

ADVOCACY AND ANTAGONISM IN AUSTRALIAN MID-20TH CENTURY PLANNING: THE PARADOX OF FLORENCE TAYLOR

ROBERT FREESTONE

*Faculty of the Built Environment
University of New South Wales
Sydney, Australia
E: r.freestone@unsw.edu.au*

ABSTRACT

Florence Taylor (1879-1969) trained as an architect but spent most of her long professional life as a publisher and trade journalist, developing strong ties with the building industry. She was also celebrated as an advocate of town planning reform. Unified by a strong environmental determinist position, early preoccupations with eradicating slums segued into numerous practical suggestions for improving city efficiency, focusing on urban renewal and traffic planning. Florence was nonetheless often critical of planning as it developed in practice. She was antagonistic to planning as an activity of the modern state because of its apparent privileging of the public sector and over-regulation of private enterprise and everyday life. This ideological tension became particularly apparent in the 1940s as planning moved from propaganda and voluntary advocacy to statutory procedures and protocols. While Florence's life and career continued to be celebrated, her identification with mainstream town planning declined. This paper explores the contradictions in her encounters with planning, shifting from advocate to antagonist over many years. While Florence continued to dream about new rise developments, her persona in print transitioned to an anti-planning position. For a woman who declared that town planning was the 'only subject' she knew, this was a rather paradoxical denouement. Yet in some ways her ideas were ahead of their time.

INTRODUCTION

Through the first half of the 20th century, Florence Taylor (1879-1969) was a prominent and enduring player in Sydney's professional, publishing and social worlds. She assumed many guises: architect, aviator, businesswoman, feminist, philanthropist, journalist, publisher, socialite, ideologue. Perhaps her most lasting influence came through her prodigious commentary on the design and construction of the built environment as writer, editor and publisher for *Building* magazine and other titles produced by her Building Publishing Company. She founded the company with husband George (1872-1928) in 1907 and worked alongside him for twenty one years and then at the helm herself for more than three decades.

From early in her career until her last public speeches, she often maintained that her main interest outside publishing was town planning. She even hijacked her own thank you speech at a 1955 Citizen's Appreciation Luncheon to berate Sydney for its "indifference" to town planning woes and concluded by

Cities, nations and regions in planning history

apologising for bringing up town planning “but it is the only subject I know” (Ashton 1955, 36). Her reputation as a planner was based on her early advocacy of planning goals and sensibility to feminist values; her status as a leading light of the propagandist lobby group the Town Planning Association of New South Wales (NSW); the opening up of the pages of her various publications like *Building*, *Australasian Engineer*, and *Commonwealth Home* to planning content; and the invention of practical planning improvements to address the traffic problems and urban renewal opportunities of Sydney. She was neither a civil servant nor caught up in the administrative machinery of the state; that would have been anathema to her. Her networks inter-linked the private sector, professional bodies and community associations.

This paper concentrates on her contributions to planning in the 1940s. This was a crucial decade in Australia, as it was in many countries worldwide, in transitioning planning from a sporadic and aspirational endeavour for social betterment into a bona fide commitment by the modern welfare state. The shift was crucial for Florence because the iconoclastic advocacy which she stood for made way for a more sober and considered professionalism. She found herself marginalised by a new generation of mainstream planners in not just holding onto old ideas but revelling in her reputation as a strident critic of many aspects of planning.

This paper build on previous cameos (Freestone 1991, 1995) but draws primarily from an extended biographical study (Freestone and Hanna 2007) where the paradox of advocate-antagonist is traced into other facets of her career to challenge the hagiographic spell which hangs over so much of the Taylor legend (e.g. Giles 1959). While the dominant discourse in analyses of progressive design and social policy is embedded within a liberal paradigm, in Florence Taylor we confront the perspectives and contributions of a vocal right wing individualist. The paper has four main sections: an overview of Florence’s planning activities; a vignette of Australian planning in the 1940s highlighting an increasing schism with her approach; the conservative critique of planning which intensified at this time; and finally how her political and social values collided with the emergent paradigm of post-war planning.

TOWN PLANNER

In many ways Florence Taylor’s approach to urban improvement was an orthodox endorsement of scientific city plans, slum eradication, planned suburbanisation, and the realisation of the city beautiful. Consistent and enduring themes were the importance of economic growth, social progress, personal liberation, efficiency, modernity, and aesthetics. The dominant flavour was architectonic-constructional, reflecting her architectural training and the major concerns of her publishing empire. Whereas her early rhetoric for planning drew on discourses of public health and social morality, her later rationale would be couched in terms of free market efficiency. This injected a distinctive contribution at a time when a greater role for the state in planning economic development was being countenanced in the 1940s. She also injected a distinctive feminist strain alert to particular issues faced by women.

In the 1910s Florence's planning contributions were largely restricted to writing about home and domestic interests. Her vehement anti-slum, pro-home ownership, and pro-suburban mentality captured the essence of the times. Better living conditions would prevent "race deterioration", the great fear of the eugenics movement. She passionately subscribed to the "one family one house one garden" creed. It was advisable "to encourage separate homes" (Taylor 1915). There was an initial aversion to flat life. She described flats variously as "unhealthy", "pernicious", "artificial", and "the enemy of home life". However, from the early 1920s comes a change in attitude towards apartment living. Florence and her publications became "vocal supporters of the flat boom" in Sydney (Spearritt 2000). By the early 1950s her ideas began to synthesise into a vision of a more woman friendly city based around high rise, inner city, mixed use commercial, residential and retail towers alongside a critique of suburban sprawl.

From the late 1900s into the early 1920s, George and Florence were at the epicentre of the town planning movement in Sydney. George established the Town Planning Association in Sydney in late 1913, the first organisation of its kind in Australia (Freestone 2009). Its most important task was propagandist, in "reporting and publicising the town planning cause" (Sandercock 1975). The Association endorsed the classic paternalist stance, subscribing to the environmental determinist philosophy that physical reconstruction directly made for a healthier, more efficient, civic proud if not nationally patriotic citizenry. Leading architects, engineers and surveyors were conscripted for the cause alongside notable politicians. Florence took on various executive positions and convened a short lived and controversial women's section in 1915. She was rewarded with life membership in 1930.

Her publishing interests intertwined with her social reform ideals. Her journals became the official organ of the Town Planning Association. Most of them including *Construction* and *Commonwealth Home* carried town planning content and so the Building Publishing Company unavoidably became the chief mouthpiece of the movement in Sydney. There was an economic dividend for the Company given that considerable printing was required to disseminate written propaganda and it seemed only natural for Building Limited to assume this task in Sydney. Florence continued this self-interested publishing and printing policy when she took over from George in the late 1920s, although the major affiliation moved toward lucrative contracts available from the building and construction sector. Close ties were forged with the Master Builders Association of NSW.

Florence's planning projects for Sydney remain fascinating products of a dogged architecturally-inspired civic improvement mentality infused by modernist (and, more subtly, feminist) sensibilities. They hark back to an earlier era of city improvement when piecemeal schemes were regularly advanced to make cities function and look better. Florence had the famous motto from Daniel Burnham hanging over her desk: "Make no little plans. They have no magic to stir men's blood". Her quest was for grand statements, those that would bring more attention to Sydney (and herself). The idea behind them was "to create in the minds of people the practicability and the possibility of their city's development in terms of efficiency or beauty" (Taylor 1948a, 69). She worked with several

Cities, nations and regions in planning history

collaborator-delineators but her most arresting schemes of the 1940s were drafted by the architect Francis Hood.

Her projects spanned scales from site-specific through urban precinct to area master plans. There were numerous targets including new health complexes, hotel quarters, markets, and cultural centres; the comprehensive renewal of inner city neighbourhoods; improved wharf and warehouse facilities for the port of Sydney; a remodelling of the city's main maritime gateway at Circular Quay; a city square; a naval base in Botany Bay; and a new international airport. Improving traffic flow was a constant preoccupation and many of her schemes were engineering-based concoctions of expressways and parking stations, roundabouts and flyovers, bridges and tunnels, viaducts and cantilevered streets. Florence brought together many of the ideas she had worked on since the 1920s into an overall scheme first published in *Construction* in 9 October 1946 (Giles 1959). It is easy now to debunk many of these fanciful ideas but some of her proposals seem remarkably prescient with their bases in high density living, compact cities, the revival of the inner city, tolled motorway tunnels, mixed use buildings, and private sector-led development. Others look awfully dated and dysfunctional, moreover all of Florence's schemes ignored financial questions and any detailed consideration of the approval processes let alone environmental assessment as we know it today. They were static design blueprints conceived completely independent of any institutional context and hence destined to remain drawing board dreams.

THE 1940s

By the 1940s Florence's style of town planning looked increasingly old-fashioned to a new generation of professional planners pursuing a broader and more sophisticated agenda attentive to process, scale, plurality of interests, legislative requirements, and implementation. The theory and practice of planning had moved on from pre-war ideas, and notably from the 1910s when the Town Planning Association was established. The credibility of the Association declined slowly from the mid-1920s as progressive civic figures and built environment professionals looked elsewhere for leadership. Formation of the breakaway Town and Country Planning Institute in 1934 marked the beginning of a new era in NSW with the Town Planning Association reduced to a sideshow (Margalit 1999). Sidney Luker observed that the Association was "discredited in the eyes of most professional planners in this state, in spite of the fact that many years ago it had a membership of prominent professional men" (quoted in Freestone, 2009, 329-330). Indeed, by the 1940s the Association had metamorphosed into a conservative organisation rigidly opposed to many government initiatives rather than offering a constructively critical independent voice.

Table 1 summarises the major events which cumulatively convey the number and range of key events playing out in the 1940s. It was a watershed decade with a great surge in propagandist activity through diverse media: exhibition, photography, film, and print. There was also an increasing professionalisation of practice, high level initiatives by government, passage of new town and country planning legislation in three states, and the beginnings of formal post-graduate planning education. Organised in this way, the milestones form a compelling

15th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

chronology of sustained interest and intervention which was driven in large measure by the ideology of post-war reconstruction with its vision of a new economic and social order.

Mainstream town planning discourse in the 1940s fused local concerns of urban sprawl, housing quality, open space, community facilities, land use zoning, accessibility and connectivity with ideas derived in part from international exemplars such as neighbourhood units, greenbelts, satellite towns, and comprehensive urban renewal. Bunning's *Homes in the Sun* (1945) is representative of the assembly of these elements from room to region into a widely endorsed modernist vision of well-structured cities with clearly delineated land use zones, rebuilt city centres, organisation of homes and apartments into planned slum-free neighbourhoods, an articulated hierarchy of traffic corridors from high-speed motorways to pedestrian-only pathways, greenbelts, green wedges, and satellite towns.

Table 1 - Major planning-related events in Australia in the 1940s

Year	Event
1942	F.O. Barnett and W.O. Burt, <i>Housing the Australian Nation</i> (Melbourne)
1943	NSW Housing Commission Commonwealth Housing Commission Housing and Town Planning Exhibition, sponsored by the Victorian Housing Commission
1944	R.E. McMillan, <i>The Influence of the Lessons of The War on the Future of Town Planning, Building Design and Other Matters</i> , Department of Home Security H.H. Smith, <i>Planning the Community</i> (Sydney) F.O. Barnett, W.O. Burt and F. Heath, <i>We Must Go On</i> (Melbourne) Royal Australian Institute of Architects, <i>Wanted A Plan: Post-War Development</i> Commonwealth Housing Commission, <i>Final Report</i> Planning Institute of Australia (Victoria) Town Planning legislation, Tasmania Town Planning legislation, Victoria
1945	Housing and Town Planning Exhibition, sponsored by the Ministry of Post-War Reconstruction Walter Bunning, <i>Homes in the Sun</i> (Sydney) Town Planning legislation, New South Wales
1946	E. Fooks, <i>X-Ray the City!</i> (Melbourne)
1947	SA Town Planning Institute
1948	Report on the Planning Scheme for the County of Cumberland Exhibitions of Sydney and Brisbane city plans Lecture Tour by Sir Patrick Abercrombie Town and Country Planning in Britain Exhibition, sponsored by the British Council
1949	A. Benko and T.R.V. Lloyd's <i>Replanning our Towns and Countryside</i> (Adelaide) Department of Post-War Reconstruction, <i>Regional Planning in Australia</i> Denis Winston appointed professor of town and country planning at Sydney University Planning courses begin at the South Australian Institute of Mines (with G. Walkley) and Sydney University (D. Winston)

Florence's planning projects stopped short of embracing the underlying logic for constituting planning within a highly organised governance framework. Proposals for a nationally integrated system led by a central planning authority

Cities, nations and regions in planning history

were widely explored and endorsed in both professional and government circles. This quest for stronger, more efficient, hierarchical planning led to considerable interest in the centralised regime of Russia which many saw as having important lessons for how Australia might approach urban and regional welfare in the post-war period (e.g. Barnett et al 1945). One way or the other, an enhanced state presence was a corollary of planning visions in the 1940s, a prospect at which conservative commentators balked.

CONSERVATIVE CRITIQUES OF 1940s PLANNING REFORMS

By the late 1930s the doctrine of unadulterated laissez faire capitalism appeared to have run its course and there developed a greater acceptance of the need for state regulation in the economy (Pemberton 2006). World War 2 heightened the discourse of planning as a general societal compass, with planning connoting a range of targets notably full employment, re-organisation of industry, public health and social welfare. Alongside, a vigorous questioning and critique of the aims, methods and outcomes of planning in capitalist societies developed involving leading thinkers of the day. Australian debates virtually interchangeable with those in Britain (Pemberton 2004). To critics, planning ranged from the utopian to the darkly sinister. Far from securing a brave new world for everyone it instead promised a new politics of intervention, meddling bureaucracy, and enhanced state power. Unease and outright opposition developed from conservative political forces and business interests. Pemberton (2004, 45) notes that “once the nuts and bolts of reconstruction schemes were exposed, planning increasingly came to be seen as the slogan of a ‘political creed’ rather than as a neutral, scientific instrument of social betterment”.

Arch-critic J.A. Hayek did concede that town planning could be a justifiable form of public intervention given problems of city life and pollution (Goodchild 2008). Nevertheless physical planning was also seen as a more contentious activity than the more generalised visions of post-war reconstruction revealed. In the United Kingdom, relabelling of the railway station at the site for the first New Town from Stevenage to “Silkingrad” exemplifies the darker reception to planning goals (Mullan 1980). This counter discourse was not enough to scuttle such new planning legislation but limits to cross-political consensus as to desired approaches to planning practice were exposed.

In Australia, scepticism about and impediments to expansion of planning’s ambit were also apparent. Burt (1945) counted four main sources of objection to increased state involvement in urban development: the selfishness coming from addiction to laissez faire; ignorant dismissal of alternatives to the status quo; politicians suspicious of collectivist constraints on their own patronage; and “panacea fanatics” unable to reconcile any form of planning with democracy. Planning advocates patiently explained the promise of commonsense planning to doubters. Rosette Edmunds (1947) was at pains to distinguish town planning as a cooperative, creative, democratic process from more centralised planning, at once heartless, detached and academic.

FLORENCE TAYLOR'S CRITIQUE OF PLANNING

Florence's standpoint on the role of town planning in Australian society has to be contextualised within her broader conservative political philosophy. She stood consistently for private enterprise and its capacity to deliver social betterment for individuals, households, communities, cities and the nation as a whole. She believed passionately in the capitalist rhetoric of free enterprise. Growth was good and profits were desirable and "not a crime"; they were "vital to one and all in order to keep going in any investment, enterprise or undertaking" (Taylor 1964). Her position became more hardline as she became immersed in the world of business and published journals affiliated with private sector interests. She opposed the largesse of the welfare state and abhorred communism's twin pedestals of anti-individualism and centralised planning. She was also fundamentally anti-union; she cast unions as a ruling class of "gangsters" insisting on maximum living standards for minimum effort and frequently holding the nation to ransom (Giles, 1959).

She expended considerable efforts throughout her adult working life on anti-labor politics. Federally, from the 1920s, her heroes were conservative Prime Ministers like Robert Menzies. The Labor Party provided the villains both at state and federal levels. For a time her politics veered toward the ultra-right wing and she endorsed the secretive, pro-empire military organisation, the New Guard, which protested the apparent slide towards socialism under the NSW inter-war Lang Labor Government (Teather 1994). There was a fascination for Mussolini and an extolling of the virtues of benign dictatorship. Florence considered the wartime Labor Government under John Curtin as a government "drunk with its own power"; "consummate bunglers"; and "oppressors". It was a government driven by "Hitlerite malevolence" under which wages skyrocketed, coal miners called strikes with impunity, and nationalisation tendencies spelt "the curtailment of initiative, complete cessation of individuality, and a discouragement of development and success" (Taylor 1942). Her rhetoric exemplifies the continuing concern of the political right that federal Labor was set to legislate socialist principles (Moore 1995).

She was fearless and formidable in expressing her views, and woe betide anyone with a counter position. Her differences of opinion could quickly escalate to all-out warfare with people across a range of political (and personal) issues. Glossed over in the initial idealistic consensus for planning reform early in the peace, differences soon began appearing in the Town Planning Association between the "right wing" of the planning movement (led by George and Florence) and the "left wing" including Professor R.F. Irvine, progressive politician-unionist J.D. Fitzgerald, Walter Burley and Marion Mahoney Griffin, and Charles Reade, the planning advocate whose regulationist approach was condemned as messily bureaucratic (Sandercock 1975). Far from mellowing with age, Florence became more strident in her views.

At the very time she was floating her own pet planning projects, she was highly critical of the direction others were advancing the planning cause and how it was set to be institutionalised. While she may have been peeved that her own city improvement suggestions were ignored, her critique of mainstream town planning and town planners formed part of a wider anti-government stance.

Cities, nations and regions in planning history

Early calls for more planning were displaced by critiques of too much planning of a kind “hardly distinguishable from plain totalitarianism” (Taylor 1948c).

Florence professed a strong and consistent position on interference by government in the private market. She supported only minimalist intervention to correct the grossest disbenefits of unregulated procedures and outcomes leading to socially undesirable outcomes. Her major problem with government controls was their stifling of the benefits flowing from a free enterprise system. “Red tape” was a restraint on the contribution of profit-making to national development. She complained about “controls and regulations pinning us down on every hand” (Taylor 1945, 36) and compiled a long list of laws she saw as superfluous, from arbitration to restrictive shopping hours. The post-World War 2 period was “the most frustrating”, she wrote for Giles, witnessing “ludicrous laws clamp down on almost every kind of enterprise as soon as it shows itself capable of succeeding, and capital is thus turned away from its project” (Giles 1959, 71). The way in which fair rent controls distorted the property market was a particular concern, so too unduly restrictive development controls. She loathed labyrinthine public service practices of internal supervision and accountability (Taylor 1945).

Her sympathies lay with the needs and achievements of the free market:

“Private enterprise built this city. It belongs to them and the people they serve. It does not belong solely to those who have been appointed to administer over it for a limited period ... We should say ‘thank you’ to all the big merchants of Sydney who, by their enterprise, have built it up to its present standard and beauty and prosperity which will enable us to forge ahead in providing them with transport facilities, to enable them to carry on, prosper and enrich the city by further developing it. They have done a noble work. They should be lauded, not blamed, and helped, not frustrated” (Taylor 1953, 25, 29).

State and local governments were thus frequently portrayed as negative, small-minded and lacking vision. Public servants could be unsympathetic “government numbskulls” who “rejected what they could not fathom as a progressive move” (Maegraith 1968). Town planners could be bully-boys, blending unrealistic utopianism with pervasive government sets of rules to “strangle development”. Few of them understood economics, she complained; they were “all academic, scientific or technical - no one amongst them understood finance, which is the drive behind all schemes” (Giles 1959, 15). They could certainly “learn from the business world” in better promoting community understanding of their proposals (Taylor 1948b).

Inevitably, she found it difficult “to come to grips with the restrictions, controls, and labyrinthine procedures which formed the basis of the post-war planning machine” (Freestone 1991, 12). There would be firsthand experience to draw upon. For a time she lived in a large house in Sydney’s elite eastern suburbs but the local council would not approve extensions because of floor space ratio constraints. In this way, planning constituted another constraint on individual liberty and prospectively with seemingly few individual benefits: “It is a bit of an impertinence, come to think of it, to expect a person to give up all

he holds dear, for some advantage to somebody else in which he personally will never be able to participate” (Taylor 1949, 81). Overly restrictive land use zoning regulations were also problematical. For example, banning shops from residential areas simply introduced inconvenience for those without good access to transport, like stay-at-home mothers (Freestone and Hanna 2007).

Unlike most of her peers in the planning movement, Florence was also diametrically opposed to the concept of public housing. This was one of her more consistent stances over more than half a century. She was an early critic of Sydney’s first government-planned garden suburb at Daceyville developed before World War 1. This was a place “where people will be tenants all their lives - providing they be fools enough” (Taylor 1916, 83). She saw house construction as “purely a personal transaction between private individuals” which “should be financed through private enterprise and personal negotiation” (Taylor 1957, quoted in Freestone and Hanna, 2007, 108). Public housing produced bland, standardised environments; it was a “hare-brained scheme to build stereotypes homes for everybody ... reducing the art of graceful living to the depths of mediocrity” (Taylor 1944). The same uniformity critique surfaced in Britain (Goodchild 2008). Her solution to the housing shortage crisis at the end of World War 2 was typically deregulationist; the solution lay not in more controls but a booming free market economy delivering full employment and hence a high material standard of living (Taylor 1945).

Finally, comes her take on Sydney’s County of Cumberland Planning Scheme of 1948, an iconic metropolitan strategy in the Abercrombie tradition. She acknowledged the need for such a plan if it could ease traffic congestion, provide open space, and eliminate slums. And while thundering about centralised bureaucratic planning, like Hayek, she conceded that there could also be a consultative planning attending to the quality of urban life (Taylor 1948c). As details of the plan slowly became apparent she became less enamoured and ultimately sided with the discredited Town Planning Association in criticising an expensive, heavy-handed approach stifling development (Freestone and Park 2009). She came to see the plan as pro-sprawl, promoting banishment of people to “the mosquito and fly-infested outer suburbs” (Taylor 1949, 83). She became critical of “the new fetish of Town Planners”, namely decentralisation of jobs and population, for condemning workers to long, wasteful commutes chewing up time, energy and costs (Taylor 1949, 81). Somewhat ahead of her time, she stood for greater centralisation - the opportunity for people to live close to where they worked. She was an early critic of the green belt as prolonging “straphanging” journeys by public transport to and from outer suburbs (Taylor 1949, 85). In short, she attempted to discredit Sydney’s official metropolitan planning strategy, writing ironically:

“The Cumberland Planning Scheme embodies all the idealistic considerations that normal Town Planners provide, and all would be well if everyone concerned would only alter their ways of life, sacrifice their built-up possessions and property, which the new scheme threatens to snatch from them without option but with such recompense as some valuer would assess them to be worth, without any regard for goodwill or sentiment” (Taylor 1949, 81).

She felt that the business sector would surely agree by telling planners: “We made the city by our activities - you go and make a city of your own if you want an ideal place” (Taylor 1949, 86).

CONCLUSION

It is difficult to distill the essence of Florence Taylor’s variegated life and contributions. A 1969 obituary by Adrian Ashton, a loyal deputy at the Building Publishing Company for thirty years, praised her as “a great worker”:

“Morning, noon and night, she was indefatigable in writing, writing, writing about all the things in which she believed so intensely. Not everybody agreed with some of her views, but few did not respect this remarkable woman for her forthright views, her tremendous energy and her dedication to the things in which she believed” (Ashton 1969).

This paper has considered her contribution as a town planner, a cause with which she was associated for four decades, arguably longer than any other man or woman in 20th century Australia. She did help create through her writings, lectures, organisational capabilities and shameless self-promotion a social climate more receptive to thinking about the need for change and improvement. Her own town planning schemes were well documented but never built in her lifetime, mostly for the better. Most projects were just made redundant by economic, technological and social change. With her publisher-editor hat in the 1940s, she became more vocal about planning matters but the contributions while prescient in some ways came across as amateurish, old fashioned and largely irrelevant given the main directions of planning thinking at that time. That the nascent planning professional was male-dominated would not also have helped her cause (Freestone 1995). Given her conservative views, she also found herself deeply alienated by all the governmental restrictions, controls, and procedures which mid-20th century planning reforms ushered in.

Florence Taylor as a town planner thus presents a paradoxical figure as a conservative ideologue in a field wedded to state intervention as a vehicle for collective advancement. Her views were divorced from any thoughtful appreciation of the cut and thrust of the new institutional and cultural environment for planning by the mid-1940s. They sat provocatively alongside professional discourse, which was always more moderate, deliberate and even-handed. Her dogged prioritisation of widened streets, new roads and high rise development tapped but a fraction of the increasingly holistic concerns of the new professional planning of the day. While she early played the classic role of the progressive reporter-reformer, Florence’s politics were right-wing, and even showed fascist leanings for a time between-the-wars. An outspoken supporter of the capitalist system and small government, she railed against unions, strikes, left-of-centre Labor politicians and bureaucratic controls of all kinds. By the 1940s this political philosophy collided with the dominant direction of post-war planning which envisaged an expanded role of the state into the quotidian environment. The further paradox arises in that this stance remarkably anticipated the more recent turn to small-government neo-liberalism (Gleeson and Low 2000).

REFERENCES

- Ashton, A. "Industry Mourns Its Most Distinguished Lady", Construction, 25 February 1969, p. 1.
- Ashton, A. "Empire's Most Remarkable Woman", Building, November 1955, pp. 30-36.
- Barnett, F.O., Burt, W.O. and Heath, F. We Must Go On: A study of planned reconstruction and housing. Melbourne: The Book Depot, 1945.
- Bunning, W. Homes in the Sun: The past, present and future of Australian housing. Sydney: W.J. Nesbit, 1945.
- Burt, W.O. "National, Regional and Local Planning", Architecture, Vol. 34, 1945, pp. 143-153.
- Edmunds, R. "Town and country planning and democracy", Twentieth Century, vol 1(1), 1947, pp. 48-57.
- Freestone, R., ed. Cities, Citizens and Environmental Reform: Histories of Australian Town Planning Associations. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 2009.
- Freestone, R. "Women in the Australian Town Planning Movement 1900-1950", Planning Perspectives, Vol. 10, 1995, pp. 259-277.
- Freestone, R. "Florence Taylor: The lady town planner of Loftus Street", New Planner, No. 6, December 1991, pp. 11-12.
- Freestone, R. and Park, M. "A new planning landscape for professional and community action in Sydney 1935-67", in R Freestone, ed. Cities, Citizens and Environmental Reform, 2009, pp. 313-341.
- Freestone, R. and Hanna, B. Florence Taylor's Hats: Designing, Building and Editing Sydney. Sydney: Halstead Press, 2007.
- Giles, J.M., 50 Years of Town Planning with Florence M. Taylor. Sydney: Building Publishing Company, 1959.
- Gleeson, B. and Low, N. Australian Urban Planning: New challenges, new agendas. Sydney: UNSW Press, 2000.
- Goodchild, B. Homes, Cities and Neighbourhoods: Planning and the Residential Landscapes of Modern Britain. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Maegraith, K. 'The Taylors of Loftus Street', unpublished manuscript, c1968. Mitchell Library, Sydney, Maegraith Papers ML MSS 4944.
- Margalit, H., 'Planning, Anxiety and Imperial Identity in Early Twentieth Century Sydney', Architectural Theory Review, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1999, pp. 51-60.

Cities, nations and regions in planning history

Moore, A. The Right Road: A History of Right-Wing Politics in Australia. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Mullan, B. Stevenage Ltd: aspects of the planning and politics of Stevenage New Town 1945-78. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

Pemberton, J. "The Middle Way: The Discourse of Planning in Britain, Australia and at the League in the Interwar Years", Australian Journal of Politics and History, Vol 52, 2006, pp. 48-63.

Pemberton, J. "'O Brave new social order': The controversy over planning in Australia and Britain in the 1940s", Journal of Australian Studies, Vol 28, 2004, pp. 35-47.

Sandercock, L. Cities for Sale: Property, politics and urban planning in Australia. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1975.

Spearritt, P. Sydney's Century. Sydney: UNSW Press, 2000.

Taylor, F. "Meditations and Reflections", Construction, 11 March 1964, pp. 2, 5.

Taylor, F. "My Blood Boils", Building Lighting Engineering, May 1953, pp. 25-29.

Taylor, F. "Industry-A plea for factory consideration", Building and Engineering, November 1949, 81-89

(Taylor, F.) "Vale: Francis Graham Hood", Building and Engineering, November 1948a, pp. 69-71. [Uncredited articles in parentheses].

(Taylor, F.) "Advertising Town Planning", Building and Engineering, September 1948b, pp. 46-48.

(Taylor, F.) "Two Ways of Planning", Building and Engineering, June 1948c, p. 29.

Taylor, F. "What can be done about housing", Building and Engineering, September 1945, pp. 36-40.

Taylor, F. "Governments must do this and that - all hooley", Building and Engineering, September 1944, p. 49

(Taylor, F.) "Around Australia: Height of Buildings and Progress", Building, June 1934, pp. 11-12.

Taylor, F. "Home Building Section", Building, April 1916, pp. 83-84.

Taylor, F. "The Home or the Flat", Building, May 1915, pp. 125-127.

Teather, E.K. "Fascism and Australian town planning propagandists: some implications", Australian Journal of Politics and History, Vol. 40, pp. 335-350.