

---

# Geography, colonialism and town planning: Patrick Geddes' plan for mandatory Jerusalem

*cultural geographies*  
18(2) 231–248  
© The Author(s) 2011  
Reprints and permission: sagepub.  
co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1474474011402256  
cgj.sagepub.com



**Noah Hysler Rubin**

Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Israel

## Abstract

Patrick Geddes worked in Jerusalem between 1919 and 1925. He was originally summoned to the city by the Zionists, in order to plan the Hebrew University of Jerusalem; eventually, he also submitted an overall plan for the city, presented to its British Governor. Geddes' university plan and many of his other local cultural and educational endeavours were not successful. However, his plan for the city was approved and still dictates its development on many planes. The article discusses Geddes' overall work in Jerusalem as a product of his imperial world view, as he pictured the re-instatement of a biblical Jerusalem and assigned the homecoming Zionists the ancient role of a regional leader among its neighbouring countries. Geddes' tools for the study of the environment, such as the survey, and his educational endeavours such as the museum and the exhibition, are discussed as local manifestations of the geographical imperial project. Geddes' urban theory is discussed as a rigid and a foreign product of western and orientalist nature, which was enforced upon the landscape. Geddes himself is presented as a colonial town planner, one who practiced through an imperial professional and personal network and who had aspired to serve both the British and the Jews over the control of identity and space in contested Palestine. Finally, the article links Geography and Planning through the colonial practice of urban and social transformation.

## Keywords

Colonial town planning; imperial geography; Jerusalem; Patrick Geddes

## Introduction: Geddes and study of the planning of colonial cities

Patrick Geddes (1854–1932), a Scottish town planner, is a popular subject of research, in Israel as well as throughout the world. Several biographies describe the life of the biologist, sociologist, geographer, and planner, and many researchers discuss the work of the planner who is considered a disciplinary pioneer. Following changing trends in planning theory and practice in the late 1970s, Geddes has been crowned more specifically as a planning prophet, and his name became synonymous with anything that was sensitive, local, and humane in planning; Helen Meller's corpus of

---

### Corresponding author:

Noah Hysler Rubin, Urban Design Masters' Degree Program, Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, 23 Jaffa St., Jerusalem, Israel

Email: noah.rubin@mail.huji.ac.il

Geddes research has especially supplied a conceptual framework for many works which follow this interpretation.<sup>1</sup> Since then, alongside the ongoing theoretical research, Geddes' work has been discussed locally in various cities in which he had been active throughout the British Empire, mainly in Britain, India, and Palestine.

Between 1918 and 1925 Geddes worked in Palestine, submitting plans for old cities such as Jerusalem, Haifa, and Tiberias, and planning new settlements along the popular lines of the garden cities paradigm. His plan for Tel Aviv (1925), at the age of 75, eventually became his swan song. Geddes' work received a place of honour in Israeli writings on geography and history, being generally described from a national perspective and mentioned regularly in research regarding the foundation of the State of Israel. The research describes Geddes' contribution to the identification and conservation of the built heritage of the Jewish homeland through the modern discipline of planning, thus also a cornerstone in the local planning heritage.<sup>2</sup> The interpretation of Geddes' work in Jerusalem especially reflects his overall perception as a planner who strove to reflect the needs and aspirations of the local Jewish community, which, together with his employment by the Zionist movement, made him a full associate of the Jewish homecoming.<sup>3</sup>

It seems as if the monolithic reading of Geddes' oeuvre as a planner, in Israel and elsewhere, sanctified both his goals and his means, shielding him from more in-depth comprehensive scrutiny while casting aside temporary criticism, finally protecting his status as a flawless representative of the positive practice of planning.<sup>4</sup> A more critical approach towards Geddes' work arises today from the subfield of cultural geography, which draws on contemporary cultural and post-colonial theories. Geography is scrutinized as an imperial science, unconsciously ethnocentric, rooted in European cultures and reflective of a dominant western worldview.<sup>5</sup> In the discussion of Geddes' plans and related educational endeavours in relation to geographical concepts prevailing in Britain at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, his visual appliances and graphic products are no longer considered innocent but rather linked to complex relationships of knowledge and power and imperial belonging.<sup>6</sup>

Analysis of Geddes' work through cultural geographical critique, nevertheless, only uses components of his work as illustrations for broader issues, never attempting a fuller analysis of his theory and practice. Moreover, despite the fact that Geddes worked for over 30 years in dozens of cities and applied his theory in various countries, no comparative study of his work was ever carried out. Most importantly, critical geographical scrutiny has not affected the appreciation of Geddes as a planner. Thus, although Geddes' work had been carried out within the political, social, and cultural framework of the British Empire, no thorough research has discussed his work as a colonial planner or examined his effect on colonial cities, sparing him so far from forthright contemporary critique regarding colonial town planning.

Contemporary approaches to the study of colonial cities mirror the rise of subaltern studies, relocating western narratives of progress in their wider colonial histories.<sup>7</sup> The colonial city is treated as a complex product of conflicting sets of values, research emphasizing hybridity and contestation while examining different perceptions and utilizations of the built environment by various communities.<sup>8</sup> Termed 'contested spaces', these cities are also examined as sites of recurrent undermining of imperial orders through negotiations over identity and place.<sup>9</sup>

The study of colonial town planning, as efficient means for the spatial extension of the concurring social, political, and economic relationships, has linked the knowledge of a place and its inhabitants with subordination and control. Planning has thus been studied as an exported practice, a set of modern techniques imposed on local settings.<sup>10</sup> Other readings discuss the way planning has been employed by local communities, examining contested urban visions produced by the indigenous population by responding to, or even domesticating, foreign professional strategies.<sup>11</sup>

Colonial planners are similarly examined as having been influenced by, if not directly responding to, the priorities and expectations of various actors from their host cities.<sup>12</sup> They are also described as operating within a professional network of imperial interconnectedness, thus providing insight into ‘the dynamic trajectories and networks of knowledge, power, commodities, emotion and culture that connected the multiple sites of the empire to each other, to the imperial metropole and to extra-imperial spaces beyond’.<sup>13</sup>

The object of this paper is to claim the coloniality of Geddes as a town planner by analysing his work in Jerusalem in 1919. Geddes’ work in Palestine in general, and in Jerusalem in particular, will be discussed here as a product of his multiple loyalties to the empire and its imperatives as well as to the Zionist cause. It is, therefore, presented as a fascinating case study of the planning of a space contested by British rulers as well as by the complex indigenous society of Arabs and Jews. By linking, for the first time, between the existing scrutiny of Geddes within the discourse of postcolonial geography and the ongoing analysis of colonial cities, I will claim that Geddes employed his quasi-scientific methods for studying and analyzing the built heritage of the city mainly as evidence of its great Hebrew past. I will examine how Geddes’ educational activities, deeply rooted in the geographical tradition, were used in Jerusalem as regulatory means for renewing the role of the Jews as regional leaders. Finally, I will present the resultant plan, a professional document of immense magnitude, as a practical vision of Jerusalem as a modern biblical city. I will thus present Geddes’ work in Jerusalem as part of a professional and cultural imperial network which supported his desire to serve the homecoming Jews, reflecting his western, evangelist, and orientalist worldviews.

After presenting the complex imperial aspects of Geddes’ planning commission in Jerusalem, the paper will examine five different features of the planning process: the survey, the museum, the travelling Cities and Town Planning Exhibition, the university and the overall plan. Each component will be discussed in the overall context of Geddes’ planning paradigm and its current geographical scrutiny will be presented. The role of each component within the planning of Jerusalem will be analysed accordingly. The overall impact and importance of each component within the imperial shaping of Jerusalem will be discussed in the conclusion.

As the paper aims to show, in spite of Geddes’ acknowledged sensitivity to the local population, his passionate worldview and his inflexible planning system obstructed any real local input, and his vision for Jerusalem was in fact estranged from both his Zionist and British employers. Nevertheless, the plan, which has been mostly implemented, determines the development of Jerusalem to this very day. Although most of the related meanings have been stripped from it, its constituting ideals, based on imperial geographical concepts, are still apparent. Thus, by providing a joint study of geography and planning through a postcolonial lens, the article also suggests the study of planning as theoretical and practical development of the social and political imperatives of imperial geography.<sup>14</sup>

## **Geddes in Jerusalem, a representative of the Empire**

Geddes’ colonial endeavours constitute the bulk of his practical work; most of them came about through personal acquaintances and professional networks. In 1914 Geddes was invited to display his travelling Town Planning Exhibition in Madras by the Governor of Madras, John Sinclair, Lord Pentland, former Secretary of State for Scotland and also the son-in-law of Lord and Lady Aberdeen, with whom Geddes had worked in Dublin only a few years earlier.<sup>15</sup> Lord Pentland and his fellow governors arranged a tour for Geddes throughout the subcontinent. For the next ten years Geddes would be employed as a planner on various commissions by British officials and also by local princes and maharajas.

In 1918 Geddes suggested a plan for a university at the city of Indore, commissioned by the local Prince of Holkar.<sup>16</sup> Very proud of the result, he sent a copy of the accompanying report to Jewish British psychoanalyst David Eder, a friend and colleague.<sup>17</sup> Eder was also an elected representative of the Zionist Executive in Palestine. Already in 1918, shortly after the British occupation of Jerusalem, Geddes had suggested planning the city; at the time he approached Eder through Israel Zangwill, Eder's nephew and also an old acquaintance of Geddes since their joint days working at the poor East End of London.<sup>18</sup> Back then, Eder had to decline: 'I need scarcely tell you how I would rejoice to see you here, engaged in reconstructing . . . I cannot offer you an official invitation as the Zionist Commission is unfortunately not the reigning government'.<sup>19</sup> However, in 1919 the planning of the Hebrew University was on the agenda. Eder wrote to Chaim Weizmann, the head of the Zionist Commission to Palestine, and Geddes' appointment was soon under way. Upon his arrival in Palestine Geddes received a list of eight additional projects for the Zionist Commission, consisting mainly of the planning of new neighbourhoods and agricultural colonies.<sup>20</sup>

When Geddes arrived in Jerusalem, the first plan for the city, commissioned by the British, had already been submitted. Prepared by the engineer William McLean, the plan was critically reviewed back in London; it was also followed by a fierce debate among the Jewish population, regarding its status in the city.<sup>21</sup> As Geddes soon associated with Charles Robert Ashbee, another former colleague and also the civic advisor to Governor Ronald Storrs, it was suggested to employ him in the preparation of a report to the Zionist Organization in London: ' . . . Prof. Geddes knows how to maintain what is traditional and beautiful of the past whilst combining it with all the necessary requirements in the way of sanitation, hygiene and modern requirements'.<sup>22</sup> Again, the reply was in the affirmative: 'we are convinced with you that the town planning question in general is of the greatest importance and that the future appearance of Jerusalem as a whole deserves our special attention . . . Dr. Eder's proposal to have the whole question studied by Prof. Patrick Geddes meets with our entire approval'.<sup>23</sup>

However, being commissioned to plan Jerusalem for the Jewish population was not a simple matter. Following an article on the subject in the *Jewish Chronicle*,<sup>24</sup> the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs turned to Weizmann, who immediately wrote to Geddes: ' . . . the paragraphs which appeared in the press regarding your mission to Palestine may give offence to the British administration in Palestine and also perhaps alarm the Arabs. It may be construed as meaning that the Zionist Organization desires to encroach upon the town planning schemes which have been initiated by the authorities on the spot . . .'.<sup>25</sup> Geddes replied that Ronald Storrs had promised him his support with whatever improvement he would suggest to the existing plan;<sup>26</sup> nevertheless, from then on, planning Jerusalem did not appear on the list of jobs Geddes was assigned.<sup>27</sup> However, Geddes' planning report, which was officially addressed 'to the General Administration of Palestine – and to the Governor of Jerusalem', was printed at the Zionist Commission's offices and submitted formally by Eder to both Storrs and to Weizmann.<sup>28</sup> In January 1920 the report was reproduced and distributed among Jewish leaders and organizations throughout the world, emphasizing its confidentiality.<sup>29</sup>

Upon his return to Jerusalem in June 1920 Geddes wrote to Ashbee, maintaining that his work in the city was carried out 'with just the same independence of Jewish or other specific influence or bias as in any previous city'.<sup>30</sup> The ambiguity regarding Geddes' employers in Palestine continued to increase, as both British and Zionists employed him, separately and together, throughout his visits.<sup>31</sup>

## Geddes' planning theory and the Holy Land

Geddes' imperial career can also be described as part of the 'Scottish Empire', prominent both in India and in Palestine.<sup>32</sup> The Scottish cultural response to Palestine, claims Michael Fry, moved between

evangelist to orientalist, as the Scots' sympathy for the Jews emanated from their shared regard for the Holy Scriptures. The Scottish, he describes, wished to restore 'the civilised country' and encourage the repossession by the Jews of their native land; following their God, the Scottish chose the Jews.<sup>33</sup> In his passionate, religious interest in the Zionist homecoming, Fry claims, Geddes joined his countrymen, fostering the spiritual and intellectual qualities of a small nation forging an independent identity.<sup>34</sup>

These notions were indeed also embedded into Geddes' elaborate planning theory, which he had formulated in Britain and later practiced throughout the Empire. It is generally agreed that Geddes practiced in India (and later in Palestine and elsewhere) the theory he had amalgamated at home, and also that in his first stop in India, Madras, he devised a basic practice which he was to carry throughout his work since.<sup>35</sup> Apparently, Geddes' basic theories were already developed by the time he embarked on his first experiment in regional social and economic planning in Cyprus in 1897.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, Geddes' theory, tools and expected outcomes all seem to have remained constant since their initial inception, composing an overall urban scheme which can be defined and traced throughout his various endeavors, reflecting a fixed worldview and inflexible practice.<sup>37</sup>

In the historical, cultural scheme within which Geddes operated, the ancient Hebrew civilization played an important role. According to the popular cultural interpretation, which Geddes embraced in his theory, the biblical people of Israel formed the earliest stage of western civilization holding traits which he wished to revive such as holistic approach, spiritual leadership, and a rich educational heritage.<sup>38</sup> As early as 1913 Geddes expressed his wish to plan Jerusalem, which he viewed as an ancient prototype for urban renewal.<sup>39</sup> He later expressed his admiration of the Zionist society in Palestine, picturing its recent homecoming as the re-instatement of a biblical entity in the Holy Land and assigning it the ancient role of a regional leader among its neighbouring countries.<sup>40</sup> The result in Jerusalem was a plan which aimed at returning the city to its biblical glory, restoring the ancient regional and cultural order, manifesting once again a popular Christian desire.

## The Survey: imperial gaze and biblical vision

Jerusalem of 1918 was a predominantly oriental, traditional city, whose character was being challenged by modernization and exposure to western technology and culture. Competition for an imperial foothold in Palestine resulted in monumental edifices and large compounds of European religious and philanthropic institutions, mainly outside the old city. Zionist modernizing forces encouraged Jews to leave the crowded Jewish quarter, resulting in the construction of many Jewish housing estates around the city; a modern Jerusalem was slowly emerging. Upon the British occupation in December 1917 and the acquisition of a League of Nations mandate in 1922, Jerusalem, still recovering from the war, was emerging as an important political and cultural entity.<sup>41</sup>

Geddes' account of the city is described in his report, 'Jerusalem: Actual and Possible', a written forecast, alongside with a plan, for the development of the town and the education of society.<sup>42</sup> Geddes' planning report is based on a comprehensive survey, a geographical practice which he advocated as a preliminary step in planning already in his early years in Edinburgh.<sup>43</sup> The survey was meant to allow the planner to study the city and its society by employing maps, plans, statistical data, local artefacts, personal impressions and more in his effort to identify the local urban and social potential for growth.<sup>44</sup> The survey was based on the belief in any person's – let alone the planner's – visual capacity and inherent potential to observe and analyse his findings objectively, generally reflecting popular geographical positivism.<sup>45</sup>

However, the popular devices and visual products which Geddes had relied upon and produced himself, mainly the fieldwork and the map, have long been scrutinized as direct applications of the



imperial, totalizing, gaze.<sup>46</sup> Thus, Geddes' camera obscura, installed in the Outlook Tower in Edinburgh and employed for panoramic observation, endowed the observer with 'a funny, potentially voyeuristic kind of power over the object, deriving from both the nature of the image and its place in the dome'.<sup>47</sup> As Geddes conceived of the environment as a visual archive, explains Christine Boyer, 'the phantasmagoria of material facts . . . had to be mapped and structured in some manner if this plethoric accounting of details was to be intelligible'.<sup>48</sup> Thus, she describes Geddes' 'variety of optical instruments' as connoting power over the landscape, placing the viewer outside the instrumental proposition of the daily lives,<sup>49</sup> 'through which the world/city could be gazed upon, penetrated, analyzed, recorded, ordered and classified, and laid down for proposed changes'.<sup>50</sup> As a conscious yet inclined observer, Geddes can be similarly accused of making sense of the world from his own experiences, his representation being narratives of his own worldly interpretations.<sup>51</sup>

Geddes' survey, described by Naylor and Jones as a process of global homogenization which allowed local-level groupings and classifications,<sup>52</sup> presented a vivid image of ancient Jerusalem as a sterile entity, producing a carefully selected archive of biblical elements chosen mainly by their oriental imagery. Already in his first stop in Jerusalem, just after alighting from the train and taking the views, Geddes notices 'the noble City Wall leading on to the ancient Castle and Gate, but also the many modern disfigurements . . . on the one hand the mean modern buildings in the valley . . . and on the other the exaggerated scale and ill-designed detail of various modern religious buildings'.<sup>53</sup> Geddes praises Ashbee's intention to rehabilitate the ancient citadel and the surrounding walls. Other features which he marks out for rehabilitation and preservation are generally remnants of Israel of old, such as pools and agricultural terraces, being 'the only monuments of biblical times which it is possible to restore to their pristine condition and beauty'.<sup>54</sup> True to his historic paradigm, he also lists cemeteries and major tombs, schools and welfare institutes, monasteries and convents, all reflecting the city's preferred character.

The elements which Geddes condemned, on the other hand, were those which obstructed his chosen image of the city, whether they hindered its unique built traits; were foreign to its biblical landscape; or very simply, ugly. In this spirit, he mocked, among others, the many monumental institutes built by foreign empires, demanding to pull down the Turkish clock tower erected adjacent to the city walls or foreign European buildings, to which he pointed as vulgar modern decoration.<sup>55</sup> The recently built Jewish quarters reminded Geddes of European ghettos and were generally destined for removal.<sup>56</sup>

## The Palestinian Museum

In Geddes' scheme, the material facts picked by the viewer-planner, other than serving for future planning, were also intended to constitute the beginning of a Civic Museum, incorporating existing collections of local libraries or museums and providing a comprehensive representation of the city.<sup>57</sup> The museum suggested by Geddes was in fact a typical form of display in the line of popular exhibitions, fairs, museums, botanic gardens, and archives, all imposing a unified interpretation and ordering.<sup>58</sup> These are interpreted today as educational devices in which the arrangement of the artefacts in convenient and ordered categories reflected, according to Mary Louise Pratt, 'Eurocentred planetary consciousness', thus producing a new kind of knowledge based on imperial hierarchy.<sup>59</sup> Geddes' own description of the incipient institute brings to mind imperial accumulation and its classification: 'We bring home . . . spoils, treasures, wonders, beauty-feasts . . . each obviously the beginning of a museum-gallery proper. But the specimens are as yet unarranged and unlabelled'.<sup>60</sup>

The museums Geddes suggested for Jerusalem supported his local vision and reflected his unified worldview. One would be a War Museum, 'a collection of ordnance and weapons of past historic times . . . the well known examples of the Tower of London, and of Edinburgh Castle, may be cited here as War Museums of great interest'.<sup>61</sup> Another museum would be 'a Palestinian museum, a Jerusalem museum, or whatever it may be called on lines at once comprehensively regional and civic'.<sup>62</sup> The outline of the museum was meant to recount the local succession of historic cultures which have surrounded and affected both the Hebrews and Palestine:<sup>63</sup>

In fact, the long history of Israel, from the Patriarchs to the present . . . how attractive will be a series of good Relief Models of Jerusalem, illustrating . . . the extent and character of the city from its earliest Jebusite days, to its glories under David, its greatness under Solomon, and so on throughout its chequered history. In the sketch it will be noted that those Galleries, namely: (1) those of Geography (2) general history and (3) of Hebrew and Jerusalem history, all lead into a final Gallery, for the renewing Palestine with its developing Cities and Capital.<sup>64</sup>

The Palestinian Museum can easily be related to Boyer's claim regarding Geddes' Edinburgh Outlook Tower<sup>65</sup> as an 'encyclopedia of memory', displaying images which enabled comparisons and acting as the stimulus to memory by filling the didactic role of resurrecting past ideas;<sup>66</sup> more practically, as Boyer proclaimed, the museum would have called on images for arousal to civic action and city planning.<sup>67</sup> However, the museum's plan, which once again illustrated Geddes' personal inclination and proclaimed aims for the city's future, was criticized by a British official concerned with its political implications:

The museum should be Palestinian in the fullest sense of the term. It should be an institution in which the Christian and Moslem as well as the Jew should figure prominently . . . the plan as proposed by Mr. Geddes is not made from this point of view and contains many features which should be criticised. In the first place history and excavations inform us that the country was only partially occupied by the Jews . . . to show a parallel range and a distinct development of Jewish antiquities culminating in Zionism, without doing the same for other peoples would not only be scientifically a serious mistake, but it would be wholly unacceptable.<sup>68</sup>

## The travelling Cities and Town Planning Exhibition

Geddes' travelling exhibition was meant to enrich the local planning process by presenting suggestive examples of surveys of characteristic cities. The exhibition, which was originally mounted in London and later travelled throughout India, was based on Geddes' historical paradigm. It described the high points in western civilization, starting with the Hebrew one and progressing through the great empires of Greece and Rome, the medieval ages, the Renaissance, and finally, the present age. Jerusalem was provided as a comparative example, as well as Rome, London, and New York.<sup>69</sup> A specific gallery was devoted to the modern science of town planning and displayed two themes: new garden cities, and social improvements upon the lines of modern eugenics. Geddes' exhibition, an explicit educational tool, was accompanied by tours and lectures which, as with many others in their time, were meant to aid in maintaining geographical accomplishments and promoting imperial identities.<sup>70</sup>

The exhibition accompanied Geddes on his work in Palestine but remained in boxes until his second visit in 1920. As elsewhere, the content and aims of the Palestinian Exhibition were to outline the ever-fitting main aspect of the great human heritage, that of Civilization as well as the

practical aim of re-awakening citizens.<sup>71</sup> The local exhibition was opened by a range of local officials and received with a variety of remarks:

Mr. Nashashibi, the Mayor of Jerusalem emphasized the importance of combining the cultures of East and West, and expressed the hope that the High Commissioner may be successful in achieving his high minded programme for the improvement of Palestine's cities . . . Mr. Ussishkin, who brought the greetings of the Zionist Organisation, said in part: 'It is the Zionist Organisation which is responsible for the presence of Prof. Geddes in Palestine'.<sup>72</sup>

The exhibition, which represented Geddes' local ideal, revealed once again the ongoing discrepancy between his own vision and those of the local communities. The exhibition was not successful, as was reported in the special edition of *The Palestine Weekly* devoted to town planning.<sup>73</sup> When asked about the evident failure, Geddes replied:

After these ten days of opening to visitors, my impression is only too clear. In the last ten years I have held fifteen Exhibitions in as many cities . . . and this Jerusalem exhibition is as yet the most unsuccessful in arousing the attention of the educated, and professional classes, or the general interest of the public – with one solitary exception, that of Belfast, the city of Europe as yet most submerged of all in material interests, in political strifes and in religious hatred . . . That Jerusalem has to be improved, all sections of the public agree; but that this improvement . . . can only be realised in the measure of their general and individual arousal to a renewed spirit of citizenship, such as has existed at each and every constructive period of the city's history – this they have not yet awakened to see.<sup>74</sup>

To one of his Zionist collaborators he later wrote, 'between the historic idealism and the idealism of the future here was the concrete, the visual and practical building up. But only the mere handful, even of Zionists, realized this'.<sup>75</sup>

## The Hebrew University and the regional vision

The university, the original reason for Geddes' invitation to Palestine, was a crucial part in his urban plan: it is where the local tradition is studied and refined, and the future is outlined.<sup>76</sup> Planning a university in Jerusalem was a dream comes true. Geddes had high hopes for the Hebrew University as the first manifestation of the new, post-war order as a nascent Hebrew institute. From this perspective, the university had a missionary role, as it was meant to bring 'more and more clearly into view the yet wider claims of Israel throughout the ages, and of standing for these anew'.<sup>77</sup> Geddes' Hebrew University was in fact planned to be a Palestinian university, manifesting an ancient, joint, national, and regional goal, as a centre provided by the Zionist Movement, not only for the people of Israel but for the region as a whole: 'Nor can Israel, as the people who have most distinctively combined Oriental with Occidental ideals, ignore such suggestiveness as there may be in the developments of education among other Eastern peoples, each with its own culture, its corresponding share of light'.<sup>78</sup>

These notions were apparent in the layout of the university, its design, and its architecture and made a blunt – yet problematic – statement. The central Great Hall of the university, which had the role of gathering the Jewish population on suitable occasions, was also intended 'for the coming of the Palestinian people at the various great occasions of the year'.<sup>79</sup> Its design was based on the ultimate symbol of synthesis, which was also a Jewish symbol: 'Israel has her distinctive plan, though not yet so far as I know thus utilised that of the Hexagon, which is central to the Magen David upon her banners'.<sup>80</sup>



## The plan for biblical Jerusalem

Geddes' plan for Jerusalem constitutes his most direct and influential contribution to the city. As the earliest graphic manifestation to present a clear image of the future city, it can be viewed as a significant visual construction which enabled the practical processing of reality, a procedure which, in Ola Söderström's analysis, complies with the geographical procedures of selection, schematization, and synthesis.<sup>81</sup> The sophisticated form of mapping enabled the plan to pass from the complex reality to its simplified figuration and, eventually, its future projection. The visual product was complemented, according to Söderström, by the external capacity of the planner as a professional, producing a powerful combination which enabled total and immediate regulation, increasing even further the perception and visibility of the planned urban space and its rational ordering. This was an art, claims Söderström, which was fast developing in Britain at the beginning of the 20th century and can be best exemplified by the pioneering work of Patrick Geddes.<sup>82</sup>

Geddes' plan was in fact a compilation of both McLean's existing plan for the city and of Ashbee's suggestions.<sup>83</sup> Geddes partially adopted the zoning system suggested by McLean, which designated the Old City and its closest vicinity as an urban asset of great aesthetic value and archaeological importance. To the east, construction was totally forbidden so as to preserve the topographically dramatic and archaeologically valuable area including the formidable view of the Mount of Olives:<sup>84</sup> 'the oliveyard below Scopus [i.e. Scopus] is at present the only spot which gives an idea of the ancient aspect of this valley and of what should thus become its future aspect as well'.<sup>85</sup> To the west, Geddes suggested surrounding the Old City with a protective green belt incorporating those old artefacts to which he pointed in his survey, and comprising 'the great Sacred Park of Jerusalem' to create 'an almost complete Park Ring all around or through Jerusalem'.<sup>86</sup> Thus, Geddes' plan in fact isolated the Old City from its closest vicinity.

Nevertheless, having identified the desired origin for the new city, Geddes commended the architecture of the new city to be 'as far as possible in the traditional style, i.e. with flat roofs or small domes, and not sloped roofs with red tiles',<sup>87</sup> disregarding the fact the existing traditional architecture was mostly Arab. A new road pattern was also developed along existing roads while a new road northwards was planned to lead directly to the site of the planned, already marked, Hebrew University. Altogether new additions to the city were planned according to the popular lines of the Garden City, including some very near Herod's gate<sup>88</sup> and the new Jewish garden suburb, Talpioth, which included a school, place of worship, tennis courts, and playing fields, all within close walking distances.<sup>89</sup>

## Conserving the Old City?

In Geddes' plan for the Old City, which was to be preserved in its entirety, no planning can be discerned; however, it was the site for the employment of Geddes' unique technique for exposing and replenishing urban elements of old, *the conservative surgery*, which certainly involved some demolition, albeit on a smaller scale or – more precisely – following more selective criteria.<sup>90</sup> In Jerusalem, Geddes employed the technique for the rehabilitation of the ancient fosse surrounding the old city wall, in which 'the squalid buildings on the west side of the road next to the older dumping-ground along the valley, will naturally be removed to make room for the necessary new markets and Khan'.<sup>91</sup> The conservation scheme also included the replacement of a missing part of the city wall across the entrance roadway, removed in 1898 to allow Kaiser Wilhelm and his entourage to enter the city, but which Geddes considered desirable on both historical and artistic grounds.<sup>92</sup> In order to further enhance the look of biblical Jerusalem, Geddes also commended the



**Figure 1.** Geddes' plan for Jerusalem (1919).

Prof. Patrick Geddes, 1919, Jerusalem: Town Planning Scheme No. 2 From: C.R. Ashbee, Jerusalem 1918–1920: being the records of the Pro-Jerusalem Council during the period of the British military administration edited by C.R. Ashbee (London: J. Murray for the Council of the Pro-Jerusalem Society, 1921).

demolition of Jewish buildings, including the Montefiore Houses built from the 1860s en route from the train station to Jaffa Gate and newer neighbourhoods along Jaffa Road.<sup>93</sup>

More intricate treatment was suggested for the site of the sacred Jewish 'Wailing Wall' and its vicinity, resulting in a plan which shows Geddes' problematic position in all its complexity. Geddes suggested the removal of the nearby 'Mogrebbin village' of Moslem residents, which was boasting of vulgarly modern decoration and was generally, thus Geddes, unsuited to the locality. Moreover, he claimed, 'With a removal of a single row of houses, and with the acquirement of the small garden at the north end, the length of the Wailing Wall will be about doubled, and the space in front of it sufficiently increased'.<sup>94</sup> The scheme was rejected.

Following an Arab attack on Jewish worshippers at the Wall in August 1929, Geddes approached a few of his former collaborators, trying to convince them of the potential contribution of his scheme to alleviating the critical political situation. A letter to Storrs, by then the Governor of Cyprus, provides another account of Geddes' aim to secure safer access to the Wailing Wall instead of 'that long lane of descent through unfriendly Arab quarter and especially through Moghrebbin [Geddes' spelling; NHR] houses, most unfriendly of all. My scheme however included the possible removal of

their little quarter to a better vacant site, nearer the “Dung Gate””. On the vacated site, he details, ‘there would be room for some decent cottages (I hoped Jewish) or perhaps better for some neutral building – or policemen’s cottages’.<sup>95</sup> Storrs claimed to have no recollections of the plan.<sup>96</sup> Arthur Ruppin, an official Zionist land agent to whom Geddes had written about ‘the Mogrebbin houses, which have always been a danger, since of lower class inhabitants’<sup>97</sup> wrote in reply:

Your suggestion is, from the technical point of view, without any doubt the best possible solution. Unhappily however it must be recorded that under present circumstances it is impossible to get the consent of the Moslem Supreme Council to get a road constructed which will pass through their land to the Wailing Wall . . . There is another plan similar to yours . . . this road would be parallel to the one devised by you, but it could pass through Jewish owned land.<sup>98</sup>

## Conclusion: Geddes’ imperial geography of Jerusalem

By presenting for the first time a comprehensive critical geographical analysis of Geddes’ oeuvre, the paper exposes the complex imperial notions of Geddes’ planning, as he employed his quasi-scientific methods for studying and analysing the built heritage of the city which he was planning. Moreover, by analysing Geddes’ work in Jerusalem through the combined critical lens of postcolonial geography and the planning of colonial cities, the paper presents Geddes’ work as a direct derivative of an imperial network, a portrayal of the complexities of the local colonial situation. The paper shows how Geddes’ educational activities, including the survey, the museum, the exhibition and the university, all deeply rooted in the geographical tradition, were used as regulatory means for the transformation of the society according to a predefined ideal. Finally, the resultant plan is discussed as a graphic manifestation of all of the above. Geddes’ planning, then, is claimed as a powerful professional mechanism for the enforcement of geographical notions upon the city and its society. Thus, more than simply shedding a new light on Geddes’ colonial planning and his overall unproblematic image, the paper exposes the crucial connection between imperial geography and modern town planning, illustrating the infiltration of geographical tools and conceptions into the new formative science and presenting town planning as part of the overall imperial project.

Planning in Jerusalem was for Geddes the realization of a dream, both personal and professional; the Zionist society was a convenient vehicle for all his urban ideals. The uniqueness of Jerusalem on one hand and the complex political and historical situation on the other did not seem to come in the way; on the contrary, they made the planning endeavour only dearer. However, in contrast to the popular reception of Geddes as a sensitive planner, who strove to serve the local population and aid its natural evolution, it seems that the implementation of his urban theory in Jerusalem was rigid and arbitrary. In many cases, Geddes subordinated the environment to his ideal plan, urban and social. In fact, it seems as if Geddes, who was determined to protect and reconstruct local history, nevertheless overlooked local contemporary goals. Rather than being loyal either to the needs of his British or Zionist employers, Geddes tried to enforce upon them a foreign, romantic ideal.<sup>99</sup>

Undoubtedly, in his role as a British planner in mandatory Palestine, Geddes represented many of the local and more global conflicts which dominated Jerusalem in those days. In his work, Geddes got involved in many of the more sensitive and difficult local issues, regarding modern education, national desires and urban improvement. Geddes’ position as a British planner enabled him to select those physical and social elements which he deemed necessary for his future plan. These, as described above, reflected mainly imperial sentiments, common to Geddes and to his British colleagues.<sup>100</sup> However, it was not the British who brought Geddes to Palestine, but the Zionists. Today,

this seems to make sense; but in Mandatory Jerusalem, the Zionist Commission was in fact competing with the British rulers for hegemony. There was not merely a dual imperial society in Palestine, as local society itself was rivalling over control of the Holy Land. In this conflict, Geddes, the colonial planner, served not one but two entities competing for the control of the space.

Yet Geddes' zealous planning theory blinded him from seeing local politics as they were. In his passion to serve the Zionists, he failed to see the problematic situation of enforcing a biblical vision onto the disputed land of Palestine.<sup>101</sup> As a matter of fact, the Zionists didn't need Geddes' personal narrative; they had their own. Moreover, his personal aims collided with theirs. In his wish to see the Zionists assume an ancient role of past cultures, Geddes avoided seeing Zionism as it truly was – western and modern – and forfeited the cooperation of his local colleagues. Geddes' survey was meaningless when faced with the real New Jerusalem; his suggested museum was overruled for obvious political reasons; and the exhibition neglected by all but the Arab leadership, possibly hoping for more. Even Geddes' plans for the Hebrew University were eventually rejected. All in all, Geddes' educational endeavours in Jerusalem were a great disappointment.

The notions upon which all these were based were nonetheless manifested in Geddes' plan for Jerusalem. In view of their wish to rebuild the city, Geddes' Jewish employers were apparently not partner to his keen desire to bring the city back to some imaginary past and freeze it there,<sup>102</sup> however, the plan was approved and eventually became statutory. To this day, Geddes' plan for Jerusalem dictates the development – and mostly the preservation – of Jerusalem on many planes. While Geddes' educational endeavours and his own ideal of biblical Jerusalem were cast aside, his ideas are forever recorded in the everyday life of the city and its inhabitants. Geddes' plan for Jerusalem thus allows claiming planning as a powerful professional mechanism for the enforcement of geographical, and unavoidably imperial, notions upon the landscape.

### Acknowledgements

This paper is partially based on my PhD thesis, 'Patrick Geddes: town planner in the colonies: a comparative study of his work in Britain, in India and Palestine', The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel, 2007. Most of the research was carried out while I was a visiting scholar at Queen Mary, University of London. I would like to thank my hosts and colleagues, and especially Catherine Nash and Miles Ogborn, for sharing with me their vast knowledge and for their priceless support. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Ronnie Ellenblum, for his many insights, and three anonymous reviewers, for their helpful remarks.

### Notes

- 1 H. Meller, *Patrick Geddes: Social Evolutionist and City Planner* (London: Routledge, 1990). See also G. Ferraro, *Rieducazione alla speranza: Patrick Geddes, Planner in India, 1914–1924* (Milano: Jaca Book, 1998); V.M. Welter and J. Lawson (eds), *The City after Patrick Geddes* (Oxford: P. Lang, 2000); V.M. Welter, *Biopolis: Patrick Geddes and the City of Life* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002).
- 2 For a comprehensive discussion of Geddes' work in Palestine see Benjamin Hyman, 'British Planners in Palestine, 1918–1936', PhD dissertation, The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1994. See also G. Biger, 'A Scotsman in the First Hebrew City: Patrick Geddes and the 1926 Town Plan for Tel Aviv', *The Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 108, 1992, pp. 4–8; N.I. Payton, 'The Machine in the Garden City: Patrick Geddes' Plan for Tel Aviv', *Planning Perspectives*, 19(4), 1995, pp. 359–81; R. Kallus, 'Patrick Geddes and the Evolution of a Housing Type in Tel Aviv', *Planning Perspectives*, 12(3), 1997, pp. 281–320; G. Herbert and S. Sosnovsky, *Bauhaus on the Carmel and the Crossroads of Empire: Architecture and Planning in Haifa during the British Mandate* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 1993), pp. 68–85, and others.
- 3 Y. Ben-Arieh, 'The Planning and Conservation of Jerusalem during the Mandate Period in Israel 1917–1926: A Land Reflected in its Past', in R. Aaronsohn and H. Lavsky (eds), *Studies in [the] Historical*



- Geography of Israel* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2001), pp. 441–500 [Hebrew]; S. Shapiro, 'Planning Jerusalem: The First Generation, 1917–1968', in D. Amiran, A. Shachar and I. Kimhi (eds), *Urban Geography of Jerusalem: A Companion Volume to the Atlas of Jerusalem* (Jerusalem: Mas-sada Press, 1973); E. Efrat, 'British Town Planning Perspectives of Jerusalem in Transition', *Planning Perspectives*, 8, 1993, pp. 377–93; S.E. Cohen, 'Greenbelts in London and Jerusalem', *Geographical Review*, 84(1), 1994, pp. 74–89; H. Meller, 'Conservation and Evolution: The Pioneering Work of Sir Patrick Geddes in Jerusalem, 1919–1925', *Planning History Bulletin*, 9, 1987, pp. 42–9; M. Shapira, 'The University and the City: Patrick Geddes and the First Master Plan for the Hebrew University, 1919', in S. Katz and M. Head (eds), *The History of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem: Roots and Beginnings* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1997), pp. 201–35 [Hebrew]; D. Dolev, 'The Architectural Master Plans of the Hebrew University, 1918–1948', in Katz and Head (eds), *History of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem*, pp. 257–80 [Hebrew].
- 4 For a critical study of Geddes' historiography see Noah Hysler Rubin, 'The Changing Appreciation of Patrick Geddes: A Case Study in Planning History', *Planning Perspectives*, 24(3), 2009, pp. 349–66.
  - 5 A. Blunt and C. McEwan, Introduction to Part 1: 'Postcolonial Knowledge and Networks', in A. Blunt and C. McEwan (eds), *Postcolonial Geographies* (New York and London: Continuum, 2002), p. 9; M. Bell, R. Butlin and M. Heffernan, 'Introduction', in M. Bell, R. Butlin and M. Heffernan (eds), *Geography and Imperialism 1820–1940*, Studies in imperialism (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 1–7; C. Nash, 'Cultural Geography: Postcolonial Cultural Geographies', *Progress in Human Geography*, 26(2), 2002, pp. 219–30, all drawing from earlier geographical discussion: J. Duncan and D. Ley, 'Introduction', in J. Duncan and D. Ley (eds), *Place/Culture/Representation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 1–24; D. Cosgrove and S. Daniels (eds), *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
  - 6 See mainly: M.C. Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1998 [1994]), pp. 210–14; D. Matless, 'Visual Culture and Geographical Citizenship: England in the 1940's', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 1996, pp. 424–39; D. Matless, 'Regional Surveys and Local Knowledges: The Geographical Imagination in Britain, 1918–39', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, new series, 17, 1992, pp. 464–80; S. Naylor and G.A. Jones, 'Writing Orderly Geographies of Distant Places: The Regional Survey Movement and Latin America', *Ecumene*, 4(3), 1997, pp. 273–99; see more below. Many others discuss geographical devices which were extensively developed by Geddes yet fail to connect him with their critical conclusions.
  - 7 D. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 3–23; Nash, 'Cultural Geography', p. 220; J.D. Sidaway, 'Postcolonial Geographies: Survey-Explore-Review', in Blunt and McEwan (eds), *Postcolonial Geographies*, p. 13, and many more.
  - 8 N. AlSayyad, 'Urbanism and the Dominance Equation', in N. AlSayyad (ed.) *Forms of Dominance: On the Architecture and Urbanism of the Colonial Enterprise* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1992), pp. 1–26; Z. Çelik, *Urban Forms and Colonial Confrontations: Algiers under French Rule* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1997, p. 2; M.S. Kumar, 'The Evolution of Spatial Ordering', in Blunt and McEwan (eds) *Postcolonial Geographies*, p. 86; T. Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 34–62.
  - 9 B.S.A. Yeoh, *Contesting Space: Power Relations and the Urban Built Environment in Colonial Singapore* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1996); B.S.A. Yeoh, 'Postcolonial Cities', *Progress in Human Geography*, 25, 2001, p. 464; J. Hosagrahar, 'City as Durbar: Theatre and Power in Imperial Delhi', in N. AlSayyad (ed.) *Forms of Dominance*, pp. 83–106; L. Kong and L. Law, 'Introduction: Contested Landscapes, Asian Cities', *Urban Studies*, 39, 2002, pp. 1503–12.
  - 10 A. King, *Urbanism, Colonialism, and the World-Economy: Cultural and Spatial Foundations of the World Urban System*, The International Library of Sociology, University of Lancaster (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 9; P. Rabinow, *French Modern: Norms and Forms of*

- the Social Environment* (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1989); G. Wright, *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991); J.M. Jacobs, *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996); J.T. Kenny, 'Colonial Geographies: Accommodation and Resistance – An Introduction', *Historical Geography*, 27, 1999, p. 1; and more.
- 11 J. Nasr and M. Volait, 'Introduction: Transporting Planning', in J. Nasr and M. Volait (eds), *Urbanism: Imported or Exported?* (Chichester: Wiley-Academy, 2003), pp. xi–xxxviii; N. AlSayyad, 'Prologue', in N. AlSayyad (ed.), *Hybrid Urbanism: On the Identity Discourse and the Built Environment* (Westport, CN and London: Praeger, 2001), p. 2; J. Hosagrahar, *Indigenous Modernities: Negotiating Architecture and Urbanism* (London: Routledge, 2005); N. Perera, 'Indigenising the Colonial City: Late 19th-Century Colombo and its Landscape', *Urban Studies*, 39(9), 2002, pp. 1703–21; N. Perera, 'Contesting Visions: Hybridity, Liminality and Authorship of the Chandigarh Plan', *Planning Perspectives*, 19, 2004, pp. 175–99; M. LeVine, *Overthrowing Geography: Jaffa, Tel Aviv, and the Struggle for Palestine 1880–1948* (Los Angeles, London, and Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).
  - 12 G. Myers, 'Colonial Discourse and Africa's Colonized Middle: Ajit Singh's Architecture', *Historical Geography*, 27, 1999, pp. 27–55; G. Myers, 'Intellectual of Empire: Eric Dutton and Hegemony in British Africa', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 88(1), 1998, p. 5; Kenny, 'Colonial Geographies', p. 3; Nasr and Volait, 'Introduction', p. xiii.
  - 13 A. Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth Century South Africa and Britain* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), pp. 9–20; A. Lester, 'British Settler Discourse and the Circuits of Empire', *History Workshop Journal*, 54, 2002, pp. 27–50; D. Lambert and A. Lester (eds), *Colonial Lives across the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
  - 14 A recent article has linked Geography and Planning, generally attributing theory to the former and practice to the latter; however, here I claim their joint roots on a more substantial level. See: N.A. Phelps and M. Tewdwr-Jones, 'If Geography is Anything, Maybe it's Planning's Alter Ego? Reflections on Policy Relevance in Two Disciplines Concerned with Place and Space', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, 33, 2008, pp. 566–84.
  - 15 Meller, *Patrick Geddes*, p. 199, ref. 95.
  - 16 *The Proposed University for Central India, at Indore: A Reprint from Town Planning towards City Development – A Report to the Durbar of Indore* (Indore: Holkar State Printing Press, 1918).
  - 17 Welter, *Biopolis*, p. 22.
  - 18 Zangwill supported Geddes' work and also encouraged the writing of his first biography. See, for example, Zangwill to Geddes, 23 August 1919, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem (hereafter CZA) A120-326.
  - 19 Eder to Geddes, 16 July 1918, CZA L3/13/III.
  - 20 Arthur Ruppin, London to Palestine Office, Jaffa, 5 September 1919, CZA S15/123c.
  - 21 Henry V. Lanchester, 'Mr. Mclean's plan revised', *The Observer*, 12 July 1919.
  - 22 Zionist Commission, Palestine to Inner Actions Committee, Zionist Organization, London, 15 May 1919, CZA Z4/1721.
  - 23 Palestine Office, Zionist Organization, London to Secretary, Zionist Commission to Palestine, Jaffa, 9 July 1919, CZA L3/13/III. Hyman claims that examining the plan for Jerusalem was actually the main cause for Geddes' summons. Later on his commission had coalesced into three distinct planning commissions: the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and Jewish suburbs and settlements. See Hyman, 'British Planners', pp. 113–14.
  - 24 Editorial, 29 August 1919, quoted in Hyman, 'British Planners', p. 114.
  - 25 Weizmann to Geddes, 1 September 1919, Geddes Papers, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh (hereafter NLS) 10546/82.
  - 26 Geddes to Weizmann, 3 September 1919, CZA Z4/2790.
  - 27 Notwithstanding, his payments always included a clause regarding town planning. See, for example, Political Department to Dr. Weizmann, 16 Jan. 1920, CZA Z4/2790; Frank Mears to Samuel Landman, 3 Aug. 1920, CZA Z4/2790. In the report of the 'College Department' of November 1919 Geddes' work in Palestine includes the plan for Jerusalem; CZA Z4/2790.



- 28 Storrs wished to prevent Eder from presenting the report to the General Administration and so did it himself; Eder to Geddes, 4 Dec. 1919, CZA L4/109.
- 29 Colonisation Department, Zionist Organization, London, to Brandeis, Ruppim, Kauffman and others, 20 Jan. 1920, CZA Z4/1650.
- 30 Patrick Geddes to C.R. Ashbee, Pembroke Storrs Papers III/3; 19 June 1920, NLS MS/10516/60.
- 31 In 1922, while planning Jewish garden estates in Haifa, Geddes was also employed by the city's British governor in producing a plan for Haifa's development. In 1925 Geddes was commissioned by Meir Dizengoff, the mayor of Tel Aviv, to plan an extension for the city; this Zionist commission was soon expanded by the British governor of Jaffa, which was also in need of proper planning according to the new planning laws.
- 32 M. Fry, *The Scottish Empire* (Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press and Brillinn, 2001), p. 429.
- 33 Fry, *The Scottish Empire*, p. 399. Prominent figures such as Lawrence Oliphant and Arthur Wauchope made Palestine another Scottish stronghold; Fry, *The Scottish Empire*, pp. 389–91. See also: M. Macdonald, 'Patrick Geddes: Environment and Culture', in W. Stephen (ed.), *Think Global, Act Local: The Life and Legacy of Patrick Geddes* (Edinburgh: Luath Press, 2004).
- 34 Fry, *The Scottish Empire*, p. 395.
- 35 H. Meller, 'Geddes and the Indian Reports', University of Dundee, special occasional paper in town and regional planning, delivered at 'Patrick Geddes: A Symposium' (1 March 1982), an event organized by the Department of Town and Regional Planning to celebrate the centenary of the foundation of the University, p. 5; Ferraro, *Patrick Geddes, Planner in India*, p. 27; and others.
- 36 P. Green, 'Patrick Geddes', PhD dissertation, University of Strathclyde, 1970; P. Green, 'Patrick Geddes – Pioneer of Social Planning (1854–1932)', *Journal of Indian History*, 1973, pp. 847–62;
- 37 Many constant themes can be traced also in Geddes' work in India. For a full discussion and critical assessment of Geddes' urban theory see: N. Hysler-Rubin, *Patrick Geddes and Town Planning: A Critical View* (London and New York: Routledge: 2011). This matter will be further illustrated by specific examples throughout the paper.
- 38 This scheme is prominent in many of Geddes' writings; see mainly: *The Masque of Learning and its Many Meanings, Devised and Interpreted by Patrick Geddes* (Edinburgh: Patrick Geddes and Colleagues, Outlook Tower and Chelsea, 1912). It has received various interpretations; see mainly H. Meller, *Patrick Geddes; Welter, Biopolis*.
- 39 Geddes to Amelia Defries, 9 Dec. 1913, NLS 10574/2-22.
- 40 P. Geddes, 'The City of Jerusalem', *Garden Cities and Town Planning*, 11, 1921, pp. 251–4; 'Palestine in Renewal', *The Contemporary Review*, 670, 1921, pp. 479–81; Concerning Palestine: Jerusalem Old & New, Strathclyde University Archives, Glasgow (Hereafter SUA) T-GED 8/2/11. These notions were also well expressed in Geddes' report for Tel Aviv; for example: 'Clearly realized then, is not once more the high function of a renewing Zionism, to repeat her ancient message upon our modern spiral . . . and to recall the ancient conception of Unity throughout the whole Universe?' Town planning report – Tel Aviv–Jaffa, 1925, p. 58.
- 41 R. Fuchs and G. Herbert, 'A Colonial Portrait of Jerusalem: British Architecture in Mandate-Era Palestine', in N. AlSayyad (ed.), *Hybrid Urbanism*, pp. 83–108.
- 42 P. Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible: A Preliminary Report to the Chief Administrator of Palestine and Military Governor of Jerusalem on town planning and city improvements', November 1919, p. 2, CZA Z4/10202.
- 43 The Regional Survey Movement in particular was a Scottish endeavour; Geddes was a prominent member, part of group of Scottish scientists and public figures holding views on the contribution of geography to modern citizenship and its potential to transform society. M. Bell, 'Reshaping Boundaries: International Ethics and Environmental Consciousness in the Early Twentieth Century', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, new series, 23, 1998, pp. 155–8; D. Matless, 'Regional Surveys and Local Knowledges: The Geographical Imagination in Britain, 1918–39', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, new series, 17, 1992, p. 477.
- 44 P. Geddes, 'The City Survey: A First Step: I, II, II', *Garden Cities and Town Planning*, 1, 1911, pp. 18–19, 31–3, 56–8.

- 45 These notions were elaborated quite early in Geddes' guides to art exhibitions: *Every Man his Own Art Critic at the Manchester Exhibition* (Manchester and London: John Heywood, 1887), pp. 9–15, T-GED 5/3/1; *Every Man his Own Art Critic: Glasgow Exhibition, 1888* (Edinburgh: William Brown; Glasgow: John Menzies, 1888), pp. 22, 24; and later on, in a 'Paper on the Power of Sight, the Art of Seeing and the Camera Obscura', [n. d.], T-GED 7/4/5.
- 46 J.B. Harley, 'Maps, Knowledge and Power', in Cosgrove and Daniels (eds), *Iconography of Landscape*, pp. 279–312; M.L. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992); J. Duncan, 'Sites of Representation', in Duncan and Ley (eds), *Place/Culture/Representation*, pp. 42–3; G. Rose, 'Geography as a Science of Observation: The Landscape, the Gaze and Masculinity', in *Nature and Science: Essays in the History of Geographical Knowledge*, Historical geography research series, no. 28 (London: Institute of British Geographers, 1992), pp. 7, 11; Bell, Butlin and Heffernan, 'Introduction', p. 4; A. Godlewska, 'Napoleon's Geographers (1797–1815): Imperialists and Soldiers of Modernity', in A. Godlewska and N. Smith (eds), *Geography and Empire* (Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 31–54; D. Mitchell, *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000).
- 47 Matless, 'Regional Surveys and Local Knowledges', p. 465.
- 48 Boyer, *City of Collective Memory*, pp. 212, 221–22.
- 49 Boyer, *City of Collective Memory*, pp. 210–14.
- 50 Boyer, *City of Collective Memory*, pp. 204–5.
- 51 Duncan and Ley, 'Introduction', p. 13; Cosgrove and Domosh, 'Author and Authority', in Duncan and Ley (eds), *Place/Culture/Representation*, p. 31.
- 52 Naylor and Jones, 'Writing', p. 280.
- 53 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 4.
- 54 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 6.
- 55 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 11.
- 56 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 30.
- 57 P. Geddes, 'A Suggested Plan for a Civic Museum (or Civic Exhibition) and its Associated Studies, read at a research meeting of the Sociological Society, at the School of Economics and Political Science (University of London) March 19th, 1906, James Oliphant, Esq., in the chair', *Sociological Papers, III* published for the Sociological Society (London: Macmillan, 1907), pp. 199–240; P. Geddes, 'The Museum and the City: A Practical Proposal [read at the Dundee Conference, 1907]', reprinted from the *Museums Journal*, 1908, pp. 371–82, T-GED 5/3/26; P. Geddes, *What a Local Museum Might Be*, [n.d.], T-GED 5/1/7.
- 58 Naylor and Jones, 'Writing', pp. 275–6; D. Haraway, *Primate Visions* (London: Verso 1989); F. Driver, *Geography, Empire and Visualization*, Royal Holloway: Department of Geography Working Paper, no. 1 ([London]: Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London, 1994); F. Driver, *Geography Militant: Cultures of Exploration in the Age of Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001; 1st ed. 1999), ch. 7: 'Making Representation: From an African Exhibition to the High Court of Justice', pp. 146–69; P. Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: A History of the Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851–1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988); P.A. Morton, *Hybrid Modernities: Architecture and Representation at the 1931 Colonial Exposition, Paris* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 2000).
- 59 Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, p. 38; Duncan, 'Sites of Representation', p. 42; Naylor and Jones, 'Writing', p. 275. See also: D.N. Livingstone, "'Never Shall Ye Make the Crab Walk Straight": An Inquiry into the Scientific Sources of Racial Geography', in *Nature and Science*, pp. 38–40.
- 60 P. Geddes, 'Nature Study and Geographical Education', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 18, 1902, p. 529.
- 61 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 2.
- 62 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 25.
- 63 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 29. Geddes later suggested similar themes for the museum in Tel Aviv.
- 64 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', pp. 27–9.

- 65 See, for example, P. Geddes, 'The Outlook Tower as an Embryonic School and College: On the Tower's Aim of Training Students as Social Minds and Socialised Men and the Women of Action', 1892, pp. 1–2, T-GED 7/4/8.
- 66 Boyer, *City of Collective Memory*, pp. 221–22.
- 67 Boyer, *City of Collective Memory*, pp. 221–22.
- 68 A.T. Clay, 'Notes on Mr. Geddes Museum Plan', [1919], Israel Antiquities Authority, Jerusalem (hereafter ATQ), Jerusalem General File (78).
- 69 P. Geddes, 'Two Steps in Civics: "Cities and Town Planning Exhibition" and the "International Congress of Cities". Ghent International Exhibition', 1913, T-GED 1/5/40. The Exhibition was described by A. Defries, *The Interpreter Geddes: The Man and his Gospel* (London: Routledge, 1927), pp. 57–68. Texts drawn from the catalogue to the first exhibition (1910) illustrated with a selection from the second exhibition were incorporated in P. Geddes, *Cities in Evolution* (2nd Edition) (London: Williams & Norgate, 1949), pp. 162–89.
- 70 Bell, Butlin and Heffernan, 'Introduction', p. 6; T. Ploszajska, 'Historiographies of Geography and Empire', in B. Graham and C. Nash (eds) *Modern Historical Geographies* (Harlow: Longman, 2002), pp. 121–45; Graham and Nash, 'Constructing the Subject: Geographical Models in English Schools, 1870–1944', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 1996, pp. 388–98; J.R. Ryan, 'Visualizing Imperial Geography: Halford Mackinder and the Colonial Office Visual Instruction Committee, 1911', *Ecumene*, 1(2), 1994, pp. 157–76; F. Driver and A.M.C. Maddrell, 'Geographical Education and Citizenship: Introduction', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 1996, pp. 371–2; A.M.C. Maddrell, 'Empire, Emigration and School Geography: Changing Discourses of Imperial Citizenship, 1880–1925', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 1996, pp. 373–87; R. Walford, 'Geographical Education and Citizenship: Afterword', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 1996, pp. 440–2.
- 71 P. Geddes, 'Civics and Town Planning Exhibition, Jerusalem', *The Palestine Weekly*, 1(39), 1920, Special Town Planning Number, pp. 594–95.
- 72 Geddes, 'Civics and Town Planning Exhibition, Jerusalem', p. 597.
- 73 '... in Jerusalem he has attracted the serious attention only of a small band ... That is an indictment that Britishers in Palestine should hasten to repudiate during the remaining 3 days of the exhibition. We confess to being greatly surprised that the opening of the exhibition to which all classes had been invited, was conspicuous by the lack of general support from the English community'. 'In support of Professor Geddes', Geddes, 'Civics and Town Planning Exhibition, Jerusalem', p. 593.
- 74 Geddes, 'Civics and Town Planning Exhibition, Jerusalem', p. 596.
- 75 Geddes to Louis Brandeis, 18 Oct. 1920, NLS MS 10516/101.
- 76 Geddes, *The Masque of Learning*, pp. 67–9; P. Geddes, *On Universities in Europe and in India, and a Needed Type of Research Institute, Geographical and Social: Five Letters to an Indian Friend, reprinted from The Pioneer (14 August 1901) and from East and West (September 1903)* (Madras: National Press, [n.d.]), in T-GED 12/2/449.
- 77 'The proposed Hebrew University of Jerusalem: preliminary report by Patrick Geddes, Director of the City and Town Planning Exhibition, professor of sociology and civics, University of Bombay, assisted by Captain Frank C. Mears, [Jerusalem] December, 1919', p. 3, CZA L4/108.
- 78 'The proposed Hebrew University', p. 5.
- 79 'The proposed Hebrew University', pp. 27–8.
- 80 'The proposed Hebrew University', p. 29. More about the symbolism of the 'Magen David' and its use in Jerusalem: P. Geddes, 'A Note on Graphic Methods, Ancient and Modern', *The Sociological Review*, 15, 1923, pp. 230–1.
- 81 O. Söderström, 'Paper Cities: Visual Thinking in Urban Planning', *Ecumene*, 3(3), 1996, pp. 249–81.
- 82 Söderström, 'Paper Cities', pp. 277–8.
- 83 Ashbee was an Arts & Crafts Architect who worked in Jerusalem between 1918 and 1922. For more on his artistic urban theory and work in Jerusalem see N. Hysler-Rubin, 'Arts & Crafts and the Great City: Charles Robert Ashbee in Jerusalem', *Planning Perspectives*, 21(4), 2006, pp. 347–68.
- 84 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', pp. 17–19.

- 85 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 16.
- 86 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', pp. 20–1.
- 87 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 9.
- 88 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 13; see also Hyman, 'British Planners', p. 132.
- 89 Geddes, 'Jerusalem Actual and Possible', p. 18.
- 90 J. Tyrwhitt (ed.), *Patrick Geddes in India*, with an introduction by Lewis Mumford and a preface by Henry V. Lanchaster (London: L. Humphries, 1947).
- 91 Tyrwhitt (ed.), *Patrick Geddes in India*, pp. 11–12. Similar treatments were suggested for the Mount of Olives, commending to renew desolated and fallen terraces and planting. See Tyrwhitt (ed.), *Patrick Geddes in India*, p. 16; Damascus Gate was also to be exposed by removal of rows of shops and provided with an improved public place, Tyrwhitt (ed.), *Patrick Geddes in India*, p. 13.
- 92 Tyrwhitt (ed.), *Patrick Geddes in India*, p. 11.
- 93 Tyrwhitt (ed.), *Patrick Geddes in India*, pp. 4–5.
- 94 Tyrwhitt (ed.), *Patrick Geddes in India*, pp. 10–11. For the plan see Hyman, 'British Planners', p. 139, Fig 3.6 (CZA L4/770).
- 95 Geddes to R. Storrs, April 1930, NLS MS10518/73-4.
- 96 Storrs to Geddes, 16 April 1930, NLS MS10518/75. The plan is today kept among the papers of Charles Robert Ashbee, Jerusalem Municipal Archives.
- 97 Geddes to A. Ruppin, 10 Oct. 1930, NLS MS10518/137.
- 98 A. Ruppin to P. Geddes, 3 Dec. 1930, NLS MS10502/15b.
- 99 For similar conclusions regarding Geddes' work in Calcutta see Martin Beattie, 'Sir Patrick Geddes and Barra Bazaar: Competing Visions, Ambivalence and Contradiction', *The Journal of Architecture*, 9, 2004, pp. 131–50.
- 100 See, for example, N. Shepherd, *Ploughing Sand: British Rule in Palestine 1917–1948* (London: John Murray, 2000); Annat Almog, 'Focus on Detail: The Critical Role of Architectural Elements in Representational Architecture: The Case of British Buildings in Jerusalem (1849–1939)', PhD dissertation, York University, 1996; Daniel B. Monk, *An Aesthetic Occupation: The Immediacy of Architecture and the Palestine Conflict* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002).
- 101 For similar criticism regarding Geddes' work in Tel Aviv see M. LeVine, 'Conquest through Town Planning: The Case of Tel Aviv, 1921–1948', *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 27(4), 1998, pp. 36–52.
- 102 Fuchs and Herbert similarly blame Geddes for his wish to re-Hebraize the Jews; see Fuchs and Herbert, 'A Colonial Portrait', pp. 101–2. Geddes' plans for the Hebrew University were never carried out as he never fully complied with his employers' demands; Meller, 'Geddes and the Indian Reports', p. 278; Hyman, 'British Planners', p. 306.

### Biographical note

Noah Hysler Rubin is a qualified town planner and also holds a PhD in Geography from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. She teaches planning theory and history at the Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Jerusalem. Her research interests include: The multidisciplinary origins of town planning; planning across the British Empire; colonial and post-colonial cities; planning as a contested practice in Israel today. Her book, *Patrick Geddes and Town Planning: A Critical View* has recently been published by Routledge.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.