



Jaqueline Tyrwhitt's Correspondence Courses: Town Planning in the Trenches

Citation

Zalduendo, Ines Maria. 2005. "Jaqueline Tyrwhitt's Correspondence Courses: Town Planning in the Trenches." Paper presented at the Society of Architectural Historians Conference; Vancouver, April 2005.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:13442987>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Jaqueline Tyrwhitt's Correspondence Courses: Town Planning in the Trenches

*Inés Zaldueño, Special Collections Archivist, Harvard University Graduate School of Design
Paper presented at the Society of Architectural Historians Conference; Vancouver, April 2005.*

Abstract

Jaqueline Tyrwhitt (1905-1983) was the Director of Studies at the School of Planning and Research for Regional Development during the 1940s in Britain, where she founded the town planning Correspondence Courses for architects and others serving with the Allied Forces. With a significant enrollment, the Correspondence Courses were not a single course, but three independent and sequential courses made up of ten to twelve lectures each, with required readings and practical exercises for each lecture. They promoted collaboration among different disciplines and had a clear orientation towards practice. When the war ended a series of intensive post-war completion courses for returning ex-service men were organized, which enabled about ten percent of those enrolled in the Correspondence Courses to qualify in three months as associate members of the Town Planning Institute and enter actively into the profession.

Certainly the breadth and depth of the Correspondence Courses cannot be ignored; neither can the conceptual framework within which they were conceived be overlooked. First, they were founded in the belief that it was necessary to impart knowledge of planning to potential collaborators. Second, they were grounded in the conviction that for a much needed rapid training of young field officers there was value in a course in which the theoretical and the practical were closely related. This paper focuses on the Correspondence Courses: it outlines the particular circumstances in which these courses emerged, analyzes their component parts and conceptual structure, and traces their influence in Tyrwhitt's Harvard period when collaborating in setting up the urban design courses and program at the Graduate School of Design. In terms of the design approach, the "physical shaping of cities" as understood in the 1950s at Harvard was, in the end, not far conceptually from "shaping the environment" as understood in the Correspondence Courses that Jaqueline Tyrwhitt initiated in the 1940s.

Background

The School of Planning and Research for National Development was created in 1935 as a post-graduate extension of the Architectural Association in London. The initiative was the product of Francis Rowland Yerbury (1885-1970) and Eric Anthony Ambrose Rowse (1896-c.1982).¹ Yerbury – together with Robert Atkinson and Howard Robertson – had been instrumental, during the years between wars, in turning the Architectural Association "from an evening to day school, and in harmonizing its course of studies with the Royal Institute of British Architects' examination system."² Rowse had been the Associate Director of the Architectural Association since 1933, and soon after Director in 1936, he was also appointed Principal of the School of Planning and Research for National Development upon its founding in 1935. Rowse believed in planning as the "synthesis of many different activities and factors"³ and, under his directorship, the School began its activities with the aim to "train men from different backgrounds and whose collaboration would ensure an ordered development."⁴ He also initiated a clear move towards modernism which would ultimately distance him from the Architectural Association.⁵ With premises at 7 Bedford Square the School had a short existence,

since due to finances and internal politics it was closed down by the Architectural Association's Council in 1938. Nevertheless, in April 1940 Rowse moved to the independent Association for Planning and Regional Reconstruction (APRR) to carry on the work of the School, soon to be renamed the School of Planning and Research for Regional Development, and established the new offices at 153 New Bond Street.

The newly formed APRR had a board of six members under the chairmanship of Lord Forrester and the support of an Advisory Council with fifty experts.⁶ It was to be financed by annual subscriptions from individuals, payments from firms and organizations, and grants from professional and learned societies.⁷ The APRR's aims were to make a practical contribution towards the solution of the problems of post-war reconstruction, the emphasis being in research and the establishment of technical standards. The APRR stated that it "works with and for individuals, organizations, local and national authorities, but does not itself undertake works of practical reconstruction, its object is to serve as a research center and to advise and suggest, but not to control; to correlate experience, but not to compete with institutions or organizations operating in any specific field of activity."⁸ The procedure for the development of the work done by the APRR consisted in the selection of subjects related to issues of local, regional, or national development; and their subsequent study under the direction of a group of experts for the preparation of a draft paper to be read at one of the weekly evening meetings. The paper would then be fully discussed and redrafted as a report that after being revised for a last time would be published in full as a four page "broadsheet" designed as a suggested standard for the presentation of planning information.⁹ Apart from the *Broadsheets* the APRR published biweekly progress sheets on their activities that included summaries of previous meetings, discussions on draft reports, descriptions of conferences and courses, lists of library acquisitions, short accounts of proceedings, information on new planning publications and exhibitions, and announcement of future meetings.

Soon after the APRR was established, London would be blitzed (1940-1941). In *Life in the Debris of War* what is left of the city is described as "Out of a total of 460 acres of built-up land, buildings covering 164 acres were destroyed. The sirens sounded 715 times, a total of 417 high explosive bombs were dropped in the city alone, 13 parachute mines, 2498 oil bombs, and thousands of incendiaries."¹⁰ This is the moment the campaign for the reconstruction of Britain after the war begins. The APRR's building was also bombed in 1941 and soon Rowse left the School for active duty. Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, who had been his student at the Architectural Association during the 1930s, was called in to replace him as Acting Director where she remained until his return in 1947. It was in 1942, at new premises at 32 Gordon Square, that the School of Planning and Research for Regional Development was started as a separate body with full support of the APRR. The first job of this sister organization to the APRR was announced in the Association's *Progress Sheet #127* of 5 August 1943: "The War Office has commissioned the School of Planning to prepare the official Army Education correspondence course in Town and Country Planning. The course will be in three parts: the Background of Planning, Planning Factors, and Planning Practice. Each will consist of ten lectures and test papers. The first part will be ready for distribution early in the autumn and will include the following lectures..."¹¹

By the time of this announcement, the British Information Service had already published a pamphlet on post-war planning that covered the war period in Britain from September 1939 to the end of January 1943. It contained accounts of the work carried on by the many organizations concerned with post-war planning and it stated that "One of the first reactions to the heavy air raids of 1940-1941 was a surge of interest in rebuilding and planning. Towns which were almost destroyed by enemy action set to work on their plans for rebuilding within a few weeks of their destruction and incorporated in those plans long-sought improvements in urban organization and public amenities."¹² The subject of physical reconstruction was discussed widely. A number of public conferences, talks on the subject and exhibitions such as *Living in Cities*, *Living in Houses*, and *The Englishman Builds* had circulated throughout the country. The BBC held several interviews with town and country planning experts and held debates over the air on the topic.¹³ Much of the responsibility in terms of planning was placed on the Ministry of Works and Building that, since its creation in 1941, insisted that the principle of planning be accepted as national policy and that some central authority be established. Therefore, in February 1943 the Ministry of Town and Country Planning was created, and it immediately "extended planning control over the entire country."¹⁴ The government stated publicly the need for over 2000 planners, and its concerns about the feasibility of their being trained appropriately and in time.¹⁵ The significance of the War Office commission by the end of 1943, undertaken by the School of Planning and Research for Regional Development under the direction of Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, understood against this background of the need for reconstruction at a massive national scale and of the lack of trained planners, becomes a demanding task which Jaqueline Tyrwhitt would embrace enthusiastically.

London, 1940s

As described by Jaqueline Tyrwhitt the first of the three sequential Correspondence Courses "outlined the principles of planning, the second described the tools employed in town planning, and the third introduced students to the methods by which these tools could be used."¹⁶ The courses were meant for three classes of students. First, those who had already passed the final examination of the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Institute of Civil Engineers, the Institute of Municipal and County Engineers, or the Chartered Surveyors Institution. After a Completion Course upon their return -that would exempt students from the Town Planning Institute's final examination- they would be qualified to enter actively into the planning profession. The second group of students was comprised of members of allied professions to architecture, engineering and surveying who would be applicable to sit for the intermediate examination of the TPI; and the third group of students was that of those "interested in planning but that did not seek an examination qualification."¹⁷ The three courses were written by a group of thirteen specialists¹⁸ in particular branches of planning (including economists, sociologists, geographers, architects, engineers and lawyers). They were made up of ten to twelve lessons each, and had required readings from textbooks issued on loan.¹⁹ Each lesson was also accompanied by a series of practical exercises that students had to return providing "as concise as possible" answers with observations and sketches of plans and maps, and asked to "make the fullest possible use of personal experience and personal observation."²⁰

The Correspondence Courses' *Part I: Background for Planning* went to print in November 1943 and the first students were enrolled on December 21 of the same year. By February 1944 students were enrolling at a rate of six per day and the course was opened to all members of

the armed forces of the United Nations.²¹ By May 1944 over 300 students were enrolled, including some with the British Liberation Army and the Central Mediterranean Force. In August of the same year some had already embarked on the second part on *Planning Factors*, and Part III, *Planning Practice* was being compiled.²² On Thursday, 19 October 1944 (a little over a year after the original announcement of the course) a meeting at the SPRRD was organized where, for the first time, those students who were available would meet tutors and lecturers as well as representatives from the ministries and professional institutes associated with planning. At this meeting Jaqueline Tyrwhitt described the plans for after the war. She envisioned two tasks: first, to assist students who had not completed the courses when demobilized, for which she had hired a tutor; and second, she was committed to the preparation of the three month completion course.²³ She had already devised an outline of the course -with emphasis on survey, studio work, and civic design. She had also approached staff, and had secured the premises where to teach the completion course.²⁴ A representative on behalf of the War Offices stated that the Correspondence Courses had been recently opened to the Middle East Forces by airmail and that they hoped to make arrangements to enroll students from India.²⁵ Cecil Stewart, one of the course tutors, gave some statistics on the student body: the School had enrolled a total of 525 students, of these 229 were within the first class of students -147 were architects, 37 were surveyors, 25 were civil engineers, and 20 were municipal and county engineers.²⁶ During the discussion that followed students were interested in knowing whether those who had been demobilized would be allowed to continue their training (Tyrwhitt was going to take this matter to the Ministry of Labor); whether there were differences in the quality of work sent in from the front lines (very little difference had been noted); and whether the courses would be continued after the war (they were intended as an “emergency measure” but Tyrwhitt hoped they could be published after the war).²⁷

Town Planning 1: Background for Planning began with a first lesson on “The Modern Concept of Planning” where the planner is defined as “the shaper of the environment” and that as such had to understand what post-war reconstruction entailed. Students were told to take advantage of “the opportunity to see different types of towns and villages as you move about the country from place to place at home or abroad” and to form their own impressions of how the gradual restoration of cities could be approached. Added to this was the intent for students to understand the “modern” concept of planning, defined as “the right use of the land in the interests of the community that lives on it”²⁸; in Lewis Mumford’s words, the “social foundations of post-war building” were now to be considered in parallel to the physical needs.²⁹ This social concept of planning was accompanied by a multi-disciplinary approach, where the notion was that “in planning it is the work of groups of investigators who are in different fields with prolonged study and research who are able to propose solutions for an area.”³⁰ Students were encouraged, if at all possible, to take the course in groups, each making their own investigation of the place they happened to be in, and to pool the results of their findings.³¹

This general introduction was followed by very specific lessons into the physical, social, and economic components of planning. There was a lesson on “Topography and Geological Structure” that covered orography, drainage, contours, soil, water table, rocks and snow, rainfall, fog and mist, atmospheric pollution, thunder and hail, the influence of climate on soil and crops; and another on “Distribution of Population and Location of Industry” that discussed

movement of population, and the effect of urbanization and suburbanization on the environment. A lesson on “Rural Community” discussed land ownership and labor, landscape, agriculture, mechanization, farm buildings, occupations, migration, community size, and distribution of services; while a lesson on “Urban Community” described the city as a living organism and described types of towns depending on industry and its impact, urban shape, and urban services. “Thirty Years on Town Planning in Britain” was a brief history of planning that was followed by individual lessons on “The Barlow Report”, “The Scott Report”, and “Background of the Uthwatt Report.” These reports were understood as “aspirations of the period and guidance to future actions.”³² The significance of all three reports was that they recommended the mentioned need for planning and for the establishment of a central planning authority.³³

Town Planning 2: Planning Factors introduced students to elements of sociology which was soon to be replaced by Ruth Glass’s “Social Aspects of Town Planning” that covered population structure and trends, social and geographical groups, and methods of obtaining information. The three major social aspects in town planning were considered to be the characterization of dwellings, the grouping of housing, and the institutions to support the groups such as schools, churches, clubs, hospitals, libraries, and so forth. The methods of obtaining information discussed were existing statistics, sample surveys, institutional censuses, and systematic observation. The second lesson was on the “History of Town Planning” from ancient civilizations to the twentieth century. The lessons that followed were “Law and Administration of Planning”, and “Structure of Local Government” where the division of local government and its scope and area of influence were discussed. The lesson on “Surveys for Planning” described the planning method, what to analyze, and scope for a civic survey including transportation, public utility services, industry, population, housing, retail, education, administration, and health. There were two lessons on “Transport”, one covering roads and railways, the other on aerodromes and waterways. There was also a lesson on the “Physical Structure of Utility Services”; another on “Planning of Retail Services”; and a last one on “Social Services and Amenities.”

Of this second course, two topics seem particularly relevant to mention separately. The first is the extensive description that is given to the structure of local government and its area of influence. At the time in Britain each town and county had an elected council, plus the positions for an engineer, a surveyor, an architect and a town planner. There were 62 county boroughs with several wards each, and 83 county councils with several municipal boroughs, plus urban districts, rural districts, and rural parishes. In all there were around 1400 entities entitled to prepare planning schemes, all to be approved by the newly created Ministry of Town and Country Planning.³⁴ The Correspondence Courses were therefore concerned with adequately training the many local town planners that were needed for post-war reconstruction and development. The second topic worth mentioning is that in the last lesson on social services and amenities there is a section on what are called “community centers” as a relatively new concept that was understood as a meeting place for a community and that was associated with democratic values.³⁵ The wording is relevant since the Correspondence Courses refer to them as of utmost importance in the “re-planning of the hearts of our great cities.”³⁶ We cannot but relate it to the theme of CIAM 8 almost a decade later when Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, as member of MARS and chair of one of the CIAM commissions, was undertaking most of the preparation of

the Hoddesdon Congress, and out of which the book *The Heart of the City* was to be published.³⁷

Town Planning 3: Planning Practice introduces students to the notion of regional integration, land use and regional planning, principles of design and planning, and the need and use of regional surveys. This part of the course began with an introduction to “Regional Integration” centering on why it was necessary, and on the interdependence of social and economic integration. It was followed by a lesson on “Land Use, Population and Industry”; another on “Community Services” which centered on the social basis of physical planning; and one on “Rural Planning.” These lessons were followed by “Power in Relation to Regional Planning” on electric power, gas, its sources and distribution; “Decentralization” on how to assess its magnitude, and methods of putting into practice solutions to decentralization problems; “The Instruments of Transport and Their Synthesis”; and “Local Land Use Zoning” on changes and practices in zoning, building restrictions, and use of land. “Layout of Town Areas” covered topics on traffic circulation, community buildings, and housing. “Design and Planning” introduced students to principles of design, street design, historic buildings, landscape and urban open space; it also covered the countryside with sections on roads and parkways, national parks, woodlands and forests. The second to last lesson was once again on “Regional Integration” considered to be reached through a grid of parkways, railways, roads, and utility services; the redistribution of population and industry; and a network of social services buildings. The last lesson was “Interpretation of Surveys”. The importance of the survey was in that it “represented the unveiling of problems that allowed for further analysis, and were the basis for a solution and implementation of a plan as the ultimate goal of the planner.”³⁸

Clearly oriented towards practice, the exercises that accompanied the lessons were as varied as “describe briefly the character of six villages illustrated in given diagrams, drawing deductions from the plan” to “draw up for one of the illustrated villages an immediate post-war program, a ten year program, and a thirty year program.” Both observation and proposal were given importance as integral to the task of the planner. Back in London, after the mentioned meeting of students and tutors, the total of registered students by December 1944 were 667 students (56 from the Navy, 497 from the Army, 93 from the Royal Air Force, 7 from the Women’s Royal Naval Service, 12 from the Auxiliary Territorial Services and 2 from the Women’s Auxiliary Air Force).³⁹ By May 1945, the total number of students enrolled was 964, some had already enrolled for the third and final part, and some released prisoners of war had started the course. *Progress Sheet #160* of November 1945 announced that “The first three months intensive course in planning opens this winter. This short course is designed primarily for men and women in the Force who have satisfactorily completed as Class A students the War Office Correspondence Course in Town and Country Planning.”⁴⁰ The first Intensive Completion Course opened on 6 January 1946 with 21 students who had had six years of war service, 3 had been prisoners of war in the Middle East, and 3 had served in India and Burma (10 were architects, 7 were surveyors, and 4 were engineers), 19 continued to work with local government authorities. There were seven Completion Courses in all, the last ending on 20 December 1947 with 155 students out of 162 having passed successfully.⁴¹

Cambridge, 1950s

When writing in 1946 and 1947 on the training of planners in Britain, and particularly on the Correspondence Courses, Jaqueline Tyrwhitt speculated on similar courses for graduate studies and on what such courses should be comprised of.⁴² From these writings, two seem to be the main principles derived from her experience in the Correspondence Courses. First, the belief that planning knowledge should be imparted to potential collaborators, so that it could be undertaken by interdisciplinary teams.⁴³ Second, a model of training that was based both on theory and practice.⁴⁴ Both principles are present at the Graduate School of Design at Harvard where Jaqueline Tyrwhitt taught during the 1950s. Collaboration and practical training were especially present in the urban design courses first offered there in 1954.⁴⁵ According to Jaqueline Tyrwhitt by the 1950s “The profession of town planning changed its direction and especially after the Second World War it became more and more engrossed in regional science and social statistics [...]. In the 1950s some training centers realized that a bridge must be built across the gap between the planning reports (prepared by men who had no training in three dimensional vision) and the construction of urban renewal projects (undertaken by men who had no training in the interpretation of statistics) [...] although it had proved very difficult to teach social scientists how to see, perhaps it would be less difficult to teach architects how to read.”⁴⁶ This “bridge” was to be embodied at Harvard by the concept of “urban design”.

By 1955 Jaqueline Tyrwhitt had joined the Faculty of Harvard’s Graduate School of Design⁴⁷, but it was only in 1959 that a full program in urban design is announced, the first in the United States, and it is also described in terms of collaborating professions.⁴⁸ Jaqueline Tyrwhitt was included in the list of professors teaching in the new program. Other professors within the program included Josep Lluís Sert, Martin Meyerson, Hideo Sasaki, Jerzy Soltan, Eduard Sekler, Fumihiko Maki, Francois Vigier, and Shadrach Woods. As explained by Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, “The term ‘urban design’ is used at Harvard in quite a limited and specific sense to mean an area of interaction between the three professions of architecture, landscape architecture, and city planning [...]. It was partly a realization of inadequacy of collaboration that caused the Harvard Urban Design Program to come into being.”⁴⁹ Jaqueline Tyrwhitt’s influence in the definition of this new interdisciplinary field dealing with urban matters went beyond her teaching. She helped organize the Urban Design Conferences, initiated at Harvard in 1956, almost a decade after she had left the Correspondence Courses in Britain. During the first of the conferences -on the role of the three professions- urban design was defined as “the part of city planning that deals with the physical form of the city” and as “being concerned with the shaping of our cities.”⁵⁰ In April 1957 Jaqueline Tyrwhitt is asked to edit a series of replies that architects, landscape architects, city planners and others had given when asked by *Synthesis*, a journal published by the students of the Graduate School of Design, for definitions of urban design in order to “come to grips with an elusive field of work that seems to slip between the fingers of the three design professions.”⁵¹ Among diverse responses, Jaqueline Tyrwhitt chooses to end her analysis with one definition that characterizes urban design as “a magnificent ‘rallying device’ to delineate a field of mutual interest to members of all three design professions.”⁵² Jaqueline Tyrwhitt is by now instrumental in defining and shaping a new interdisciplinary field, as she had done with town planning through the Correspondence Courses.

As mentioned, both collaborative work and a grounding in theory and practice were at the root of the teachings of Jaqueline Tyrwhitt throughout her life. Her views on collaboration may have

been influenced by Karl Mannheim (1893-1947).⁵³ Jaqueline Tyrwhitt was familiar with Mannheim's work: she was the one who reported to the APRR, about six months before the Correspondence Courses were initiated, on the Oxford Conference of the Winter School of Sociology and Civics in January 1943. On that occasion Mannheim, who was by then teaching sociology at the London School of Economics, lectured on the topic of "working" and was an advocate of team work on the grounds that there was a noticeable difference in behavior of people when acting as individuals, or as members of a group.⁵⁴ Her views on urban design as grounded both in theory and practice are similar to those of her earlier teaching of town planning through the Correspondence Courses where both theory and practice were also stressed.

Furthermore, the urban designer as providing the "physical shaping of cities" as understood at Harvard, is strikingly similar to the town planner as the "shaper of the environment" as understood in the Correspondence Courses. This understanding is also conceptually similar to that of Louis Wirth (1897-1952) who interestingly uses the term "urban design" early on, during the 1948 Convention Seminars of the American Institute of Architects. In his lecture entitled *Sociological Factors in Urban Design*, he talks specifically about the occupation of "urban designers," the audience he was addressing: "The city is many things. You have had it described in the course of these meetings as a physical fact; as a relationship between man and his habitat [...] I take it that design has as its purpose to create the physical forms to enable men to achieve as close an approximation to the solution of their problems and the fulfillment of their hopes."⁵⁵ This understanding of design and of the profession is what Jaqueline Tyrwhitt adamantly taught, defining positions in the trenches: both in the Correspondence Courses and at Harvard.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Volker Welter, who chaired the SAH Session *In the Shadow of CIAM and Marshall McLuhan: Jaqueline Tyrwhitt and the Course of Twentieth Century Urban Design and Architecture* at the Society's 58th Annual Meeting in April 2005 where this paper was first presented.

¹ John Summerson, *The Architectural Association, 1847-1947* (London: Shenvall Press: 1947).

² Ibid.

³ Mary Ashton, "Tomorrow Town: Patrick Geddes, Walter Gropius and Le Corbusier" in Volker Welter and James Lawson (ed.), *The City after Patrick Geddes* (Bern: European Academic Publishers: 2000).

⁴ Association for Planning and Regional Reconstruction (APRR), *Information Bulletin, Sheet No. 183*, London, August 1948.

⁵ For discussion on the topic of modernism at the Architectural Association, see Ashton, op. cit.

⁶ APRR, *Information Bulletin, Sheet No. 182*, London, July 1948.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ APRR, *Broadsheet: General Information*, London, first printed June 1940.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Maureen Waller, *London 1945: Life in the Debris of War* (London: John Murray Publishers: 2004).

¹¹ APRR, *Progress Sheet No. 127*, London, August 1943.

¹² British Information Services, *Post-War Planning in Britain, 1939-1943*, London, 1943.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Harold Spence-Sales, "British Town Planning" in *Planning 1947: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting held in Cincinnati* (American Society of Planning Officials: Chicago: 1947).

¹⁵ Ibid.

-
- ¹⁶ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course in Town Planning: Planning Practice*, London, April 1945.
- ¹⁷ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course on the Background of Planning*, London, June 1944.
- ¹⁸ Among them were E. G. R. Taylor, G. L. Pepler, Ruth Glass, R. B. Hounsfeld, R. V. Hughes, D. Barber, Arthur E. Smailes, Cecil Stewart, and Jaqueline Tyrwhitt.
- ¹⁹ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course on the Background of Planning*, London, June 1944.
- ²⁰ Ibid. Text continued with the admonition that “in answering questions requiring description of a locality, site, or buildings you must be careful not to give any information which might be conceivably of use by the enemy. The censor is a very busy man. Do not add to his worries.”
- ²¹ APRR, *Progress Sheet No. 138*, London, February 1944.
- ²² APRR, *Progress Sheet No. 146*, London, August 1944.
- ²³ APRR, *Progress Sheet No. 148*, London, October 1944.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ APRR, *Progress Sheet No. 148*, London, October 1944.
- ²⁷ Ibid. The book *Town and Country Planning Textbook: An Indispensable Book for Town Planners, Architects, and Students* was published by the APRR in 1950. Some of the original texts of the lessons of the Correspondence Courses were included in the textbook as chapters, however many were substantially revised and/or replaced, and others were written by completely different authors.
- ²⁸ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course on the Background of Planning*, London, June 1944.
- ²⁹ Lewis Mumford, *The Social Foundations of Post-War Building*, Rebuilding Britain Series, No. 9 (London: Faber and Faber: 1943).
- ³⁰ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course on the Background of Planning*, London, June 1944.
- ³¹ Ibid. Supporting this approach, Patrick Geddes is referred to as the “pioneer of modern thought about the environment” when he insisted in three fields of investigation for any place where people are associated; embracing the physical (in reference to Geddes’ place - communication), the social (in reference to Geddes’ folk - housing), and the economic (in reference to Geddes’ work - industry). Furthermore, the physical, social and economic unity was to override all planning where the planner was to have an “integrated” approach for the technical, aesthetic, sociological, and legal structure of post-war planning building into a single whole.
- ³² Spence-Sales, op. cit. Until the 1943 Town and Country Planning Act that extended planning control there really was little central control although a series of steps had been established. In 1937 the Barlow Commission recommended “the establishment of a central authority, national in scope and character for regulating the location of industry and had recommendations on planning matters that pointed the way towards a new conception of planning under positive central direction.” The 1938 Scott Committee was established to “examine conditions in rural areas which had been considered outside the terms of reference of the Barlow Commission.” In 1941 the Uthwatt Committee was charged with the task of considering “the payment of compensation and recovery of betterment in respect to public control of the use of land.” The recommendation was that the state “acquire the development rights and suggested a leasehold system under government ownership.”
- ³³ Spence-Sales, op. cit. By the time of the Correspondence Courses the Town and Country Planning Act of 1944 “to deal with the reconstruction of extensive war damage and of obsolete and badly planned urban development” had just been put into effect, and its most interesting feature was in the powers given to local planning authorities. For more information on town planning in Britain in the 1940s, see G. L. Pepler, “A Review of Recent Advances in Town and Country Planning”, in *Report of the Town and Country Planning Summer School* (Birmingham: Town Planning Institute: 1943).
- ³⁴ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course in Town Planning: Planning Factors*, London, October 1944.
- ³⁵ Ibid. The section refers to the National Council on Social Services’ particular conception of a community center that emphasizes “the need of a democratic organization which serves all members of a community [...] a new social and cultural nucleus for community life.”

³⁶ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course in Town Planning: Planning Practice*, London, April 1945.

³⁷ Eric Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism: 1928-1960* (Cambridge: MIT Press: 2000). For an in-depth discussion on this topic, see Volker Welter "From locus genii to heart of the city: Embracing the spirit of the city," in Iain Boyd Whyte, *Modernism and the Spirit of the City* (London, Routledge: 2003).

³⁸ British War Office, *Correspondence Courses for Members of H. M. Forces: Syllabus on a Course in Town Planning: Planning Practice*, London, April 1945. Tribute is given here once again to Geddes who is described as the "originator of the idea and technique of the regional survey, his importance being in the fact that he was the first person who really placed the housing problem within the larger physical and social framework of society."

³⁹ APRR, *Progress Sheet No. 152*, London, February 1945, indicates that there were 825 students enrolled for Part I of the Correspondence Courses, and 41 had started Part II. Nearly 1/3 of the students were overseas, and Part III was almost complete and ready to go to press.

⁴⁰ APRR, *Information Bulletin, Sheet No. 160*, London, October-November 1945. The announcement continued to read: "Class A Correspondence Course students who have not yet completed the course on demobilization will be allowed to join the 3 month course if delay will jeopardize their chance of obtaining a government grant. The course is recognized by the TPI, and successful completion, including an oral examination conducted by an external examiner appointed by the TPI Examination Board will lead to Associate Membership of the Institute, subject to a period of practical experience."

⁴¹ APRR, *Information Bulletin, Sheet No. 177*, London, February 1948. Among the graduates was Percy Johnson Marshall, who in "Mary Jaqueline Tyrwhitt: In Memoriam" (*Ekistics*, Vol. 52, No. 314/315, Nov.-Dec. 1985) recalls: "When I returned from Burma I found that Jaqueline had organized a highly successful three month completion course [...] it concentrated on the needs of ex-Service people, and I wasted no time in joining it, despite some time spent in a military hospital."

⁴² Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, "Training the Planner in Britain", in *International Federation for Housing and Town Planning News Sheet VII*, December 1947. She writes that "The main principles of procedure are that the course must be divided into a series of distinct projects; that the lectures, though deliberately general in nature, must be clearly capable of interpretation in terms of a particular project; that lecture (the theory of planning), survey (the discovery of the problem), analysis (the appreciation of the problem), designing the plans (the solution of the problem), and implementing the plans (realization of the ideal) are part and parcel of one process."

⁴³ *Ibid.* She wrote that "the value of the architect and the economist sharing the same training cannot be over-estimated [...] far from assuming that each has learnt the others job, each has learnt exactly how and when to call in and rely upon the judgment and work of the other."

⁴⁴ Tyrwhitt, *op. cit.* She writes: "one of the many lessons that have emerged from the rapid war training of young officers was the great value of a course in which the theoretical and the practical work were obviously and at all stages related."

⁴⁵ In 1953 Josep Lluís Sert (1902-1983) –whom Jaqueline Tyrwhitt knew from CIAM and from their collaboration for *The Heart of the City* publication- became Dean of the Graduate School of Design at Harvard. The 1953 announcement of his deanship indicated that "new plans for the training of architects, landscape architects, and city planners will take effect this fall at the Graduate School of Design at Harvard University." Soon after, in May 1954 a press release announced that new courses in urban design would be offered starting in September. One was a first year mandatory course by Giedion in the History of Urban Design which studied "the culture of cities and the development of urban design as a natural expression of the needs, knowledge, means and social conditions of each period. The structure of the community in streets, squares, open spaces, the civic core or heart of the city, pedestrian and vehicular." The other was an elective course given by Sert with lectures and seminars on the physical expression of city planning.

⁴⁶ Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, "Urban Planning Training in South East Asia," in *Ekistics*, Vol. 26, No. 157, December 1968.

⁴⁷ The *Official Register* for that year reads: "The three professions [architecture, landscape architecture and city planning] should benefit from a certain collaboration which will broaden the views of the student and make him more conscious of the social role of his work contributing towards the improvement of community life [...] the three professions are concerned with the satisfaction of our physical needs; but the work of the architect, landscape architect, and city planner should also fulfill our spiritual aspirations, and this condition brings them into the fields of the arts. The three curricula have a common beginning, and joint study is especially emphasized in the first year at the GSD."

⁴⁸ Harvard University Graduate School of Design, *Official Register of Harvard University: The Graduate School of Design, 1959*: "Beginning with the academic year 1960-1961 the GSD will offer an advanced interdepartmental program in urban design, open only to selected candidates from among those who already hold one of the school's first professional degrees. The program will require a minimum of one year's study in residence and will lead to the degrees of Master of Architecture in Urban Design, Master of Landscape Architecture in Urban Design and Master of City Planning in Urban Design."

⁴⁹ Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, "Education for Urban Design: Origin and Concepts of the Harvard Program", in Marcus Whitten (ed.), *The Architect and the City*, 1966. In fact the *Official Register* of the School for 1962 would describe the program as "an exceptional opportunity for conjunctive effort [...] the existence of three interrelated departments offering professional courses of studies, and the joint problems given for many years at the GSD, have served as a basis for the establishment of the urban design program. It is comprised of one academic year of intensive theoretical and practical study comprised of a two-term Studio in Urban Design, a one-term seminar on The Shaping of Urban Space, another one-term seminar on Factors that Shape the City (physical and cultural), and two one-term electives."

⁵⁰ Sert, Josep Lluís, *Introductory Remarks to the First Urban Design Conference on The Role of the Three Professions*, 1956.

⁵¹ Harvard University Graduate School of Design, *Synthesis*, April 1957. As analyzed by Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, there were 32 responses: 12 from architects, 1 from a landscape architect, 8 from city planners and 11 from others in the fields of art, history, law, geography, government, administration, economics and promotion. Jaqueline Tyrwhitt indicates that of the 32 responses, 20 did not commit and/or indicated they were unable to respond on accounts of diverse reasons. There were 7 responses that said urban design was related to "physical form", and 5 suggested that the task of urban design was to "transform chaos into harmony."

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Two schools with programs in sociology that assembled international groups of scholars during the 1920s and 1930s were, in the United States, the University of Chicago with a graduate program in sociology known as the Chicago School, and in Germany the Institute of Social Research known as the Frankfurt School. Karl Mannheim headed the Frankfurt School, while Louis Wirth works at the Chicago School.

⁵⁴ APRR, *Progress Sheet No. 99*, London, January 1943. "People in a group of differing professions were conscious of their individual superiority, with a parallel consciousness of their lack of knowledge of the other men's jobs, consequent inferiority and an unwillingness to let themselves –and their own professions- down."

⁵⁵ Louis Wirth, "Sociological Factors in Urban Design", in *1948 Convention Seminars: Addresses and Discussions on Aesthetics, Urban Planning, Dwellings, Retail Buildings, and Modular Design* (Department of Education and Research, American Institute of Architects: Washington DC: 1948). Wirth was the President of the American Sociological Society and had translated to English Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia*.

Appendix

Three Month Completion Course Graduates as published by APRR.

APRR, Information Bulletin, Sheet 164, Jun/Jul 1946:

“The first of the Three Months’ Completion Courses in Town and Country Planning ended on 30th March, 1946. The following candidates were successful in all studio work and examinations, and are accordingly Planning Institute. The first six, in alphabetical order, were: T.A.L. Belton; ARIBA, London; K.R. Fennell, PASI, Orpington; L.N. Fraser, AMICE, AMIStructE, AMIMun & CyE, Southport; W.H. Mundy, ARIBA, Farnham; E.G. Sambrook, Walsall; R.V. Ward, ARIBA, London. Other successful candidates were: G.E. Carter, ARIBA, London; M.A. Carter, PASI, Ipswich; T.A.L. Concannon, FRIBA, Hong Kong; E.J.L. Griffith, PASI, AAI, Bristol; S.C. Lock, ARIBA, Huntingdon; R.C. McKenzie, PASI, East Croydon; R.C. Tice, PASI, AMI Mun & CyE, Letchworth; T.E. Vulliamy, MA, Cambridge; A. Wilson, Carshalton; J.D. Wood, ARIBA London.”

APRR, Information Bulletin, Sheet 165, Aug/Sept 1946:

“The School was honoured by a visit from both Lewis Mumford and Professor Holmes Perkins, of Harvard University, when Professor W.G. Holford opened an informal exhibition of the works of students of the Second Three Months’ Completion Course on June 26th. Members of the Board of the School and the Association were present and samples of the work of APRR were also on view. Results of the Second Three Months’ Completion Course: Nineteen candidates were successful in all studio work and examinations, and are accordingly exempt from the Final Examination of the Town Planning Institute. They are listed in order of passing. Distinctions were obtained by: A.W. Jackson, ARIBA, Bournemouth; E.B. Redfern, ARIBA, Stoke-on-Trent; J.E. Lloyd, Guildford; R.W. Paterson, ARIBA, Cheltenham. Other successful candidates were: A.W. Bowman, ARIBA, ANZIA, New Zealand; S.W.J. Smith, ARIBA, Kent; W.E. Tatton-Brown, ARIBA, London; A.P. Porri, ARIBA, London; A. Morris, PASI, London; A.G. Fairhead, PASI, London; R. Dobson, ARIBA, West Hartlepool; C.C. Gimingham, PASI, Harpenden; P.J. Marshall, ARIBA, Coventry; M.H. Ingham, Louth; A. Nicholls, Sheffield; F.M. Fiddian, PASI, Birmingham; D.S. Mellor, Leeds; J.W. Lee, ARIBA, Southampton; R. le R. White, ARIBA, Beaconsfield.”

APRR, Information Bulletin, Sheet 167, Dec1946/Jan1947:

“Twenty-one candidates successfully passed out from the Third Course which ended on September 30th, and are accordingly exempt from the final examination of the Town Planning Institute. Their names are: E.W. Beaumont, ARIBA, Lancaster; S.H.A. Rollison, PASI, Tonbridge; H.S. Howgrave-Graham, ARIBA, Sussex; B. Buck, ARIBA, Southampton; E.W.N. Mallows, ARIBA, South Africa; R.F. King, PASI, London; G.T. Coalen, ARIBA, London; R. Carton Tickell, Dip.Arch. (Liverpool), Cheshire; B. Buchbinder, Dip.Arch. (Prague), Czechoslovakia; J.G. Hird, ARIBA, Glasgow; P.L. Joseph, ARIBA, Birmingham; B.C. Maynard, ARIBA, London; W. Fairbank, Lancashire; R.J. Morling, AILA, London; H.J.C. Pratt, ARIBA, Essex; F.A.G. White, PASI, London; R.A.C. Macfarlane, ARIBA, Wrexham; D. Boyd, ARIBA, London; R.L. Thorpe, ARIBA, New Zealand; B.A. Le Mare, ARIBA, London; G.A. Atkinson, ARIBA, Hull; H. Jackson, ARIBA, Cambridge; C.H. Every, ARIBA, London; L.B. Reed, Chichester. The sixth and final Completion Course for Class “A” students of the War Office Correspondence Courses will open on April 14th, 1947. J. Tyrwhitt, AMTPI, AILA, will remain Acting Director for the duration of the Three Month Completion Courses.”

APRR, Information Bulletin, Sheet 168, Feb/Mar 1947:

“Twenty-three candidates successfully passed out from the Fourth Course, which ended on December 21st, 1946. Their names are: J.C. Ratcliff, ARIBA, AADipl, Sussex; Nancy Northcroft, ARIBA, ANZIA, BArch NZ, New Zealand; A.C. Sutherland, ARIBA, DArch, Glasgow; W. Windyer Morris, BAGeog., Dorset; J.M. Gorst, Nottingham; L.F. Baker, ARIBA, BArch, London; D.E. Johnson, ARIBA, London; D.B. Peace, ARIBA, Derbyshire; E.S. Sibert, Middlesex; R.F. Knott, ARIBA, London; J.A. Hepburn, PASI, Bucks; J.W. Dark, AM InstMun & CyEng, London; J.T. Pearse, Warwickshire; P. Allen, ARIBA, AA Dipl, London; O. Spender, Middlesex; H. Kane, AMInstMun & CyEng, Manchester; V. Crowe, ARIBA, AADipl, London; Dickerson, ARIBA, Staffs; G. Addison, ARIBA, AA Dipl, London; T. Woodman; Hants; F.N. Hendry, AM InstMun & CyEng, Yorks; S.H. Nicholls, Cornwall; M. Eker, ARIBA, BArch, London. The fifth course opened on January 6th with twenty-one students, and the Sixth and final Course for “Class A Students” will open on April 14th, 1947.”

APRR, Information Bulletin, Sheet 170, Jun/Jul 1947:

“The fifth of the Three Month Completion Courses in Town and Country Planning ended on 29th March 1947. The following candidates passed the course successfully and are accordingly exempt from the final examination of the Town Planning Institute: A.B. Bunch, ARIBA, Coventry; W.N.B. George, BArch (Liverpool), ARIBA, Coventry; W.D. Woodall, PASI, Hunts; G.W. Seddon, BSc, AMICE, Lancaster; J. Bolton, M Eng., AMICE, AMI Struct.E, London; R.A. Jensen, ARIBA, London; T.J. Widdaker, DiplArchLeeds, ARIBA, Leeds; R. Blizzard, PASI, Southampton; W.J. Scott, ARIBA, Wiltshire; J. Botterill, PASO, AMInstMunE, Huntingdon; F. Marston, ARIBA, Derby; R.P. Gray, ARIBA, London; V. Kostka, DiplIng, London and Czechoslovakia; B.E. Warren, PASI, Surrey; H. Dessau, ARIBA, Nottingham; R. Dyet, PASI, Lancaster; C.E.D. Gibson, ARIBA, AADipl, Gloucestershire; G.V. Rees, Glamorgan; G.P. Pitot, DiplEcoledesBeauxArts, Mauritius; J.D. Peake, PASI, Herts.”

APRR, Information Bulletin, Sheet 171, Aug 1947:

“The following students were successful in the sixth Three Month Completion Course. Distinction: G.H. Samuel, MA, ARIBA, London; F.S. Knight, ARIBA, Somerset; R.W. Rose, AMInstMunE, Norwich; R.W. Leggatt, ARIBA, Southsea. Pass (in alphabetical order): T.W. Atkinson, ARIBA, London; K.H. Baruth, Haifa; G.L. Burke, BSC (Estate Management), London; G.V. Charles, ARIBA, Folkestone; D.S. Craig, ARIBA, AADipl, London; J.B.S. Dahl, ARIBA, London; P.A. Deane, MA, ARIBA, London; I.G. Dunn, ARIBA, ANZIA, New Zealand; A.M. Edwards, ARIBA, London; V.W. Fishwick, ARIBA, London; A.L. Gabites, ARIBA, New Zealand; R.W. Gray, ARIBA, London; R.D. Hammett, ARIBA, AADipl, London; A.E. Howard, Sc (Eng), AMICE, MInstMunE, South Africa; L.T.B. Kealey, BEng, Liverpool; A.D. Knapton, ARIBA, Worthing; J.S. Lacey, ARIBA, AADipl, London; J. Lankester, PASI, Isle of Man; K. Linden, ARIBA, AADipl, Glasgow; L.V. Mitchell, ARIBA, London; W. Morris, ARIBA Southampton; F. Murray, PASI, London; R.M.W. Norris, Norwich; R.J. Soper, MEng, AMICE, AMInstMunE, Coventry; J.D.M. Taylor, MA ARIBA, Hythe; C.G. Trimmer, AMICE, Sussex; N.L. Vosper, Arch, ARIBA, Ruthin; I.F. Warwick, ARIBA, London; D.A.S. Webster, MA(Arch), ARIBA, London.”

APRR, Information Bulletin, Sheet 177, Feb 1948:

“The Final Completion Course in Town and Country Planning ended on 20 December 1947. The following candidates passed the course successfully: Distinctions were obtained by: K. Watts, BSc, Geography, Southampton; R.F.F. Williams, AM Inst Mun Eng, Cheshire; K.D. Fines, Sussex; T.N.W. Akroyd, MSc, Lancaster. Other successful candidates were: T.A. Baldwin, ARIBA, London; J.A. Brant, Gloucestershire; J.D. Cordwell, ARIBA, AADipl(Hons), London; L. Doudkin, Palestine; J.A. Francis, Wiltshire; D. Goldhill, ARIBA, AADipl, London; R. Gorbing, London; F.H.B. Layfield, Durham; I.G. Maclaurin, ARIBA, Hants; L. Mellinger, ARIBA, London; R.H. Pullan, BSc, Civil Engineering, Birmingham; A.E. Rochard-Thomas, ARICS, Surrey; J.A. Smeed, BSc (Estate Management), Herts; D.A. Tookey, BA Geog, Leicester. Of the 162 students who have attended these courses, 155 were passed out successfully.”