Delft University of Technology

The What, Why, and How of Planning History

Hein, Carola

Publication date

2018

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

The Routledge Handbook of Planning History

Citation (APA)

Hein, C. (2018). The What, Why, and How of Planning History. In C. Hein (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Planning History* (pp. 1-10). Routledge - Taylor & Francis Group.

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' – Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

THE ROUTLEDGE HANDBOOK OF PLANNING HISTORY

Edited by Carola Hein

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

1

Carola Hein

Planning is a complex discipline, with more than one body of terminology, multiple interpretations, and manifold applications through space and over time, and historians have commented on it from a variety of perspectives. *Urban planning*, *city planning*, *town planning*, *urban design*—practitioners and scholars working in English use numerous terms to describe the design and regulation of spaces, their physical form, and their use, function, and impact. Other languages and traditions further describe and categorize these activities in various and often diverging ways. The variety of terms and concepts used to describe planning history and historiography—captured in this book and illustrated

Figure 1.1 Word cloud of *The Planning History Handbook*.
Source: Wordle.net.

in a word cloud—exemplifies the complexity of the topic and the multiplicity of approaches and disciplines (Figure 1.1). As diverse and multiple are the actors that contribute to it and the methodologies and the tools they use. Politicians, economists, planners, and urban designers have shaped physical spaces through many kinds of interventions, considering planning variously as an aesthetic, economic, political, or even engineering endeavor. Different planning approaches can coexist in a single city: whereas the design of ports can be the result of economic needs and engineering planning, the design of a representative government district might be the result of political interests and aesthetic planning, and revitalization of a former industrial site may focus on social needs and multifunctional use. Planning also varies in different national and cultural contexts, from Soviet-era five-year plans that translated into spatial development, to building plans from social engineers that resulted in urban forms, to City Beautiful-type New Urbanism. These contexts shape planning practice, as well as planning education and planning history.

The different terms and disciplines are further complicated by change over time. The design of urban form has a much longer history than modern planning, including the four-thousand-year history of the Imperial Chinese cities, the plans of Hippodamus of Milet for Greek cities, the planned cities of the Mayas, Renaissance and Baroque planning, or the Law of the Indies. In all of these cases, national or local leaders put extensive funds and manpower into carrying out the plans. Many of these earlier interventions are still visible in our cities. They continue to shape practice in multiple ways, through governance structures or planning cultures, through inherent path dependencies of institutions or laws and regulations, as formal references, or as frameworks for design, transformation, and preservation. More concretely, multiple cities have copied them, and professional planners of later years have learned and borrowed from them.

In the late 19th century, one form of planning emerged as a discipline in England, continental Europe, and the United States. It was conceived as a rational, modernist pursuit for societal improvement in response to the urban ills produced by the industrial revolution. Planning practitioners tried to respond to rapidly transforming cities, to new forms of production and consumption, to uncontrolled population growth, and to new types of transportation and communication. In short, planning targeted hygiene, housing, and transportation. As industrialization and colonial empires spread, various models of planning followed colonial and postcolonial geographies of power, political allegiances, corporate interests, and professional networks of planners. The global spread of Ebenezer Howard's 1902 garden city concept before World War I stands as an example, with German, French Japanese, or Russian writers making early references to Howard's schemata and fully translating his work into their languages (Figures 1.2, 7.2, 11.3). The diffusion of these concepts has continued, with their translations into Czech, Polish, Chinese, or Arabic, opening up new research possibilities on border-crossing planning concepts.

The discipline and focus of planning has shifted in tune with political and economic developments as well as societal changes across the decades. Today, planning is primarily a forward-looking discipline, in which past developments and approaches play a limited but changing role. Over time, some architects and planners have looked to the past as a toolbox, while others cite prior plans only in passing, or ignore them altogether.

This change is also reflected in planning education. A brief look at curricula and their change over time indicates that planning schools increasingly prefer to teach planning theory rather than planning history, and most planning schools do not train planning historians. But discerning what planning is, and what the city is in time and place, planning history builds awareness of diverse ideological and theoretical positions. It also allows for new approaches to emerge that challenge ideas of modernity in urban form and function, and that call into question concepts of planning and representations of space.

Acknowledging these dynamics and their historical development, the *Handbook* starts with the assumption that planning is a flexible system rather than a fixed one. Taking a networked, cross-cultural, balanced approach, and writing from different vantage points, the *Handbook* explores spatial

Figure 1.2 The global spread of the garden city by Ebenezer Howard through time. Diagrams, 1, 2, 3 and 5, originally published in English, are shown here with their translations into German, French, Japanese, Czech, and Russian.

Source: from top line, left to right: Top line: Diagram No. 1, The Three Magnets in: Ebenezer Howard, *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Ltd. 1898; Diagram No. 3, translated into Japanese in: Naimushō Chihōkyoku, Denentoshi, Tokyo: Hakubunkan, Meiji 40 1907; Diagram No. 3, translated into Czech, in: Hruza, Jirí, *Stavitelé měst, Praha: Agora, 2011*; Diagram No. 3, in: Ebenezer Howard, *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Ltd. 1898. Second line: Diagram No. 2, translated into Czech, in: Hruza, Jirí, *Stavitelé měst, Praha: Agora, 2011*; Diagram No. 3, translated by Alexander Block into Russian: in Goroda Budushavo, St. Petersburg, 1911. Center: Diagram No. 7, in: Ebenezer Howard, *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Ltd. 1898. Third line: Diagram No. 2, *Gartenstädte in Sicht* translated into German by Maria Wallroth-Unterlip, Jena: E Diederichs, 1907; Diagram No. 3, *Gartenstädte in Sicht* translated into German by Maria Wallroth-Unterlip, Jena: E Diederichs, 1907. Bottom line: Diagram No. 2, in: Ebenezer Howard, *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Ltd. 1898; Diagram No. 2, translated into Japanese in: Naimushō Chihōkyoku, Denentoshi, Tokyo: Hakubunkan, Meiji 40 1907; Diagram No. 5, translated into Japanese in: "Nishiyama Uzō, 'The Structure of the Base of Life,' Kenchikugaku kenkyū no. 110+111 (1942). Reprinted in Nishiyama Uzō, Chikikūkanron, Tokyo: Keisō shobō, 1968; Diagram No. 5, in: Ebenezer Howard, *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1922.

traditions and cultural landscapes—imagine folding and unfolding the world anew, as in the Dymaxion map made by the American architect Buckminster Fuller.

The *Handbook* further posits that planning *history* is an interdisciplinary field with contributions from multiple disciplines. Urban historians, economic historians, social historians, architectural historians, and historians of landscape and the environment have all tackled questions of plans and planning, including housing, construction, local government, social policy, utopianism, urban form, and so forth, as part of larger research projects. All of these fields are well established, with their own journals, conferences, and major publications, and they can advance research in the field of planning history. Given the existence of these fields, what then is the particularity and *raison d'être* of planning history as a field, with specialized journals focused on histories of planning, plans, and planners, or on the history of city and regional planning, particularly in the Americas, as stated respectively in the mission statements of *Planning Perspectives*, or the *Journal of Planning History*? Why do we need planning history? And, how should it be done? This publication is conceived as a foundational publication for students from different disciplinary backgrounds, as well as academics and professionals from around the world to understand the historical origins, the methodological practices, and the academic output of planning history.

What Is Planning History?

This handbook maps the range of what we mean by *planning history*. Some authors in this handbook define planning history as describing the formal, aesthetic appearance of the built environment, taking an architectural or urban design approach. For others, planning history comes out of the social sciences, and for yet other scholars it is the focus of urban geography, or is situated in political, social, and economic histories.

Planning History as a field has existed since the 1970s, and several institutions and journals focus on it, but this handbook is the first to provide a foundation for research in the field. It complements wide-ranging English-language books like Peter Hall's seminal *Cities of Tomorrow* (Hall, 1988 [1996, 2014]). While being one of the first books to explore the history of planning, and its theory and practice, Hall's work did not reflect on the field of planning history itself. Several readers present original texts of 19th- and 20th-century planning (LeGates and Stout, 2003; Birch, 2008; Larice and Macdonald, 2012; Wegener, Button, and Nijkamp, 2007). Broader questions of global planning cultures, as tackled in other works, also include reflections on historical trajectories and their relations to specific national and local traditions (Sanyal, 2005). But the *Handbook* is very different, composed of new and original work by leading scholars in the field, including pieces that will themselves become classics.

The *Handbook* first establishes the premises and achievements of interdisciplinary and international planning history, and the key players and institutions. It then goes beyond this established narrative by exploring new methodological, theoretical, and typological approaches. It posits that a wider range of narratives is important to the rewriting, rethinking, and reorienting of planning history itself. If Sub-Saharan African planning, for instance, has largely been left out of the canon of planning history, a more expansive understanding of these histories can prove transformative (Silva, 2015). Such a rethinking also involves acknowledging the places and languages from which planning history is written, and questioning underlying premises. It acknowledges the extensive historiography of planning, and that much of the important writing on planning history came out of England and the US first. It also emphasizes that these are in the end regional or national stories that need to be paralleled with other approaches guided by different language patterns and by different political, economic, social, and cultural approaches to planning. Reflecting on the multiple planning histories and historiographies of Southeast Asia and South Asia, for example, requires that authors

understand planning in relation to the transformation of formality as an expression of state power. The *Handbook* sets the stage for expanding scholarship, encouraging scholars to ask what connections have remained unwritten, what networks unconsidered.

The *Handbook* adds new perspectives to planning history. It builds on recent writing that has aimed to overcome the limitations of both discipline and geography. Research in planning history, including research by some of the authors of this book, has started to address the challenges of planning history writing, including the need to overcome national stories, and to go beyond empirical and narrative-driven research to develop theories (Ward et al., 2011; Nasr and Volait, 2003; Hein, 2014). While such an approach cannot be comprehensive, this handbook at least models new global planning histories, giving insights into different approaches, geographical patterns, languages, and principles. It aims to further open up the parallel worlds of academic planning history in different disciplines, and to facilitate the emergence of collective languages, terminologies, methodologies, and theories. A diversity of approaches enriches a discussion of planning history. It can also throw into relief the disciplinary logics involved in writing about planning.

Why Planning History?

Planning history helps us to understand planning's past influence on our cities, regions, and nations, and to imagine the future of planning as a professional practice, as the past performance of the discipline is challenged and global challenges require comprehensive new measures. Planning has been called upon since the mid-19th century to propose interventions that would channel future development based on calculations, assumptions, and formal criteria from the past. Planners have taken up this complex challenge, often with the best of intentions. They have worked with national governments and local elites, occasionally involving civic society. They have responded to the needs of expanding cities and of transforming nations. They have provided new infrastructure and identified functional zones. They have projected urban futures in times of war and disaster as well as peace. They work to integrate existing (planned) spaces and established (planning) cultures into their interventions. At a time when informal urbanism is becoming more prominent, planning history provides an opportunity to understand the motivations for planned interventions and serve as a foundation for future intervention.

As a means to better understand the role of planning in the historical transformation of cities and regions, planning history can also help us understand the downsides or shortcomings of historic planning practice and the needs for novel approaches. For example, in some areas of the world, planning has created more economic, social, or ethnic inequalities rather than solving them, and a close analysis can help understand the reasons for these shortcomings. In other areas, attempts to undo former colonial planning practice can benefit from a comprehensive understanding of the complexity of colonial planning practice, ranging from legal practices to aesthetic and symbolic interactions. Furthermore, the emergence of informal settlements that in some areas of the world are more extensive than planned ones raises questions about the necessary flexibility of planning and the changing intersection between planned spaces and informal urban development. Many interventions have simply failed, or have been too inflexible to accommodate urban change. In short, not all blueprints established to guide urban development have succeeded.

Planning has shaped our environment extensively but it has also faced extensive criticism—and that at a time when it may be most needed. Over the last decade, cities and regions around the world have been facing increased challenges ranging from climate change and global water rise to migration and population growth, and comprehensive solutions are needed to create resilient systems. Planning history can be an important and valuable tool for conceptualizing resilient planning systems for the future, speaking to the challenges of the future, and integrating lessons from the past.

The American planning historian Larry Vale introduced the concept of critical resilience, arguing that such discussions need to be more attuned to issues of power and politics in moments of disaster and post-trauma (Vale, 2016). Pointing out that planning historians are well trained in analyzing historical disaster recovery, Vale believes that this analytical tool should be applied more widely when thinking about contemporary and future resilience. We do not need ideological answers or engineers who engage only with future challenges; we need planners with a sense of history and historians with a sense of planning.

Planning historians also have an important role in analyzing past plans for a bygone future, pointing out challenges for future visions. As they evaluate and sometimes revive visions of the future, they provide grounding for contemporary design. The planning of Berlin as a capital is just one example of the impact that visionary plans have had on planning discussions worldwide (Hein, 1991). Numerous visionary projects for Berlin that did not become reality—from monumental plans under Albert Speer, Adolf Hitler's favorite architect, to megastructural projects for the 1957–1958 Capital Berlin competition—have informed projects in later decades. These visions can be as inspirational as realized plans (or even more so); they can travel through time and space, influencing later decision-making or flourishing where they find fertile ground. Speer's projects, while not realized, would shape planning decisions in West Berlin from the end of the war until after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, with subsequent planners avoiding all monumental or axial designs. Other concepts live on, and many have since been realized in piecemeal fashion at the hand of public institutions and corporations: megastructural visions established in Europe and Japan can be seen as predecessors of extensive underground shopping malls, huge skyscrapers connected by pedestrian bridges, and large infrastructure such as floating airports (Hein, 2016). Spatial planning has even left its imprint on *Sim City* and other computer games, where the history of real cities intersects with visionary projects and everyday urban experiences.

How (to Write) Planning History?

The notion of planning is intimately related to the concept of modernity and modernization after the industrial revolution, and to the assumption that changing the physical spaces of a city would change its residents' life conditions, and social and cultural patterns (Scott, 1998). Planning historians have contributed to writing the history of modernity, documenting the efforts of leading planners, strains of practice, and intervention. In turn, this handbook both documents and reconsiders planning history and its connection with modernity by going beyond the fixed notions of scholars, who explored urban transformation in the early industrialized countries, notably in Europe and North America. Rethinking the definition of "modern" as being related to industrialization, the book both defines the concept of planning, and revises that definition, going beyond the concept of planning as "progress" and the activity of the historical "avant-garde," and exploring planned interventions in conjunction with vernacular or unplanned spaces. As historian Manfredo Tafuri put it:

The history of contemporary urban planning does not at all coincide with the history of the avant-garde hypothesis. On the contrary, as certain philological investigations have been able to ascertain, the tradition of urban planning rests on foundations constructed outside of any avant-garde experience. . . . This necessitates a radical reexamination of the relationship between the history of urban planning and the parallel history of the ideologies of the modern movement. If this method is followed, many myths are destined to crumble (1987).

Questioning the concept of the modern in planning brings new themes and questions to the forefront of research. Planning has presented itself as a science, employing social engineering,

traffic engineering, and other supposedly objective methodologies. However, few planners or historians have questioned or tested the results of specific interventions. Perhaps even worse, what was presented as a scientific response to health in one era later itself became seen as a health hazard. For example, blocks and slabs in greenery-type housing projects of the 1920s and 1950s are now condemned for reasons of security and aesthetics, elements that are important to walkability, a topic that scholars today have recognized as essential to combat obesity and build community. Working from a historical perspective to challenge assumptions about progress and modernity and the ways in which they have shaped planning, the book shows how understandings of the modern city have emerged and changed as cultural constructions.

As a result of the prominence of a Western, that is Euro-American-Australian, approach in history writing, there are lines of influences that are taken for granted rather than being critically explored and reflected. Mesopotamia was connected with Greece and the Roman Empire but often appears as disconnected from them in contemporary writing, as it now belongs to the Arab world, while they count as European. Scholars have long considered Japan a recipient of planning practices rather than a translator or generator of them, as Asian languages and approaches to planning history do not easily communicate with languages and scholarly discussions in Europe and North America (Hein, 2017).

Historiography is never objective, but we have to be very careful to make sure that it doesn't become only subjective. To do that, historians (including those of planning) provide evidence that is significant and appropriate. The "history of practice" as examined by historians focuses on how people acted in the past, but typically does not consider the past's implications for the present. In contrast, practitioners "practice history," that is, they turn to history for their work in the present, but they do not always consider the past on its own merits. This is also true for analysis that crosses borders: often books "learning from" other cultures are about creating an argument for planning rather than gaining understanding. Treating planning history explicitly as the history of a future-oriented discipline, this handbook explores the changing history of how the discipline has narrated the past and how practitioners have mobilized the past for the future.

Questions of planning's authorship, spatiality, and temporality are reproduced in planning history as it has traced the development of planning and its targets, focusing on issues of hygiene, infrastructure, and housing, and on capital design, infrastructure planning, and heritage (the use of the past itself). But planning histories have not addressed all areas, time periods, or practices in the same ways. The writing of history at times went hand in hand with the making of history. Some of the early planning histories have been written to legitimize a group of planners or a specific ideology. Occasionally (architectural or urban) historians were even part of iconic movements: Kenneth Frampton famously documented the modern movement, and Noboru Kawazoe wrote for and with the Japanese metabolists. These engagements raise the question of how historians more generally have created an official narrative of the modern city and its planning while being affiliated or intellectually connected with certain movements.

When planning historians narrate the past, they risk creating heroic histories. The actors of planning and thus the heroes of planning history were often elite white males who followed their "interest" or "genius." Emphasizing these stories—not necessarily historians' conscious goals but rather the result of a specific cultural moment—ensured that other plans and planners would be ignored and that a celebratory track record emerged. The resulting planning history can be read as a listing of their achievements without acknowledging the specific political, social, economic, or cultural context. Studies abound of Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann, Ildefonso Cerdá, Ebenezer Howard, Le Corbusier, Robert Moses, and the Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM), and their respective plans. Even when histories are critical, these are often still the types of projects and images that figure prominently.

Heroic stories also risk perpetuating gendered structures. But women have always been in planning. While fewer women were active as planners in the early years, upper-class women tried to help

the poor, such as the German writer and social activist Bettina von Arnim, who worked with the architect Wilhelm Stier to propose for a city of the poor, establishing a well-recognized line of intervention in planning by women. By the 1920s and 1930s, women started to become professional planners: Catherine Bauer and her sister Elizabeth Bauer Mock, and Jaqueline Tyrwhitt are just some examples. Planning history also has its female leaders, from Francoise Choay to Annie Fourcaut, Susan Fainstein, Leonie Sandercock, Donatella Calabi, and Helen Meller, who have contributed innovative approaches. Many of these authors are referenced in the *Handbook*, but a full account of planning history from a female lens is still missing.

Other patterns of planning that have yet to be fully acknowledged in planning history include the history of engineering. The history of engineering has been closely connected to that of planning, but historians have yet to recognize engineers' contributions to planning. Studying the ways in which planners have picked up new technologies in attempts to promote organized, planned spaces over unplanned ones may reveal new connections in the long-term narrative of planning. Planners have not been initiators but have picked up on engineering responses as drivers and executors. Visionaries like Le Corbusier promoted engineering, and dressed it up. Elevators, trains, cars, and planes—all these different means of transportation have provided the incentive for extensive changes of urban form and function. Trains and cars provided the opportunity and tools for suburbia, while planes allowed for the creation of networks of cities more closely connected to each other than each city was connected to its surrounding urban area. Engineers made it their goal to counter the forces of nature while planners and architects provided the designs and rationales that sustained the transformation. New materials made possible buildings and entire cities that could be defended against water, earthquake, or climate, in river deltas once flooded on a regular basis, on coastlines or next to rivers, in areas that were prone to earthquakes or tsunamis, or ones located in punishingly hot and cold climates. But the engineer's preferred focus remains narrow, whereas planning implies some degree of comprehensiveness, a social or environmental function.

Moreover, critical planning histories and awareness of missing narratives can provide a foundation for planning that addresses the challenges of the future. For example, historical analysis of the physical and financial flows of petroleum can help us understand the formation of modern cities, making visible that industry's need of industrial, administrative, retail, and ancillary spaces, as well as its representation of the built environment in advertisement, art, architecture, or urban form. Such a study can also help us anticipate and design for changes in an imminent post-oil future: remediating and repurposing defunct refineries and storage tanks, rethinking infrastructural and other linkages between oil industries and headquarters, reorganizing global towards more circular economies. Understanding how and these systems and dynamics developed historically will help planners imagine new futures for them.

Connecting past, present, and future, the *Handbook* can help challenge the teaching of planning and its history in the diverse educational systems, in planning schools, and in other academic departments. That also might mean integrating and teaching design thinking not only in the context of planning education, but also in social science departments, and developing relevant curricula that engage with new perspectives. The *Handbook* hopes to seed this process, and invites complementary research.

Imagining the Future(s) of Planning History?

Such a complex topic cannot be handled in a single volume, and this book doesn't pretend to cover every country, city, topic, or historical moment. Themes that could have been included—planning and nature, planning in all under-studied parts of the world, social planning, planning scales—were discussed in the Planning History Workshop in 2015. For various reasons, mostly stemming from practical limits, they have not been included in this version of the *Handbook*.

The *Handbook* does touch on the problem of definition (what is planned? what is unplanned?), but those places organized without any state involvement are the subject of another volume.

Acknowledging biases in terms of culture, colonialism, gender, and fields of inquiry will be a necessary foundation for planning historians going beyond this book. For example, they will have to reflect on the writing of planning histories involving countries that have fought wars against each other. Questions of gender will be central, especially when they engage with planning in societies where men dominate the public realm, considering not only questions of exclusion and the role of women but constructions of masculinity itself. They will have to reflect on the role of theory elaborated in European and North American analyses of megacities in China and elsewhere, as it ignores the specificity of these cities and theories of those cultures. Other boundary-pushing work for planning historians will concern the "urbanization" of oceans—the proliferation of drilling platforms, energy parks, and other floating structures—questions of energy networks and food landscapes, and the study of commodity flows and their influence on the built environment.

Structure and Overall Contribution of the *Handbook*

The *Handbook* investigates the history of planning since its emergence as a discipline in the mid-19th century. It does so while both recognizing and provincializing Euro-American-Australian traditions of international planning history, and introducing new approaches that take into account global approaches and themes. Scholars in the *Handbook* start to challenge the traditional writing of planning history as a history of heroes and unique ideas. They go beyond the current state of planning history, providing both new global standpoints and new approaches, querying official iconographies, including other disciplines, and investigating different parts of the world. The *Handbook* establishes a first step towards overcoming biases such as the focus on English-language sources, and develops novel interdisciplinary, transcultural, and postcolonial approaches. It examines sites, dynamics, and typologies, and explores the state of the field—its achievements and shortcomings and future challenges. It thus serves as a foundation for defining the field and as a springboard for scholars, practitioners, and students engaging in innovative research.

Given the broad range of achievements, challenges, and needs in planning and planning history, this handbook aims to do two things: to write planning history and to write the historiography of planning history. Each of these factors is balanced differently in each chapter. It provides a broad audience with a truly international planning history and the unique opportunity of exploring these findings comparatively. Four parts and thirty-eight chapters offer insights into the academic writing of planning history—its core writings, key people, institutions, vehicles, education, and practice. As such it places the writing of planning history in relation to geographical and temporal context, considering theory and methodology, scales and cultures.

These historic investigations focus on the period since the mid-19th century, seen as the beginning of the modern discipline, while acknowledging earlier dynamics. To both enrich historical analysis and provide insights for future planning, this book looks critically at the ways in which planning history is being written and taught. The contributions open new perspectives on topics that merit further investigation, and identify literature in areas in which planning historians have been active but that are not systematically explored yet. It explores moments where the selection of topics reflects, accompanies, or precedes political discussions and societal change.

The *Handbook* consists of four parts of varying lengths with a complementary focus. Part I addresses cutting-edge questions of **Agents, Theories, Methods, and Typologies** that have shaped the evolving subdiscipline of planning history over time, through the writings of established and recognized planning historians and leaders of the International Planning History Society (IPHS). These latter explorations set the stage for Part II. **Time, Place, and Culture** starts to address the broad array of topics missing in the current scholarship, turning from Euro-American to

global planning history and opening up a framework for global analysis in global language systems. The next chapters then engage with regional stories and their specific political, economic, social, and cultural frameworks. Part III, **Sites and Dynamics: Issues, Movements, Themes, and Debates**, then explores broader place- and typology-based approaches in planning history, tracking new lines of interdisciplinary and transnational investigation, and spearheading research into new/underexplored sites and dynamics (many of them intrinsically global, translocal, or transcultural). Part IV on **Futures** comprises essays that explore new perspectives on topics that merit further investigation, pointing to current research foci and opening perspectives on future research. Each of the parts follows its own chronological, thematic, or scalar logic.

The *Handbook* takes stock of the state of planning history, reconnects it with the discipline of planning, and explores future directions—notably at the global scale. It calls for scholars and practitioners alike to rethink planning. It identifies lessons from the past, and positions them in larger contexts of histories of continuities and change. It analyzes planning histories and historiographies while acknowledging the difficulties of comparing planning in a global setting. The selection of topics reflects, accompanies, or precedes political discussions and descriptions of societal change: from landscape to infrastructure, from housing to issues of social justice and community building. The chapters position these writings, authors, and approaches in their general political, economic, social, and geographical context. The *Handbook* combines theoretical, methodological, historical, comparative, and global approaches to planning history—a comprehensive and synthetic approach for which there is no precedent.

References

- Birch, E. L. (Ed.) (2008). *The Urban and Regional Planning Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, P. (1988 [1996, 2014]). *Cities of Tomorrow*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hein, C. (1991). (main author and Ed.) *Hauptstadt Berlin, internationaler städtebaulicher Ideenwettbewerb 1957/58*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Hein, C. (2014). Special Issue on Transnational Urbanism. *Planning Perspectives*, 29.
- Hein, C. (2016). Modernist Urban Visions and the Contemporary City. *Joelho* 7, <http://Impactum-Journals.Uc.Pt/Index.Php/Joelho/Issue/View/167>.
- Hein, C. (2017). Nishiyama Uzō: Leading Japanese Planner and Theorist, in: Uzō Nishiyama, *Reflections on Urban, Regional and National Space: Three Essays*, with an introduction by Carola Hein. London, New York: Routledge.
- Larice, M. and Macdonald, E. (Eds.) (2012). *The Urban Design Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Legates, R. T. and Stout, F. (Eds.) (2003). *The City Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nasr, J. and Volait, M. (Eds.) (2003). *Urbanism—Imported or Exported? Foreign Plans and Native Aspirations*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Sanyal, B. (Ed.) (2005). *Comparative Planning Cultures*. New York: Routledge.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Silva, C. N. (Ed.) (2015). *Urban Planning in Sub-Saharan Africa: Colonial and Postcolonial Planning Cultures*. New York: Routledge.
- Tafari, M. (1987). *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Vale, L. (2016). In: Hein, C. (Ed.) *International Planning History Society Proceedings, 17th IPHS Conference, History-Urbanism-Resilience, TU Delft 17–21 July 2016*. Delft: TU Delft Open.
- Ward, S. V., Freestone, R., and Silver, C. (2011). The “New” Planning History: Reflections, Issues and Directions. *Town Planning Review*, 82, 231–261.
- Wegener, M., Button, K., and Nijkamp, P. (Eds.) (2007). *Planning History and Methodology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.