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Leicestershire planning.

2. Planning is an established strand of Australian planning history. The proceedings of the first Australian planning history conference held in 1990 represent the first focused collection of biographically-inspired papers.

The six papers assembled in this special issue of Planning History were first presented at the 1990 Sydney conference. They appear here in corrected and revised versions as a sampler of Australian research into the broad currents of and eccentricities within the planning profession.

The six papers assemble to make a collective contribution to the factual record. But more importantly than that, like the best biographies they actually map planning history beyond individual lives towards revealing the more general impacts of ideas and institutions, suggesting research hypotheses, revealing contradictions and new murrings, and inviting debate.

A focus on the life and work of individual planners is an established strand of Australian planning history. The proceedings of the first Australian planning history conference held in 1990 represent the first focused collection of biographically-inspired papers. The six papers assembled in this special issue of Planning History were first presented at the 1990 Sydney conference. They appear here in corrected and revised versions as a sampler of Australian research into both the broad currents of and eccentricities within the profession.


3. John Pigott (1806-1876) had already been the subject of one article in this journal (Vol. 10, No. 3, 1988). Here, drawing on parallels to the progressive movement in America, Stefan Petrov looks sympathetically at his career as the leading political supporter of town planning reforms early in the century. The darker side of progressive’s emphasis on efficiency, organisation and order is revealed in Elizabeth Teather’s fascinating case of George Augustin Taylor (1872-1929) and his partner Florence Mary Taylor (1879-1967). Focusing on the Castlemaine development in Sydney, James Wierick explores the radically different social and planning agenda of another husband-and-wife team, Walter Burkey Griffin (1876-1937) and Marion Mahony Griffin (1861-1961).

Renate Howe’s public life of F. Oswald Barnett (1883-1972) really records the transition from the era when progressive ‘social’ reformers dominated the debate on housing and urban reform to the period of dominance by professionals. Drawing on their work, Vital Connections: Melbourne and its Board of Works 1891-1991, Tony Dingle and Camille Rossman deal with one of these professionals, the engineer J. Fermor (1894-1968), who founded chief planner of metropolitan Melbourne through the 1950s. The final study by Barbara Norman’s account of the early career of the architecture-trained Peter Harrisson (1816-1990), chief town planner of Canberra through its ‘golden age’ of development from the late 1930s.

Three of these papers obviously make a collective contribution to the factual record. But more importantly than that, like the best biographies they actually trace planning history beyond individual lives towards revealing the more general impacts of ideas and institutions, suggesting research hypotheses, revealing contradictions and new murrings, and inviting debate.

NOTICES

Editorial Notes

The Editor would like to thank Robert Freestone and colleagues for their contributions to this issue of Planning History.

Conference Convener

The International Planning History Society’s new Conference Convener is Dr. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin. Dr. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, School of Architecture, University of Thessaloniki, Greece. She has a Degree in Architecture and a Doctorate in Urban Planning from the University of Thessaloniki. She has also studied urban sociology and has a Diploma from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris. She has participated in several research projects in the fields of urban sociology, urban rehabilitation and urban policy in Greece. Dr. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin is currently engaged in research work on the evolution of city planning in the United States and the other Nordic countries during the inter-war period.

Dr. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin has published several books and numerous articles on contemporary and historical issues in city planning, and has edited special issues of international journals on similar topics. She is invited to lecture in Poland, Portugal and the United States.

Besides being an active member of the International Planning History Society, Dr. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin is also a member of the European Association of Urban History Teachers and the Greek Section of the International Committee for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage. She is also on the management board of the Helvetic Planning and Urban History Association. The latter, in association with the International Planning History Society, will be organizing a conference on ‘Planning of Capital Cities’ in Thessaloniki between 31 October and 3 November 1996. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin has been nominated as convener for this conference.

The Urban History Association Prizes 1994

Recipients of prizes awarded by The Urban History Association in 1994 for outstanding scholarship include:

Best dissertation in urban history, without geographic restriction, completed in 1993:
Dr. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin, ‘Sorting Out the New South City: Charlotte and Its Neighbours’. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Best journal article in urban history, without geographic restriction, completed in 1993:
Dr. Yhela Gustav-Atamnulin, ‘A Model Flemish Bureaucratic Teaching in South Studies at Emory University’.

Planning History: Back Issues

Paul Yning of Wynn Thomas and Partners has a complete set of Planning History that he now wishes to dispose of. Anyone interested in purchasing them from him can reach him at: 17 Wingfield Road, Whitchurch, Cardiff CF11 1NJ, UK. Tel: 01222 643073 (home); 01222 398661 (office).
Progressivism and Town Planning

While acknowledging the diverse international influences on Fitzgerald’s thought, we can analyze his ideas in terms of Progressivism. Progressivism developed as a response to America’s rapid transition from a rural to an urban, industrial society. Industrialization had created and intensified social ills such as poverty, poor housing, and overcrowded cities, all of which had repercussions for social stability and health. Progressives demanded that governments abandon the laissez-faire principles associated with nineteenth-century liberalism and extend their activities into all spheres of American life to protect the welfare of citizens. They placed “great faith in the power of an expert bureaucracy to apply technological and scientific skills for the betterment of all society.”

Harmony and cooperation between all classes should be fostered by the government to overcome the impersonal industrial environment and make the nation strong. Organisation could achieve efficiency, order, and progress. Efficiency, a key concept for Progressives, meant being “imbued with purpose, and bending every spirit and skill to that purpose.” Waste resources were anaathema. The emphasis on cooperation, applied science, organisation, and efficiency permeated the major components of Progressivism: scientific management and welfare capitalism: engineries and health reforms; conservation, the back to the country movement and, above all, town planning.

For Progressives, the city was the microcosm of the nation, where all the evils they desired were found. The town planning movement “symbolized the Progressive infusion with efficient social organization.” Town planning would ensure control over the growth of cities and reduce poverty, relieve congestion and overcrowding, and improve health. Efficient municipal government, staffed by experts, such as engineers and town planners, was required to achieve their goals.

Let us now turn to Fitzgerald’s ideas. He believed the city was the “home of the race” and “no effort and no expenditure must be spared to make it a beautiful” and “a highly organised and splendidly efficient instrument of civilization.” He adopted Burns’ definition of town planning as the “continuous ordering by cities of their social, economic, and civic growth, expressed and embodied in the land.” Like all Progressives and all town planners, Fitzgerald did not intend to change the economic and social order but he did want to ensure that all classes enjoyed a decent standard of living. In 1913 he wrote that the ideal of town planners: “is the highest which we can animate the human mind. It is nothing less than to create conditions which will produce a higher type of human being — a superman associated with the man of today in his physical, mental and moral attributes, in his capacity for creating wealth, and in his position to control his own destiny and enhance his own health and happiness.”

The type of men involved in town planning, “that strange co-operative and international brotherhood,” were, according to Fitzgerald “not mere dreamers or enthusiasts.” They were experts in their fields, who were imbued with a touch of practical humanitarianism. They included architects, artists, surgeons, engineers, sanitarians, ecologists, landscape park designers, town and municipal experts. But they also included businessmen, house agents, land experts, and builders, whose economic and political interests might not be the same as the first group. As Fitzgerald was a labor man, they would not be his natural allies, but town planners needed their support or at least their acquiescence. In true Progressive fashion, Fitzgerald wanted this body of experts to transcend their party political and sectional ties and to apply their special skills to overcome the problems created by rapid urbanisation. If they combined, Fitzgerald believed town planning would secure “greater opportunities for the workers and their families, and bring higher hopes to the nation, than any other reform now appearing above the horizon.” For Fitzgerald, town planning was a test of the central themes: reform of municipal government and environmental improvement.

Fitzgerald held that the ideal city could be achieved through an efficient system of government. Sydney had been poorly governed and the result was in 1907 a “city run down as a corrupt, lawless, inordinate, a maze of slums; its commercial centre crowded and embarrassed and choked by the overcrowding of its plankless thoroughfares.” Apart from the Sydney Municipal Council, representing the twelve inner wards of the central core, there were forty suburban councils. In addition to these elective municipal councils existed a number of non-elective or partially elected bodies overseeing municipal functions. Divided control caused unnecessary duplication of services, resulted in competition between the bodies instead of the mutually beneficial Progressive policy of cooperation, and meant there was “no coherent plan or organization to guide them in one steady direction.”

In 1909 Fitzgerald became a founding member of the Greater Sydney League to bolster his campaign for the establishment of a united body of local government. Fitzgerald wanted the Greater Sydney Council to control a wide range of services, seeing municipal ownership as “co-operative ownership.” Members of municipal enterprises were shared with consumers by reducing prices and thus minimising class differences in material terms. A Greater Sydney Council would also improve the administration of public health. This concern for public health was a crucial tenet of Progressive thought. Racial efficiency had to be maintained in all costs to the health-producing capacity of workers. In 1914, in a lecture on the government of Sydney, Fitzgerald told the Chamber of Commerce members: “As long as the workers are healthy and happy, they are an asset to the community.” He said that the businessmen were the best workmen, he more contented, he more healthy and does not continuously. He is no burden upon his fellow citizens.”

After he joined the Legislative Council, Fitzgerald failed in 1915 and 1919 to have Greater Sydney included in the Sydney Bills passed. The Local Government Act 1919 was Fitzgerald’s greatest municipal reform. The Act provided for the establishment of county councils. Two or more councils could combine resources for a specific purpose such as electricity lighting or to deal with common problems. The Act was part of an apocalyptic process to show the councils of New South Wales “by a practical illustration... what can the law allow them to cooperate to improve services for their constituents.” Creating a municipal system of government run along the business principles of efficiency and economy was the aim of Progressives.

Fitzgerald thought town planning could improve the urban environment in two ways. One was to provide more parks and recreational areas and the other to...
provide better housing for workers. Providing a comprehensive system of parks eased issues such as health, social stability, and conservation that were important to Progressives. Parks provided country conditions in the wake of city life which was of inestimable value for the health and stamina of the race. Progressives took on the "city park" as "the center of communal life."

All citizens, irrespective of their class, could enjoy the fresh air, the scenery, and attractions like gardens and music that a modern park should offer. If city residents occupied their leisure time in such pleasurable pursuits, the incidence of crime and other social diseases would be gradually reduced (an exaggerated view of the social benefits of parks). Sydney contained many areas of unoccupied land, filled with trees. As the city grew people knew that open spaces should be organized along scientific lines. The beauty of Sydney could be enhanced by a wall of forests around the outskirts of the city and by linking the masses of inner house and rows of trees. As a "Progressive," Fitzgerald asserted that to conserve "the status quo of prodigal nature" was the most noble task of statesmen.

The center of Fitzgerald's interest in town planning was providing better housing for workers. Decent housing was at the core of what Fitzgerald the social reformer constituted a reasonable standard of living. He was appalled by the crime, immorality, and poverty associated with the slums dotted throughout the Greater Sydney area. Fitzgerald was particularly worried by the effects of slums on the health of women and children because of the implications for the future physical and moral condition of the race.

In 1912 Fitzgerald was given an opportunity to put precept into practice when he was appointed chairman of the New South Wales Housing Board. The Housing Board's major brief was to build a model garden suburb, which became known as Daceyville, on land at Kingsford, five miles from Sydney. Daceyville, Fitzgerald said, was "a small experiment in economics" because the high standard of housing would improve the health and the "moral rectitude" of residents. Opposition to public housing schemes and Fitzgerald's appointment of the Housing Board for inefficiency stunted the growth of Daceyville, which never realized its potential.

Fitzgerald was a controversial Progressive cause. Fitzgerald refuted the deterministic view of genetics that the race could be regenerated by mating men and women of perfect health and intellectual ability if they lived in slums. But if the children of degenerate mothers and fathers were placed at an early age in a decent house in a garden village, were given abundant recreational opportunities, proper nutrition, if the mother was able to give proper care during pregnancy, and if the father worked shorter hours, then their offspring had "a better chance of being physical superman and superwoman than the offspring of equivoque half-bloods living in a bad environment." Moreover, Fitzgerald believed that "the first step in making Sydney a City that can be proud of is to get rid of the slum problem." Fitzgerald did not accept the fatalistic argument that slums were a permanent and inescapable by-product of laissez-faire urbanization. Positive action by civic bodies, in conjunction with the State government, could provide a solution to the slum problem. Fitzgerald saw housing slum-dwellers as analogous to re-education. In a well-governed country the forests prevented trees from being cut down without planting new trees. Similarly, in an ideal municipal system slums would be replaced with the type of housing found in garden cities.

Fitzgerald and his government were determined to build "something of a different order from our factory zones, our residential zones, our shopping zones, and our recreational zones." If a municipal council declared a district to be a residential zone, then a commercial service like a gasworks could not be built there. Councils were also empowered to examine the density and types of accommodation within the residential zone. Zoning benefited workers but also real estate agents and businesses seeking to maintain the value of their property. While not all that was greater compulsion for councils was a dire omission — the Local Government Act was a noble advance and the culmination of Fitzgerald's efforts for the town planning movement.

Conclusion

Progressivism, like town planning, can be characterized as "a movement of the established and possessing classes, seeking to save society from its excesses." To be sure workers would benefit from progressive reforms like town planning. They would receive better housing, improved health, and gain access to visited communal facilities. Progressives sought to alter the distribution of wealth. Even a compassionate social reformer like Fitzgerald accepted this limitation. In his town planning and other writings he tended to place the national welfare ahead of sectional interests like workers and housewives. But doubts about his motives remain. Too often after 1900 did Fitzgerald speak of the need to conserve and enhance "wealth-creating capacity" and "to resolve class conflict in the interests of 'industrial peace and progress.'" Too often the emphasis seemed to be on saving order and efficiency and only then dealing with injustice and inequality. His message has an apocalyptic ring that attracted few business owners and even fewer workers. Without wider public and political support, town planning only achieved piecemeal success before the early 1920s and was not the engine of social reform that Progressives like Fitzgerald had envisioned.

NOTES

13. Ibid., p.3.
GEORGE AND FLORENCE TAYLOR: PROTOFASCISM IN THE 1920S

ELIZABETH KEWORTHY TAYLOR, UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND

This paper summarises the evidence that George and Florence Taylor, prominent advocates of town planning in NSW, after the establishment of their journal, Building, in 1907, had fascist views and connections. It briefly outlines the social and historical contexts which gave rise to such views and, at the time, rendered them acceptable to many influential people. It suggests that one aspect of fascism — militarism — may have been particularly significant in the development of the planning profession and its philosophy and practice in New South Wales.

The Taylors: early town planning enthusiasts
George (1872-1926) and Florence (1876-1976) Taylor married in 1907 (Figs. 1 and 2). Florence had served five years as an articled draftsman with the Sydney architect E.S. Garnett. She was a highly competent businesswoman and an effective journalist, and made her way with determination into elite Sydney society in the 1920s. She continued editing Building: Lighting, Engineering (a monthly), Construction (a weekly) and The Australian Engineer long after George’s death. George, in his early years, trained as a builder’s apprentice and survey draftsman. Later he became well known as a cartoonist, and developed serious interests in the design and practical applications of aircraft and wireless. When the Great War broke out, he left Florence to shoulder the bulk of the responsibility for most of the journal that he had founded in 1907, while he contributed his expertise in mapping and wireless in the army. He wrote prolifically, including several short texts on housing planning. George campaigned vigorously against the Departmental Board’s modulated plan for Canberra, and organised a petition of architects and engineers throughout Australia demanding the implementation of Walter Burley Griffin’s plan, under Griffin’s supervision. The Taylors were instrumental in establishing the Town Planning Association of NSW in 1913. Building offered George and Florence an influential forum from which to air their views on all aspects of town planning after 1907.

Fascism in NSW during the Great War and after
A brief description of fascism defines it as “an antidemocratic, anti-liberal political movement [which] played heavily on fear of Communism and Socialism (and) evolved into a system of tightly regulated national industrial and economic policies.” The interest in fascism that typified European America and Australian intellectual circles in the first decades of this century represented a backlash against the rise of the Labour movement and its successful entry into national politics. Property-owning Australians were exceedingly fearful of policies that might be introduced by democratically elected Labor governments. Union membership was surfeited by the expansion in the economy as a result of the war. The Australian Communist Party was founded in 1920, militant unions campaigned to form the One Big Union that would overthrow the government and eliminate the power of big business, and the Russian Revolution demonstrated the potential power of the proletariat. Fear of a communist revolution in Australia, however ill-founded, was very real.

With democracy discarded in their opinion, many influential members of society saw in fascism the hope for an intolerant, progressive and patriotic society. Brigadier General G.B. Campbell, writing in the monthly journal of an organisation established in NSW in 1917, the King and Empire Alliance, argued, referring to the Italian Fascists, that “their ideals and their actions and the result of them are well worthy study by us in Australia at the present time”. The Fascists, he pointed out, had restored law and order where necessary and regarded the Nation as “greater than any form of Government”, their blood-stained red flag was second to none. Military men such as G.R. Campbell were particularly incensed at the unruly nature of postwar Australian society. The King and Empire Alliance was one public manifestation of Fascism. Eric Campbell’s New Guard was another. The New Guard comprised groups of men organised in paramilitary cells throughout Sydney and some country towns and the latter (1918). However, there was another paramilitary organisation known as the Old Guard, which Moore’s research has shown to have been more widespread and potentially more powerful than the New Guard. It seems to have had the tacit support of senior officials and politicians at state and federal level during the twenties and early thirties, and Moore assembles evidence that it was poised to take over the government of NSW in the event of Governor Game not dismissing the NSW Labor Premier J.T. Lang in 1912. The Old Guard was a secret army with the aim of protecting property interests in the country and the city. Such were the manifestations of fascism in NSW in the interwar years, and the Taylors were either involved or on the fringes of such movements, as will be shown.

Commenting on the widespread sympathy for fascist views during these years, Roe notes that “Fascism, in its pristine form, was not that syzygym for evil which both reality and rhetoric later made it”. It seems important to ask how the evolving attitudes to fascism were absorbed into ideas about planning’s role in Australia in the interwar years.

The social and political views of the Taylors
A detailed analysis of the full range of George’s and Florence’s writing would yield much more than the initial survey made for the purposes of this paper. George’s views may have altered during the twenties; Florence retained some strongly conservative views to the end of her life. In 1915, George serialized in Building, and later published as a novel, The Sequel: What the Great War Will Mean to Australia. Discussing The Sequel, Roe comments that “ultimately [Taylor] was to show as clearly in any Australian that progressivism could take fascist colouring.” The novel is a vehicle for expanding his opinions about the directions in which Australian society seemed to be heading at the time. The central issue in the novel is the confrontation between Humanism and the Socialism movement and parties and unarmed opposing forces. When the Humanists take over European governments after the defeat of Germany, they demonstrate the incompetence of democracy when it is not led by its natural leaders, who, in Taylor’s view, are the capitalists who have succeeded because of their natural abilities and integrity. Australian society succumbs passively to this form of domination. Taylor reiterates constitutional issues. Only economic, not political, organization appears to be significant in the new, postwar age of The Sequel. Capitalist rule is bemoaned: “the capitalists know the value of human flesh and nurtured it”. The twin principles of “Organisation and Co-operation”, “a similar system that had led them to power in the battlefields of Europe”, under the Syndicalism “grip on society and the economy, intolled into the Australian character by the perfect organisation that military training gave, and the intense co-operation the call of the blood demanded”.

Taylor’s admiration for the military led to his search for a man with military experience to lead the country. He had for many years admired the architect, Charles Rosenthal (Fig. 3), having met him in various contexts before the war, when their mutual interests in wireless, aviation, music and membership of the militia, as well as their overlapping professional fields, had...
women's auxiliary petered out after the debacle at the opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, when the New Guardian, de Groot, was unseated from his horse while leading the ribbon across the Premier. It seems that the New Guard's discontent was in the long run, greater than that of the Premier. Again, further analysis of Florence's writings are needed. Both she and Greig were fervent supporters of White Australia, and an illustration (Fig. 5) of a slim young woman in dupionis-draped in the margin of Florence's book, A Pot-Pourri of Eastern Asia, about her voyage to China and Japan, carries the caption: "Tall and Graceful, The White Race."

Discussion

Planners and planning enthusiasts who supported fascist lines of thinking in the first three decades of the century did no more than reflect the ethos of the times. Three strains of thought need to be mentioned here. First, there is the conviction, so clearly expanded in Lawrence's Kangaroo, that democracy could neither produce nor accommodate the wise leadership needed by western societies such as that of Australia. Secondly, alongside such disillusionment was the class view that "property and respectability conveyed a moral right to rule." Thirdly, the "call of the expert" is yet another world view that challenges assumptions about democracy as a rational basis for organising society. Planners were particularly likely to be attracted by this attitude. Sir John Salter wrote: "One competent expert will produce a better scheme in less time and at less cost than any board or combination of representatives."

The failure of planners to place the issue of resources, and therefore politics and social reform, at the heart of their barrage on "discipline" around the turn of the century despite the lead from Florence Howard has, arguably, thwarted their attempts to establish an independent professional of sectoral politics and founded on a discrete philosophical integrity. As Sandbrook puts it, "the triumph [was] of the relaxed view of planning as a technical, administrative task rather than as an essentially political process."

It was the first two or three decades of this century that saw the crystallisation of views about town planning. They were decades of intense debate and action on a political level. In horrified reaction to the trend towards fascist sympathy, many artists and writers turned to using their creative talents quite deliberately to oppose fascism and to express their sense of menace and social crisis. Where did individual members of the town planning movement stand in this era of turmoil in values?

Refusing to offer a definition of fascism, Haynes deals with several key themes. I will conclude by discussing one of these themes: Planning has long been riddled with militarism, both in its ideas and practice, and in its personnel. In terms of personnel, Sir Charles Rosenthal was far from unusual in being a military man in a planning-related profession in Australia. In Britain, the situation seems to have been different.

The penetration of planning by militarism has major implications. The original Garden City concept of social reform stands in antithesis to values brought by militarism. Planners with military training, or saturated with militaristic values through a socialisation process - and this could include women - could not be expected to sympathise with those who believed that people were equal. Spontaneity and delight at central principles of design would need to take second place to order and efficiency. To such people, peace was to be maintained by a high degree of arms and readiness, not by a grassroots process of social reform, as conceived by Howard. What is more, military men had chosen, and were trained, to uphold the social order, not reform it. Indeed, many were to offer their lives in the Great War to defend the status quo, and after the war Rosenthal, among others, was prepared to continue this attempt by both formal and informal means.
Another implication of militarism for the directions taken in Australian planning concerns the attitude of planners to women's roles in society. Even today, the depiction of women as passive is notoriously chauvinistic in its attitudes to women in the military. It may be that we should be looking at the penetration of militarism into Australian planning culture in order to explain the failure of planners to perceive the fundamental restructuring of gender roles that has slowly but relentlessly taken place this century — a failure that is bluntly expressed in Streatfeild's first edition of Ideas for Australian Cities, published in 1970. This is certainly an area deserving further research.

20. Sandercock. "The gendering of politics and planning: a poetics of feminism in architecture and town planning philosophy and practice. Further examination of planning practices and personnel in the 1920s and 1930s is needed to clarify whether planning, in the years before the Second World War, could ever legitimately claim "traditional planning's" postulate of political neutrality." 20

I am grateful to Martin Austin for drawing my attention to some useful preliminary research. Emeritus Professor Russell Ward, Chris Cunningham and Dr R. Haworth have also read and commented helpfully on this paper.


4. Taylor's books on town planning were: Town Planning for Australia, 1914; and Town Planning with Common Sense, 1918, both published in Sydney by his own publishing company, Building.


12. Ibid.

13. This is discussed by M. Roe, Nine Australian Progressives, pp. 191-201. In The Sequel, Taylor comments that Australia needs "an experimental Kitchener".


15. Giles, 50 Years of Town Planning, p. 76.

16. K. Maugraith Papers, op. cit., Ch. 8, p. 7. See also Chapter 4, pp. 7.


out to give physical form, tangible reality to a new national consciousness they believed to be in the vanguard of democracy. After he had been declared winner of the competition, but before crossing the Pacific to see the site or experience the society he had imagined, Walter confidently described Australia as a vast potentially productive undeveloped island continent with a people cherishing the highest standard of human rights, with no diet poverty or political corruption... a democracy already in the vanguard of political progress setting a standard for the entire world in its struggle against private monopoly and exploitation.

However, within a year of moving to Australia, Walter and Marion had drastically revised their opinions. They had begun to experience an orchestrated campaign of opposition to every aspect of their Canberra Plan. The bureaucratic and political battles which Walter, in particular, had to fight were a great shock to them. Caught in a complex web of jealousy, intrigue, indifference and misunderstanding played out against the social hysteria of Australia during the First World War, their faith in Australia as a rational, modern society was fundamentally shaken.

In 1920, after a seven-year struggle, Walter was forced to sever all connection with the city and the departmental officials with whom he had battled so long took charge. These "administrating authorities", he subsequently observed, proceeded to violate his "aesthetic social and economic principles in almost every act." Yet Walter and Marion Griffin remained committed to Australia. They turned their distinctive talents to highly significant but somewhat smaller scale projects than Canberra — most notably, the development of Castlecrag. In the process the social dimension of their work changed from emphasis in a concern with abstract ideals to a quest for authentic experience — a personal journey which would take them from the progressive program of Henry George to the spiritual world of Ralph Waldo Trine, a journey from modernism to a strangely compelling anti-modernism.

The creative tension between these two tendencies can be seen in every aspect of the Castlecrag venture (Fig. 2). The system of contour roads was a supremely rational solution to the problem of subduing the precipitous sandstone terrain. In horizontal and vertical profile, the roads were engineered to perfection. Sweeping around the contours, they were designed for effortless motoring, the quintessential experience of modernity. Yet in cross-sections the roads were narrow, confined in little terraces, lodges and cuttings incised in the living rock. As such, they were much more evocative of a pre-modern world, much more a series of timeless tracks like the mountain roads of feudal Japan which were their principal inspiration.

Walter named the roads for parts of a medieval castle The Parapet, The Rampart, The Bastion, The Citadel, The Bulwark, and so on, all peculiarly appropriate in relationship to each other and to particular features in the rugged topography, and all inspired, like the name Castlecrag itself, by the estate's crossing sandstone outcrop, long known in the district as Edinburgh Castle. Here an exercise in placemaking and image-building equal to any in the modern world of marketing was linked through a series of distinctively modern associations, with fortifications, strongholds, and the aesthetics of siege warfare — concepts barbarous in the extreme and far from remote to that generation of Australians. Powell has documented the converse force of anti-modern anxiety which has characterised literary expression and everyday language since the horror of 1914-18. In the context of suburban Sydney in 1921, Walter's system of road names was essentially double-coded, setting an anti-modern dream against the modern conditions of uncertainty, insecurity and alienation.

The domestic architecture at Castlecrag was similarly double-coded. Walter's houses were uncompromisingly modern in their sting and orientation, modular plan forms, efficient kitchens, floor slab construction and flat roofs, modern in their use of reinforced concrete, patented building systems, picture windows, built-in furniture, trap courtyards, skylights, roof gardens and integral garages. Yet these modernist devices were combined with a mode of architectural expression distinctly primitive in its deployment of rough-hewn granite, earth pressing walls, crystalline structural members, suppressed columns, summed like stumps, massive lintels, hooded windows, strange castellations and exaggerated vasculature. The Griffins seemed to want to revert to deep archetypes — the cave, the temple, the edifice. In these elemental houses fitted with future, Walter and Marion challenged conventional notions of suburban status, comfort and domesticity. Instead they proclaimed another set of values based on individuality, theatricality and the rejection of materialism.

In the 1920s and 1930s, Castlecrag was the domain of the modern family, avant-garde, committed to causes and broadly based interests, involved in play readings, discussion groups, contemporary dance and cooperative child care. Older children ranged free in the bush. The adults, somewhat eccentric in their ways, tended to be artistic and intellectual, free thinking if not bohemian, with a propensity to defy the conventions of marriage and the norms of gender relationships. Yet in the Griffins' day, the small human drama played out at "The Crag" could be compared to the heightened experience of the human condition contained in the extraordinary productions of Greek tragedy, Medieval mystery plays and mythical fairy tales, mostly staged in the bushland amphitheatre on the ancient cycle of solstice and equinoxes (Fig. 3). Again the modernist tendency towards the new, the rationalised, the transparent, a social reality freed from illusions, was countered by a return to the archaic, the elemental, the deeply mystical. The theatre of life at Castlecrag was poised between the experimental edge of modern experience: "the refusal to seek limits... to continually reach out... to go always beyond, beyond morality, beyond tragedy, beyond culture..." and the search for receiving archetypes, primal experience and reintegration ritual, "a veil of deep religious longing, an unending yearning to restore infinite meaning to an increasingly finite world."

These characteristics of Castlecrag as a place and as a community projected the Griffins' venture far beyond the established norms of real estate development, even though the enterprise was not immune from premature subdivision, inadequate servicing, ambitious advertising and outright hoardersm. Castlecrag's magical qualities also projected the Griffins' scheme beyond the norms of garden suburb design, despite the fact that precedents and parallels abound. Some of these schemes provided direct inspiration for the Griffins, others may be seen as significant parallels to the Castlecrag concept, but none more precisely than the Sydney enterprise. The history of land development, planning controls, middle class suburbia and utopian colonies is only partially relevant to our understanding of Castlecrag. As a concept and as a physical reality, Castlecrag has had to take on in the history of that highly charged but problematic, inheritances from the nemteenth century, the Gesamtkunstwerk, the total work of art.
From Wagner to Diego Rivera and the Bullies. Rrose, the integration of the arts served as a compelling metaphor for unalienated, organic experience. It involved the animation of the environment and its activities from the perspective of contemporary culture; this aesthetic movement was not only infused with avant-garde and primitivist, pure expression, but passed over in the commission that "the further one goes back ... psychologically, historically, or aesthetically, the simpler things become ... that because they are simpler they are more profound, more important, and more valuable." This analysis of primitivism in modern art applies with equal force to the built form and social space of urban landscapes.

When Walter was invited to speak on Castlecrag at the New South Wales Institute of Architects in 1931, he chose the title "Town and Simplex Homes," and in his address sought insights into "the inner imaginings, inspirations and intimations of individual consciousness, taking this example of the primary act of building the hut, the primitive house which "embodies ... consciousness, purposeless simplicity." Rejecting intellectualization and materialism, as forces which "had doomed the beautiful, exclusive cultures of the past, as well as west," he argued that "the new departures ... in sculpture, painting, music and architecture" could not develop from any rationalizing process. Instead he advocated a "subtle relation with the creative forces, whose most general available expression is the wonders of nature. If we use, and at the same time conserve; their current elements as intimately with them, not only economically, but emotionally and involuntarily, their inclusive harmony offers a common basis for the general culture, the great come homes should not be allowed to dominate, but should subservie the landscape." This inclusive aesthetic, with nature as its inspiration and framework, transformed the process of suburban development into an orchestrated artistic production.

The Griffins were able to initiate this ambitious program by acquiring the freehold of an extensive tract of relatively undisturbed suburban bushland on three peninsulas. Walter had been granted several lots by the shareholders who invested in his land development company, the Greater Sydney Development Association (GSDA), and through force of personality, the experiment that Griffin had joined in architecture, landscape architecture and community development over more than twenty years was brought directly to bear on new opportunity.

Griffin's freedom of action was guaranteed by the company's directors, who in 1931 granted the GSDA with a capital of thirty £1000 shares, the owners consisted, for the most part, of Walter's friends and political supporters whose faith in his abilities had survived the seven year battle over the implementation of the Canberra plan. The group included King O'Malley, the most powerful backer of Griffin's vision for the federal capital during his term as Minister for Home Affairs, the Reverend Chek Hang Chuang, leader of Melbourne's Chinese Community, Julius Gran, theatrical entrepreneur, Agay Wagar, a former Postmaster General, Roy Lippincott, Griffin's brother-in-law and fellow architect Malcolm Moore, the engineer who had developed the machines for Griffin's patented concrete block system, David Parkinson, Melbourne solicitor and Single Taxer, and two Sydney architects, George Thomas and F.G. Biggs. This group readily agreed to Griffin holding three special shares, with ten times the voting rights of the remaining ordinary shares. Peter Harrisson in his biography of Griffin states that his "arrangement would not normally be entertained by a prudent investor, but it is indicative of Walter's characteristic quality of dominating businessmen, politicians and professionals each subscribed one thousand pounds to enable him to pursue a dream." Walter's own investment was inadmissible and he would subsequently marry Marion and himself deeply into debt in an attempt to buy himself out of the GSDA's estate. However, to the extent that the Castlecrag venture was a total work of art, the GSDA shareholders modelled the role of the prehistoric builders. A number of them took advantage of the opportunity of securing a free lot in this most common condition that they constructed a Griffin-designed dwelling. This helped establish the distinctive character of the new suburb from the start. As these houses were available for rent, and the early residents were drawn from the Griffin's circle of interesting friends, the distinctive social character of Castlcrag was also established from the very beginnings of the new community.

In 1932, the GSDA lands were relatively inaccessible. Proposals to build the Sydney Harbour Bridge had imposed during the First World War. They were renewed in 1932 which would have been a further decade before the Bridge was completed. On the North Shore, there was no train or bus service, nor store or cafe and car access was far from direct via the distorted grid of arterial roads laid out over the broken terrain. Perhaps the most appropriate was to depend on the Castlcrag peninsula was the most circumscribed and leisurely of all, by water. The picturesque foreshores had long attracted picnickers, and the peninsula was the landscape was typical of the sandstone plateau country of the Sydney region, rising steeply from the shoreline in a succession of forested sandstone cliffs of a landscape of dramatic but sable beauty dissected by streams and waterfalls, canyons and rock ledges. The indigenous flora, dominated by the sinuous forms of eucalypts and angophorans, consisted of a profusion of species described by Griffin as "the richest in the whole world ... evergreen, ever flowering, lacking all weary characteristics ... and possessing the utmost variety of colour variation not only in foliage, but in twigs and bark, with open decorative structure and picturesque outline, embellishing rock formations and the most exquisite natural curving and waterways of every character, from waterfalls to land-locked reach and open beach." This landscape inspired Griffin's most distinctive innovation attempt, the creation to a suburb in which the highest elements of Griffin's imagination and ingenuity were, in the case of the GSDA's estate, unprecedented in the Griffiths' work, certainly at the scale of the Castlecrag venture. Philosophically this idea had clear links to the "humanist and American environmental movement, and there are some physical indications of the concept amongst the Griffiths' early projects and built works. Before their move to Australia, Walter and Marion had been involved in the design of individual summer homes in the northern woods of Illinois and Michigan, very much in the spirit of Thoreau. Griffin had also designed a small group of forest cabins, and an extended road system to service them, as part of the Allanrayon scheme in Decorah, Illinois. A summer resort for the employees of a manufacturing company. The most impressive community design of Griffin's American career, the Rock Creek Rock Glen subdivision in Mason City, Iowa, anticipated some of the architectural qualities of the Castlecrag scheme, such as the fusion of powerful primitive forms with dramatic formations of living rock. However, the landscape works at Mason City involved the restoration of a highly modified site rather than the integration of built forms with an indigenous forest. The Eagletown subdivision in suburban Melbourne, which dates from the early years of the Griffiths' Australian practice, incorporated a system of interior parks on the same principle as those later included at Castlcrag. However, Eagletown occupied farmland rather than an extensive stand of unfortified forest. The Castlecrag concept is therefore unique in the Griffin's career. The aim of using intimately with the Sydney bush did prove difficult to sustain. After Walter's death in India in 1937, the development of the suburb departed radically from the grand vision, but the ecological consequences of bushland development, such as rampant weed invasion, seem to have been unnoticed by him. Yet in the immediate post-war Australia, the dream of being at one with nature has not had such a powerful expression as the Castlecrag experiment of Walter and Marion Griffin. The source of this synecolosic mythopoeic power seems to reside in the dramatic tension between the modern and the anti-modern which was so characteristic of Castlecrag, the synthetic urban and social space. Ultimately, Castlecrag must be understood in terms of a certain set of wish-images and utopian visions ranging against the realistic and functional house production in the modern world. This is the condition which Walter Benjamin has described, in which the new turns back upon the past.

To the form of every now men means of production there correspond images in the collective consciousness in which the new and the old are intermingled. These images are wish-images. In these there emerges a vigorous aspiration to break with the past in contrast -- which means, however, with the most recent past. These tendencies turn the image fantasy, which gains its initial stimulus from the new, back upon the primal past. In the dream in which every epoch sees in images the epoch that is to succeed it, the latter appears coupled with the former pre-historically, that is to say, of a classless society. The experiences of this society, which have their true place in the collective unconscious, are the new that gives birth to the utopias which leave their traces in a thousand configurations of life, from permanent buildings to ephemeral fantasies.

---
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F. Oswald Barnett: Social Reformer and Planner

Oswald Barnett was one of the most significant figures in Australian housing and planning in the 1930s and 1940s. He was essentially a Melbourne man, convinced that well-planned suburbs provided the ideal urban environment. Barnett played a leading role in a campaign for slum reclamation in Melbourne, a campaign which led to the establishment of the Housing Commission of Victoria.

Barnett (Fig. 1) was “born poor” in 1883 in Brunswick, a Melbourne working-class suburb. The Barnett’s were Wesleyan Methodists and attended the large Methodist Church and Sunday School in Sydney Road. The influence of this active congregation remained with Barnett throughout his life and was especially evident in his firm and thoughtful Christian belief, commitment to social reform, and faith in the value of self-improvement.

Through determination and part-time study, Barnett in the 1920s was a dapper accountant, happily married with a young family and living in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne. Yet the “bay from Brunswick” was dosed with his comfortable life. After visiting the ragged schools and missions of the “back shums” of central Melbourne, Barnett argued over the dichotomy between life in the shums and suburbs. His response was to enlist the support of the Young Men’s section of the Methodist Church Laymen’s Missionary Movement in rescuing children from such appalling living conditions. The idea for the group to take as its particular task the establishment of a Babes Home to care for neglected babies and to provide for their adoption into Christian families seems to have come specifically from Barnett and in 1926 the Methodist Babes Home (MBH) was opened in South Yarra.

Barnett’s early theological and social imperatives also shaped his later ideas and activities. He wrote that the establishment of the Babes Home was “young” and “Christian faith in action.”

The success, the saving of the slums baby, inspired the youth of the Methodist Church, enabling them to put their spiritual ideas into actual practice for the benefit of little babies, otherwise condemned to live in a slum environment, often of a vicious and immoral nature. The change of environment worked miracles.

Although his later analysis became more sophisticated, he retained a strong belief in the influence of environment and in the value of a scientific approach to social problems; the importance of the existence of slums and suburbs in cities, and the desire to relate his Christian belief to social action.

Barnett’s subsequent involvement in the slum abolition movement and the establishment of the Victorian Housing Commission owes much to his experience in establishing the Babes Home. But he soon realized that his initial response to Melbourne’s poverty was seriously flawed. There was a grave limitation to the saving of babies in the slums. When a baby living in a slum had parents who were moral and wholesome, the Board would not consent to commit that baby to a Babes Home. The only practical solution was to lift the whole family out of its environment, and then demolish the slum they lived in.

The Unexpected Slums
The plunge into depression, especially severe in Melbourne’s inner city, demonstrated that comprehensive approach to poverty was needed. As well, Barnett, ever the enthusiast for self-improvement, had enrolled at Melbourne University, studying for a mature age student under Professor Douglas Copeland in the Faculty of Commerce. Barnett’s thesis on the economia of shums was published in The Unexpected Shums in 1933. It was based on a study of families involved with the inner suburban Fitzroy Methodisit Mission and revealed Barnett’s continuing concern at the relation between “slum mindedness” and poor housing. There was also, however, a growing recognition of the structural causes of poor housing, especially on the influence of unemployment and casual employment on the poverty and vulnerability of families.

In the mid-1930s Barnett’s Slum Study Group represented the main focus for social reform and housing professional groups in Melbourne and was an important reform coalition in the slum abolition campaign. The group met in Barnett’s office and discussed the latest books and reports, mostly from Britain, on slum abolition. The Group included representatives of the Brotherhood of St. Laurence, the Town and Country Planning Association, the Melbourne Ladies Benevolent Society, the YMCA and YWCA, and the Jewish Philanthropic Association. Barnett also gained the support of Keith Murdoch and the Melbourne press. His circulation afternoon paper, The Herald, for the slum abolition campaign.

As a result of this pressure, the Victorian Premier appointed Barnett to a Housing Investigation and Slum Abolition Board (HSAB). The Report of this Board in 1936 was a pioneering piece of social research in a country which had relied on Royal Commissions and public service reports as a basis for legislation. The HSAB Report was based on research on households in inner city areas of Melbourne identified as “slum pockets.” The research was initiated by Barnett and drew on his MA thesis. The HSAB Report was used to build support for the establishment of a public housing authority. This was a radical recommendation given that the State government had no role in housing regulation and provision and had no desire to undertake one. The Board’s recommendation reflected Barnett’s priorities and his belief in the positive and protective role that governments should play in society. It was a recommendation that had to be fought for; there was
little support for such an authority within the State government while the Trades Hall Council and the Australian Labor Party favoured housing schemes run through religious groups. The Report reflected Barnett's concern at the slums and suburbs dichotomy in Melbourne. If the CRC had demonstrated the existence of slums suburbs with those in middle class suburbs, especially in terms of differences in income, infant mortality and juvenile crime, it recognized the fundamental importance of unemployment and casual employment in explaining experimentation as the sort of alternative land use in lack of maintenance and the charging of high rents to powerless residents. Despite later developments in social science, Sweeney observes that Barnett remained in an important state of information on inner city living conditions in the 1930s and one of the most significant and influential social surveys in Australian history.

Barnett at the Housing Commission

The link in the evolution of Barnett's thought through the 1930s was his belief that all children had a right to a sound and healthy home environment. He developed the Babies' Home "neonate and adopt model" to one of the total relocation of the slum family to a healthy, well-designed living environment and also planned for the redevelopment of the old slum neighbourhoods. These were the aims of the Housing Commission of Victoria (HCV) established in 1933, with Barnett as deputy chairman. The early work of the Commission involved the rehousing of families in garden city environments and building of inner city estates. The work of the Commission was innovative in terms of designing and site planning. Some of Melbourne's best architects and planners worked for the HCV in this period. Barnett's ideas on low-income housing were further developed as a result of his experience with the HCV. He moved from his early views on slum reclamation and the rehousing of families in garden city environments to the building of large scale housing estates. Despite some adverse experiences with the HCV, however, Barnett remained convinced that the development of well-designed suburbs for low-income housing was the ultimate solution to slum housing.

From 1941, Barnett became increasingly involved in changing the HCV from a slum reclamation authority to an estate developer. The HCV was responsible for the planning and building of estates related to industrial development in the outer northern and western suburbs of Melbourne and in regional Victoria. The Commission pioneered the large scale prefabrication of housing in the post-war period, especially in concrete housing, which was used to build villa houses and walk-up flats on the new estates. By the end of the war, the HCV had emerged as a major urban planning and housing authority.

The new order

Barnett's ideas influenced post-war ideas of housing and planning. The CRC had recommended the HCV as a model for other State governments and the Commonwealth, which was turning its attention to the problems of inner city housing and solutions to the anticipated post-war housing shortage.

The HCV was the most advanced experience of the State housing authorities and had carried out the most extensive of the pre-war housing projects. Walter Banning, executive officer of the Commonwealth Housing Commission which was established in 1943 to investigate the housing needs of post-war Australia, though the HCV had "carried out the best and most extensive of the pre-war projects in its demolition and building campaign." He believed the practice of the HCV in buying large areas of land near industrial employment, subdividing and building under large contracts and adjusting rent to tenants' incomes, was the way to go in the post-war period. The Victorian housing legislation and experience was an important contribution to the federal body's deliberations and recommendations.

Barnett's Housing the Australian Nation (1942), written with W.O. Barr, a fellow HCV commissioner, set out the achievements of the HCV and projected it as a model. His We Must Go On: A Study of Planned Reconstruction and Housing (1944) with Barr and Frank Heath, was a call for centralized planning of economic development, urban infrastructure and housing and argued for strong central planning not only to create pleasant living and working environments in the post-war era but to ensure a more equal and fair society. Barnett considered a significant contribution to the post-war debate through these books, produced at the height of wartime restrictions by what for any other author would seem an unusual combination: the Left Book Club and the Methodist Book Depot.

In Australia post-war reconstruction had a rather different agenda than in Europe, where it was closely related to the rebuilding of cities horribly destroyed by war. Post-war planning was equated with aspirations to improve the Australian standard of living. The reconstructionists believed that this objective could be achieved through the centralization and coordination of planning, the decentralization of housing and industry, and the establishment of a more efficient and modern public administration which would enable the nationalization of industry and land and guarantee a living wage for all. The book attacked the capitalist system arguing that "only the establishment of a classless society based on the principle of cooperation and goods will enable us to have life in its fullest and highest sense." We Must Go On advocated a more moderate Commonwealth Planning Authority to which Parliamentary Planning Authorities and Regional Committees would be responsible.

We Must Go On was described by the planner Sidney Laker as an "inspiring book." The authors argued that town planning should deal with more than maps, vision, lay-out and architecture. Model towns must be related to social and economic development and have in an ideal community human beings and their welfare. The book included chapters on economic planning, planning for social services and financing reconstruction. The CRC encouraged an extensive bibliography and recommendations for a regional, State and national planning structure.

At the State level, Barnett envisaged a high degree of cooperation between Victoria's statutory infrastructure authorities; he was instrumental in the early post-war period in the establishment of a Central Planning Authority (CPA) representing these bodies and chaired by the Minister for State Development. The CPA assisted the HCV in developing housing estates related to industry in the metropolitan area and regional Victoria. The largest project undertaken by the infrastructure authorities was the building of large housing estates in the Latrobe Valley related to the development by the State Electricity Commission (SECV) of new power stations and the expansion of brown coal mining. The HCV and SECV joined in 1946 to explore the possibilities of developing the region on a planned basis.

The Latrobe Valley plan was based on the American model of making the primary school the centre of the residential units with no house more than half a mile distant from the school. Barnett believed that this would create a sense of community. The CRC's planning was driven by the belief that the establishment of central planning authorities would ensure a more equal and fair society. The CRC considered a significant contribution to the post-war debate through these books, produced at the height of wartime restrictions by what for any other author would seem an unusual combination: the Left Book Club and the Methodist Book Depot.

In Australia post-war reconstruction had a rather different agenda than in Europe, where it was closely related to the rebuilding of cities horribly destroyed by war. Post-war planning was equated with aspirations to improve the Australian standard of living. The reconstructionists believed that this objective could be achieved through the centralization and coordination of planning, the decentralization of housing and industry, and the establishment of a more efficient and modern public administration which would enable the nationalization of industry and land and guarantee a living wage for all. The book attacked the capitalist system arguing that "only the establishment of a classless society based on the principle of cooperation and goods will enable us to have life in its fullest and highest sense." We Must Go On advocated a more moderate Commonwealth Planning Authority to which Parliamentary Planning Authorities and Regional Committees would be responsible.
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effective planning body and in 1947 the task of preparing and implementing a metropolitan plan was handed over to another infrastructure authority the Metropolitan and Monash University, Melbourne.

The backlash

Even before the war ended, the political tide was turning against the reconstructionists. In We Meet Go On, Barnett and Heathe answered criticisms of their policies as Fascist plans.

Our purpose is just the opposite. The State must make the necessary provision to enable each citizen to fulfill his or her own peculiar individual talents to the utmost... In fact, to plan to develop every citizen's highest will bring not only happiness to the individual, but greater prosperity and commitment to the community as a whole. In finding his or her own salvation each individual becomes a fully developed personality and with all its citizens so developed a nation becomes truly great.

Such arguments could not count the strong demand for private rather than communal control of productive resources. The backlash against the controls of the war years and the post-war demand for consumer goods as the nation recovered undermined the plans for the "new social order." As Barnett wrote in We Meet Go On, "we realize that new plans and laws however commendable will not of themselves build a new order... It would ultimately wreck the grand purpose of the best plans!

In 1948 Barnett resigned from the HCV when it was clear that the conservative State government of the time would not renew his appointment as commissioner; the reason given was his alleged socialism. Barnett's own career had moved considerably away from its early years in the Communist Party. Barnett described himself as a socialist, but not "because of Karl Marx, but because of Jesus Christ" and the Methodist journal, the Spectator, supported him against the "underground" attacks.

Planning for the future

Barnett made a significant and important contribution to the debate about planning and housing in the period of post-war reconstruction. He argued for a larger vision at time when planning in Australian cities was at its height. His insistence on the importance of strategic planning, of coordinating housing and urban development with economic and infrastructure planning and of cooperation between levels of government, still needs to be treated in Australian planning.

Barnett also made an important contribution in emphasising the social goals of planning and in his focus on communities. Barnett's career had moved considerably away from an early years in the Communist Party. Barnett described himself as a socialist, but not "because of Karl Marx, but because of Jesus Christ" and the Methodist journal, the Spectator, supported him against the "underground" attacks.

Barnett took his toll on Barnett's reputation and business. Now in his sixties, he felt bitterly the recriminations of the cold-war period. As he noted in his memoirs:

Even now people say: Well he mightn't be a communist but he's a fellow traveller—he's a socialist at heart.

T he Victorian Parliament passed legislation giving the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works an authority, which was to prepare a Master Plan for Melbourne in 1949. The Board of Works was one of the few broadly representative metropolitan-wide bodies in a city where local government was fragmented into scores of independent municipalities. It had been formed in 1891 to operate Melbourne's water supply and sewage systems, consequently it had the all-important power to levy taxes on properties to finance its activities. Geoffrey Hutton, regular writer on planning issues in Melbourne's Argus newspaper, could only raise very qualified enthusiasm for the legislation. "The State," he wrote: has had its way into planning like a swimmer taking a first dip into a river—first a toe, then a foot, then an ankle. Today, it would be far from easy to say that we are up to our knees in it, but no more.

It would also be fair to say that it was E.F. Borrie, the man chosen by the Board of Works to prepare the plan, who plunged Melbourne fully into the water. Victoria lagged behind much of Australia in planning matters in the 1940s. Pressure from the federal government and the state government had been building for a long time, but Victorian planning was still largely uncoordinated. The Board was the only viable option. Again Hutton was right.

F. F. BORRIE AND THE 1945 MASTER PLAN FOR MELBOURNE CAROLYN RASMUSSEN, UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE AND TONY DINGLE, MONASH UNIVERSITY
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his plan. Ultimately, the system that was built departed very little from that already prepared by the Board's chief engineer, William Thwaites, but Mansorh continues to get the greater part of the credit. It was also the case in 1950 that any overseas appointment would have to rely heavily on Borrie. The Board was clearly swayed by arguments such as those put forward by the Victorian Institute of Architects. Borrie would be in "the unique position of knowing the working of local government administration, which is undoubtedly the basic requirement for the success of any town-planning scheme." Borrie himself was confident that he possessed broad knowledge and experience on a number of critical aspects of planning. More significantly, he stressed that it was "not a job for one man or one profession." He would simply be "the leader of the team." Ultimately, that team included an architect, an economist, a surveyor, and a sociologist. Although Borrie undertook a course in statistics to extend his skills, he considered "common sense and judgment the main qualifications for a good planner." Hugh Stretton, an influential intellectual, later described him affectionately as one of a rather rare breed "an engineer capable of intelligent thought about social matters." The Master Plan encompassed land within a fifteen mile radius of the city centre as well as some additional areas to take account of Melbourne's lopsided growth. The Plan was to be financed with a one-off levy of a halfpenny in the pound, a very tight budget indeed. Because most of the planning positions were only offered on a temporary basis they proved difficult to fill and the commencement of the work was delayed for many months. Eventually a team of about thirty people was assembled and they spent several years "ascertaining the facts" about Melbourne. Hundreds of maps charted existing patterns of land use and volumes of statistics were collected. Where there was no existing data on what were considered to be important questions, the planners were innovative in generating their own. G. J. O'Connor, the economist and sociologist on the team brought in the Gallup Poll Organisation to distribute a questionnaire to over 4000 households seeking "to ascertain the habits, desires, and needs of the people." More than 1200 businesses were also surveyed. Professional bodies, engineers, architects and surveyors, were encouraged to set up consultative committees to comment on proposals. There was close liaison with other public authorities so far as this was possible. The underlying assumption was that "the accurate interpretation of people's wants ... is fundamental to any successful planning scheme in a democratic community such as ours." The Plan was ready by August 1953 (Fig. 2a). It had a number of basic aims, of which perhaps the most important were: the limitation of the urban area through the use of a rural zone with a minimum sub-division size of 2.5 acres; a rationalisation of future development through a system of land-use zoning, and the reservation of land for future public purposes such as schools, hospitals, and roads. The primary aim of the zoning system was orderly future development. It was not intended to disrupt existing use. The rural zone, popularly known as the "green belt," was placed more or less at the limits of current settlement. Industrial and residential zones were designated with an eye to keeping journey to work times as short as possible and five district business centres were identified at Footscray, Moorabbin, Preston, Box Hill and Dandenong. At the outset, Borrie had stated his commitment to a flexible plan that could be modified to meet unforeseen circumstances and that his intention was to follow trends rather than lead them; he was convinced that "economic and social factors will determine the overall size, character and needs of any Australian city. A planning scheme can merely provide for such needs in the best possible manner, and so long as people are free to choose where and how they live, this must continue to be so." It was true that there was no legislative basis for doing anything beyond this and it is doubtful if the community was prepared for any major disruption of existing patterns of development. Even so, there was much in the plan that was radical for the time. Borrie's admiration for American cities led him to accept rather earlier than many that the car would have to be accommodated and that this would radically alter the shape and design of the city. At the same time, his dislike of the ageing inner suburban housing stock and his belief that central city employment would expand markedly, led him to argue strongly for its replacement with greater density and high-rise housing. His proposal for the redevelopment of the symbolic and administrative heart of the city involved virtually axing eight central city blocks. A ring road would encircle the area and link up with a network of radiating freeways. Finally, Borrie built into his plan a generous formula for the provision of parks, playing fields and other forms of open space. This he was responding to a powerful and distinctly romantic element in the public pressure for planning, but, like all the more radical elements of the plan, if it involved finance or legislation, implementation would be fraught with difficulty. The basic themes of Borrie's plan were efficiency and practicality. Borrie was at pains to dampen unrealistic expectations. The belief that town planning was "merely the creation of the city beautiful was mistaken." It was true that planning would lead to a more beautiful city, but its main purpose was to make the city more efficient, a place in which it would be easier to earn a living and "a better place to enjoy the rewards of labor." "A city must be efficient to prosper." Planning would ensure this by taking stock of present and future needs, developing a "blueprint" based on them, and then enforce orderly development so that "when the time comes works which will be needed to keep the city functioning efficiently can be carried out at the lowest possible cost." This was music to the ears of dwellers in the newer suburbs waiting through stagnant water in "beachbreak streets", waiting years for the sewer to arrive, suffering poor water pressure in summer and electricity "blackouts" in winter. Of course, the Plan, however efficient in theory, would not give them these things if the finance for public works was not
Borrie knew only too well that preparing the Plan was just the beginning. He was conscious that its implementation would be unusually difficult, not only because of the vagueness of the legislation — "little more than window dressing", as the architect, Robin Boyd, aptly described it — but more especially because responsibility for implementation was divided between the Board and the municipalities. This meant, as Borrie explained to the Second Australian Planning Congress in 1952, that "acceptance of the Plan and the possibilities for effective implementation" would largely depend on "the reaction of the general public". Since he also believed that the public press was "probably the most powerful means of influencing public opinion and the best medium for bringing the full facts before the public in their proper perspective", he cultivated the media carefully from the very beginning. Although by nature a reserved man, Borrie adopted the role of publicist with enthusiasm.

It was Borrie's skill in selling his plan to the public generally, and municipal councils in particular, that ensured its adoption and the appointment of the Board as a continuing planning authority for the metropolitan area. The wide consultation involved in creating the Plan had already established much goodwill and commitment. When it was released to the media, the response was uniformly supportive. All the daily papers devoted pages to and editorials called on the Government to introduce enabling legislation immediately. The Age headlines for 11 November 1953 catch the flavour: "Ending a Legacy of Neglect"; "Vision of Progress in City Plan"; "Orderly Expansion"; "Bad Traffic Schemes". Other commentators, such as Robin Boyd, and Brian Lewis, Professor of Architecture at Melbourne University, provided detailed and favourable analysis. Borrie had even gone so far as to encourage international planners, such as Charles Bennett, Los Angeles Director of Planning, to visit Melbourne and comment favourably on planning and the plan. The public pressure which had given the Board the task in 1949 was successfully revived to ensure that this plan did not join the 1929 plan on a dusty shelf.

There was, however, at least one influential voice raised in caution against the wave of enthusiasm for the Plan which was sweeping not only because it overshadowed so precisely much subsequent criticism. Joseph Baric, Professor of Fine Arts at Melbourne University, worried about the undue influence of the "car parking school of planning", which, while masquerading as "realism" consisted largely of "efficient transport and sewerage disposal". Such planners, he argued, misled the public in representing planning as a short-term investment which will pay its way in 10 years and thereby wrecking its vital proposals.

Borrie was not impressed with the Los Angeles model, a city he believed had already delivered up its soul to car parks and freeways. He was far more impressed by Brisbane Mayor, Sir Raymond Chandler's "inspired" leadership in securing a "green belt" for that city. All the same, he was advocating more, not less, "vision" and he wholeheartedly endorsed the pursuit of public enthusiasm because "good planning is terrifically expensive, and can only succeed if there is a wave of idealistic public opinion behind it."

The climax of Borrie's campaign was the public display of the Plan in the State Library (Fig. 3). A four page news sheet, published to coincide with the exhibition, exhorted people to:

Make sure your children see the Planning Scheme Exhibition. It is a preview of the Melbourne of the Future, the Melbourne they will know if the plan is adopted.

It was an undoubted public relations success. People flocked to look at the maps and scale models, 1700 on the opening day alone, and more than 30,000 in total. Borrie and his team followed this up with extensive personal appearances at meetings all over the metropolitan area. It was a thrilling schedule, sometimes five nights a week, even for such a notoriously hard worker as Borrie, but it bore dividends. All the political parties had serious reservations about the whole issue, but the groundswell of public support was irresistible.

The Board was made a continuing planning authority to implement the plan and an Interim Development Order to enforce the plan throughout the metropolitan area came into force on 1 March 1953. The plan itself would be subject to a long process of refinement as objections were lodged and Melbourneans gradually came to understand the details of planning action or lack of it in their particular area, but the days of totally unplanned urban growth were over. The state had been pushed out into the deep waters of planning with Borrie's Master Plan for a life jacket.

NOTES

13. Later 5 acres.
20. Dingler and Ramussen, Vital Connections, Ch. 9.
Peter Harrison
THE EARLY CANBERRA YEARS
BARBARA NORMAN, CANBERRA

P
eter Harrison (Fig. 1) often described himself as an "awake bastard". Bob Lansdown, first secretary to the National Capital Development Commission (ANZC), and many said that he was right about the first, but not about the second. In fact, he was very much loved. However, this was this awkward but respected man with his obvious professional expertise that made Harrison such an influence on the planning and development of Canberra.

Background
Harrison was born in Brisbane on 23 October 1918 and grew up in Rose Bay, Sydney. He qualified as an architect through night school at Sydney Technical College. During World War II, Harrison worked as a sergeant draughtsman in the air force and after being discharged at the end of the war, joined the Works and Services Branch of the Department of Interior as an Architect. However, in 1946 he moved to join the Cumberland County Council (the first metropolitan planning authority in Australia) as a draughtsman's assistant for Sydney Lake (Chief Planner) and Rod Fraser (Chief Draftsman).

In 1950 he joined the Canberra Planning team at Cumberland County Council. This team was a formidable group with Eric Willis (who was later, briefly, Premier of NSW), Ken Thomas, who headed TNT (Thomson Nationwide Transport) with semi-trailers, and Bill Andrews, who later became Associate Commissioner and then Commissioner of the NCDC. It was during this period that the Cumberland County Council established the planning principles that were to underpin the metropolitan strategy for the city of Sydney. This included the use of a "green belt" and the notion of properly servicing rural lands prior to opening for development. Harrison was regarded as Chief Planner following the death of Sydney Lake, as the "intellectual backbone" of the Cumberland County Council and was greatly influenced by him.

Peter Harrison left the Cumberland County Council in 1950 to work as a valuer for a group of building societies for twelve months, while undertaking a postgraduate diploma course in town planning under Denis Winston at University of Sydney. During this period, 1950, he became a part-time teaching fellow and was soon promoted to Senior Lecturer after completing his Diploma. Harrison regarded this as the "easiest farming period of his life".

While at Sydney University, Harrison organised a host of visiting lecturers equipping himself with many international scholars and accompanied Denis Winston on his tour of Australia. Winston was a major influence on Harrison in his early professional life.

At this time, Harrison developed a keen interest in Walter Burley Griffin and his plan for Canberra. As the first secretary to the first congress of the Australian Planning Institute held in Canberra in 1951, where he initially met William Holford, he was exposed to critical international comment on the development of the National Capital. In his oral history, he reveals that he initially regarded Griffin's plan for Canberra as "completely unacceptable. Realisation". Harrison relates that it only arrived at an event in London, that he experienced a "change of heart". In 1955, when Harrison was attending an Italian conference, the Vice President of the Italian Institute of Town Planning, Dr. Antonio Del Ben, delivered a lecture calling for the use of "Italian green belts". This lecture was a revelation for Harrision. Del Ben's work was based on the ideas of Walter Burley Griffin.

Following this, Harrison was keen to regularly visit Canberra to examine Griffin's plan on the ground, where he reached the conclusion that Griffin "obviously knew what he was doing". In 1955, he followed up a call received by Trevor Gibbons, the Chief Planner for the Department of Interior, about some plans that had been drawn. These plans were Griffin's original drawings.

Brave new world
After thirty years of apparent neglect by various Ministers, the development of the national capital was again receiving political attention. The mid-1950s was a time of growth and prosperity and with that came a renewed interest in the planning and building of Canberra.

On 3 November 1954, a Liberal Senator for New South Wales, John Calman, asked the Senate to appoint a Select Committee "to inquire into and report upon the development of Canberra in relation to the original plan and subsequent modifications and matters incidental thereon". During this inquiry, Harrison made his first mark on Canberra. He helped write the submission to the Australian Planning Institute, developed by a committee comprising Walter Bunning, Roderick Fraser, and Geoffrey Fasthub. As a result of this submission by the NSW Division of the Royal Australian Planning Institute, the Senate Committee recommended to further hear evidence on the development of Canberra.

Arriving on an "auster" aircraft at Canberra, having missed the commercial flight from Sydney's Kingsford-Smith Airport, Harrison proceeded to give his evidence. In the Senate Committee's record of evidence, Harrison was critical of the lack of attention given to Griffin's main views and stated that "Griffin's scheme depended upon a landscape setting for the public buildings, like jewels in a landscape. It is not an architectural composition but a landscape composition". The Committee concurred with Harrison on the issue of landscape, but differed on the question of architecture: "it does not believe, however, that architecture is important ..."

The Senate Committee concluded, in part, that "Canberra's development has not been worthy of a National Capital" and that "to relieve this a body should be established with powers to take the necessary initiative and to actually make decisions". Prime Minister Robert Menzies, who then had developed a strong personal commitment to the development of the National Capital, asked Sir William Holford to examine Canberra's problems. Harrison visited Holford in London in 1955 while on sabatical leave and discussed his draft report. Holford concluded that Canberra's alternatives were either: a) to remain a divided city, with the floodplain as an open wedge between the federal town in the south bank and the municipality on the north — the third element in the group being the industrial town of Queanbeyan; b) to be a planned community, metropolitan in character if not in size, a cultural and administrative centre and a national capital.

Between the years 1956 and 1958, three far-reaching decisions were made: to establish a Parliamentary Joint Committee on the ACT; shift the Development Commission from Melbourne to Canberra; and establish a National Capital Development Commission to plan, develop and construct the city of Canberra as the national capital of the Commonwealth. Behind all these major initiatives affecting Canberra's future was Prime Minister Menzies. There is no doubt that his strong political support was critical to the subsequent rapid development of a national capital.

Building the national capital
The NCDC was established on 29 August 1957. The Commission was quickly staffed with leading administrators and professionals eager to fulfil the task ahead. John Overall was appointed Commissioner, with the Assistant Commissioner positions being filled by Grenfell Roddock (architect/planner) and Bill Andrews (engineer). Soon after Bob Lansdown was appointed secretary-manager. Harrison was then approached to join the Commission as Chief Planner, due to his expertise on Griffin and Canberra. Harrison had already visited the NCDC in mid-1958 to provide planning advice when, on his own volition, he prepared an initial scheme for 250,000 people. This was subsequently presented to the November meeting of the National Capital Planning Committee of the NCDC for consideration. Finally, Harrison joined the NCDC in late January 1959 after much negotiation revolving around whether his professional independence was going to be respected, something he fiercely protected.

While the initial focus of the NCDC was on the so-called "Parliamentary Triangle" and responded to Holford's report, it was not long before the Commission realised that the original Griffin plan for 75,000 would not be adequate and the next task was to develop a revised plan. As Chief Planner, Harrison immediately began to undertake a series of studies for the growth of Canberra. These studies included: the identification of densities at existing population centres coupled with the extension of the urban fringe areas in the traditional growth pattern of Australian cities; or preserving the open character of the city by limiting the existing population area and freeing new areas or peripheral districts on the surrounding rural areas.

The Commission adopted the latter and, during 1959, produced an outline development plan for 250,000. This plan, under Harrison's guidance, emphasized "garden city", landscape and topography.

Importantly, a identified planning team was to be extended to the city and established the "neighbourhood" concept for the design of future residential areas. Residents at the time were as comparatively self contained new towns in the open valleys, with creeks of hills and ridges to keep free of development. Major traffic routes would avoid passing through residential areas.

The chief proponents of these ideas were Harrison and the principal outline planner, Keith Storrie. The details of the plan for 250,000 were published by the NCDC in 1965 in a major book, The Future of Canberra. As Gordon Stephenson has said in a tribute to Harrison: "By the time the plan for a city of 250,000 people was adopted, Walter Burley Griffin was in place and for the first time Canberra was cohesive." Harrison strongly defended these principles for the future city of Canberra, both in the NCDC debate and in the evidence he gave to the Senate Committee. Harrison's view of the future of Canberra was well documented in John Gleghorn's work on Woden-Western New Town. After nearly twelve months, Harrison told the Senate Committee that the "scheme as presented was the best he could offer".

This dispute between Harrison and members of the Committee was finally resolved by Commissioner Overall in favour of Harrison, and the planning and development of Woden was underway. By 1964-65, Harrison was again focusing on the long term planning of Canberra. In a paper he delivered to a Royal Australian Planning Institute congress he argued that "an attempt should be made to find a pattern of growth rather than a precise plan" and he expressed in one method a series of districts essentially rectilinear rather than radial, an arrangement under which "the city centre and parliamentary zone need not suffer the pressures of unchecked build up of central employment of the kind which choked other cities".

Harrison continued to advocate a dispersed pattern of development as opposed to aggregation and delivered a paper on New Towns along these lines at the joint Conference of American Institute and Australian Planning Associations held in Toronto in 1963. During this trip he met Alan Vorhees, an eminent transport planner who specialised in the study of urban transportation studies. An earlier study in 1963, the Canberra Area Transportation Study, had already alerted Harrison to the need for a strategy review, but he had difficulty in
getting at the Commission to accept the need for a longer term plan. Finally, during 1966, the NCDC commissioned Alan Vothers and Associates to prepare a long term land use transport study for Canberra.

The transport plan that developed out of this work formed the basis of what became known as the "Y" plan. This has provided the strategic framework for the planning of Canberra until this day. It defined "national areas", accommodated growth by a linear system of boulevards, and established major employment and retail centres in each of the towns and the central area and created a significant open space system. Details of the "Y" plan were later published in Tomorrow's Canberra (1970).

Harrison resigned from the NCDC at the end of 1962, two years after Moneties had retired. During the period 1958 to 1968, Canberra had been transformed from a country town to a National Capital with the population growing from 30,000 to 90,000. The key elements of the Parliamentary Triangle were in place, including Lake Burley Griffin, the National Library and the Australian National University, and the development of the new town was well under way, in accordance with a long term strategic plan. The support of Moneties and the skills of people like Sir John Overall, Bob Landown and the chief engineers were essential to these achievements.

Peter Harrison's main contribution, as NCDC Chief Planner, was his ability to take Griffin's original plan and transform the principles into a visual, strategic and spatial plan that still guides development today. Harrison contributed to all three aspects of urban planning, design and management. In many ways, it was his "ability to transcend these disciplinary boundaries that made him such a successful Chief Planner".

Between 1968 and 1972, the NCDC was the departure of Harrison to the Urban Research Unit at the Australian National University, the senior engineers, Peter Fonda and Clive Price, and finally, in 1972, the departure of Sir John Overall and Bob Landown to the National Capital Development Authority. Harrison spent the next twelve years at the Urban Research Unit which gave him the opportunity to study other planning and development projects without leaving Canberra. During this period Harrison wrote several articles, completed his master's thesis on Walter Burley Griffin awarded by the University of New South Wales in 1970 and advised many scholars and authors on planning matters. In 1974, he was awarded the Luker Memorial Medal for his work on Griffin's plan and the history of urban planning.

Reflections

The focus of this paper is on Harrison's early years in Canberra. However, Harrison's contribution and influence on Canberra did not cease then. He spent the rest of his life defending what he believed was in the best interests of the long term development of the national capital. He became very disillusioned with the planning of Canberra and the planning profession during the 1980s. His principal concerns in relation to the development of Canberra were the management of the leasehold system, the "overdevelopment" of Civic, which he believed was contrary to the metropolitan plan of 1984, and the departure from neighborhood principles in new residential development. During his last years, he became involved in major court cases where he was challenging the appropriateness of the planning decisions. For Harrison, these cases were very demanding and exhausting.

In a letter to Gordon Stephenson in mid 1990, he referred to an "environmental assessment" by the newly created Inner Territory Planning Authority as a "shattering disregard of documents, exemplifying everything that has gone wrong with our planning profession - looking through the wrong end of a telescope with a blind eye. I have to demolish it. I will take some time." Later that year, after a cold tiring winter, exhausted from both illness and unpopular campaigning against what he saw as an inadequately planned decisions, he again wrote to Stephenson on 15 October. He began his letter, "I'm afraid I've run out of steam. After a pretty miserable winter, Spring has finally arrived in Canberra. The dogwood outside my window has an exuberant display of new leaves..." Peter Harrison died two weeks later on 30 October 1990.

Harrison contributed to and influenced the development of Canberra. As Chief Planner between 1958 and 1968, he championed Griffin's plan for Canberra and translated the principles of "garden city" landscape and neighbourhood into a metropolitan plan. By all accounts he was an awkward person, but a principled one who pioneered a new, more flexible, approach which many had to argue through rapidly changing times. As stated by Sparkes: "Behind the colloquial bluntness for which he was well known, Harrison had a planning idealist and visionary who cared quite passionately about the National Capital and had, mixed up with it an abiding poetic intuition about Griffin's grand design."

My thanks to John Gilchirst, Sheila Harrison, Mark Peel and Patrick Troy for their comments.
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Wye College Centenary
Gordon E. Cherry, University of Birmingham

Wye, Kent, is 'England's smallest University town with fine buildings and a profound sense of history; amply providing for residents' needs: enjoying a dry climate, beautiful countryside, and resting beneath the orchard-rich slopes of the Downs amid such neighbouring settlements as Boughton Aluph, Old Wives Lees and Pett Bottom.' From this bucolic description it is hard to imagine such a settlement providing an institution crucial to the course of countryside planning in Britain this century. But it is indeed the case, and an excellent and lavishly illustrated College centenary history reminds us of the contribution to teaching and research in agriculture and rural affairs conducted there over the last 100 years. (Stewart Richards, Wye College and its World: a centenary history, Wye College Press, Ashford, 1994.)

The institution began life as the College of St Gregory and St Martin, established in 1447 by John Kempe, a late medieval political prelate who later became Archbishop of Canterbury. After a chequered history it became a charity school but it closed in 1889 when it ran into financial difficulties. The College land and buildings were purchased by Kent and Surrey County Councils in 1902; two years later it was reformed as the South-Eastern Agricultural College.

What follows is a fascinating story in which many of the great figures in 20th century agriculture and related matters breathe the stage of Wye College. We can read Richard's narrative with profit: what might have been a self-indulgent account of a small and at times inward-looking community, is in fact a window to a world where planning historians all too interestingly gaze — rural land use change and the agricultural industry. Those with an urban orientation begin the century agly enough with Lindsworth and Hampstead as portals of things to come, and the legislation of 1909 which introduced Town Planning Scholars. But there is a different perspective: the setting up of the Development Commission in 1918 gets a much more intelligent mention, but it signalled a new attention by the state to play a significant part in supporting agriculture and influencing rural affairs, from which much was to follow.

The subsequent part played by Wye College in the visitations of national policy has been considerable, and at some points the history of Wye almost becomes a history of agricultural development and countryside planning. After World War I the rural areas were marginalised from public policy, but after the inter-war years, during World War II and immediately afterwards, the countryside moved centre stage. Later, with science and technology reapplied to agriculture, a whole raft of agricultural and ecological issues formed a new agenda for rural planning. At Wye, the rise of agricultural economics from a position where it had been a very junior partner to biology and chemistry, to one where it became a dominant influence, tells of this transformation graphically. The career of Gerald Webberley, which brought together the study of agriculture, planning and rural affairs, was of profound significance for British Planning.

The centre is marked by another publication, also profusely illustrated: The Natural History of a Country Estate, edited by T.A. Watt and G.P. Chapman. The Wye College Estate comprises substantial areas of semi-natural habitats, formal gardens and a variety of farms and horticultural enterprises. This provides a context for the interaction between agriculture and nature conservation, ecology and the environment, an ancient setting for the study of contemporary change which has clearly been inspirational.
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There were ambiguities in the 1929 Plan. Although the harbour was a central element in the plan, the economic goals and policies were quite vague. The authority wanted to build up a new Chinese centre, there was no clear solution put forward to encourage these centripetal forces that would residents into the centre to live and work. It would seem that economic factors were less important than ideological factors.

Compared with the 1929 Plan, the political and ideological colour of the 1949 Plan was light. The former nationalist belief that Shanghai would hold sway over the Far East (and even the world) was not manifested directly in form and space. The planners produced an embryonic form of modern planning in Shanghai, with western democratic ideas instead of the bureaucratic tradition. The City Plan of Greater Shanghai (1949) represents a great step forward in Chinese urban planning.

Why, under the same Nationalist government were the two plans so different? It was a period of social, economic and political fluctuation. The ideological backgrounds of the two plans were completely different from each other. The conditions of technical preparation in the two phases were also different. In the 1940s, many more students studied abroad. They brought back the modern conceptions of urban planning, and encouraged their absorption in China.

Conclusions

The years from 1927 to 1949 witnessed theoretical and practical progress in China’s urban planning. The tree of modern western planning theories was transplanted into Chinese soil. A wealth of experience of planning practice had been accumulated in this period, and that experience was still valid after 1949. In the socialist society, the City Plan of Greater Shanghai at least provided one pattern for Shanghai’s urban modernisation in the light of up-to-date planning conceptions and techniques. Although the Greater Shanghai Plan and the City Plan of Greater Shanghai were both dream on in the air.

My sincere gratitude goes to my supervisor, Professor Li De-hua, who gave me a great deal of concrete help and instruction during the research. I would also like to particularly thank Mr. Derek Gowling for his patient and generous help.


S. B. Duan, ‘Shanghai Shuiziyuan de Qianjing yu Chunjingkou Shuiziyuan Bayou’ (Perspectives on the water resources in Shanghai and the protection of the water resources of the Yangtze River), Yanjui Luncong, no.1, 1983, p.118.


Shanghai Zhaofang ‘The planning in Shanghai’, Shanghai Kezaixi Puji Chuban She, 1993.
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There were ambiguities in the 1929 Plan. Although the harbour was a central element in the plan, the economic goals and policies were vague; the authority wanted to build up a new Chinese centre, there was no clear solution put forward to encourage these entrepreneurial forces that would transform the city into a centre to live and work. It would seem that economic factors were less important than ideological factors.

Coined as the 1929 Plan, the political and ideological colour of the 1949 Plan was light. The former nationalist belief that Shanghai would hold sway over the Far East (and even the world) was not manifested directly in form and space. The planners produced an embryonic form of modern planning in Shanghai, with western democratic ideas instead of the bureaucratic tradition. The City Plan of Greater Shanghai (1940) represents a great step forward in Chinese urban planning.

Why, under the same Nationalist government were the two plans so different? It was a period of social, economic and political fluctuation. The ideological backgrounds of the two plans were completely different from each other. The conditions of technical preparation in the two phases were also distinct. In the 1940s, many more students studied abroad. They brought back the modern conceptions of urban planning, and encouraged their absorption in China.

Conclusions

The years from 1927 to 1949 witnessed theoretical and practical progress in China’s urban planning. The tree of modern western planning theories was transplanted into Chinese soil. A wealth of experience of planning practice had been accumulated in this period, and that experience is still valid after 40 years. In the socialist society, the City Plan of Greater Shanghai at least provided one pattern for Shanghai’s urban modernisation in the light of up-to-date planning conceptions and techniques.

Although the Greater Shanghai Plan and the City Planning and Policies were quite vague, the Nationalist government was responding to, or initiating, housing development and the extent to which perceptions and reality were being altered by the impact of war are important issues.

Housing had developed as an area of some importance during the inter-war years, starting with the cry of ‘Homes for Heroes’ at the end of World War One. It was a subject which aroused much popular concern and interest, with its attendant electoral implications both nationally and locally. One of the key issues revolved around questions of who was to build the houses, along with the extent, if any, of public subsidy, and the question of slum clearance. The Housing and Town Planning Act of 1919 had required authorities to survey housing needs and to build council houses and offered government subsidies to cover the cost, but reversion brought the end of the subsidies in 1922. This did not mean, however, the ending of the principles of local-central government partnership, involving subsidies upon government demand. These same principles were to remain the backbone of fresh legislation when the Chamberlain Housing Act of 1923 and the Wheeler Housing Act of 1924 were formulated. Under the Chamberlain Act, local authorities could only use subsidies if they could convince the Minister of Health that they could build houses better than private enterprise, and in the six years of the Act’s life 363,000 houses were privately constructed and only 78,000 by Councils. The Labour Government of 1924, however, offered a new round of subsidies specifically aimed at local authorities to encourage them to build houses with controlled rents. These were to be further subsidised out of the rates. By the time of its demise in 1933, the Wheeller Act had resulted in around 52,000 new houses, mainly council built. In 1930 the Greenwood Act gave subsidies for slum clearance, while the Housing Acts of 1935 and 1936 laid down standards of recentiment in housebuilding and, in the case of the latter, obliged councils to give preference to people in overcrowded dwellings. By 1938 the contributions which local authorities were required to make from the rates in respect of flats and cottages for slum clearance and the relief of overcrowding was expected to half the...