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EXPLORING THE REGION
1920-1926
3.1 Introduction

Despite some modest successes, the Belgium reconstruction campaign had largely resulted in failure. The IFHTP urgently needed an update of the garden city gospel to gain a new relevance. Projecting garden cities in the countryside simply did not provide an adequate solution to the pressing housing and town planning issues in the new post-war context, nor did it fit the notion of a rational, comprehensive town planning discipline that gained popularity among the backing of the IFHTP. The absence of direct competitors immediately after the War gave the IFHTP some slack, but surely its British leadership could not ignore the writings on the wall.

Available literature on planning history describes the international organisation as one of the most important players, if not the most important transnational player in the transnational debate on urban affairs in the Interbellum. This position suggests a remarkable transformation in the 1920s. But how did this transformation take shape? Literature hints at a reassessment of the outlook of the international body to meet a growing dissatisfaction with the way the British leadership ran the IFHTP. It does not explore the nature and extent of this transformation or investigate other possible motivations.

This chapter analyses the transformation of the IFHTP in the early 1920s. In his monograph of the British Garden Cities and Town Planning Association (GCTPA) Hardy provides a very rudimentary outline of the organisation and internal power balance of its international counterpart. Using the surviving minutes of the bodies of the IFHTP, a source that has not yet been properly studied, I want to expand Hardy’s outline and come up with explanations for change. Additionally, I want to analyse the changes of membership and the networks of the members. French historian Saunier has demonstrated the importance of transnational networks for the international trade of town planning ideas and experience, in which the IFHTP held a central position. He focuses on a handful of prominent activists that held executive positions in several international bodies, including the IFHTP, but he does not behold the full extent of (cross)membership of single organisations. By using the IFHTP as a case study I want to verify and possibly expand his assumptions. Are Saunier’s ‘men of good will’ indeed the people that define the course of the IFHTP, or are there other relevant players as well? Finally, I want to compare the organisation and membership of the IFHTP with the transnational civil society at large and the Urban International in particular. Do they share similar patterns or does the IFHTP follow a unique trajectory?

Literature exclusively focuses on the congresses, but the IFHTP did more. Usually literature only refers to single congresses – for example Bosma and de Ruijter to the 1924 congress in Amsterdam and Hall to the 1925 congress in New York – or provide a basic summary of the agenda of the congresses – for example Albers. A concise analysis of the congresses to trace an evolution has not been made yet. In this chapter I want to provide such an analysis by studying the activities as well as the central message that was disseminated through these activities. This analysis shall not be merely descriptive, but seeks plausible explanations for changes.
### Figure 3.1: Power Balance at Meetings of the Executive Committee (EXCO), Council (C) and Provisional Council (PR.C) of the IFHTP, 1919-1926, expressed in number of attendants (source: Minutes of meetings of the IFHTP, located at IFHP-Archives).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>EXCO</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>PR.C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.09.1925, Vienna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06.1925, London</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.09.1925, Paris</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.04.1925, New York</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.04.1925, New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.02.1925, Brussels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.10.1924, London</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.07.1924, Amsterdam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.07.1924, Amsterdam(1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.07.1924, Amsterdam(1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.05.1925, Brussels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.01.1924, Brussels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.08.1923, Gochenaug</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.08.1923, Gochenaug</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01.1023, Brussels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.10.1922, Paris</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10.1922, Paris</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.06.1024, London</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.06.1922, London</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.10.1921, London</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.09.1920, Brussels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.02.1920, London</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.01.1920, London</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.11.1919, London</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 From British extension to international body

British leadership
The previous reveals that the British remained firmly in the saddle immediately after the War. All official positions of power were held by GCTPA representatives. Combined with the fact that the IFHTP was still accommodated at the offices of the GCTPA in London, it is safe to conclude that the parent was still in control of its international offspring. It seems that this British domination rested on two pillars: “corporate culture” and active membership. The culture of decision-making in the IFHTP was characterized by an urge to uphold an image of harmony and unanimity. Explicit internal criticism was considered not done. As a consequence, the policy-making of the international body was characterized by a top-down structure, in which the (foreign) members had little to say. The secretaries Culpin and Purdom ran the IFHTP almost single-handedly.

The British domination was further intensified by active membership. Active membership is interpreted here as actively attending the meetings of the IFHTP and participating in the policy-making. The earliest meetings mainly attracted British members (see figure 3.2). But this situation was short-lived. In the course of 1922 the British lost their absolute majority among the active members. There seems to have been a correlation between the place of the meeting and the attendance. Meetings in London attracted a British majority, whereas at meetings on the Continent continental members had the upper hand. Because the earliest meetings of the IFHTP (up to 1922) were concentrated in London, the British members initially dictated the agenda.

Continental discontent
Prominent French and Belgian members like Bruggeman and Vinck increasingly made their way to the meetings of the bodies of the IFHTP. They resented the naturalness of British leadership. International collaboration under strict guidance of the GCTPA and the almost exclusive monopoly of British garden city experience that came with it, simply did not fit their idea of internationalism. French representative Bruggeman aptly put words to the continental discontent at a meeting of the Council in London on June 10th, 1922. Careful not to breach the harmonious culture of the IFHTP or to offend its British leaders, he raised the issue of the future of the IFHTP. Would it not be beneficial to widen its scope, to attract more members and provide for the affiliation of national housing and town planning organisations? Bruggeman suggested that it might be advisable to open a second office on the Continent and proposed to acknowledge the influential French periodical *La Vie Urbaine* as an official organ of the IFHTP, besides *Garden Cities and Town Planning* that thus far had acted as the sole mouthpiece of the IFHTP.

Bruggeman’s suggestions initiated profound changes in the organization. Strict guidance by the GCTPA was considered to be too narrow a foundation for post-war internationalism and measures were formulated to repair this deficit. The Council unanimously resolved that in future the IFHTP should operate independently, from its own office, with its own staff. Thus the IFHTP left the warm nest of the GCTPA to establish its own headquarters – still in the same building as the GCTPA. Harry Chapman was engaged as (paid) organizing secretary. Chapman quit his job as librarian of the GCTPA. Apparently, Honorary Secretary Purdom...
also gave up his position as officer of the GCTPA. Additionally, *La Vie Urbaine* was acknowledged as official organ of the IFHTP besides *Garden Cities and Town Planning*.

The severing of the ties with the GCTPA gained momentum at the 1922 Paris congress. The Council presented a new set of rules that was adopted by the Annual meeting. The new rules conveyed two distinct changes. The General Secretary, now called Organizing Secretary, was no longer regarded a separate body, to be controlled by the Executive Committee (1922 Rules, Article 7). Only honorary officers, not the Organizing Secretary, were ex officio members of all bodies of the organisation (1922 Rules, Article 8). Undoubtedly, these alterations served to restrain the free reign of the British secretaries. The second important change was the revision of membership qualifications (1922 Rules, Article 5). No longer was principal membership exclusively attributed to “Garden Cities and Town Planning Propagandist bodies” (1919 Rules, Article 5), which basically referred to the various garden cities associations in Europe, that had been the earliest foreign allies of the GCTPA. Now membership was open to “Garden City and Town Planning Propagandist, Educational or Professional bodies.” Additionally, membership was opened to public bodies and institutions dealing with housing and town planning. If a national federation of these potential members existed in a country, applications for membership could only be made through these national federations. Clearly, the continental members wanted the IFHTP to be a truly international collective of national societies, not an extension of the network of the GCTPA. To stress that the international organization was an international collaboration of countries, rather than individuals, the IFHTP amended its formal name from International Garden Cities and Town Planning Association to International Garden Cities and Town Planning Federation.
The reduction of the English grip was intensified and partly facilitated by other events that also occurred in 1922. The first, and probably most important, was the return of the Germans and Austrians. Eager to get re-admitted, the Germans and Austrians had repeatedly applied for membership after the War, but it would take until October 1922 before their pleas were finally rewarded. The Germans aspired active membership and claimed the seats in the bodies of the international organization they were entitled to. Although they counted among the most loyal allies of the British garden city workers before the War, they now sided with the continental faction that desired a more international outlook. Thus the ‘continental block’ gained votes in the Executive Committee and Council. More importantly, the Germans with their Städtebau and coherent regional planning regimes, as initiated at the Ruhrkohlenbezirk by Robert Schmidt, could easily rival with British views on housing and town planning. It was the intellectual baggage, rather than the new votes that had the bigger impact on the internal power balance.

The re-admittance of the Germans coincided with a reorganization of the Dutch participation. In June 1922 the Nederlandsch Instituut voor Volkshuisvesting en Stedebouw (NIVS) joined the IFHTP and took over the organisation of the Dutch participation from the Dutch Society of Architects. The Dutch architects had been faithful attendants of the conferences, but they had never taken an active interest in the policy-making. This changed under the NIVS. Its director, Dirk Hudig, immediately set out to increase the Dutch influence in the organization. Under Hudig the number of Dutch delegates and paper presenters at the congresses steadily increased. He also claimed the chairs in the internal bodies the Dutchmen were entitled to and he himself made it into the Executive Committee. Once in a position of power, Hudig joined the discontent continental members, which he already knew through his involvement in the International Housing Congresses.

From propagandist body to study platform
Although the organizational measures presented at the 1922 conference in Paris posed radical changes, they were only an overture to what was to follow at the Gothenburg congress in 1923. According to planning historian Hardy, in 1922 Montagu Harris had to retire as Chairman to make place for Henri Sellier who thus became the first non-British officer. However, in the 1922 conference report Sellier was listed as Chairman of the Executive Committee, whereas Harris was and remained Chairman of the Council. Rather than to dismiss a British officer, the British leadership chose to create a new office to keep the continental members satisfied. The curtain first fell for Harris at Gothenburg. During the meeting of the Council the suggestion was adopted to appoint a Chairman of the Council from the country that was to host the next congress. Although this decision was carefully phrased, effectively a British officer was being disposed. The principle of a circulating chairmanship prevented a return of a British Chairman on a permanent basis. Clearly, the naturalness of British leadership was no longer sacred.

The continental reticence to follow the British lead indiscriminately was perhaps even better felt in the sessions. For the first time British garden city workers felt a need to address growing criticisms of the garden city faith, criticisms that before had been persistently ignored. More importantly, the paper presentations revealed that the garden city concept alone was inadequate to solve regional planning issues. The continental members seized the opportunity to finish the (British) garden city monopoly and urged the study of a
comprehensive regional planning discipline. The British garden city workers did not want to lose face and wanted to reassess the relevance of the garden city idea in regional planning matters. Thus the next two conferences (Amsterdam 1924 and New York 1925) were exclusively dedicated to the definition of a regional town planning science that combined the merits of British garden city experience with established regional planning experiences from other countries. As a consequence the outlook of the IFHTP shifted from a propagandistic body to a study platform.

The Gothenburg gathering also had a positive effect on membership. The event attracted an unprecedented audience of between 250 and 300 delegates. Especially the growing participation from the other side of the Atlantic was noteworthy. The Americans participated with two papers and their representative John Nolen attended the meeting of the Council. In the following years a growing number of Americans found their way to the conferences and they were increasingly represented in the bodies of the international organisation. The IFHTP was quick to consolidate this growing American participation and strategically chose to hold its 1925 conference in New York. However, the American membership was not a truly active one. The Americans only showed up at the conferences and rarely attended meetings in between. As a consequence, their direct influence on the policy-making was marginal. But their intellectual baggage did have an influence. American (regional) town planning experience could easily rival with British experience, contributing to the dawning conclusion that an international regional town planning profession could not solely rest on British town planning doctrine. Additionally, the Gothenburg venue consolidated and increased (active) membership from the Nordic countries. A growing number of members from Scandinavia visited the congresses and started attending meetings on a more regular basis. So by late 1923 the initial British domination was counterbalanced by active membership from Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the Nordic countries. This active membership inspired many other national delegations to get more actively involved and from the mid-twenties onwards the diversity of membership was increasingly translated to the attendance of the meetings of its bodies.

In 1923 also the position of the *Garden Cities and Town Planning* as the foremost mouthpiece of the IFHTP came to an end. In 1922 *La Vie Urbaine* had already been acknowledged as official organ of the IFHTP besides this British periodical. Now *Boligsak I By og Bygd* (Norway) and *Tijdschrift voor Volkshuisvesting en Stedebouw* (Netherlands) were also qualified as official organs. More importantly, the IFHTP started issuing its own independent periodical called *The Bulletin of the International Garden Cities and Town Planning Federation*, that would become its main mouthpiece.

At its Amsterdam congress in 1924 the IFHTP evaluated its name to reflect the reorientation of its scope and subsequently it became the International Federation for Town and Country Planning and Garden Cities. Besides this change of names, the Rules saw another change in Amsterdam: the number of members of the Council, nominated by the Annual Meeting was quadrupled. This move was probably intended to increase the involvement of the new members. Especially the English benefitted from this alteration: the majority of the members selected for the Council by the Annual Meeting was of British origin. So the amendment might well have served as a British attempt, albeit unsuccessful, to counter the ‘continental take-over’.
The steady growth of the number of participants and the reorientation towards research ('survey') soon called for organisational measures. At the 1925 conference in New York it was therefore decided to consider a sectional division of the IFHTP and subsequently Bruggeman (F), Keppler (NL) and the two secretaries Purdom and Chapman were charged to work out suggestions. On the steamer back to Europe these four discussed the matter and came up with the recommendation to form four sectional committees, dedicated respectively to housing, garden cities, regional planning and town planning. This suggestion was adopted by the Executive Committee, but the definitive constitution of sections was temporarily shelved.  

The marriage of housing and regional planning

Especially the continental housing reformers were interested in the new sections. They had embraced the arrival of regional planning, especially because it heralded the end of the British garden city monopoly, but after two conferences almost entirely dedicated to this new topic, they were beginning to feel that the real issue was being neglected. So they jumped at the opportunity to place housing on the map once more. Moreover, they recognized an opportunity to revive the activities of the International Housing Congresses (IHC). After years of fruitless attempts to resurrect itself, the IHC wanted to dissolve itself and transfer its activities to another organisation. Through cross-membership it was familiar with the IFHTP and after informal meetings in Brussels and The Hague it had come to the conclusion that the housing section of the IFHTP would be the perfect candidate for the intended transfer, provided that this section had some independence. Obviously, the continental housing reformers felt that the IFHTP was still too British. A committee, the so called ‘Brussels-committee’, was installed to draft a proposal to the IFHTP. A little later the IFHTP received letters from Vinck and Hudig on behalf of this committee, proposing an amalgamation of the IFHTP and the IHC, urging the immediate formation of a housing section and suggesting changes to the rules of the IFHTP to enable the fusion.  

The proposal of the housing reformers was enthusiastically received by the IFHTP. The general principle of the immediate formation of a housing section was embraced and a subcommittee, composed of Bruggeman (France), Hudig (Netherlands), Otto (Germany) and Purdom (Britain), was charged to draft amended rules for the IFHTP and a memorandum on the functioning of the housing section. The ‘Brussels committee’ was invited to join a meeting of the Executive Committee at the 1926 Vienna Congress to discuss the redrafted rules and the memorandum.  

The joint-meeting took place on September 13th. The discussions centred on the redrafted rules. Firstly, the IFHTP settled for the name International Federation for Housing and Town Planning. More importantly, the rules opened the opportunity to create “within itself sections to deal with specific objects”. The members of the IFHTP would be registered as members of the sections they wanted to join. The central offices of the IFHTP would remain in London, but sections were allowed to establish their own secretariats in other countries. The competences of the sections, however, were not limitless. They were not allowed to make decisions on “questions involving the responsibility of the Federation”. Additionally, the standing orders of a section would only come into force after the approval of the Council. Bruggeman stated that the Executive Committee had come to the conclusion that all funds must be centralised but that special donations to the Federation could be devoted
to particular sectional work, provided that the Council approved. Basically, he introduced central financial control over the sections. Although the amendments introduced such a control, the housing reformers nevertheless thought their desires were adequately met and adopted the amended rules. The fusion was a fact. Sellier, who chaired the joint meeting, expressed his great pleasure to have presided a meeting “where so many workers in housing reform had agreed to unite all their efforts (...) for holding that meeting which can be considered as one of the most important steps made by the Federation since its inauguration and which will prove to be epoch-making in the future of the housing reform movement (...).”

3.3 Converging networks

Although an organizational analysis is instrumental to get a grip on the profound changes that occurred within the IFHTP in the first half of the 1920s, the IFHTP of course was more than a formal body with a hierarchical structure, characterized by an internal power struggle between a British top and continental members. Very likely the internal redistribution of power originated in and facilitated changes in membership and the (transnational) social networks at which intersection the IFHTP was located. Who were these members, what were their social networks and what was the position of the IFHTP in these social networks?

3.3.1 Officials and professionals

Who were the members in the period 1920-1926? Again there are no straightforward answers, as there is no surviving membership administration of the IFHTP. Fortunately, there are other sources available for the early 1920s, that are far more precise than the reports in Garden Cities and Town Planning, that were used in the previous chapter to map the contours of active membership in the earliest period. The oldest surviving minutes of meetings of the bodies of the IFHTP, from late 1919 onwards, contain attendance lists and give a good picture of who was actively involved in the policy-making. Additionally, the IFHTP started issuing conference reports in 1920. These reports render us valuable information about who presented papers, who actively participated in discussions and sometimes who had registered for the conference. Still, these sources do not reveal the total extent of membership. But the question is, whether we have to know all the members. It was a relatively small population of active members that defined the performance of the IFHTP.
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If we order the membership of the IFHTP according to the extent that it defined its appearance, we can create a pyramidal model (figure 3.3). At the top are the secretaries of the IFHTP: initially Ewart Culpin and C.B. Purdom, from 1922 onwards Harry Chapman and C.B. Purdom. These secretaries were responsible for the day-to-day business of the IFHTP. They handled the correspondence and organized the meetings of the internal bodies. They also were the most loyal attendants of these meetings, and as they had a vote in the decision-making as well, their influence was significant. This situation changed in 1922, as Chapman was appointed as organizing secretary without voting rights. However, this restriction did not affect Purdom’s position as honorary secretary.

The next level in the model is formed by the active members, who actively attended the meetings of the internal bodies and subcommittees of the IFHTP. Although the IFHTP was characterized by a spectacular growth of membership between 1920 and 1926 – in 1920 170 registered delegates attended the London conference; at the 1926 Vienna congress attendance had increased to over 1,000 delegates -, the active members only constituted a fraction of the total membership.25 The surviving minutes of the Executive Committee and the Council list only 59 different attending members. If we filter out the members who only attended one meeting, we register 39 active members that decided upon the agenda of the IFHTP (figure 3.4). A closer look at these active members learns that despite the changing power balance between British and continental representation, throughout the period 1920-1926 the British active members, foremost the British officers, in terms of continuity dominated the meetings. If we behold the composure of this relatively small population, it immediately becomes apparent that we are dealing with a lot of new names compared to the previous period (see 2.3). Of the 39 active members listed in figure 3.4, only 7 members, foremost British officers, are explicitly mentioned in the pre-war reports in Garden Cities and Town Planning26, and 4 members first turn up during the reconstruction campaign of the International Federation.27 What was the background of these active members? I will limit the identification and analysis of active membership to the larger national factions (minimum two active members): Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Austria and the United States.

British active membership
As of old, the British delegation held a leading position in the IFHTP. The GCTPA continued to deliver the principal officers of the international organisation, but the other British active members all had ties to the GCTPA as well. The majority of them also were affiliated to the Town Planning Institute (TPI) and or the National Housing and Town Planning Council (NHTPC). However, the TPI only joined the IFHTP in 1924 after it had shook off its initial propagandistic outlook to give way to the comparative international study of town planning, a mindset that far better suited the objectives of the TPI. Most British active members have already been identified in the previous chapter (2.3). Notable newcomers are George Pepler, who acted as representative for the TPI, new organizing secretary Harry Chapman and prominent British garden city campaigners Theodore G. Chambers, chairman of Welwyn Garden City ltd. and Richard Reiss, chairman of the GCTPA. Especially Pepler was very active, not only in the executive committee, but also in the subcommittees (see 3.5.3).
French active membership
The composure of the French delegation changed dramatically after the War. The French garden city association continued to participate on a negligible level. The undisputed French champion, Augustin Rey, left the IFHTP sometime after the 1920 London congress, probably resenting the re-admittance of the Germans. In the absence of the old French ringleaders, Auguste Bruggeman and Henri Sellier, both representing the Office Public des Habitations à Bon Marché du Département de la Seine, a French public housing body best known as the initiator of the chain of garden suburbs around Paris, became the dominant active French members. They moved in the circles around the influential Musée Social and were among the prime architects of the Association Française pour l’Etude de l’Aménagement et de
[i] Active members in the IFHTP: members of the Council (photo taken at the 1924 congress in Amsterdam), in the front row (from left to right) are Hendrik Petrus Berlage (Netherlands), Raymond Unwin (England), Emile Vinck (Belgium), Dirk Hudig (Netherlands), Ebenezer Howard (England), Auguste Bruggeman (France), John Sulman (Australia) and Gustav Langen (Germany).
[ii] Active members of the IFHTP: members of the executive committee (photo taken at the 1926 congress in Vienna), in the front row (from left to right) are Henry Wright (United States), Raymond Unwin (England), Anton Weber (Austria) and Robert Schmidt (Germany), in the back row are (from left to right) L.S.P. Scheffer (Netherlands), Dirk Hudig (Netherlands), Otokar Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia), Roman Heiligenthal (Germany), C.B. Purdom (England), John Nolen (United States), Emile Vinck (Belgium), Hans Kumpffmeyer (Austria), Auguste Bruggeman (France), Arie Keppler (Netherlands), Adolf Otto (Germany) and Kai Hendriksen (Denmark)
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*l’Extension des Villes*, an umbrella organisation founded in 1919 that united active propagandistic and professional bodies in one single institution. Bruggeman was the director of this new association that became the undisputed French representative of the IFHTP in France. However, the new French delegation had a larger picture in mind when referring to town planning than just the garden city concept. Although *faubourg-jardins* had become an obligatory element in French town plans by the 1920s, the French militants of town planning advocated a town planning that encompassed the whole of urban life, called by Marcel Poëte “science de la ville”, much in analogy to civics as proposed by Patrick Geddes. In this wider scientific approach the garden city idea was but one element of the whole, not a universal solution to all urban problems.

**Belgian active membership**
The contours of active Belgian membership were already defined during the Belgium reconstruction campaign (see 1.3.1). It was Emile Vinck, the director of the *Union des Villes et des Communes Belges* (UVCB) that stood up as Belgium’s most prominent active member, followed by architect-planner Raphael Verwilghen. After the War the *Société Nationale des Habitations à Bon Marché* (established by law in 1919) under the direction of Van Billoen joined the IFHTP, but this prominent national housing society never provided active members. Just like the new active French participants, the Belgian active members favoured a broad urban science, that embraced both municipal governance and (technical) town planning, as propagated by the *Union Internationale des Villes* – of which Vinck was also the director.

**German active membership**
German membership was only reinstated in late 1922. The old allies Adolf Otto and Bernard Kampffmeyer, representing the *Deutsche Gartenstadtgesellschaft*, were the first Germans to join the active members in the post-war period. In the wake of the re-admittance of the *Deutsche Gartenstadtgesellschaft* a flow of German professional and educational town planning organisations joined the IFHTP, and subsequently their representatives made it to the bodies of the international organisation. The new active German members included the renowned German town planning pioneers Joseph Stübben, representing the *Verband der Architekten- und Ingenieurvereine*, and Gustav Langen, representing his *Deutsche Archiv für Siedlungswesen*. Other noteworthy active German members included Robert Schmidt of the *Siedlungsverband Ruhrkohlbezirk* and prolific town planning authors Cornelius Gurlitt and Roman Heiligenthal. On December 4th 1924 the scattered German participation was united in one single body by the creation of the *Spitzenverband für Städtebau und Landesplanung*, of which Robert Schmidt became director. Otto and Kampffmeyer were the active members attending most meetings of the executive committee and council; Langen was the most important German contributor to the subcommittees (see 3.5.3).

**Dutch active membership**
The Dutch participation was taken over by the *Nederlandsch Instituut voor Volkshuisvesting en Stedebouw* (NIVS), represented by Dirk Hudig. Also the NIVS by no means was a propagandist body devoted to garden cities. Its background lay in the housing reform movement. The affiliation with the IFHTP had been an issue of heated internal debates, for prominent members such as Bakker Schut considered the garden city concept useless for the Netherlands. Nevertheless, in the end a majority favoured Hudig’s proposal to join as a
means to stay in touch with the latest international town planning experiences. Arie Keppler, L.S.P Scheffer and Dirk Hudig became the most active NIVS members in the IFHTP.

**Scandinavian active membership**

Norway was the first Scandinavian country to provide active members. Christian Gierlöff of the *Norsk Foreningen av Boligreformer*, a Norwegian housing reform association with an explicit orientation towards British garden city experience, visited England in 1918 to study the British examples. In return, Richard Reiss toured Norway in 1919 to give lectures on garden cities. This tour might well account for the unprecedented large delegation of Norwegians turning up at the 1920 congress in London of the IFHTP and partaking in the post-congress tour that was especially arranged for them. After the London meeting Norwegian active membership shrank to a more modest size, with primarily Gierlöff taking care of the continuity, closely followed by Norwegian town planning professor Sverre Pedersen. These Norwegians were among the most faithful allies of the British leadership of the IFHTP.

Sweden’s active membership started in 1920 in the person of diplomat Erik Sjöstrand, an active (international) campaigner of the labour movement. He was Swedish Social Attaché accredited to the International Labour Office from 1924-1933. His participation in the labour movement had brought him in close contact with prominent socialists such as Sellier and Vinck. Unsurprisingly, he shared their vision of a broad urban science covering municipalism and (technical) town planning. The other prominent Swedish active member was Albert Lilienberg, city architect of Gothenburg and honorary member of the TPI. He played a vital role in the organisation of the 1923 Gothenburg congress and showed his best side in the subcommittees (3.5.3). The many garden suburbs in Sweden, especially those at Gothenburg and Stockholm, proved that the garden city idea had hit fertile soil in Sweden.

The 1923 Gothenburg congress marked the start of active membership from Finland. The most important active Finnish members were Yrjo Harvia of the *Suomen Kaupunkiliitto* (Finnish Union of Towns) and Einar Böök of the *Asuntoreformiyhdistys*, a Helsinki based housing reform association. Finnish historian Katri Lento has demonstrated that Finnish housing reformers and town planning campaigners were inspired by foreign garden city experiences, especially the garden suburbs in Sweden.

The Gothenburg venue also marked the arrival of active Danish representatives. The most prominent Danish active members were the housing reformers Dalgaard and Frederik Boldsen of respectively *Faellesorganisationen af Almennyttige Danske Boligselkaber* and *Københavns Almindelige Boligselkab* and town planners Kai Hendriksen and Aage Bjerre of the *Dansk Byplanlaboratorium* (Danish town planning laboratory, established in 1921). The Danes were very susceptible to British garden city experience.

**Austrian active membership**

For the previous period (1913-1920) I was unable to gather particulars about active membership from Austria. Culpin mentioned Max Ermers as the official Austrian contact of the GCTPA in his *The Garden City movement Up-to-date* (1913), but the reports in *Garden Cities and Town Planning* on the events of the IFHTP simply do not mention names of Austrian participants. After the reinstatement of Austrian membership in 1922, Hans
Kampffmeyer, representing the Österreichische Gartenstadt- und Siedlungsgesellschaft, became the dominant active member from Austria. Kampffmeyer of course is not an unknown name. We already encountered this cousin of Bernard Kampffmeyer of the Deutsche Gartenstadtgesellschaft, as a prominent exponent of the pre-war German garden city movement. The other active Austrian member was a Stadtrat of Vienna, Anton Weber.39

American active membership

The American participation changed dramatically after the War. The Christian socialists did not return. Instead, a growing stream of housing and town planning professionals crossed the Atlantic to learn more about European housing and town planning experience. The American active members mainly stemmed from three organisations. Lawrence Veiller represented the National Housing Association (1911).40 John Nolen represented the American City Planning Institute (1917) - the American equivalent of the TPI - of which Thomas Adams was one of the founding fathers.41 The third organisation was the Regional Planning Association of America (1923), represented by architects Clarence Stein, Henry Wright and Frederick Bigger.42

Changing patterns of membership

If we analyse the population of active members in the bodies of the IFHTP as a whole, a distinct pattern becomes evident. Although representatives of the British garden city movement returned in a leading capacity after the war, the composition of active members in the first half of the 1920s shows a distinct drop of representatives of the garden city movement. Benoît-Lévy and his French Garden City Association had fallen into disgrace in the town planning circles of his country, the Dutch and Belgian garden cities associations had fallen apart and the Spanish La Sociedad Civica La Ciudad Jardin had fallen into a stage of inactivity after the departure of its principal champion C. Montoliu. Their departure was compensated by the arrival of new garden city enthusiasts from Scandinavia and a steady upsurge of new members, arriving from the adjoining spheres of housing reform, municipalism and (technical) town planning. This trend was not confined to the active members, but can also be found among the prominent contributors and “other members” as represented in figure 3.3. Many active members were also prominent contributors (paper presenters and active debaters at the congresses). Moreover, as a rule the active members handpicked prominent contributors. The “other members”, the anonymous participants at the congresses, must have been friends, acquaintances, colleagues and admirers that were recruited through the networks of the active members and prominent contributors. For example, the archives of the NIVS reveal how its director Dirk Hudig actively recruited paper presenters and members for the bodies of the IFHTP from the small circle around the Stedebouwkundige Raad (Town Planning Council), a body of the NIVS that united the leading town planners and housing reformers in the Netherlands. Additionally, it shows that Hudig was effectively recruiting new members for the international organisation, resulting in a steady increase of Dutch participation at the congresses.43

3.3.2 Interwoven nebulae

The congresses of the IFHTP were first and foremost an international platform where protagonists of the housing reform and town planning movements could meet and exchange knowledge and experience. As such, they offered an ideal opportunity for members to
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maintain and expand their international social networks and plug into the transnational trade of housing and town planning ideas. Because of their physical performance these conferences posed a valuable asset to the networks of both affiliated organisations and individual members. After the War this role as international platform significantly gained importance. French historian Saunier has adequately pointed out that it was the First World War that compelled rationalisation of international contacts.44

The IFHTP fared well under this new surge of transnationalism and managed to secure a steady growth in the early 1920s. This growth was partly facilitated by the inactivity of the International Housing Congresses (IHC) and Union Internationale des Villes (UIV) immediately after the War. The UIV first successfully resurrected at its 1924 congress in Amsterdam.45 The IHC never got on its feet again and was eventually swallowed by the IFHTP in 1926.46 The members of these inactive organisations resorted to the IFHTP and through internal dialogue strived to alter the naturalness of British leadership and the almost exclusive monopoly of the garden city idea that came with it to meet their own agenda. Even the most fanatic hardliners of the garden city faith increasingly acknowledged that the narrow confines of a strict garden city interpretation had to be breached to gain relevance and backing.

The flow of new members from the two inactive organisations was of the utmost importance for the transformation from propagandistic garden city organisation to international (comparative) town planning study platform. Before the War, the IFHTP had only occupied a niche within the broader Urban Internationale, but now it was propelled to the very heart of this international plane for the debate of urban affairs. In the 1920s it became the foremost constituent body of the Urban Internationale besides the UIV.47 Its membership increased dramatically and the intricate constellation of networks, of which it was at the heart, rapidly branched out. However, in this steadily expanding universe, the centrality of the British secretaries in these networks diminished.48 The new active members already knew each other in various capacities, mainly through involvement in the UIV and IHC, and did not need the intermediation of the British secretaries to contact each other. It seems that they used their interconnection to sideline the control of the British secretaries over the networks and effectively form a “continental block”, aimed at reducing the British grip over the IFHTP.

How did the social networks of the IFHTP perform? Looking at the conferences we can discern an international community of housing reformers and town planners from different countries, thus bringing together the social networks of the individual delegates and the organisations they represented. However, it is quite difficult to clarify the connections between them and to evaluate the unity of this community as a whole. A sort of looseness seems to surround the participating national societies and their ties, a looseness that was reflected in the participation in the IFHTP. The organisation of national participation was hardly institutionalized – apart from formal representation in the bodies - or programmatically defined. Participation was foremost based on practical considerations. The composition of the national delegations at the conferences shifted continuously. National delegates made their choice to participate dependent of the conference’s agenda and location, who else was going and of course their personal agenda.
[iii] cross-membership with the *Union Internationale des Villes* was substantial. amongst the congress delegates at the UIV congress in Amsterdam, IFHTP dignitaries are featured prominently; in the front row are George Montagu Harris (man with the white breast-pocket handkerchief), Henri Sellier (left of Harris), F.M. Wibaut (left of Sellier), Emile Vinck (left of Sellier) and Auguste Bruggeman (left of Vinck).
Confronted with a similar problem, French historian Renaud Payre uses the concept of *nébuleuse* (nebula) to describe the loose network of associations behind the leading French town planning journal *La Vie Urbaine*, a concept introduced earlier by Christian Topalov. The use of the nebula-concept is very suitable to describe the social environment of the IFHTP. In the first place, we can easily identify Payre’s *nébuleuse Sévigné* as the circle from which French participation in the IFHTP originated. *La Vie Urbaine* was acknowledged as official organ of the IFHTP in 1922, and the *Association Française pour l’Etude de l’Aménagement et de l’Extension des Villes*, a prominent exponent of the *nébuleuse Sévigné* was the official French section of the IFHTP. Prominent individuals from this French nebula, like Bonnier, Bruggeman, Poëte and Sellier, not only frequently attended the conferences of the IFHTP, but also actively participated in paper presentations, discussions and policy-making. It is not hard to see similar nebulas in the alliance of the GCTPA, the NHTPC, the TPI and the Royal Institute of British Architects, that were responsible for the British participation in the IFHTP. Analogously, urban nebulas were centred around the NIVS (the Netherlands), the UVCB (Belgium) and the *Spitzenverband für Städtebau und Landesplanung* (Germany), and we can assume similar nebulas existed in other participating countries. These national nebulas were not isolated, but were connected through active participation in the Urban Internationale of which the IFHTP was an important focal point.

![Figure 3.5 cross-membership of active members of the IFHTP, the International Housing Congresses and the Union Internationale des Villes, 1920-1926](image)

So, metaphorically speaking, we can qualify the IFHTP as a density in the transnational nebula of the Urban Internationale, made up of interwoven national nebulas. Although it is impossible to get a detailed picture of the environment in a nebular surrounding, it is possible to discern contours of its structure. Once again the active members stand out. Most of them not only held seats in the bodies of the IFHTP, but also occupied influential positions in other exponents of the Urban Internationale. Figure 3.5 represents cross membership of active members of the IFHTP to the IHC and the UIV. I have added one name that has not been mentioned so far: Amsterdam alderman F.M. Wibaut. He only joined the ranks of the active members in 1926 as the IHC amalgamated with the IFHTP, but nevertheless he is a very important link in the networks, underpinning the IFHTP. As a member of the *Stedebouwkundige Raad* of the NIVS he was well-acquainted with Hudig and executive positions in the IHC and UIV had brought him in close contact with Vinck and Sellier.
3.4 Transnational civil society

As a nongovernmental organisation, the IFHTP in the early 1920s was part of the transnational civil society. Unlike the newly established League of Nations, not the nation-state, but voluntary (federations of) national societies dedicated to garden cities, housing and town planning were the envisioned principal members. However, the non-governmental character of the IFHTP was not always entirely clear. The decision in 1922 to make public bodies eligible for membership somewhat blurred the clear delineation of non-governmental organisation. The public bodies that subsequently joined the IFHTP mainly stemmed from the local level – municipal housing and town planning departments etc. – and the level between the local and the national – Sellier’s Office Public des Habitations à Bon Marché is a good example of the latter category. Direct participation and representation of national governments did not occur in the early 1920s. But still, the distinction between the national representatives and their national governments often was very thin. Some prominent active members were directly employed by national governments. For example, the British members Unwin, Pepler and Harris worked for the Ministry of Health. This close connection might well have been the cause for the cancellation of the excursion program by the French for the 1922 Paris conference due to “a sudden outbreak of political difficulties between Great-Britain and France”. Danish planner Hendriksen also worked for his national government. An even closer relation with the national government was to be found in Swedish representative Sjöstrand, who also was an official representative for Sweden in the International Labour Organisation. Additionally, the active members included prominent political activists, like Sellier, Vinck and Wibaut, who, although not directly representing national governments, were well-connected in governmental circles.

The advance of public bodies among the members, reflecting the post-war institutionalisation of housing and town planning in the participating countries, was but one significant trend. Far more striking was the enormous expansion of participation in the IFHTP and the width of its scope steadily expanded as well. In the span of half a decade the attendance of its congresses grew from 170 registered delegates at the London conference of 1920 to more than 1,000 registered delegates at the 1926 Vienna congress. The rapid expansion of the scope can be grasped by looking at the succession of rebaptisms of the international body in the same interval: International Garden Cities and Town Planning Association (1913-1922), International Federation for Garden Cities and Town Planning (1922-1924), International Federation for Town and Country Planning and Garden Cities (1924-1926), International Federation for Housing and Town Planning (1926-1956). This expansion fits the trends described in literature on the transnational civil society at large. The pioneering scholar of international non-governmental organisations Lyman Cromwell White argued that the post-First World War organisations were larger and more ambitious than their pre-War predecessors. Speeckaerts has pointed out that the number of international non-governmental organisations displayed an unprecedented growth in the 1920s. However, within the Urban Internationale, the early 1920s did not bring such a spectacular growth. Although the volume of transnational activity significantly expanded, mostly the same pre-War international bodies populated this international plane. Despite the renewed demand for transnational action international organisations like the IHC and the UIV experienced difficulties in adapting to the new post-war context and were slow in getting on their feet again. Unlike the IFHTP, they could not build on wartime experience.
The 1920s were characterized by a rapid series of innovations in the field of mass transportation and communication (Gerd Arntz, 'Krafwagenbestand der Erde' from O. Neurath, Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft, 1930)
British historian Davies argues that the spectacular growth of post-War transnational activity was facilitated by the same factors that defined transnationalism in the preceding period (see paragraph 2.4). In the early 1920s the rapid succession of technological innovations in the field of mass communication and mass transportation surely must have contributed to the post-war rise of transnational civil society. Economic recovery, facilitated by international loans, and continuing social trends like the advancing urbanisation also contributed their parts. As for ‘internal political’ factors, Davies refers to the apparent success of movements such as for the women’s votes, the creation of the League of Nations which supported the international idea that civil society actors could have a significant impact gained popularity, and the post-War structural change of international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and their increasing preoccupation with political change improved the means for the realization of this idea. Concerning ‘external political’ factors, especially the War must be mentioned. Its brutal consequences provided a need for the creation of new humanitarian and ex-servicemen’s organisations, while the desire to ban such armed conflicts from the future reanimated the peace and disarmament movement. Moreover, the War increased the awareness of humanity’s shared fate and accelerated significant socio-political changes.

Surely the factors that benefitted the transnational civil society as a whole also had a positive effect on the IFHTP, but they do not adequately explain its explosive growth in the early 1920s. The inactivity of its principal competitors also only offers a meagre explanation and immediately prompts a new question: why was the IFHTP better off than its immediate rivals? Basically, the IHC and the UIV were fishing in the same pond as the IFHTP. They roughly attracted the same audience and dealt with the same issues, albeit from a slightly different perspective. What then were the factors defining its success? In the first place, its wartime activities provided the IFHTP a flying start, whereas its rivals more or less had to start from scratch. Additionally, the IFHTP was not a truly independent international body, but was conducted by the GCTPA in London. Although this soon became a stumbling block for the continental members, it did provide a sound footing immediately after the War. Unlike the loose organisation of the IHC, the IFHTP had a strict hierarchical structure with a central secretariat, that had just been strengthened by the appointment of a second secretary (Purdom). Organisationally, the IFHTP already at an early hour was well equipped to handle the post-war expansion and professionalization of transnational activity.

A major difference between the IFHTP and its continental counterparts was its culture of public debate and decision-making that was characterized by consensus-seeking and maintaining, at least outwards, a picture of harmony and unanimity. Controversial issues were anxiously ignored and the IFHTP focussed on practical issues instead. This culture differed from the continental culture of fierce debates and, if unanimity was not to be reached, votes by majority. There was ample consensus on the issues that were to define the agenda of the Urban Internationale, namely the housing question and control over the advancing urbanisation, but opinions went different ways when it came to defining steps of action. Thus we find advocates of governmental intervention versus private initiative, cottages versus tenements, cooperative housing versus collective housing tumbling over each other when it came to drafting resolutions at the end of 1920 Inter-allied Housing and Town Planning Conference in London, the brief post-War incarnation of the IHC.
these fierce internal debates eventually tore the IHC apart, the British leadership of the IFHTP anxiously avoided principal choices on these issues.

The UIV experienced heavy weather because of its institutional character. Unlike the IFHTP, it principally served local authorities. However, after the War the generally accepted model for institutional, administrative and economic development that assumed political life, both national and international, was entirely focused on the nation state. This orientation towards the state was most clearly embodied in the League of Nations, an authority that drastically pruned the municipalities’ liberties of action on the international stage. Contacts between the UIV and the League of Nations were an uphill battle for “fears, expressed at the Assembly of the League, of seeing inter-municipal action encroach on the lofty sphere of national sovereignty.” Thus the UIV silently abandoned its ideal of a global governance by an international union of local authorities and, following the example of the IFHTP, settled for a focus on practical issues.

3.5 Towards a golden formula

To the outside world the IFHTP above all was defined by its activities. The organising of congresses was its core business, but by no means were the congresses the sole activity. The early 1920s were a hectic period of continuous growth, in which the palette of activities rapidly expanded. What activities did the IFHTP offer and how were these activities adjusted to the new post-war internal and external context? In answering these questions I will focus on the congresses as main activity, but I will first go briefly into the factors that constituted the relevant context.

3.5.1 Professionalization and expansion

Most of the internal factors that affected the activities of the IFHTP have already been mentioned in the previous paragraphs. Roughly these factors can be divided into three categories: organization, membership and culture. These categories were closely interrelated. The interconnectivity manifested itself in two distinct trends: professionalization and expansion. Essentially the IFHTP was a lobby organization, aimed at selling its garden city ideals on a global scale. It had every interest to raise its backing to be able to make a strong fist and attract a large audience that was to take the central garden city message to the heart. Already during the War it had looked beyond its original members, the garden city enthusiasts of the earliest hour, to establish contact with Belgian (and French) governmental circles in order to gain sounder footing on the Continent. After the War this reorientation persisted and was expanded to the new institutionalized town planning layer embodied in local and national departments and professional town planning and housing organizations. To appeal to this potential target group the IFHTP urgently needed a make-over.

It called for a professionalization of its congresses, its organization had to be adjusted to accommodate the newcomers and its thematic horizon had to be expanded to include topics of interest to the new target group. Although the IFHTP was slow in introducing these changes immediately after the War, it did implement them and subsequently its membership steadily grew. This growth necessitated further measures to secure a basic level
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of efficiency and commitment. The bulk of the new attendants at the conferences by the mid-1920s was constituted by a growing contingent of anonymous civil servants from housing and town planning departments. Their appearance made the session rooms overcrowded, but they did not actively participate in the discussions. One might conclude that it was the profoundness of the discussions and therefore in the end the message of the international organisation that suffered from mass participation. German delegate Ockert in 1926 proposed to limit the number of congress participants, but the British leadership saw nothing in this proposal as the IFHTP was heavily dependent on the income generated by its congresses. 62

The financial dependence on the congresses brings us to the culture of the international body. When referring to this, it is important to distinct two levels: the cultural background of the members and the culture of the IFHTP as a whole. These two cultural dimensions not necessarily were congruous and frictions between the two were responsible for some of the major changes of the international organisation in the 1920s. The newcomers had a distinctly different background than the garden city enthusiasts that had flocked to the international organisation before the War. They were (continental) civil servants, administrators, politicians and technical professionals with an agenda of their own. They were not satisfied with a dominant British leadership that almost exclusively propagated (British) garden city solutions and demanded more influence and attention for continental housing and town planning problems and solutions. Thus the British leadership gradually loosened its grip on the IFHTP, opening the door to increased active membership from continental Europe. Of course, the tremendous growth also fed practical cultural problems: language barriers had to be bridged and different cultural customs had to be accommodated. A professionalization of the organisation – for example organising secretary Chapman made himself more effective by learning French and German -, the dominant culture of the organisation as a whole and a sort of spirit of internationalism prevented these practical problems causing real harm.

Although the British leadership and its exclusive diktat of the agenda was effectively pushed back in the first half of the 1920s, the quintessentially British culture that had thus far defined the framework for transnational cooperation of the IFHTP persevered for the moment. Eventually this perseverance would give way to fierce internal debates in the late 1920s, but this will be treated in the next chapter. The governing British culture proved to be both a blessing and a curse. We already saw that this culture was characterized by harmony and unanimity. It was this culture that kept the controversies that tore the IHC apart at bay, but at the same time it prevented the international body from resolving topical controversial issues and it also made the organisation slow in adapting to changes. Harmony and unanimity was but one characteristic of the culture that the British leadership had introduced. It stressed the associative and voluntary nature of the organisation. Societies and individuals were the envisioned principal members, although public bodies did become eligible for membership in 1922 under pressure of the continentals. The subscription fee was set as low as possible to make membership accessible to all interested parties. At the same time it deliberately renounced governmental subventions. This principal stance was rather naive, for politics entered the international body anyway through its members. National factions were often driven by a national (political) agenda. The IFHTP presented a platform where the national housing and town planning movements could
translate their national arena to an international stage to seek international acknowledgement and support, to be used for the campaign at home. All agreed that the countries with the latest pioneering experiences were to be featured prominently at the conferences, but they were less eager if they themselves were outshone or not featured at all. The joint international race for more and better housing in a well-planned environment clearly had an element of rivalry. Additionally, with the subscription fee already set very low, the renouncement of subventions made the IFHTP financially rather dependent on its congresses. If a congress was to fall through or was to suffer from fierce competition of other international venues, it could find itself in a tight position indeed. Fortunately, problems did not occur. Boosted by a series of successful international congresses, drawing ever larger audiences, the IFHTP matured from a modest international gathering of garden city adepts fronted by the British garden city pioneers into a thriving large-scale international voluntary association with active membership from most European countries.

The voluntary character implicated that there was no paid staff. All officers worked in a honorary capacity. The only exception was the general secretary. However, immediately after the War the finances did not permit a paid secretary. There were two secretaries (Purdom and Culpin), but both served in a honorary capacity. Things only changed in 1922 when Chapman was appointed as (paid) organising secretary. Moreover, there was no compensation for out of pocket expenses available for members of the internal bodies and committees. It almost goes without saying that active engagement in most of the activities of the IFHTP came with a lot of travelling, especially for the members furthest removed from headquarters. Therefore, active participation was not attainable for all. You either had to have a fat purse and ample spare time or had to represent a body with sufficient financial means that was willing to substantially invest in international exchange.

3.5.2 Rivalry and collaboration

Also outside the IFHTP factors can be found that influenced its activities, both directly and indirectly, in fact largely the same factors Davies mentioned for the growth of the transnational civil society. However, one extra factor needs explicit mentioning here: international competitors. Although immediately after the War the IFHTP found itself in a position almost free from (international) competition, this situation soon changed. Because it heavily leaned on its conferences for its income, it had every interest in scoring points off its competitors and, if this was not possible, in trying to come to arrangements to avoid unnecessary competition. When referring to rivals, the IFHTP had three specific international organizations in mind: the IHC, the UIV and the International Labour Office (ILO). On paper substantial cross-membership was a good foundation for dialogue and collaboration, but in reality it often prompted the issue of loyalty. Cross-membership did little to reduce the tensions caused by the competition for domination in the Urban Internationale or overcome the squabbling over scarce resources and the awkward fact that the organizations had similar frames of reference.

Immediately after the War the IHC had great difficulty re-establishing itself and it perfectly well understood that it could not compete with the IFHTP on an equal footing. Thus it sought cooperation. However, the IFHTP chose to ignore the advances of the housing reformers. Only after a successful Inter-allied Housing and Town Planning Conference in London in 1920
the IFHTP realized that the internationally organized housing reformers were still a force to be reckoned with and subsequently agreed to join forces for an international congress to be held in Rome in 1921. However, this joint venue never came through. By now the IHC was torn apart by fierce internal discussions, rendering it impotent. Despite the Rome fiasco, the IFHTP did not turn a blind eye to its competitors again. For its 1924 conference in Amsterdam it sought its competitors out to try to make arrangements and avoid unnecessary competition. The faltering IHC was trying to get a conference together in Brussels in the same period. More importantly, the UIV returned to the international stage with its first post-War conference in Amsterdam, held just before the gathering of the IFHTP. Emile Vinck, being an obvious choice because he was an executive member of all three international bodies, was charged with the task to draw up a draft of the principles for cooperation. Despite this attempt, collaboration between the three never materialized. The IHC was eventually swallowed by the IFHTP in 1926, but the relation with the UIV would remain a precarious one. Once re-established, the UIV rapidly became the foremost competitor of the IFHTP, which continued to press for a mutual arrangement, albeit unsuccessful.

No reservations were felt concerning the newly established League of Nations. Collaboration with this new international body could considerably boost the international standing of the IFHTP. It desired to be endorsed as exclusive agent of the League in housing and town planning matters. Howard was eager to recommend the IFHTP: “there would be found in the International Garden Cities Association an ally of tremendous power and value to that other great organization, the League of Nations.” However, collaboration as envisioned by the IFHTP was never achieved. Instead, the International Labour Office (ILO), the executive branch of the International Labour Organisation, another international institution resulting from the Versailles Peace Treaty, actively entered the international housing and town planning arena. The very presence of the ILO in its working sphere probably offended the International Federation and the way the ILO carried out its activities did not do much good either.

It was the IHC that opened the door for the ILO to the international housing arena. It had contacted the ILO to get support for its 1922 Rome congress. The ILO agreed to contribute documentation for the congress and subsequently its officers came up with an ingenious scheme: first a standardized framework for national housing reports was to be adopted, then these housing reports could be edited to be finally synthesized in a comprehensive general report. This general report was to be presented at the Rome congress. However, the director of the ILO, Adam Thomas, had higher ambitions. The Rome gathering was to be used as a stepping stone for the creation of a new international housing organisation under the guidance of the ILO. The work was taken up fervently and in early August 1922, well before the planned Rome congress, the ILO could hand out housing reports on eleven European countries plus the United States. The circumstances seemed ideal to cash in at the Rome congress. However, this event was postponed once more.

Nonetheless the ILO pushed ahead. In the absence of the Rome congress, support was to be mustered elsewhere. Thomas now wanted the International Labour Congress of November 1922 to retroactively sanctify the ILO’s housing studies. After some difficulties, he got the desired approval and subsequently the housing studies were lifted to a more ambitious
plane. The finished reports were to be published separately in the Office’s Etudes et documents series and at the same time a new housing study was to be started, covering more countries, to be crowned by a general synthesis on the housing problem. The whole enterprise called for a sustained documentation activity, intensive correspondence and connections with specialist networks. Thus by spring 1923 the ILO actively entered the international housing reform networks. The warm contact with the faltering IHC was cherished, but this time the ILO also looked for other potential partners. The UIV was one of the first to be contacted. Some of the ringleaders of the UIV, like Vinck, Wibaut and Sellier, were old (socialist) comrades of Thomas, and of course the ILO already knew these individuals as leading in the IHC. 68

The IFHTP was also on the list of the ILO, but was not exactly forthcoming. A basic form of mutual agreement was achieved concerning the exchange of documentation, but on a more general level the IFHTP chose to adopt a role of injured party and subsequently ignored all advances of the Office. Thus the ILO representative was denied access to the 1923 Gothenburg congress. 69 A year later, the International Labour Conference and the Amsterdam conference of the IFHTP were scheduled in the same period and the IFHTP was unwilling to reschedule its congress. 70

Already in 1924 the ILO published European housing problems since the war 1914-1923, followed in early 1925 by a much smaller volume dealing with the housing situation in the United States. These published housing studies effectively landed the ILO as an authority in the field. The housing studies were widely circulated, read and commented. Vinck was quick to secure cooperation for his revived UIV. By December 1924 it was agreed to launch a joint research on housing statistics, aimed at defining uniform statistical categories to facilitate international comparison. 71

The year 1926 brought a renewed contact between the ILO and the IFHTP which probably still was not enthusiastic about the Office. The housing volumes of the Office only added a new dimension to the simmering grievances. In the prefatory note the ILO in a single line dismissed the raison d’être of the IFHTP: “Purely technical questions and matters such as town planning, the garden city movement, and land settlement, which were of importance before the war, have been passed over, as they do not fall within the scope of the present survey.” 72 Despite this awkwardness the IFHTP and the ILO were condemned to each other. The IFHTP had just merged with the IHC and had publicly committed itself to the housing question. But also the ILO had to make the best of it. The merger created the largest organisation in the field, which the ILO could not ignore.

3.5.3 An outline of the activities

Referring to the activities, Unwin in 1924 wrote that the IFHTP “conducts enquiries, publishes bulletins and reports, and arranges international conferences and exhibitions.” 73 In the following text I will briefly discuss these activities. The international conferences with adjoining exhibitions and excursions will be treated separately in the next subparagraph (3.5.4).
The Bulletin of the International Federation
The IFHTP started issuing its own periodical in 1923. Compared to the grandness of the conferences, the periodical was rather a poor man’s performance, undoubtedly reflecting the tight financial position of the IFHTP. Unlike the professional periodicals of the participating national societies, the Bulletin basically was a stack of stencilled papers, stapled together. It was published about three to four times a year. The organising secretary Harry Chapman acted as editor. He introduced a rigid threefold arrangement for the periodical, consisting of a first part reserved for ‘Federation notes’, an extensive mid-section devoted to national reports and articles and a final part for ‘Valuable publications received.’ The Federation notes basically were an editorial in which Chapman conveyed decisions taken by the bodies of the IFHTP, reported on the latest achievements of the national members and national town planning developments in general, announced upcoming conferences of the IFHTP and other congresses of interest, et cetera. The mid-section primarily was reserved for national reports, drafted on the basis of standardized questionnaires, issued by temporary subcommittees, established to conduct specific enquiries. As its name already reveals, the final section contained a list of publications received by the IFHTP, including reviews.

Town planning Notation Subcommittee
Besides temporary subcommittees devoted to specific questionnaires, the IFHTP had two subcommittees with a more permanent character. The Town Planning Notation Subcommittee was established at the Gothenburg conference as a direct outcome of a paper presented by George Pepler in which he pleaded for a uniform international town planning notation, to facilitate the international comparison of town planning maps from different countries. The committee was staffed by John Nolen (US), Albert Lilienberg (Sweden), Gustav Langen (Germany), Emile Vinck (Belgium) or an architect nominated by him and George Pepler (UK) acting as convenor. Almost a year later, this committee had still not arrived at unanimous conclusions. Apparently, national differences posed a formidable barrier. Finally, at the meeting of the Executive Committee on October 18th 1924 Pepler could hand out a report. It was decided to print this report, send it to members and sell it to non-members. I have been unable to locate a copy of this report, but its very obscurity – contemporary sources, other than the periodical and conference reports of the IFHTP, do not refer to it at all - probably is a good indication for its ill-served fate. Even the IFHTP did not wholeheartedly believe in it. The recommended international notation code was not compulsory for the exhibition at the Vienna conference; exhibitors were only asked to use this code as far as possible in their exhibits. After the accomplishment of the town planning notation report, the subcommittee was set on a new task at the 1926 Vienna conference: an international, tri-lingual glossary of technical terms in town planning and housing, which was published in the early 1930s.

Travelling Exhibition Subcommittee
The Travelling Exhibition Subcommittee was the second subcommittee established at Gothenburg to “consider the selection and arrangement of plans for the travelling exhibition.” This selection was to be made from exhibits at the Gothenburg conference, to be lent by the national societies. The committee was initially composed of Raymond Unwin (UK), Albert Lilienberg (Sweden) and Gustav Langen (Germany). It is very hard to track the activities of this committee in archival documentation and the Bulletin of the IFHTP. The
provided information is not consistent. It is clear, however, that despite the efforts, the travelling exhibition never took place. Correspondence between Chapman and the ILO in 1924 reveals that the IFHTP lacked the financial means to pull this travelling exhibition off.\textsuperscript{81} Despite the failure to organise a travelling exhibition after the Gothenburg conference, the idea was not abandoned and the travelling exhibition subcommittee stubbornly ploughed on. The surviving minutes refer to an annual election of the members of this committee up until 1927.\textsuperscript{82} In 1928 the travelling exhibition subcommittee became exhibition committee and proposed to drop the idea of travelling exhibitions, “because it would quickly get out of date and especially because the Federation does not appear to possess the necessary funds.”\textsuperscript{83} The exhibition committee thought it wiser to produce periodically well illustrated brochures instead.

The idea of a travelling town planning exhibition as an educational comparative method to spread the town planning message was not a novelty. This method had already been pioneered by Patrick Geddes and Gustav Langen. In 1910 Geddes assembled a Cities and Town Planning Exhibition, that was displayed as part of the International Town Planning Exhibition organised by the Royal Institute of British Architects in London. Subsequently, Geddes’ exhibition went on tour ending up, amongst others, at the civic section of the exhibition at the Congrès international de l’art de construire les villes et l’organisation de la vie municipal in Ghent in 1913, where it won a gold medal. Unfortunately Geddes’ original exhibition met a premature end. On its way by ship to India, it was sunk by a German warship.\textsuperscript{84} Langen turned his entry for the international Baufachausstellung in Leipzig into a Wandermuseum in 1913.\textsuperscript{85} Parts of the Wandermuseum ended up at the German entries of the exhibitions at the conferences of the IFHTP in the 1920s. Both travelling exhibitions were meant as an educational institute (‘travelling museums’) and possessed a permanence; they were not an occasional assembly, destined for one specific tour. As such, they were not static collections, but growing, changing and above all evolving organisms.

The lack of archival evidence makes it impossible to assess what the travelling exhibition of the IFHTP exactly was meant to be. There seem to have been distinct differences compared to its mentioned forerunners. The IFHTP wanted to work with loans, provided by the national societies; it did not have a permanent collection of its own. The selected exhibits would have to be two-dimensional, so just maps and photos, to make them easily transportable. The original intention was to arrange for at least two identical exhibitions that would circulate simultaneously to make the impact of the travelling exhibition more directly felt, instead of waiting years for one exhibition to complete its tour around the globe.\textsuperscript{86} This sense of hurry brings me to another point. Although the travelling exhibition of the IFHTP as educational method was attributed a certain permanence – the survival of the travelling exhibition subcommittee is ample proof for this assumption – the surviving archival evidence hints at the fact that the collection sent on tour had a more temporary nature. It was to be assembled from the exhibition adjoining a conference, then to tour the globe for about a year and then to be disassembled, as the new travelling exhibition was selected from the exhibition of the next conference. This rather short circulation period gave the travelling exhibition a static character; it did not have sufficient time to mature before it was dissolved.
Leisure was not forgotten at the International Town Planning Conference in Amsterdam in 1924. Gathering of the delegates at an accommodation of the university of Amsterdam to interact informally, while enjoying a drink and a cigar.

Delegates at the 1925 New York congress
3.5.4 CityEvents

After the War the congresses soon transcended the pre-War level of informal gatherings of garden city enthusiasts. The 1924 congress in Amsterdam is one of the best documented congresses of the International Federation. It was a large event, attracting over 400 delegates, that received enormous exposure in the media. It was well-organised, covering several days of thematically arranged sessions plus meetings of the bodies of the organisation, interlaced with sumptuous luncheons, banquets and festive evening programs, an adjoining town planning exhibition and an elaborate offer of excursions. This conference concept can be considered a fixed formula, for it was copied for later congresses. It is tempting to label these congresses what Ward Rennen calls *CityEvents*. Rennen provides us with a model that uses the *Actor Network Theory* to analyse the production process of large international events from three interacting domains: the hosting city, the event owner and the media. This model enables us to study how these parties engage relations with each other and other relevant actors that are necessary to start the production process and how divergent interests are bundled.87 *CityEvents* are characterized by a number of features. They are governed by a specific time cycle and on every occasion are organised in a different city. The main characteristic however is that the event is based on a generic event formula. Besides the hosting city and the event owner, the *CityEvent* model distinguishes an important third party: the media. No event can mature into a large international event without sufficient coverage by the media.

The *CityEvent* model presents an interesting lead to analyse the conferences of the International Federation. It offers an opportunity to look beyond the motives of the event owner (the International Federation). The host most certainly also had its own motives for hosting such an event, a motive that encompassed more than sympathy with the International Federation’s objectives. It was an opportunity to present itself to an international audience as a progressive city in contact with the latest housing and town planning achievements, revelling in its status of temporary epicentre of the town planning world. Of course, the event also meant good business. Hordes of delegates had to be accommodated, fed and entertained which certainly benefitted the local economy. Moreover, the city could present its most attractive side, hoping to generate a tourist crowd. Although the use of the *CityEvent* model is tempting, its application is not without dangers. Firstly, the model is developed to analyse mega-events of a far larger scale than the international congresses of the International Federation, although this difference of scales should not offer too much difficulties. The principal interactions between the three distinguished parties are basically the same. Furthermore, negotiations about the conference as a rule were always conducted through intermediation of the national representative(s) of the country involved. This national representation had a somewhat ambiguous position. On the one hand, the members of the event owner had to take into account the interests of the event owner, while on the other hand they were also supposed to foster the interests of the host. But the national representatives often had their own agenda for the conference as well, that not necessarily corresponded with the interests of the event owner and the hosting city. Figure 3.6 represents an adjusted version of the *CityEvent* model to accommodate the national representative(s).
There are, however, fundamental problems to use the CityEvent model for analysing the early congresses of the International Federation. According to Rennen a generic event formula is an essential characteristic of his model. However, the generic congress formula, as witnessed at the Amsterdam conference, was only first conceived for the 1923 Gothenburg conference. The formula of the preceding conferences displays a remarkable variety and can hardly be labelled generic. Additionally, the city host also was first introduced at the Gothenburg congress. This does not mean that the CityEvent model is useless. If we consider the ‘Gothenburg formula’ as the end of an evolutionary trajectory, we can use the elements of the CityEvent model to analyse this maturing process and discern different phases. In the following text I will discuss the elements of the CityEvent model. As I have already amply discussed the International Federation and its members in the previous text I shall not focus on the event owner and the national representatives here.

**The hosts**
Initially the national societies in affiliation acted as hosts for the conferences of the IFHTP, but this soon changed after the War. It was an invitation in 1920 of the Daily Mail’s Ideal Home Exhibition in London that provided an opportunity to lift the conferences to a larger and more professional level. Following the example of the World Exhibitions, the Daily Mail had invited several (international) societies to hold conferences adjoining the exhibition. Undoubtedly, these invitations served to boost the status of the Ideal Home Exhibition as a major international event and to attract a large (international) audience. The host must have been pleased with the participation of the IFHTP, for the invitation was extended to the next Ideal Home Exhibition in spring 1922, which the IFHTP gratefully accepted. For the second conference in 1922 in Paris, a suitable host could not be found, so the national representative stepped in.
The next conference (Gothenburg) saw the introduction of the city host, setting the standard for the conferences to follow. Contact with the city of Gothenburg was established through the intermediation of Albert Lilienberg, the city engineer of the host who also was an active member of the IFHTP. The hosting of the international event served to acquaint an international audience with the latest Swedish housing and town planning experiences and to acquire international consent. On a more practical level the hosting was to add lustre to the festivities, celebrating the 350th birthday of the city. The importance of the Gothenburg conference went beyond the introduction of the city host. At Gothenburg it was decided that in the future a chairman of the Council from the country that was hosting the conference should be appointed and to give the hosting country an opportunity to make suggestions for the conference agenda. The Dutch hosts would use these new liberties to leave a prominent mark on the next congress in Amsterdam in 1924. The city of Amsterdam used the event to place itself on the international map, while the intermediating national representative, Dirk Hudig and his NIVS, exerted the international gathering to place regional planning on the (political) agenda in the Netherlands. The arrival of the city host reflected the institutionalization of town planning at a national level. By the 1920s most municipalities and relevant ministries had housing and town planning departments. These public bodies joined international organizations, active in the field of housing and town planning, either directly or through the national representative(s). The introduction of the city host also reflected the success of the conferences of the IFHTP in attracting a steadily increasing audience. The national representatives were able to accommodate the early conferences with a modest attendance, but the growing numbers of participants must have presented a problem to them. Unlike the city hosts, they simply did not have the capacity, facilities and financial means to accommodate hundreds and eventually thousands of delegates.

**Media**

Besides the event owner and the host, the media presents the third party in the network, defining the production of CityEvents. Both the event owner and the host for obvious reasons needed the press: (1) to advertise the event in order to attract large audiences and (2) to gain international acclaim, broad public support and an influence beyond the attending delegates. But the media had an interest as well. Hundreds of housing reformers and town planners, descending on a city to discuss the creation of a new and better world through housing reform and town planning was exciting news that, if reported properly, could appeal to a wide audience. When talking about the media, it is important to make a distinction between the general press – newspapers, radio - and the professional press – (inter)national periodicals dedicated to housing and town planning. Extensive coverage in the newspapers of the proceedings of the conference was thought very important to gain wide public support and add prestige to the event. So the local organising committee, composed of members of the national representative(s) and the host, with the secretaries of the International Federation providing support and directions, made sure the (local) newspapers were provided with press-kits and a steady flow of news flashes on a day-to-day basis during the event. Some newspapers asked a delegate of the conference to act as reporter. Important though newspapers were, they were not considered the foremost medium. This position was reserved for professional periodicals.
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Official opening of the town planning exhibition at the 1923 congress of the IFHTP in Gothenburg. The photo displays delegates studying a scale model of Gothenburg.
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Part of Otto Neurath’s Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsmuseum was used for the town planning exhibition at the 1926 congress of the IFHTP in Vienna.
We have to bear in mind that the target group solely consisted of professional planners and housing experts and people with an interest in planning and housing reform. Therefore periodicals dedicated to housing and town planning were the most suitable medium to reach this target group. Of course a lot of these periodicals were issued by the affiliated national societies. The IFHTP only started issuing its own periodical in 1923 and therefore was rather dependent on the periodicals of the national representatives for communication with its members. It was primarily through these national periodicals that announcements of upcoming conferences were issued. Only in the second instance did the national representatives circulate the announcements to other periodicals. There seems to have been an unwritten law that the main national representative was entitled to publish reports in its periodical. For example, in the Netherlands we find reports on the early conferences of the International Federation in periodicals affiliated with the Dutch Society of Architects: Bouwkundig Weekblad en De Bouwwereld. After the Netherlandsch Instituut voor Volkshuisvesting en Stedebouw (NIVS) took over the organisation of the Dutch participation in the 1920s, the reports on the conferences were subsequently solely published in Tijdschrift voor Volkshuisvesting en Stedebouw, the periodical of the NIVS.

Time and place
Now that we have discussed the parties involved in the CityEvent model, we can move on to the event itself. CityEvents are organised at regular intervals in different cities and they are governed by a fixed format. If we ignore the failure to hold a conference in 1921, the IFHTP did hold its conferences at regular (annual) intervals in different cities, although they undeniable were concentrated in Western Europe. This focus on Western Europe was only logic, because as of old it was the heart of the infrastructure of the Urban Internationale. The IFHTP was one of the very first exponents of the Urban Internationale to escape this narrow geographical setting. In 1923 it headed to Gothenburg and two years later it was the first to cross the Atlantic to organise a congress in New York.

Conference formula
The 1920 conference in London was the first post-war opportunity to systematize the conference program and say goodbye to the merry chaos of the pre-war period. This time there was a strict separation of business and pleasure. For the first time the paper presentations were thematically arranged into four sessions (garden cities, housing, town planning and reconstruction). The arrangements of the outings had also expanded. Now there were parts of days between the working sessions reserved for recreational and professional day-trips and the conference was ended by an extensive post-conference tour. The event also featured an international town planning exhibition. However, this exhibition was not arranged independently. It had only organized an international town planning section for the larger Daily mail’s Ideal Home Exhibition that acted as host for the conference of the IFHTP.

The next step in the development of the conference program was established at the 1923 Gothenburg conference. The lay-out of the 1920 London conference was copied and enhanced with a large international town planning exhibition, the largest contemporary display of its kind. This time the IFHTP itself had organized the exhibition. More importantly, it had formulated demands for the national entries. In London it had exhibited everything it could lay its hands on, but now “housing schemes unconnected with a general scheme for
town development” were explicitly excluded.\textsuperscript{90} The Gothenburg exhibition was well received and set the standard for future exhibitions. “The town planning exhibition occupying a large building of the exposition during the period of the conference was considered the largest and best ever assembled on that subject, and the catalogue published in English and Swedish is its enduring monument. The large space gave opportunity for a simple arrangement of the exhibition without crowding and for grouping of the exhibition by countries.”\textsuperscript{91} Apparently, the exhibition was geographically ordered and the organisation had also issued an exhibition catalogue. However, not everybody shared the enthusiasm of the quoted American reporter. The Dutch reporter of the event was more critical.\textsuperscript{92} He thought that only the first steps towards a systematic treatment of the town planning issue were made. Each country had arranged its own national entry, but a coherent system for the entries seemed to be missing. For the next conference in Amsterdam, the requirements of the exhibits were tightened even further. This time only exhibits with a direct relation to the subjects under discussion at the conference were admitted.\textsuperscript{93} Despite stricter requirements, coherence would be a recurring deficit of future exhibitions of the IFHTP. Although the standards for the national entries became higher, most national delegations insisted on using their own national annotation codes, a problem that the efforts of the Subcommittee on town planning notation could not solve.

The last important change of the conference formula was introduced for the 1926 Vienna conference: the paper presentations of old were replaced by national reports on the conference themes. It was Austrian representative Hans Kampffmeyer who had made the suggestion to circulate a questionnaire regarding land use questions and to present the results at Vienna.\textsuperscript{94} The introduction of the national report proved to be a blessing for the IFHTP. Not only did it meet the demand to push the town planning profession in a more rational and objective direction, but it also greatly stimulated the international study of town planning by facilitating the method of international comparison. In former times, the sessions often were a heterogeneous collection of papers, the title of the session being the only binding element, but now it was easy to compare the national reports and draw general conclusions. On a more practical level, the introduction of the national report could also be used to address some of the negative effects of mass-participation. The steady growth of participation no longer made it possible for each participating country to deliver papers at the conference. Far more standardized reports fitted into a session than individual papers, if need be summarized in a general report.

### 3.6 The mission redefined

The reconstruction campaign had revealed that the garden city gospel did not hold answers to all the ardent issues that occupied the minds of housing reformers and town planners across Europe. Still, the British leadership of the IFHTP was reluctant to relinquish its cherished garden city idea. German planning historian Albers rightly remarks that the first post-War conferences of the IFHTP were dominated by the garden city concept.\textsuperscript{95} However, it did not just reach back to the familiar pre-War agenda. The new post-War context posed altogether different challenges. How was the old garden city message transformed to meet modern conditions?
3.6.1 Satellite towns

The 1920 conference of the IFHTP in London revealed that the garden city had become part of mainstream town planning across Europe, albeit in compromised form.\(^9\) The pressing housing situation called for immediate relief near the existing cities, rather than to waste energy and limited resources on anything as fanciful as a colonisation of the countryside through independent new towns. To the majority of the delegates town planning was primarily about building houses, preferably to be situated in city extensions on garden city lines. In Britain the situation was not much different. It was garden suburbs and garden villages that had received legislative blessing in the 1919 British housing and town planning act, the Addison Act. Clearly, the garden city advocates had to come up with an update of their concept to give it topical relevance and halt the process of dilution.

Already at the 1920 congress in London garden city champions Purdom and Unwin presented their solution: satellite towns.\(^9\) A year later satellites would be officially embraced as GCTPA policy in *Town Theory and Practice* (1921). Basically it was an intermediary – a dependent garden city - between the ideal garden city and the garden suburbs that sprang up everywhere across Europe.\(^9\) As such, the satellite idea was a compromise, not an innovation. Moreover, the idea was not new at all. Already in 1912 Unwin had presented the idea at a lecture in Manchester. Just like the garden city moniker, the term satellite had been borrowed from the United States where it meant something different. In *Satellite Cities* (1915) G.R. Taylor referred to towns around Chicago, St Louis and other American cities where industries had escaped congestion and created industrial settlements in the surrounding country. Initially the British garden city workers upheld Welwyn as the perfect example of a satellite, but by 1923 Unwin openly acknowledged that Letchworth also was a mere satellite of London.\(^9\) Although garden cities and satellites were not the same thing, they were considered synonyms. Purdom used both terms exchangeable at in his lecture at the 1920 London congress.

The case for satellite towns was perfectly summarized by a bold scheme of Purdom for a system of 23 satellite towns around London, effectively proposing an unprecedented forced migration of about a million Londoners. This scheme was first presented at the *Daily Mail Ideal Home Exhibition* and was repeatedly dug up for the following congresses of the International Federation.\(^8\) Unsurprisingly, the satellite idea did not immediately convince the foreign members. The continental reservations about the garden city idea, as voiced during the Belgium reconstruction campaign, were not addressed and were joined by a new argument against British garden city experience: the British cottage, still the envy of Europe before the War, had now been outstripped by cheap(er) workers’ houses on the continent. Despite the continental grumbling, the British leaders were reluctant to adjust its satellites path. Foreign criticisms were easily dismissed. According to Purdom, not the inadequacy of the satellite idea, but the large-scale introduction of tenement buildings was responsible for the dwindling international interest in British housing experience. Moreover, he thought the larger picture was being overlooked. The garden city or satellite message was not primarily about building cheap houses; it essentially was about creating town structures and building communities.\(^1\) The garden city workers saw the righteousness of their ideas confirmed by the policy of leading captains of industry like Henry Ford who favored the principle of industrial decentralization.\(^2\) Additionally, they could boast that the Business School of
Purdom’s ambitious satellite towns plan for the decentralization of London, presented in 1920 (above).
Welwyn garden city near London, as presented on the master plan by Louis de Soissons in 1920 (below), was presented as the ideal satellite town.
Columbia University had adopted the garden city concept as the most efficient form of town planning.\textsuperscript{103} 

Boosted by this external acknowledgement, the British leadership deliberately steered away from the limited interpretation of the garden city concept as mere attractive mode of residential site planning to enter the larger realm of regional planning. The final session of the 1923 Gothenburg congress was dedicated to “the development of new towns and industrial centres with special reference to regional planning [...].” Although garden cities or satellites were not explicitly mentioned, everybody knew what was meant with new towns and industrial centres. Apparently the British leadership was not totally confident in its set course. For the first time the naturalness of the garden city concept was set aside to address growing criticisms that before had been persistently ignored. Unwin lashed out against American planner Arthur C. Comey, a prominent protagonist of the rivalling concept of the hexagonal city.\textsuperscript{104} In his \textit{Regional Planning Theory} (1923) Comey dismissed the establishing of new self-contained nuclei as unnatural and contrary to economic forces. Instead, he proposed a policy of multidirectional city growth along radial transportation lines laid out on hexagonal patterns. Unwin vehemently dismissed Comey’s disqualification of the satellite idea. He admitted that further study in the matter of transportation innovations was required in connection with the garden city movement, but he also saw evidence that favoured the principle of satellites, linked together by rapid transport facilities.\textsuperscript{105}

On paper Unwin’s fellow lecturers in the final session of the Gothenburg congress were supporters of decentralisation to new towns. Gustav Langen, the first post-War German speaker at the congresses of the International Federation, was a confessed militant for \textit{Umsiedlung} (resettlement).\textsuperscript{106} American planner John Nolen was working on the new town Mariemont (1920-1925), an American adaptation of the British garden suburb.\textsuperscript{107} Although they could easily agree with the general idea behind the satellite message, they did make similar reservations. Langen attacked the German new towns. Simply projecting garden cities or satellites in the countryside did not create viable communities. As an alternative for the feeble attempts of constituting communities in German new towns he advocated “a supervisory science, which looks to all the vital conditions of the town and justly weighs all conflicting interests, which obtains its knowledge of the interdependence of all the parts from the geography of economics and population, which is acquainted with the centres and movements of trade and industry and which [...] aims at a creative system, an economic equilibrium and ideal in which the development of all businesses shall be able to be carried on without friction like a well-oiled machine.”\textsuperscript{108} Nolen referred to the policy of decentralisation of Henry Ford and his fellow industrialists and especially to the writings of pioneering business statistician Roger W. Babson. Babson, looking for real estate conditions in and around large cities, predicted “the greatest shifting in population since the institution of the railroad. Within the next ten or more years the building of suburban homes should rival the growth of the automobile, good roads, the movies, the phonograph or radio.”\textsuperscript{109} These spectacular innovations had opened up the countryside and enabled the rise of a phenomenal suburban movement. Nolen thought the inevitable exodus from the large cities had to be rightly prepared and organised, posing an exciting challenge for town planners.\textsuperscript{110}
Hexagonal schemes for decentralisation by Arthur Comey (1923)

Industrialist Henry Ford, on the stairs, and business statistician Roger W. Babson acknowledged the principle of decentralization in the early 1920s.
The British leadership had intended to strengthen the position of the satellite idea by introducing regional planning, but this strategy backfired. The limitations of the garden city gospel were laid bare: the complex constellation of social and economic requirements on a regional scale could not be adequately answered by merely projecting satellites on cheap stretches of farmland around the existing cities. The IFHTP had to come up with a conception of a supervisory regional planning science, that could not be defined exclusively by the old garden city ideals.

3.6.2 Decentralization in the region

After the Gothenburg conference a revaluation of the central message of the IFHTP became inevitable. Because the British garden city workers still held a disproportional influence, the dismissal of the satellite idea was out of the question. So a synthesis of British satellite experience and regional planning achievements had to be worked out that would provide a framework for an international regional planning discipline and that also would prevent the British garden city advocates from loosing face. This became the formidable task for the 1924 conference in Amsterdam. Dutch literature usually overrates the influence of Hudig of the NIVS in putting regional planning on the agenda.\(^{111}\) However, after Gothenburg the exploration of regional planning was imperative. How then was regional planning defined at Amsterdam?

All lecturers placed regional planning in the context of the giant city and assumed that the pressing urban problems could only be properly addressed through a regional perspective.\(^{112}\) Dutch architect M.J. Granpré Molière, professor at the Technical University at Delft, identified a disorder in the existing cities caused by the greed for immediate gain and called for a restoration of the harmony between town and country that could only be achieved by regional planning. Nature had to enter the towns and the increasing urban populations had to be guided towards the country in an orderly fashion. Unwin recognized the same urban disorder, but chose a more pragmatic approach. In the giant city mounting costs of distribution and increasing congestion were likely to destroy prosperity. Moreover, the megapolis had bereft its citizens of full employment in organic communal life. Further expansions, both horizontally and vertically, had to be substituted by definitely planned and organised units, self-contained suburbs, satellite towns or garden cities. Molière and Unwin crossed the ball well for Purdom to once more elaborate on satellite towns as the best alternative for overcrowded, congested cities.

This time the garden city or satellite message was not treated as sole constituent of regional planning. Instead, other planning experiences were called upon to provide a solid scientific foundation. Because the stakes were very high, only practical experience that had already proved itself was admitted. This practical experience had to be (politically) undisputed and consistent with the British satellite idea.\(^{113}\) The four main additions were: the British regional surveys executed by the likes of regional planning pioneer Patrick Abercrombie, the \textit{Regional Survey of New York and its Environs} (1921-1931) under supervision of Thomas Adams, the regional planning scheme in the Ruhr area headed by Robert Schmidt and the conception of regional planning by Fritz Schumacher.
Renowned regional planning pioneer Patrick Abercrombie was programmed to deliver a lecture on British regional survey experience. Undoubtedly, his highly influential regional plan for the Doncaster region had earned him his ticket to the Amsterdam congress. Whereas in 1919 Geddes’ survey method was still dismissed as fanciful and impracticable by the pragmatically orientated garden city workers, Abercrombie’s practical implementation was now called upon to provide a solid scientific foundation for the satellite idea that was sorely missed. Abercrombie gave an overview of regional schemes in Britain and gave a summary of the headings of a regional survey: (a) physical – geology, climate, etc.; (b) historical; (c) commerce – business and industry; (d) population and housing; (e) health – comparison of conditions of environment and resulting public health; (f) means of communication; (g) open spaces; (h) zoning – surface utilisation and general tendencies of development. English regional survey experience not only held a prominent position in the sessions, but also dominated the adjoining town planning exhibition. In addition to the well-known plans for the Doncaster, Manchester, Dee-side, Rotherham, North Tyneside, West Middlesex and Thames Valley plans, the British displayed preliminary plans for North East Surrey, West Kent, Mansfield and East Kent.

Thomas Adams, the former secretary of the GCTPA, tackled the subject of zoning. He identified four main zoning categories; (1) commerce, (2) residence, (3) recreation and (4) agriculture. He stated that the large cities were greatly affected by the rapid growth of motor traffic and its demand on highways, the increasing trend of industry to relocate in suburban and rural areas and finally the excrescences of haphazard urban expansion. There was no one golden zoning regulation to counter these circumstances; zoning should be based on sound survey of specific local needs and conditions. Adams illustrated his argument by referring to the *Regional Survey of New York and its Environs*, of which he was in charge. This bold American regional planning exercise was prominently featured at the town planning exhibition and was presented in full in another paper presentation by Flavel Shurtleff. The New York survey was to hand an analysis of the development of the city from a regional perspective over a longer period. The whole enterprise was a private initiative, funded by the Russell Sage Foundation. Although Adams and his staff envisioned a regional model to guide the growth of New York, their proposals first and foremost had the character of a theoretical exercise in the tradition of Geddes (survey before action). The methods for gathering and ordering relevant information were the primary objective of the project. The survey was divided into four parts: research of the natural state (geology, climate, etc.) of the New York region, its social conditions, relevant legal regulations and economical and industrial situation. By extrapolating the collected data the surveyors concluded that developments in commerce and industry were primarily responsible for the growth of population and that this growth in turn was the chief factor for the rocketing land prices. Together with the material, economical and social elements, the land prices defined urban society. People expecting Adams to use his position as chief director of the survey work to propose a fulfilment of Howard’s dream of the Social City in the New York Region were to be disappointed. He opted for a course less likely to meet opposition from the ‘business elite’ of the Russell Sage Foundation. The plan sought to use the benefits of concentration, without the evils of congestion. Thus the surroundings of New York had to be suburbanized and connected with Manhattan by a high-quality transportation network, while at the heart of the city high-rise (skyscrapers) was to advance dramatically.
Village classification from Patrick Abercrombie’s regional plan for the Doncaster region (1922)
Inventory of land use (above) from Thomas Adam's *Regional Survey of New York and its Environs* (1929).
Roberts Schmidt’s paper on the regional plan of the Ruhr area of which he was the director – this plan was also displayed at the exhibition - clearly showed that practical regional planning experience was not confined to the Anglo-Saxon world. He gave an outline of the administrative foundations, spatial organisation, objectives and bottlenecks of this first legislatively backed regional plan in Europe. The Ruhr plan did not originate in a scientific interest of survey methods, but in bitter necessity. The Versailles Peace Treaty obliged the Germans to compensate the war damages through coal supplies. This posed a gigantic logistic challenge that could not be solved at the municipal level. Thus in 1920 the Siedlungsverband Ruhrkohlenbezirk, a public corporation of the Ruhr municipalities, was created to systematically prepare and guide the required growth of the mining industry in the region and house the massive stream of miners entering the region. The central task of the Siedlungsverband was to use inter-municipal regional planning to formulate an economic plan and bundle traffic flows to avoid the Ruhr region from falling into one gigantic suburban mass. Schmidt wanted to keep the landscape open. He saw the need to establish decentralised towns with an open lay-out, analogous to the British idea of satellites as raison d’être for regional planning. The regional plan for the Ruhr area required a sound survey of the industrial ambitions and the terrains needed for housing, working and leisure. Allocation in relation to traffic, low-rise housing and large gardens were regarded essential elements. Strategically located forested areas near future colonies were to be preserved and used as recreational havens. The remainder of the region maintained an agricultural function and acted as a fluid greenbelt between the mining colonies.

Fritz Schumacher was the odd man out in the company. Unlike the other papers, his did not present decentralisation as the answer to the pressing urban evils. The city was to expand in broad strips along arterial roads surrounded by nature, creating an octopus-like lobed city. This expansion model had far more in common with Comey’s multidirectional growth along arterial roads on hexagonal patterns and the concept of the linear city than the British satellite idea. Schumacher’s regional extension planning attributed a key position to open spaces as a means to order the transition from the city centre to the country. He wanted “to design the metropolis as to gradually and systematically convert the architectural essence of its residential districts into nature, starting with the type of the medium-sized city, gradually changing to the type of the small town and finally ending in the village.” A social program was an essential part of any extension plan. Such a program was not only to arrange open spaces for sport and play, but also squares, social housing, schools, libraries, museums and the preservation of monuments. Open spaces were no longer conceived as isolated islands in the urban sea, but as a linked system that functioned as a vital artery of the city. This system was used to integrate old and new elements and to reconcile them with mass housing. By embedding the system of open spaces in the urban character of public spaces and representative buildings Schumacher could create characteristic centres that were to propagate modern social ideals. He had brilliantly translated these principles in regional plans for Hamburg and Cologne, that had landed him his invitation for the Amsterdam congress.
Siedlungsverband Ruhrkohlenbezirk, regional plan for highway routes (circa 1926)

Th.K. van Lohuizen prepared a regional survey of the Dutch region that would later be known as ‘Randstad’ for the 1924 congress of the IFHTP in Amsterdam.
In this grand display of regional planning the Dutch hosts also had their parts to play. Pieter Bakker Schut, director of the department of public works of The Hague, picked out four regions that urgently required a regional plan based on Anglo-Saxon survey experience. Gerrit van Poelje, secretary general of the department of education of The Hague and prominent expert in administrative sciences, made a brief analysis of foreign legislation for regional planning to select the best options for the Netherlands. He proposed to develop existing medium-sized towns into satellites, rather than to attempt to build new ones. Moreover, he strongly urged to plan large arterial roads, waterways and aviation at the national level to secure adjustment of regional plans to one another. Preservation campaigner A. Cleyndert Azn, executive member of the Vereeniging tot Behoud van Natuurmonumenten, stressed the necessity to equip regional plans with a social program to promote leisure and to preserve the open countryside. Parks, other open spaces and the open countryside should be linked by parkways to create a coherent park system. Although this plea sounded a lot like Schumacher’s paper, Cleyndert actually referred to an older planning tradition: the nineteenth century American park systems as pioneered by Frederick Law Olmsted. Theodoor van Lohuizen, employee of the housing department of Rotterdam prepared a regional survey of the Rotterdam-the Hague area based on British examples, especially the work of Abercrombie, for the town planning exhibition. This was the very first Dutch regional survey on the lines of Geddes.

The Amsterdam conference achieved the desired reassessment of the satellite idea: a regional plan based on sound survey was to guide the urban explosion in an orderly fashion to decentralised new centres (satellites, garden cities, Siedlungen et cetera), to arrange infrastructural networks to secure accessibility and mobility between the old and new centres and to project comprehensive park systems to preserve the open countryside and natural and historical values, to secure sufficient open spaces and to provide facilities for leisure. It was this rejuvenation of the satellite idea that Purdom published a year later in his well-known The Building of Satellite Towns (1925). However, the updated message did not embrace all teachings of the keynote lecturers. Although the main papers had explicitly also put the old city on the map as a subject for regional planning, Purdom and his companions continued to focus on the establishment of independent new centres, assuming the old cities would subsequently dissolve. Moreover, for all the talks about social programs, it was economic validity and efficiency that provided the main logic behind regional planning. The new framework adopted at Amsterdam served as a point of reference for the next conferences. But the effects of the Amsterdam conference were felt beyond the IFHTP. De Ruijter and Bosma describe how the conference served as an accelerator for the advance of regional planning in the Netherlands. Additionally, the resolutions adopted at the conference explicitly served as a reference for the new Prussian town planning bill.

3.6.3 Dissidents
The previous subparagraph discussed the trajectory from the garden city idea to regional decentralisation that characterized the message of the IFHTP in the early 1920s. It is important to note that this trajectory was made possible by mechanisms of exclusion. Most of the times exclusion was effective, but it was rarely absolute. Who was excluded and how was their exclusion effected in the IFHTP?
Urban decentralization scheme, presented by Raymond Unwin at the 1924 congress of the IFHTP in Amsterdam.

Urban decentralization scheme, presented by George Pepler at the 1925 congress of the IFHTP in New York.
The politically undesirable
After the War the IFHTP broadened its target group beyond the garden city advocates of the earliest hour to include the governmental agencies in the field of housing and town planning. Doing this, politics inevitably entered the picture, despite the formal principle of neutrality. Thus the outcasts of the international political arena no longer were allowed to participate. Although the British leaders favoured an early return of their old comrades from Germany and Austria, the re-admittance of the aggressors of the War definitely proved to be a bridge too far for most continental members. The Germans and Austrians managed to redeem themselves in late 1922 and rejoined the congresses in 1923, but their brief absence must have been a severe drain for the satellite town discussion in the first years of the 1920s. Of all the continental authorities it was ‘Red Vienna’ that was most actively experimenting with the garden city idea to meet the pressing post-war demands for mass housing. Besides the aggressors of the War, also Russia found itself in a political isolation in the 1920s. Western Europe feared a spread of the communist revolution and followed the Soviets with wary eyes. The IFHTP adopted the general western policy of turning a cold shoulder to Russia and did not invite Russian lecturers for its congresses. This of course meant that the IFHTP ignored the tremendous Russian efforts to industrialize the regions in the Caucasus, Siberia and Ukraine, including the planning preparations. However, unlike the Germans and Austrians after the War, the Soviets were not barred from membership.

The rivals
The IFHTP also anxiously avoided offering platform to rivalling ideas. Only Geddes’ concept of civics was given a modest spot on the stage. But then, there was no real animosity between civics and the garden city idea. The champions of civics were all related to the garden city movement. Initially, the British garden city militants did not regard civics as a serious contender; the theoretical science of town planning was no match for the supposed pragmatic superiority of the garden city idea. Things rapidly changed in the early 1920s as theory was tested and was implemented in acclaimed pioneering regional plans. The garden city advocates did not fail to notice that these plans offered garden villages and garden suburbs. Thus it was only logical to turn towards civics to borrow a scientific regional framework for the garden city idea.

Apart from civics, representatives from rivalling town planning concepts were denied access to the stage at the congresses. However, they were not barred from membership, so they were able to attend the congresses and use discussions and corridor chats to disseminate their ideas. For example, George Benoît-Lévy, the French garden city advocate of the early hour who had matured into one of the foremost advocates of the linear city, made himself prominently heard during the proceedings of the 1922 congress in Paris. However, some dissidents did not settle for this situation and demanded more attention for their ideas. Thus Ottawa’s engineer-planner Noulan Couchon presented his ideal conception of town planning at the 1925 congress in New York. Just like the earlier mentioned planner Comey, Couchon was a militant of the hexagonal city. He certainly was not a programmed lecturer, so he must have been one of the unofficial speakers Purdom complained about that “brought papers with them which they read whenever an opportunity presented itself.” Couchon’s proposal was well-received. It was reprinted in numerous technical journals and landed him several invitations for conferences in the United States. At the conference he met British planner Barry Parker. Parker had become obsessed with what he called “the
present motor age” and “economy of development.” He was very susceptible to Couchon’s ideas and later tried to combine the hexagonal schemes with the Radburn-layout (1929), first in a theoretical paper, later on the ground of his influential Wythenshawe scheme near Manchester. However, the most important European advocate of the hexagonal city was not Parker, but Benoît-Lévy, who integrated the hexagon in his linear (garden) city concept.125

The idealists

Not just dissident concepts were excluded. After the War the IFHTP wholeheartedly embraced a pragmatic course to see its message adopted in governmental circles. This effectively meant that the overtly utopian interpretations of the garden city idea were silenced. Howard and his propagation of an ideal international garden city were the first to fall prey to this new course. After the War Howard’s position in the international body was rapidly confined to mere symbolic father of the movement without any real influence.126

The mechanisms of exclusion become even clearer when we analyse the agenda of the 1924 congress in Amsterdam. Confronted with a crisis – a revaluation of the garden city or satellite faith in relation to regional planning was urgently required to secure the rationale of the international organisation - it deliberately handpicked representatives of proven expertise for the paper presentations and anxiously avoided the ideological opposition of the selected pragmatic experience, even if this opposition was concentrated in (parts of) its own backing.127 Thus American regional planning was represented solely by Adams and the Regional Plan of New York and its Environs. From the outset the New York survey was criticized by an unlikely opponent: the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA; 1923-1933), championed by Lewis Mumford. The RPAA members were not invited to deliver papers at Amsterdam, although RPAA member Clarence Stein was present and even acted as one of the sub-chairmen of the conference. Why did Adams and the RPAA clash over a regional plan for New York? The dispute was not centred around the preferred regional scope, nor the surveying methods to be employed. Both parties were adamant followers of the Geddesian teachings. The controversy focussed on the mental, or perhaps even better said the moral horizon of the regional plan. Adams thought that the regional plan should reflect the art of the possible and that therefore “the Regional Plan was to be no revolutionary prescription but a set of mild controls on market abuses to aid efficiency, plus some uncontroversial good things like new roads, parks and beaches”, while Lewis Mumford primarily saw regional planning as an agent to establish his revolutionary reform.128

Just like Adams’ survey for New York, Schmidt’s pragmatic regional plan for the Ruhr region became a target for criticisms by planners that upheld a higher moral horizon for regional planning. It was Gustav Langen who made himself the main spokesman of the opposition. Langen was present at the Amsterdam conference. Not only did he provide material from his Wandermuseum for the German entry of the town planning exhibition, but he also actively participated in the discussions at the sessions. According to him the regional segmentation into open spaces and infrastructural bundles – the central objective of the Siedlungsverband – was not about town planning, but was a purely technical affair. Proper town planning demanded a social program, “not just elastic forms for a totally useless future development.”129
3.7 Conclusion

Once international contacts normalized after the War, the IFHTP was quick to fully resume its activities. Initially, the international organisation wanted to turn back the clock. Despite continental reservations about the naturalness of British leadership that manifested themselves during the reconstruction campaign in the wartime years, the IFHTP was still exclusively served by its British officers, first and foremost the secretaries Culpin and Purdom, from GCTPA headquarters in London. However, this British hegemony was soon challenged. The French and Belgian members did not want the international body to serve as an extension of British garden city propaganda and demanded attention for their housing and town planning problems and solutions as well. The Belgian and French critics were joined by a tremendous influx of new members – the increase of conference attendance from about 150 registered delegates at the 1920 London congress to more than 1,000 registered delegates at the Vienna congress perfectly illustrates this growth. These new members mainly stemmed from the faltering International Housing Congresses and Union Internationale des Villes – the members of the largely inactive international housing and town planning organisations ‘switched’ to the IFHTP to resume the transnational trade of ideas and experiences – and a growing volume of professional institutions and organisations that reflected the rapid institutionalisation of housing and town planning in advanced Western countries after the First World War. This significantly changed the composure of (active) membership. Interested laymen stepped back, professionals and officials gained the upper hand. The new membership considered exclusive garden city propaganda under British guidance a too narrow foundation for internationalisation of housing and town planning.

Pressured by the foreign members, the British leadership reasserted the outlook of the International Federation. The firm grip of the GCTPA on its international counterpart was gradually pushed back to appease the dissatisfied foreign members. The IFHTP moved to its own office, employed its own paid staff – organising secretary Harry Chapman – and for the first time appointed non-British officers – Frenchman Henri Sellier became the first chairman of the executive committee. In 1923 the office of chairman of the council became a circulating office. Due to the tremendous influx of new foreign members, the British faction by the mid-1920s had lost its absolute majority in the organs of the international organisation. Despite the shifts in the internal power balance, the IFHTP did retain a distinct ‘British flavour.’ The original British culture of voluntary action (besides Chapman none of the officers were reimbursed), hierarchy, harmony and unanimity persevered.

The post-war growth of the IFHTP is consistent with the trajectory of transnational civil society at large in the 1920s. However, this growth deviates from the trajectory of its immediate competitors. Its competitive advantage can be partly explained by its starting position immediately after the War. The International Housing Congresses and the Union International des Villes had to re-establish themselves after the War, whereas the IFHTP could build upon its wartime activity. But the character of the organisation played a role as well. Whereas the International Housing Congresses was torn apart by fierce internal debates and eventually became an easy prey for the IFHTP – the two merged in 1926 -, the (British) harmonious culture of the IFHTP kept such conflicts at bay. The Union Internationale des Villes was seriously handicapped by its institutional character. It principally served local
authorities, whereas after the War the national state was generally acknowledged as the basic level for international and transnational activity. The *Union Internationale des Villes* only successfully resurrected itself once it abandoned its old ideal of a global governance by an international union of local authorities that was to replace the belligerent nations. Following the example of the IFHTP, it settled for a focus on practical issues, rapidly becoming the foremost rival of the IFHTP.

The organisational changes of the IFHTP called for a professionalization and systematization of the activities of the IFHTP. Thus the annual international conferences quickly matured from modest gatherings of garden city enthusiasts into large CityEvents that served as focal points in the international networks for the transnational trade of town planning ideas and experience. Additionally the IFHTP started its own periodical to disseminate knowledge acquired on the basis of standardized questionnaires, thus facilitating international comparison. This quest for an international comparative town planning discipline to substitute the traditional diktat of British garden city experience was further dressed by a range of subcommittees working on proposals for a universal town planning annotation, travelling town planning exhibitions and a tri-lingual town planning glossary.

Shifting internal power balances and the new post-war context also affected the agenda of the IFHTP. Confronted with opposition against the true garden city – even at home the British garden city militants were unable to sell the Howardian dream in its purest form – the British leadership resorted to the propagation of satellite towns, garden suburbs with all the properties of the true garden city. However, most members considered the satellite town too meagre a solution to address the manifesting problems of urbanisation. Thus the satellite idea merged into a broader international, comparative conception of regional planning in which the satellite was but one, albeit an important, constituent.