EDIToRIAL

Members of the International Planning History Society will, no doubt, be aware of the death of Professor Gordon E. Cherry, the President of the Society, on 11 January 1996. Some of you will have read obituaries in the local and national press and in professional journals, like Planning Week. A large group of his friends and colleagues managed to attend the Thanksgiving Service for his life at the Parish Church of Hampton-in-Arden, where Gordon was a regular worshipper. (The Vicar’s address is reprinted here along with other tributes.) While most of those attending the service expressed their sense of sadness and loss, the tone of the event was almost uplifting. While Gordon’s illness and death at a relatively young age came suddenly, he had had a full, rich and varied life and he was liked, respected and admired by those who came into contact with him.

I first came across Gordon Cherry at some of the early Planning History Group meetings. As a young post-graduate student I had read his early published works. It was a pleasure to find him such a friendly and encouraging character. He showed a real interest in my work, and later published a piece of mine in Planning Perspectives. After I moved to Birmingham he was even more supportive. In particular, he has encouraged me in my work on Bourneville. He also persuaded me to become editor of Planning History, in succession to Stephen Ward. He had a wonderful kind way of pushing people forward and encouraging them at the same time. I am already missing the advice and the brief notes that he frequently used to send me.

During this year, there will be a number of occasions at which Gordon Cherry’s friends and colleagues will be able to pay tribute to his memory. It is envisaged that there will be a brief opportunity (especially from those of us North American to consider and mark Gordon Cherry’s contribution to planning history at the Joint ACSP/AESOP Congress in Toronto in July. The International Planning History Conference, held between 31 October and 3 November in Thessaloniki, jointly hosted by the Hellenic Planning and Urban History Association and the International Planning History Society, will be an appropriate occasion to remember and celebrate the life and work of Gordon Cherry.

This issue of Planning History includes a number of personal and professional tributes to Gordon Cherry. They come from people who knew and worked with him over the years. They cast some light on the man and his work and they reflect the wide-ranging impact that he had, both here and overseas.

In addition to these memorial notices, Planning History contains its usual complement of notices, articles, research projects and book notes. Although this issue is largely devoted to Britain, I trust that readers will appreciate the range of material covered. The articles are on markedly contrasting topics: public conveniences and public sculpture. Clara Biegel reflects on the provision of public toilets. She insists the technical background, legislative provision, the design and placement of these facilities, mainly drawing on local examples from the south-west of England. As much of her work, she also addresses gender issues, noting the provision of lower public lavatories for women in Britain. In marked contrast, George Naskoy and Jeremy Beach look at the provision of public sculpture and review its meaning for, and assess its impact on, the built environment of Birmingham in the period from the late nineteenth century through to the late twentieth century. This article is a by-product of the Public Sculpture Research programme at the University of Central England.

Another valuable contribution to this issue is Toby Haggard’s research paper on documentary films and the reconstruction programme in Britain at the end of the Second World War. He advocates a multi-faceted approach to the subject, which places the films in their historical context. He seeks to combine documentary research, oral history and film analysis. Besides looking at those who commissioned and made the films and the context of the films themselves, he seeks to explore the reactions to the films. In addition, he also provides us with an invaluable checklist of British films on planning in the period from the 1930s to the early 1950s. As another couple of items show, this period of British planning history is currently attracting a good deal of attention.

I conclude with another farewell. Jeremy Beach, who has provided me with invaluable and necessary technical assistance since I took over the editorship of Planning History, is taking up a post at the University of Northumbria. On my own behalf, and on behalf of the Society, I would like to thank him for his excellent efforts. Thankfully, two colleagues, Ruth Levy and Gordon Langbroek, have kindly offered to assist me with the production of Planning History.

GORDON CHERRY 1931-1996

An Acknowledgement from Margaret Cherry

Over the last five weeks or so, my family and I have received over 350 letters and cards of sympathy for our very great loss. In our sorrow we tended to think of Gordon’s death as leaving such a blank in our lives, but we realize, through these letters and cards, that our loss is shared by so many others who knew him and held him in such esteem.

We, Gordon’s family, knew and loved him for his gentleness, kindness, integrity, generosity in all things, and especially in the giving of himself, and his great sense of humour. To realize that so many of his friends and colleagues also recognised these qualities in him is indeed a great comfort to us.

Gordon was a gifted teacher, and an able administrator. In 1968 he became Senior Lecturer and Deputy Director at the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies in the University of Birmingham. Gordon was elected to the chair of Urban and Regional Planning at Birmingham in 1976, served as Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Social Science for five years, completing his academic career at Birmingham as Head of the School of Geography, before retiring in 1991. Gordon was also a scholar of international repute. He published five major books about the history of planning, and a sixth which was incomplete when ill health struck is also going to be published.

He was a founder member and chairman of the Planning History Group, and a student of the International Planning History Society — an international forum which meets to analyse the historical origins of contemporary planning problems and policies.

Among a number of public honours Gordon received an honorary Doctorate from Heriot-Watt University, The City Planning History Institute of Japan awarded him their silver medal, the first ever such award to a non-Japanese scholar, and the Royal Town Planning Institute gave him their ‘Outstanding Service Award’.

Whenever Gordon and Margaret travelled abroad in connection with Gordon’s work, they would be welcomed and honoured by his contribution to his field was recognised throughout the world.

But Gordon was no narrow specialist. He was a man of wide vision and broad sympathies. Alongside his academic career was a lifetime of public service, much of it voluntary and unpaid.

At a national level he served the Royal Town Planning Institute in a succession of offices for over 35 years. For ten years he also served on a group which advised the Sports Council. For ten years he was a member of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. And for a number of years, he served on the Landscape Advisory Committee of the Department of Transport.

His voluntary contribution in Birmingham was as a trustee and later chairman of the Bourneville Village Trust. He was the first chairman of the Trust for Reproduction of this page is prohibited without written permission from the publisher.
who was not a member of the Culverton family. To this end, he brought an infectious enthusiasm and a vision of Bourneville as being in the forefront of solving the problems of urban decay and housing need. His initial interest in Bourneville may have been its place in the history of town planning, but his vision as chairman of the Trust and his dedication to his commitment to social action and the environmental needs of ordinary people. So it comes as no surprise that Gordon and Margaret were also involved as local organiser for Christian Aid, and that Gordon was a director of Solihull Family Care Trust, and for many years served on the Birmingham Diocesan Board for Social Responsibility. These were all manifestations of his deep religious faith, and his care for those in need.

And what of the private side of Gordon’s life? — the side that we in Hampton were privileged to share. Well, at the heart of that was his love for Margaret and his family. And he and Margaret met on tennis court — well not quite the tennis court. They met on holidays when Margaret’s friend said, “I’d love someone in this hotel playing tennis.” So Gordon, ever so gallant, obliged with a game, and as Margaret put it, a match that lasted for 53 years.

Gordon was devoted to his family, and he and Margaret created a loving and welcoming home for Shelagh, Shona and Ian and later for Keith and Tim, and for their grandchildren Jamie, Robert, Alistair and Kirsty. It was also a welcoming home for his colleagues and friends. The day Pam and I moved into the Vicarage, Gordon and Margaret invited us for supper — just “come as you are — we know what it’s like to move” was an invitation that would put anyone at their ease. We expected a simple meal in the kitchen — we were treated to a minor banquet with plenty of lovely conversation. I suspect many people have enjoyed such warm hospitality at the Cherry home.

Going back to tennis: Gordon was something of a tennis player and he was still playing just a few months ago. He was also something of a football fan. He kept an encouraging eye on Barnley F.C. (his home team), and enjoyed long and lazy days down at the Warwickshire County ground with a former Vicar of this parish, whose Vicarage is conveniently situated nearby. Expertise in town planning has its advantages!

But one cannot really understand Gordon without considering the central part that his Christian faith had in his life. He was a deeply committed member of the Church, and that commitment was not only to the Church of England. At heart his commitment was to the whole Christian community, and his deep desire was for Christian unity. How appropriate is it then that today should be the start of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. So it is not surprising that Gordon served on the Solihull Council Churches, or that he was involved in the Ecumenical work of the University Chaplaincy. Nor is it surprising that he was deeply interested in the dialogue between Christians and others of other faiths. The Journal for the Council of Christians and Jews often appeared through my letter box, and I know exactly who pushed it through.

Gordon exercised a gentle ministry of education to his parish clergy. He was forever trying to encourage us all to think more widely about God’s love, and our responsibilities in sharing that love.

Having said that, Gordon was also deeply committed to his own local Church. The Churchwardens staved, halfway down the nave, were his gift to the Church on completing his term of office as churchwarden. When I arrived he was responsible for the Church’s stewardship scheme, and at the ADAM he became Secretary to the Parish Church Council (PCC). His contribution was enormous, and of those who know about PCCs will realise the force of what I say, when I tell you that his greatest gift to us all was the breadth and clarity of his thinking.

Gordon could do in four words what many of us would have failed to do in a page and a half, and he always did it with gentleness and good humour.

Last February he pushed out through my letter box. It was a quotation from T.S. Eliot’s “Choruses from The Rock”:

The endless cycle of life and action.
Endless invention, endless experiment.
Brings knowledge of motion, but not of stillness:
Knowledge of speech, but not of silence.

All our knowledge brings us nearer to death.
But nearness to death no nearer to God.
Where is the life we have lost in living?
Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?
Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?
The cycles of History twenty centuries
Bring us farther from God into inner to the Divine

Gordon lived and died ministering in the Lord, whom he served so faithfully all his life. He was a wise, courageous, gifted and energetic man who touched many lives with his faith, with his love and friendship, with his common sense and his sense of fun, and with his gifts, his knowledge, and his skills. We have all been richly blessed, and there is much to be thankful for.

May he rest in peace and rise in glory.

Rev. John de Wit, Vicar of Hampton-in-Arden

An Australian Appreciation

In 1979 I was one of a couple of Ampleford delegates to the Royal Town Planning Institute Conference in Birmingham, Secretary-General David Fryer took me under his wing and introduced me to the then incoming President. Any qualities I may have had about English reserve were immediately dispelled. President Gordon Cherry made me feel at home and, before I knew it, he was drawing on his Evolution of British Urban planning to encourage my then half-baked interest in planning history.

We met again in 1986. The World Planning Conference was held in Adelaide. Organised by the Royal Australian Town Planning Institute, the International Federation of Housing and Town Planning and the East Asian Organisation of Regional Planning and Housing, it attracted hundreds of delegates from around the world, and had as one of its keynote speakers, Gordon Cherry. Some struck the notes of triumph and pessimism. Not Gordon. Drawing on planning history, linking Light’s Adelaide plan to Howard’s Garden Cities of Tomorrow and beyond, he inspired us all to understand how town planning was a profession of hope. Ray Banker and I had just published With Conviction — a title which, Gordon opined, said it all. On a visit during the Congress to Charles Hampton’s Richard garden suburb, Colonel Light Gardens, he suggested it was time for Australians to form a planning history network.

Gordon’s encouragement led me to visit Oxford Polytechnic (now Oxford Brookes University) in 1987 as a visiting fellow, where I tested out my commitment to planning history by lecturing to Mike Breakell’s and Paul Murrain’s planning, and urban design students on aspects of South Australia’s front row and urban development. Of course, there was a side trip to Hampton-in-Arden, during which my wife Nora and I got on famously with Gordon and Margaret.

As the Royal Australian Planning Institute Conference in 1988, I put out a notice suggesting that these interested in planning history should gather. I cannot say an Australian planning history group was formed, but, at least, the meeting established that there were kindred spirits around the nation.

Later, one of these turned out to be Robert Freestone, and he and I attended the 1989 Bourneville Conference, after which the Cherrys and the Freestones again spent many happy hours in and about Hampton-in-Arden. One expedition to Hay-on-Wye, during which Gordon ignored (almost!) the Malls of endless bookshops was perhaps the most memorable.

Period interest in Australian planning history by way of a paper published Planning Perspectives in 1993. Indeed, that year it could be said that Gordon’s gentle suggestions, or, at times, more forthright urgings, to academics and practitioners about the theoretical and practical importance of the history of town planning and urban and regional planning did not go unanswered. Two editors, one of whom was Gordon, turned out to be Australian and regional planning, and regional planning came to fruition. Saturday 13 March 1993 saw the re-election of the Keating Federal Labor Government. To the point, saw the holding of the First Australian Planning History Conference by what is now the School of Planning and Urban Development at the University of New South Wales. Organised by Rob Freestone, with Gordon as special guest, it was not only attended by those of us who formed that tiny band in Melbourne in 1988 but others who had subsequently taken up the challenge: Martin Austin, Jim Colman, Stephen Hanssnet, Barry Molloy, Patrick Troy, to name a few.

I was the President of the International Planning History Society, joint editor of Planning Perspectives and our mentor, had, inter alia, this to say in the preface to the Conference’s proceedings:

Planning history, or offering a powerful explanation of events, opens up a rich field of inquiry: why certain things happened in the past, what did and when did they; if they did, what did they; consequences of these; and, if they did not, what new problems unfolded and how were they tackled? In other words, planning history takes us to the heart of professional and academic subject — planning as a process, with all the quirks of the unexpected outcome.

It has never been better put.

This has been something of a personal "in memoriam" to Gordon. But I know I speak for all of those many Australians who have been stimulated by Gordon’s intellectual vision and have enjoyed his friendship and unsung generosity, both during their visits to the United Kingdom and when he was in Australia.

A great man, he will be missed. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the Cherrys and other families.

Alan Hutchings
Environment Research Unit
Development Court, South Australia

The Bourneville Connection

Gordon Cherry was, at the time of his death, the Chairman of the Trustees of the Bourneville Village Trust, one of the foremost and most respected housing organisations in the country dating back to 1900. He died on 11 January 1996, following a sudden stroke.

He was Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Birmingham and President of the Royal Town Planning Institute when, in February 1979, he was appointed to succeed H.J. Gittens as the University’s nomination to be a Trustee of the
IN MEMORIAM

Bourneville Village Trust

Over the next eleven years, Gordon Cherry combined his duties as architect with an increasingly important portfolio of responsibilities at the University, becoming Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Social Sciences and then Head of the School of Geography. He held a number of important posts outside the University, serving on the Local Government Boundary Commission, the National Housing Council and the Advisory Committee on the landscape treatment of trunk roads. 

In 1984 he received an Honorary Doctorate from Heriot-Watt University for his outstanding contribution to twentieth century planning and in planning history. Further honours followed in 1995 when the Royal Town Planning Institute presented him with an outstanding achievement award. He published a number of books on planning (the latest, one on Birmingham, was published in 1994), all of which were highly regarded by the profession. From 1977 on, during his appointment as a Trustee, Gordon Cherry was keen to see that the Bourneville Village Trust re-established itself as a key and innovative player, trying to solve some of the country’s problems of poor housing and urban decay. Cherry instigated a wide range of new initiatives at the Trust. He looked at helping to improve the quality of life for inner city owner-occupiers. Another was the “Runnymede Report”, an attempt to develop policies of housing associations as they affected older people. He was particularly interested in the problems of the urban fringe, but a particular issue for him was the feasibility of building a second Bourneville.

In 1992 he was appointed Chairman of the Trustees, succeeding Vivienne Wootten, grand-daughter of the Trust’s founder, George Cadbury. It was under his leadership and inspiration that the Trust became actively involved in the regeneration of Birmingham Heartlands, taking on responsibility for building the Village Centre in Bordesley, with its associated shops, houses and community centre.

He was particularly concerned with the preservation of the Bourneville Estate as a living example of how the Garden City tradition had survived, and was interested in ensuring that Bourneville remained a prime example of the British suburban landscape. It was fitting, therefore, that at the very last meeting he attended on 30 November 1995, he heard proposals for a five year programme of renewal of the landscape on the Bourneville Estate. The series of celebrations held throughout 1995, marking the hundredth anniversary of the building of the first houses in Bourneville in 1895, as a precursor to the Trust’s own Centenary in the year 2000, was very much his inspiration, and one for which he will be remembered, both by the Trust and throughout Birmingham.

As Chairman, Gordon Cherry was always very committed to the concept of the communities within the Estate at Bourneville being able to share in the making of decisions affecting both their lives and their environment. He always gave tremendous support to all the staff of the Trust and inspired them with his own enthusiasm and drive, and they will remember him with affection. The sudden onset of his illness last autumn came as an unexpected shock to everyone, but his resilience and determination to try and heal was typical of his spirit, and an example to all those who knew him. His subsequent death in the New Year was, therefore, all the more saddening to all those who had known and worked with him.

He will be greatly missed.

James Wallis and Philip Hemeloa
Bourneville Village Trust

A Message from Greece

Commemorating Gordon Cherry is not an easy matter for those who had a limited contact with him, like scholars from overseas. Those in Greece who knew him, namely Victor Haslam, Marina Alexandra Yerolymphis and I, were deeply sorry to hear of his death; yet we are not sure we can properly put this into words. I met Gordon Cherry at the Bourneville Conference and his unassuming and encouraging attitude to new members who approached him played a decisive role in my subsequent decision to be involved with the Planning History Group. Working with him (and J. Holland) on an article on J.H. Dawson was a particularly happy experience. Gordon Cherry, who had overall responsibility, would regularly send fine notes and letters that I still keep on the process and context of the work. I realise how valuable his unauthoritarian wisdom, his perception and knowledge were for the progress of the research. He was unutterably human, yet he maintained an iron-strong commitment to the academic standing to which he set.

The last time I saw Gordon Cherry and his wife was at their place last June. I was already aware that he looked so harmony in the balanced environment in which he chose to live.

This note does not refer to his professional activities: we all loved Gordon for his warm personality, and that is why his death is a loss to us. In such a short space we can say little about his illness last autumn came as an unexpected shock to everyone, but his resilience and determination to try and heal was typical of his spirit, and an example to all those who knew him. His subsequent death in the New Year was, therefore, all the more saddening to all those who had known and worked with him.

I, and many who were privileged to study under him at CURS at Birmingham University, will long remember his warm and kindly guidance. If he was critical, he always managed it in a friendly and unobtrusive way, and was constantly encouraging his students to attain meticulous standards of research, always directed towards the larger context, rather than detail for its own sake. He made light of obstacles which he felt were unimportant—in my case he managed to convince the authorities that I could undertake a part time Ph.D. while holding down a full-time job over one hundred miles away. Indeed, his encouragement of my work was typical of the man. Having attended a few Planning History Society conferences in which we had become acquainted, he came up to me at Edinburgh way back in 1979 and, out of the blue, said, “Why don’t you come to Birmingham and do a Ph.D. with us?” The procedure from then on seemed to be as simple and straightforward as an illness.

Graduation did not mark the end of involvement with Gordon. Over many years I looked forward to meeting him at conferences held in the United States and the Far East, where, often accompanied by his wife, Margaret, he would always have a good company. I felt as did many of my colleagues, that we were part of an extended family, and the loss of its head suddenly and so tragically will create a void which will be very difficult to fill. The profession, through the Royal Town Planning Institute, had already given its outstanding service to Gordon last year at a reception, at which I was pleased to be present. I feel sure that the International Planning History Society will, in addition to the customary tributes, look to announcing a suitable event in honour and memory of the man who did so much to initiate and develop planning history. Regrettably, I was unable to be present at the service held locally for him. I hope that there will be an opportunity both to commemorate Gordon and his work, and to look to ways of continuing and developing his life’s work.

Mervyn Miller, Balcombe, West Sussex

A Planning Perspective

It was in 1974, at the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies at the University of Birmingham, that Gordon Cherry brought together some forty people interested in the history of town planning. Part of the day was spent in the capacious cellar under the CURS building of those days. Gordon’s typical approach and led him to invite people from a wide range of professional backgrounds, and various kinds of historians mingled with planners, architects, geographers and social scientists. All this reflected Gordon’s book, Town Planning in its Social Context, published in 1970, which had approached a number of British planning issues as social history. It was often used to tell me how much he liked history, bringing it into much of his work in other fields. His concept of planning history developed between Birmingham as Deputy Director of CURS in 1968, and 1977, with the setting up of the Planning History Group after the Birmingham meeting in 1974, the two international conferences of 1977 and 1980 which set up planning history on a world basis, and a brilliant series of books, written mainly in evenings and at weekends. These included Urban Change (1974), The Evolution of British Town Planning (1974), The Politics of Town Planning (1982), Hiepion: A Study in Planning, Architecture and Civil Design (with Leslie Penny 1986).

This led almost entirely due to Gordon’s warm and generous qualities. It was a privilege and a pleasure to work with Gordon Cherry. When, in the early years of
Planning Perspectives, our main editorial discussions took place on the telephone around nine o'clock in the evening, which seemed to be exactly the right time to have them. When you worked with Gordon, it was always the right time. Like many others, I shall always remember what a help he gave me in terms of inspiration, new links—in other words, new perspectives and a special example. With Gordon, you knew that the combination of gentleman, scholar, expert, entrepreneur and friend was possible in real life. I hope that memory never fades.

Anthony Sankey, University of Leicester

A Letter from America
Although we encountered each other just twice, once on each side of the Atlantic, I hold a firm sense of the late Gordon E. Cherry. Most of all, I think of him as an energetic, effective and tactful international organizer among planning historians, whose research knew few geographic bounds.

Extracting my ‘Gordon E. Cherry’ file from its place among my most active folders as I prepared to compose these words, its totality was a surprise. For me, his hallmark was that he remained in regular contact. Moreover, he did it in the old-fashioned way, using Royal Mail rather than cyberspace or fax machines. Virtually all our correspondence had to do with the advancement of the extant Planning Perspectives or the International Planning History Society, whose birth he did much to foster. Most often, the missives I received were brief, handwritten and focused upon just one or two points. Usually, they provided this recipient with some explicit, if gently phrased, directions. For example:

Dear Michael,
As a member of the interim board [of I.P.H.S.] you should have a set of new... brochures. They are to use as you wish. Do distribute them in appropriate circles. The cards should be folded, but they travel better flat. Thank you for your letter of 26 January. The Association’s affiliation is lovely news. 8 February 1993

Whoever delivered the daily post to ‘Quaker Ridge’ in Hampton-in-Arden surely recognized Gordon Cherry’s links throughout the world. Michael H. Elster, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, The Urban History Association, U.S.A.

A Message from Oxford
Like all readers of Planning History I was sorry to hear of the death of Gordon Cherry. Possibly I can share two memories, separated by some twenty years, during which Gordon was at his most productive, and focused on planning history.

As an academic novice, returned from the USA, I joined the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies of the University of Birmingham at Selly Wick House (a short walk from Bourneville). Gordon was another recent arrival, offering solid practical expertise to a younger research audience. Gordon pitched into the endless research debates, publication programmes and grant getting, but knew when to stop. I am still amazed that we managed to play lattinitchie on the House lawn. Gordon also sobered us with the balanced view — his recent experience in a press-ravaged Tyneside was never hidden or neglected.

Moving on twenty years, my last memory of Gordon is in his conduct of a Ph.D. examination at the Joint Centre for Urban Design at Oxford Brookes University. The candidate, a very nervous but very capable Egyptian, was put at ease by a senior academic who had never forgotten the human emotions of such an encounter. Gordon was most complimentary in his closing remarks and provided a positive memory of the advanced degree race of the 1990s.

Gordon’s personal qualities provide a model which those working in academe could do well to reflect on. Brian Goodey, Oxford Brookes University

A German Dedication
I heard from Thomas Hall about Gordon Cherry’s sudden death. It was a particular shock to me, because, on the day that Gordon died in January, I had written to him asking for some information on the M.A.R.S. Plan for London.

The reason for this was the fact that I am just about to finish a book (with Juan Rodriguez-Lores) On the Linear City: the long suppressed alternative to the Garden City. It will be mainly a documentation of those linear plans in Europe and the U.S.A. which gave rise to fierce debates within the planning profession. The book will have a historical perspective, starting with some early American railway proposals in the 1850s, followed by Otto-Straus’s Geduld Linienvor der Welt in 1923 and the 1938 German concept of the ‘industrial corridor’ and its progeny, including the two famous plans by M.A.R.S. for London and Schaarborn and Friedrichs in Berlin in 1946, and finishing with the debates on linear planning on an urban and regional scale around 1970.

The book will be published in 19th Volume in our series on ‘Town Planning History’ in Autumn 1996. We will dedicate it to the memory of Gordon Cherry. Gerhard Friederichs

A Note from Norway
Reading Urban Change and Planning (1971) in the 1970s was an eye-opener for me. It was a time when students were beginning to challenge the way their courses were taught, when the profession was in the process of losing its certainty and when people became more critical of the results of its practice. The book helped us to develop an awareness of urban change in a broad historical perspective. At the same time, it encouraged new interpretations and pointed the way forward in urban studies. It promoted interest in, and created a new optimism for, planning as a discipline and as a profession.

A brief search made me aware of Professor Cherry’s earlier publications Sociological Research Techniques for Planners (1970). He required high intellectual standards of those devoted to planning matters. This book meant a lot to my Scandinavian colleagues and myself in our attempts to carry on research in urban planning. His later works also have a lasting place on the lists of recommended reading for planning courses in Scandinavia.

In other publications, Gordon Cherry devoted himself to gathering together the various academic pursuits of his community to form the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies of the University of Oxford. Gordon was a member of the esteemed Social Research Association’s affiliation is good city planning.

Brian Goodey, Oxford Brookes University

We will certainly be able to say that the profession has never been so in the public eye, or so busy with its various activities. The book will be published in 19th Volume in our series on ‘Town Planning History’ in Autumn 1996. We will dedicate it to the memory of Gordon Cherry.

Gordon Cherry: Seen from South Africa
As I write this tribute to Gordon Cherry, my desk is cluttered with the many letters and notes that I have received from my colleagues around the world during the last few years. Most are in that distinctive free-flowing hand that seemed to provide an additional dimension of plan to his characteristic turns of phrase, and virtually all reveal facets of his personality. For Gordon was above all a writer and, thereby admirable, his written word was arguably more telling than the spoken. While we met frequently in such far-flung places as Hong Kong, Ireland, the United States and South Africa, it was, by and large, the flow of letters that fuelled a friendship across a divide of some 6000 miles. He said in one of his letters...
that he was firm believer in lighting forest fires and seeing what happened. This letter was one of an increasing number in support of our efforts to bring the Planning History Study Group in South Africa into being. I believe he was gratified by our endeavours. In October 1994, he sent a presidential message to the third symposium of the PHSG:

Two years have now elapsed since the inaugural symposium in Johannesburg, at which I had the honour to officiate. It was a forest fire well lit, and the flames of academic and professional enterprise continue to lick around the edges of planning history. That the fire spread to the southern edge of Africa is, in large measure, attributable to his influence and interest.

Gordon came to South Africa in 1992 as a Visiting Professor in the Department of Town and Regional Planning at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. His presence wakened the dormant spirit of a planning history in the Republic and a pioneering group of potential planning historians gathered around him at a workshop at the University in August. Contributions to that workshop appeared in Planning History 15(2) of 1993, which, at the suggestion of Gordon, was dedicated to South African planning history. The publication of the dettial was followed by a letter: “I hope that 15(2) will serve as a spur don’t demphise the enthusiasm, John,” he wrote, “let it express itself” - That spirit of enthusiasm was indeed expressed in two further symposia and some 35 papers of diverse historical content in a two year period. He wrote that it continued to give him pleasure and that so much had grown from the first small acorn, and said of the proceedings of the 1994 symposium, “The papers are a mixed bag, but no matter.” This was not a rebuke but a gentle reminder that rigorous standards of scholarship are essential in historical studies.

Gordon will always be remembered in South Africa not only for his passion for, and promotion of, the historical foundations of the planning discipline, but equally for his sympathetic interest in, and generous encouragement of those seeking an involvement in the planning history movement. He will be remembered too for the openness of his friendshiop, and of his home, ‘Quaker Ridge’ in the cherished Hampden-on-Arden, upon which colleagues from the African continent descended from time to time.

At a personal level, my memories of the man and his broad spread of interests are stirred by the letters lying in front of me. These refer not only to his labours of love: the IPIHS; the Birmingham book (“grinding somewhat but sports shower occasionally”), his last work on the me and full of the planning ideal (“I am rather enjoying putting it together”) and the Bournemouth Village Trust, but also to such diverse and diverting matters as Sibelius in the Finlandia Hall, Oliver Tambo and the ANC, the Ashes (“I remain convinced that the Australian team is not exceptional mind you, English cricket is brittle”), Warsaw, the Vistula and Polish planning, sun tanning in Sicily, the RPTI outstanding service award (“it sounds a bit like a medal for gallantry”) and the work of William Holford.

Beyond correspondence, I recall, on Gordon’s insistence and with the convenience of Ian Tron, sweeping my way up Hong Kong’s Victoria Peak, accompanying him on a walk through Richmond’s historical precincts, wandering through Hampden-on-Arden (in the rain) after one of Margaret’s splendid meals and, most recently, spending time together at the BIFAP congress in September last year.

This was the last occasion that Janet and I could remember that rigorous standards of scholarship are essential in historical studies.

Gordon will always be remembered in South Africa not only for his passion for, and promotion of, the historical foundations of the planning discipline, but equally for his sympathetic interest in, and generous encouragement of those seeking an involvement in the planning history movement. He will be remembered too for the openness of his friendship, and of his home, ‘Quaker Ridge’ in the cherished Hampden-on-Arden, upon which colleagues from the African continent descended from time to time.

As a personal level, my memories of the man and his broad spread of interests are stirred by the letters lying in front of me. These refer not only to his labours of love: the IPIHS; the Birmingham book (“grinding somewhat but sports shower occasionally”), his last work on the me and full of the planning ideal (“I am rather enjoying putting it together”) and the Bournemouth Village Trust, but also to such diverse and diverting matters as Sibelius in the Finlandia Hall, Oliver Tambo and the ANC, the Ashes (“I remain convinced that the Australian team is not exceptional mind you, English cricket is brittle”), Warsaw, the Vistula and Polish planning, sun tanning in Sicily, the RPTI outstanding service award (“it sounds a bit like a medal for gallantry”) and the work of William Holford.

Beyond correspondence, I recall, on Gordon’s insistence and with the convenience of Ian Tron, sweeping my way up Hong Kong’s Victoria Peak, accompanying him on a walk through Richmond’s historical precincts, wandering through Hampden-on-Arden (in the rain) after one of Margaret’s splendid meals and, most recently, spending time together at the BIFAP congress in September last year.
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full of researchers contemplating Britain’s urban problems.

It was as it was that I first met him. He taught us about the history and current problems of planning, drawing from his first book, Town Planning in Its Social Context, published in 1939, and the work he was then writing, Urban Change and Planning, which appeared in 1972. He also taught us about recreation planning, a subject which developed from his own considerable interest in sports, both as participant — he was a very keen tennis player — and spectator, especially of football. I must confess to being rather unversed by this second area of his interest, but the history of planning certainly fascinated him. He had already studied under Tony Sutcliffe, an undergraduate, so I was coming in with some knowledge, though not as much as I thought. When the time came to choose a dissertation topic, I opted for a historical subject. My first choice was to examine green belt policies, never Gordon’s favourite aspect of planning, nor altogether happily. He steered me away to a more empirical study of Birmingham, encapsulating the Cadbury, Nettleton, Macaroni and the other key ingredients of one city’s planning.

I must have made a reasonable choice, because it led to the next step of my research — and to my next position. Gordon had by this time been able to devote more of his energies to outside professional interests and, moving on to what had now become his central historical interest, planning history. The RTPI History of the Evolution of Planning, Town Planning, was published in 1973 and his volume of the Cabinet Office history, on National Parks, appeared in 1975. Still more important was his 1974 initiative, with Tony Sutcliffe, to create the Planning History Group. Gordon and CURS hosted several of the early meetings and the precursor of Planning History was for many years produced at Birmingham, usually by Gordon’s curriculum secretary. (Not the least of his skills was his ability to be the best out of secretaries, reflecting many of the same gentle management skills that I had experienced as his research assistant.)

By this time I was myself firmly entrenched on an academic career, thanks in no small measure to Gordon’s generous recommendation. In thanks, I recall especially the unfavourable comment he made between the secretariat, rather cynical C. P. Snow-type of atmosphere he perceived at Birmingham. However, he was thoroughly pleased by the collective effect of the work of planning.

Gordon’s career meanwhile was advancing on all fronts during the later 1970s and 1980s. Thanks to Paul Cadbury, he secured a personal chair at Birmingham. His service to the RTPI and his role as chairman when he became its president in the late 1970s, Gordon and Town’s efforts together built the Planning History Group into a respected international organisation.

Gradually Gordon, encouraged I think by Tony, widened his interests from the British scene and began to research and write about the development of planning elsewhere. Within the University he also secured tenure of the managerial responsibility he had wanted. He became a very successful Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Social Science in the early 1980s.

Despite these numerous managerial duties, the flow of more articles and books continued. More of them were at this stage ordered works as he brought together the works of other scholars he met through the Planning History Group. He also launched with Tony Sutcliffe and Ann Radkin the book series Studies in History, Planning and the Environment, published originally by Mansell, later by Spon. He also wrote an important study of The Politics of Town Planning, largely viewed through the eyes of the historian, in 1982. His biography, Hoffman (co-authored with Leith Penny, another of his doctoral students) was published in 1986 and his textbook, Cities and Plans in 1988. It was during this same period, in 1986, that he launched, again with Tony Sutcliffe, the journal Planning Perspectives, a refereed journal for the work of planning historians.

In 1986, I was seven years earlier. The odd thing was that, roughly two decades on, the Department looked exactly the same; I was astonished to see that lecturers who, in the somewhat imperceptible impression of a 20 year old, had seemed to be on the verge of retirement (though were probably only in their late ‘thirties) were still there. Nonetheless, it had the rather smug air of a solid, reliable undergraduate teaching department in a well funded University. With some students, the staff were very set in their ways and had not, in Gordon’s words “put pen to paper yet.” This was not just a figure of speech, of course. Gordon always drafted his own book by hand and never caught on to the computer age. He was an amusing type. Although, when Governments were under increasing pressure to do more with less resources, Gordon found it difficult to change the culture of his new Department and did it for a strong enough internal and external profile. Having said that, there is no doubt he relished his own teaching contacts with undergraduate students. Nonetheless the sheer hard grind of the Department in these difficult years limited his own opportunities for research and writing. It was the intention of concentrating more on these and developing a limited amount of private planning practice,
that he took early retirement in the early 1990s. The productivity soon resumed. In 1994 he published his last book to appear in his lifetime, a study of his adopted city of Birmingham. A co-authored study of the development of rural planning was in the press at the time of his death. He had also just completed a book on the rise and fall of the planning ideal for Blackheath. It was a major study he was commissioned to write and he relished the prospect of writing what he considered a rather critical assessment of planning’s more recent fair.

Throughout these years my own close working association with Gordon over planning history matters had become permanent. At his invitation, I had succeeded Dennis Hardy as Editor of Planning History from 1991-4, (one of the most enjoyable and rewarding jobs I have ever done, incidentally). Thereafter, again at his invitation, I became one of the Review Editors of Planning Perspectives. I suppose he was the person from whom, year in, year out, most correspondence, usually handwritten notes with various ideas and thoughts, sometimes several each week. My files are full of them. (Other people tell me this was his favoured means of communicating with them as well). At a personal level our relationship mellowed into a genuine friendship. It was never quite a friendship of equals (I suppose it is often like this between mentor and student), but at least something nearer to it. When our paths crossed at more general academic functions, outside planning history, he was still apt to greet me with phrases like, “that’s my boy!” (which, though he was not being entirely serious, was, of course, as very many ways, true).

Many readers will have their own memories of Gordon, particularly as an extremely effective and affable personal ambassador of planning history. Certainly he raised the profile of the subject and built it into a recognised and respected specialism. Many people have told me how much they valued his interest in their work, his good humour and patience, his kindness and hospitality. All these were certainly genuine qualities that I experienced in increasing measure over a quarter of a century of association with him.

He combined these qualities with a tremendous sense of optimism about life that was always regenerating and encouraging. I don’t think he ever brooded resentfully for any length of time about anything, even when he had ample cause. Ultimately, I suppose this optimism grew out of himself, but it was every day renewed by the wider frameworks of his life. His extremely happy marriage and family life, his faith and the sense that he was serving others all contributed to his buoyant and affable disposition. This was linked, I think, to his family judged skill in managing people to bring out their best. In larger gatherings, he was a very eloquent public speaker, whether fulfilling ceremonial duties (for a time he served as the University’s Public Orator) or undertaking scholarly excursions. Occasionally I heard him speak, with a certain regret, about the fact that he had not, in any definitive way, established a school of thought or brought a new theoretical approach to his subject. I never quite understood what he meant by this. While the very strict sense this may be true, my own view is that he actually did all this and more. Certainly he did not coin new words or concepts that predetermined how his fellow planning historians should think about their subject. He brought instead a fairly traditional approach to the writing of historical geographic and applied it to a sector whose obscure sub-field, planning history. His own scholarship and, even more, his networking skills built up this area into an important area of intellectual inquiry. As to how that inquiry was undertaken, he encouraged a plurality of approaches. He understood the impact of impersonal forces such as economic structures and social formations, but he always gave due emphasis to the actions of individuals. (He had, after all, seen at first hand the difference an individual like Dan Smith could make to a city). His only requirement was that the writing should be clear, accessible and scholarly. In that sense I believe we, the membership of IPHS, are all also members of the “Chenery school”.

We are all in his debt.

Stephen Ward, Oxford Brookes University

Archives and the Metropolis

An international conference at the Barbican Centre, London will bring together speakers from all over the world to discuss cultural, social and political aspects of the archives of great cities from antiquity to the present day. The aim is to investigate the nature of the records generated by these cities and to increase understanding of the role they play in metropolitan life.

Among the themes covered will be their political purpose and use, their display, access, buildings and value as sources. There will be case studies from a varied range of cities, including Vienna (Frances Ogg), Stockholm, Tokyo, Chicago (John Daly), New York (Clifton Hood), Cairo (Raud Abbas) and, of course, London.

The conference is sponsored by the Corporation of London, and organised by the Centre for Metropolitan History, the Greater London Record Office and Guildhall Library Manuscripts Department.

Details are available from the Greater London Record Office, 40 Northampton Road, London EC1 0HB, or by e-mail from c-met@luc.ac.uk.

Centre d’archives d’Architecture du XXème siècle, Paris, April 1997

A feasibility study for a rational centre for archives relating to town planning is being conducted by several partners in France: the Centre de Documentation en Urbanisme (Ministère de l’Equipement), the Atelier d’Urbanisme de l’Agglomération de Tours and the Institut Français d’Architecture.

The first aim of the project is not to centralise the documents, which for the most part are held by public bodies, but to establish a close link between them and to get ‘producers’, ‘keepers’ and ‘users’ to work together. In other words, it should bring new methods in filing, a new consideration on the part of producers towards their own documents and those of their partners and greater accessibility to the documents to a wide range of users. A feasibility study for this project will be completed by June 1996.

For information contact D. Payser and P. Guermat at the Centre d’archives d’Architecture du XXème siècle, 127-129 rue de Turenne, 75003 Paris, France. Tel: 43 85 12 80, Fax: 43 70 79 38.


Fifty years ago, the blighted cities of Britain began reconstruction. Some had commissioned visionary plans which they hoped to realise. Most imagined they would be creating new and better local environments. Over the next fifteen or twenty years there were, however, many disappointments. The ‘planners’ moon’ rarely heralded the dawn of a new age.

This is a fascinating episode in British urban and planning history, and the University of Luton is organising a conference to examine it in more detail. This will be held in Luton on 7-8 February 1997. We hope to encourage a multi-disciplinary approach and also to include comparative studies of the reconstruction experiences of other countries.

Offers of papers or general enquiries should be sent to Nick Gribben, Department of History, University of Luton, 75 Castle Street, Luton, Bedfordshire LU1 3AU, Tel: 01582 489014, Fax: 01582 489013.


The Planning Exchange
with the introduction and background to the movement, and items on over thirty topics and subjects will look at how they were handled in the new town context. Once complete it will include concise, comprehensive and easily accessible single source of material on the new town projects intended to appeal to a wide-ranging audience, from the more senior level through to advanced researchers and professionals from a range of disciplines both at home and overseas. It should be completed in Spring 1996.

More information on the New Towns Record can be obtained from Joyce Hartry at Colin Humphreys on 0141 248 9141.


CALL FOR PAPERS

Herald L. Platt and Chris Sellers have gained approval for a day-long symposium entitled "The Industrial Environment: Perspectives on the Science, Technology and Politics of Pollution in the Age of Industry" at the congress. Authors are invited to submit papers on the historical interactions between industries and their environment and the important ways in which science and technology mediated these interactions. The symposium will bring together a wide range of perspectives on environmental impacts themselves (from toxic waste dumps to greenhouse effects) and the ways in which lay people as well as scientists became aware of them; that is, when, where, and why different groups began to single out these phenomena and frame them as "problems". They are especially interested in bringing together people interested in environmental perspectives from different countries. They also plan to pre-circulate the papers among participants, so drafts must be ready to present at the symposium.

To submit a proposal or for more information contact: Herald L. Platt, Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine, University of Mass. Amherst MA 01003, U.K. e-mail: platt@hmsc.amherst.edu. Proposals should be submitted immediately and papers will be due on 1 April 1997.

The Urban History Association

Prizes 1995

Recipients of prizes awarded by the Urban History Association in its 1995 competition for scholarly distinction include:


This Seminar is organized by the Dipartimento di Architettura dell’Università di Venezia, the Centre de Recherches Historiques/ESHESS, la Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, l’Istituto d’Storia Moderna e Contemporanea di Paris, and the Dipartimento di Storia Economica dell’Università degli Studi di Venezia.

The main themes to be addressed will be:

1) The spatial distribution of foreigners in the city in relation to the structural elements of the urban territory, street, ‘horizon’, church, zoo, park, neighborhood, ghetto;

2) The way in which foreigners market, with their presence and the intervention, the material condition (architectural or urban planning) of the city.

Starting with these specific themes, the ambition of this Second International Seminar is to merge two tendencies in urban history which are often kept separate, that is the social and the architectural.

The organizers aim to publish a collection of essays resulting from the two Seminars (the first of which was held at Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, 9-11 November 1995) in the near future.

Information contact: Professor Donatella Dalbera, Dipartimento di Storia dell’Architettura, 5, Pala 2554, 30123 Venezia, Italy. Tel: 39-41 2571433, Fax: 39-41 315449.

NOTICES

TOWNS AND TOILET: TOWNSCAPE AND TABOO

CLAIRGREEN UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND

This paper is based upon research currently being undertaken on ‘public conveniences’ that is, as Toynbee also knew them as lavatories in Bantam). As explained in Planning History, 16 (1), I have moved on to this topic, because in my previous research on towns and planning, 1 found that many women, especially the elderly and those with young children, encountered difficulties in using public washing places because of the lack of availability of public toilets. 2 Thus I started my investigation, and write this paper, from the viewpoint that there is a problem of underprovision, especially for women. Lastly this paper gives an historical overview of public toilets. In order to consider the factors that have influenced the ‘choices’ of toilets being given a high priority, the different policy ‘agendas’ which have facilitated or hampered provision will be considered. The development of legislation and provision from the last century will be discussed. In the concluding section the relevance of the topic to town planners will be considered. It is argued that public toilets are both a necessary, practical element in the built environment and an important townscapes component. Examples from Broad and Bath are used to illustrate the urban design dimension of different ‘facets’ in public toilet provision. Undoubtedly negative cultural attitudes towards toilet provision, and bodily functions in general, within British society have limited the chances of provision. Attention is drawn throughout to such non-spatial factors which have affected the levels, location and design characteristics of spatial provision.

There have long been public toilets, indeed it may be argued that public latrines, as against private dwelling-based closets, were the normal form of provision for most, except the rich, until the nineteenth century. 3 One of the earliest existing latrines in Britain is at Broad Street, Broad, on Hadrian Wall, which provided communal provision for twenty soldiers. 4 Roman cities and villas were equipped throughout Europe for them, while advanced sewage, drainage, and heating systems. 5 Doctores Cloacini, Roman goddess of the sewer and sewerscape would no doubt be pleased by the demand for ‘privacy’ and individual facilities, and by negative modern attitudes towards the ‘sleek streams which below the city glide’. 6 In the Middle Ages, public communal latrines were also constructed, thirteen have been identified in London, mainly situated over rivers. For example, early in the twelfth century, Queen Matilda, wife of Henry I ordered a latrine to be erected for the use of the citizens in Queenhithe, a quay near London Bridge. By 1355 the River Fleet in central London choked up altogether from effluent from latrines overloading this tributary of the Thames. Public improvements in individual toilet design and in city-wide sewerscape were introduced. In 1596, Sir John Harington invented the first lavatory using water, in 1755 Alexander Cummings patented the E-Bidet. In the nineteenth century Sir Thomas Cubberley perfected a widely marketed modern W.C’s with syphon cisterns with executive names like the Delay. 7 The provision of inside toilets (and bathrooms) in each dwelling was increasingly seen as (essential among the middle classes at least), if only to protect the modesty of ‘ladies’, and save individuals the trouble of going to the bath in the rain, the bottom of the hole. Many founding planning books recoom it was not uncommon in working-class tenements for 200 people to share one privy, and increasingly housing legislation required individual ‘closet’ provision for the labouring classes too. But, privies were not an absolute necessity as the use of chamber pots among the working classes, and commodities among the more affluent was commonplace. Secondly, the situation that poor sanitation contributed to the spread of cholera, which (was no respecter of social class), and also the influence of ‘cow pasture’, led to state intervention and the construction of sewerage systems in many large cities. 8 Chadwick’s report on sanitary conditions in 1842 was followed by the 1848 Public Health Act, yet improvement was limited. The River Fleet exploded alongside Fleet Street in 1846, suggesting that little had changed since Medieval times. 1855 is remembered as ‘The Year of the Big Stink’, when Parliament closed because of the stench from the adjacent Thames. Subsequently the Royal Sanitary Commission of 1869-71 set more stringent standards, and these were embodied in the 1875 Public Health Act.

In the nineteenth century, public health, housing, sanitation, municipal engineering, surveying, and town planning were all nascent professions which still overlapped and interlinked. 7 Sanitation and drainage, 8 gas and water socialism and related ‘public health’ issues were key components of the agenda of nineteenth century town planning. Early planning reformers saw ‘the urban problem’ in terms of germs and disease, often conceived as a problem of disease control. Curiosities such as Dr. Richardson’s model town plan, 9 Hygeia’ took the concept of efficient, germless living to the limits but appear entirely out of place against the wider public health context of the time. 10 Not only was private, domestic provision of toilets improved, public toilets were also installed but to a limited degree. The 1848 Public Health Act first gave general powers of provision, updated by the 1875 Public Health Act. 11 It should be noted that this was enabling legislation: there is no compulsory requirement to this day that provision must be provided, nor any minimum tables of provision in respect of public-
street toilets, but local authorities may provide facilities if they so wish. Standards giving very limited provision for off-street public facilities, such as in restaurants, do exist. In spite of the legislation provision of public toilets for women was less than that for men. It would seem that there is a greater cultural acceptance of the natural right of men to urinate in the greater number of male toilets, and so men are less likely to be ‘caught short’. Cheesebelly* which is the situation of the installation of a private (male) public toilet in the village states: ‘Only males are privileged to overlook on the public highway.’ The process of France have been notorious in setting the pace in public provision for men and not for women. Many British cities also still sport ornate Edwardian street frontage (men only) toilets (urns) such as on Hotfield Common in Bristol (Fig.1) and also on Black Boy Hill at the top of White Ladies Road in Bristol as name implies previously the site of slave auctions and before than a market). It should be noted that the Ladies which was added later at Hotfield Common is, typically and dangerously, isolated behind bushes. Now the need for public conveniences for women was greater than before as more women were travelling about in the city, commuting to work, spending all day in the centre. Women (especially ‘ladies’) were further thrilled by late Victorian dictates of ‘modernity’, which prevented them simply squatting over the gutter, or ‘going under the cover of the wide hoop skirts, as apparently had been socially acceptable in Georgian times for both ‘ladies’ and ‘women’. Women had difficulty being ‘heard’ as few women were involved in decision-making bodies. In the nineteenth century, patriarchal, sanitary engineers predominated. The situation would be much worse today for women were it not for the ceaseless efforts of ‘suffragists and drain feminists’ as such members of the Ladies Sanitary Association, established in the 1850’s (and going through several name changes) who campaigned for public lavatory provision and sought to change the discourse from one of ‘plumbing’ and ‘disease’, to that of ‘amenity’ and ‘health’. In 1884 the Ladies Lavatory Company opened its own private public conveniences at Oxford Circus for ladies who had to spend the whole day in London. Indeed, the campaign for public lavatories for women was a key component of the ‘suffrage movement’. Lyons Corner House Restaurants, and ‘tea rooms’ in general, were popular with women because they provided toilets for women, in many cases when they would not go into a pub or traditional restaurant on their own. The first permanent public toilets for women were built in 1893, opposite the Royal Courts of Justice in the Strand, London. A 1927 survey of toilet provision in the London County Council area (Inner London boroughs) found that there were 233 conveniences for men and 184 for women, in which there were 1,260 cubicles for men plus 2,680 units but only 876 cubicles for women. Recent research concludes that both the present day proportion and amount of public toilet provision for women has actually declined.4

Nevertheless the Victorians should be commended as builders of public lavatories and proponents of improved sanitation standards and toilet technology.5 Because, in Victorian times public health had the status of a prestige science, sanitary engineering too was highly regarded, with this is reflected in the resources and detail which is lavished upon the building and design of public toilets. They constituted a new, and worthy component within the built environment. As to their impact on the townscape, many Victorian public conveniences, especially those in London built between 1894-1925 are underground, partly out of propriety, but also because by-passed street are the ‘subwall’ beneath the public highway should be used for such facilities and for sewer routing, thus creating great inconvenience of access, especially for the disabled, and those with pushchairs. In provincial cities, such as Bristol and Bath, for example, many were built on the surface, and they were designed in a classical style to complement the surrounding Victorian or Edwardian architecture, with an eye on space saving, many Victorian buildings, for example in Park Row, Bristol, an edifice which still retains its original porcelain sanitary ware. The mid eighteenth century tended to more utilitarian in design. But significantly, the Park Row toilets, although right beside the University, and on the tourist circuit, are not a status symbol. In contrast in Bath, so strong is the urban conservation movement that when the Larkhill public conveniences in Bath were refurbished their appearance was changed from that of twentieth century municipal.

Figure 1. Hotfield Common, Bristol, c.1900-1934 and Ladies Toilet, 1934 (C. Green)

Figure 2. Park Row, Bristol, built in 1964 for £4079 (C. Green)

The ‘concrete block’, functional edifice to a Georgian ‘conservation area’ style pavilion. The fountain set into the exterior and proudly declaring construction in 1977 was, in fact moved back into the wall from an adjacent free-standing location (Fig. 3).

In the early twentieth century, additional toilets were built by the LCC, and other local authorities, usually in an unassuming, municipal, modern style using concrete walls and roofs and toilet blocks with no white or green tiles inside, with some children’s facilities. A trend towards ‘modern abstract’ architecture was apparently used as an excuse to build the cheapest type of toilet block well into the 1970’s throughout the country. If they were built at all. Not only were they poorly designed, nineteenth century public toilets, in general, are to be found hidden behind trees, down steps, or in underpasses, and in a bad state of repair, as illustrated by the situation in Bristol (Figs.4 and 5). Attempts at building modern ‘accessible’ toilets in the 1990’s have produced some interesting variations. For example, Castle Park Toilets in Bristol is approached by a steep slope, but declares itself to be wheelchair accessible, and is only open during office hours. The New Lifeboat House at Burnham on Sea, notorious for being built as one of ‘Challenge Archer’ experiences, provides 24 hour toilets, but makes twice the provision for men as women, the toilet section having 3 doors, one for women and one labelled ‘unisex’. Such is the gendered nature of public space(Fig.6).

In spite of demonstrable under provision for women’s facilities for women were often seen as an additional expense, for which women themselves should pay extra. For example, the 1936 Public Health Act Section 87, sub-section 3 gave local authorities the rights to build and run on-street ‘public conveniences’ and to charge such fees as they think fit ‘other than for urinals’. Thus, although recipients of lesser provision, women were likely to find their access to public toilets further blocked by pay terminals at the entrance. After a heated campaign public lavatories were eventually outlawed under the 1965 Public Lobbies (Toilet) Act. Note, the rules outlawing toilet houses never did apply to ‘private conveniences’, only ‘public ones’, and they never applied to railway stations where they are currently reappearing much to the extreme inconvenience of women passengers. Even today, the statutory guidance documents

Figure 3. Larkhill, Bath: refurbishment in a Conservation area (C. Green)

Figure 4. Anchor Road, Canon’s Marsh, Bristol, built in 1950s. (C. Green)

Figure 5. Underneath St. James Barton, the Haymarket, Bristol, built in 1970s. (C. Green)

Figure 6. Burnham-on-Sea, three door toilet, 1994 (C. Green)

British Standard BS5465 (Part 3), and the linked Approved Document G of the Building Regulations which provide the national guideline standards for toilet provision make it a legal requirement for men to be provided with approximately a third more provision per set of toilets than women. 6 This is because men are often seen as ‘female’ or not on the ‘Ladies’ plus urinal provision, and they have more provision overall. Nowadays, a state of provision is a matter of concern in Britain, because of poor, and declining levels of provision, and a general lack of investment, maintenance and care. Over the last ten years 771 conveniences have been closed in 180 local authority areas, 22% of local authorities have only 1 public conveniences per 5,000 to 10,000 people. According to recent surveys, men still have approximately two thirds more provision than women. 7 There is a disparity of provision, ranging from one facility per 35 men and 86 women in the best local authority area, to one facility per 6,427 men and 11,284 women in the worst. In the 1990’s not only have women inherited less public toilets than men from past generations, but in many areas traditional toilets are being closed down, because of vandalism, and lack of funding for maintenance and supervision. In some cases they are being replaced by Superloos, that is the ACP, the Automatic Public Convenience, which many consider to have little architectural merit. Paris was the first city to introduce the ACP, known there as the sanitaire, and many of its original ‘resipients’, (the ornate wrought iron men-only pissors) have now been turning into magazine kiosks. In Britain redundant public toilets have been turned into shops, bungalow, offices, and restaurants. For example, when Thurrock Council in Essex closed its public toilets and replaced some of them with Superloos, one located in South Ockendon was turned into the Raj Indian Restaurant (stickered Veda Lord). The present situation is that such buildings are recognised as architecturally worthy of retention. Many public conveniences were designed to the highest standards, and were not intended,...
dangerous and "dirty" ambience of many toilet locations. Attempts have been made to increase provision by means of "planning gains" (bargaining with the developer or owner to get provision in return for a better overall planning permission) 36, and through incorporating requirements within statutory plans and design guides. 37 Planners, however, have few powers beyond persuasion to implement better provision, precisely because of the historical development of toilet legislation and policy, which has fixed the regulatory powers firmly within the technological domain of building inspectors, public health inspectors and sanitary engineers - and not within the realms of user-related planning policy. In particular it is alarming to find that the present uncoordinated provision standards are the descendants of principles and aims first enshrined in sections of the 1848 and 1875 Public Health Acts which have never actually been repealed, but have been incorporated in subsequent legislation and thus carried down to the present day.

As modern toilet planning developed in the early twentieth century, one may identify three negative trends coming into play which were to disadvantage the 'chances of a more social and more holistic, as a practical problem: on unresolved regarding toilets, such as the inequality, inadequacy and unavailability of provision, lack of children's toilets and baby changing facilities and the against technological or medical, perspective being adopted towards toilet provision right up to the present day. Firstly, the founding fathers of modern planning often appeared to share the 'sanitary engineer's perspective, in prioritising the need for sewerage systems and water supplies at the city-wide level, rather than considering the local area needs for citizen's toilet provision (a key distinction). Secondly, and in part overlapping this, the town planners seemed to be focusing ground to the municipal engineers, and the 'planning engineer' as so had control over the planning of such infrastructural provision. By 1933 Abercrombie, in discussing the importance of the PLAN, makes it quite clear that it had to be produced without "a full control of sewage (sic) and pollution". 38 However, the 1932 Town and Country Planning Act Section 3, subsection (3) still left the planner, in producing the scheme, to make provision for necessary sewerage and drainage work. But this was merely an enabling role rather than a city-wide strategic, sewerage-planning role. Thirdly, there was an ongoing 'medicalisation' of what were erstwhile public health issues. Most doctors saw the roots of this trend in Edwardian times, within the context of a discourse of 'national efficiency' and imperial health. The ill health is put upon the individual, especially working class women, and less upon the effects of the inequity of provision of basic facilities and services including adequate sanitation. Likewise nowadays members of all Mad Cods (the national pressure group for more public toilets) have found that their demands are often met with disdain and resistance.

Some planners do not even consider 'toilets' to be a town planning issue. Town planning inspectors have judged requirements for provision imposed on developers to be ultra vires, because toilets are not seen by them as a valid town planning requirement. This raises the question of what were the town planners' understanding of 'environmental' and 'sustainability' although concerned with the "old" issues of sewage and pollution have not helped with the toilet problems. The remanting of many 'public health' departments as 'environmental health' departments has led to a polarisation of the environment over the citizens who live in it. Also 'Local Agenda 21' which emanates from the UN Environment and Oceans Programme of 1992 (i.e., the Rio Earth Summit) calls for each local authority to promote sustainable development. Women, and 'brownies' in particular, may find that toilets are better helped than such initiatives, as they are seen as the 'culprits' creating so much of the pollution, as the main shoppers and users of the washing machines, and in using disposable nappies and sanitary wear.

Rather, to create sustainable environments, deal effectively with sewage, and improve toilet provision, there is a need for more investment in collective solutions to disposal, laxity, and recycling sewage properly back to the land as a proven industry (now linked to a greater investment in support services, childcare, and community facilities including much better public conveniences. Town planners are ideally equipped to deal with such city-wide issues. As Lewis Mumford is renowned to have said: "A civilisation may be judged by the way it disposes of its waste." Such a society and its behaviours and services which meet the everyday needs of its citizens would be regarded unquestionably as the sources of civic pride: not underfunded, vandalised ruins, and those who addressed these issues would be respected.

![Figures 7 & 8. Recent Historian and Modern facilities in Japan (Japanese Toilet Association)](image)

8. A. Worth, The Genres of Modern British Town Planning, London, Routledge, 1954. This text is prepared with reference to sanitary improvements, which constituted a major component of the agenda of nineteenth century town planners. Peter Hall, explains what a revelation it was when S. Wau, first signified cholera as a water borne disease, that he found that the breakthrough could be traced back to one contaminated water pump. Urban and Regional Planning, 1992 ed., Routledge, pp. 18-19.
11. L. Beyruth, (ed.) The Study of Urban History, London, Arnold, 1968, p. 34. See footnote 100, more on research wastewater supply at that time.
12. As discussed in C. Greed, Women and Planning: Creating Gendered Realities, London: Routledge, pp. 50-55. 'Etiquette and Finery'.
15. British Standards Institute BS 6465 Sanitary Installations (Part I revised 1995), but one can trace the genealogy of these standards back over 100 years to the regulations of the 1875 Public Health Act.
17. Birmingham City Planning Department, Caught Short: Urban Behavioural Planning, Birmingham: Birmingham for People community group, 1991. There have been a number of century century public conveniences in Birmingham over the past century or so, often wrought into pis- sors, similar to the ones described in Bossl.
PUBLIC ART AND PLANNING IN BIRMINGHAM

JEREMY BEACH AND GEORGE T. NOZCZOK, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ENGLAND

In contrast to the pragmatic attitude generally associated with the planning of small to medium-sized towns, the central business district in Birmingham has also been influenced by a combination of aesthetic and civic principles as well as by purely practical considerations. In recent years, Birmingham's international profile has been greatly raised, and the proliferation of work by both local and international artists has reflected both local and national developments in art in the choice of artists and the style of work. The dominance of local sculptors William and Peter Hollins (in the period from the 1890s to 1930s) and William Bloyde and his associates (from the 1920s to the 1960s) has been augmented by the work of nationally famous artists such as Richard Westmacott (1830s) and Antonio Gomelsky (1930s). Stylistically, works from Archer's late Regency church of St. Philip's through to the end of the twentieth century cover the full panoply of artistic movements.

It could be argued that Birmingham has led the rest of Britain in science, manufacturing technology, political illusion and religious reform since the English Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution. Sculptures from the Victorian period onwards which reflect this heritage have been placed at prominent junctions, where moral messages would be appreciated by many people as possible. For example, John Thomas's statue of Thomas Attwood (1859), campaigner for a final and effective representation of the lower and middle classes of people in the House of Commons (Fig. 1), stood, as the Stuart civic building, at the centre of the bustling shopping area at the junction of Stephenson Place and New Street. Thomas's 1860 memorial statue to the diplomat and philanthropist Joseph Braye, however, was set at the far more peaceful (at the time) location of Free War - the west of the centre - close to where he had lived.

By the 1970s, industrial concerns saw themselves as John Mason's patron to steel-plate manufacturers, Bagnalls, (Fig. 2) was erected in the middle of the major roundabout, created as part of the middle ring road construction at Five Ways. This major act of road planning shifted the peaceful Stour to one side. Birmingham has been at the forefront of developing road transport networks, with inner and middle ringroads and fast motorways linking the heart of the city, culminating in the so-called Spaghetti Junction, the largest motorway interchange in Europe at the time. These have become dearer for promoting the supremacy of the car, but the numerous and ingenious silver stone finials on different levels that have been added to the ringroad from being subjugated by the car have become sites for many works of art. These range from a futuristic swing by Kevin Alberto, installed in the middle of a huge roundabout in the shadow of St. Chad's Roman Catholic cathedral, to a nineteenth century beam engine, reassembled by the council on Dartmouth Circus roundabout, a 'ready made' monument to Birmingham's industrial past. The truncated to make bases and transformed into bronze from the original marble. This has tended to destroy the original visual context and socio-political intentions behind the commissioning and siting of pieces, which has been compensated by subsequent neglect of what were formerly celebrated works of art. However, Birmingham's public art works have sometimes reflected both local and national developments in art in the choice of artists and the style of work. The dominance of local sculptors William and Peter Hollins (in the period from the 1890s to 1930s) and William Bloyde and his associates (from the 1920s to the 1960s) has been augmented by the work of nationally famous artists such as Richard Westmacott (1830s) and Antonio Gomelsky (1930s). Stylistically, works from Archer's late Regency church of St. Philip's through to the end of the twentieth century cover the full panoply of artistic movements. The roundabout where these pieces are placed, being major junctions, are precursors for a more recent concept, that of 'gateways' to certain areas of the city. For example, a Development Corporation has placed works of art at prominent sites to define the boundaries of Heartlands, an area to the north east of the city with working class housing and vast tracts of space where factories once stood.

While raising these general issues, this essay concentrates on an area of the city in which the link between planned space and public art is at its strongest. To the north and west of the modern shopping centre is an area only half a mile square, yet containing most of the major civic, recreational and religious buildings of the city. Victoria, Chamberlain and Centenary Squares form a virtually continuous pedestrianised space, running from the city civic power at the Council House to the modern complex combining the activities of culture and economics at the International Convention Centre (Fig. 2).

Victoria Square is now seen as “a public space to rival that of any European city” following its redevelopment in the early 1990s, from what had become a nondescript area cut off from the Council House by a road in the 1980s, into a sloping plaza dominated by a water feature by Driona Mydwy in 1993. It also contains Antony Gormley's Iron Man and Thomas Brock's Queen Victoria. However, public art has always played a central role in the designed space since the building of the Council House and City Museum and Art Gallery (designed by Yvonne Thomas) in 1874-85. The Town Hall, designed by J.A. Hansford and F. Welch in 1832, is based on the temple of Castor and Pollux in the Roman Forum, conveying the aspirations of the city as a local democracy. Opposite was the classical facade of Christ Church, built in 1805 (demolished in 1899). When the Council House and City Museum and Art Gallery came to be built, there was given over to monumental artistic works by Richard Boulton and Sons, to the design of the architects. The elaborate iconographical programme is devoted to Birmingham’s place in the nation and her concern for the arts in relation to manufacture. The five large pediments, the central one showing Britannia rewarding the Birmingham manufacturers, with the other representing Manufacture, the Union of the Arts and Sciences, Literature and Commerce, dominate the spaces below with their allegorical message. At the time they would have been viewed with regard to their physical relationship with the nearby library, art gallery, Midland Institute, Mason college and Town Hall, and the whole Council House building faces eastward towards the commercial heart of the city down New Street to the Bull Ring (Fig. 3). The central pediment clearly reflects the social hierarchy in the city, as the classically robed Britannia, holding laurel wreaths over the heads of bountiful factory owners, rewards them for their achievements, whilst apropos workmen stand by displaying their tools and wares.

While the allegorical iconographical programme of the Council House pediments presented a framework for the city centre, a number of monuments to actual people gave the public reality, notably in the way that space was given over exclusively for the sitting of memorial statues. A massive statue of Robert Peel by the locally renowned Peter Hollins was the first work to be sited at ground level here in 1837. Situated just beside the Town Hall (prompting a Victorian joke “Why is the Town Hall like an orange?...”) Peel was also turned to face eastwards in 1878, and behind him an island was set aside for statues which split the traffic flow in two. The works which were sited there were Joseph Priestley (1874) and John Snow who built the statue of Sir John Snow in 1883, also by F.J. Williamson. The statue of Queen Victoria by Thomas Brock unveiled just 12 days before her death in 1901. The two thinkers who framed her embalmed the radical aspect of the Birmingham pediment above, which was not an overt celebration of empire like other manifestations of this national symbol could be. Historically, Birmingham had an ability to record the political aspects of the Birmingham pediment above, which was not an overt celebration of empire like other manifestations of this national symbol could be.
what amounts to a Pantheon to people intimately connected to the city and its progress.

This was given most concrete form in the setting aside of an entire square to the celebration of Joseph Chamberlain's mayoralty (1869-1876), which then became the site for a number of other works over the years. The Chamberlain Memorial fountain of 1885, although viewed unfavourably at the time as "an architectural scarecrow" and "a singular hash of ornamental details,"58 anchors this amphitheatre-like plaza beneath a pediment sculpture of Fame rewarding the Arts on the Art Gallery, and off-set the two conventional memorial figures of James Watt and Joseph Williamson.59

The public's involvement in the determination of what happened in this space is illustrated by the story of a memorial to the local firebranded preacher, George Dawson. After his death in November 1876 a public meeting was held on 3rd January 1877 where a George Dawson Memorial Committee was formed and resolved to erect a statue to his memory. They decided to erect the statue under a canopy in emulation of the memorial to Sir Walter Scott at Edinburgh. Thomas Woolner was chosen to execute the work and John Henry Chamberlain was asked to prepare a design for the canopy. A site for the statue was reserved in the space behind the Town Hall then being laid out to receive the Chamberlain Memorial Fountain. The statue and canopy were completed in 1880 and formally unveiled on 5th October.60 Shortly afterwards, considerable dissatisfaction was expressed with the statue (one was the last time that the public's opinion would turn against a work that it had commissioned). The objections seem to have centred on the general agreement that the statue was not a good likeness; the heavy overcoat and wide trousers give little sense of the figure beneath and generally gave it a rather squat appearance. A meeting of the Memorial Committee took place and after much deliberation it was decided to commission a new statue from F.J. Williamson.61 Woolner's statue was put into a niche in the Old Council House when the new statue was erected in 1885. It then went into store in 1873 and then was re-erected between the Museum and the Gas Hall in 1925. It was temporarily removed in 1995 as the area was being upgraded, and a fresh site has been found for it behind the Library in an area newly opened to pedestrians. Chamberlain Square's latest "man of the people" is a bronze statue of Thomas Chamberlain reclining on the steps - in contrast with previous memorial works is marked in the way the great man is devoid of traditional pedestal, and elements of the piece are distributed at ground level across the square, like details from a still life.62

Victoria Square's remodelling has also resulted in some striking, modern works of public art which look beyond conventional representations of great personalities: and pick up the theme of the general iconographical programme of the Council House pediments once again. Antonio Gormley's Iron Man is an enigmatic and monumental figure, its feet buried in the paving slabs. It reflects the alienation of the individual in modern society, whilst relating to Birmingham's industrial heritage in the use of self-excluding ("nutted") iron, forged at one of the few large-scale foundries left in the area. Ulrich Wert's solution to the spatial problem of linking an upper terrace in front of the Council House with New Street below was to have four distinct elements, unified by a stepped water feature, seen as essential because of the existing civic pride associated with the modernisation of the water works in the 1870s by Joseph Chamberlain (Figure 4). Finally, a multi-cultural approach to the centre-piece was desirable to reflect the growing diversity of the city's ethnic groups. The non-didactic approach of these pieces has caused problems of comprehension, despite the artist's claim that "the arsenal of vocabulary would end up creating a cohesive impact."63 However, the sculptural complex has had a socio-cultural impact by becoming an obvious place to meet and sit out in the summer, with the works of art becoming important landmarks in the cityscape.

The post modern concepts of inter-textuality, contrasting mediums and methods of dealing with subject matter are reflected again in Centenary Square.
The most recently redeveloped area – the Centenary Square and Broad Street area – has been a colossal statue of The Spirit of Birmingham by William Bloye, on a 42 meter high column.25 Nowaday, this area of approximately 0.5 km x 0.2 km, designed in 1991 by Tom Jarvis, contains not only the already existing inter-war Hall of Memory and post war Repertory Theatre, with sculptures at each, but also a number of works commissioned through a ‘per cent for art’ scheme which used one per cent of the capital costs (the International Convention Centre (ICC) for public art.26 A walk westwards from Paradise Forum takes one on a continuous art trail across the plaza (Figure 6), then through the ICC and out to Brindleyplace – the most recently redeveloped area – which is again defined by a striking work of art (Miles Davies’ Aqueduct, referring to the nearby canal systems),27 and one could continue down Broad Street to Five Ways and the works there already mentioned. The pieces in Centenary Square return to celebrating Birmingham in general. The square itself is seen as a painting, with the paving, railings, lighting and bins designed by Jarvis, so that the pedestrian moves across a vast work of art where once there was dereliction and decay, now ‘transformed into a place of beauty, with a strong identity of its own’. Subsequent publicity emphasised the teamwork of local designers and craftspeople on the project.28 Tom Lomas’ Spirit of Enterprise, significantly another fountain, acts as an allegory of modern multicultural Birmingham in its representation of ‘Industry, Enterprise and Commerce by different heads’. Mason’s Forward, with its cartoon-like appearance antithetical to the traditional sombre colours of monumental sculpture, has at its base a figure holding up his hand which, according to the artist, signifies industry, whilst his other hand folded on his chest signifies Birmingham as the ‘Heart of England’.29 Mason, a Birmingham born and trained sculptor now living in Paris, has monumental sculpture in Paris and Montreal. Despite some severe criticism in the press, and continued attacks on it by established art world figures, Forward has now become an icon of the renewal of Birmingham’s inner spaces, with children using it as a sort of climbing adventure area, and serves as an important link between the ICC and the spaces beyond.29

The notion of public art is so entrenched that no new planning concept of significance in Birmingham can go ahead without some sort of artwork incorporated into it. The modern sculptures in these recently created spaces, however, still reflect the part that commerce plays in Birmingham’s life: Iron Man was funded by the TSB bank, the chairman of which greatly enjoyed the controversy surrounding its setting;30 Centenary Square by ‘per cent for art’ from the public-sector scheme of the ICC; other works in the ICC have been directly paid for by private companies;31 and Brindleyplace Hill have chosen works in consultation with the Royal Society of British Sculptors as part of their scheme.32 This collaboration between the council and private enterprise has ensured that, despite insinuations to the contrary, remarkably little public money has been devoted to works of art when it might have been spent on more ‘worthy’ projects such as housing or education. Birmingham fits into an international movement towards creating more humane and habitable city environments by its continued patronage of the arts. It is worth remembering that it is in creating public monuments that the work of the artist and the service of the public good are most intimately joined.33


Figure 6. Some of the sculptural works in Centenary Square. (Top) Hall of Memory, with figures representing the armed services by Albert Toft. (Upper Middle) End block of David Patten’s Industry and Genius, Monument to John Baskerville. (Lower Middle) Tom Lomas: Spirit of Enterprise. (Bottom) Roderick Tyr: Battle of the Gods and the Giants.

NOTES

3. Approximately 370 sculptural works are listed on the Birmingham Public Sculpture Interactive Catalogue CD-ROM, Birmingham, 1996.
6. For example, the statue of Robert Peel, by Peter Hollins (1855, bronze) originally stood just to the east of the Town Hall, but was moved first to Centenary Plaza in 1927, then to the police training centre on Pershore Road in 1963.
7. For example, Peter Hollins’ statue of Sir Rowland Hill (1869, marble) was originally in the Exchange Buildings at Stephenson Place, and after being re-sited to the forecourt of the postmen’s office in Edgbaston was finally placed in stone in 1940.
8. For example, J. F. Foley’s statue of Prince Albert (1866, marble) was meant to be sited outdoors under a Gothic canopy, but was ‘temporarily’ placed in the Corporation Art Gallery. It was subsequently moved to a position on the Council House site in 1887.
9. For example, the statue of Thomas Astwood, by John Thomas (1859, alabaster marble statue on stone pedestal) originally stood at the busy junction of Stephenson Place and New Street. However, it was moved to Calthorpe Park in 1925, then to Highbury Park in 1975, when an ‘inviting’ ceremony took place on 23rd September.
10. This has happened to many previously full-size pieces, though often because of the effects pollution on them. For example, the statue of John Snowrow Wright by E.J. Williamson (1883) stood in front of the Council House from until 1913, when it was moved to Chamberlain Square, then to store in 1951. A bronze copy of the best was made in 1956 before the sculpture was destroyed.
11. The most famous example of this is the statue of Queen Victoria by Thomas Brock (1901) which was originally in white marble on a black granite pedestal. After a copy was made in 1951, the dark bronze statue now stands on a white stone pedestal. 12. This was the first aim of the Birmingham Political Union, stated on 25th January 1830, quoted in R.K. Dent, op. cit., p.354.
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FILMS AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT: BRITAIN 1939-1951

Toby Harrup, Imperial War Museum, London

Virtual reality and computer generated images are being employed by architects and town planners to bring their designs to life in cities such as Los Angeles, Berlin and Newcastle. Building professionals are naturally excited by the possibilities of this new technology. In Newcastle, computer models for the reconstruction of the quayside has enabled some timely and cost saving modifications of designs which would have obscured parts of the view. Computer simulations will also enable architects to offer the future inhabitants of these reconstructed urban areas an incredibly realistic preview of their designs. By 'experiencing' these designs the people can provide feedback for the professionals which, some suggest, will mean 'the end of planning disasters'.

Although this particular technology is new, the particular building and planning problems it is designed to overcome are perennial. Similarly, this is not the first time that architects and planners have tried to animate their designs to make shortcuts in the building process or inform future clients. During the Second World War, and in the period of post-war reconstruction, many architects and town planners thought that film was the vehicle for portraying the ' Brave New World'. Films and large scale models of urban reconstruction projects were regarded as essential tools to visualise the professional drawings and plans for ordinary people. Thus films were produced about the reconstruction plans for several cities (eg Coventry, London, Dartfomele, and Dover) and aroused keen interest when screened to the people of the featured towns.

From the beginning of cinema film-makers have recorded urban environment. Early actualities such as A Train Ride in Norwich (1902) recorded views of the built environment in an indiscriminate manner or exploited the cine-camera's ability to capture urban panoramas from the air. But film-makers quickly developed a more conscious perspective towards buildings. Feature film-makers like D.W. Griffiths used sets of palaces and castles to provide escape and drama for audiences, while propagandists used film to transport wealthy private audiences to the slums, highlighting the inequities of 'housing provision'. In fact film has had a long association with the built environment. Feature film-makers, particularly in Europe, have continued to be preoccupied by the cinematic potential of buildings and cityscapes whether real or artificial. A number of film directors such as Antonioni and Fritz Lang, and a very high proportion of art directors, have had an architectural background. Propaganda and documentary film-makers have also continued to work on subjects about the built environment looking at town planning, architectural history, instructional films for builders, the problems of inner city estates, etc. In Britain between 1920 and 1931 issues of the built environment took a prominent place in many films. The R.A.F. has located at least sixty non-fiction films which deal with aspects of this subject.

The purpose of my research is to examine how films relate to the historical debates on reconstruction. Therefore I am concentrating on non-fiction films released between 1939-51. The majority of these films were produced by the government through the wartime Ministry of Information's (MOI) Film Division or after 1946 in the same section of the Central Office of Information (COI). A minority of films, including some particularly influential ones such as Where We Build Again (1942) and Land Of Promise (1946), were produced independently.

Writing on reconstruction films

Although a number of historians have looked at official film during this period they have generally been interested in issues of propaganda in general rather than specific aspects of policy. Therefore very few studies systematically examine the film treatment of reconstruction of the built environment. The nearest one to this is a film historian in a polemical study of MOI Peace-time films by Nicholas Penny. This analysis places Pronay alongside the historian Corelli Barnett, who suggests that the film was partly due to the exposure of the public to officially sponsored propaganda films. Pronay states that the left-wing documentary film movement took control of the MOI Films Division from 1940, and thereafter were able to produce a stream of subversive propaganda films attacking the inner war years and advocating radical reform. He is particularly vehement in his attack on planning films which, he contends, presented planning from the perspective of the technocrats and planning visionaries. Typically, he says, the films explained to the viewer the problems of cities and then advocated the creation of 'New Jerusalems', 'some of them glaringly obvious and dreadful post-war mistakes in town planning including several of the very blocks of flats which were blown up as unsuitable for occupation'. He is also highly critical of those films which emphasised the consultation process in planning, arguing that they were not only manipulative but a laughable imitation of representation of events on the ground.

The most important and thorough analysis of films about the reconstruction of the built environment has been produced by John Gold and Stephen Ward. In contrast to Pronay, they take the view that film on urban redevelopment remained within the official consensus. They describe an evolution in the film depiction of housing issues. The pre-war period films such as...
number of films which have been ignored in other studies. I have also been fortunate to locate some relevant films which were considered lost. By referring to a broader range of films it has been possible to challenge and modify existing knowledge. For example, Gold and Ward’s work has missed a small number of films which do not adhere to their stated model. As a case in point the film *Housing Progress* (1957), produced for the Housing Centre, questions the slum clearance campaigns of the time and advocates the creation of more garden cities.

My research has examined the films in these ways, it looks at how the films were produced, how the films portray issues of reconstruction, and how the films were screened and received. This approach attempts to blend formal historical methods, primarily using documents and other written sources, with film text analysis. I have also been keen to contact and interview, where appropriate, people involved in the production of the films. I have chosen this multi-faceted approach to avoid the pitfalls of previous work. Film historians and critics who have based their analysis of “government policy” films mainly on the “visuais” have often made serious historical errors and crude generalisations. On the other hand a study which concentrated purely on the context of film production, drawn from an examination of documents, would be an idiotic pursuit. Similarly, it is my contention that an examination of propaganda films is worthless without some attempt to discover how they were distributed, screened and received.

This multi-faceted approach does present theoretical and methodological problems. For a few films, a large range of documents have survived such as treatments, scripts, correspondence, production cost breakdowns etc, but for the majority associated documentation is sparse. Comparing and contrasting a fully documented film with one supported only by some contemporary reviews or a brief mention in council minutes undermines balanced and coherent analysis.

Another difficulty that arises when writing-up is simply blending commentary on the films’ text (visuals) with historical comment and narrative. Both these particular methodological problems also raise theoretical conundrums. Is it fair to compare films about which we possess such different levels of historical knowledge? Can films produced by different organisations be compared at all, even when they share subject matter? Should the historian employ a special technique in order to ‘read’ a film’s text?

One way I have got around the documentation problem is to examine a large number of films in order to ensure that my ideas are well corroborated. An architect or historian of the decorative arts would adopt a similar practice. Similarly, by working on the wider historical context of a film it is possible to ‘map’ the film without necessarily having all the immediate evidence at hand. Finally, I am reassured that my approach is broadly right as it has coincidentally also been adopted by another historian working in the related area of films on public health.

Conclusions and broad themes

One of the interesting things to come out of this research has been the degree to which film professionals have been drawn to film as an educational and propaganda tool. Since the thirties, when Maxwell Fry first suggested the idea, architects have argued that film propaganda could be exploited to promote the role of the architect in British building. Planners have also been keen to use film to promote the garden city and urban redevelopment. In fact, the RIBA, The Housing Centre, and the Town and Country Planning Association have all been closely involved with films as advisors, distributors and scriptwriters. The Bowesville Village Trust even produced and distributed its own campaigning film *When We Build Again* (1942) based on its survey of Birmingham housing.

Although some film-makers and building professionals were keen to peddle their own propagandist message in official films, they were not given a free hand. My research has completely contradicted Pryor’s contention about propagandist. In the case of films about reconstruction policy, scripts were examined by civil servants working at the Ministries of Health, Works and Buildings, and, after 1944, Town and Country Planning. This external monitoring was in addition to checks being conducted by civil servants at the MOI or COI. These officials were very aware of the wider political climate relating to reconstruction in general as well as detailed policy on the built environment. To give an example, during the production of *A City Reborn* (1945) about the reconstruction of Coventry, the Director of the Department of Technical Education of the Ministry of Information ordered changes to be made to a script he considered politically controversial. While film evidence indicates sensitivity to the wider political issues of reconstruction, documentary evidence reveals how films projects could become a battle ground between conflicting ideological strands. For example during the production of a British Council film, *Garden Cities*, Frederick Osborne, the screenwriter, came into conflict with civil servants from the Ministry of Health because of his opposition to flats. The conclusion from my research is that making films on reconstruction was very tricky. Film producers had to present a contentious view while government policy was often still being formed and where conflicting advice from outside bodies like the TCPA and the RIBA.

During the war, officials at the Ministry of Information, British Council and other Ministries often seemed to be in two minds about films on reconstruction. On the one hand, they were under some...
pressure from planning lobbyists and, for certain periods, the general public, to issue proposals about reconstruction. On the other hand, they were unwilling to make proposals that did not have official approval or seemed unlikely to be feasible.

After the war the debate on reconstruction seemed to have been settled. New towns were now government policy and a large urban reconstruction programme promised. However, in the post-war era new problems arose for the propagandists. The way of presenting these new ideas was fraught with difficulty. The people who moved to new towns were extremely mixed and the way of presenting such a radically new and disruptive measure proved very difficult. For example, the class composition of the new town inhabitants and the location of new towns created particular difficulties for film producers working on projects like Charley’s New Town (1948). Another dilemma was how to reassure the public that the government was doing its best to fulfil its electoral promises on reconstruction, while being faced with shortages of all kinds. This problem led the Ministry of Health to try to dissuade the COI and the Ministry of Health from distributing a theatrical version of The Task Before the Building Industry (1950), a film which had previously only been screened to members of the construction industry.

Prony and Gold and Ward have argued that wartime films on reconstruction of the built environment tried to reveal planning as a dictatorial process, with very little actual dialogue, or input from the people, to be "planned". While this is certainly true of films such as The City (1940), Proudi City (1945) and New Towns In The Town, it ignores many films that invited the peoples’ involvement such as New Town For Old (1942), When We Build Again (1942), Land of Promise (1946), The People and The Plan (1945), The Way We Live (1946) and Town and Country Planning (1946). These films emphasised the democratic nature of planning, encouraging the people to ensure they received the plans they wanted by voting or, better still, becoming active in local politics. People were also encouraged to have a direct input into the plans as they were being created. This element is even present in Proud City about the County of London Plan, when at the end of the film, the leader of the LCC, Lord Latham, invites the viewers to comment on the plan. Many of the films also showed how a particular plan was based upon a survey of the people or some other form of participation. With hindsight these elements could easily be dismissed as a simple ploy by politicians and planners to ensure their plans were made palatable to the people. However, this would be to ignore the intentions of the film-makers, planners and politicians involved.

A recurring theme in planning and architectural literature during and after the war was the need to sustain the interest of the people in planning reform and to involve them in the creation of the plan. In fact the overtures to participation found in Proud City merely echoed the intentions of officials and politicians at the LCC who were responsible for setting up a public exhibition of the Greater London Plan and publishing a cheap pamphlet version. One should remember that a number of towns such as Hillingdon and Middlesborough planners were successful in eliciting a good deal of input from the people. Documentary film-makers like Jill Craigie, Kay Mander and Paul Rotha who were particularly sympathetic to this kind of planning, encouraged building professionals to grasp the possibilities offered by film. Paul Rotha, introducing some documentary films to an audience at the Architectural Association said:

I do not believe that in a democracy you can have a plan worked out by experts and superimposed on the people. There will have to be several plans, and each one will need explanation, discussion and amplification before it will be accepted by the people in this country. In my view the screen is an excellent place for these preliminary discussions.
Toward the end of the war and in the post-war era, local government became particularly interested in screening films on reconstruction. These were used to educate local officials responsible for reconstruction and to interest the electorate in specific reconstruction schemes. In a number of areas local government publicity officers arranged for screenings to be accompanied by talks about local reconstruction plans. In at least two towns, models and plans for local reconstruction schemes were displayed in the lobbies of cinemas when The Way We Live (1946), about the Plymouth plan, was screened (Fig. 3).

After the war some local authorities even produced their own films promoting reconstruction plans. The existence of these films and the history of their production, provides an interesting counterpart to nationally produced and distributed examples. As these films were all produced by Labour authorities they tend to challenge the notion that the Labour Party ignored modern publicity techniques. Stylistically some of these films are rather dull, but a few, notably Neighborhood 15 and A City Speaks, provide an exciting contrast to the films produced by the government and commercial producers.

Reception
It is extremely difficult to assess how reconstruction films were received and whether or not they had any impact on public debate about reconstruction. When my research was completed I hope to be able to answer this question more satisfactorily. However, what we do know is that when films about reconstruction plans were screened in the towns featured, they were shown to packed houses and aroused a good deal of interest and comment.

The films themselves offer a rich contemporary perspective on reconstruction. As I have already stated reconstruction films offer two versions of the planning process: the dictatorial and the participatory. A related issue is the portrayal of the planner. In some films planners such as Abercrombie, Owen-Jones and Charles Bressy are shown as visionary figures, creating innovatory and brave town plans on the people's behalf. But in A City Renewed and Neighborhood 15 the planners are portrayed as approachable figures, working closely and, indeed, in a subversive fashion to the people.

There are a number of other important elements of reconstruction which merit scrutiny, for example: How are the ordinary people portrayed? What is the role of government? Is there a relationship between planning and society described? What architectural styles are preferred? etc. These will be addressed in my final thesis.

Conclusion
In the period from the 1930s to the 1950s, film was regarded by many people concerned with the built environment as a valuable tool of education and propaganda. In particular it offered a much needed way of visualizing complex planning principles and reconstruction plans to the public. In part this was motivated by the need to publicise these in order to ensure public support. But public reactions during this period also demonstrated the encouragement of citizens to participate in a range of local political processes, including reconstruction.

For planners and architects of the 1940s and 1950s film was an exciting and novel method of reaching and communicating with their clients as computer imagery is to contemporary professionals. In the past building professionals saw films as a way to ensure democratic planning, now architects and planners describe their goal as 'client satisfaction'. The mechanics of managing this participation, once the interest and involvement of the people has been achieved, is a far more controversial issue. Some planners of the 1940s and 1950s had thought through and devised methods of incorporating the people's ideas into new plans. However, at the moment modern planners seem to be so excited by the new visualising technology that they have not really thought through the political implications.

If film is studied in context and examined imaginatively it may provide many valuable insights into the history of our built environment. Moreover, as I have suggested, film is relevant to many debates on planning history. It would be a shame if, as John Gold and Stephen Ward will agree, remained a relaxing discussion to be screened after boozey breaks at IPSH conferences.
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1920-1951

Glasgow’s Housing Program and its Solution (1937-20)
Sp: Glasgow Corporation
Pr: British Utility Films
Rt: 81 ft.

Housing Progress (1937)
Sp: Housing Centre
Pr: Matthew Nathan
Rt: 17 mins.

One Hundred Years (1937)
Sp: Pearl Assurance with Co-op of Min. of Health
Pr: National Progress
Dir: Charles Barnett
Rt: 478 ft (16 mm) 12 mins.

Some Activities of the Bermondsey Borough Council (1937)
Sp: Bermondsey Borough Council Health Propaganda Dept.
Rt: 25 mins.

The Great Crusade: Story of A Million Homes (1936)
Sp: Various sponsors
Pr: Pathé Pictures Ltd.
Rt: 18 mins.

Wealth of a Nation (1938)
Sp: Strand
Pr: 14 mins.

The City (1939)
Sp: GPO Film Unit
Rt: 2000 ft (35 mm) 22 mins.

Building Dreams (1942)
Sp: Viscorner Educational Films
Rt: 177 ft (16 mm) 7 mins.

Development of the English Town (1943)
Sp: British Council
Pr: GB Instructional
Rt: 1490 ft (35 mm) 16 mins.

How We Build Again (1942)
Sp: Cadbury Brothers
Pr: Strand
Rt: 30 mins.

Housing in Scotland (1945)
Sp: MOI and Scottish Dept of Health
Pr: Merlin
Rt: 14 mins.

The Ten Year Plan (1945)
Sp: Scottish Film Archive
Pr: Educational Corporation
Dir: Ivor Montagu.
Rt: 7 mins.

The Road Ahead (1945)
Sp: Unknown
Pr: NFTVA
Rt: 3 mins.

New and Yesterday (1940)
Sp: Health and Cleanliness Council
Pr: GPO Instructional
Rt: 424 ft (16 mm) 11 mins.

A City Reborn (1945)
Sp: MOI
Pr: Gryphon
Rt: 23 mins.

Peace and Plenty (1939)
Sp: Daily Herald
Pr: Basic Films
Rt: 2966 ft (35 mm) 22 mins.

When We Build Again (1942)
Sp: Cadbury Brothers
Pr: Strand
Rt: 30 mins.

Housing Societies (1939)
Sp: National Federation of Housing Societies
Pr: Matthew Nathan
Rt: 45 mins.

Cost and Plenty (1939)
Sp: Daily Herald
Pr: Basic Films
Rt: 2666 ft (35 mm) 22 mins.

A Proud City (1945)
Sp: MOI
Pr: GPO
Rt: 15 mins.

The Londoners (1937)
Sp: British Gas Assoc.
Pr: Realist
Rt: 18 mins.

Housing Societies (1939)
Sp: National Federation of Housing Societies
Pr: Matthew Nathan
Rt: 45 mins.

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Archives Dept.

The Ten Year Plan (1945)
Sp: Scottish Film Archive
Pr: Educational Corporation
Dir: Ivor Montagu.
Rt: 7 mins.

Wealth of a Nation (1938)
Sp: Strand
Pr: 14 mins.

The City (1939)
Sp: GPO Film Unit
Rt: 2000 ft (35 mm) 22 mins.

Building Dreams (1942)
Sp: Viscorner Educational Films
Rt: 177 ft (16 mm) 7 mins.

Development of the English Town (1943)
Sp: British Council
Pr: GB Instructional
Rt: 1490 ft (35 mm) 16 mins.

How We Build Again (1942)
Sp: Cadbury Brothers
Pr: Strand
Rt: 30 mins.

Housing in Scotland (1945)
Sp: MOI and Scottish Dept of Health
Pr: Merlin
Rt: 14 mins.

The Ten Year Plan (1945)
Sp: Scottish Film Archive
Pr: Educational Corporation
Dir: Ivor Montagu.
Rt: 7 mins.

Wealth of a Nation (1938)
Sp: Strand
Pr: 14 mins.

The City (1939)
Sp: GPO Film Unit
Rt: 2000 ft (35 mm) 22 mins.

Building Dreams (1942)
Sp: Viscorner Educational Films
Rt: 177 ft (16 mm) 7 mins.

Development of the English Town (1943)
Sp: British Council
Pr: GB Instructional
Rt: 1490 ft (35 mm) 16 mins.

How We Build Again (1942)
Sp: Cadbury Brothers
Pr: Strand
Rt: 30 mins.

Housing in Scotland (1945)
Sp: MOI and Scottish Dept of Health
Pr: Merlin
Rt: 14 mins.

The Ten Year Plan (1945)
Sp: Scottish Film Archive
Pr: Educational Corporation
Dir: Ivor Montagu.
Rt: 7 mins.
This one day symposium was organised by Birmingham Central Library and the University of Birmingham's School of Continuing Studies to coincide with an exhibition of photographs by Bill Brandt and Max Jones from the collection of the Bournville Village Trust. The event brought together specialists from the fields of housing, planning and photography to explore Brandt's photographs of housing conditions in Birmingham and London in the early 1940s. The aim was to place the work in its social, historical and photographic context. The sessions were chaired by Peter James, the Photography Development Officer at Birmingham Central Library.

The day began with a barnstorming presentation on 'Homes for the people' by Carl Chinn (University of Birmingham). He provided a richly illustrated historical review of housing provision for the working class in Birmingham. He ranged from the back-to-backs and courtyard dwellings of the 19th century through to the inter-war council estates. He concluded by looking at post-war schemes aimed at building a 'New Jerusalem'. He argued that the planners did not notice or ignored the things that made the old neighbourhoods tolerable (like the corner shops and the extended family).

Mike Bradley (University of Birmingham) gave a broad account of the creation of the post-war planning machinery, concluding with that 'momentous piece of legislation', the 1947 Act. He reviewed the anti-slum campaign, government reports (Bartow, Scott, Ullswater, Roth, etc.) and some of the literature on the Rebuilding of Britain. Bradley drew special attention to Birmingham, which he claimed to be "a unique..."
laboratory for the studying of planning history”. He pointed to the work of the Bourroville Village Trust and the West Midlands Group on Post-War Reconstruction and highlighted their publications, especially When We Build Again (1941), English County (1946) and Contributions (1948).

Mike Hallett (University of Central England) took as his theme British journalism. He introduced the large audience to Lippitt (‘a pocket magazine for everyone’), Weekly Illustrated and Picture Post and the work of Stefan Lorant. As editor of these ventures, Lorant introduced illustrated stories. He used prominent photographers, such as Brassai, Kentsz and Brandt. Hallett explored the way in which stories were commissioned and worked up. He highlighted the way in which Brandt built up his pictures. He showed that Brandt had shown an interest in housing before he was commissioned to work on this theme by the Bourrville Village Trust and generally stressed his empathy with the working class. He warned those present about the dangers of using photographic sources, encouraging them, in particular, to check whether the publication date of a photograph was the same as when it was actually taken.

After lunch the delegates were treated to a showing of the film version of When We Build Again (1943). It was introduced by Philip Handford (Bourroville Village Trust). He put the film, which contrasted the ‘elders of the slums’ with new suburban estates and Bourroville, in its context. The film suggested that planners and architects should ‘listen to people’. Interestingly, Mass Observation investigators were in ‘Modelville’ at much the same time as the Strand Film Company were making When We Build Again.

The rest of the afternoon session was given over to photographers. Bryan Campbell (former Picture Editor, The Observer) offered a personal perspective on Bill Brandt. He explored Brandt’s links with Man Ray and the Surrealists. He also analysed the professional way in which Brandt worked on an assignment. Campbell paid particular attention to Brandt’s interest in buildings and people. This comes through in his well-known personal series and in the work commissioned by the Bourroville Village Trust.

Richard Sadler (former Head of Photography, University of Derby) reviewed the equipment, techniques, methods and themes used in Brandt’s photographic representations of the Home Front. He reflected on what Brandt could do with the cameras at his disposal (Rolleiflex, Reflexe-Korelle, etc.). He analysed the way Brandt used lighting to intensify the atmosphere (Sadler reminded the audience of the time Brandt spent with Brassai). He also noted the cramped and claustrophobic conditions in many of the photographs of interiors, especially slum interiors. Despite their knowledge of the man and his work, they found Brandt difficult to pin down. Campbell found his ‘enigmatic’, and Sadler claimed it was ‘difficult to unpin him’.

Max Jones concluded the Symposium by describing how he came to follow Bill Brandt’s footsteps. He had been invited by the Bourrville Village Trust to make a contemporary record of life at Bourroville in 1995, to mark the centenary of the commencement of the estate. Jones explained how he had made a conscious decision to create the work of Brandt. At the same time, he believes he has produced a set of images that reflect typical people and scenes at Bourroville. We will have to wait some time to see whether this group of photographs interests planning and photographic historians.

What this, otherwise excellent, symposium lacked was someone (and some time) to pull the various stands together. Some reference to documentary films and the vast literature on ‘Rebuilding Britain’ would have added to the richness of the event and helped to establish the broader context in which the Brandt photographs should be seen.

Bill Brandt, ‘Family Meal: Kingstanding, Birmingham, c.1943’ (Bourroville Village Trust)
students of modernism today. His buildings are now critically neglected, partly because of their Fascist associations, but also because it was certain that Sottsass’s work deserves to be rehabilitated for its architectural merit alone.

Left at this level, evaluation of totalitarian architecture would mainly be a matter of taste, preference and criticism of ‘architectural effect’, independently of the buildings’ original function. But these are elastic concepts which soon elide with questions of function and symbolism anyway. Neurath’s Zeppelin field and parade grounds were good architectural solutions for the staging of political rallies, Stamp insisted, thus having it both ways. Soper had successfully addressed form and function. Likewise, as Stamp demonstrated, Hitler’s Chancellery was ‘effective’ architecture in the way that it functioned to ‘overawe’ visitors.

Stamp’s pragmatism was, in fact, subtle and persuasive, but although it attracted little in the way of direct responders, it has to be said that problems with such pragmatism are either self-evident or could be adduced from other papers, notably that of Peter Blundell Jones (Sheffield University). Blundell Jones feels that the grey areas in the relationship between architecture and power (Mies van der Rohe’s flirtations with Nazism, or Italian Rationalism’s patronage by Mussolini) should not distract us too much from a tendency towards the dangers of fascism. Of course, the symbolism and aura of classicism are not automatically totalitarian, but they can be useful in the point where they become so. The monumental and gigantic anti-humanism of Speer’s projects for Berlin could double for any purpose, and the ideological reinterpretation that Speer envisaged only four per cent demolition of old Berlin, as opposed to Le Corbusier’s one hundred per cent demolition of oldParis for the Plan Vossian, does not make the former the more humanist, and Stamp’s efforts to compare pre-war Berlin projects with those of totalitarian reconstruction did not account for the unintended demolition work of the Luftwaffe.

Speer’s philosophical and ethical modes of evaluation are impoverished without proper historical evaluation. Happily, two speakers in particular, Catherine Dent (Open University) discussing Stalinism and, and Francesco Garafalo (University of Venice) on Musso林’s patronage, flushed out the debates with the social and historical contexts in which totalitarian buildings were planned and built. In both Italy and Russia the production of totalitarian architecture was an ongoing process. In Italy, the rivalry between rationalism and classicism for the attention of Mussolini was practically ‘resolved’ in a compromise between classical axial planning and modern structural techniques; Garafalo left us with the image of L’abita’s projected Symbolic Arch for Rome, 1942, which at the same time spanned an heroically ‘fascist’ axial plan and anticipated Sottsass’s ‘democratic’ 1948 Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at St Louis, USA. Cooke ended her talk by poignantly explaining the link between the Stalinist urbanism in Leningrad and Moscow enjoyed in co-opting wooden cottages. In Moscow, street widening and the opening of the Metro provided genuine services and an introduction to the exhilaration of modernity; and one could hardly deny the ideological impression left by Golderade’s photographs of the opening of the first book on the Slovene academicism and professor, Edwardian. He was an architect and urban designer, painter and graphic artist, teacher and thinker. He was a follower of the pioneers of modern Slovene architecture, Fabiani and Pecihn, a collaborator with Le Corbusier and the great purveyor of the Central European architectural tradition. This is a well illustrated collective work by fifty authors from nine countries. It was conceived and edited by Us and Concern for the public architect and publicist, France Ivanesc. The text is in Slovene and English. The book begins with a review of Ravnak’s career, an extensive collection of photographs from his personal collection, a catalogue of his architectural works. There follows a richly illustrated architectural statement on the man and his varied work. It concludes with a list of Professor Ravnovan’s students. This is an unusual, but invaluable and comprehensive study.


This handsome book emerges from one of Melbourne’s greatest historians. It has riducled modernism’s claim to moral authority, and ensured that Brass-Arts axiady lived to fight another day.

But too often at ‘Architecture in Uniform’, an inappropriate level of critical sensitivity was overlooked by the will to provide architectural entertainment. Not even the most guarded speaker was prepared to question the legitimacy of political and social-economic authority per se, as its imposition through architecture is only as long as it isn’t excessive. Symptomatic of this rather cavalier attitude was one speaker’s suggestion that the work on the screen in front of us was interesting precisely because it was amongst the last surviving examples of totalitarian architecture.

We propose symposia on the new architecture of, say, China and Iraq.

France Ivanesc (ed.), Hommage à Édouard Ravnak 1907-1993, 1995, ISBN 88 880.0, DEM £30.00 (Europe), £102.00, DEM £90.00 (all other countries).

To the last of the book, the telic trap of Jewish cabaret artists, many of whom are still estranged from the danger of Nazism until it was too late. The last performances of Berlin cabaret and cabaret’s concentration camps of Westerbork and Theresienstadt, where much of the performers were sent to their deaths at Auschwitz. Throughout, the simply researched and beautifully written book. Jelavich demonstrates the ambivalent relationship between the metropolitan culture of the cabaret and the political culture of the German nation. In the trajectory from Berlin to Auschwitz, a vital part of Berlin’s metropolitan culture, an exemplified by Jewish cabaret artists and impresarios, was annihilated. (Reprinted from The Urban History Newsletter. )


This book provides an ambitious and insightful account of the physical transformation of Washington D.C. during the last four decades of the twentieth century. The author evaluates the nature of the city’s development and suggests that despite the greater influence of economic and professional managers, the essential character of the city’s ‘promotional regimes’ and the physical structures built differed but little from cities dominated by bosses and corrupt politics. (Seymour J. Mandelbaum, University of Pennsylvania.)


This anthology focuses on a variety of public policy issues, including downtown planning.

This book examines economic development programmes undertaken by ten medium sized cities during the 1980s and 1990s. The authors emphasise the decision-making role of local leaders and conclude that politics matters in regard to urban development. The book's modification of development theory contributes to a sparse dialogue between economists and scholars from fields such as history and political science. (Allison Lusberg, Florida International University.)


This book examines the development of the African-American community in three Southern cities: Atlanta, Memphis and Richmond. It reviews the racial politics of the cities and examines the interplay between competing groups within the black ghetto and the white power structure. The authors describe the effects of developmental policies, urban renewal programmes and the battle over desegregation in public schools. (Robert A. Calvert, Texas A and M University.)

The Separate City is prepared by using MacWrite II and the journal is designed in Pagemaker v.4.2. Contributions on disk compatible with this software are encouraged along with accompanying hard copy.
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