Newcastle University ePrints

Phelps NA, Tewdwr-Jones M. [A man for all regions: Peter Hall and regional studies](#). *Regional Studies* 2014, 48(10), 1579-1586.

Copyright:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Regional Studies* on 10 September 2014, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/00343404.2014.957933>.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2014.957933>

Date deposited: 10 March 2016

This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](#)

ePrints – Newcastle University ePrints

<http://eprint.ncl.ac.uk>

A MAN FOR ALL REGIONS: PETER HALL AND REGIONAL STUDIES

Nicholas A. Phelps and Mark Tewdwr-Jones

Regional Studies (2014)

Regional studies, or the study of regions, was central to Peter Hall (1932-2014) as a person and as a scholar. He was instrumental in founding the Regional Studies Association and the journal *Regional Studies*. He was its' first editor and remained an incomparable ambassador for the journal and the Association. But he was also, more fundamentally, a man for all regions. In this article we briefly consider aspects of Peter Hall's contributions to regional studies, drawing on interviews we recently conducted with Peter.

History and geography in Peter Hall's regional studies and planning

Though at one point he desired to defect and become an historian, Peter trained as a geographer at St Catharine's College, Cambridge. Human and physical geography at that time were unified and taught as regional geography and he retained in his personal curiosity and writings this attachment to a cornerstone concept of geographical inquiry – the nature of the region, how to define it and analyse it. As he described, 'I grew up in a world where you really did have to care about places and regional geography and that stuck with me. It's one of the great contributions of geography to planning'.¹ Peter's writing style owes much to the influence of his tutor at Cambridge, Alfred Augustus Levi Caesar (1914-1995) who instilled a rigorous linear approach to argument. More than this, though, Gus Caesar had himself worked with and been greatly influenced by G.H.J. Daysh, the professor of geography at the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Daysh's work on regional planning in the North East of England had left Caesar with the strong belief that geographical knowledge ought to be applied to practical problems; a belief that was to rub off, in turn, on Peter as one of the so-called 'Caesar's Pretorian Guard'.²

Peter's belief was that 'you can only understand process by understanding how places, economies and cultures evolve over time. I don't think we do enough economic history as a

¹ Interview 30th May 2012

² Interview 1st February, 2012

basis for planning or anything else'.³ It is curious in some ways that Peter led a parallel existence with another champion of geography, history and policy - Doreen Massey. Despite some shared interests in specific subject matter such as the nature of the regional problem and spaces of high technology industry and innovative activity, their different approaches and entry points into policy and politics meant they passed by each other like ships in the night. Doreen Massey developed her relational perspective (Massey, 1979, 1984) on regional economic development drawing something of a parallel between the deep geological structures and the surface appearances of landforms from her geography training and the foundations of local economic fortunes in successive participation in deeper economic structures highlighted by Marx.⁴ Peter also subscribed to a broadly Marxian view of the historical rhythms of capitalist economic development in his work on Kondratiev long waves (see, for example, Hall, 1982). However, one legacy of his geography training was an approach that remained one of inductive generalisation based on empirics and direct observation. This was underlined by both his journalism and his inveterate trespassing into policy concerns which meant that he operated at least as much as a raconteur of surface events and phenomena as he did of the deeper and longer-term historical trends. Peter noted recently how, 'I have spent an unnatural part of my entire life actually communicating through journalism', and he freely acknowledged that his journalistic outpourings forced him to constantly reflect, react and be relevant.⁵ Moreover, Peter's Fabianism had a strong tinge of anarchist thought that actually made him difficult to pigeon-hole as a thinker and allowed him to be far more critical of political dogma and economic orthodoxy left and right than he was often given credit for. Who else could have been involved in the then scurrilous *Non-plan: a radical experiment in freedom* and a later 'thought experiment' that had its lineage in *Non-plan*: the idea of a selective form of planning that would eventually find political and physical form as enterprise zones. There was a playful side to Peter that revelled in and allowed him to enjoy the eccentric and maverick in others.

³ Interview 30th May 2012

⁴ Massey's parallel here was not, as has been described (Warde, 1985), one of a geological metaphor (Phelps, 2008), although her training and interest in physical geography certainly proved an inspiration to the thinking in her relational approach.

⁵ Interview 30th May 2012.

Peter's formative experience with the practice of urban and regional planning developed as systems theory (McLoughlin, 1969) and recourse to forecasting with large scale data came to the fore in both regional and structure plan preparation. Systems theory and the forecasting of demand for land use were often undermined by the pace of events and by the instrumental nature of the plan preparation processes that often accompanied such exercises. And yet Peter retained much of his interest in the use of large scale aggregate data to understand the changing dynamics of urban and regional economies, especially with regard to questions of planning for major infrastructure investment. Indeed, he remained largely unmoved by subsequent theoretical developments and associated writing in the geography and planning disciplines. He continued to tell direct linear stories of enormously important topics in geography and planning in a clear prose style with considerable flourish and invention. Increasingly this style, in part, placed him apart from the mainstream of academic geography and even planning communities which he complained had lost their way in endless critical carping (Phelps, Tewdwr-Jones and Freestone, 2014). As a person who wanted not just to analyse but to *do* things, he was not someone who suffered from what we have described elsewhere as a sense of paralysis in the schism that has emerged between geography and planning (Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones, 2008). But as we have noted (Phelps, Tewdwr-Jones and Freestone, 2014), Peter's pragmatic planning imagination – his desire to be relevant and to do something – came at a price in terms of his intellectual consistency over the years: invoking in the 1970s the density and urbanity of Hong Kong but against anything remotely approaching this in the formulation of a British urban renaissance in the 1990s; greatly enamoured of a car-based future for cities in the 1960s but ultimately, at the time of his passing, a champion of high-speed rail and trams.

Regions and the man

Peter's intellectual curiosity relating to urban and regional development and planning stretched far and wide. He remained personally and intellectually anchored in Britain but also acutely aware of its contrasts north and south. On and off, over half a century, old Britain and its stubborn economic divides would provide in turn an inspiration to, and an exasperation for, someone who believed passionately in doing the greatest good for the greatest number. As a prime example of *homo urbanus* (The Economist, 2014), Peter did more than most as a public intellectual to confront what he recently described as 'a certain

sickness about the UK... a kind of insularity and almost defensive aggressive insularity...' with regard to politics and policy.⁶

Initially, as he emerged into the job market of swinging 60s London, the 'great wen' was not only the subject of his academic training (developed from his PhD thesis) in *The Industries of London since 1861* (Hall, 1961) but also a source of wonder itself in *London 2000* (Hall, 1963) and *The World Cities* (Hall, 1966). Moreover, attempts to deal with London's population 'overspill' saw Peter appointed by the Wilson government to the South East Economic Planning Council while in his mid thirties where he enjoyed considerable freedom to write along with a handful of others much of the South East Regional Plan.⁷ Peter was directly and personally involved in these early years of his career in a change in the zeitgeist surrounding planning in Britain. A sense of common purpose among Britons outlasted the war, while the war effort itself proved the value of government direction of resources. For a brief moment from the end of the war up until the late 1960s Britain tried to be modern and embraced planning as part of a broader idealism of post war reconstruction (Kynaston, 2007). However, this optimistic 'we' of planning evaporated in a few short years in the late 1960s and early 1970s giving way finally to Margaret Thatcher's summoning of an 'I' of the heroic individual to vanquish any residual sense of the greater public good associated with planning. With it went the top-down regional planning and comprehensive redevelopment of town centres that Peter had originally subscribed to. Though Peter remained a great champion for the bigger picture of regional and strategic infrastructure planning, the tone of his writing had turned distinctly critical of planning, a point some in the planning profession remembered for years after and one that proved to be a sticking point initially in nominating him to the profession's gold medal – subsequently awarded in 2003. *The Containment of Urban England* study of the early 1970s was above all a devastating expose of the social inequities of the collective delusion that was Britain's celebrated system of town and country planning. More scathing yet was the question posed – in *Non-plan* - of whether the result would be worse without any planning at all.

'He was, above all, a pragmatist, willing to abandon ideas that didn't work and to work with anyone who would listen' (The Economist, 2014). Soon enough the optimism surrounding

⁶ Interview, 1 February 2012

⁷ Interview, 30 May 2012.

post-war reconstruction and the economic expansion of the 1960s had waned to be replaced (again) by the frailties of the British economy. The north-south divide became a much firmer part of Peter's writing in *Urban and Regional Planning* (Hall, 1975) which over five editions became a textbook for a generation or more of British university students of geography and planning. No one had seen the low ebb of the 1970s coming, as he later recalled, and he perhaps more so than anyone sought practical and sometimes typically provocative ways of addressing the important questions of the day – such as how to stimulate inner city economies when nearly all else seemingly had failed. Personally, he became so disillusioned with Britain that at the height of the winter of discontent in January 1978, sitting in a non-moving traffic queue for petrol (gas) on Manchester's Oxford Road, he decided to take up the offer of a chair at the University of California Berkeley. While overseas he remained interested in British cities and British politics, and became a central player in the foundation of the Social Democratic Party (the SDP) with two politicians of the centre left that he had worked with in the 1960s, Shirley Williams and Bill Rodgers⁸. His increasing reputation as an academic and popularity as a public figure and speaker were bringing him into contact with new regional worlds of rapid economic growth, enterprise and high-technology policy. He had first visited Los Angeles in the 1960s and had been drawn to the palpable sense of possibility in California. By the end of the 1970s he had made his first speaking engagements in the Far East. These new regional worlds doubtless appealed to Peter's fundamental optimism and activism as a public intellectual. They were to form the basis of several notable books including *Technopoles of the World* (Castells and Hall, 1994), *Carrier Wave* (Hall and Preston, 1988), *Silicon Landscapes* (Hall and Markusen, 1985) and *Cities in Civilisation* (Hall, 1998).

However, his enthusiasm for these new regional worlds combined in a very unpredictable way with his more non-conformist critique of the effects of the extant social structure vested in the British planning system that inhered in *The Containment of Urban England* and *Non-Plan*. It led to him being misunderstood to an extent by his academic peers. While critics

⁸ Shirley Williams, Baroness Williams of Crosby, b. 1930, former Labour Cabinet minister, co-founder of the SDP; Bill Rodgers, Lord Rodgers of Quarry Bank, b. 1928, former Labour Cabinet minister, co-founder of the SDP. Williams and Rodgers were two members of the original 'gang of four' senior politicians who broke away from the Labour Party in 1981. The SDP merged with the Liberal Party in 1988 to form the Liberal Democrats. Peter rejoined the Labour Party in 1994.

were effective in exposing flaws in some of the detail of the economic logic to enterprise zones (Massey, 1982; Harrison, 1982; Goldsmith, 1982), they were surely wide of the mark in attributing the idea to neoclassical orthodoxy and certainly wide of the mark in detecting any desire on Peter's part for it to spearhead a larger neoliberal ideological and political experiment. Nevertheless, it seems certain that he did indeed underestimate 'the political and ideological function' of the idea (Massey, 1982) and its potential to travel as a result.

For good or ill, the idea travelled which is some testament to its tractability and malleability; properties common to many of the most mobile planning ideas – garden cities, polycentricity, sustainability to name just three. The enterprise zone concept was taken up enthusiastically on the other side of the Atlantic by many states (Harrison, 1982; Mossberger, 2000; Yardley, 2014). In this and also in many other respects, Peter was the embodiment of the sorts of policy mobility that have become the subject of frenzied interest in academic geography and planning presently (see, for example, Harris and Moore, 2013 for a review). As no armchair geographer, he might have cast a wry smile at all this indirect compliment to men and women of action.

Returning to London in 1992 was more by accident than design, but the publication of the mammoth 1169-page *Cities in Civilisation* (Hall, 1998) marked his preoccupation with London and other world cities. London's renaissance had started to occur during this time but the north-south divide that had re-opened earlier from the 1970s remained. Moreover, the London that had re-emerged powerfully was itself a markedly more unequal London. So, once again, while London provided a significant intellectual mine for Peter it also was an important counterpoint to the more expansive and worldly view he had acquired over the preceding years. He supported and helped shape plans for both the M25 motorway around London (in actuality a scheme that had been discussed politically over many decades before), and 'orbirail', an orbital railway around London that eventually took the form of the London Overground network, and his active role in discussions of both the location of a third London airport and new towns in Kent meant that he had long seen the indecorous relationship between Greater London and the Greater South East of England. He could note of London's renaissance how 'London gets the model that everyone said was the right model. It turns out to be the right model that's brilliantly successful. Don't let's ever forget that we got it right. Then you get the most bizarre outcome that London begins to detach itself from the UK'.⁹

⁹ Interview May 30th 2012

This dual form of polarisation – London detaching itself from the rest of the UK while also causing social and economic cleavages within London itself – would find expression in two works: *Working Capital* (Buck et al, 2002) which examined life and labour in the city, and Peter's follow-up study, *London Voices, London Lives* (Hall, 2007).

Originality

It would be a mistake to view Peter - with his preference for a direct unencumbered and linear style of writing – as just a skilled surveyor and chronicler of events urban and regional. Many of his books have served as excellent textbooks but others reveal his originality, including his analytical or theoretical originality. While several of his most successful pieces of writing – *Urban and Regional Planning* (Hall, 1975) and *Cities of Tomorrow* (Hall, 1988), for example - are probably best regarded as textbooks, they are hardly typical of the genre. Others were distinctly original in different ways. It hardly needs pointing out that in the 1960s Peter had already alighted on the peculiarity and importance of world cities two decades or so before Friedmann and Wolff (1982) and later Sassen (1991) were to. In the quest to persuade, Peter ventured into the realms of fiction with his Dumill family in *London 2000* in a stylistic flourish very rarely used by academic writers.

He masterminded the two volume *The Containment of Urban England* (Hall et al., 1973) which remains unsurpassed as a statement of the effects of the British town and country planning system. For all their merits in terms of theoretical approach and empirical detail, subsequent studies (McNamara et al, 1988; Cox, 1983; Champion, 2002 and Phelps, 2012) ultimately did little more than reiterate the key findings of the socially iniquitous effects of this definitive statement. *The Containment of Urban England* was also revealing of Peter's longstanding interest to the definition and measurement of urban regions in functional economic terms. Thus, the large scale European Polynet project allowed Peter to return to his first love – geographical analysis of urbanisation and travel to work patterns – and resulted in a mass of data and intelligence (some, but not all, reported in *The Polycentric Metropolis*, Hall and Pain, 2006) about different European city-regions and enabled him to apply similar methodologies to analyse urban-regional developments in Chinese cities. His long standing interests in these regards appear to have played an important part in mobilising new work examining functional and morphological polycentricity notably among Dutch scholars (see, for example, Burger and Meijers, 2012; Musterd and Kloosterman, 2001).

Though not commonly regarded as a planning theorist, his *Great Planning Disasters* (Hall, 1980) - a book he recalled as one of the most difficult to write – is clearly significant in theoretical terms. It prefigured many of the issues that scholars were to turn to subsequently in the guise of applying complexity theory to urban dynamics and planning interventions (Batty, 2014). In its analysis of the uncertainty and political and bureaucratic conflicts that characterise the planning process, it also surely exposed the limits of the normative aspirations in theories of collaborative (Healey, 1997; Innes, 2005) or communicative planning (Forester, 1993) that were to rise to prominence from the 1980s.

Technopoles of the World (Castells and Hall, 1994) is typical of another trait of much of the joint work that Peter did - his ability to make an academic and intellectual virtue out of policy-originated opportunities for research. *Technopoles of the World* was a piece of comparative work funded largely by the Seville city government in the lead-up to the Expo held there in 1992. But rather than a flimsy piece of consultancy it is a masterful and comprehensive investigation of the major science spaces of the day - so much so, that it remains a classic reference. His interests in high technology industry, innovation and regional development at this time hardly singled Peter out. He was one of many enthused by a rediscovery of Schumpeterian economics of innovation. But his contributions were often more accessible and memorable than other important but theoretically (Mandel, 1985) or empirically (Marshall, 1987) dense contributions on the subject. *High Tech Fantasies* (Massey, Quintas and Wield, 1992) had appeared two years earlier as the major accessible academic competition to *Technopoles of the World* although they coexisted in the same subject matter waters as rather different contributions. Moreover, despite his strong interest at this time in the new urban and regional worlds produced by the emergence of new technologies seen also in *Silicon Landscapes* (Hall and Markusen, 1985) and *Carrier Wave* (Hall and Preston, 1988), his historical interest in the economic longevity of great cities produced something of a tension at the heart of *Technopoles of the World*. One of the book's key observations was that the largest metropolitan areas remained the major sources of innovation in a way which somewhat undermined much of the policy impetus to the development of the science cities and parks that were the subject of the book. Yet this key conclusion was quite in keeping with his earlier *Cities in Civilisation* and prefigured a subsequent academic turn back towards the city as an economic engine (Glaeser, 2011) and centre of innovation (Simmie, 2000).

Regional planning

To add to the history that often explicitly or implicitly underlay Peter's geography, he was perhaps best known as a planning academic and indeed a *practicing* planner. He was not merely someone who dipped his toe occasionally into dirty policy waters from the safety of the dry land of academia, but actually can claim to have had a hand in several major planning triumphs and even, perhaps, the odd disaster. He had been active in the Regional Studies Association at its outset, the appetite for which had been brewing since the 1950s. The Association's manifesto which argued that 'Town centre layouts cannot be separated from regional traffic predictions: industrial rebuilding cannot be isolated from regional economic policies and migration, or housing need from transportation networks' (Sharman, 1967: 1-2) is one that might have been written for Peter himself.

The reputation he gained for himself in this respect on important occasions rendered him suspect, notably to those on the political left as he freely recognised. This was nowhere more so than in connection to the enterprise zone idea and his acting as advisor to the UK Conservative minister Michael Heseltine. However, again, to discount his firm commitment to 'doing something' is to miss something quite fundamental about Peter the person – his undimmed optimism. Doubtless he recognised more than most that engagement with the world of policy making as a public intellectual is almost certainly not to have influence one might have hoped or desired. Here Peter the man's experiences as a policy maker were the embodiment of the frailties of planning more generally as 'never ending rounds of reactive, palliative, and piecemeal measures' (Scott and Roweis, 1977: 1106) dashed on the rocks of fundamentally wicked problems (Rittel and Webber, 1973) that produce all kinds of unintended and unanticipated consequences. With respect to the enterprise zones idea, he was certainly a victim of the politics of the policy-making process itself. He reflected recently how 'politics is politics. You've really got to learn that it's a very vicious game and most the time a very dishonest game. Politicians choose what they like and discard what they don't like and will re-label you quite cheerily' surely applies to this episode.¹⁰ Doubtless reflecting on his experiences, Peter cautioned 'do not, as an academic, succumb too easily to the fatal temptation of moving from writing to action. With writing, whether or not the result is gratifying, at least you are in control of your fate... With policy, you have no such guarantee: years of negotiation, of grant-chasing, of policy backtracking and reversal can all too easily

¹⁰ Interview 30th May, 2012

result in no measurable outcome at all.’ (Hall, 2012: 560). Through his attempts to shape policy, he was surely aware that history can make fools of the wisest of individuals. But perhaps it was precisely this awareness (including that of his own limitations) that allowed him to carry on undaunted; despite his caution to others, he himself could not resist. He remained a fantastic and enthusiastic advocate for planning but he looked back with particular pride on his involvement during the 1960s in particular arguing that ‘I think we did good things. We built good places that withstood the test of time. No one talks about them because they’re okay and so they’re not a problem. We tend to forget this and denigrate ourselves...’.¹¹

In the contemporary world of policy impact, it is worth reminding ourselves that much of Peter’s policy influence has come via his journalism or near journalism – his shorter more accessible articles for magazines and periodicals rather than his academic journal or book length treatments of subjects. The UK Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer Geoffrey Howe plucked the enterprise zone ideas as a policy from a speech Peter gave to the Town and Country Planning Summer School in the 1970s, conveniently dropping some important but less politically palatable aspects of it along the way. The possibilities of the Channel Tunnel rail link driving an East Thames Corridor (later Thames Gateway) were originally aired by Peter in an article in *The Times* (Hall, 1990), but even here Peter was utilising his accrued knowledge of South East planning growth options developed by the Labour government from the 1960s including infrastructure developments and new towns. *The Times* article piqued the attention of the newly appointed Secretary of State for the Environment Michael Heseltine. The latter experience serves to underline something potentially quite fundamental about academic impact on policy, its scarcity and the difficulty of measuring it. If ‘history is about chaps, geography is about maps’, then academic policy influence is revealed fundamentally as history; a history, not of ‘chaps’ but of a meeting of minds of individuals, as Jacobs and Lees (2013) have recently recounted of Alice Coleman’s influence upon Margaret Thatcher and Conservative Government housing policy. After having been defeated in a contest for the leadership of the Conservative Party in 1990, Michael Heseltine had famously let it be known that the environment portfolio was not the limit of his ambitions. Heseltine’s search for *grand projet* to match his ambition provided the opening for Peter who became his

¹¹ Interview 1st February 2012

special advisor – and Peter would remark later that Heseltine was one of only three politicians that had impressed him over the years¹².

Peter remained engaged actively with policy right to the very end. He held a strong interest in railways and trams (and could name railway junctions and recount railway history in forensic detail) although in the early 1970s he had thought that railways were in decline and could be replaced by roads in some regions, a point he acknowledged he had been mistaken about. He was an active and strong supporter of both High Speed Rail 1 (London to Paris and Brussels), booking himself a ticket on day one of the new service into London St Pancras, and of the High Speed Rail 2 connection between London, the Midlands and the North of England. This led to the curious situation of one of his main debaters being one of his own work colleagues (Tomaney and Marques, 2013). Notably he produced a report with Chris Green, the former senior British rail director, on improving Britain's railway stations, characteristically drawing on his knowledge of stations on the European continent, and even lapsing into the fantastic future by suggesting the construction of subterranean travelators linking together the London stations of Euston, St Pancras and King's Cross. At the time of his death was running an EU project called SINTROPER (Sustainable Integrated Tram-Based Options for Peripheral European Regions) which examines tram systems and economic development in five European regions.

He had long been interested in the garden city concept, republishing a centenary version of Ebenezer Howard's 1902 book *Cities of To-morrow*, but was concerned with the regional dynamics of linking together brand new settlements on good transport networks with existing urban areas. This aspect of Peter's work brought together history with his passion for *Sociable Cities* (Hall and Ward, 1998) and directly led to his final major book contribution, *Good Cities, Better Lives* (Hall, 2013). These ideas served Peter well not only in his advice on the development of the Thames Gateway, but also more recently with ideas for eco-towns and garden cities. His belief in garden cities had made him uncomfortable with some aspects of Richard Rogers's (1999) Urban Task Force report on urban renaissance, despite having been appointed to the committee as a full member. In particular he voiced opposition on the possible densification of cities, even though he had argued in the 1970s for 'Hong Kong solutions' to the problem of UK cities. He was more than a little puzzled and frustrated by

¹² The other two politicians named were David Miliband (b. 1965, former UK Foreign Secretary) and Andrew Adonis (b. 1963, former UK Transport Secretary).

his own UCL colleagues' reticence to enter the 2014 Wolfson Economics Prize to design a new garden city for the UK. Typically he drew upon his great knowledge and fascination in detail to propose a series of regional rail linked settlements. The plan, which was produced with Wulf Daseking, David Lock, Will Cousins, David Rudlin and John Walker, was not shortlisted. It did, however, receive a commendation from the judging committee and we may yet see some of Peter's ideas come to fruition in the future

The man

So much for the regions, what of the man? We were both privileged to know Peter and to have had him as a colleague albeit for a fraction of his long scholarly and public life. He was a man at ease with himself and, despite his invariably perfectly formed sentences in writing and speech, was able to put people of all sorts at ease. The honours awarded to him in the last 20 years of his life reflected the high esteem he was held in around the world, but he remained firmly grounded¹³. This is not something that can be said of all influential academic and public figures. Part of his enormous appeal was his enthusiasm and affableness and the fact that he seemed, by and large, to be able to get on with many different people; 'to work with anyone who would listen'. He became great friends and a co-author with Manuel Castells and Melvin Webber at Berkeley despite the two being very different in their influences and personality.

Though justifiably proud of his achievements he wore them extremely lightly. Indeed, he had a refreshingly healthy line in self-deprecation in an academic world not free from pomposity and egotistical displays - more often than not from those with a fraction of Peter's achievements to their name. He possessed an encyclopaedic knowledge of cities and regions, could communicate complex ideas in extremely accessible ways, and above all never lost his scholarly inquisitiveness. Peter was immensely generous with his time in a way that often seemingly defied the rigors of the twenty four hours most of us have been granted in a day. And his insatiable appetite for travelling, exploring and observing new urban and regional phenomena resulted in him accepting invitations to present talks on cities and city futures the world over. He estimated that over 40 years, he had travelled in the region of 70,000 miles (112,000 kilometres) each year.

¹³ Among the honours and awards were a knighthood in 1998 for services to the Town and Country Planning Association, being named as a 'pioneer in the life of the nation' by The Queen in 2003, and the Deputy Prime Minister special achievement award in 2005.

There was a dimly felt sense of urgency in our editing with Robert Freestone (Tewdwr-Jones, Phelps and Freestone, 2014) a recent collection of essays flowing from a two day event at UCL in June 2012 celebrating and evaluating many of Peter's key writings. It was clear at that event in what high esteem and genuine affection Peter was held by contributors drawn from around the world. Peter listened attentively and responded to the various challenges to his work among the presentations of chapter contributions with his usual erudition and mixture of disarming candor and humour.

Of course we could not have predicted that this collection would come to be something of a testament to his enormous contributions to urban and regional studies quite so soon. And yet Peter's contributions are large enough and manifold enough to ensure that his name and influence will be felt for years to come. Not only was he actively researching, writing and winning major research grants up until the end but we are aware of several outputs currently in print and at least one further volume designed specifically to celebrate one of his contributions more specifically (Miao, Benneworth and Phelps, forthcoming). He leaves behind a publication record that will be difficult to match: almost 50 books, over 3000 articles, scores of television interviews and videoed lectures, and a photographic collection of over 70,000 images. Life goes on. Peter's ideas will carry on here in the pages of the journal and in the work of the Association he helped found.

References

Batty, M. (2014), 'Great planning disasters' in Tewdwr-Jones, M, Phelps, N.A. and Freestone, R. Eds. (2014), *The Planning Imagination: Peter Hall and the Study of Urban and Regional Planning*. Routledge, London.

Banham, R., Barker P., Hall, P. and Price, C. (1969) 'Non-plan: a radical experiment in freedom', *New Society* 338, 20 March 1969.

Buck, N., Gordon, I., Hall, P., Harloe, M. and Kleinman, M. (2002) *Working Capital: Life and Labour in Contemporary London*. Routledge, London

Burger, M., and Meijers, E. (2012) 'Form follows function? Linking morphological and functional polycentricity', *Urban Studies* 49 (5): 1127-1149.

Castells, M. and Hall, P. (1994) *Technopoles of the world: The making of 21st century industrial complexes*. Routledge, London.

Champion, A.G (2002), *The Containment of Urban Britain: Retrospect and Prospect*, Franco Angeli, Milan.

Cox, A. (1983) *Adversary politics and land: the conflict over land and property policy in post-war Britain*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

The Economist (2014) 'Obituary: Peter Hall', *The Economist*, 9 August

Forester, J. (1993) *Critical theory, public policy, and planning practice*. SUNY Press, Buffalo.

Friedmann, J. and Wolff, G. (1982) 'World city formation: an agenda for research and action', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6: 309-344.

Glaeser, E. (2011) *The Triumph of the City: How our greatest invention makes us richer, smarter, greener, healthier and happier*. Pan Books.

Goldsmith, W. W. (1982) Enterprise zones: if they work, we're in trouble', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6 (3): 435-442

Hall, P. (1961) *The Industries of London since 1861*, Huthinson, London.

Hall, P. (1963) *London 2000*. Faber and Faber, London

Hall, P. (1966) *The World Cities*. Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London.

Hall, P. (1980) *Great Planning Disasters*. Methuen, London.

Hall, P. (1982) 'Response', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6 (3):443-446.

Hall, P. (1990) 'A cure for Britain's tunnel vision', *The Times*, 10th November, p.10.

Hall, P. (1998) *Cities in Civilisation*. Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London.

Hall, P. (2007) *London Voices, London Lives: Tales from a Working Capital*. Policy Press, Bristol.

Hall, P. (2012) 'Why write books?', *Regional Studies* 46: 559-560.

Hall, P. (2013) *Good Cities, Better Lives: how Europe discovered the lost art of urbanism*. Routledge, London.

- Hall, P. and Markusen, A. (1985) *Silicon Landscapes*. Allen and Unwin, London.
- Hall, P. and Pain, K. (2006) *The Polycentric metropolis: learning from mega-city regions in Europe*. Earthscan, London.
- Hall, P., and Preston, P. (1988) *Carrier Wave: New Information Technology and the Geography of Innovation, 1846-2003*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Hall, P., Thomas, R., Gracey, H. and Drewett, R. (1973) *The Containment of Urban England*. 2 Vols. George Allen and Unwin, London,
- Hall, P., and Ward, C. (1998) *Sociable Cities: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Harris, A. and Moore, S. (2013) 'Planning histories and practices of circulating urban knowledge', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37: 1499-1509.
- Harrison, B. (1982) 'The politics and economics of the urban enterprise zone proposal: a critique', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6 (3): 422-428.
- Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning*. MacMillan, Basingstoke.
- Innes, J. E. (1995) 'Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice', *Journal of planning education and research* 14: 183-189.
- Jacobs, J.M. and Lees, L. (2013) 'Defensible space on the move: revisiting the urban geography of Alice Coleman', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37: 1559-1583.
- Kynaston, D. (2007), *Austerity Britain 1945-51*, Bloomsbury, London.
- McLoughlin, J.B. (1969) *Urban and regional planning: a systems approach*. Methuen, London.
- McNamara, P., Elson, M. and Doak, A. (1988) *Land use planning and the mediation of urban change: The British planning system in practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mandel, E. (1995) *Long waves of capitalist development: A Marxist interpretation*. Verso, London.

- Marshall, M. (1987) *Long waves of regional development*. MacMillan, Basingstoke.
- Massey, D. (1979) 'In what sense a regional problem?', *Regional Studies* 13: 233-243.
- Massey, D. (1982) 'Enterprise zones: a political issue.' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6 (3): 429-434.
- Massey (1984) *Spatial Divisions of Labour*. MacMillan, Basingstoke.
- Massey, D. Quintas, P. and Wield, D. (1992) *High Tech Fantasies: science parks in society, science and space*. Routledge London.
- Miao, J. T, Benneworth, P. and Phelps, N.A. Eds. *Making 21st Century Knowledge Complexes: Technopoles of the World revisited*. Routledge, London.
- Mossberger, K. (2000) *The politics of ideas and the spread of enterprize zones*. University of Georgetown Press, Washington DC.
- Musterd, S. and Kloosterman, R.C. (2001) 'The polycentric urban region: towards a research agenda', *Urban Studies* 38(4): 623-633.
- Phelps, N.A. (2008) 'Spatial Division of Labour (1984): Doreen Massey', pp. 83-90 in Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R. and Valentine, G. Eds. *Key Texts in Human Geography*. Sage, London.
- Phelps, N.A. (2012) *An Anatomy of Sprawl: Planning and politics in Britain*. Routledge, London.
- Phelps, N. A. and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2008) '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* 33: 566-584.
- Phelps, N.A., Tewdwr-Jones, M. and Freestone, R. (2014), 'Geography, history and the planning imagination', in Tewdwr-Jones, M, Phelps, N.A. and Freestone, R. Eds. (2014), *The Planning Imagination: Peter Hall and the Study of Urban and Regional Planning*. Routledge, London.
- Rittel, H.W.J., and Webber, M.M.. (1973) 'Dilemmas in a general theory of planning', *Policy sciences* 4: 155-169.

Sassen, S. (1991) *The global city*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Scott, A.J., and Roweis, S.T. (1977) 'Urban planning in theory and practice: a reappraisal', *Environment and Planning A* 9: 1097-1119.

Sharman, F.A. (1967) 'The Regional Studies Association: origins and opportunities', *Regional Studies* 1: 1-2

Simmie, J. Ed. (2000) *Innovative Cities*. Spon Press, London

Tewdwr-Jones, M, Phelps, N.A. and Freestone, R. Eds. (2014), *The Planning Imagination: Peter Hall and the Study of Urban and Regional Planning*. Routledge, London.

Tomaney, J., and Marques, P. (2013) 'Evidence, policy, and the politics of regional development: the case of high-speed rail in the United Kingdom', *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 31: 414-427.

Warde, A. (1985) Spatial change, politics and the division of labour', pp. 190-212 in Gregory, D. and Urry, J. Eds. *Social Relations and Spatial structures*. MacMillan, London.

Yardley, W. (2014) 'Peter Hall, who devised the enterprise zone, dies 82', *The New York Times*, 12 August.