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On Display: Planning Exhibitions as Civic Propaganda or Public Consultation?
KEITH D. LILLEY
School of Geography, Queen’s University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT7 1NN, UK
E-mail: k.lilley@qub.ac.uk

Introduction
In June 1945, the Town Clerk of Coventry, Frederick Smith, wrote to fellow Chief Officers of the City Council calling them to a meeting to discuss an exhibition "to illustrate the theme—"Coventry of the Future"—using various models and exhibits, he explained, this exhibition was "intended to place before the public the various proposals which have been made in connection with the physical replanning and housing in the City", proposals that had been developed by the City Architect and his team following the devastation caused to the city by aerial attacks in November 1940. Smith clearly had in mind an exhibition that would inform the people of Coventry about the plans for the reconstruction of the city now the war was over, and his letter to the Chief Officers shows that even before their meeting he had the purpose and arrangement of the exhibition mapped out. Two months later on, with preparations for the exhibition in full swing, Smith wrote another letter, this time to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, inviting the Minister, Lewis Silkin, to Coventry to open the exhibition on October 8. This letter states again Smith's idea of what the exhibition was for: "to foster public interest and possibly excite useful criticism and suggestions".

The aim of this paper is to explore how far town planning exhibitions, such as the one on "Coventry of the Future", were early exercises in public participation in British urban policy-making, and to what extent they provided local people with an opportunity to involve themselves in the decision-making processes that led to the reconstruction of cities after the Second World War. Addressing these questions forces us as planning historians to think carefully about what is meant by "consulting the citizen", while at the same time they also help us to reflect on how the concept of public participation was understood in the past. To consider these matters this paper focuses on the consultative role of town-planning exhibitions held during the 1940s in towns and cities across the UK. To this end I start with a brief look at the place of exhibitions in British planning during first half of the twentieth century and introduce the question of how to judge levels of public participation. Then, to examine this in more detail, the second part of the paper focuses on a particular case study, the "Coventry of the Future" exhibition, to see how a planning exhibition was understood at the time by those who were responsible for creating it, as well as by those who consumed it. The idea here, then, is to examine the ways in which planning exhibitions played a consultative role in 1940s urban policy.

Exhibitions in British Urban Planning
"Coventry of the Future" was just one of many such planning exhibitions that were held by local authorities to put on display their plans and proposals for post-war reconstruction. Few urban historians have bothered with these exhibitions, yet in the 1940s much time, money and effort was expended on them by local authorities. Finding out where and when these exhibitions took place some fifty years later is not easy, but initial research suggests that they were usually tied in with the publication of an 'advisory plan' produced either by commissioned planning consultants or 'in-house' by city architects, borough engineers or town planners employed by the local authorities themselves. Coventry's exhibition was held when local planning exhibitions were seemingly at their height, in the middle 1940s, though not all those places that staged planning exhibitions had been as badly damaged as Coventry by the war, indeed some small towns, such as Knutsford and Sudbury, were holding planning exhibitions, as well as larger cities such as Manchester and Sheffield (Fig. 1).

Figure 1: Town-Planning Exhibitions held in Britain, 1940-1951

The 1940s was a decade that witnessed exhibitions of all sorts. Writing in the Architectural Review in 1943, G S Kallmann commented that there are now more
exhibitions than ever, with exhibitions which toured around the country, such as “Living in Cities”, “Homes to Live In”, “The Englishman Builds” and “Plaistow Scotland Now”, as well as others based in the capital and major cities on rather more war-related themes and organised through the Exhibition Division of the Ministry of Information. The abundant proliferation of exhibitions in wartime Britain was also commented upon by Minna Black in her review of exhibitions in the Architects’ Yearbook of 1947. She noted, “the use of exhibitions as a method of propaganda for ideas has suddenly blossomed from a frail plant... into a vigorous growth. Its tendrils have seized Oxford Street and Piccadilly to provincial towns, remote villages and isolated army camps.” For Black, this ‘propaganda for ideas’ was not inherently dubious or inauthentic. Concurring with Julian Huxley’s dictum that propaganda in a democracy must be based on the “principle of persuasion, consent and participation”, she saw the exhibition as an instrument which provided the public with information in an interesting and clear way. In contrast, the core of informed opinion on specific subjects [such as town planning] whose influence can spread widely as a contagious disease. This town planning exhibitions of 1940s Britain were part of a much broader culture of display being developed during the war in a context when pop-up exhibitions were an accepted and acceptable part of everyday life.

Planning exhibitions were not an innovation new to Britain in the 1940s. Three decades before the outbreak of the First World War, Patrick Geddes had been advocating their use for the purposes of educating citizens in aspects of citizenship. In his Cities in Evolution Geddes wrote, “our immediate need is educational—most effectively through a Civic Exhibition”. One such approach was to have ‘a local exhibition in each city telling essentially of its own site and origins, its own best part, its present good and bad alike, its possible opening future also.’ To this end Geddes was responsible for Patrick Geddes had been advocating their use for the purposes of educating citizens in aspects of citizenship. In his Cities in Evolution Geddes wrote, “our immediate need is educational—most effectively through a Civic Exhibition”. One such approach was to have ‘a local exhibition in each city telling essentially of its own site and origins, its own best part, its present good and bad alike, its possible opening future also.’ To this end Geddes was responsible for the exhibition ‘Civic and Town Planning Exhibition’ which began in Chelsea in London in 1911, travelled to Edinburgh, Belfast and Dublin, and won an international prize when it was taken to Ghent in Belgium, and finally met its end when it was burned down in India in 1914. “The principle of this new exhibition”, explained Geddes, “was no longer simply that of seeking and accepting examples of good contemporary work as it comes, important as this was, but that of following an ordered design that of presenting a type-selection of housing and town-planning schemes of suggestive character towards city development; and further of working towards the comparative presentation and study of the evolution of cities—historic, actual and possible.” This exhibition, he concluded, “has effected more or less of this education of public opinion, and towards practical results.” For Geddes, the exhibition was not just a means of informing the public but educating them.

Between them, Black and Geddes saw the exhibition broadly as an exercise in public consultation, but consultation that hinged on a flow of information from exhibition to onlooker by means of engagement and participation via a ‘space’ of display that was the exhibition. This exhibition was seen as a carefully managed and controlled environment where people were channelled through and subjected to visual stimulation, the principle being, as Black herself put it, “to persuade the visitors to undertake action under present conditions, often contrary to their natural appetites”, that is, to consume what they see. This is evidently how the Town Clerk at Coventry initially viewed the “Coventry of the Future” exhibition when he wrote his letter to Chief Officers in June 1945, an orchestrated piece of information-giving to inform the public of ‘their’ planning proposals. But ultimately the Coventry exhibition became more than that. It was a space in which and through which local people and local planners negotiated their future work. As revealed by what happened with the exhibition at Coventry, both in terms of the story of its setting up and the story of how people responded to it. In this respect, the planning exhibition became a forum of ‘civic participation’, for it opened up a dialogue between the ‘planner’ and ‘planned’. To help understand the complexities of conceptualising ‘civic participation’ of this kind, Astin (1965) formulated in the late 1960s when she was trying to make sense of citizen involvement in planning and urban policy in the United States. Her ladder consists of eight levels of participation, ranging from ‘manifestation’ (level one), where the aim is simply to get public support, through to ‘civic control’ (level eight), where policy making and management is directed by those within the local neighbourhood. (Fig. 1). A similar area here is not to fit the ‘Coventry of the Future’ exhibition into one or other of these categories, but rather to use this model as a device to open up questions on the consultative nature of the exhibition, thinking about how the exhibition was viewed at the time by those who were involved in its production and consumption. By so doing what I hope to do is suggest that while the 1940s planning exhibition was on one level an exercise in civic propaganda (or ‘education’, depending on one’s point of view), it was at the same time an avenue for public consultation, a means by which Coventry of the future was negotiated and, in some ways, contested.

Exhibiting “Coventry of the Future”

After the initial meeting in summer 1945, the Chief Officers of Coventry city council had just over three months to organise their exhibition. The Town Clerk placed the City Architect, Donald Gibson, and the City Engineer, Ernest Ford, to work on practical matters such as the exhibition layout, producing models and drawing up a booklet to accompany the exhibition. During this time attempts were made to publicise the forthcoming exhibition and raise local and national awareness of it by having announcements made from a “loudspeaker van” and copies of the exhibition guide sent to various newspapers and journals, in addition to which an unsigned memorandum of mid-August lists ‘suggested events’ to be held in conjunction with the exhibition, such as talks by local residents and talks by local institutions. As well as a suggestion for a competition sponsored by the council together with the local newspaper, the Coventry Evening Telegraph, inviting suggestions and “to ascertain views of Coventry people as to general improvements”. It seems therefore that the preparations for the exhibition advanced during late summer 1945, more emphasis was being placed on looking at ways to involve people actively in replanning of the city. The staging of the exhibition was seen not simply as a means of informing the public, but encouraging active participation.

The exhibition was opened on Monday October 8, 1945 by the Mayor of Coventry and the Minister of Town and County Planning. That same day, the Coventry Evening Telegraph newspaper pronounced “Coventry of To-day sees the Coventry of To-morrow”, and set out in an adjacent column details about the competition which accompanied the exhibition, a display at the exhibition informed visitors that they could win 50 guineas by submitting an essay on the theme of how you would rebuild your city” and a further 50 guineas for submitting “six ideas” for the Coventry of the future. In this display there was also an invitation to send comments to the council about the proposals on show, as well as a book stall from which visitors could purchase, for two shillings and sixpence, copies of the booklet, The Coventry of the Future, to “interest and make the street”, which included extracts from the exhibition and reproductions of some of the perspectives and illustrations. The aim was, it seems, to ensure that the person leaving the exhibition would not simply forget what they had seen, but would instead have something tangible to remind them of what they had been looking at (the booklet) as well as an opportunity to engage with the planning process (the competition and comments), both of which further encouraged the individuals to take ownership of the proposals and giving the impression that they had some say in the future of the city. This amounted to what Black regarded as one of the most important aspects of the ‘propaganda exhibition’, to ensure that the visitors having accepted the general thesis with a comfortable feeling that, at the exhibition, he [sic] has been given the facts which justify his new or righteously sustained belief”, the belief that the future belonged to them.

Through negotiating the exhibition, visitors encountered “Coventry of the Future”. The exhibition guide instructed them to “proceed to the left” on entering the hall, and then took them through various spaces dedicated to a particular theme, such as “Roads and Transport”, “Amenities”, “Central Redevelopment”, each consisting of various models and wall-mounted displays. The segregated spaces of the exhibition, the ordered flows of visitors, were in a sense reproducing the future Coventry as conceived by its planners. The exhibition spaces were in this respect “consulting the citizen”, but it would be naïve to assume that those who visited the exhibition all experienced and negotiated it in the same way. The exhibition was a site of negotiation, a space for the shiftings and rearrangements terms. There were 45,808 visitors over the thirteen-day period of the exhibition, and on one day alone 7000 attended. As a consultative exercise, then, one might regard the exhibition at Coventry as a success. However, people’s reactions to the exhibition, and to the invitations to comment on proposals and contribute to the competition, reveal that among some there was a sense that they were simply being informed rather than consulted over the proposals. An impression of these
public reaction can be gleaned from letters written to the council and to the Coventry Evening Telegraph, and also the results of the competition and its impact.

For many who visited the Coventry exhibition, there was either no time or no inclination to write in either support or protest against the proposals, for only fourteen letters about the exhibition were published in the Coventry Evening Telegraph. In oral history interviews conducted in 2001 with Coventrians who had lived during the city’s reconstruction the sentiment was that in the 1940s there were too many everyday matters to deal with – work, rent, family – to worry about visiting planning exhibitions and thinking about rebuilding proposals. The letters to the Coventry Evening Telegraph show that there were some who clearly disliked what they saw: “the general concept of the scheme is not in keeping with the characteristics of the Coventry people... They all say ‘Give us back the Coventry as we knew it’,” one person wrote. While others disagreed, saying “those with whom I’ve discussed the new scheme are full of praise for the concept”. However, the exhibition was more of a civic propaganda than public consultation. It may be, that the apparent dearth of letters to the newspaper and to the council both during and after the exhibition reflected the same resigned attitude that individual opinions and views would not be valued anyway. This is also, to some extent, further suggested by the response to the council’s ‘essay’ and ‘idea’ competitions.

Perhaps more than the exhibition, the accompanying competition gave the impression that the council were willing to listen to local views and take on board ‘ideas and suggestions for the future of Coventry from citizens of all ages’. As well as the ‘essay’ competition ‘to attract developments’ for improvements, and the ‘idea’ competition ‘for the six best practical suggestions for the future of Coventry’, there was also a ‘schools competition’, for juniors and seniors. A day after the exhibition’s opening, the Coventry Evening Telegraph reported that “the school pupils were among the first to visit the exhibition and to discuss the plans with the council”. Later, two further competitions were announced, one being a poster competition, and the other was a competition to provide the council with a new city plan. The exhibition was therefore a ‘living city plan’, the exhibition was seen to be a vehicle for encouraging greater public participation in the city’s replanning, being as such not only by its organisers and by the local newspaper, but clearly by those who felt it worthwhile to write to the paper and submit competition entries. Did they believe they were making a difference? One would assume, since they extended time and effort in writing their essays and listing their six best ideas. But how the entrants felt later, when hardly a further word was mentioned of their views and opinions, and when the plans for the city remained the same, is not necessarily difficult to judge. Perhaps the realities of post-war living took precedence. If the council had believed the exercise had been a genuinely consultative one, then certainly little effort was made to perpetuate the process of participation after 1945. After fifteen years later, in June 1961, the exhibition and competition were to be recalled at a council meeting debating the removal of trees from Warwick Road: Alderman Hodgkinson, opposing the changes, reminded the chamber that back in 1946, the Coventry people had showed their submissions to the competition concern that their city should have not only good housing but also public parks and open spaces.”

In June 1946 a start was made on the reconstruction of Coventry, beginning with the symbolic unveiling of the ‘levelling stone’ from which point the new city would be planned. From then, the exhibition proposals drawn up by Gibson and his team in 1945 began to take concrete form in the construction of new buildings, starting with Broadgate, the new heart of the rebuilt city, and the pedestrian precompression. Despite the entries submitted to the competitions, the letters to the Telegraph and the Council, the city’s architects’ plans for Coventry remained more or less unchanged as the city’s plans for the new city replaced those of the old.

What can be said of the consultative role of the exhibition in the case of Coventry? It would seem, at least on the surface, that the exhibition performed its exercise of providing the council with a opportunity to raise local awareness of plans for reconstruction. This was certainly the initial purpose of the exhibition as it was conceived by the Town Clerk.

However, the exhibition was also seen to be a vehicle for encouraging greater public participation in the city’s replanning, being as such not only by its organisers and by the local newspaper, but clearly by those who felt it worthwhile to write to the paper and submit competition entries.
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Notes


4. These are the exhibitions I have come across: Aberdeen (1945), Bath (1945), Belfast (1943), Bilston (1944), Bournemouth (1946), Bristol (1942), Clydebank (1945), Coventry (1945, 1945, 1946), Edinburgh (1942, 1943), Exeter (1946), Glasgow (1945, 1949), Grimsby (1944), Hamilton (1948), Hull (1946), Inverness (1942), Islington (1947), Liverpool (1947), London (1943, 1943), Manchester (1948), Middlesbrough (1945), Nottingham (1945), Oxford (1943), Plymouth (1945), Sheffield (1945), Swansea (1946), Sunderland (1944), Warwick (1946, possibly 1947), Windsor (1946), Worcester (1944).


10. Ibid, pp 82.

11. Ibid, pp 83.


14. These details are made clear in files belonging to the Town Clerk kept at the CCRO (CCRA/CAT/C/27/1-4).


16. Coventry Evening Telegraph, October 8 1945, p 5.
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The term “reconstruction” in its widest sense refers to the economic and social development that followed the war, including the rebuilding of cities and towns, the re-establishment of industries, and the restoration of public utilities. This process was guided by the need for the reconstruction of urban areas and the establishment of a “central planning authority”, which was the essential instrument for the re-planning of the bombed cities and towns. In this context, the role of the central government constitutes the fundamental factor to be realized effectively within an extensive reconstruction programme. At the same time, social consensus is needed [2].

In town planning terms, the great utility for investigation of urban reconstruction cases derives from the opportunities to implement new ideas and aspects, which were otherwise impossible. The Second World War was the most disastrous event in 20th century European History. The need for reconstruction of the European countries immediately after the end of the hostilities was evident. Therefore, several countries responded to the problem in different ways, mainly because of the various economic possibilities as well as the local conditions. The British case is a particular interesting one, due to the fact that the machinery for reconstruction was prepared during the war. As a result, the British reconstruction plans were prepared systematically and in an uninterrupted manner. The advantages were evident, as the machinery of the whole reconstruction procedure was available, which resulted in successful re-planning of the towns and cities.

This paper focuses on the 1940-44 period, and it deals with the administrative developments related to the formation of the reconstruction machinery and its effects in establishing the central planning authority. These developments are considered as a great stimulus for the resurgence of the town planning movement and the creation of Britain’s post-war planning system. In this sense, the formation of the British reconstruction machinery during the Second World War was a pioneering process.

The need for re-organization of the governmental machinery

The need for re-organization of Britain in economic and physical terms was profound many years before the outbreak of the Second World War (fig. 1 & 2).

According to Peter Hall, “The need for national-regional planning only became fully evident in the aftermath of the Great Depression of 1929-32 [4]. This led to the constitution of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population in July 7, 1937 [5]. The publication of the Report of the Commission in January 1940 could be considered as

Figure 1
the last governmental attempt to respond to the above need. Generally speaking, the Commission recommended that action should be taken by the Government to stop further development of the main urban agglomerations of the country. The great opportunity for reconstruction was absent from the British scene. The strong impetus was given by an undesirable fact: The Second World War. As William Ashworth claims: 'The greatest stimulus brought by war to town planning came through the shattering of cities by bombing from Autumn of 1940' [6].

As expected, the objectives of the British Commission were very wide. On the one hand they contained the arrangement of external affairs, such as commercial relations with other countries, war compensation from enemy countries and the agreement of loans mainly from the U.S.A. On the other, they were involved in the management of internal problems, such as re-organization of production activity, redistribution of the labour force, provision of adequate housing, re-planning and rebuilding of town centres and improvement of communications.

As a consequence, the entire reconstruction question was difficult to address without a governmental plan of action and the Commission was very complicated. In order for the entire enterprise to be effective, it was necessary to separate the inter-related issues in administrative terms, this required the re-adjustment of the existing responsibilities of governmental departments as well as the creation of a new body for the management of the entire reconstruction activity. The formation of the British reconstruction machinery presents analogous actions. The entire enterprise was under the control of the War Cabinet, but it soon became apparent that an independent administrative body needed to be developed for the co-ordination of the Departments. In addition, substantial changes needed to be introduced in the responsibilities of the Departments with technical character; that is, to the Ministry of Works and Buildings, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Transport, and the Ministry of Trade. In this point the question which arises is two-fold: How was the British reconstruction machinery co-ordinated in its initial stage and what were the main departmental developments until the end of the war period?

The co-ordination of the reconstruction machinery

The origin of the British reconstruction machinery was stated in the War Aims Committee of the Cabinet, which was set up on August, 23rd 1940 with very wide terms of reference [7], as follows:

i. Making suggestions with regard to a post-war European and World system.

ii. Considering means of perpetuating the national unity achieved in the country during the war through a social and economic structure designed to secure equality of opportunity and service among all classes of the community [8].

About a year since the outbreak of the war, on December 30, 1940, Arthur Greenwood - who was responsible for the Secretariat of the War Aims Committee - was appointed Minister without Portfolio of the Coalition government in charge of reconstruction. The objective of the new minister was more confined than that of the War Aims Committee; the period of three years was estimated to be enough for the first stage of reconstruction. The most noteworthy point in this primary phase is in the political choice to create a co-ordinating liaison mechanism, instead of the establishment of an administrative body with complete responsibility for reconstruction. As J.B. Cullingworth notes: 'From the beginning of reconstruction the work of the minister was not expected to do more than collate and co-ordinate, and in exceptional cases to inspire departments to produce official proposals' [9].

In 1941, a series of ministerial, departmental and interdepartmental committees were set up to cover the various subjects of reconstruction. The activity of the War Cabinet, as well as that of the Minister without Portfolio was impressive concerning the preparation of the reconstruction machinery [10]. Of major importance were the Cabinet Committee on Reconstruction Problems and the Ministerial Committee on Economic Aspects of Reconstruction.
The important result of these events was that the idea of a central planning authority began to be accepted by the governmental machinery. Reith did not stop at these developments. In 1941 he appointed two significant Committees, the Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Justice Uhswatt and the Committee on Land Utilisation in Key Areas, under the Chairmanship of Lord Justice Scott [29]. In addition, pressure for the establishment of a new Ministry with planning responsibilities was presented from the professional associations. In 1941, the Town and Country Planning Association adopted a National Planning Basis, which was later approved in principle by the Royal Institute of British Architects, the National Council of Social Service and the National Plan of Field 1942. Among its main provisions were that the Ministry should be set up to guide future development and redevelopment and the future of industry and population [30].

The Reports of the Scott and Uhswatt Commissions, submitted in September 1942, suggested the establishment of a general central planning authority. There were differences of view as to whether this authority should be a Ministry or a Commission. According to Reith, it was clear that no single authority short of the entire Cabinet could plan national development in the widest sense, but in the narrower sense of land use planning there many who thought that a semi-independent commission would do better than a ministry [31].

Finally on 11 February 1942, under the terms of the Minister of Works and Planning Act, the Minister of Works and Buildings became the Minister of Works and Planning and took over from the Minister of Health the powers of the Central Government under the Town and Country Planning Acts, while the Secretary of State for Scotland remained responsible for the exercise of these functions in Scotland [32]. Reith was the first Minister of Works and Planning, but within a fortnight he was asked to resign and was replaced by Lord Portal [33].

It becomes clear from the above that the road for the creation of a separate Ministry with planning terms of reference was open. A decisive event occurred on 26 January 1943, when the Paymaster General introduced the Minister of Town and Country Planning Bill. The Bill proposed: 'To make provision in connection with appointment of a Minister of Town and Country Planning; to provide for the transfer to that Minister of statutory function; and to provide for the establishment of statutory commissions for the purpose of exercising such functions in relation to the use and development of land in England and Wales as may hereafter be determined' [34].

The Bill was passed on 4 February 1943 and W.S. Morrison was appointed Minister of Town and Country Planning [35]. The Ministry of Works and Planning became Minister of Works. According to J.B. Cullingworth: 'The more positive role which was to be played by the Minister of Town and Country Planning was emphasized' [36]. However, at the same time he noted that: 'It was true that the Minister would not have all the powers required to compel planning authorities to carry out development but such power could not be obtained without a recasting of the present legislation' [37]. In this context, the main objective of the new Ministry was the preparation of the legislation concerning land policy. This is confirmed in a note prepared by the Ministry of Town and Country Planning for the Lord President: 'The whole basis of planning legislation will need reviewing in order to give statutory expression of this new conception of the objects of planning' [38].

The most important legislative product of the Ministry of Town and Country Planning during the war years was the 1944 Act. It will not be analyzed in this paper, except to state the evidence indicates that it satisfied all the political parties of the Parliament. As an example, Bevin (Labour), the Minister of Labour and National Service of the Coalition government, threatened to withdraw support for the negotiations if certain specific clauses in the Act remained [39]. On the other hand, in a long memorandum prepared from the Ministry of Economic Warfare, the Earl of Selborne, wrote that: 'It must necessarily be difficult for Conservatives, Liberals and Socialists to agree about post-war legislation... In Town and Country Planning the Socialist and the Liberal will wish to extend State interference with private trade and property much further than most of the Conservatives will think necessary or desirable' [40].

The above political declarations show that the tasks of land policy threatened the unity of the Coalition government, which was the necessary stabilising factor during the war period. In other words, it was obvious that the Coalition government would not be easy to face such a kind of problems, which are suitable of a government with pure political aspect in town and country planning terms. In Britain, it happened just after the Second World War, when the Labour Party came in power and the Ministry of Town and Country Planning History 2003 Vol. 25 No. 3
Planning introduced new legislation (the New Town Act of 1946, and the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947), and issued instructions dealing with the technique of planning (fig. 3, 4 & 5).

**Conclusion**

According to the previous analysis it can be concluded that in terms of town and country planning, the significant step in the successive developments in reconstructing Britain after the Second World War was the establishment of the Ministry of Town and Country Planning. It is clear that this Ministry forms the core of the central planning authority. The process of its creation and development was complicated and long-term, mainly because it was expected to intervene in responsibilities previously delegated to other departments of the government and to become a new, powerful ministry. In Britain, the catalyst was the war; its adverse effects on the man-made environment created the ostensible social consensus which facilitated the introduction of progressive institutions in all levels of social life.
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8. Ibid., p. 4.
9. Ibid., p. 5.
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ii. "Inter-departmental Committee on Social Insurance and Allied Services", in 1 July 1941; see in: P.R.O., CAB 124/599.
iii. "Official Committee on Post-War Economic Problems and Anglo-American Cooperation", in 6 August 1941; see in: P.R.O., CAB 117/20.
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16. Ibid.
17. Ashworth, W., op. cit., p. 222.
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20. Ibid., pp. 224-5.
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22. Ashworth, W., op. cit., p. 228.
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39. Ibid., p. 140. Especially it is written there that Bevin said: ... if classes 45 and 46 were dropped, it must be understood that Labour ministers were not committed to the compromise embodied in these clauses, and that whole question of the basis of compensation would have to be considered afresh ... .
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**Legends of figures**

**Fig. 1** Typical area in the East End of pre-Second World War London showing the existing interministry of housing, industry, etc. Source: Forsyth, J.H. & Abercrombie, Patrick (1943), County of London Plan, London: McMillan & Co. Ltd., plate XXXII (facing page 104).

**Fig. 2** A view of pre-Second World War London showing the anomalous development with houses close alongside industries and warehouses. It is significant the absence of private gardens and the negligible public open spaces. Source: Forsyth, J.H. & Abercrombie, Patrick (1945), County of London Plan, London: McMillan & Co. Ltd., plate II (facing page 8).

**Fig. 3** An imaginary example of a town with its pre-war existing urban densities. Source: The Ministry of Town and Country Planning (1947), The redevelopment of central areas, London: H.M.S.O., p. 20.

**Fig. 4** The previous imaginary example see in (fig. 4) with the proposed urban densities by the Ministry. Source: The Ministry of Town and Country Planning (1947), The redevelopment of central areas, London: H.M.S.O., p. 21.

**Fig. 5** Alternative ways of redeveloping an office area. Source: The Ministry of Town and Country Planning (1947), The redevelopment of central areas, London: H.M.S.O., p. 70.
"A thoroughly capable man versed in the science of town planning": Appointing a town planning expert for New Zealand
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Introduction
The quote in this article's title comes from a pamphlet produced in 1918 by A. Leigh Hunt called Town Planning: What Is It?, a publication intended to encourage both acceptance of town planning in New Zealand and the passing of legislation. The quote represented Leigh Hunt's definition of the appropriate person to be the Government's Town Planner, and by definition its premier advisor in this new area. It's author, an active member of the Greater Wellington Municipal Electors and Town Planning Association (GWME + TPA) was one of a band of enthusiasts who drove the early town planning movement in New Zealand, a movement that would not see its labours bear fruit until 1926 when legislation was eventually passed.

This article is only peripherally concerned with that struggle and is instead focused on the efforts to both establish the exact powers and functions of the town planner within any legislation and to identify and recruit a person of defined qualities to fill that position. It is a tale that reveals much about the difficulties of both establishing the position and in recruiting anyone with the required technical/professional expertise to work in a small country literally at the bottom of the world.

Some Early Visions of a Town Planner
The early proponents for town planning gave little thought, at least in their published work, to the position, responsibilities and attributes of who ever would advise the government on town planning. This is hardly surprising given that the original struggle was to gain both public and government acceptance that New Zealand needed and in fact might benefit from this newly developed scientific art. The situation was probably clouded particularly prior to the early 1920s when the first New Zealander trained as a town planner, by the difficulty in establishing who might be regarded as having the appropriate skills and training to make them a town planner, rather than an architect or engineer with an interest in the subject. It is a problem which haunts any newly established profession. Certainly there was no mention of such a person or position in Charles Reade's 1911 public lectures which were presented in Auckland and Wellington. They instead concentrated on the perils of the sham and the need for town planning to ameliorate them. Similarly the 1914 Australasian Town Planning Tour which visited twenty-five New Zealand towns and cities in July 1914, did not address the issue. The very general recommendations produced from the Reade and Davidge as part of the Tour, which were identical to those produced for Australia, made no mention of such a position.

This early lack of concern is probably understandable given that a town planning advisor is probably a luxury in a system which has no town planning legislation. However, it is legislation that defines the role that expert will play, creates specific responsibilities for the person and determines their relative power and influence within a governmental system. Achieving legislation was a slow process and interestingly it was not until the 1926 legislation that the actual position of town planner was created. There was no mention of a town planner or in fact anyone with town planning expertise or training in the legislation proposed in 1911 and 1912, or in the draft bill of 1917. In all of this proposed legislation power was vested instead in a Town Planning Board. While the membership of that board varied it always involved some or all of the significant public service professional staff particularly the Surveyor-General, the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department and the Government Architect. The 1917 Bill proposed, in its Town Planning Commission, the widest group of public servants which was to include in addition to the three detailed above, the Valuer-General, the Chief Health Officer and the Under-Secretary of Internal Affairs. These gentlemen were to be joined by nominees of the Municipal Association and the Institute of Architects. The breadth of those included is a clear signal of the confusion that still existed as to what town planning, in this case through legislation, might achieve. Was it to be slum clearance, urban improvements or the forward planning of new urban developments? Such confusion hardly made the role of a town planner clear and opened the door to the participation of a number of professionals who might be deemed to have an interest in the area.

Emerging Images
From 1914 onwards however there is some evidence that at least some individuals were beginning to contemplate the characteristics and attributes that the town planner should exhibit. In May 1914 the Greater Wellington Municipal Electors Association added the term Town Planning to their title, largely at the behest of Leigh Hunt. Shortly after this it would appear, given that the material is undated the new organisation prepared a detailed pamphlet of their aims. Aim 3 involved the creation of a Town Planning Department and Commission and “the appointment of a scientifically trained Town Planner who shall be free of politicians influence”. This was a clear indication that the town planning enthusiasts who powered the early movement realised that there was a distinct disciplinary body from which this town planner could be drawn and that the position need not necessarily be filled by one of the allied professions such as architecture, engineering or surveying. By 1919 Leigh Hunt was firmly convinced that New Zealand needed a man with the attributes of the title, and that “there is no man at present in the Dominion capable of holding such office”. Equally he was not to be “a landscape gardener, architect or civil engineer”. His solution was to have such a person selected from Britain. This would have been a solution that was common at the time. New Zealand's small size and relative isolation meant that the government, the university and to a lesser extent private firms had problems recruiting people with specialised skills and knowledge. In government circles this was sometimes overcome by sponsoring promising New Zealand employees to complete training overseas. This was certainly the approach used by organisations such as the State Forestry Service, and it was a practice that continued well into the 1980s.

That other bastion of the early town planning movement, Samuel Hurst Seager also believed that a town planner was needed and that the appointment “must be made from among the English town planners” and “must not only be a man of great imagination, and a skilful draughtsman, but also a man of business, of tact and of ability to press his views offered to local bodies”. He also accepted, despite the fact that he himself was an architect, that “it would not be in the interests of the movement to appoint an architect to this position however capable me may be”.

By the time the 1919 Town Planning Conference and Exhibition was held, organised by Hurst Seager, the call for the appointment of a town planner had grown stronger. In discussion of the 1917 Town-planning bill that existed in some form of legislative limbo, there were suggestions that there was a need for both a Town-planning Department and the appointment of a town planner. C.J. Farr an MP and former mayor of Auckland again advocated that “an expert Town Planner” should be recruited from Britain to fill the position. It was suggested that “his appointment should be put in the forefront of any legislation contemplated.”

The Appointment of a Director of Town Planning
While the 1919 Conference ended on a high note of optimism in reality it marked a point where the drivers of the movement changed from the enthusiasts to the representatives of the allied professions, namely the Institute of Architects and the Institute of Surveyors, particularly the latter. The 1917 Bill was quietly shelved with the conservation Reform government of the 1920s having more important matters than town planning to deal with. This did not stop individuals offering their town planning services to the government. One Enos Pegler, land developer of Manurewa, Auckland believed he was well qualified for the job on the basis of his observations during the “1921 World Bowlers Tour” and “his involvement in land development”! Not surprisingly his offer was declined.

Despite agitation from the surveying and architecture professions for legislation to be passed, worsening economic conditions made this unlikely. Quite unexpectedly in early 1926 the Prime Minister Gordon Coates became convinced of the necessity of such legislation. Work started early in 1926 and the legislation was passed by late 1926. A truly incredible
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feat, given the delays of the past and the fact that it was written by Reginald Hammond. Hammond, an architect, had undertaken the town planning course at the University College, London, was young (32) and comparatively inexperienced. His main claim to fame was as the winner of the 1925 garden suburb design contests at Orakei and at Lower Hutt.

The legislation this time established a more specific position the Director of Town Planning. This Director was appointed for a five year term after which he would be eligible for reappointment. He could be removed for a narrow range of reasons and his salary and conditions were set by Parliament. The roles and responsibilities, despite extravagant claims when the Bill was being rushed through its formulation, were in fact quite minimal. He was an automatic member of The Town Planning Board, where he could easily be outvoted by other members, and had the power to grant some exemptions with regard to subdivision. However the peculiar, for the times, nature of the Director's appointment meant that it fell outside the normal public service procedures and protections. This might potentially lead him to feel he had a special relationship with Parliament and his Minister, though this was tempered by his location within the Ministry of Internal Affairs. All these matters were to bode badly for the future. At the time the Department of Lands that was trying to wrest control of the legislation from Internal Affairs, saw the Director as one on 'whom the success of the Act depends' and who 'should be a thoroughly qualified and experienced man whose abilities are undoubted'.

There were no applications for the first position of Director. As the Under Secretary of Internal Affairs wrote, Hammond's position as author of the legislation made 'it appear a natural corollary that he should be appointed the first Director of Town Planning'. Hammond shown in Figure 1 trained as an architect but had experience in surveying and engineering through his father's firm. He was in several architectural practices before he travelled to Britain to complete his training and to work with Herbert Baker's architectural practice. He became a member of the Town Planning Institute in 1923, at which point he returned to New Zealand. Thus while he had the qualifications and some of the experience that advocators had envisaged for the position, he was still comparatively inexperienced in the cut and thrust of both central and local politics.

Hammond did not last long in the position which is hardly surprising given he was given few resources (a typist) and appeared to be subordinate to the head of Internal Affairs, in whose Ministry he resided. By September 1927 he had resigned because he felt "he could render more valuable service by assisting Local Authorities in the actual preparation of their town planning schemes". Ultimately given the difficulties of finding a replacement he continued in the position on a contract basis for a further six months.

The Search for a Replacement

Hammond had suggested that Mr Butcher, another London graduate, who was by then working for the Wellington City Council, be appointed to succeed him. This caused much consternation primarily because Butcher had formerly worked in the Government Architects office for a salary of £350, had a present salary of £650, and would receive £1,000 as Director of Town Planning. This was clearly a quite unacceptable breach of public service etiquette given the Government Architect commanded a salary of £850.

At this point the government seemed to be paralysed as to what to do. Agitation from the Auckland Town Planning Association prompted the creation of a set of criteria for the new appointment. This included a town planning qualification, working knowledge of local government and an ability to secure "the good will and assistance of local bodies". Of importance was the recognition of the need to employ a trained town planner. Given the explicit rejection of Butcher, the only other trained town planner, the government rather handicapped itself by insisting on a New Zealand appointment in line with "the Governments policy to encourage local talent". Ultimately the Cabinet appears to have decided to advertise more widely while preserving the option of preferring a New Zealander.

The Candidates

The position attracted 23 applications from a diverse group. Some 50% were in fact surveyors and included F.H. Waters the Chief Surveyor and Archie Bogle the Institute of Surveyors nominee on the Town Planning Board. Only six candidates including the Government Architect J.T. Mait described themselves as architects and all had additional qualifications in surveying or engineering. The fact that public servants such as Waters and Mair applied demonstrates either the attraction of the salary or the perceived power of the Director's position. Interestingly a Professor F.H. Arthur from the University of Toronto was among the applicants, as was H. Butcher who provided testimonials from Herbert Baker and Ernest Flagg. Some candidates were clearly unlikely to be given consideration such as P.L. Hollings, a lawyer; and A.M. Vrett and A. S. Mair on whose signatures were in fact combined the practice of the 1925 gardener suburb developer. The committee formed to consider applications were clearly a quandary and by December 1927 they had decided that there was not an appointable candidate. Bizarrely the committee thought that the High Commissioner might persuade Unwin or Pender to come over for £1,000 plus travelling expenses, or that Mawson would drop his request for £1,250 a year and accept £1,000. Consideration was also given to asking the British Government to 'lend' an expert but this was quashed by May 1928 when the British Government indicated they had no one to lend. By this point press agitation for an appointment was increasing though they were advocating for a New Zealand candidate "whose interests are here and who is likely to remain here and not in this opinion quite up to the requirement, send him abroad".

Eventually in desperation the Committee reengaging negotiations with John Mawson (Figure 2) who got the £1,250 salary that he had sought. He arrived late in 1928 to commence what was to be a frustrating career for a mercurial and highly talented man. As a sop the Appointments Committee stated that the approach would give "an opportunity to young New Zealanders to obtain essential experience...thus qualifying later to succeed Mr Mawson in this important position." However, by 1933 Mawson had resigned, worn out and frustrated of the government's lack of dedication to, and under-resourcing of town planning. While he returned to government service later in the 1930s the position of Director was never again filled.

Conclusion

The need for a competent town planning expert to establish town planning as a standard activity was undeniable. The government had advocated for the discipline and this was a role that Mawson was to undertake with energy and commitment. With the assistance of a small group of dedicated enthusiasts he ensured that town planning did emerge as a separate profession though the number of practitioners remained very low.

However it was always going to be difficult to recruit the right person either from within this country or from overseas. This is the personal problem of small countries and was made worse by the fact that New Zealand did not get university town planning training until 1957. The recognition of the specific skills and training of the town planner were frustrated by the paucity of appointable candidates. However, the problems in appointing a candidate also demonstrated that there was a real desire if possible to appoint a New Zealander. This was not simple nationalism, this was after all a period when people in New Zealand still regularly referred to 'Home' meaning Britain, rather a recognition of the need to encourage indigenous talent and to build a local professional cadre. Further it also offered the opportunity to encourage the growth of a profession by offering the opportunity of a high level, and in those decades, public service position. Thus the appointment of Hammond can be seen as meeting the desire to both appoint a New Zealander and have a fully-trained planner. The problem was that Hammond lacked the other qualities that earlier commentators had recognised that the applicant must have. Mawson in fact combined the professional qualification with the experience and thus more closely met the position's profile. However it was that professionalism and experience that brought him into conflict with his superiors, as he quickly recognised that there was no real government commitment to town planning. In short it was not the qualifications, qualities or nationality of the Director that would determine the fate of town planning but rather the commitment of government. That commitment would not be forthcoming until 1953.
This book is a record of the contributions to two linked conferences each entitled ‘The New Garden City’ which were held in Teuszkawa and Kobe, Japan in September 2001. The primary aim of the conferences was to begin to develop the idea of a new and relevant Garden City for the 21st century. The book is made up of a number of individual contributions on a variety of topics in seventeen topic chapters. I refer to a sample of them in this review.

As background to the garden city and its origins, Mervyn Miller provides a compact and interesting history of garden cities over a 100 year period. His concluding comments make brief reference to the links between Garden City planning and present day sustainability. In an attempt to make tangible links between garden city planning and the ‘new urbanism’ Matthew Taeker claims that ‘Howard’s Garden City and the New Urbanism represent conscious commitments to integrating complementary uses within walkable towns and neighbourhoods’. He refers in particular to the work of the urban designer Peter Calthorpe. From his experience in Letchworth Garden City UK Stuart Kenny provides a practitioner’s view of some of the challenges which probably face any urban manager in the present day. He discusses current issues such as privatisation, regeneration and job creation in Letchworth.

Switching to Japan, Shun-ichi Watanabe considers the influence of Howard’s garden city on specific developments in that country and on the Japanese planning system. He believes that Japanese planners ‘gave up the idea of garden cities and instead moved in the direction of the garden suburbs.’ On a similar theme in the chapter by Katsushi Sakanoto he concludes that ‘the idea of the garden city was never realised in Japan.’

The chapters on Teuszkawa, Japan by Shuichi Akita and Hiroshi Dohe provide some background to the planning of this new town and highlight some current and future developments. Chasaku Yasuda provides a fullsone description of the Master Plan process as applied to the New Town Development in Kobe which is described as a multi-nuclear, network city. These three contributions tend to be descriptive. There are few issues raised and little if any evaluation of the urban areas being created.

Given that these are major new town development areas, making the links to the garden city would be of interest.

Other chapters refer to experiences in Korea and Taiwan. Yong Hwan Park provides a brief, descriptive piece on apartment housing in Korea, especially in Seoul but also refers to the Korean new towns. Hyun-cee Lee in the chapter on ‘Garden Housing in Korea’ provides a good illustration of what not to do if you embark on any housing scheme that even vaguely claims to reflect the principles of the garden city. Lee enumerates one mistake after another. Garden Housing areas are small, isolated pockets of development in rural areas and are constructed as self-build estates on a rather ad hoc basis. Jong Hyan Choe provides a one page chapter on ‘A Study on the Traditional Geography – Builder’s Thoughts’. This rather stopped me in my tracks and I could not see its relevance to this book. Also, Shy-hung Huang endeavours to relate Howard and the Garden City concept to the Taiwanese experience. Unfortunately, partly due to poor editing, most of this chapter did not make a lot of sense to me.

Three authors consider more contextual and fundamental issues. In the chapter ‘Beyond the Future of Cities and Rural Areas’, John Chien-yuan Lin offers a very summary fashion considers global economic changes and their influence on urban developments. This could have been expanded to provide more explanation of this crucial global dimension. In his chapter ‘Towards the New Garden City in Asia’, Robert Freestone makes the crucial point that the mega-urbanisation in Asia poses immense challenges for the relevance of planning and design based on traditional garden city and new town forms – given the different cultural, social and legal contexts in any one country. The real challenge in the 21st century globally and in particular in the Asia Pacific region is to combat the deteriorating environmental conditions in burgeoning cities. Because of the different cultural, institutional and legislative arrangements in Asian countries the transferability of a model which works well in Europe is questionable and maybe impossible.

In his chapter on ‘Garden City History Theory and Practice’, Steven Ward points out that the new discourse in the 21st century is ‘sustainable development’. To achieve genuine sustainable development, making the links to the garden city would be of interest.
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settlements there have to be significant changes in the institutions that manage urban areas and more fundamentally changes to the attitudes to personal consumption and resource use by individual citizens, especially in the richer countries of the world.

The primary aim of the conference was to ‘begin to develop the ideal of a new and relevant Garden City for the 21st century.’ I think that to achieve this there is a need for more contextual material on global changes which influence urban development; a greater input on sustainable development and commentary on cultural transferability, especially as the book is considering European and Asian experiences. Also, there is a need to link the individual contributions with a theme that the reader can follow. Editing in some places is weak and poor English frustrates the reader and therefore restricts the communication of the message.

Whilst I have a number of criticisms of this book, I consider that I have learned something from it, in particular with respect to the history of garden cities and the links to Japan in particular. It is a text which will be of more interest to the reader who enjoys the historical view. It is possible for the reader to pick and choose topics from any of the seventeen chapters, depending on his or her particular interests. It is well presented with diagrams and photographs, some of them in colour.

The sense of idealism and the desire to make the world a better place, comes across in this book. I welcome this.

Dr. Mervyn Dobbin,
De Montfort University,
Leicester, UK.
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The modes of diffusion of ideas that shape planned environments, and the ways these ideas are realized, have been gaining prominence as subjects of study and discussion among planning historians and others. Recently, some researchers have begun to approach the relations between actors and stakeholders in the processes of planning diffusion in increasingly complex and ambiguous ways.

The planning influences started to be seen as going in multiple directions, including back to the source of dissemination. The natives in developing countries, whether colonial or post-colonial, are now being recognized as full-fledged participants in the shaping of the built environment, with a variety of roles to play and means to play them, even if they frequently face many constraints to their actions. The specific traits of the indigenous are even in question: ultimately, who are the ‘locals’?

The research presented here recognizes the importance of both provider and recipient as essential and influential entities within this diffusion process.

This book raises important conceptual questions as to the identities and roles of the actors involved and looks at the methodological implications for historians and the new challenges that arise from this questioning of a long-standing traditional view.
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