers.

Christina deMarco's biographical account of Gordon Stephenson gives a different twist, focusing on the growth and application of the ideals of an individual planner. On the whole most of his efforts survived the transition from plan to reality, but we see how they were occasionally thwarted and corrupted by
forces outside the USA, Poland, and Canada, and the collaborative efforts of the International Planning History Society, we are now able to present a truly international perspective on planning and planning history. This issue is the first in a series of special thematic issues on planning and planning history, and will be followed by others in future issues.

This investigation into our relationships with the way we plan and conduct them. We welcome the initiative of individuals to pursue such questions and to extend the frontiers of our knowledge. We expect to distribute a preliminary programme at the end of 1993. The best research proposals will be published in the full registration materials.
inquiring sessions of three related papers. The
organisers should collect a complete set of abstracts
and provide a cover statement of roughly 100 words
describing the rationale for the session.

The Jury Room
We invite practitioners to present current planning
projects or programmes across the entire profes-
sional spectrum and at every scale from great multi-
purpose regional development projects to small
neighbourhood conservation schemes. We will
organise a jury of expert critics appropriate for each
presentation. Proposals for presentation in the Jury
Room should describe the setting in which the
planning effort was mounted, the major features of
the effort, its special qualities, and its likely state in
October, 1993. Please also indicate the qualities you
would seek in a panel of jurors. We welcome ex-
pressions of interest in serving as a juror. Please
briefly describe your areas of expertise.

Two International Meetings
We are organising two small international meetings
embedded in the larger conference. The first will
deal with the ‘international trade in planning stu-
dents’ as an element in the global movement of
planning ideas: the second with the ‘design of
markets’ (particularly for land and shelter) in Eastern
Europe and the newly independent states of the
former Soviet Union. These meetings will begin on
Thursday, October 28, 1993, will be limited in enrol-
ment, and will require the pre-circulation of papers.
We welcome both formal proposals for papers for
these meetings and early informal expressions of
interest in participation. We are seeking funds that
would allow us to subsidise the travel costs of
participants.

Roundtables
We will reserve places on the programme for several
informal roundtables. We welcome the initiative of
individuals in proposing a topic or (even better)
proposing a topic plus a prospective panel to kick-
off the discussion.

Appraisals and Reappraisals
We expect to organise several roundtables discuss-
ing articles, books, reports and plans published prior
to 1974 that have attained a classic status. We
welcome suggestions for texts that merit such
reappraisal and recommendations for prospective
panelists.

We also expect to organise roundtables on work
published in 1992, that is of commanding impor-
tance. Again, we welcome your nominations of both
texts and prospective panelists.

Journal Symposia
We would like to devote one or more roundtables to
discussion of symposia published in planning
Nominations (by authors or journal editors) should be
accompanied by a copy of the symposium.

Wish List
If there are speakers outside the ACSP circle whose
participation you would like us to elicit, please
provide us with names, addresses and likely topics.
We will follow-up on your suggestions.

Thursday at ACSP
In addition to the two international and the usual
array of business meetings, we are eager to support
informal study or discussion groups on October 28.
If you would like to list such a meeting in the pro-
gramme, please briefly describe the topic you pro-
sess, the time slot you would like, and the anti-
cipated attendance.

Computer Users Group
The meeting of the Computer Users Group on
October 28 will be devoted to large scale land use
and transportation models. Early, informal expres-
sions of interest in the CUG meeting should be
addressed to Professor Stephen Putnam at the
Department of City and Regional Planning, Univer-

Students
Planning students at every level are encouraged to
attend the conference. We are particularly eager to
encourage doctoral students to apply for places on
the programme. If you are a doctoral student but are
not quite ready to give a paper, come anyway! There
is no better way to join the community of planning
scholars than to chime-in from the audience of a
session and to make new friends in the conversa-
tional circles in the corridors, at the bar, and over
meals.

Proposals and suggestions should be sent to:

Sixth International Planning History Conference
Hong Kong

Following earlier conferences by the Planning
History Group (since 1988 in Tokyo, Birmingham
(England) and Richmond (Virginia), its successor,
the International Planning History Society is prepar-
ing for a conference in Hong Kong during the last
week of June 1994. The provisional theme is ‘Town
Planning in the Colonial and Post-Colonial City’.
The call for papers will follow as soon as financial
sponsorship issues are clarified, but in the meantime
contact points are:

Dr Robert Horne
Dept of Estate Management
University of East London
Duncan House
Stratford High Street
London E15 2JB

or

Dr Kerrie MacPherson
Dept of History
University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road
Hong Kong

The City and the Cinema
Leeds, UK

This is an advance call for papers for a major confer-
cence on The City and the Cinema to be held in con-
junction with the Seventh Annual Leeds Interna-
tional Film Festival. The Festival is one of the largest
in the country and the conference is set to be a
significant feature of the Festival, as well as an
important event in its own right. It aims to attract
speakers from a wide range of academic disciplines.
In addition, a number of film directors have been
invited to speak. It is scheduled to take place over
the Friday and Saturday, 15-16th October, 1993.

The seventh Film Festival includes the following
seasons

- ‘Future Imperfect’ - urban dystopias and the
future city
- ‘Going Underground’ - hidden subcultures of the
city
- ‘Shadowland’ - the city of film noir
- ‘The city of Gold’ - the city and the country
- ‘Celebrating the city’

The conference will pick up on some of these
themes. Additional issues the conference may
broach include

- ‘The “third world” city/other non-Western views
of the city in film
- ‘Jameson, Film and the City’; an examination of
the possibility of representing the postmodern
city, drawing especially on the work of Frederic
Jameson
- ‘Women, Film and the City’

Anyone interested in submitting papers on any of
these, or indeed other themes, should contact Dave
Clarke at the address below in the first instance. It is
intended that the conference will be structured
around a small selection of these themes depending on
the interest displayed in offers of papers. Note that
the conference plans make space for a separate section
of feminist work; of course, particular approaches are
welcome on any of the above themes.

The conference papers will be published as an edited
collection early in 1994. The collection should
represent an important contribution to film theory
and urban theory alike.

Offers of papers should include a suggested title and
a brief abstract. These should be sent as soon as possible
to

Dr David Clarke
School of Geography
University of Leeds
Leeds
LS2 9JT
Tel: 0532 333303 (Direct line)
Fax: 0532 333308

Note that the

Professors Seymour J Mandelbaum
ACSP ’93
227 Meyerson Hall
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6311
USA
Telephone: (215) 898-6492
Fax: (215) 898-9731
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Advance Notice

The Planning of London 1944-94

Michael Hebbert, London School of Economics, is organising a conference on the above topic under the auspices of the International Planning History Society. It is to be held in London in April 1994.

Anyone interested should contact Michael at Department of Geography
London School of Economics
Hougham Street
London WC2A 2AE

Fuller details are contained on the flyer inserted in this issue.
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Urban Renewal in Hamburg and London - Origins, Procedures, Effects - A Structural Comparison from 1875 to 1950

Dirk Schubert, Technical University Hamburg - Harburg, Germany

Introduction

This is a short survey and an abbreviated version of a research project on a comparison of slum clearance operations in London and Hamburg. Within the scope of this work, the instruments of urban renewal developed and put into practice as early as the late 19th century are reappraised and compared on the basis of case studies in Hamburg and London. Origins, procedures and effects of urban renewal processes will be comparatively analysed in the context of the emergence and development of town planning models. The processes of urbanisation and urban growth in Germany and England and the simultaneous specialisation and functionalisation of parts of the city are taken as the background against which origins, procedures and effects of urban renewal processes will be comparatively analysed in the context of the emergence and development of town planning models. The institutionalisation of town planning as a state/municipal task, the development of know-how and the increasing professionalisation of town planners and urban developers are examined in contrast to comparable developments in the fields of civil engineering, medicine, health reform and architecture.

Urban renewal projects affect the reorganisation of urban parts and the modernisation of urban structures and living conditions. The measures of renewal are normally designed for the old towns or city centres and represent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Boundary St</td>
<td>1044 A</td>
<td>5719 P</td>
<td>H/Hy</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Südfliche Neustadt</td>
<td>4977 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Millbank</td>
<td>894 A</td>
<td>4430 P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Altstadt Nord</td>
<td>4152 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Kingsway Aldwych (parl. to Bourne Estate)</td>
<td>3700 P</td>
<td>1864 P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1918 to 1935</td>
<td>Altstadt Süd</td>
<td>2459 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Tabard Garden Estate</td>
<td>2850 P</td>
<td>H/Hy</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Nordl. Neustadt</td>
<td>520 A</td>
<td>2000 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Ossulston Estate</td>
<td>925 A</td>
<td>3300 P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Definitions

In German town planning terminology the broader term 'Stadterneuerung' has today largely replaced the term 'Sanierung'. In England the term 'Urban Renewal' adapted from American English is used analogously. The term 'Sanierung', which had been used for a long time, implied a medical origin with great emphasis on the supposedly unsound. For example the 'Handwörterbuch des Wohnungswesens' (Handbook on housing) states: 'Sanierung' means measures taken in order to improve unsound housing conditions, especially to clean or remove the so-called slums. The English term 'slums' is likely to go back to the German word 'Schlamm' and it has come to be associated in the public mind with areas, inhabited by the very poor, composed of mean streets and squalid houses.

A generally valid, precise definition of the term 'Stadterneuerung' or the English 'urban renewal' is problematic for several reasons. Urban renewal is made up of different problem fields, occasions, aims and measures of urban interventions. These include terms of 'Assanierung' (redvelopment), 'inneres Stadtentwickeln' (inner city extension), 'Gesundheitsmaßnahmen' (measures for public health), 'Durchbruchs-sanierung' (break-through redevelopment), 'Verkehrs-sanierung' (traffic redevelopment), and 'Eldersviertelsanierung' (redevelopment of slums). In England the terms were 'slum clearance', 'urban regeneration', 'urban redevelopment' and 'urban reconstruction and improvements'. In each context different emphasis was place on a physical or a social component. This definition will refer to the following aspects:

* projects initiated and planned by the municipality (institutional and instrumental dimension).
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Slum Clearance in London and Hamburg - some introductions to a comparison

The temporal delimitation of the research is given by the last two decades of the 19th century and plans for reconstruction after the Second World War. As early as the beginning of the 19th century the structural features of redevelopment areas and slums the first usage of the term in England dates back to 1812 - were described in terms of a combination of constructional and social criteria. The indices employed to characterise such areas have always been similar, even though with shifting emphasis and interpretation according to the changing historical context: high population density as a result of high-density housing and overcrowding of flats, low income of the tenants, high morbidity and mortality (above all infant mortality), frequent occurrence of all forms of social anomalies, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, prostitution. However, it is important to emphasise the relative of these criteria and their dependence on the individual historical standards, norms, living conditions and social and cultural moral concepts.

The insufficient hygienic housing conditions, the fear of epidemics ("King Cholera") and riots are reflected by a large number of contemporary publications and suggestions to act of different shades. In England London had, like Hamburg in Germany, a leading position in the implementation of redevelopment plans. The housing reform efforts, which were articulated earlier in England than in Germany, led sooner to the corresponding laws and were developed mainly on the background of the problems of industrial towns like Manchester, Glasgow, Leeds, Birmingham and London.

The development of Hamburg takes a special position within Germany. Already after the Big Fire in 1842 and with the construction of the Warehouse District gigantic redevelopment and restructuring processes were realised which at those times served as examples for other towns in the whole of Germany. A catalyst for the carrying through of redevelopment measures was the outbreak of the cholera epidemic in 1832, in which more than 8,600 people died. With preparations starting in 1892 a gigantic redevelopment work was initiated, which (with altered emphasis) was finished in the 1930s. As early as about 1900 the relevant journals made reference to the exemplary character of the redevelopment measures of Hamburg. No other town in Germany has similar achievements in the field of public health and housing provisions", wrote one of the most well-known German town-planners in 1904. 14

German-English Links

Between Germany and England and above all between Hamburg and London there existed manifold commercial and cultural relations. Already when installing the sewer system after the Big Fire in 1842 Hamburg followed the example of London. An English expert in the person of Lindley, was consulted, who was to influence town-planning in Hamburg decisively for many years. Until the end of the 19th century Hamburg was called the most "English" town of the continent. Good contacts existed and information between the two countries and towns was exchanged concerning urban development and town-planning. 15

Towards the end of the 19th century the urban growth had reached a new quality requiring increasing specialisation and functionalisation of parts of the urban area. Housing, urban construction and hygiene reform, which started in Germany in the middle of the 19th century and in England at the beginning of the 19th century, had met with a growing consensus and it was no longer confined to a few reformers. 16 By the press, specialist journals, conferences and a multitude of investigations the public had increasingly become aware of the relevance of the housing provision problems. 17

In England this discussion found its expression in legislation such as the Housing of Working Classes Act of 1894. In Germany it was evident in discussions on a Housing Act (which was not passed), in Hamburg in 1893 and 1902 in acts to support the construction of small flats. Institutional changes were caused by the setting up of the LCC 1899 in London and the Commission for the Improvement of Housing Conditions (1897) in Hamburg. Both were thereby given similar authorities concerning redeveloping measures. Social welfare was more and more accepted as a public task, which is reflected on the municipal level by expanding benefit administration.

As a port city, London was regarded as an example for Hamburg in many respects and there were manifold interrelations between England and Germany, between Hamburg and London. In 1886 Hamburg's chief planner F A Meyer hopefully compared the development of the City of Hamburg with that of London. "So the old city centre which has become open by many streets breaking through the density of buildings and by removing the resi-

Figure 1: Plan for clearance and rebuilding in Hamburg - südliche Neustadt starting about 1900.

Figure 2: Crosset Place London-Southwark 1923.

Figure 3: A slum-alley in Hamburg-Hammerbrook 1929.

The above-mentioned comments show clearly that England, which preceded all other peoples in so many questions of practical hygiene, is far ahead of us, also on the field of housing maintenance, so that we have good reason to emulate her example. However, this cannot be reached by a mere transformation of English forms to German condition, but only by starting from the local conditions and applying on them consequences resulting from the English experiences'. 19

However, the physical characteristics of the slums, and redevelopment areas are different in London and Hamburg. The dominant form of housing in London, as in other parts of England, even for the lower income groups was the small, two-storey terraced house, rented or as property, often in bad structural condition and overcrowded (often back-to-back houses), whereas in Hamburg and Germany there were normally small, overcrowded rented flats showing a significantly higher density per flat as well as on the level of urban development. 21

The Twentieth Century

After 1900 the national and international flow of information was increasingly intensified by personal contacts, visits and excursions, specialist journals and conferences. However, at these conferences emphasis was normally laid on questions of urban construction ("urban extension"), aspects of housing provision ("housing standards") and above all on the construction of new houses ("minimum standard housing"). The conference of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning in 1935, which was devoted to the redevelopment of slums and which looked at examples from Hamburg, London and other cities remained the exception. Thus experts were relatively well informed about questions of housing provision, urban construction and partly also about redevelopment projects in the
international comparison. Although the necessity of extensive redevelopment projects was emphasised, the projects which were realised were rather small in number and of minor importance.

The redevelopment projects realised in London as well as in Hamburg primarily aimed at the removal of undesirable buildings and housing and very little was done for the former tenants who normally were forced to move away. One effect of this was that after the demolition the tenants had to move into other inferior buildings where the rents were still relatively low, but thus these districts became even more crowded and the houses more dilapidated.

In 1926 the Chairman of the London County Council Housing Committee formulated the central question for all redevelopment projects: ‘Does the slum make the slum dweller, or is the slum dweller the slum? Would someone who is ‘filthy’ in one room be clean in two?’

Towards the end of the 1930s a change in trend started from redevelopment measures limited to small areas to identifying areas of redevelopment within the frame of overall urban plans. For the total urban area the districts were indicated which should be renewed on a short, medium or long-term basis. In Hamburg, classifications (similar to those of the Slum Board in London) were made on the basis of the work of sociologist Andreas Walther in a changed ideological context which combined measures of redevelopment with those of a comprehensive population ‘clean-up’. The new town-planning concepts designed to make Hamburg one of the capitals of the Fuhrer carried this approach on, although it mainly aimed at development and restructuring and the redevelopment was largely a (desired) result of these measures. Redevelopment goals were continued with the general development plans for Hamburg in 1941 and 1945.

Charles Booth in London 1889) were for the first time made on the basis of the work of sociologist Andreas Walther in a changed ideological context which combined measures of redevelopment with those of a comprehensive population ‘clean-up’. The new town-planning concepts designed to make Hamburg one of the capitals of the Fuhrer carried this approach on, although it mainly aimed at development and restructuring and the redevelopment was largely a (desired) result of these measures. Redevelopment goals were continued with the general development plans for Hamburg in 1941 and 1945.

In England the bombing of Coventry in November 1940 caused a lasting shock. London also suffered from sustained bombing. The plans for London, which were worked out afterwards, were obviously made under the impression of the effects of the bombing war. The Abercrombie-Forsah plan for London of 1943 and Abercrombie Greater London Plan which were connected with extensive ‘remedial actions’.

The Second World War and After

In England the bombing of Coventry in November 1940 caused a lasting shock. London also suffered from sustained bombing. The plans for London, which were worked out afterwards, were obviously made under the impression of the effects of the bombing war. The Abercrombie-Forsah plan for London of 1943 and Abercrombie Greater London
Planning of the following year were both based on an open and spaciously structured city and intends to reduce the building density and to resettle 1 million inhabitants within the frame of redevelopment measures. The Second World War with its bomb destruction provided a unique chance for experts to use the fear of destruction for an extensive redevelopment of towns.

From 1943 the London planning efforts were known to German planners in spite of all barriers to information flows during the war. It was taken as an important example for the town planning models in West Germany during the 1950s. The London plans of neighbourhoods were published in Hamburg as models. Despite the war, contacts among the experts were maintained. In 1981 R Hillebrecht stated in a conversation that the English occupying officers had been highly astonished about the Hamburg general development plans and their similarity to London plans. Besides these overall urban development plans with their consequences of extensive demolition, in practice however, ‘the approach of reconstructural urban renewal’ was of central importance.

In Western Germany in the early 1950s and, at the latest, from the middle of the 1950s, the focus of reconstruction shifted to the periphery. Social housing was then assigned the task of solving the problems of housing shortage, which was often effected by building large housing estates. Only after a pause of 10-15 years towards the end of the 1960s did the discussion about urban renewal come to the fore again, however, with a different character. Urban renewal was then connected to the new task of removing residential functions in the inner cities and creating space for the increasing office and business sector. Although there was not so much bombing and destruction in Britain compared to Germany, in this period new housing was often linked with redevelopment and clearance, for example in the East End of London.

**Overall Themes**

For the whole investigation period one structural problem in London and Hamburg was that the workers had to be accommodated near their work places, especially the docks. The geographical conditions and the borders of the administrative districts in Hamburg made it difficult to realise the redevelopment projects and to find new accommodation for the population affected.

In London, by contrast, redevelopment measures led to suburbanisation. Even if flats had been planned in the respective district after redevelopment, there were fewer and more expensive flats available than before, especially when redevelopment measures were connected with removing housing and creating space for the business and office sector. In London, the population was resettled in rather peripheral areas and the redevelopment project was connected to the emergence of the idea of garden cities and new towns later.
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Barrack Camps for Unwanted People: a neglected planning tradition

Robert Home, University of East London, UK

Asylum-seekers, economic migrants, and persecuted ethnic groups are news these days. Camps for unwanted people are springing up in many places, some of them used for atrocities not heard of in Europe since the Nuremberg trials. While ethnic cleansing, segregation, and special camps may not seem part of the town planning intellectual tradition (the typical planner doubtless seeing himself as safeguarding and improving the quality of community life), yet that same community may seek through the state to isolate, control and even eradicate unwanted social groups.

The terms need defining. 'Barrack' is discussed below. 'Camp' is taken here to mean a largely self-sufficient, state-run settlement, kept separate from the rest of society under a special disciplinary regime. 'Unwanted people' includes those excluded from society for reasons of state, whether as a temporary expedient or more permanently:

- criminals and political dissidents;
- prisoners of war and wartime internes;
- segregated ethnic groups;
- hostile colonial populations;
- displaced persons, refugees and other forced migrants.

A slightly wider interpretation would also include groups of workers, viz:

- armed forces;
- forced labour on estates or in special camps (eg the Soviet Gulags);
- migrant or indentured labour;
- women confined for the sexual gratification of troops (eg for the SS during the Second World War, and in the recently publicised 'rape camps' in the former Yugoslavia).

The topic is not one for the squarist, and is also large and difficult to research, with source material in many languages and cultures. Although millions of people worldwide have been, and are still being, subjected to these regimes, the physical arrangements of the camps have been little studied. The Nazi concentration camps of 1933-45 are perhaps the most extreme example: their state-sanctioned regimes of brutality and extermination have become symbols of civilised society's potentiality for barbarism. Such camps can, however, be seen as not so much a monstrous aberration, but a perverted extension of a discernible intellectual tradition.

Colonial expansionism and the First World War provided important models which were adapted in the Nazi camps. So-called 'concentration camps' were used to control hostile populations in colonial wars of the late 19th century: the Spanish in the Cuban insurrection of 1895, the Americans in the Philippines in 1898, and the British in the South African War (1900-1902). During the First World War millions of troops and munitions workers were organised and accommodated in temporary camps. In the Russian empire, both under the Tsars and (after 1917) the Bolsheviks, the Siberian forced labour camps (where an estimated 15 million people died in the Stalinist period alone) anticipated the Nazi camps in many details.

This article is offered as an initial traverse over the terrain, but addresses only certain aspects of this sombre history. The paper begins with the 19th century intellectual links with British utilitarianism, the British contribution to barrack form, and the physical layout of the Nazi camps.

The utilitarian link

Classifying and segregating social groups became a major part of European political thought during the fifty years following the end of the French Revolutionary Wars in 1815. Restored conservative governments applied new methods to controlling their populations, aided by an emerging science of society. Foucault has traced the development from the 18th century Enlightenment of systems of thought which redefined the 'power-knowledge' relationship between the state and social man, and provided much of the intellectual framework for new codes of social discipline.

After Waterloo Britain found herself not only a world industrial and maritime power, but also with a vast overseas empire to control. Utilitarianism was seeking to bring the benefits of the industrial revolution to society through 'the greatest good of the greatest number', became what has been called the largest contribution made by the English to moral and political theory. Utilitarian ideas, absorbed into government in this period, contributed to an increased regulatory role for the state over many aspects of society - classifying, segregating and controlling. The philosophy's father figure, Jeremy Bentham, devised the famous panopticon (cited by Foucault as a paradigm of disciplinary technology), which subjected prisoners to solitary confinement under an all-seeing central supervision. His ideas were applied to the isolation of groups such as criminals and lunatics for special institutional treatment in purpose-designed buildings and settlements. Some of these institutions, notably the long-stay mental hospitals, have only recently been closed under a new philosophy of community care (admittedly one driven more by cost-saving considerations than by enlightened social policy).

Utilitarianism was associated with an increasing specialisation of building forms. Olsen has identified the emergence of a 'professional building':

'After Waterloo there appeared one after another new types of building designed from the outset for a specialised function...Prior to that period, most urban buildings were amateur, ad-hoc for a variety of purposes.'

New industrialised building technologies and materials also became available for specialised and temporary buildings. Among such innovations were machine sawing of timber, mass-produced wirecut nails, cast-iron framing - and barbed wire.

Figure 1: Ebenezer Howard's plan for a system of garden cities. Source: Voigt (fn 10)

Figure 2: Plan of Bremen housing welfare institution, Germany (1936). Source: Voigt (fn 20)

There is a clear line of descent from utilitarianism to the 'father of town planning', Ebenezer Howard, and to discredited eugenic theories of social Darwinism and racial superiority. Howard's famous plan for a system of garden cities (figure 1) would have located in his version of the green belt special institutions for various groups - 'infectives', 'waifs', the insane, epileptics, convicts, etc. the blind. Voigt sees Howard's plan as isolating 'those people which the eugenists wanted to exclude from further propagation', and shows both that approach and the Benthamite panopticon applied in a Nazi housing welfare institution for the socially undesirable (figure 2).

Britain and the barrack tradition

Utilitarianism and industrialised building come together in the principal building form used incamps for unwanted people - the barrack. The form is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as 'temporary hut or cabin, esp for the use of soldiers in a siege', and is etymologically linked to the 'baracca' (quarters for slaves in transit). An early example, from the Housesteads Roman fort on Hadrian's Wall, shows how it changed over time (figure 3): the 2nd century arrangement of ten rooms (contubernia), each for eight soldiers, with a larger apartment for the centurion, became by the 4th century a row of individual small dwellings or chalets, separated by narrow alleys, and probably accommodating families or dependents.

Soldiers through the centuries have been either billeted upon civilian households, or accommodated in barracks, the latter having the advantage to military authority of segregation and greater control. The barrack seems to have developed in scale and
The design of barracks in British India was severely criticized in the mid-19th century by a Commander-in-Chief, Sir William Napier, who resigned his position because of policy differences with the civilian administration. In a book written upon his return to England, he accused the Military Board, which was responsible for housing the troops:

'Murdering Board should be its name, for directly or indirectly it causes more loss of life, more extravagance than can be described'.

One of a prominent family closely associated with political radicalism and the utilitarians, Napier based his recommendations for better barrack design upon utilitarian space standards of at least 1000 cubic feet per person:

'with less, insufferable heat and a putrid atmosphere prevails, death is the result'16

The barracks, based upon such 'scientific' principles, was adapted for the millions of indentured labourers recruited after 1845, mostly from India and China, to till the estates and mines of South Africa, the Caribbean, Fiji, Mauritius, Sri Lanka, Malaysia and elsewhere17. Government regulations covered every aspect of the indentured labourers' living and working conditions, and prescribed housing standards which derived directly from military models. Such barracks housing (variously known as 'barrack ranges', 'coolie lines' and 'hostels') typically comprised long, single-storey buildings, about 10-12 feet wide and 100-150 feet long, constructed of machine-sawn timber planking, subdivided into cubicles about 10 feet square for the workers, with a corridor or verandah down one side18.

In Trinidad, for instance, such barracks became the main form of worker housing, both on the estates and in the towns. A critic in 1888 called them 'a legacy of slavery, being little more than a modified form of the old slave barracoons':

'All noise and cooking smells pass through the open space from one end of the barrack to the other. There are no places for cooking, no latrines...Comfort, privacy and decency are impossible under such conditions...With all this, can anyone wonder at the frequent wife-murders and general demoralisation among the Indian immigrants?'19

Such approaches to regimenting and controlling whole populations were carried forward into the later stages of the British empire. As mentioned above, General Kitchener created 'concentration camps' in South Africa in 1900-2 for the families of Boer commandos, where bad water and sanitation killed about 30,000 women and children (as well as uncounted deaths in similar camps for the black Africans)20. Fifty years later, when the British returned to Malaya after the Japanese occupation to find widespread Communist sympathies among the Chinese minority population (mostly descended from indentured labourers), they devised the 'resettlement village', during the so-called 'Emergency' of 1948-56 (figure 4). Over half a million people, mostly Chinese, were forcibly resettled in 480 such villages, each enclosed by a barbed wire fence, with one or two controlled entrances. The model was soon afterward applied in South Vietnam21.

Nazi concentration camps

The most inhuman and extreme barrack camps were those created under the Third Reich in 1933-45. Millions of human beings were classified into categories such as 'life unworthy of life' (lebensunwertes Leben) or 'racially unfit to live' (rassisch nicht Lebenswerten), transferred to such camps, and then either 'exterminated through labour' (Vernichtung durch Arbeit) or by special treatment (Sonderbehandlung) in the gas chambers. The large literature on the Holocaust includes relatively little systematic work on the built environment of the...
The barracks camp influence is apparent in the plan of Dachau (figure 5). This was the first Nazi concentration camp, created within weeks of its coming to power in 1933, on the site of a former munitions factory near Munich. Jews, political prisoners, and others selected by the state, were systematically maltreated, terrorised and killed, in a testing ground for methods and staff. The camp had a simple layout, with rows of barracks, an administrative block, and communal facilities limited to a market-garden, canteen, and infirmary in which medical experiments were undertaken. The official records (acknowledged to be an undercount) registered some 200,000 prisoners there between 1933 and 1945, of whom 31,000 died.

The number of camps under the Third Reich grew rapidly after the invasion of Russia in 1941, and the existence of several thousand has now been documented. Most extreme were the Operation Reinhard camps in the forests of eastern Poland, whose physical layout makes abundantly plain their function as extermination centres. Treblinka (east of Warsaw) was typical (figure 6). The camp, enclosed with a double barbed-wire fence and watchtowers, was subdivided into two. Camp A included the railway platform, housing, office, clinic, and workshops for the Germans and Ukrainians who ran the camp, with a fenced-off area for the Jewish prisoners who served there. An open square acted as a reception area where deportees on incoming transports were taken off the train and subjected to a variety of procedures. Once stripped of clothing and possessions, they were driven naked down a narrow fenced path, called the 'tube' (Schacht), into Camp B, the extermination area. Completely fenced in and covering an area of one acre, Camp B contained gas chambers disguised as bathhouses, but with the doors kept locked. Those too weak to reach the gas chambers were sent to an infirmary (lazaret), where they were killed. Permanent staff numbered about twenty SS-120 Ukrainian guards and about 1500 prisoners who operated the extermination area; an estimated 700-900,000 Jews were murdered there.

The plan of Auschwitz-Birkenau (figure 7) shows the vast scale of the largest Nazi concentration camp. Here extermination was undertaken alongside forced labour with an exceptionally high death rate from disease. In the words of a prisoner in both Dachau and Auschwitz:

"As a clerk in both camp hospitals, I received a sharp object lesson in Dachau: we spoke of a bad day if we had to announce ten or more deaths that day. In Auschwitz, we had shifts working day and night on seven typewriters just drawing up lists of the dead."

Poles, Jews, Russian prisoners-on-duty, gays and others were brought from all over Europe. Those selected for work were tattooed (Auschwitz being the only camp to follow this practice) - 405,000 during the life of the camp (1940-45), of whom 261,000 died there. Those not selected for work (estimated at between two and four million people) were gassed immediately on arrival. The plan shows the railway platform where the selections were made, with barracks-style camps on either side, and the combined gas chambers/crematoria in a separate area within a short walk.

Conclusions

Barrack camps are an important historical phenomenon: millions of people suffered and died in them, particularly in the 20th century. Usually intended to be temporary, they often became permanent settlements, as for instance in Palestine/Israel and in Malaysia. Yet their physical form and the evolution of the ideologies behind them have been relatively under-researched. Colonial economic system from the early days of plantation slavery treated people primarily as units of labour in built environments which were dehumanning, with no provision for family or communal life. In the 19th century the application of scientific principles to social organisation, particularly utilitarianism, provided an intellectual justification for classifying, isolating and disciplining sections of society. Military barrack were among the first to be abandoned and new types to emerge at this time, benefiting from improved building technologies, and become models for housing workers from subordinate races all over the British Empire. The idea of concentration camps' to control whole populations seems to have appeared at the end of the 19th century and, as the coercive power of the state grew with two world wars, was applied in motivations, including the machinery of the Holocaust.

Note: The author would welcome further information on the physical form of such camps, especially in a colonial context.
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International Influences on Urban Design: The impact of the Aesthetics of British Guild Socialism on Yorkville Village in Camden, New Jersey

MichaeI H Lang, Rutgers University, New Jersey, USA

‘That art will make our streets as beautiful as the woods, as rearing as the mountainsides: it will be a pleasure and a rest, and not a weight upon the spirits to come from the open country into a town; every man’s house will be fair and decent, soothing to his mind and helpful to his work— all the works of man that set lives amongst and handle will be in harmony with nature, will be reasonable and beautiful: yet all will be simple and unassuming, not childish nor enervating: for as nothing of beauty and splendour that man’s mind and hand may compass shall be wanting from our public buildings, so in no private dwelling will there be any sign of cause, pomp or insolence, and every man will have his share of the best. It is a dream, you may say, of what has never been and never will be: anyhow, dream as it is, I pray you to pardon my setting it before you, for it lies at the bottom of all my work in the Decorative Arts ... help me in realising this dream, this hope.’ William Morris

Introduction

During the housing shortage occasioned by World War I the Emergency Fleet Corporation (EFC) and the United States Housing Corporation (USHC) were funded by Congress to provide emergency housing for the wage workers in the strategic shipbuilding and munitions industries in America’s industrial cities. In a major effort, some 55 housing developments (27 USHC, 28 EFC) of varying size were built by these corporations in 1918. The men placed in charge of the design aspects of these programs, F L Olmsted Jr., landscape architect, and F L Ackerman, architect, were experienced professionals who were familiar with the wide range of innovative and progressive housing and community planning approaches as practised both here and abroad. They in turn were careful to hire like-minded architects and land planners to design the individual housing projects. The involvement of this team of architects
and planners ensured that the designs for these war time housing developments were based on their professional experience with model communities, British garden cities and philanthropic housing schemes. Their efforts resulted in the production of a series of well planned and designed garden villages. Many appear to have been influenced by the so-called ‘English Free Architecture’ approach to urban design that often resulted in picturesque vernacular cottage architecture utilizing local materials and building methods creating a near open space. Many of these developments featured clustered group housing, well crafted streetscapes and town centres equipped with shops and community facilities. It could be said the best of these communities constituted the best American adaptation of the design principles and the social philosophy associated with John Ruskin and William Morris as exemplified in the work of the British architects Williams Lethaby, Philip Webb (architect of Morris’ Red House) and Frank Baines. 5

Located throughout the US, some of the more prominent examples of these garden villages include: Seaview Village, Gateway Village in Bridgeport, Corkish Village in Camden, New Jersey. These garden village communities survive to this day, often in extremely depressed inner city surroundings, testimony to the timelessness of good urban design. Indeed, they may be considered a more subtle forerunner of today’s planned neo-traditional village popularised by such architects as Krier, Dunay and Pfister.

While Ackerman and Olmsted provided the central design concepts for the programme, many of the country’s most notable architects and land planners were involved in creating the designs for the individual garden villages. Henry Wright, John Nolen, Henry V Hubbard, Arthur A Surtiff and Electus D Litchfield were notable contributors. Marcia Mead of Schenk and Mead, one of the first women’s architectural firms, designed Gateway Village in Bridgeport.

British Design Influences

Several British architects have a determining effect on the design aspects of the programme. For instance, Ackerman (Chief of Design for the Emergency Fleet Corporation) helped produce the programme guidelines, but much of its tone and direction came from Ackerman’s personal knowledge of the early British Garden City movement, the internationally renowned Hampstead Garden Suburb and the British government’s own garden village housing programme for war industry workers. Indeed, Ackerman was sent to Britain by the American Institute of Architects to visit these planned war time communities in 1917.

When in Britain, he met with some of the major British architects and town planners concerned with the application of garden city principles to the war time need for low cost housing; men such as Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker, the designers of the Letchworth (1904) and Hampstead Garden Suburb (1897). In addition, he was probably introduced to the less publicised cottage housing estates begun by the London County Council (LCC) in 1904. These estates represent an often ignored but important intellectual input to both the British garden city movement as well as the American war housing programme.

The LCC Cottage Estates

These estates were produced as a result of pressure by newly ascendant socialists and other progressives in the LCC who were concerned about scandalous conditions in London’s slums and were anxious to improve the housing conditions for the working classes. A group of idealistic young architects such as Charles Webb were given the chance to work for the LCC where they were challenged to create a new standard of community housing for the working classes. As architects of Letchworth and Webb, these young men were dedicated to developing high-quality housing for workers based on the principles of guild socialism and a modern approach to vernacular architecture, craftsmanship and building materials. All of these cottage estates, while built at rather high densities, were very successful. Beattie goes so far as to call the best of them ‘revolutionary’. 4

These LCC developments were based on powerful philosophical principles that influenced both their design and layout. Specifically, they were the product of a philosophical continuum that linked the English romantic poets, and the progressive aesthetic and social philosophy of Ruskin and Morris with the architectural theories of William Lethaby and Philip Webb. The intellectual basis of this philosophy was expressed by Ruskin in his chapter on ‘The Nature of the Gothic’ in The Stones of Venice. 5 His reasoning was based on a strong appreciation of the honest expression of the picturesque qualities of nature epitomised by the artistic achievements of the craft based medieval village community as contrasted to the sterility of monumental classical architecture built by slaves. He joined his aesthetic analysis with a developing socialist philosophy in his influential book Unto This Last which used a concept for aesthetic values in community life to mount a strong challenge to the prevailing urban squalor occasioned by free market capitalism. 6 His socialist utopia was an inclusive, guild based, hierarchical society rather than a strictly egalitarian one. Morris further developed these joint themes in the classic utopian novel of Guild Socialism: News from Nowhere. 7 It described a pastoral village where everyone was happily engaged in making beautiful handicrafts according to their individual abilities.

Webb and Lethaby took Ruskin and Morris’ aesthetic and social philosophy, and developed it into a new theory of urban design, architecture and planning. This theory developed out of an admiration for Webb and Lethaby’s actual building experience as well as classes and discussions held at the Central School for Arts and Crafts in London under Lethaby’s direction as well as Morris Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB). All the LCC architects were early members of these important associations. 8 Sometimes called ‘English Free Architecture’, this theoretical approach emphasised the avoidance of all style or artificial ornamentation; the role of the architect and planner was reduced to that of facilitator for various artisans rather than artistic superstar seeking personal identification with a particular style (this viewpoint might explain Webb’s lifelong avoidance of publicity). Instead, design was to follow an assessment of the natural conditions of the site as well as the local building traditions and materials. Ideally, the building process would be based on the medieval system; a communal process giving craftsmen of all types input into the final design. The physical result of this design approach was to appear as if it had grown up naturally on the site. Honest design could only be achieved if nature was the only true guide; an approach initially carried out by Webb’s hero, the architect William Butterfield in his village of Balderby. 9 This new design method was both respectful of local building traditions while being modern in its concern for the functional needs of the contemporary user. Today this theoretical approach to modern architecture and planning is kept alive in the work of the architect and planner, Christopher Alexander. 10

The practical results of this design approach, though short-lived, were impressive. Figures 1 and 2 show the Old Oak Estate, designed in 1911 by Barry Parker in 1913. Due to pressure from conservative elements within the LCC, it was built to a high density and with rather cramped accommodations, however, its external appearance is striking in its provision of village scale views and vistas. The use of varied setbacks, enclosure and traditional architectural details helped to evoke an environment of picturesque domestic tranquility absent in the working class sections of major industrial cities of the day. Beattie has remarked on the direct linkage to Webb. The character of the Fitzheal Street quadrangle, with its tiled roofs and hipped dormers, owes as much to the architecture of Philip Webb and the English vernacular tradition as to Unwin’s theory and example. In their single largest commission to this date the ideals the architects of the LCC continued to avoid the quiescence of expression and cloying sentimentality that constantly threatened the garden suburb ideal and did not leave even Hampstead Garden Suburb unscathed. Combining inventiveness with austerity in its design and breadth with intimacy in its planning, the Old Oak Estate is, perhaps, the LCC’s finest contribution to the revival of English domestic architecture. 11

Figure 1: Old Oak Estate. The pre-war section is to the west of the railway line. (Source: LCC, 1937).

Figure 2: Part of the Old Oak Estate, built in 1913.
British War Housing Estates

The LCC cottage housing estates were an important precursor to the larger programme developed a few years later by the central government in order to house munitions workers. Two prominent architects were in charge of this programme: Raymond Unwin and Frank Baines.

Unwin, architect of the garden city of Letchworth as well as Hampstead Garden Suburb was initially allied with the Morris-Webb approach to design. As head of the Housing Branch at the Ministry of Munitions he designed the communities of Gretna and Eastriggs in 1915. These communities were good examples of the art of garden city planning. However, their design reflects a break with Unwin’s earlier use of picturesque vernacular design idioms in favour of a simplified architectural approach set within a formal rectilinear layout as can be seen in Figures 3-4. One visitor to the new development was quoted as saying that the overall effect of the estate was dreary and repetitive, while Swenarton describes the architecture as having a ‘brick box’ effect.

Unwin’s impulse towards a simplification resulted from diverse influences. As early as 1903 in The Art of Building a Home Unwin was arguing in favour of simplification and against the application of the artificial picturesque elements which he felt had been abused by builders of suburban villas. To some extent, his attitude may have been influenced by the strong anti-picturesque campaign mounted by Liverpool University Professors Reilly, Adshead and Abercrombie who championed a return to a design approach based on the simplicity and formalism of Georgian architecture. Also important was Unwin’s involvement with the Fabian socialists. The Fabians approached socialism from a social science based, administrative perspective and rejected the aura of community based, medieval romanticism they associated with the guild socialism of Ruskin, Morris and Webb. After the war Unwin was put in charge of developing a national housing policy that would favour simplified cottage design over a more individualistic or picturesque approach. The result was the development of the successful, if uninspired, interwar council housing estate known to all British citizens.

Morris and Webb. After the war Unwin was put in charge of developing a national housing policy that would favour simplified cottage design over a more individualistic or picturesque approach. The result was the development of the successful, if uninspired, interwar council housing estate known to all British citizens.

Figure 3: Part of the Development at Gretna. The northern part of the site includes the permanent buildings, including houses and community facilities. (Source: Whitaker)

Figure 4: Examples of dwellings at Eastriggs showing permanent cottages and cottage shells used as hostels. (Source: Whitaker)

Figure 6: Housing types at Well Hall. (Source: The Builder)

Baines took a different approach in the war communities of Roe Green and Well Hall which he designed for the Office of Works in 1915. These communities reflected a strong adherence to Webb’s ‘English Free Architecture’ approach. Indeed, Baines apprenticed under C R Ashbee founder of the School for the Handicrafts and one of the leading exponents of the views of Ruskin and Morris. The result of this tutelage is evidenced by Baines’ successful use of design elements such as continuity, enclosure, contrast and surprise as well as other design elements praised by Ruskin in ‘The Nature of the Gothic’. The result was truly organic architecture; the estate looked, according to Beaufoy, ‘as if it had grown and not merely been dropped there’. It is not hard to appreciate why Ewart Culpin called Well Hall ‘...from an architectural standpoint, without equal in the whole world’. The creative use of a vernacular design approach aided by the use of varied set backs, curvilinear streets, and varied architectural materials and features resulted in architectural triumph. Swenarton has described Well Hall scheme as ‘...a tour de force of picturesque design, in which the components of the old English village were assembled with a virtuosity, exceeding anything attempted by Unwin, even at Hampstead Garden Suburb. At Well Hall the wide range of materials was put to dramatic visual effect and emphasised by the variety of finishes: brick, stone, roughcast, half-timbering, tile-hanging, slate-hanging, and weatherboarding. Diversity of finishes was matched by complexity of shape and silhouette, achieved not only through the usual gables and dormers but also through overhangs, turrets, assorted projections and recesses and careful adjustments of the building line. Figures 5–6 show just a portion of the elevations and street layout of Well Hall and cannot do justice due to the variegated nature of the street views and street patterns. Webb, who was always frustrated in having to make his living designing houses for the wealthy would likely have approved of Baines’s efforts on behalf of England’s workers.

Ackerman’s role

Ackerman was clearly impressed with the results of the British war time housing programme. He came home laden with pictures and plans of Well Hall as well as Gretna and Eastriggs. These plans were subsequently published, together with Ackerman’s detailed defence of government provided housing, in a monograph as well as in the journal of the American Institute of Architects. His testimony before Congress was instrumental in persuading the government to fund the construction of permanent housing for workers in the munitions industry.

Ackerman was probably the most progressive of the architects and planners involved with the American war housing programme. A prolific essayist who was trained at Cornell University and in Paris, his writings reflected a clear admiration for the views of Fabian socialism. Indeed, he would quote Sidney Webb and R H Tawney as frequently as he did the American radical economist Thorstein Veblen. But it is not clear from his published work whether he appreciated the distinction between the design implications inherent in the centralising tendencies of Fabian Socialism favoured by Unwin and the more community based principles of Guild Socialism espoused Webb and Baines. Since Ackerman’s...
personal papers were destroyed, his personal feelings and influence on this matter remain unclear.

For instance, in his published comments, Ackerman appeared to favour the simplified design of Gretna and Eastriggs. Referring to the British war housing programme in general, he wrote: "the work is, on the whole simple and more direct than the garden city work with which we are familiar, and I am inclined to think that it is, in many respects, of a higher order of merit than much that was executed in the days of peace...I saw it in contrast to our rather stupid efforts at industrial housing." 22 This view may have been simply a reflection of sentiments expressed in the Journal of the American Institute of Architects in 1916 by Ewart Culpin who wrote, "The logic of circumstances has forced upon cottage architects the conclusion that the simple style of cottage is the one which must now be concentrated upon...Building had become, I fear, permanently dearer, and we must cut our coat to suit our cloth?30"

One way to gain insight as to Ackerman's attitude on this issue is to assess his work, since the design orientation of the EFC projects under his direction would seemingly constitute evidence concerning which tendencies he embraced. An examination of the EFC projects while inconclusive, appears to show that Ackerman was strongly influenced by Webb's vernacular approach to cottage design. For instance, the EFC programme under Ackerman was extremely disaggregated for a government programme: it consisted of various teams of planners and architects who were given considerable responsibility for the design of individual projects. They were encouraged to follow general garden city design principles as outlined in a book of 'standard plans' compiled by Otto Eidlitz at the USHC as well as a statement entitled 'Standards Recommended for Permanent Industrial Housing' written in 1918 by the housing reformer, Lawrence Veiller. However, since these 'standard plans' were intended only as a 'condensed practical guide, rather than hard and fast forms', they had significant freedom and encouragement to design their individual projects according to vernacular housing patterns. 24 For instance, the architects and designers were set to work with the following advice regarding the overall aesthetic goals to be achieved: 'First, in seeking a unified effect the designer should not make all the houses and lots so much parts of one set and formal design that they look like a penal or charitable institution. Second, in seeking interest and picturesqueness he should not make all the houses so different and each so unusual, with so much done evidently for effect, that the whole looks like a village on the stage.

Neither kind of development would find a ready market, and the reason in both cases would be at bottom the same: that people in this country want to live in independent, self-sufficient homes of their own in a real complete American town, which they understand and run in their own way, and they do not want their houses to be or to look like parts of an artistic or sociological experiment. 25

This organisational framework and its aesthetic orientation largely corresponds to the facilitator approach suggested by Webb. On the other hand, some of the 'standard plans' and some, but certainly not all, of the actual housing projects appeared to adhere to a design aesthetic more akin to Unwin's simplified Georgian architecture than Baines' picturesque vernacular villages. (See Figures 7-8)

While there is evidence of Unwin's influence with regard to the simplified architecture used in some of the projects, Webb's influence was reflected in the architecture, layout and site plans of the best of the projects. For example, some projects developed by the EFC and the USHC utilised a modern architecture that reflected local and regional styles. The better projects, notably Yorkship Village, Gateway Village and Seaview Village in Bridgeport, Connecticut, cut all possessed picturesque architectural and compositional elements as well as a high degree of architectural detailing. Many of the EFC projects were based on quite complex curvilinear street systems, complex site plans, and clustered housing more akin to that of Well Hall rather than Eastriggs or Gretna. (See Figures 9-17)
Yorkshire Village

Yorkshire Village in Camden, New Jersey is usually considered the best of all the wartime housing developments. It was designed along garden city lines by Electus Litchfield with assistance from Henry Wright and Pliny Rodgers, all working under Ackerman’s direction. An examination of its design features gives evidence of both the simplified Unwin approach and the more picturesque vernacular approach favoured by Webb and his followers. For instance, the community was planned around a large and functional village green. Four storey apartments ring two sides of the green while the remaining sides were lined with row housing. The total effect was a sense of enclosure. This green was clearly planned as the heart of the community; a place to meet friends and to socialise. Churches, library, school and public meeting hall were located just off the green and provided for a full measure of community life and interaction. Balancing this sense of enclosure were several generous greenswards and pedestrian footpaths that radiated out from the green and led into the community. Additional open space was provided by a large green belt that surrounded the community on three sides.

The central green was also the centre of the street system which was made up of a series of concentric rings divided by radial streets reaching to the periphery (see figures 18-20). This pattern restricted the usual dominance of the car while the pedestrian footpath system separated children and pedestrians from the street.

The picturesque site planning shows the influence of Webb and Baines. Varied setbacks, grouping and imaginative placing of units on their lots provided visual stimulation and variety as well as enclosed streets with terminal vistas. A community of some
Georgian may have been based on more than a desire for simplicity since in the eastern United States, Georgian architecture was the vernacular architecture and brick the local building material. Thus the designers of Yorkshire village could be seen as attempting to follow vernacular forms when they decided to adapt the Georgian architecture of nearby colonial towns such as Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Burlington, New Jersey and Newcastle, Delaware into a modern format. In that sense, and in their use of appropriate architectural detailing, their approach was very like that suggested by Webb.

Conclusion

Overall, the design approach used in Yorkshire Village while safely within the garden city tradition, appears to be in sympathy with Webb's vernacular approach. Specifically, the highly detailed Georgian architecture, its environmentally sensitive layout and complex site planning achieve a picturesque overall composition which Webb might have sought. Overall, its design avoided the repetitive character evident in Gretna and Eastriggs which made these communities look more like 'projects' than true architectural design. As Webb sought to follow vernacular forms when they were available, its design avoided the repetitive character evident in Gretna and Eastriggs which made these communities look more like 'projects' than true architectural design.
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Figure 19: Group of three houses at Yorkshire. (Source: US Shipping Board)

Figure 20: Street view in Yorkshire.

140 units, a hierarchy of housing accommodation was provided by the inclusion of single houses, twins, triples and short rows. This hierarchy conforms more closely to the philosophy of guild socialism rather than the more strictly egalitarian values of Fabianism.

The architecture of Yorkshire Village is neo-Georgian with a generous amount of high quality architectural detailing: windows with mullions, shutters, porch, fanlights, decorative mouldings, slate roofs and high quality brickwork. Litchfield encouraged the building of Fairview along the craft-based lines advocated by Webb and Lethaby: ...the joining and the bonding of the brickwork was infinitely varied - the different foremen competing to make the brickwork the most interesting. Here and there in the gables they amused themselves making some special design in brick, or introduced a concrete tablet bearing the date of the armistice or some object of interest. 28

While Unwin opted for the Georgian style at Gretna and Eastriggs in a conscious effort to achieve simplicity, Litchfield and Ackerman's choice of neo-

While Unwin opted for the Georgian style at Gretna and Eastriggs in a conscious effort to achieve simplicity, Litchfield and Ackerman's choice of neo-
New Towns as the Monuments of Tomorrow

Stawomir Gzell,
Warsaw University of Technology, Poland

Introduction

The assessment of the value of monuments is increasingly one of the main aims in the planning and management of cities. The reasons for this is on one side stimulated by the existence of an extensive built fabric which can be specified as historic and, on the other, by the rapid decay of that fabric. This theme has been the subject of research, observations, publications and scientific and professional meetings by different disciplines. This could be most easily demonstrated through bibliography, but such a bibliography would certainly at the same time show how the works are mainly concerned with buildings characterised by their age. There are a few works which examine buildings created not too long ago in the same light.

‘Not too long ago’ in this context means a period wholly within the twentieth century and with a marked date of its beginning. We can accept that in the twentieth century there have been two such dates, both of them at the end of world wars. In 1918, the threshold to the twentieth century was defined through new political and economic powers which clashed in a rhythm of early industrialisation. Nearly simultaneous destruction and uncontrolled building construction brought negative effects. It became clear that without equally wide action to preserve there would not survive the influence of their new surroundings. This dangerous atmosphere caused the actions mentioned early. Apart from some obvious successes these actions have had an uneven impact, as experiences of one town or country are not so easily transported to the other place. Moreover, there still arises the question: where should a borderline appear between those elements which should really be kept in unchanged state, and those which may be changed? What, in short, should be preserved?

As it has been said, the number of categories of buildings which should be preserved is still growing. As a result, there might arise a situation where ‘everything is considered history’ and should consequently be preserved. This is unrealistic, unnecessary and incorrect. Yet, how can one define qualification rules, especially when remembering their variety? It seems that the best solution is to lead complex overall architectural - urban - historic research, make inventories and describe the objects, and then choose from them those which are most representative of the trend, and those which are the witness of the historic, social and economic events. Those objects should be classified in a certain ranking list. The most important aspect is the attitude towards the cultural heritage. Its essence is its very changeability, the fact that it becomes the element of social integration. In the atmosphere of moral responsibility for everything that has been built earlier or later, it is important to find a place for the newest constructions among objects accepted as monuments. Different institutions have pushed the candidacy of various towns as monuments. Great pressure is exerted for ‘integrated conservation’. This has the effect of widening the list of monuments by the acceptance of urban complexes. This is in fact in accord with the intentions of the various advice and recommendations.

Preservation Ideals

The concept of the ‘historical monument’ first appeared in the nineteenth century. The definition accepted that the monument had an impact upon its surroundings and at the same time was also influenced by ‘genius loci’. Those relations have never been questioned. They existed. They were implemented instinctively in each city, town and village.

The twentieth century changed everything. New, powerful ideologies and two world wars broke the natural ties within and between the built and natural environments. Nearly simultaneous destruction and uncontrolled building construction brought negative effects. It became clear that without equally wide action to preserve there would not survive the influence of their new surroundings. This dangerous atmosphere caused the actions mentioned early. Apart from some obvious successes these actions have had an uneven impact, as experiences of one town or country are not so easily transported to the other place. Moreover, there still arises the question: where should a borderline appear between those elements which should really be kept in unchanged state, and those which may be changed? What, in short, should be preserved?

Once again we may ask the questions, as to which elements of our contemporary architecture and planning might be accepted as valuable, as the heritage of our present times? One must remember a large number of constructions and variety of architectural concepts. If it is accepted that we have to justify a certain eclecticism of the chosen representative, at the same time defining the values of entirely different types of buildings and towns.

What to Preserve?

Once again we may ask the questions, as to which elements of our contemporary architecture and planning might be accepted as valuable, as the heritage of our present times? One must remember a large number of constructions and variety of architectural concepts. If it is accepted that we have to justify a certain eclecticism of the chosen representative, at the same time defining the values of entirely different types of buildings and towns.

So, the choice of the creations which should find their place in the ‘preservation group’ must be done in two ways. The first one is undoubtedly the avant-garde creations built in a short series or as single objects (which does not mean that we are talking about a single house). Usually, even now, or sometimes already during their construction, they are thought of as worthier of keeping as historic monuments, even if they never subsequently become representative of mass building. This then suggests the proposition of a second way, to choose representative objects from large scale building schemes. Here one can mention for example the garden cities, Mediterranean and Atlantic Coast recreation towns, green spots in towns, industrial company towns, cooperative or communal housing etc.

When we consider large housing complexes, there is
a problem. It is quite true that they are characterised by the monotonous aesthetic of domino pieces, and do not reflect the richness of city life. Nevertheless those complexes were, and still are being built. They are the facts of our surroundings and their representation should be preserved. It would be best if they were kept as fragments of whole town districts, new towns characteristic of our age.

In contrast to previous ages, when generally speaking, towns were shaped similarly (accepting their morphological differences), in the twentieth century towns appeared with entirely new spatial configurations. The already known configurations were given a new meaning. There are many publications upon this subject. In our discussion the best works would be those which try to solve the dilemma which specifies to what degree a town is a single object and should be preserved as a whole. One must refer here to Norma Evenson’s book upon the city of Paris between 1878 and 1978, to a collection of essays by the scientists of the Institute of the History of Architecture in Venice about American cities, and, above all, to Donald Olsen’s work under the title The City as a Work of Art.

Olsen starts off with a question: ‘Is the city a work of art?’ and answers ‘certainly not’, quoting other functioning definitions of a city. Yet, as we read on, turning from page to page, we see that the author finds in each chosen city those issues which are the rudiments of the work of art. Desire to create monumental objects, seeking composite solutions in large scale, trying to convey ideas or historic background through three dimensional forms - those elements, just as in sculpture, painting, music - we also find in the constructed towns. So the outcome is pretty obvious - a town, in favourable conditions, may become one great work of art. Such an opinion is also expressed by George and Christiane Collins, who deal with Camillo Sitte’s works, so important for contemporary town planning.

Polish Examples

In Poland there are very few examples of towns with distinctive historical identities. Until 1939 few towns were founded (or entirely changed). The most famous one is the city of Gdynia. It is possible to say that its plan, even though changed in the interwar period has survived nearly intact until our times. The ‘dressing’ was changed, but those were only superficial changes. (Figure 1, figure 2).

A totally different situation developed in the small town of Mały Kack. It was situated in the immediate vicinity of Gdynia, and was influenced by its territory.
Nowa Huta, the leading creation of social-realistic planning in Poland, seems likely to be less fortunate. Firstly, it is not an independent unit any more (it was annexed by Kraków). Secondly, after repudiation of the communist system in Poland, many people question its right of existence and of any objects which were shaped under the influence of that system. The mind dictates their preservation as the witness of a certain epoch; the prevailing emotions turn against such a solution. (Presented in Planning History Vol 13, No 2, 10991).

Nowa Huta, the leading creation of social-realistic planning in Poland, seems likely to be less fortunate. Firstly, it is not an independent unit any more (it was annexed by Kraków). Secondly, after repudiation of the communist system in Poland, many people question its right of existence and of any objects which were shaped under the influence of that system. The mind dictates their preservation as the witness of a certain epoch; the prevailing emotions turn against such a solution. (Presented in Planning History Vol 13, No 2, 10991).

Conclusions
At this point it is possible to formulate some conclusions:

1. The easiest test through which it would be possible to establish whether the town is a 'monument of the future' is its value in comparison with other towns, under criteria specified at the beginning of this paper. The main criterion is the existence of the town as a crystallising element.

2. There is no other prescription for securing the values which were specified above, without a 'planning continuity'.

3. The basis of city development depends upon a flexible plan. One could think that it stands in opposition to the rule of keeping the town plan and the town itself in an unchanged shaped. Yet it is possible to understand flexibility somewhat differently, as a feature which enables adaptations of new parts of a town, merging them with already existent schemes. Such understanding of flexibility should be recommended. Indispensable is morphological monitoring, which would show instantaneous danger, existence or loss of spatial values, through changes such as introduction of different building materials etc. Certainly one must not think about repudiation of all new architecture and planning a priori. There should be a place in each town for new stylistic trends. One should turn aside the rule of preserving a museum town instead of a living town.

4. A new town is created for a long time and very often it may be reshaped during its realisation process. It is therefore important to define the scope of the unchangeable elements of the plan, without which, after many planning changes, it could be found that an entirely different town is being created.

5. Our contemporary methods of planning enable us to reach the aims defined in the above four points. Firstly, international standards reject homogeneity of planning processes, and turn towards individualisation of the towns. Secondly, it is possible to observe a revaluation of urban thinking to encourage the more traditional meaning of the town. Thirdly, there exist a number of known ways of financing, favourable to the monuments of tomorrow. Fourthly, there exists a real possibility of including the most important examples of the twentieth century towns upon the list of our cultural heritage, and at the same time creating a breakthrough in 'historic' thinking that we are presently building a future.
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Gordon Stephenson: Designing the Great and the Small

Christina DeMarco, City of Vancouver Planning Department, Canada

Like his mentor Abercrombie, he taught because he had practiced, and having taught continued to practice. His account of A Life in City Design gives a welcome introduction to the workshop of planning; he opens a window into the world of human aspirations and its essential function to enable cities to enhance the lives of their citizens. (Sir Peter Sheppard)

Introduction

This article is based on the recently published book On a Human Scale: A Life in City Design by Gordon Stephenson and edited by Christina DeMarco. All quotations are taken from this book.

Gordon Stephenson is best known in Britain for his plan for Stevenage, the first post-war new town. He was the fourth Lever Professor of Civic Design at Liverpool University from 1948 to 1953. In Australia, his Feith Metropolitan Plan of 1955 is considered a masterpiece of metropolitan planning. In Canada, he was founding professor of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Toronto and prepared many important urban renewal schemes. He has pursued his mission of improving the built environment with incredible enthusiasm and boundless energy. The number and breadth of projects he has taken on is nothing short of astounding.

Early Years

Gordon Stephenson was born in 1908 in Walton, a suburb on the north-eastern edge of Liverpool. His father was a policeman and his mother's father was a stonemason. Stephenson attended the Liverpool Institute High School for Boys. He gained entrance to high school through an unusual competition. The Headmaster gave a lecture on bridges and afterwards, requested the boys to write a paper on the subject. Stephenson's paper and drawings impressed the headmaster and he won a scholarship.

In 1925 Stephenson was interviewed by Charles Reilly, Professor of Architecture at Liverpool University. Professor Reilly liked his drawings and awarded him a 5 year scholarship to the school. Stephenson has fond memories of those years and Reilly left a lasting impression on Stephenson. He looked forward to the 'crits' every Monday.

'Every Monday students of every year did a sketch design, generally presenting a solution in perspective to a programme set by Reilly. The bigger and more dramatic the drawing the more he liked it. He criticised the drawings before the whole school, which in his day never had more than 100 students and his 'crits' were always a source of enjoyment. He praised the good, gently dismissed the bad and kept up his weekly contact with his students. In any studio, Reilly's presence cheered everybody.' (On a Human Scale, p 18)

Stephenson met William Holford on the first day of architecture school. That was the beginning of a close and lasting friendship. They could not have been more different in backgrounds and personalities - perhaps that was the great attraction.

Stephenson and Holford went to Paris together on a travelling scholarship in 1937. Prior to this trip the furthest Stephenson had been away from home was London. Holford, on the other hand, was well travelled and worldly.

'My trip to France left a lasting impression...I was an innocent abroad. Bill, on the other hand, was the master of every situation. It was almost as if he'd memorised Baedeker. I gradually learned that although he knew more than any person I had yet known, he could act his way through gaps in his knowledge.' (Ibid, p 19)

Rich as his educational experience was at Liverpool, Stephenson considers his time in Paris from 1930-32 as the best years of his education. He very much wanted to work with Le Corbusier in Paris so Charles Reilly invented a scholarship which would allow him to study sanitary science at the Sorbonne.

The period 1930-32, my two years in Paris, was the beginning of the Great Depression and the world seemed to be slipping into economic, social and political chaos. There was mass unemployment in Europe and American Fascism and communism were attracting many of the young, and Hitler was bidding for power. Students were generally poor. But they still came to the Left Bank from all parts of the world...Postgraduate education at the Sorbonne and with Le Corbusier was exhilarating but not exhausting. Indeed, after work one had the time and energy verbally to settle world problems every night at the Dome or Coupole on the Boulevard Montparnasse.' (Ibid, p 26)

Stephenson had visited Le Corbusier's office on several occasions for letters of introduction to visit buildings. Finally in the fall of 1931, drawings under his arm, Stephenson plucked up enough courage to ask if there was a place in his atelier. Le Corbusier liked his drawings and the very next day Stephenson began his year in Corbusier's office. His first project was to help with Le Corbusier's entry in the Palace of Soviets' competition:

November 27, 1931

Dear Mums

Today, the greatest event of my young and innocent life took place. I entered the office of Saint Corbusier! After a steady attack during which I paid him four visits inside the space of a month, he capitulated, despite the fact that he is up to his neck in a whopping great competition. Now I find myself plunged into the middle of the new Russia, as if to learn some real socialism and...
some real architecture at the same time..." (Ibid, p 29)

On returning from Paris in 1932 Stephenson was offered a position as lecturer in the Liverpool School of Architecture. Stephenson fresh from Paris and Le Corbusier’s atelier would help the school ‘go modern’.

In 1936 Stephenson was awarded a Commonwealth Fellowship to complete a master’s degree in City Planning in the School of Architecture of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. During this time there were only two full-time planning teachers at MIT. Others were borrowed from outside the institution and included leading professionals such as Clarence Stein, Raymond Unwin, and Thomas Adams. Before leaving Boston in 1938, Stephenson married a fellow student, Flora Crockett. She was an architect and the first woman to complete the master’s degree in City Planning from MIT.

Inside the Ministry of Town and Country Planning

After working for two years on Holford’s team designing and supervising giant wartime building projects, Stephenson was invited to join Lord Reith’s Reconstruction Group at the end of 1941. H G Vincent headed the small team which at that time was made up of H Charlton Bradshaw, John Dower, William Holford and Thomas Sharp. The group decided that revolutionary planning techniques were needed to grapple with post-war planning, departing from the zoning and laying out of suburbs which had constituted pre-war planning.

Holford, Stephenson, and Kennedy were the driving forces of the Planning Technique Section. Holford concentrated on the administration and left Stephenson and Kennedy to get on with the technical side of things. One of the most important documents produced by Planning Technique was The Redevelopment of Central Areas, a guide to assist local authorities in re-building war-damaged areas.

He was also loaned to Sir Patrick Abercrombie to assist with The Greater London Plan. It was not easy for Abercrombie and the ministry to recruit a team in the middle of the war. He had seven qualified assistants, including Stephenson who was working part time and running Planning Technique in the Ministry at the same time. Nevertheless, the entire plan was completed in 18 months.

"It is now difficult to imagine town planners busy at their drawing boards preparing comprehensi-
chair of the School of City and Regional Planning at MIT to commence in 1935 and secondly he was asked to help Perth prepare their first metropolitan plan. He planned to stay in Perth for about 18 months and then move to Boston.

Russell Dumas, the Western Australia State Director of Works and Allan Green, Town Clerk for the City of Perth travelled to England in 1952 looking for a consultant to prepare a metropolitan plan. They were advised to start from the top and try to get Stephenson or Holford. They asked Stephenson first and he accepted.

The need for a plan for Perth had long been obvious. The metropolitan area was growing rapidly as a result of high migration levels and the beginnings of major industry in the region. Mr Alistair Hepburn was appointed as Town Planning Commissioner and together they put together a small team. In the introduction to the plan, completed in 1955, they wrote:

‘With or without a comprehensive plan, the region would continue to grow…with a Plan...the cities and the communities in the Metropolitan Region could grow in a spacious and orderly arrangement on either side of the broad Swan River as convenient places…Decisions taken now will mean much to this as well as succeeding generations. It is time for practical men, but for also bold and courageous action...’ (Ibid, p 138)

The Greater London Plan was their model. Stephenson, a man of big ideas, persuaded everyone that the plan should show how another 1,000,000 people could be accommodated in the region. They forecast that Perth would grow from about 400,000 in 1955 to 1,000,000 in 1985 and in fact it did just that. The outstanding open space system in Perth protecting not only the river foreshores and ocean fringing but also the wetlands and escarpment is one of the most important contributions of the plan. It also laid the foundations of an excellent metropolitan transport system, which greatly improved public transport and established a system of regional roads.

A Victim of McCarthy

While living in Perth, Stephenson applied for his visa for the United States in order to take up his position at MIT. His wife Flora was an American and they thought that securing the visa would be a simple task. Sadly, he was refused a visa for his so-called un-American activities:

‘We supposed that the ‘evidence’ against me was in large part gathered by the US FBI in England. In the McCarthy era the FBI probably put the worst complexion on things. They would have found out that, when teaching in Liverpool School of Architecture in the early 1950s, I had visited the Soviet Union on two occasions and I had worked desperately hard in my free time as Secretary of the Liverpool Relief Committee for the Victims of German Fascism...’ (Ibid, p 135)

Despite several supporting letters, including letters from the President of MIT and Bert Hawke, the Premier of Western Australia, nothing could persuade the Americans to give Stephenson a visa.

As soon as the University of Toronto heard that Stephenson’s visa was refused they offered him the founding chair of the School of City and Regional Planning. He remained at the University of Toronto from 1955-60. He continued to undertake many important consultant studies during his time in Canada, including urban renewal schemes for Kingston and Halifax.

Return to Perth

Before Stephenson left Perth he had also prepared a new plan for the rapidly growing University of Western Australia campus. In the late 1950s while Stephenson was in Canada, the vice-chancellor of the University of Western Australia asked him to return to Perth to advise on important planning decisions. The Public Works Department, then custodians of the plan, were asking the university administrators to discard the principle of separating pedestrians and cars and suggested that the library should be built in the middle of the university’s finest open space, the Great Court. Stephenson came to Perth and persuaded them against the major departure from his plan. During his visit, the vice-chancellor and chancellor asked him if he would return permanently as consultant architect and professor of architecture. Stephenson accepted and he held the chair until 1972 when he resigned to undertake plans for Murdoch University in Perth.

In 1975 Stephenson undertook an important study on The Design of Central Perth. He also prepared the first plan for the new town of Joondalup in Perth in 1977. Unfortunately his plans were altered and lost all the important principles that he had fought so hard to win for Stevenage almost forty years earlier:

‘Sad to relate, in recent years, the planning of Joondalup Regional Centre has been regressive. The proposed pedestrian system has been destroyed and motor vehicles have been given price of place in a plan which contains far too many intersections and is unsuitable for both pedestrians and cars. The shopping area is going to be contained in another large, banal, suburban shopping centre for which conventional wisdom dictates fort-like buildings, locked up when not in use and surrounded by car parks.’ (Ibid, p 224)

It is now twenty years since Stephenson ‘retired’. He is still consulting and continues to keep a watchful eye on Perth. He is currently assisting the Western Australia State Department of Planning with the structure plan for Perth’s north-east corridor.

Christina DeMarco is a planner in the City Plans Division of the City of Vancouver Planning Department. She has worked in Toronto, Sydney, Canberra, and Perth.
Research

Entries in the 1912 Competition for the Design of the Australian National Capital

Help is requested from planning historians in providing biographical information about the 137 participants in the 1912 competition for the design of the Australian Federal Capital, in locating any of their original drawings, and in finding written explanations of their plans. The following brief comment explains why this material is needed.

In 1994 the National Library of Canberra will hold an exhibit that will focus on the 1912 competition. It will feature thirty-eight previously unpublished designs recorded on very large photographs. The judges used these images to select the finalists from among a group of forty-six entries regarded as worth further study.

From this group the judges chose the eight finalists. Original drawings for only four of the eight are known to exist in public archives: those by Griffin; Saarinen; Agache; and the joint submission of Griffiths, Coulter, and Caswell. The basic plans of these and of the other four finalists were depicted in lithographs printed in 1913 but remain virtually unknown.

The exhibition of the ‘new’ thirty-eight designs together with those of the eight finalists will thus present a fascinating cross-section of planning thought and practice in the early twentieth century. The plans are remarkable in their variety, and many reflect principles of urban planning advocated by theorists and critics of the time. The long and detailed written explanations of their plans submitted by seven of the final eight entrants as well as by another have also been located, and others may be found.

In advising the National Library on the exhibit during the final quarter of 1992, I prepared a detailed exhibit outline. In addition to notes on each design, this identified and explained the significance of dozens of their potential exhibits. These include many depictions of the site, revealing documents about the selection of the judges and their work, and contemporary newspaper and journal comments and criticism of the competition and its results.

Biographical information about the participants, however, proved elusive, and efforts to find collections or individuals holding original drawings yielded meagre results. Some limited additional information on US participants has since been found. This plea for assistance recognises the need for an international search. I appeal to all who may read these words to send any information they may have to me at this address:

John W Reps, Professor Emeritus
Department of City and Regional Planning
College of Architecture, Art, and Planning
216 Sibley Hall, Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

The names and addresses of the 137 participants as they appear in hitherto unpublished archival records will be found below. They include few persons usually associated with the town planning movement. This suggests that we need to widen our studies beyond the usual suspects rounded up from time to time in articles, lectures, and conference papers. These competitors of 1912 looked on themselves as town planners, and some doubtless served in that capacity before or after the competition. I hope this information will lead to fruitful investigations of this cast of characters that has lurked in the wings for 80 years and now returns to the stage of history.

COMPETITORS IN THE 1912 COMPETITION FOR THE DESIGN OF THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL CAPITAL
Compiled by John W Reps, Cornell University

Note: Countries of origin are arranged alphabetically, as are the names of competitors within each country. Numbers were those used to identify designs and do not indicate any order of merit.

Competitors from Australia

93 Adams, Alexander, AMICE, 'Waratah', Silver Street, Randwick, NSW, Australia
94 Bennett, Edward James, Boomerang St, NorthQuay, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia
113 Bicknell, George, 52 Bridge St, Ballarat East, Victoria, Australia

120 Bocking, Murray R, 11 Wigram Road, Glebe Point, Sydney, NSW, Australia
110 Byron, A H, C E, 187 A'Beckett St, Melbourne, Australia
97 Buttersworth, William, Landscape Engineer and Building, Bulli, NSW, Australia
88 Cousins, C, 120 Erskineville Road, Erskineville, Sydney, NSW, Australia
34 Cracknell, E W, Queensferry, Via Granville, Victoria, Australia
44 Davies, J Hugh, Mooroonup, Victoria, Australia
32 Ekberg, Dr B F, Stanley, Tasmania (Or 'Malmo', Elm Street, Hawthorn, Victoria), Australia
5 Fauron, Albert, 25 Rosby St, Drummoyle, Sydney, Australia
61 Garner, Frank, 11 Edwards St, Glenferrie, Victoria, Australia
1 Gilroy, W J, 136 Barkley St, St Kilda, Melbourne, Australia
87 Greatly, Louis J, Survey Office, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia
10 Griffiths, Robert W, Charles Gibson Coulter, Charles Henry Caswell, 52 Royal Chambers, 3 Castlereagh St, Sydney, Australia
60 Haath, Charles, Licensed Surveyor, Sydney Road, Fawkner, Melbourne, Australia
25 Hine, James, FRBA, Colonial Mutual Buildings, St George's Terrace, Perth, W A, Australia
108 Jackson, William M, 109 Denison Road, Lewisham, Sydney, N S W, Australia
114 Jacob, H, Government Surveyor, Survey Office, Adelaide, S A, Australia
78 Jorgensen, C, Architect, Bundaberg, Queensland, Australia
134 Lalor, Robert H, Seven Hills, N S W, Australia
103 Lawrinova, Raoul Gaston, Wakeh Road, New England, N S W, Australia
13 Lundberg, H W, St Peters, near Adelaide, S A, Australia

Macdonald, A J, Brighton Road, Eisternwick, Victoria, Australia

McClay, A S H, Menzies, W A, Australia

McLean, O J, Ben Lomond Park, Bagshot, Bendigo, Victoria, Australia

McMullen, George, Forest Chambers, 81 St George's Terrace, Perth, W A, Australia

Parer, Joseph, 193 Danks St, Albert Park, Melbourne, Australia

Parsons, George & Son, 317 Collins St, Melbourne, Australia

Pullman, Edwin, Windermere Crescent, Brighton, Victoria, Australia

Powries, W, Albury, N S W, Australia

Roberts, R J A, Alexandra Street, Hunter's Hill, Sydney, Australia

Robinson, H W, 59 Sydney Row, Marly, N S W, Australia

Sennett, A, 16 Sennett, A

Wood, Arthur B, Licensed Surveyor, Tooranie, Moulamein, N S W, Australia

Mcdonald, A J, Brighton Road, Eisternwick, Victoria, Australia

McClay, A S H, Menzies, W A, Australia

McLean, O J, Ben Lomond Park, Bagshot, Bendigo, Victoria, Australia

McMullen, George, Forest Chambers, 81 St George's Terrace, Perth, W A, Australia

Parer, Joseph, 193 Danks St, Albert Park, Melbourne, Australia

Parsons, George & Son, 317 Collins St, Melbourne, Australia

Pullman, Edwin, Windermere Crescent, Brighton, Victoria, Australia

Powries, W, Albury, N S W, Australia

Roberts, R J A, Alexandra Street, Hunter's Hill, Sydney, Australia

Robinson, H W, 59 Sydney Row, Marly, N S W, Australia

Sennett, A, 16 Sennett, A

Wood, Arthur B, Licensed Surveyor, Tooranie, Moulamein, N S W, Australia

Competitors from Canada

122 Barrett, Ambrose, 22 Beach St, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

85 Cartwright Metheson Co, Consulting Engineers, 503 Cotton Buildings, Vancouver, B C, Canada

49 Ouimet, Seraphin, Civil Engineer, 15 St Lawrence Building, Montreal, Canada

118 Stone, E A, Vancouver, B C, Canada

Competitors from France

4 Apache, Agache, 11 Rue Eugene Flachat, Paris, France

37 Berard, Andre, Architect, 19 Villa Spontini, Paris, France

98 Delattre, M M & H Mantez, Ingenieurs des Arts et Manufactures, 64 rue de Lille (?), Halluin Nord, France

46 Hanin, H, 63 rue d'Auteuil, Paris, France

83 Machiels, Andre, Engineer & Auguste Stuttge, Architect, 31 ave Henri Martin & 42nd boul Drag, Paris, France

128 Segovia, Louis de, Engineer, Froges, Isere, France

Competitors from New Zealand

107 Byron, D J, Islington, Christchurch, New Zealand

133 Davies, Robert W, Box 195, Christchurch, New Zealand

82 Maddison, V, 39 Molesworth St, Wellington, New Zealand

Competitors from South Africa

95 Eisenhofer, A A, 78 Nord St, Johannesburg, Transvaal, South Africa

80 Elphinston, F S, Government Surveyor, 105 Voortrekker St, Central Chambers, 12 Bureau Lane, Pretoria, South Africa

58 Fallon, W A Ritchie, ARIBA, Southern Life Buildings, St George St, Capetown, South Africa

62 Forbes, A J J, Architect, St George's House, 75 St George St, Capetown, South Africa

43 Gibson, James Gibson, Box 54, Cleveland, Transvaal, South Africa

36 Lawson, George G & David J Parr, Public Works Dept, Pretoria, South Africa

92 Lovemore, J W, Tumey's Post, Queenstown, South Africa

73 Masey, Francis, FRIBA, Salisbury, Rhodesia, South Africa

118 Menmuir, R W, AMICE, National Mutual Buildings, Church Square, Capetown, South Africa

27 Moffat, John A, National Mutual Buildings, Corner Rissik & Market Sts, Johannesburg, South Africa

121 Moffat, John A, National Mutual Buildings, Corner Rissik & Market Sts, Johannesburg, South Africa

11 Roberts, Thomas Nisbet, 10 Markhams Chambers, Capetown, South Africa

67 William T Olive, MICE & Hugh S Olive, 4 & 5 National Bank Chambers, St George's St, Capetown, South Africa

72 Winder, Arthur, 41 Durban St, King Williamstown, Cape Province, South Africa

Competitors from the United Kingdom

125 Backhouse, Bernard, Deanfield, Meopham, Kent, England


45 Blackwell, J, Architect, 33 Lynn St, West Hartlepool, England

132 Canal, Wilfred Adams, 150 Promenamoor (?) Road, East Moors, Cardiff, Wales


71 Clayton, Charles H & Harold Slicer, MSA, 23 Barry Road, London, England

40 Coutts, James, Jr, CS, 18 Bridge St, Aberdeen, Scotland

50 Elsworth, Frank, Station Road, Fish Ponds, Bristol, England


100 Greenfield, John, CE, c/o Messrs Cassell & Langton, 45 Gresham St, London, EC, England

22 Harford, Henry, R E Office, Delhi Barracks, Tidworth, Andover, England

76 Heaton, Ralph, Architect & Surveyor, 19 Newhall St, Birmingham, England

91 Hinchcliff, John Herbert, The Quarry, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield, Yorkshire, England

119 Jackson, George, Bellinge Road, Herne Bay, Kent, England

51 Jones, John Humphreys, ARIBA, 76 Fairburb Road, London, England

106 Knowles, Leslie, PSI, 47 Portland St, Manchester, England

38 Langston, John Alfred, 106 St Paul's Road, Cannbury North, London, England

79 Leech, Donald C, MICE, Baron's Court Road, London, SW, England

69 Mortelmans, Louis, Salisbury Works, Salisbury Road, Harringay, N London, England

12 O'Connor, Henry, AMICE, 1 Drummond Place, Edinburgh, Scotland


65 Powell, Charles E, The Little House, Binfield, Berkshire, England

70 Price, Arthur J & Sons, Engineers & Surveyors, 14 Park Road, Lytham, Lancashire, England


123 Renwick, Edwin Ernest, 7 Claremont Terrace, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England

Plan~ning

19 Reynolds, J F Jodrell & Eric Byron, 19 Old Queen St, Westminster, England
77 Saunders, James, 44 Victoria Road, Clapham, London, England
35 Schanfelberg, Rees & Gummer, 31 Great James Street, London, England
77 Saunders, James, 44 Victoria Road, Clapham, London, England
21 Stables, Robert Lawrence, 48 Saville Road, London, England
23 Schulz, Walter, G Pepler and Allen, Howard House, 4 Arundel St, Strand, London, England
21 Stables, Robert Lawrence, 48 Saville Road, Silverstown, Essex, England
127 Strachen & Weekes, Civil Engineers, 9 Victoria St, Westminster, London, England
66 Sunderland, Thomas, C E, Architect & Surveyor, 151 Far Gosford St, Coventry, England
90 Waddington, Alfred H, 11 Hampton Place, Bradford, Yorkshire, England
14 Waite, Christie L, Church St, Castleford, Yorkshire, England
63 Williamsen, G Wallace, ‘Surbiton’, 90 Paisley Road, West Southbourne, Hampshire, England
26 Wilson, George, CE, Gracious St, Knarborough, Yorkshire, England
116 Wingrove, C, Jr, 38 Bellevue Road, Southend on Sea, England
64 Yorath, Christopher James, AMICE, 98 Twyford Avenue, Acton, London West, England

Competitors from the United States
55 Bellamy, Edward, 60 Washington Square, New York NY, USA
140 Brown, Thomas Seabrook, Architect, 615 First National Bank Building, Roanoke, Virginia, USA
138 Bruno, George H, 34 Orton Place, Brooklyn, New York, USA
102 Chivers, Herbert C, 126-128 Russ Building, San Francisco, California, USA

41 Comey, Arthur C, Landscape Architect, Harvard Square, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA
137 Gieske, J R, Architect Engineer, Ceredo, West Virginia, USA
29 Griffin, Walter Burley, 1200 Steinway Hall, Chicago, Illinois, USA
48 Holme, Ole Jacob, Architect, 1 Washington St, Poughkeepsie, New York, USA
136 Hulluck, George W, 6410 15th Avenue Building, New York, USA
30 Jones, Francis L, 1336 East Acacia St, Stockton, San Joaquin Co, California, USA
20 Kellaway, Herbert J, Landscape Architect, 2a Park St, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
24 Keller, George, FALA, Architect, Hartford, Connecticut, USA
7 Magounie, Harold van Buren, 7 West 36th St, New York, USA
47 Maybeck, Bernard R, M H White, & Prof Charles Gilman Hyde, 35 Montgomery St, San Francisco, California, USA
31 Mische, E T, Portland, Oregon, USA
56 Mitchell, C S, La Ward, (probably Texas), Jackson Co, USA
74 Roevede, Alfred J, CE, 2642 (2842 on list) Francisco Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, USA
112 Rowntree, Richard, 3552 Cascade View Drive, Laurelhurst, Seattle, Washington, USA
135 Wayman, John H, 38 Cowan (7) St, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
86 Weisman, S G & S Arkin, 744 East 179th St, New York, NY, USA
115 Yost, Clarence B, Tyler, Texas, USA

Competitors from Italy, Hungary, Sweden, India, Paraguay, Mexico and Finland
131 Botazzi, Agostino, Architect, Trisobbia, Italy
101 Forbath, Dr Imre, Eugene L. Schrader, Architect, & Ladislas Wanga, Engineer, collaborators, V Falk Mikos-utza, Budapest, Hungary
81 Gellerstedt, Nils, Civil Engineer, Ivan Lindgren, & Hugo du Rietz, collaborators, 2 Kungsbroplan, Stockholm, Sweden
126 Gogerly, John, Architect & Civil Engineer, 15 Metcalfe St, Calcutta, India
124 Leckie, John D, Villa Rica, Paraguay
139 Roveda, Pedro, Avenida Cinco de Mayo, No 1, Mexico, D F, Mexico
18 Saarinen, Eliel, Helsingfors, Finland

Practice

DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group

Miles Glendinning
University of Edinburgh, UK

DOCOMOMO is an international working party which was set up several years ago to pursue the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement.

In our country, almost all Modern architecture was built during the four decades between c1940 and 1980. In the interwar years, classical and Art Deco styles had been completely dominant, but the late 1940s and 1950s saw the meteoric rise of Modern design, and the 1960s and 1970s its nationwide ascendency. Modern Architecture thrived in our country for a great many reasons: it cannot be defined in a simple statement. Partly, it seems to have grown out of a national tradition of massive monumentality in architecture and city planning, and, as a result, to have drawn strength from existing patterns of building and urban life.

DOCOMOMO was established, with the chief aim of starting the task of documenting the architecture and...
building of those momentous decades - or, more accurately, of coordinating this task, as substantial records had already been made or collected on an ad hoc basis, by the National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS) and the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland (RIAS). Our aim is to foster an informed climate of discussion concerning a period which is now slipping into history. The buildings which concern us cover a huge range, drawn from all aspects of the immense post-war reconstruction - from Burton's Red Road tower blocks and Gillespie, Kidd and Coia's Seminary at Dunblane to massive industrial and public-service developments such as Monktonhall Colliery and Cruachan Hydro-Electric power station. As part of the scope of its work will encompass the 'late' work of previous phases (such as neo-Romanesque churches) and early examples of the successor phases: the Conservation and Post-Modern movements.

This task of documentation is greatly complicated by the anomalous present-day position of postwar architecture within 'public opinion' - by the fact that the values which drove forward this tremendous collaborative enterprise are now largely obscured or transmuted. The monuments of Modern architecture are all around us, yet sometimes they seem today as inscrutable as prehistoric monuments. Most obviously, the reason for this is that Modern architecture has fallen from fashion across the world. But the particular vehemence of the repudiation of Modern architecture in our country (compared to, say, Italy or France) stems from something beyond mere fashion. It derives ultimately from a violently fluctuating framework of evaluation of buildings, invented in England by A W N Pugin and subsequently imported to our country as part of the attempt to construct a 'British culture'. This alien framework of 'Westminster debate' sets out to polarise periods of building into opposed 'Utopias', which are first praised, then violently rejected, and finally 'revived' once again as 'heritage'. The result of this process of caricature and counter-caricature, in the field of postwar architecture as any other, is to repudiate, and reduce to silence, participants from those years - people whose experience could be of special help in remedying the real practical problems which arise in any major period of building.

To end this 'silence', we organised a symposium in Glasgow in October 1992 - 'Visions Revisited' - which brought back into the public domain the values of the postwar building drive. This inaugural conference of the Scottish National Group of DOCOMOMO, opened by Prof Hubert-Jan Henket of the University of Eindhoven, brought together 150 delegates to hear the direct, and at times passionate testimony of a wide range of contemporary participants, ranging from the political 'housing crusaders' to engineers and architects (see report by David Whitham, 'Planning History' vol 14 no 5). We hope to publish, in due course, their papers, along with those of younger academic speakers, as a spur to further investigation and debate.

We also intend, ourselves, to contribute directly to this follow-up process, by initiating historical research into the architecture of the period, including the inventarisation of both buildings and archival collections. In common with many other national groups, the initial focus of our efforts will be the production, by the end of 1993, of a register of the most architecturally, historically and technically significant Modern (and other contemporary) monuments and sites within our country. DOCOMOMO guidelines permit each group to concentrate on a defined period, and we initially intend to home in on the quarter-century of our most intensive Modern building - the years 1945 to 1970.

A draft register of some 60 sites (including both individual monuments and areas) is being drawn up now, and this will form the basis of a major exhibition being organised jointly with the RIAS, as part of the 1993 Edinburgh Festival. This exhibition will include drawings and photographs from the collections of the RIAS and the NMRS, and from architects' and engineers' offices. We hope that, by presenting our draft register in this visually arresting way, we will provoke widespread comment and discussion among interested professionals, and the general public, and that this will, in turn, throw up further subjects eligible for inclusion in our final register at the end of 1993.

We also intend to organise a wide range of other activities, including publications and meetings. Our annual subscription is £15 (£7.50 student). This will not only support our work of research and documentation, but will give members:

- preferential rates for all events;
- a direct mailed newsletter;
- contacts with an international network of architects, critics and historians.

Planning History in Zimbabwe

Derek Gunby, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe

This brief article is an attempt to stimulate interest in establishing a Planning History Group in Zimbabwe. There is an International Planning History Society to which we may affiliate. There is also interest in South Africa. Generally we may be able to spearhead a greater awareness and interest in Planning History throughout the Continent. At present Africa is the only continent not represented on the Board of the International Planning History Society.

I have more than a passing interest. I was one of the founding members of the Planning History Group back in 1974. I have continued to support its activities since that time.

Why should we study Planning History?

To a young country with eyes firmly set on creating new, sustainable futures, the idea of delving back into history may seem irrelevant. By the same token today's planners may wonder why when we face so many difficult problems in urban and rural contexts, we need to look backwards at what earlier planners attempted. The answer is the same to all those who, like Henry Ford, saw history as bunk; without history you are no one and have no direction. In order to go forward it is essential to understand how we got to where we are. An analysis of past policies and outcomes arms us with an invaluable set of lessons and makes us, as practitioners, that much more mature.

What Planning History can we study in Zimbabwe?

Some people have suggested that because our record of planning is comparatively recent we do not have sufficient material to investigate. In fact our urban history is 100 years old and planning, as such, has accompanied much of this development. 100 years of planned urbanism, as well as the planned distribution (annexation) of land with its concomitant of rural settlement policies is as much as most countries have to offer the historian. Of course, apart from interesting speculations about how Great Zimbabwe was organised as an urban community and died, there is little pre-industrial urbanisation to study.
but this need not worry us. There is a considerable agenda of 20th century research to accomplish.

A possible agenda of research

There are a great many possible avenues of research. A possible agenda of research could stimulate interest.

*How far did the early settler towns reflect a typical colonial set of planning principles? Was there a special set of Zimbabwean influences? If so, what were they and how did they arise? To what extent have these early planning principles continued to impact on current planning and land management?

*Clearly British Town Planning law has greatly influenced Zimbabwean Planning Law, but what have been the other influences? In particular how far have the principles and practice of South African law affected us here?

*What factors have shaped the Government's planning service since its inception?

*How have the principal cities of Zimbabwe differed in their approach to town planning?

*Which individuals have made particular contributions to planning in Zimbabwe? What has been the nature of their influence?

*What was the role of the Provincial and District Commissioner in rural planning? How did these administrators affect outcomes of land management and settlement patterns?

*What have been the principal factors of continuity and change in town planning practice since independence?

*Policies of racial segregation have had a marked impact on much of the physical arrangement of Zimbabwe towns and cities. How far was this overt in professional town planning practice? What were the detailed results in terms of planning policies at national and city level? How did changes in the intensity of this racial outlook, reflect in the way cities were planned? How would one seek to unlock racial and economic factors in town development?

One could go on. These all tend to be quite large projects. There is scope for much simpler and smaller scale investigations. One may, for instance, want to study the history of a National Park or a small town. Any historical insight into the way town and countryside has changed through the influence of planning thought and practice will assist us in a greater understanding of where we are today.

A Zimbabwe Planning History Group?

I would like to see a Zimbabwe Planning History Group, with formal links to the International Body. But first we need to have a nucleus of people interested and able to undertake some research, either collectively or individually. To test the water for this proposal I would like to suggest that anyone who is interested contact either myself or Cecelia Davison. If we get a reasonable response we will announce a date and venue for a meeting early in 1993 when we can plan a course of action. I believe we have a unique opportunity to make a significant contribution to the understanding of planning here in Zimbabwe and to help broaden the perspectives of the International Body.

Planning History Group

Any individual or organisation may join the Planning History Group. The group publish a journal called Planning History which comes out three times a year. The subscription is £10 per annum with, I believe, other currency equivalents. Membership of the Group also entitles members to a substantial discount rate for the journal, Planning Perspectives. The Group organise regular Planning History conferences in the UK and every 2 years an International Conference in the UK and every 2 years an International Conference is held. The present officers are: Chairman, Professor Gordon Cherry, Membership Secretary and Treasurer, Dr D W Mussey, and Editor of Planning History, Dr S V Ward

Contact Points

Derek Gunby: P O Box FM 524, Famona, Bulawayo, Tel Byo 61447 (day), Byo 41389 (night).

Cecelia Davison, 25 Dart Road, Vainona, Harare, Tel Hre 862172

Update

I have just received a newsletter from the Group. It has been recommended to the membership that the Group be renamed the International Planning History Society (IPHS) from January 1993. The present subscription rate of £10 per annum will remain unaffected.

early months of 1993. The Council will then elect from amongst themselves a Board of Management. The Journal will continue as will the convening of an International Conference every 2 years commencing in 1994. The present subscription rate of £10 per annum with, I believe, other currency equivalents. Membership of the Group also entitles members to a substantial discount rate for the journal, Planning Perspectives. The Group organise regular Planning History conferences in the UK and every 2 years an International Conference in the UK and every 2 years an International Conference is held. The present officers are: Chairman, Professor Gordon Cherry, Membership Secretary and Treasurer, Dr D W Mussey, and Editor of Planning History, Dr S V Ward

Contact Points

Derek Gunby: P O Box FM 524, Famona, Bulawayo, Tel Byo 61447 (day), Byo 41389 (night).

Cecelia Davison, 25 Dart Road, Vainona, Harare, Tel Hre 862172

Update

I have just received a newsletter from the Group. It has been recommended to the membership that the Group be renamed the International Planning History Society (IPHS) from January 1993. Two organisations are to be invited to become affiliates: the Society for American City and Regional Planning History (SACRPH) and the Urban History Association (UHA). A Council of 20 will be elected by and from paid-up members of the Society in the

History, distinctive in its concerns, insights and its personalia, is there waiting to take off. When it does, and its scholarship becomes widely available in published form, an international readership will be grateful.

A recurrent theme during the day was to emphasise the singular contributions of key actors - politicians, professionals, academics, observers and those in various positions of authority or influence on matters of urban and regional planning and the course of urban development over two centuries. Time and again we came back to the quirkiness and irrationality of the human input to city planning. Biographical studies accordingly figured large in the day's agenda - Walter Burley Griffin, William Holford and Gordon Stephenson the most obvious in the collection.

In many ways the day came as a welcome relief from many aspects of planning today; both practitioners and the observer beset by the deadening hand of a profession weighed down by a 'system' committed to process often without self-evident purpose. Planning history throws up scholarship in a discipline often devoid of it. It adds a vibrant dimension both to academia and the profession. It points repeatedly to the essential heart of planning: a recognition of process. It acknowledges the unexpected and accordingly teaches planners to be humble in the activity of negotiation and transaction.

My Australian friends (and now I have many) may be surprised that my incarceration for a day in unfamiliar lecture halls led to such a thoughtful reaction, seemingly a little distant from the detailed business before us. But good Conferences provide material which sparks off interrelationships with other things: this Conference was one of them. Planning history is not some esoteric specialism beloved of a hardy nucleus of historians and academics; it is an essential component of the planning discipline, and I fear that many do not yet acknowledge it.

Thank you Australia.
The Society was inaugurated in January 1993 as a successor body to the Planning History Society, founded in 1974. Its aims are to advance interrelated studies in history, planning and the environment, particularly with regard to the industrial and post-industrial city. Its membership is drawn from several disciplines: planning, architecture, economic and social history, geography, sociology, politics and related fields. Membership is open to all who have a working interest in planning history. The Society for American City and Regional Planning History (SACRPH) and the Urban History Association (UHA) are US affiliates of IPHS.

Members of IPHS elect a governing council every two years. In turn the council elects an executive Board of Management, complemented by representatives of SACRPH and UHA. The President chairs the Board and Council.

**President**

Professor Gordon E. Cherry  
School of Geography  
University of Birmingham  
Edgbaston,  
Birmingham B15 2TT, UK.

Phone: 021 414 5538

**Membership**

Applications are welcome from individuals and institutions.

The annual subscription is:

- Australia 24.50 $ Aus  
- Canada 21.50 $ Can  
- France 90.00 FF  
- Germany 27.00 DM  
- Italy 23,500.00 Lira  
- Japan 205.00 Yen  
- Netherlands 30.00 Fl  
- USA 17.00 $ US  
- UK 10.00 £

Further alternative currencies available on request from:

Dr David W. Massey  
Secretary/Treasurer IPHS  
Department of Civic Design  
University of Liverpool  
Liverpool L69 3BX, UK.

Phone: 051 794 3112

Applications for membership should be sent to Dr Massey. Cheques, drafts, orders etc should be made payable to the ‘INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY’.