

The four columns for *disP* 2017 have been dedicated to planning history. I have enjoyed an eagle's-eye view of this field over the past five years as editor-in-chief of *Planning Perspectives*. This journal's title doesn't give a clear indication of content, as its editor frequently has to point out. It's amazing how many would-be authors don't bother to check the content of previous issues or read the statement of 'Aims and Scope' on the home-page. If they do they'll find a categorical statement that *Planning Perspectives* is intended 'for scholars pursuing the histories of planning, plans and planners. . . . Contributions must report original historical research, papers of a comparative or thematic nature are welcomed, and no historical period is excluded'. Manuscripts that involve no original research, have no historical dimension, or address other topics get politely rejected, or positively encouraged to switch the submission to a sister-journal such as *Cities*, *Journal of Urban Design*, *Regional Studies* or *disP*.

Though planning history is a niche specialism it has a critical mass of many hundreds of scholars worldwide, constituted as the global community through the biennial conferences of the International Planning History Society, IPHS. The call for papers currently issued for IPHS2018 in Yokohama, Japan, follows a long run of successful meetings in Delft, St Augustine (Florida), São Paulo, Istanbul, Chicago, New Delhi, Barcelona, Letchworth Garden City, Helsinki, Sydney, Thessaloniki, Richmond VA, and Tokyo. Because of the network's British origins, three of its first four conferences were held in English cities - Birmingham, London and Brighton. However a browse through delegate lists or recent issues

of *Planning Perspectives* reveals a near-global scholarly community. The final four issues during my stint as editor-in-chief contained research papers from or about Australia, Belgium, Brazil, former Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, North Korea, Palestine, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, former USSR, the USA and Venezuela. Remembering Klaus Kunzmann's strictures against the Anglo-Saxon hegemony in academic publishing, one wonders whether a journal in any other language could draw on such an immense breadth of research .

It is true that *Planning Perspectives* is published, like *disP*, by the British-based company Taylor & Francis and its editorial office has so far been housed in an English university - currently Oxford Brookes, under the editorship of John and Margaret Gold. It is also true that planning history in its early years displayed an Anglo-centric preference for diffusion narratives in which British pioneers innovated, the rest of the world followed. This centre-periphery perspective maybe worked for garden cities and green belts but offered no basis for understanding the intricate criss-crossing diffusion patterns and (as geographers say) 'policy mobilities' of land use zoning, highway design, Modern Movement housing, the boulevard, rural electrification or the *mikrorayon*. The wonderful thing about our field has been the researching and sharing of these diverse narratives via the *lingua franca* of the English language. Through provision of free language-editing support *Planning Perspectives* has tried to remain accessible to historians irrespective of their mother tongue. We've been richly rewarded in terms of the historiography of planning ideas and techniques and their transmission through market forces, or regulatory practices, or colonial

and neo-colonial channels, or the agency of professional consultants, or the whim of tyrants.

Browsing through the past few years, it's remarkable how many papers have broken new ground through original primary research: examples include the work of Natallia Barykina (University of Toronto) on the involvement of western designers in the planned industrialisation of first Soviet 5-year plan; Andreas Butter and Annika Levels (Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space) on the extensive international connections of East German architects and urbanists during the GDR era; Arun Chandu (University of Melbourne) on the development of Australia's first jetport-city at Tullamarine in the 1960s; Beatriz Fernández Agueda (Universidad Politécnica de Madrid) on the little-known trans-Atlantic career of the French urbanist Léon Jaussely; Laurel Harbin and Kristin Larsen (University of Florida) on the translation of American New Deal settlement design to post-independence India. The careful multi-lingual researches of Kosuke Matsubara (University of Tsukuba) have brought to light the previously unknown career of the Japanese architect-urbanist Gyoji Banshoya first in Paris, and then in North Africa and the most ancient cities of the Middle East. Caroline Miller (Massey University) has been documenting early twentieth century encounters between indigenous Māori settlement and colonial planning norms. Richard Němec (Universitaet Bern) brings troubling discoveries from the archives of Hitler's attempted Teutonic transformation of Czech and Polish cities. Clément Orillard (École d'Urbanisme de Paris) offers a fresh perspective on European and American interaction in urban design. Stephania Proli (University of Bologna) documents the postwar Italian

contributions of Carlo Doglio and the radical movement for bottom-up regional reconstruction inspired and funded by the typewriter magnate Adriano Olivetti. Pablo Rabasco (Universidad de Sevilla) challenges conventional design histories of the Franco dictatorship with his analysis of the tropical modernism of settlements in Spanish Morocco. Renato Rego (Universidade Estadual de Maringá) has documented the ebb and flow of international design ideas in modern Brazil. Siim Sultson and Pille Metspalu (Tallinn Technical University and Tartu Ülikool respectively) reappraise the planning legacies of Soviet-era Estonia. Ahmet Tozoğlu (Abdullah Gul University) documents the conflicts and compromises over the connecting of Ottoman Istanbul to the European railway network in the 1880s.

I could go on, but this cross-section shows the global scope and freshness of scholarship in planning history today. A measure of the success of the IPHS has been the emergence of national and regional networks. For several years the Society for American City & Regional Planning History (SACRPH) has run excellent conferences with a U.S. focus. Shun-ichi Watanabe and the late Yorifusa Ishida have built a similar network in Japan. The first Latin-American conference of urban history was held in Santiago de Chile in November 2016. The Chinese are developing a formidable network under the leadership of Li Baihao of Southeast University and Zhang Bing of the China Academy of Urban Planning and Design.

Interestingly the Chinese network's high-quality journal - now on to its third issue - is called *Urban Planning History and Theory*. Those terms are not segregated, as in the Anglo-American and European traditions. I began my first

disP Kolumne with the observation that you can't plan the future without understanding the past, and a complaint about the omission of historical research from AESOP's Lisbon 2017 conference programme. By now I hope I've written enough about planning history to pique conference organisers, heads of planning schools and editors of planning journals into wanting a share of the action.