



This is a repository copy of *Designing the garden of Geddes: the master gardener and the profession of landscape architecture*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/132699/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Woudstra, J. orcid.org/0000-0001-9625-2998 (2018) Designing the garden of Geddes: the master gardener and the profession of landscape architecture. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 178. pp. 198-207. ISSN 0169-2046

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.05.023>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Designing the Garden of Geddes: the master gardener and the profession of** 2 **landscape architecture**

3 4 Abstract

5 The influence of Patrick Geddes (1854-1932) on the landscape architecture profession
6 has been widely acknowledged, but there is no critical review of the nature of this
7 influence on theory and practice. Geddes appears to have been the first person in
8 Britain to adopt the term landscape architect to denote a profession in the American
9 sense as someone who dealt with city planning, civic design and parks systems. This
10 profession seemed to encompass his wide ranging interests, providing a suitable
11 vehicle for his transdisciplinary approaches, but which he later transferred to that of
12 town and regional planning. His approach to understanding landscapes was to study
13 towns and regions from a cultural, ecological and economic perspective in a
14 systematic way of survey, analysis and design. Geddes's methods were gradually
15 adopted by the landscape architecture profession, and purely Beaux Arts-architectural
16 approaches phased out. By tracing contemporary references, this paper highlights key
17 individuals who helped to promote his ideas in the landscape architecture profession
18 then and now, and shows how his enduring influence and longstanding impact have to
19 do with the systematic approach and methods he set forth. Today similar approaches
20 are being promoted by other professions, but with a different perspective, and
21 suggests that rather than various disciplines setting up silos, trying to defend their
22 territories, with climate change and food security looming it is timely to promote
23 more integrated approaches. This is well in line with Geddes's ideas who not only
24 encouraged interdisciplinarity, but also warned against inadvertent specialisation.

25
26 Landscape architecture, history, interdisciplinarity, cultural and ecological approaches

27
28
29 A century after the publication of Patrick Geddes's *Cities in Evolution* (1915)
30 changed the study of cities from a purely engineering, architectural and administrative
31 one to one with an emphasis on social aspects, there have been significant changes to
32 the way they have been conceived and designed. By emphasising sociological,
33 ethical, factors he ensured rich and varied approaches that have affected various
34 disciplines. Some of these disciplines were actually conceived by Geddes, while
35 others have been and are being generated based on his ideas or principles in ways that
36 he himself could not have foreseen. One of the professions that he initiated in Great
37 Britain was that of landscape architecture c.1904. Yet it was not until 1930 before the
38 profession was actually established with its own professional body. By this stage
39 many of the intended tasks had been taken on by town planners, another new
40 profession whose Town Planning Institute had been founded in 1914.

41
42 Despite the fact that he did not partake in the actual creation of the profession he has
43 been lauded as 'the most important landscape and planning theorist of the twentieth
44 century', and as the 'founder of landscape planning in Britain'. While his contribution
45 to various professions has been analysed, there is currently not one that specifically
46 looks at his relationship with landscape architecture. Thus this paper sets out to:

- 47 • More concisely consolidate and briefly describe Geddes's development and
48 interdisciplinary approach to the field of landscape architecture
- 49 • Clearly state his contributions to the field, both in theory and practice
- 50 • Identify the influence of such work on the field, and

51 • Illustrate its current relevance

52 There is presently no review that attempts to put his contribution to landscape
53 architecture in a contemporary context and explores the tension between a more
54 limited and more expansive, synoptic, vision of the discipline. This paper is an
55 attempt to position Geddes as one of the fathers of landscape architecture who by
56 pioneering new avenues helped to articulate the nature of the profession and then
57 continued to question its premise. It is primarily a literature study, backed up by
58 interviews with those that have more recently continued to quote Geddes's relevance
59 to the landscape profession.

60

61 **The Garden of Geddes**

62 Shortly after the publication of Geddes's *Cities in Evolution* (1915) one of his first
63 biographies appeared; it was entitled 'The Garden of Geddes' in which its author,
64 Huntly Carter, made the apt analogy of Geddes (1854-1932) as a gardener, and which
65 was in fact one that he himself had been promoting. Carter, an otherwise theatre critic,
66 took it a step further and described him as 'the master-gardener of modern social
67 aspiration- the aspiration towards a civic renaissance', with Geddes 'to play a leading
68 part in the re-making of the globe as the Paradise of an inspired gardener' (Figure 1).
69 He was 'to annex the universe and remould it in his likeness; to test it in the crucible
70 of his mind and to distil therefrom a solution of its mysteries'. World War I was
71 'auspicious for the beginning of a new world, founded upon the transplendent
72 traditions of the old', and he implied this provided new opportunities, continuing:

73

74 The master-gardener of these two hemispheres gathers up and focuses in one
75 comprehensive study the influences of the past and present which are the
76 forces of to-morrow. He is a union of its oldest and newest. He unites ancient
77 seeing and modern doing, prophetic vision and practical inspiration, Greek
78 theory and Georgian experiment. He expresses the secret aspiration of the
79 human will to enter into more fruitful relations with the universe. He is the
80 interpreter of a renewed desire for a world that shall be a place of oracle and
81 interpretation in one. To him the right function of the world is the
82 manifestation of beauty and life. (Carter, 1915 p.455)

82

83 Carter continues to trace the seven stages of the master gardener's life thus far, and
84 does this in a way that reveals full comprehension of Geddes's philosophy: 'The roots
85 of every man's life are the early formative influences of place, people and work.
86 Place, parents and occupation; these are his chief good or bad.' This is a clear
87 reference to the notion of 'place, work and folk', which Geddes had translated from
88 *lieu, travail* and *famille* of the pioneering French sociologist Frédéric le Play (1806-
89 1882), whose theories he had first encountered while visiting the 1878 World Fair in
90 Paris and that were to have a fundamental influence on his approach. This triad,
91 which he also adapted as 'environment, function and organism' became the
92 foundation of much of his later work (Meller, 1990, pp.34-37). Carter inferred 'that
93 the most appropriate place for a creative gardener to be born in is Eden', noting that in
94 a metaphorical sense Geddes's earliest home near Perth with 'a garden opening on
95 one side to the tender beauty of a lowland valley and on the other looking out upon
96 the rugged grandeur of highland ranges' was an Eden. Here he had learned gardening
97 and botany from his father, while the landscape had imparted a feast of nature
98 impressions that together with the discipline of gardening, would have forecasted
99 phases of his development.

100

101 Eventually Geddes would arrive ‘at a conception of the Universe as one vast garden
102 wherein he would see Life symbolized as a tree with its roots in the past, its branches
103 and members in the present and its blossoming in the future’. This ‘*arbor vitae* would
104 be emblematic of man’s seeing and doing in the past, present and possible’ and set the
105 seed from a life-centred universe to a life-centred philosophy. Thus during the first of
106 his seven stages he escaped

107 from the artificial to the natural order, to discover a renewed contact with
108 nature, forming a conception of a universal garden in the midst of which shall
109 be a tower whence man may watch the unfolding of the immense drama of
110 life. In the second decade we watch him turn from organic to spiritual
111 gardening, from the study of origins and sources to inquiry and experiment in
112 the possibilities of culture.

113

114 Before his father allowed him to study at a university Geddes worked at a bank for
115 over a year and then went to London to study with the biologist Thomas Huxley.
116 While not completing a set course it introduced him to the main theories and helped to
117 broaden his outlook, being particularly influenced by Charles Darwin’s, Huxley’s and
118 Herbert Spencer’s views of nature, Auguste Comte’s notion of civics and Le Play’s
119 social geography of region and occupation. Thus his studies had led him ‘into the
120 heart of his Garden-universe’ and during which ‘he had maintained his position as a
121 gardener’ (Carter, 1915, pp. 457-463). After a spell of temporary blindness in Mexico
122 he had discovered Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz’s philosophy that attempted to
123 reconcile life and religion and devise a mechanical logic without which Western
124 Europe ‘would get buried beneath specialisms’. Thus Carter traced the three stages of
125 the ‘creative gardener’ through ‘his seed-time in Eden, his ascent on the wings of
126 empiricism and his temporary suspension above earth while he considered all things
127 in their proper proportions and relations’.

128

129 The fourth and most important stage however was ‘the realization of his great ideals’,
130 at which, ‘[w]ith renewed strength and sight then he emerged from the Cloister of
131 Contemplation and returned to practical “gardening” armed with new and effective
132 instruments of sociology for ordered and far-reaching study in many and varied
133 directions...’ He had first accepted a demonstrator position at University College
134 London, moving to Edinburgh a few years later and to the University of Dundee as
135 professor of botany in 1888. This position required him to teach during the summer
136 months, leaving time for his wide range of other ventures during the remainder eight
137 months. During this time he developed the notion of civics, or as he put he was busy
138 “hawking Civics in a barrow round the world”, during which his ‘ever-pressing
139 questions’ were raised: “How can we create a *Real* Human Life? How can we create
140 the Garden where such life may be lived?”. Carter concluded his essay with the
141 prediction that Geddes would be ‘carrying his work to completion in all parts of the
142 civilized world’, and questioning ‘Have we not followed the gardener in his quest for
143 an answer in Science, Philosophy, Ethics, Religion, Art, Social Service, and above all
144 in the labyrinthine ways of Life itself? And finally, have we not come up to the
145 mountain of Light than which Fuji is not more beautifully crowned?’ (Carter, 1915,
146 p.595)

147

148 Geddes appreciated this label as a gardener and had promoted the notion himself
149 arguing that the ‘difference between creating gardens as places for plant life and cities
150 as places for human life is only a matter of degree: “My ambition being...to write in

151 reality- here with flower and tree, and elsewhere with house and city- it is all the
152 same” (Welter, 2002, p.18). This analogy of Geddes as a gardener thus seems to sum
153 up his wide-ranging activities, without the restrictions that a title normally includes.
154 He had pioneered in biology and ecology, science and philosophy, human evolution
155 and geography, sociology and civics, arts and economics, making original
156 contributions in various aspects and setting up organisations that furthered study and
157 application. His impatient nature did not allow him to nurture and develop these ideas
158 himself, setting the next question to explore his ever expanding realm and field of
159 work.

160
161 Furthermore, in 1887 he and his wife Anna had moved into a slum in Edinburgh and
162 with social consciousness pioneered slum clearance there when they by example and
163 ‘tactful aid... persuaded other tenants to purify and tidy their quarters, using such
164 inexpensive means as flower-boxes for dull windows and white or colour distemper
165 washes for dingy walls.’ They aroused public opinion and forced public officials to
166 remove ‘century-old accumulations of rubbish’, despite opposition from house
167 owners and officials. The experience taught him about the politics and workings of
168 the city environment and engaged him with new ideas and institutions required to
169 tackle social and environmental ills (Boardman, 1944, p.103). One of the
170 organisations he became engaged with at this stage was the National Trust, probably
171 through a friend of Anna’s, Octavia Hill, who had been involved in social reform in
172 East London, and was also on the executive committee of the Trust. Geddes joined
173 the committee in 1896, a year after it had been founded (‘The National Trust’, *Times*,
174 26 November 1896, p.8; ‘The National Trust’, *Times*, 10 July 1897, p.15).

175 176 **City development instead of park planning**

177 When in 1903 Geddes was asked to produce a report for the laying out of Pittencrieff
178 Park and Glen for the newly founded Carnegie Dunfermline Trust he and the garden
179 designer Thomas Mawson (1861- 1933) had been provided with the same commission
180 and the two men considered being in competition with each other. As it was, Geddes
181 seized the opportunity to explore and assimilate his theories in a practical application
182 as an example of a regional survey, but in doing so overstepped the brief that required
183 the adaptation of an existing laird’s park and glen and suggestions for proposals for
184 ‘structures upon the edge of the Park’ (Geddes, 1973 reprint of 1904 edition, p.32)
185 (Figure 2). Besides chapters dedicated to park and glen and their features, he included
186 chapters on ‘Neighbouring property and housing improvements’, ‘Social institutes
187 and central institute’, ‘Stream purification and its results’, Parks and buildings in their
188 bearing on city improvements’ and sections on ‘Nature museums’, ‘Labour
189 museums’, ‘History and art’ and ‘Life and citizenship’. All this was illustrated with
190 professional photographs, draughtsman’s drawings, and architectural designs, with a
191 comprehensive text amounting to 232 pages. The narrative adopted provided the
192 reader with a tour around Dunfermline that illustrates how planning might improve
193 the fabric of the town. The text leant heavily on the author’s past experience and
194 incorporated survey information (historical, physical, geological, social, etc.) and
195 proposals. It was well illustrated, including various before and after views (based on
196 the methodology of Humphry Repton, but which ‘can now be carried out with far
197 greater accuracy in these days of photography’ (Geddes, 1904), p.16n)), and dwelled
198 extensively on issues of principle, but provided scant real detail that would enable
199 implementation (Figures 3 and 4).

200

201 While the Trust was disappointed about the scope of the work that covered aspects
202 outside their ownership and control and was therefore rejected, to Geddes this was a
203 marker that publicized his principles in a practical application. It was a test case for
204 over sixty plans for towns and cities that were to follow, mainly in India and
205 Palestine. It also formed the basis for refining the collections of survey material on
206 cities that he later displayed in Great Britain and abroad. This 'Cities Exhibition' was
207 shown at the 1910 Town Planning Exhibition and consisted of 'a graphic presentment
208 of the Development of Cities and of their historic and sociologic Interpretation, as
209 well as be more fully and systematically representative of the best methods of Town
210 Planning and of the possibilities of City Development' (Geddes, 1911, p.574).

211
212 Soon after the publication of *City Development* (1904) Geddes re-presented his
213 undertaking on his letterhead as: 'Patrick Geddes and Colleagues/ Landscape
214 Architects, Park and Garden Designers, Museum Planners, etc.', which reveals that
215 the scope of work as he then considered it was best captured by the new title, which
216 he saw being used by the Olmsted firm, and others, during his visit to the USA in
217 1899-1900, and the work of which had a similar remit (Geddes, 1968, pp.232-3).
218 Geddes's scope of work was defined as: 'City Plans and Improvements/ Parks and
219 Gardens/ Garden Villages/ Type Museums/ Educational Appliances/ School Gardens'
220 (Boardman, 1978, p.230). This was the first modern use of the title of landscape
221 architect in Great Britain, well in advance of the founding of the professional body,
222 the Institute of Landscape Architects in 1929/1930. It is noticeable that he seems to
223 have discontinued the use of the name of this profession afterwards, perhaps because
224 of the invention of the term town planning in 1906 (Wright, 1982, p.21n) that caught
225 the public imagination and by 1909 had led to the passing of the *Town Planning Act*
226 and in the same year to the founding of the Department of Civic Design at the
227 University of Liverpool. This was the first university course in the world for the study
228 of town planning and related topics, and included a course in landscape architecture
229 which was taught by Mawson.

230
231 The Town Planning Institute was founded the next year in 1910. This seemed to have
232 encompassed and duplicated some of the scope of work defined as landscape
233 architecture. Later Geddes adopted 'town planning' as a broader term, and became
234 one of its main proponents, yet he maintained that 'landscape making' was the
235 'master art':

236 Plainly the hygienist of water supply is the true utilitarian; and hence, even
237 before our present awakening of citizenship, he has been set in authority above
238 all minor utilitarians, each necessarily of narrower task and of more local
239 vision- engineering, mechanical and chemical, manufacturing and monetary-
240 and has so far been co-ordinating all these into the public service. But with
241 this preservation of mountains and moorlands comes also the need of their
242 access: a need for health, bodily and mental together. For health without the
243 joys of life- of which one prime one is assuredly this nature-access- is but
244 dullness; and this we begin to know as a main way of preparation for insidious
245 disease. With this, again, comes forestry: no mere tree-cropping, but
246 sylviculture, arboriculture too, and park-making at its greatest and best.
247 Such synoptic vision of Nature, such constructive conservation of its order and
248 beauty towards the health of cities, and the simple yet vivid happiness of its
249 holiday-makers (whom a wise citizenship will educate by admission, not
250 exclusion) is more than engineering: it is a master-art: vaster than that of street

251 planning, it is landscape making; and thus it meets and combines with city
252 design (Geddes, 1968, pp.95-96).

253

254 **Cities in evolution**

255 The publication of Geddes's *Cities in Evolution: An introduction to the town planning*
256 *movement and to the study of civics* (1915) was not just an attempt to popularize these
257 topics, but sought to 'express in various ways the essential harmony of all these
258 interests and aims'. The book was an appeal that:

259 we must not too simply begin, as do too many, with the fundamentals as of
260 communications, and thereafter give these such aesthetic qualities of
261 perspective and rest, as may be, but above all things, seek to enter into the
262 spirit of our city, its historic essence and continuous life. Our design will thus
263 express, stimulate, and develop its highest possibility, and so deal all the more
264 effectively with its material and fundamental needs (Geddes, 1968, pp.xxv-
265 xxvi).

266 He stressed the need for a comprehensive survey of the city 'at its highest past, in
267 present, and above all, since planning is the problem, foresee its opening future', thus
268 considering the knowledge of the origins of the city and its life processes as an
269 essential basis for any proposals.

270

271 Cities ought to be studied not solely, but also their interconnections in city regions,
272 for which he introduced the word 'conurbation' (Geddes, 1968, p.34), requiring new
273 forms of governance that considered agglomerations of cities in connection with their
274 industry. This notion of city regions is explored in Great Britain and contrasted with
275 that of others, thus translating the issue globally. He explored social, historical,
276 economical, and health issues and contrasted these at the present with the past. The
277 modern working man being 'aristo-democratised into productive citizen... will set his
278 mind towards house building and town planning, even towards city design; and all
279 these on a scale to rival –nay, surpass- the past glories of history' (Geddes, 1968,
280 p.71). This should create more than a "Utopia", no place or nowhere, and instead
281 create a 'Eutopia', good place, 'of effective health and well-being, even of glorious
282 and in its way unprecedented beauty, renewing and rivalling the best achievements of
283 the past, and all this beginning here there and everywhere...' (Geddes, 1968, p. 73)

284

285 At one point he summarized that:

286 It is the development of a local life, a regional character, a civic spirit, a
287 unique individuality, capable of course of growth and expansion, of
288 improvement and development in many ways, of profiting too by the example
289 and criticism of others, yet always in its own way and upon its own
290 foundations. Thus the renewed art of Town Planning has to develop into an art
291 yet higher, that of City Design- a veritable orchestration of all the arts, and
292 correspondingly needing, even for its preliminary surveys, all the social
293 sciences (Geddes, 1968, p.205).

294

295 **Defining landscape architecture**

296 As Geddes moved on, the profession of landscape architecture was adopted and re-
297 defined by Mawson, who used it in the same way as he would have 'landscape
298 gardener' some years earlier (Mawson, 1901, p.1), noting that during the mid-
299 Victorian period the profession had lost status as 'a means of serious art expression,
300 and had fallen in the hands of 'ill-informed amateurs obsessed with those crude

301 conceptions of the “picturesque” which at that period produced such disastrous
302 results’. These included ‘wriggling paths, impossible contours, white spar rockeries,
303 and a distressing confusion of little aims’ and meant that landscape architecture ‘had
304 outrun its claim to serious consideration’ (Mawson, 1927, p.xiv). The phrase
305 landscape garden was first used by the poet William Shenstone in his posthumously
306 published ‘Unconnected thoughts on gardening’ (Shenstone, 1764), and it had later
307 been popularised through the writings of Humphry Repton (Repton 1794, 1803). The
308 concepts of landscape and garden architecture were popularly used by John Loudon,
309 to refer primarily to build structures in their respective contexts (Loudon, 1840). In
310 the English language landscape architecture was popularly used by the American
311 Frederick Law Olmsted to indicate the profession, in order to highlight the various
312 new responsibilities beyond the garden. While Mawson did not define landscape
313 architecture, it is clear from the way in which he split talks on his work between
314 lectures on landscape architecture and those on civic art, that his view of landscape
315 architecture was more limited than that of Geddes’s.

316
317 Mawson saw landscape architecture as primarily concerned with aspects of garden
318 making; civic art included city planning, the civic survey, street planning, park
319 systems, outdoor furniture and housing (Mawson, 1927, pp.160-61). Yet at his
320 address to the Institute of Landscape Architects, for which Mawson had become
321 founding president in 1929, it is clear that he included both landscape architecture and
322 civic design within the field of work of the landscape architect (Anon., *The*
323 *Manchester Guardian* 12 February 1930, p.4), and the artificial division may well
324 have been caused by the fact that these reflected the contents of Mawson’s two main
325 publications: *The Art and Craft of Garden Making* (1900, etc.) and *Civic Art: Studies*
326 *in town planning, parks, boulevards and open spaces* (1911). Unfortunately this may
327 inadvertently have influenced the limited scope within the official *OED* definition of
328 landscape architecture as ‘the planning of parks or gardens to form an attractive
329 landscape, often in association with the design of buildings, roads, etc.’ (*Oxford*
330 *English Dictionary* online, ‘landscape architecture’)

331
332 The lack of the socio-cultural dimension of landscape architecture and that of
333 interdisciplinarity are the main differences between this definition and the views of
334 Geddes. This shows the difficulties in defining and establishing the realm of a new
335 profession within existing ones, the processes of specialisation that define it and the
336 scope that was initially envisioned. While Mawson’s title *Civic Art* suggested the
337 influence of Geddes in his avocation of civics and importance of town planning –
338 though not acknowledged, it was presented from the point of view of the all-knowing
339 designer, rather than a bottom up approach, and it is revealing of Mawson’s
340 conservative position.

341
342 When Geddes died in 1932, the landscape architecture profession in Britain was only
343 a few years old, and he had not had any involvement with the Institute. Yet his
344 influence was clear and Thomas Adams, an early member, but also a town planner
345 who was involved in large-scale Geddesian regional surveys, particularly in North
346 America, was keen to see ‘landscape design’ as ‘a branch of town planning’. In 1934
347 he re-defined landscape architecture as being: ‘the art of creating and preserving
348 beauty in the surroundings of human habitations and in the broader natural scenery of
349 the country’ and referred to three different aspects: ‘that of the individual garden in
350 relation to an individual dwelling, that of groups of gardens and the streets connecting

351 them in town and suburb and that of the whole neighbourhood including all open
352 areas, parks, playgrounds, roads, etc.’ (Colvin, 1934, p.45). It is clear that Adams
353 considered landscape architecture primarily for aesthetic rather than functional or
354 structural purposes. He thought of it as needing to service town planning. This may
355 also reflect Geddes’s thinking in that the perception of landscape architecture as the
356 truly interdisciplinary profession that would solve various ills had now migrated to this
357 new profession.

358
359 It was the young landscape architect Christopher Tunnard (1910-1979), who in 1938
360 searched for the creative forces that might be stimulating and give rise to creativity in
361 landscape design, suggesting three approaches; functional, empathic and artistic,
362 which he had extracted from modernist approaches rather than those suggested by
363 Geddes (Tunnard, 1938, pp.106-7). By this stage Geddes’s *City Development* and
364 *Cities in Evolution* had long been out of print and could only be found in libraries,
365 where the latter was discovered by Jaqueline Tyrwhitt (1905-1983). She had initially
366 set out on a career as a gardener, with a spell at the Architectural Association in order
367 to learn to draw, then working for Ellen Willmott in her garden at Warley Place,
368 followed by international travel and a position at Dartington Hall. Here she read
369 *Cities in Evolution*, which developed her interest in town planning and encouraged
370 her to study the subject in Berlin in 1937. On her return she enrolled at the School of
371 Planning and Research for National Development (SPRND), which had been set up
372 within the school by E.A.A. Rowse, the principal of the Architectural Association,
373 who ran the two schools in conjunction with each other. The curriculum of the
374 SPRND was inspired by the philosophy of Geddes, with the Advisory Board
375 including his admirers George Pepler and Raymond Unwin (Shoshkes, 2013, p.32).

376
377 Tyrwhitt, who had also joined the Institute of Landscape Architects before the War,
378 became director of the Association of Planning and Regional Development in 1941
379 and one of her responsibilities was a correspondence course on town planning.
380 Besides this she ran a completion course for the School of Planning as well as a
381 postgraduate evening course on landscape design (Shoshkes, 2013, pp.89-91;
382 Shoshkes, 2017, pp.15-24). From 1944 landscape architects Brenda Colvin and Brian
383 Hackett taught the latter. By 1943 Colvin and Tyrwhitt had been involved in a book
384 project that selected trees for post war reconstruction, including on roadsides, in
385 towns, along streets and on village greens. It was not till 1947 that *Trees for Town*
386 *and Country* was published (Colvin, Tyrwhitt, 1947, p.5-7), by which stage Colvin
387 and Hackett had their own book projects that reveal the inheritance of Geddes. Colvin
388 did not quote the latter herself, but commenced the first chapter entitled ‘Nature and
389 man’ of *Land and Landscape* (1947) with a quote from J.W. Bews’s *Human Ecology*
390 (1935) who related his methods to that on ‘the “regional surveys” of Le Play and
391 Geddes and their respective schools’ (E.B.H., 1936, pp.560-561). She also quoted the
392 great Geddes disciple Lewis Mumford from *The Culture of Cities*, first published in
393 1938 (Colvin, 1947, pp.1, 4) (Figure 5).

394
395 Like Colvin, the influence of Geddes’s approach is not only visible from the title of
396 the book, in Hackett’s case *Man, Society and Environment* (1950), which looked at
397 landscape architecture from a much wider perspective than the traditional pre-war
398 view when most of the work was in the design of parks and gardens. It is also clear
399 from the contents. He believed that:

400 We cannot say that Geddes established a new theory of planning, but his
401 wisdom touched upon so many aspects that he certainly revolutionized
402 planning thought and prepared the way for the theory that is now crystallizing.
403 Geddes was the prophet of the art of living for this Age of global
404 understanding and misunderstanding, and of mechanization. He was one of the
405 first to see that a relationship existed between Society and its Environment
406 throughout history, that geography meant a great deal more than an
407 understanding of place names and the earth's surface, and that the pure and
408 natural sciences were inter-related with the pattern of human life. In physical
409 planning, Geddes recognized that town structure was always changing; this led
410 him to plead that the past and present need review, analysis, synthesis, and
411 projection before the framework of the future can be delineated a little more
412 clearly- the doctrines that planning is a continuous and not a static process,
413 and that Survey must come before Plan. Geddes was also a pioneer in
414 regionalism in that he recognized the dependency of communities and their
415 environment upon national and regional trends and characteristics. This new
416 way of approaching planning problems was inspired by Le Play, from whom
417 Geddes took his objective method of studying Society: Folk, Work, Place.
418 Hackett noted an earlier precedent of the Survey in *Life and Labour in London* by
419 Charles Booth, commenced in 1889.

420
421 He then showed how Mumford later 'clarified and developed' the Geddesian
422 approach and took his teaching a stage further. This was done by drawing attention to
423 the relationship between physical, social and economic factors in the past and in the
424 present. Mumford proposed that 'despite mechanization and technological progress,
425 Man is limited to the 'human' scale in his way of living' and this 'has influenced a
426 breaking-down of the vast metropolis into social units based on school patterns and
427 neighbourhoods' (Hackett, 1950, pp.230-231) (Figure 6). Hackett does not define
428 landscape architecture, despite the fact that he had just been appointed to a lectureship
429 in the subject at King's College, University of Durham. However Colvin revealed the
430 wider remit of the profession as being 'concerned with the design of human
431 environment' (Colvin, 1947, p.64).

432
433 Hackett's observations on Mumford, were of course not the first from a landscape and
434 garden perspective, and The Studio editor F.A. Mercer in his annual *Gardens and*
435 *Gardening* dedicated the 1939 issue to the progress of garden design. He noted that
436 gardens may be designed 'to read or write quietly, to meditate or to grow something',
437 relating this to 'modern houses' and the concept of "Megalopolis" that he
438 acknowledged as originating from Mumford, but which in fact had been popularised
439 by Geddes. The 'great city and all its works has led to settings so informal as hardly
440 to be called gardens at all- stretches of meadow approaching close to the house'. He
441 related this to the modernist city and noted that 'this trend in general would seem to
442 be freer and less formal planting than heretofore, a more sensitive regard for colour
443 and texture, and for the natural suggestions provided by the site itself'.

444
445 It was inevitable that 'the landscape architect sees the garden in larger terms than the
446 private owner's comparatively small space, as the face of the country in fact, just as
447 the architect thinks in terms of communal planning as well as in private houses'.
448 While it was not the intention of the book to discuss this, in their contribution Thomas
449 Adams (then president of the ILA) and Peter Youngman clearly had this in mind for

450 the garden of the future which ‘will need to be more free and flowing in its pattern,
451 with less emphasis on its plan and more on the texture, forms and time elements of its
452 plant groupings and on the relationship of these to the architecture of the house’. It is
453 clear that this provided a vision for the megalopolis, where landscape architects were
454 ‘needed to replace the architect in garden design and supplement the gardener’
455 (Mercer, 1939, pp.7, 14-15). This narrow vision of the function of the landscape
456 architect clearly contrast with the much more liberal post-war one of Colvin’s with its
457 social implications.

458

459 **Providing a Geddesian canon**

460 When Patrick Abercrombie (1879-1957) succeeded Stanley Adshead (1868-1946) as
461 professor in the Department of Civic Design at the University of Liverpool, he
462 became the main promoter of the Geddesian town and regional surveys and plans.
463 These included surveys of large areas in East Kent and the Bath and Bristol Region,
464 but he gained reputation for his Sheffield Survey of 1924 (produced with Robert
465 Mattocks, Mawson’s nephew, a town planner and expert in park design), which
466 became a model for British planners (Wright, 1982, pp.123-157). Abercrombie
467 became famous for his County of London and Greater London plans, produced in
468 1943 and ’44 respectively, which provided an international standard (Forshaw and
469 Abercrombie, 1943; Abercrombie, 1945). These were produced with a team of
470 assistants, including architect and landscape architect Peter Shephard (1913-2002),
471 who in the *Greater London Plan* produced drawings for projects for a park and a new
472 town. This not only shows the lasting influence of Geddes but also the close
473 relationship between the various disciplines, confirmed by the fact that Abercrombie
474 was also an active member of the ILA.

475

476 The post war reconstruction once again created a viable climate for the ideas of
477 Geddes. An important untapped resource for his ideas were the reports he wrote for
478 some eighteen Indian cities between 1915 and 1919. These were collated by Henry
479 Vaughan Lanchester (1863-1953), an architect and town planner with a great interest
480 in landscape architecture (Lanchester, 1908, pp.343-348; see: Woudstra, 2015,
481 pp.119-138). He had been invited to advise in India and asked Geddes to join him
482 when he ‘realised the value of his contribution to a broad humanistic outlook on the
483 social aspects of civic improvement and the importance of this aspect in dealing with
484 India’. Jaqueline Tyrwhitt edited the material under the auspices of the Association
485 for Planning and Reconstruction and selected pertinent passages that could be seen as
486 a canon that in current terms might be construed for either town planning or landscape
487 architecture: ‘The Geddes Outlook’ set his general approach to town planning, which
488 ‘is not mere place-planning, nor even work-planning. If it is to be successful it must
489 be folk-planning.’ (Tyrwhitt, 1947, p.22). ‘The Diagnostic Survey’ promoted an
490 alternative

491

492 school of planning, of building and of gardening that investigates and
493 considers the whole set of existing conditions; that studies the whole place as
494 it stands, seeking out how it has grown to be what it is, and recognizing alike
495 its advantages, its difficulties and its defects. This school strives to adapt itself
496 to meet the wants and needs, the ideas and ideals of the place and persons
497 concerned. It seeks to do as little as possible, while planning to increase the
498 well-being of the people at all levels, from the humblest to the highest. City
499 improvements of this kind are both less expensive to the undertaking and
productive of more enjoyment to all concerned (Tyrwhitt, 1947, p.25).

500

501 An alternative to driving new streets through an existing neighbourhood was
502 'Conservative Surgery' by first showing 'that the new streets prove not to be really
503 required since, by simply enlarging the existing lanes, ample communications already
504 exist' and secondly that 'with the addition of some vacant lots and the removal of a
505 few of the most dilapidated and insanitary houses, these lanes can be greatly
506 improved and every house brought within reach of fresh air as well as of material
507 sanitation...' (Tyrwhitt, 1947, p.25) 'A Sociological Approach' promoted 'active co-
508 operation... between the citizen and their town council' (Tyrwhitt, 1947, p.65).
509 'Planning for Health' was concerned with sanitation and public health and particularly
510 sustainable water supplies striving for retention of tanks and reservoirs in Indian
511 villages as they also contributed to a noticeable cooling effect (Tyrwhitt, 1947, pp.66-
512 83). 'Open Spaces and Trees' identified the importance of the village square for social
513 life and health, promoting a 'chain or network of such open spaces', gardens, and the
514 necessity of fuel and shade trees (Tyrwhitt, 1947, pp.84-95).

515

516 The Tyrwhitt publication made this material more widely available for the first time,
517 and was followed by a new edition of *Cities in Evolution* (1949) also edited by her. In
518 it she cut sections, but added further material. 'The Valley Section' was covered both
519 in the introduction and as part of the 'Cities Exhibition' text that was included as an
520 appendix. It was incorporated to elucidate reference to this in the text as Geddes
521 considered it as 'the basis of survey' and therefore the underlying principle in
522 understanding his approach (Geddes, 1949). The Valley Section had initially been
523 produced in 1909 in an attempt to envision the regional origins of the civilisation of
524 cities. After this he had produced various versions, with Tyrwhitt re-publishing a
525 fuller account in 1967 (Tyrwhitt, 1967, pp.49-57; see also Shoshkes, 2017, pp.15-24;
526 Welter, 2017, pp.25-26) (Figure 7 and 8).

527

528 **Reception by the landscape profession**

529 Despite various publications by Geddes they do not appear to have been readily
530 available and Youngman (who had also qualified as a town planner), for example,
531 declared that he had not read any of Geddes's books (Harvey, 1987, p.105). Instead
532 most of the latter's principles were received through Mumford's *Culture of Cities*,
533 which he considered as a bible (Harvey, 1987, pp.110-111). The architect and
534 landscape architect Geoffrey Jellicoe (1900-1996), however, considered that *Cities in*
535 *Evolution* 'penetrated far into an ecology that comprehended the arts of civilized life
536 as well as sciences', noting that Geddes 'maintained that his views were a
537 development of the synoptic vision of Aristotle, that saw the city as a whole, and that
538 this had expanded to become global.' This he considered retention of tradition and
539 thought that 'the most important single factor in land design was the birth of the
540 modern science of town- and country-planning.' (Jellicoe, 1975, p.287)

541

542 While Geddes's works may not have been generally available, it is clear that he
543 changed people's thinking by declaring city planning a social activity. Arthur
544 Edwards a planner and urban designer who received his ideas 'third hand', provided a
545 subjective interpretation of his influences, drawing once more the analogy of the city
546 planner as a gardener:

547

548 He demonstrated that cities behave like living organisms and that the planner's
549 task is more akin to that of a gardener than that of a surveyor, a social
reformer or an architect. Just as a gardener tends his plot for a few years of its

550 history, so a planner controls his city for a brief moment during the many
551 centuries of its existence. Just as a gardener improves his trees by studying
552 their shape, their habit of growth and the soil which suits them, and by pruning
553 a branch here or feeding the roots there, so a planner should improve his city
554 by studying its present forms, its evolution and its geographical background,
555 and by clearing slums in one place and encouraging growth elsewhere.
556 Geddes taught that man could only create a humane environment by
557 developing the intrinsic characteristics of a place and by studying the habits
558 and needs of the people who were to live there. Like all great ideas it was a
559 concept at once simple and profound (Edwards, 1981, pp.90-91).

560
561 Despite the fact that Geddes wrote little specifically dedicated to landscape
562 architecture University of Greenwich landscape educator Tom Turner referred to him
563 as ‘the most important landscape and planning theorist of the twentieth century’, and
564 the ‘founder of landscape planning in Britain’ (Turner, 1987, pp.1, 7). As a result he
565 featured as a red thread through Turner’s *Landscape Planning* (1987). Remarkably a
566 1971 book with the same title by Hackett did not once list him that suggests a
567 changing perception of the nature of landscape planning, which he saw as something
568 new and modern and to whom any engagement with history would have been seen as
569 subversive. Remarkably it is the modernist Arthur Korn who lists Geddes as one of
570 the ‘moderns’ together with Mumford and Abercrombie, despite them having an
571 alternative, place specific, approach (Korn, 1953, p.83). Turner quoted primarily from
572 various of Geddes’s Indian reports, presumably through the lens of Tyrwhitt. He had
573 had a long interest in Geddes that was awakened on his first day of study in landscape
574 architecture at Edinburgh when the whole class was taken to the Outlook Tower.

575
576 The book commenced with a quote of Mumford’s, and after defining landscape
577 progressed with Geddes’s concept of ‘good place’, eutopia, as opposed to utopia,
578 meaning no place, or no where. It then acknowledged Geddes as one of those who
579 helped to move the focus of the landscape profession to the public domain, his
580 commentary on drainage systems for cities (Turner, 1987, p.109), environmental
581 benefits of water tanks in India (Turner, 1987, p.116), observations on children’s play
582 (Turner, 1987, p.161), his recommendations for survey, appraisal and analysis
583 (Turner, 1987, p.185); while finishing with a quote from *Geddes in India* on
584 specialisation that continues to resonate today: “Each of the various specialists
585 remains too closely concentrated upon his single specialism, too little awake to those
586 of others. Each sees clearly and seizes firmly one petal of the six-lobed flower of life
587 and tears it apart from the whole” (Turner, 1987, p.189). Turner’s next book took the
588 Geddesian approach a step further. *City as Landscape: A post-modern view of design
589 and planning* credited Geddes with the use of ‘environmental layers’ as a basis for
590 analysis and planning (Turner, 1995, p.57), and the introduction of the survey-
591 analysis-design method (Turner, 1995, pp.39, 145).

592
593 The landscape architect and Edinburgh educator Catharine Ward Thompson explored
594 Geddes through one project, the Edinburgh Zoological Garden, which she treated as
595 the microcosm of his ideas. This zoo was a commission that Geddes had obtained in
596 1913 for his expertise in ‘landscape gardening’, and executed with Frank Mears, and
597 his daughter Norah Geddes. In his 1904 Dunfirmline report he had discussed the
598 importance of gardens and pet’s corners in the education of children and it had also
599 included a proposal for a zoo. The design was heavily influenced by the naturalistic

600 scenes in Carl Hagenbeck's zoo at Stellingen, near Hamburg, and was referred to as
601 the Scottish Zoological Park. Ward Thompson concluded how:

602 ... Geddes's model for the zoo and his approach to the design of didactic
603 landscapes, revisited, can assist in "joined-up thinking at the landscape scale,
604 and point to ways that immersion in and understanding of local place can be
605 consistent with a grasp of the commonalities of experience that reflect
606 mankind's engagement with environment across the globe- "thinking globally,
607 acting locally", in the words of UN local Agenda 21 (1993).

608 She thus linked this to present day concerns and her own research confirming that:

609 Geddes recognised very well the implications of growing up in a world where
610 access to nature and engagement with natural processes was denied, the sterile
611 and repressive education and desolate play environments that led to antisocial
612 behaviour. The message seems strikingly relevant a century later, as we find
613 new evidence of our need to engage with nature and to understand the many
614 levels at which it offers benefits to health, well-being and a sustainable future.

615 Additionally she noted that:

616 Geddes's work is also an important precedent for those wishing to understand
617 the "hereness" of the local and how to translate that understanding through
618 landscape planning and design that recognises the city and its region as one,
619 environmental whole (Catharine Ward Thompson, 2006, pp.80-93).

620 Ward Thompson hereby reaffirmed the scope of the landscape profession and its
621 social relevance.

622

623 Though born in Scotland, Geddes was much an internationalist and his ideas were
624 relevant in different parts of the world, although they have perhaps not always been
625 acknowledged as such. When the Tyrwhitt trained émigré landscape architect
626 Scotsman and University of Pennsylvania educator Ian McHarg (1920-2001)
627 published his *Design with Nature* (1969) it set out to 'deal with man's relation to his
628 environment as a whole'. The regional approach adopted and the titles of the chapters
629 reveal the influence of Geddes who is not acknowledged, but for the choice of his
630 disciple Mumford to write the introduction. In this Mumford declared that this text
631 provided 'the foundations for a civilization that will replace the polluted, bulldozed,
632 machine-dominated, dehumanized, explosion-threatened world that is even now
633 disintegrating and disappearing before our eyes. In presenting us with a vision of
634 organic exuberance and human delight, which ecology and ecological design promise
635 to open up for us, McHarg revives the hope for a better world.' (McHarg, 1971edn.)
636 Yet McHarg was not as generous as Mumford and never fully acknowledged his debt
637 to Geddes, at most declaring that he found him 'fascinating but difficult to read' –
638 which of course it was- (McHarg, 1996, p.112; see also Whiston Spirn, p.102), while
639 acknowledging his 'brilliant mind' (McHarg, 1996, p.93).

640

641 The Californian landscape architecture educator John Tillman Lyle (1934-1998) was
642 much clearer in acknowledging the contributions of McHarg, and particularly Geddes,
643 whom he uses to structure his 1994 book *Regenerative Design for Sustainable
644 Development*. The first half referred to the 'paleotechnic' a term Geddes had used to
645 explain the evolution of cities as referring to the 'fossil-fuel-powered industrial period
646 of the past two centuries', while the latter period was referred to as 'neotechnic' as
647 'founded partly on regenerative systems'. Lyle noted how Geddes had sought a
648 solution to the environmental problems by means of planning at a regional scale
649 (Lyle, 1994, pp. 13-14, 283). During the 1950s and '60s natural resources were

650 largely overlooked as ‘fundamental considerations in shaping the environment’, but
651 McHarg’s publication had countered this and the ‘landscape approach has gained
652 steadily since then in stature and sophistication’ (Lyle, 1985, p.45).

653

654 One of those who took up the helm and acknowledged Geddes was Michael Hough
655 (1928-2013), an Edinburgh trained architect, who was also a student at McHarg’s
656 course at the University of Pennsylvania, and became a leading landscape practitioner
657 and educator in Ontario. His 1995 *Cities and Natural Process: A basis for*
658 *sustainability* that dealt with ‘urban design issues that focus on existing cities’
659 commenced with a quote from Geddes: “civics as an art has to do not with imagining
660 an impossible no-place where all is well, but making the most and best of each and
661 every place, especially in the city in which we live” (Hough, 1995, 2004edn, p.2). He
662 acknowledged Geddes, McHarg and Philip Lewis as some of the voices ‘concerned
663 with bringing together nature and human habitat’ who have shown that

664 the processes which shape the land, and the limitless complexity of life forms
665 that have been created over evolutionary time, provide the indispensable basis
666 for shaping human settlements. The independence of one life process on
667 another, the interconnected development of living and physical processes of
668 earth, climate, water, plants and animals, the continuous transformation and
669 recycling of living and non-living materials, these are the elements of the self
670 perpetuating biosphere that sustain life on earth and which give rise to the
671 physical landscape. They are the central determinants that must shape all
672 human activities on the land (Hough, 2004ed., p.5).

673

674 It was from this premise that the city would have to be understood in connection with
675 its rural hinterland, i.e. within its regional landscape that was seen as the framework
676 for shaping the urban form (Hough, 2004ed., p.219).

677

678 Regional approaches in the Geddesian manner were also promoted by landscape
679 architects on the European mainland, and advanced quickly as a result of post-war
680 reconstruction in The Netherlands, in Germany and the creation of new landscapes in
681 Israel (see: Crowe and Miller, 1964). It was Artur Glikson, who emigrated to Israel
682 after attaining an architectural degree in Berlin in 1935, and later promoted the
683 theories of Geddes. He must have come across his ideas while working for the
684 National Planning Department in Israel, though Mumford, who edited Glikson’s last
685 book after his early death, claimed he had introduced Glikson to Geddes’s work
686 (Glikson, 1971, p.xiii). Glikson referred to Geddes as ‘the “father” of modern local
687 and regional planning’ (Glikson, 1955, p.20 (pp.10, 73, 78-85)). Glikson became an
688 authority and explained Geddes’s theories and related these to various audiences
689 including landscape architecture, e.g. summarizing proceedings for the eighth
690 congress of the International Federation of Landscape Architects, held in Israel in
691 1962 (Crowe and Miller, Vol.2 1964, pp.106-8; see also Glikson, 1971, pp.45-51).

692

693 Of greater importance in post-war Europe, however, was Mumford in promoting the
694 ideas as evolved from Geddes. The Dutch landscape architect Jan Bijhouwer (1898-
695 1974) became a good friend of Mumford and promoted similar ideas (Andela, 2011).
696 His works included a seminal survey of the Dutch landscape that explored how people
697 related to the landscape and had created regionally distinctive types (Bijhouwer, 1971,
698 2nd edn. 1977). In the mid 1950s one of Bijhouwer’s students, Meto Vroom, studied
699 with McHarg for two years before returning and ultimately chairing the landscape

700 architecture programme of the University at Wageningen, and further developing
701 Geddes's ideas. In most of these instances where Geddesian thinking was
702 acknowledged the subject matter was related to regional surveys and projects, both
703 rural and urban.

704
705 More recently Geddes was quoted for another cause: in an attempt to legitimise a new
706 discipline of landscape urbanism, the landscape architect Shanti Fjord Levy produced
707 an online article entitled 'Grounding landscape urbanism'. This claimed that
708 'landscape and urbanism have been held apart by professional boundaries, which are
709 reinforced by divergent tactics and working scales', and she suggested that the hybrid
710 methods had encouraged new ways of thinking. While quoting Charles Waldheim's
711 definition of landscape urbanism from *The Landscape Urbanism Reader* (2006) as
712 promoting "disciplinary realignment where landscape supplants architecture's role as
713 the basic building block of urban design", she rightly questioned his claims of
714 innovation. On account of endangering herself on being dismissed as a historian
715 'perhaps because the alarm these theorists express seems antiquated in a post-
716 industrial urban realm- a re-examination of their views reveals a legacy that values
717 interrelationships between culture and landscape, urban and rural.' She found these
718 interrelationships in the theories of Geddes, Mumford and Benton MacKaye and
719 believed that rather than hinder these would 'bolster landscape urbanism's potential to
720 develop key strategies of urban sustainability, drawing on relationships embedded in
721 the landscape to cultivate vital, rooted cities.' (Shanti Levi, 2011)

722

723 **Conclusions**

724 The above has shown that Geddes's contribution to landscape architecture was both
725 significant and lasting. Firstly, by introducing an integrated, multidisciplinary
726 approach he changed the way we looked at, and considered, cities. This necessitated
727 an enriched vocabulary which discussed cities in a new way, popularising a
728 Darwinian terminology with cities being considered as living evolving beings with
729 heart, lungs and arteries, as well as introducing words that seemed to capture the city
730 more accurately, inventing 'conurbation' and popularizing 'megalopolis'. Principally
731 cities were seen as a cultural product created by the people living in them, with their
732 histories and aspirations, rather than some architectural form. Secondly he introduced
733 the profession of 'landscape architecture' (rather than landscape gardening as it had
734 previously been known) for Great Britain, and he provided it with a task and
735 challenge: landscape-making as the master art.

736

737 Since 1930 when landscape architecture was established as the name for the
738 profession in Great Britain it has become a recognized discipline. Yet this has not
739 gone without challenges; the discipline has faced a number of threats relating to the
740 scope, seeing the emergence of sub-disciplines, such as urban design, landscape
741 urbanism and garden design. At the same time town planning as a discipline in
742 today's context is poorly understood, especially in an international perspective, and
743 university departments are provided with a new identity and a new name. Like
744 schools of architecture they are broadening their remit generating new courses in
745 urban design. While this might be seen perhaps as evidence that there is a need for a
746 clearer understanding between the various disciplines, it also suggests that boundaries
747 are not clearly defined, and that we should pursue integrated approaches, rather than
748 the silos put up by the various disciplines trying to defend their territories. Landscape
749 architecture in Great Britain has traditionally welcomed professionals from a wide

750 range of backgrounds, now it is timely to collaborate with these various disciplines.
751 By naming and changing and an open-minded approach Geddes not only generated
752 new professions he also encouraged interdisciplinarity and warned against inadvertent
753 specialisation.

754
755 Part of the strength of Geddes's thinking is, that, though there is a canon, this
756 provides a way of seeing, or method, rather than a prescriptive set of guidelines. Thus
757 there remains relevance for those encountering new (environmental) problems and
758 challenges in tackling these through regional approaches, and holistically. One aspect
759 that is less well, or even poorly, defined in the Geddesian approach is that it does not
760 necessarily provide a framework for beautiful design, as was observed by landscape
761 architect and town planner Christopher Tunnard who warned that these ethically
762 sound places do not necessarily create beautiful cities, and that in reading Geddes 'we
763 may expect a long lesson in civics but not in art' (Tunnard, 1953, p.52).

764
765 It is interesting to see that it exactly appears to be the fact that Geddes's writings
766 cannot claim to be discipline specific that they continue to inspire new generations.
767 His ideas and approaches do not provide a conclusive answer to today's problems
768 faced by cities, but they do provide an incentive to new generations to tackle
769 environmental problems, both outside the usual political boundaries and outside the
770 box.

771

772 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 773 Andela, Gerrie, *J.T.P.Bijhouwer: Grensverleggend landschapsarchitect* (Rotterdam:
774 Uitgeverij 010, 2011)
775 Anon., 'The landscape architect: a new professional society', *The Manchester*
776 *Guardian* 12 February 1930, p.4
777 Bijhouwer, J.T.P., *Het Nederlandse Landschap* (Amsterdam: Kosmos, 1971, 2nd edn.
778 1977)
779 Boardman, Philip, *Patrick Geddes: Maker of the future* (Durham: University of North
780 Carolina, 1944)
781 Boardman, Philip, *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes: Biologist, town planner, re-*
782 *educator, peace-warrior* (London: Routledge, 1978), p.230 the letterhead is illustrated
783 here on a letter dating from 1907.
784 Carter, Huntly, 'The garden of Geddes', *The Forum* October 1915, pp.455-471;
785 November 1915, pp.588-595
786 Colvin, Brenda *Land and Landscape* (London: John Murray, 1947)
787 Colvin, Brenda, 'Quarterly notes', *Landscape and Garden* 1/3 (1934), p.45
788 Colvin, Brenda, Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, *Trees for Town and Country: A selection of sixty*
789 *trees suitable for general cultivation in England* (London: Lund Humphries, 1947)
790 Crowe, Sylvia and Zvi Miller, *Shaping Tomorrow's Landscape: Vol.2: The landscape*
791 *architect's role in the changing landscape* (Amsterdam: Djambatan, 1964)
792 E.B.H., 'Human Ecology' [review], *The Geographical Journal* 87/6 (1936), pp.560-
793 561
794 Edwards, Arthur M., *The Design of Suburbia: A critical study in environmental*
795 *history* (London: Pembrige, 1981)
796 Forshaw, J.H. and Patrick Abercrombie, *County of London Plan* (London: Macmillan,
797 1943); Patrick Abercrombie, *Greater London Plan 1944* (London: HMSO, 1945)

798 Geddes, Patrick, 'The civic survey of Edinburgh' in RIBA, *town Planning*
799 *Conference, London, 10-15 October 1910: Transactions* (London: RIBA, 1911),
800 pp.537-574 (574)
801 Geddes, Patrick, *Cities in Evolution*, edited by Jaqueline Tyrwhitt (London: Williams
802 and Norgate, 1949)
803 Geddes, Patrick, *Cities in Evolution: An introduction to the town planning movement*
804 *and to the study of civics* (1915; London: Ernest Benn, 1968)
805 Geddes, Patrick, *City Development: A report to the Carnegie Dunfermline Trust*
806 (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1973 reprint of 1904 edition), introduction by Peter
807 Green
808 Geddes, Patrick, *City Development: A report to the Carnegie Dunfermline Trust*
809 (Edinburgh, Westminster, Bournville: Geddes, 1904)
810 Glikson, Artur, *Regional Planning and Development: Six lectures delivered at the*
811 *Institute of Social Studies at The Hague, 1953* (Leiden, Sijthoff, 1955)
812 Glikson, Artur, *The Ecological Basis of Planning* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff,
813 1971)
814 Hackett, Brian *Man, Society and Environment* (London: Percival Marshall, 1950)
815 Harvey, Sheila *Reflections on Landscape* (Aldershot: Gower, 1987)
816 Hough, Michael, *Cities and Natural Process: A basis for sustainability* (London:
817 Routledge, 1995, 2004edn)
818 <http://scenariojournal.com/article/shanti-levy/> , article dated: Fall 2011
819 Jellicoe, Geoffrey and Susan, *The Landscape of Man* (London: Thames and Hudson,
820 1975)
821 Korn, Arthur, *History Builds the Town* (London: Lund Humphries, 1953)
822 Lanchester, H.V., 'Park systems for great cities' *The Builder* 95 (1908), pp.343-348;
823 see:
824 Loudon, John Claudius, *The Landscape Gardening and Landscape Architecture of the*
825 *late Humphry Repton, Esq.* (London: Longman, 1840)
826 Lyle, John Tillman, *Design for Human Ecosystems: Landscape, land use and natural*
827 *resources* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1985)
828 Lyle, John Tillman, *Regenerative Design for Sustainable Development* (New York:
829 John Wiley, 1994)
830 Mawson, Thomas H., *The Art and Craft of Garden Making* (second edition: London:
831 Batsford, 1901)
832 Mawson, Thomas H., *The Life and Work of an English Landscape Architect* (London:
833 Richards Press, 1927)
834 McHarg, Ian L. *Design with Nature* (New York: Doubleday, 1971edn.)
835 McHarg, Ian L., *A Quest for Life: An autobiography* (New York, etc.: John Wiley,
836 1996)
837 Meller, Helen, *Patrick Geddes: Social evolutionist and city planner* (London:
838 Routledge, 1990)
839 Mercer, F.A., *Gardens and Gardening* (London: The Studio, 1939), pp.7, 14-15
840 *Oxford English Dictionary* online, 'landscape architecture'
841 Repton, Humphry, *Sketches and Hints on Landscape Gardening* (London: Bulmer,
842 1794)
843 Repton, Humphry, *Observations on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening*
844 (London: Taylor, 1803)
845 Shenstone, William, 'Unconnected thoughts on gardening' in *The Works in Verse and*
846 *Prose of William Shenstone* Vol.ii (London: Dodsley, 1764)

847 Shoshkes, Ellen, *Jaqueline Tyrwhitt: A transnational life in urban design and*
848 *planning* (Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate, 2013)
849 Shoshkes, Ellen, 'Jacqueline Tyrwhitt translates Patrick Geddes for post World War
850 Two planning', *Landscape and Urban Planning* 166 (2017), pp. 15-24
851 The National Trust', *Times*, 26 November 1896, p.8; 'The National Trust', *Times*, 10
852 July 1897, p.15
853 Tunnard, Christopher, *Gardens in the Modern Landscape* (London: Architectural
854 Press, 1938)
855 Tunnard, Christopher, *The City of Man* (London: Architectural Press and New York:
856 Charles Scribner, 1953)
857 Turner, Tom, *City as Landscape: A post-modern view of design and planning*
858 (London, etc: Spon, 1995)
859 Turner, Tom, *Landscape Planning* (London, etc.: Hutchinson, 1987)
860 Tyrwhitt, Jaqueline, 'Patrick Geddes: The Valley Section' in Dennis Sharp, *Planning*
861 *and Architecture: Essays presented to Arthur Korn by the Architectural Association*
862 (New York: George Wittenborn, 1967), pp.49-57
863 Tyrwhitt, Jaqueline, *Patrick Geddes in India* (London: Lund Humphries, 1947)
864 Ward Thompson, Catharine, 'Patrick Geddes and the Edinburgh Zoological Garden:
865 Expressing universal processes through local place', *Landscape Journal* 25/1 (2006),
866 pp.80-93
867 Welter, Volker M., *Biopolis: Patrick Geddes and the City of Life* (Cambridge Mass,
868 London: MIT, 2002), p.18 which is quoted from Amelia Defries, *The Interpreter*
869 *Geddes: The man and his gospel* (London: Routledge, 1927)
870 Welter, Volker M., 'Commentary on "Thinking organic, acting civic: The paradox of
871 planning for cities in evolution" by Michael Batty and Stephen Marshall, and
872 "Jaqueline Tyrwhitt translates Patrick Geddes for post World War Two planning" by
873 Ellen Shoshkes' *Landscape and Urban Planning* 166 (2017), pp.25-26
874 Woudstra, Jan, 'Park policy and design of public parks in London, 1900-1945', *Die*
875 *Gartenkunst* 27/1 (2015), pp.119-138
876 Whiston Spirn, Anne, 'Ian McHarg, landscape architecture and environmentalism:
877 ideas and methods in context', in *Environmentalism in Landscape Architecture*
878 edited by Michel Conan (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2000), pp.97-114
879 Wright, Myles, *Lord Leverhulme's Unknown Venture: The Lever Chair and the*
880 *Beginnings of Town and Regional Planning 1908-48* (London: Hutchison Benham,
881 1982)