

Geddes Institute for Urban Research
University of Dundee

Working Paper

[This Research Paper was developed in part to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the publication of *Cities in Evolution*. It formed the background for a presentation at the University on November 20th, 2015, as part of the programming that complemented the exhibition, *The City is a Thinking Machine*. The paper is offered here in part to explore interest in an idea advanced in the paper, namely, the call for an ‘integral biography’ of Patrick Geddes. Prospective collaborators are invited to contact ian.wight@umanitoba.ca]

The Evolutionary Spirit at Work In Patrick Geddes

Ian Wight PhD, Senior Scholar, City Planning
Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
<Ian.Wight@UManitoba.CA>

Abstract:

A larger than life presence in his day, the influence of Patrick Geddes lives on in the present. Many fields have felt his influence and acknowledge his, often formative, contribution. What was the spirit that powered him then – to such heights, and breadths and depths; that was embodied in his thinking and acting – and ‘machine-making’ - that might be tapped afresh? In particular, what might admirers have missed or downplayed, because they were not so spiritually attuned, nor so integrated in their beliefs and convictions? What does the Geddes *then*, say to us *today*; that merits our attention; that might cause us to revise our intentions - in regard to our practice dispositions and operating systems? This presentation offers an integral perspective on such lines of questioning.

Looking at Geddes afresh through an integral lens yields some intriguing insights. There have been integral, holistic influences at work, philosophically, for centuries – but they have mostly, especially in the recent century, been highly subordinate to more exclusively scientific perspectives, associated with differentiation, and reductionism. Geddes may be regarded as comparatively integral for his day, at a time when relatively narrow, fragmenting, atomizing perspectives were strongly in the ascendant. As a result, he was noted and notable – but more as an outlier, than part of the mainstream. He was almost certainly ahead of his time, but so much so that many then appear to have been unable to get their heads around his ideas; they took what they could ‘get’, leaving much un-comprehended. At best, his more workable ideas were cherry-picked, and have endured to different extents; at worst, the full humanity of the man as a whole – body, mind, soul and spirit – was missed. Perhaps his time has still to come, especially as regards the full import of his thinking machines, which actually have some resemblance to the mapping and diagramming associated with integral theory.

It appears that Geddes was a proto-integral thinker (in terms of current integral theory – building especially on the work of Ken Wilber, and developers of his integral view). This interpretation explains – in his day - both his appeal for some, and the consternation he evoked in others (as well as the general ‘cherry-picking’ of his thought in practice). There is much of the full, whole, Geddes that might be usefully re-inhabited, and re-integrated – most notably the evolutionary spirit at work in him. Geddes may well have been simply ahead of his time - by a hundred years or so, at least. This presentation offers the beginnings of an ‘integral biography’ of sorts of the man, and his thinking, and feeling, and – most profoundly - his spirit. ‘What would Patrick Geddes say today?’ about how we should think and act in relation to the evolution of cities, potentially to better align with his enduring ideals and driving spirit. It is anticipated that his response would be to embrace evolution, as ever-more-whole-making, and commend this as his – and our – spirit-in-action.

From the Preface, *Cities in Evolution*, 1915

“Furthermore, the book makes an appeal even to the professed town-planner... For its definite principle is that we must not too simply begin, as do too many... but above all things, (we must) *seek to enter into the spirit of our city, its historic essence and continuous life*. Our design will thus express, stimulate, and develop its highest possibility, and so deal all the more effectively with its material and fundamental needs” (Geddes, 1915, vi; emphasis added).

Introduction: Tapping the Spirit

A larger than life presence in his day, the influence of Patrick Geddes lives on in the present. Many fields – botany, biology, sociology and geography to instance a few - have felt his influence and acknowledge his, often formative, contribution. But that acknowledgment has not always – and perhaps only rarely – translated into a fully sympathetic and whole-hearted application of his ideas and sentiments. How many of us, for example, have taken on board Geddes’ appeal – in his Preface to *Cities in Evolution* – that city planners and designers ‘must not too simply begin, as do too many’, but should ‘above all things, seek to enter into the spirit of our city, its historic essence and continuous life’?

Perhaps we have too easily gone too directly to dealing only with perceived ‘material and fundamental needs’, overlooking Geddes’ clear direction that tending to the spiritual must precede, while complementing, attention to the material. Simply stated, how well have we integrated the spiritual and the material in our practice? Might Geddes still have something to teach us in this respect, that we might better learn and embody? His aspiration for us appears to have been as artists of possibility¹ - to ‘express, stimulate and develop (the) highest possibility’. It might be suggested that it is in such artistry – imaginative, creative, ancient, prescient – that spirit can potentially be accessed, harnessed and imbued in our material form-making. This offering considers this suggestion.

If you happen to wonder about it, and then consider inquiring further, it is quickly apparent that matters of the spirit, the spiritual and spirituality loomed very large for Geddes; it obviously infused his thinking and inspired his acting at the time, but this critical and fundamental aspect of his oeuvre rarely seems to register in current consideration of his offerings². As some Scots might say, it hardly gets a ‘look-in’, or (most) ‘folks don’t seem to want to go there’. And it has to be acknowledged that this is probably still the case, in many respects, for many otherwise admirers or sympathizers - including aficionados of his thinking machines. We might therefore need to suspend our judgment, and park some of our biases, to more fully assess any deeper, especially ‘inner’, teachings for us, where Geddes is concerned. This takes us into the realm of integrally prospecting neo-Geddesian thinking, anticipating more explicitly integral manifestations, in effect taking ‘thinking-machines’ thinking to new levels.

With this context and proviso in mind, several lines of inquiry are of interest here. What was the spirit that powered Geddes then – to such heights, and breadths and depths; that he embodied in his thinking and acting; that might be usefully tapped afresh? What might admirers – or detractors - have missed or downplayed, because they were not so spiritually attuned, nor so integrated in their beliefs and convictions? What does the Geddes *then* say to us *today*, meriting our attention; that might cause us to revise our intentions, in regard to our practice dispositions and operative systems? And how might we begin to respond in terms of our practice?

An Integral Lens: Integrating the Spiritual (and More Besides)

It is suggested that such inquiries might best be pursued through deploying an integral lens, drawing on some of the insights from integral theory (Wilber, 2007)³. Geddes may be considered comparatively 'integral' in his thinking and doing (acting and enacting) - in his time, for his time: he was attentive to the 'in-world' as well as the 'out-world'; his 'thinking-machines' encompassed many permutations, on multiple levels, of essential experiences, such as acts, facts, dreams and deeds; and he had an evolved, and evolving, developmental perspective on evolution, rooted in his studies of life in all its forms. By today's understanding of integral, Geddes appears to merit characterization as *proto*-integral – an early form of 'integral-in-action', which would have been very difficult to generally credit at the time, helping to explain why so many found him so perplexing.

Common responses to Geddes' thinking at the time – and since – include descriptors such as ambiguous, amorphous, and ambivalent, not to mention confusing. His most in-depth biographer, Philip Boardman, describes Geddes as:

“amazingly complex in personality: both simple and learned, practical and theoretical, stirringly dramatic and dully didactic, scientifically realistic and spiritually arousing... lovable but tyrannical (to family)... a source of complete exasperation as well as of constructive stimulus (to friends and collaborators)” (Boardman, 1976, 1).

Looking at Geddes afresh through an integral lens may yield some useful insights. There have been comparatively integral (or integrative, generalist or holistic) influences at work, philosophically, for centuries – but they have mostly, especially in the most recent century, been highly subordinate to more exclusively scientific perspectives, associated with specialization, differentiation, and reductionism. As indicated above, Geddes may be regarded as comparatively integral for his day, at a time when relatively narrow, fragmenting, atomizing perspectives were strongly in the ascendant; he ranged almost effortlessly across the arts and sciences, and between eastern and western philosophy – always in pursuit of the greater synthesis and the associated synergy.

As a result, he was certainly noted and notable – but more as an outlier, than part of the mainstream. He was patently – by virtue of hindsight - ahead of his time, but so much so that many then were unable to get their heads around his ideas; they took what they could 'get', leaving much un-comprehended. At best, his more workable ideas were cherry-picked (e.g. Survey-Analysis-Plan; the Valley Section; Place-Work-Folk; The Outlook Tower), and have endured to varying extents; at worst, the full humanity of the man as a whole – body, mind, soul and spirit – was missed. But perhaps his time has indeed still to come, especially when it comes to the full import of his thinking machines - which actually have some resemblance to aspects of the diagramming associated with integral theory (King, 2005).

This presentation offers the beginnings of an 'integral biography' of sorts of the man, and his thinking, and feeling, and – most profoundly - his spirit. The underlying inquiry is effectively around 'What might Patrick Geddes say today?' about how we should think and act in relation to the evolution of cities, potentially to better align with his enduring ideals and driving spirit. The sense is that, at root, it would still be about 'evolution', as ever-more-whole-making, as his (and potentially our) 'spirit-in-action' – the evolutionary spirit at work in and through Patrick Geddes.

Placing Geddes: Then and Now

Recognized as a pioneer and visionary by many, Geddes' legacy still attracts an astonishing level of highly-charged interest – laudatory and dismissive, complimentary and critical, in almost equal measure. So much so in fact that we might feel inclined to wonder – what more might be usefully proffered?

The importance, or otherwise, of the place of Geddes in contemporary discourse and practice is indeed something that the current generation of researchers, practitioners and teachers need to navigate - to find their own bearings, and to engage with these bearings. Perhaps most significantly where Geddes is concerned, the navigation also needs to be targeted in large part *within* their own selves, aiming to be true to their own experience, and to their own sensibilities about the becoming – the coming-into-being – that they might want to enact in their work in the world. This requires an uncommon concern with 'inner work', an 'in-world/in-look' orientation, a going inside – individually and collectively, attempting to more greatly privilege what Geddes construed as the realm of the spiritual (in contrast to 'the temporal'⁴ or the material). This was a foundational piece in his system of thought that seems to have been missed by many, including fawning admirers and castigating critics, to this day.

The 'integral' placing of Geddes offered here therefore reflects a particular interest in the role and influence of the spiritual dimension in his life and work, and especially the evolutionary spirit that may have powered the 'inner' Geddes, and literally 'inspired' his outer works, such as his many exhibitions and pageants, and, of course, the content we find in *Cities in Evolution*. We need to try to see Geddes as a whole, in pursuit of ever-more wholeness, and in terms of his spirit at work, fortifying him in his quest – empowering his successes and ameliorating his failures – always driving on, trying to learn from his experiences, good and bad. He was a product of his time, and time has moved on; but there may be aspects of Geddes that are timeless, that might be instructive today, and tomorrow.

My own hunch is that Geddes' modeling then – of an 'Integral Vision of Nature, Life and Society' (Ferreira, 2012, original 1976), and of the virtues of a generalist philosophy and a synthesizing impulse (MacDonald, 2009)⁵ - can help teach us how, in our own time, to be more integral in our own ways, and more attentive to our own integrated-ness and integration-ability. He was more open than most in his time to considering multiple perspectives, and more expansive and inclusive worldviews (even though he was still, effectively, a prisoner of his times). Yet he strove to unify multiple perspectives – when this was rather unfashionable, and he promoted internationalist worldviews – when nations were more prone to go to war with one another. He certainly could have been more politically correct, by today's standards, but his advocacy and activism, in relation to higher education especially, can be read as a commitment to consciousness-raising all-round, paving the way in part for the critical paradigms now used by some to assault his then views and deeds.

Geddes' example, depending on the interpretation of current generations, can underline the value of developmental and evolutionary perspectives, including the possibility of developing, or evolving, the notion of evolution itself. Geddes operated at the leading-edge of the then life sciences, pioneering exploration of the biosphere, and less mechanistic, more organic, ecological framings; today's Geddes would potentially be advocating similar exploration of the noo-sphere (nous-sphere; the sphere of consciousness), and even more holistic, integral framings – likely including an evolutionary (rather than stasis-oriented) view of spirituality, and a whole-hearted embrace of emergence. Perhaps there are some emerging 'neo-Geddesians' reading this, who might want to undertake such explorations.

The interest here is pitched in the context of the now evolving future, in line with Geddes ultimate ‘outlook’ in his time; there is less of an interest in the past or in the interim, than in the present that is emergent – with an evolving, more integrally-informed, city planning in mind⁶. It is very doubtful, as Porritt (2004) for one sensed, that Geddes would have been very approving of what currently passes for planning in many contexts⁷; given this, what might he want to be advocating now? It will be suggested that he might now more favorably view a re-thinking of planning as place-making, as wellbeing by design (Wight, 2011; 2012), perhaps with planners casting themselves more overtly and explicitly as ‘pragmatic eutopians’ – and take some satisfaction in the associated evolution of some of his own central concerns from his day in the early sun of town planning and city design. In these ways we might usefully re-visit Geddes’ ideas, and re-position his legacy – with the present, and the emerging future in mind, in all its complexity, and diversity, and flux.

The Spirit in/of *Cities in Evolution*

On the evidence of a bald reading of *Cities in Evolution* Patrick Geddes was clearly interested in matters of the *spirit*, as it pertained to cities, in their evolution. He uses the word liberally, almost naturally, in many contexts; for him it is clearly an important communication anchor⁸. To read *Cities in Evolution* by privileging the references to spirit (or spiritual or spirituality) takes us a little closer to appreciating what made Geddes ‘tick’, what ‘fuelled’ his prodigious output; it may also help point us to what others might have missed, and what we today might want to ensure we incorporate when attempting to take his ideas forward. It is difficult to escape the sense that there is much still to be learned from Geddes, and to be better embodied by us, if we are willing and able – in particular - to embrace the spiritual dimension that was obviously so central and fundamental for him.

Spirit, or the spiritual, is not something that Geddes dwells on in isolation, in an explicit deliberative way. It is more part and parcel of a larger whole, or wholeness – of interrelationships or combinations – that commands his concern and attention. The reference is often in the context of a mix or run of factors - such as when contrasting Glasgow and Edinburgh, which “are, of course, far remoter in type and spirit than their nowadays small railway distance implies; and this difference, even contrast, is natural, inevitable, and so far permanent ... contrasted in many ways geographical and meteorological, racial and spiritual” (Geddes 1915, 40).

Or when discerning the perceived essence of town planning as

“not something which can be done from above, on general principles easily laid down, which can be learned in one place and imitated in another... It is the development of a local life, a regional character, a civic spirit, a unique individuality, capable of course of growth and expansion, of improvement and development in many ways, of profiting too by the example and criticism of others, yet always in its own way and upon its own foundations” (Geddes 1915, 205).

Geddes, in the book summary and conclusion, sought to underline the importance of

“learning to realize more fully the spirit of our city or town; ... we thus are able to distinguish, beyond the general improvements more or less common to all cities of our day, those characteristic developments of which our opening future may be best capable, and by which the spirit we have learned to value may be yet more fully and worthily expressed” (Geddes 1915, 400).

Although Geddes does not delve into the explicit meaning of his copious spirit references he does devote a whole chapter to ‘The Spirit of Cities’, and it is here especially that we begin to sense some of the *sine qua non* territory for Geddes, that he might now want us to consider in *quid pro quo* terms, to do full justice to his intent. For example, while clearly valuing the survey, exhibition, and plan-drafting components of plan-making, Geddes points to the importance of ‘what’s next’:

“Each is but a beginning, a preparatory study of the city, a draft towards its improvement and extension (but) ... beyond these, we have to realize and keep in view the spirit and individuality of our city, its personality and character, and to enhance and express this, if we would not further efface or repress it.” (365)

Geddes was optimistic at the time that “(e)very town planner is indeed moving in this direction more or less; ... but long and arduous toil and quest are still before us ere we can really express, as did the builders of old, the spirit of our cities.” (365). Geddes ends this chapter insistently:

“Without such increasing, deepening, and generally diffusing realization of the character and spirit of our city, our town planning and improvement schemes are at best but repeating those ‘bye-law streets’ with which the past generation was too easily content, but with which we are now becoming so thoroughly disenchanted, as but slums after all, and in some ways the worse for being standardized” (366).

Might today’s ‘bye-law streets’ be today’s ‘cookie-cutter’ suburban subdivisions?

In this particular chapter, on ‘The Spirit of Cities’, Geddes may be regarded as effectively arguing for an equal if not greater regard for the ‘immaterial’, in contrast to the ‘material’, to round out the necessary ‘survey’ that must precede any ‘plan’. It was something he obviously felt compelled to raise, and emphasize, but we might wonder... how many professional practitioners have been up for ‘surveying’ in such depth and breadth, and for negotiating the associated ineffability?

It is suggested that the necessary integration, and integrating, can only happen on one’s ‘inside’ – individually or collectively; the realization of evolved cities requires highly evolved persons, who have consciously worked on evolving themselves – aiming to be as complete as possible (while appreciating that they will always effectively be unfinished). Geddes seemed to know this intuitively, but also appreciated the immensity of the task; hence his advocacy of education, and of experiential learning.

Geddes’ Planning and Design Outlook: The Inspiration in Manifestation

The planning and design that we encounter today was hardly the planning and design that Geddes encountered, or formulated, or advocated, in his day. Different perspectives, and life conditions, were in play. My reading of Geddes in *Cities in Evolution* has him seeing planning in the context of ‘town planning’, as ‘city design’, within a wider, essentially ‘regional’, system. The ‘town’ component seems to value a smaller urban community – larger and more complex than a rural village, but smaller than a large city or metropolitan region, which might in effect be composed of a multitude of such town-scaled/’urban village’ communities. The character of this cell-like, ostensibly ‘complete’, community - this ‘town’ - is essentially and fundamentally ‘civic’. This is a key culture marker for Geddes, differentiating the ‘towns-cum-civic-communities’ from more rural, essentially ‘rustic’ contexts. Organized ‘public domain’ planning becomes particularly

important in the expanding/growing town contexts (though not necessarily in the stable or declining rural contexts).

It seems significant that Geddes refers to planning as very much an art (rather than a science), but an art that seeks to apply ‘the science of civics’, as well as recalling the ancient ‘art of memory’ – as ‘imagination’ (King 1990a, 1990b; Jarvis 1995) And this is where Geddes appears to hitch planning and design, conceiving ‘Town Planning as City Design’, the latter being envisaged as a venue for orchestrating the integration of other, then emerging, sciences - especially various social sciences, most notably sociology and geography. ‘Planning’ emphasized the necessary analysis; ‘Design’ emphasized the necessary synthesis. The ‘Region’ afforded the critical venue for organizing and grounding both – big-picture, grand-scale, past-respecting, future-embracing; ideally, a modern agora rife with civic intercourse – civics in action, a manifest poetics.

The operative context for Geddes was obviously very different from today. He was reacting especially to the first waves of industrialization and urbanization, within the then most developed nation-state in the world, at the centre of an extensive globe-spanning empire. The industrial scene was in flux, from what Geddes termed paleo-technic to neo-technic, although his clear disposition was towards emerging something more evolved, more bio-technic – in line with what we might today identify as ecological, or living-systems-based. Sub-urbanization was still a comparatively minor chord, but he no doubt anticipated this becoming much more of an issue, and showed a preference for proactively planning for comparatively pleasing ‘con-urbanization’, featuring complete ‘town’ communities, in city-region systems, with generous amounts of intervening open space. Geddes did not have to contend with what has come to be known as globalization, but he was in his day as much an internationalist as a nationalist, and he was very much moving in the direction of conceiving the planet as a whole as ‘the home of man’. This is where his life-systems research and civic-systems ideas were leading him. Some (such as Porritt, 2004) have also suggested that within *Cities in Evolution* one can find the clearest basis for ‘Think(ing) Locally, Act(ing) Globally’, and the Patrick Geddes connection⁹.

It should be noted that Geddes was mostly pursuing his planning and design ideas before these fields were institutionalized and professionalized to any significant extent. He was primarily interested in advancing town planning *as a movement*, and situating this in the context of *a thoroughgoing civics*. The latter could be thought of as something beyond parochial politics, perhaps more akin to a practical democracies. It is doubtful that Geddes would ever have been seriously interested in active regular membership of a professional institute¹⁰, and his natural instincts in terms of institutionalization were probably more in the direction of a functional anarchism than a bureaucratic utilitarianism.

As is well documented by Scott and Bromley (2013), Geddes’ theory of society was grounded in a balancing of spiritual (time-less, more territorial) and temporal (time-bound, highly functional) powers, and he was operating in a context when the ‘temporal’ powers were very much in the ascendant. These came to define, and lock in, much of the approach to planning and design that we find today – and what might be termed the associated ‘technocratics’. This severe imbalance still represents a very strong headwind for anyone trying to advocate for more attention to the essence of Geddes’ ideas in the present-day. We need, at least, a climate that is much more welcoming of the spiritual dimension, to mitigate the ongoing dominance of what Geddes termed the temporal powers. Can we find any pointers in Geddes’ experience that might help us better contend with this headwind, and adjust our own sails to harness some of that wind, and to achieve a more even keel – in ourselves, in our work, and in our world?

Grounding the Spiritual at Work in Geddes: Sensings and Soundings

There seems to have been an uncommon spirit at work within Geddes, powering him, fortifying him, to such breadths and depths, and intensity and diversity, of action, of intervention, of prescription, of conviction. He was full of the life in Life; he studied it with a passion, and it inspired him in turn - to his very core. He was making novel connections, inspiring further inter-connections – synapsing, synthesizing, synergizing. Increasingly, it seems, he became one with his spirit, and the Spirit beyond himself; it was so natural for him to embrace it, and to want to honour it so much. It was part of his wholeness – body, mind, soul and spirit, and he could not but bring his whole self to his work. As Boardman (1976, 9) noted: “Wholeness of thought and action characterized Geddes from earliest youth to vital old age”. ‘So what?’ you might well ask.

Geddes might help us model our own sense of wholeness, of spirit-in-action, so that this becomes a natural part of ourselves – openly valued, owned intrinsically, on show – always. There is an aspect in this of ‘taking back’ our own spiritual power; and for some this may feel like a ‘coming out of the closet’ move. Perhaps there is indeed an inner politics of sorts to be negotiated, before we are prepared to act, to become spiritually-activist¹¹ (Wight, 2009). Can you contemplate a more spiritually-activist planning and design on your own part? If so, Geddes could be worth your consideration in this respect, but... how to begin? Where do you ‘stand’ (under-standing, over-standing, outer-standing, inner-standing) on such matters as the following?

Spirit and Matter: For Geddes, spirit - in quite matter-of-fact fashion - was naturally paired with matter; it was not a case of one or the other, it was always a case of both. We are obviously, straightaway, in the realm of ‘both/and’, rather than ‘either/or’, as a context for our thinking. This is the simplest complexity that has to be embraced before we can advance; it is a choice for our taking. Matter is material; spirit is spiritual - immaterial, intangible, ethereal – but essential, of the essence. Following Henri Bergson, the evolutionary Geddes probably, early on, had in mind spirit as ‘*élan vital*’ (vital impulse), but as he came round to more of a focus on *neo-vitalism*, in conjunction with his own civics enthusiasm, this might have evolved into a concern with ‘*genius loci*’ - associated with a deep sense of place.

Geddes often railed against what he perceived as a materialist bias, and attempted to counter reductionist approaches, by advocating for more integrative, generalist viewpoints and more focus on synthesis. He might be expected therefore to be highly approving of current efforts to make the case for a *post-materialist* science (Beauregard et al, 2015). And this may also give us pause, to re-set our own course. This recent development is paralleled by an increasing interest in *post-secular* perspectives, helping to dissolve inhibitions that have in the past tended to preclude progressive engagements with spiritual matters (Hochachka, 2010; Sandercock and Senbel, 2011). The ‘integral’ perspective being advanced here has on occasion been rendered as *post-disciplinary*¹²; it represents another conduit for going beyond recent convention, in a transcending while including (rather than excluding) way. Such ‘post-’ orientations may be read as an ‘evolution’ of sorts at work – the kind of evolution that Geddes would probably have embraced, especially if it meant that spirit was regarded on a par with matter; an honouring of both spiritual and material, while privileging neither.

Spiritual vis-à-vis Temporal Powers: Geddes’ studies, linked with his experiences, led him to an operative theory of society that evolved around the inter-play of two main sets of ‘powers’ – one set rendered as ‘temporal’, and the other set rendered as ‘spiritual’. It is rare to find any acknowledgment of this fundamental underpinning of his ideas, and rarer still to find efforts that explicitly allow for this in application of his ideas in the present. A major recent exception is scholarship on the founding of sociology, focusing on the contributions of Geddes and Victor

Branford, in the context of their ‘quest for social reconstruction’ (Scott and Bromley, 2013)¹³.

This points to a complexity that Geddes was taking on board as a matter of course, resisting oversimplification, or the absolutizing tendencies in others - who may not have been up for handling the complexity, or inclined to acknowledge key aspects, such as ‘the spiritual’ references. And it might be natural for today’s planners and designers to follow suit, if they can get away with similar selectivity (and associated silencing, or *de facto* reverse privileging). Yet there are other more recent precedents for recognizing such fundamental dualities at work in our work.

In my own case, with my city-region planning interests, in my reading of this aspect of Geddes, I was reminded of the importance of the territory/function distinction for rethinking regional planning, as less about ‘solving the regional problem’, than coming to better terms with the essentially permanent, effectively irreconcilable, contradiction between territorial and functional bases of power (Friedmann and Weaver, 1979; Wight 1985). As a result I now always operate from a sense of a territory/function dialectic being at work in city-region planning contexts. And in terms of my interest in professional ethics in professional education, I was reminded of Jane Jacobs’ articulation of two fundamental ‘systems of survival’ – Guardian (Politics) and Commerce, demanding extraordinary ethically-grounded ‘moral flexibility’ in practitioners willing to explicitly acknowledge the distinction (Jacobs, 1994; Wight 2013). I now try to reflect these sensibilities in my practice, as a matter of course, helped increasingly by insights gained from integral framings, which confer a capacity to engage even more complexity, involving a duality of dualities, on multiple levels, in evolutionary development.

Religious and/or Spiritual? Geddes’s sense of ‘the spiritual’, seemingly rooted initially in his botanical and biological science interests (vitalism/élan vital), appears to have clearly transcended any specific/orthodox religious affiliation. He was not irreligious or anti-religion, having had a relatively positive experience of a particular religion in his childhood, but there is a sense that this became a valuable general experience for him, helping him to appreciate the importance of religion in a larger cultural context. It was something to be included, and surveyed, and reckoned with, in any planning and design effort. Geddes can also be found advocating for an evolution of what then passed for religion – he used the term ‘re-religion’ – as part of his utopian envisioning. He appears to have been comparatively tolerant of the co-existence of multiple religions, subscribing to no one religion personally. There is no overt ‘God-talk’ in his writings, but there is no doubting his ‘OK-ness’ with spiritual languaging. If he worshipped anything it was possibly Nature, but more likely Life, writ large (‘By leaves we live’). In his final years he also had a clearly stated preference for G.T.B. (Good True Beautiful) – over the then rather prevalent J.H.V.H. and I.H.S. (Boardman, 1978, 451)¹⁴.

It is probably the case that Geddes would have identified himself – personally - as ‘more spiritual than religious’ in current parlance, but with an open-ness to the possibility of multiple spiritualities, as well as multiple (organized) religions. His experience, in India especially, sensitized him to the reality of alternative religious practices and spiritual sensibilities, but this only fed his underlying synthesizing interests. Geddes does not appear to have come under the influence of, or subscribed to, any guru or guru-figure, nor does he appear to have had any specific ‘spiritual practice’. He was extraordinarily devoted to his ‘thinking’ - intensely, most days, for several hours. Whether this included, or represented, a form of meditation is not clear; he does not seem to have been much inclined to extended deep reflection, introspection and/or journaling. He very much valued the experiencing, and especially the doing and the acting - where he applied his thinking, and harvested his learning. Geddes seems to have been – perpetually – intervening, experimenting, inquiring, synthesizing, learning ... by doing. What we see is very much what we might now term an ‘action’ researcher, in love with Life, seeking to

commune more intimately with the living systems all around him.

Discerning Spirituality (in its many facets): Geddes may have been comparatively at home with notions involving spirit (vis-à-vis matter) and the spiritual (vis-à-vis the temporal), but he does not seem to have made any particular study of spirituality itself, nor of his own spirituality. He may have anticipated, or tacitly understood, that there was something like this somewhere in the 'life/Life' that was most fascinating for him at the time, but it was – seemingly - never front and centre in his thinking and doing. It may be relevant that consciousness studies, of real consequence, had not yet made their mark in his time. Life studies represented the main leading-edge then, and exploration of the bio-sphere was the operative setting for cutting-edge thinkers like Geddes. Exploration of the noo-sphere, and the realm of consciousness, of the mind, would not begin in earnest until mid-century. Consideration of the theo-sphere, of the realms of the soul and spirit, has only recently begun to surface, and this is where spirituality is likely to be revealed, in all its possible forms - where the Geddes's of today are likely to be hard at work, and worth monitoring. An integral perspective provides a map of sorts for engaging with this next evolutionary 'sphere', or emergence.

Spirituality, viewed through an integral lens, is multi-faceted – making it important to specify, or at least attempt to specify, the particular definition of spirituality in play. With an interest in the possible spirituality underlying the spirit at work in Patrick Geddes, one definition has *spirituality as involving the highest levels of the many developmental lines* that may be identified, by integral psychology, for any individual:

“In this definition, ‘spirituality’ basically means the transpersonal, trans-rational, post-post-conventional levels of *any* of the lines, such as our highest cognitive capacities (e.g. trans-rational intuition), our most developed affects (e.g. transpersonal love), our highest moral aspirations (transcendental compassion for all sentient beings), our most evolved self (the transpersonal Self or supra-individual Witness), and so on” (Wilber, 2000, 129).

It implies that it follows ‘a sequential or stage-like course’, and in this ‘very common usage’ it reflects ‘those aspects of spirituality that embody the very highest capacities, the noblest motives, the best of aspirations; the farthest reaches of human nature; the most highly evolved, the growing tip, the leading-edge – all of which point to the highest levels of any of the lines’ (Wilber, 2000, 130). From what we know of Geddes, his spirituality seems to reflect a presence of the higher, if not highest, attributes of many, if not most, of the main developmental lines¹⁵.

Spirituality may also be considered as *the sum total of the highest levels of the developmental lines, as ‘overall spiritual development’* (which would not be considered stage-like). This favours the interpretation that ‘every person’s spiritual path... is radically individual and unique, even though the particular competences themselves might follow a well-defined path’. Aligning with this interpretation, Geddes ‘overall spiritual development’ probably increased significantly through his direct experience of India in particular, but it is uncertain that he was able to maintain a significant sustained upward trajectory later in life, especially with increasing health issues associated with his aging. It is also difficult to escape the sense that his spirit was severely dented by the death of his first wife and his younger son in close succession, in the middle of his India experience.

An integral perspective also allows for the possibility that ‘*spirituality is itself a separate developmental line*’, with spiritual development showing ‘some sort of stage-like unfolding, since a developmental line, by definition, shows development’ (Wilber, 2000, 130). There is ‘evidence that at least some aspects of spirituality undergo sequential or stage-like development’, including

‘most of the various meditative paths East and West’. Such aspects of spirituality show ‘holarchical sequential development’ (later stages transcend - while including - earlier stages), not precluding ‘regressions, spirals, temporary leaps forward, or peak experiences of any of the major states’ (130). Geddes appears to have been comparatively developed spiritually in this respect, operating in a seemingly different sphere – or spiritual constellation – from many others working in the same fields at the time. It might be surmised that they were not on the same ‘spiritual’ wavelength.

As one biographer emphasized, Geddes was ‘a most unsettling person’ (Kitchen, 1975)¹⁶. He also seems to have had a propensity for what has more recently been described as ‘vision-logic’ thinking, a quite advanced level/form of thinking even now. It can appear to be associated with forms of mysticism, that are often located in Eastern meditative traditions. Geddes did have exposure to Hindu influences while in India, but there are no indications that he processed these in depth. It seems more likely that he mostly absorbed an early stage of Western mysticism – beyond faith, beyond religion, identified by Evelyn Underhill (1915) as ‘nature mysticism’ (‘a lateral expansion of consciousness to embrace the stream of life’). Later stages of mysticism in Underhill’s framing – metaphysical/deity mysticism, and then divine/formless/nondual mysticism – do not appear to have been actively present in Geddes’ spirituality.

A fourth ‘take’ on spirituality is as ‘*an attitude (such as openness or love) that you can have at whatever stage (of development) you are at*’ - regarded as ‘probably the most popular and common definition’ though often ‘very difficult to define or even state in a coherent fashion’ (Wilber, 2000, 133). Geddes evinced a capacity for love at a comparatively high level, verging on what may currently be termed ‘world-centric’ (as distinct from ego-centric or ethno/socio-centric). For some this might appear ‘spiritual’. He also seems to have had the capacity for an unusual degree of openness, open to the possibility – for example - of at least some truth in virtually any position, and therefore interested in its part in a larger synthesis. Again, for some, this may come across as ‘spiritual’, or other-worldly - in the sense of a world-view that others may be challenged to credit or inhabit. An integral perspective, for example, can come across as very foreign to those accustomed to privileging a particular perspective over others; the integral interest in unifying multiple perspectives, and honouring the at least partial truth in other perspectives, can be too much of a stretch even for otherwise enlightened persons. As indicated earlier, in terms of attitude at least, Geddes appears to have been proto-integral – quite rare in his day¹⁷.

There is also the notion of *spirituality as basically involving peak experiences (or altered states of consciousness)* – that are essentially ‘temporary, passing, transient’. While possibly the least solid definition, it can anchor some useful discrimination that may help in applying the other definitions of spirituality. For example, ‘you can examine peak experiences more closely and find that they generally involve psychic, subtle, causal or nondual peak experiences interpreted through archaic, magic, mythic, or rational structures’, each of which show ‘stage-like development’ (Wilber, 2000, 134). It could be useful to research reports by Geddes that might be interpreted as ‘peak experiences’, and to assess them using these distinctions to better inform his operative spirituality. It might be hypothesised that, with a strong grounding in nature, Geddes’ spirituality was more subtle than gross (or psychic), but also more subtle than causal or nondual – within a proto-integral structure. It is also possible that Geddes would have preferred – in this regard – to dwell more in the realm of soul rather than spirit¹⁸. This – soul vis-à-vis spirit – affords another arena for attempting to plumb Geddes’ spirituality.

An Evolutionary Spirituality? The preceding tour of definitional possibilities around ‘spirituality’ indicates that many aspects ‘turn out, upon closer inspection, to involve one or more

aspects that are developmental' (Wilber, 2000, 134). It is apparent that Geddes, through an integral spirituality lens, was always 'in development': a complex 'work-in-progress'; a 'moving target' of sorts; and - mirroring the cities he loved - in evolution himself.

His was a view of evolution that was more evolved than Darwin's; he brought a visionary perspective to bear, as well as his eutopian ideals. His was a different 'pitch' - less analytic and backward-looking, more synthetic and forward-looking, more interested in progress as 'uplift' and 'betterment', seeking wholeness, willing an evolution as 'ever-more-whole-making'. Such discernment is available for us today, to develop and evolve, if we too might enter into the spirit that defines our purpose as planners and designers.

While engaging with body and mind might come quite easily for us, engaging with soul and spirit might take us well out of our comfort zone, and we may simply not wish to 'go there'. Geddes had no hesitation in entering this terrain; everything he offered came from this all-inclusive, all-embracing 'out-look' – that was as much 'in-look', saturated with his three S's: sympathy, synthesis and synergy. He was not hide-bound by a mono-theistic religion, nor boxed in by a spirit-denying scientism; he was open to a universe of possibility. He was fuelled by an evolutionary spirit - respecting tradition, but in no way beholden to it. His was an evolving notion of evolution, pragmatic rather than dogmatic, dynamic rather than static, in flux rather than stasis. Spirit was the spark that activated and sustained the temporal tinder; the future was something to be fired, to be forged, to be made consciously, and artfully. Geddes, probably without knowing it, was a proto-integral, able to enter this zone, and the associated flow – being energized, conducting synergy. But if he did 'know' or 'feel' something about his essentially integral nature, it is most likely that this would have been associated with his India experience.

Geddes in India – The Integral at Work in Geddes?

Through an integral lens especially, Geddes' experience in India merits particular consideration. It arrived comparatively late in his life, mainly in his fifties and early sixties, at a propitious time in adult life-span development, when much earlier development gets consolidated, or let go, and significant new development can materialize, or let come. With India, Geddes experienced a distinct widening of his cultural experience and, potentially, a significant deepening of his sense of the spiritual; at the very least his horizons were broadened immensely. And with his remarkable zest for life he certainly seems to have made a distinct impression on those who encountered him in India.

There is a sense that some of his more perceptive followers consider his town planning work in India to be among his best, all-round. In a small volume, edited by Jacqueline Tyrwhitt (1947), with an introduction by Lewis Mumford and a preface by H.V. Lanchester, there is a highlighting of some of his key teachings, with planning students in mind. Some of the 'essential' Geddes is distilled, including his distinctive 'outlook' – a comprehensive, synthesizing generalist (Boardman, 1978, 1); the emphasis on diagnostic survey; the inclination to 'conservative surgery'; the sociological sensibility; the health, healing and wellbeing imperative; and the concern for open space, trees and gardens.

It was also later in life, possibly inspired by his experience in India, that Geddes crystallized his work on temples and cities. As Welter notes, Geddes was calling for 'the building of temples, as spaces of the synthesis of knowledge and facts for the pursuit of both wisdom and a new sense of community' (2002, 24). His 1919 article on 'The Temple Cities' (*Modern Review* 25, 213-222) appears to have also made a particular impression on an Indian audience; it is included in full as an Appendix in the 1976 festschrift (Ferreira and Jha, 1976).

In Geddes' case the India experience also appears to have 'let come' some particularly generative collaborations, such as with his former student, Arthur Thompson (the 1931 volume *Life: Outline of General Biology*), but especially with Victor Branford, documented in Scott and Bromley (2013). Geddes' elder son, Arthur, in a December 1933 lecture on 'Patrick Geddes as Sociologist', reported that his father considered the sociological synthesis work to be 'the crowning work of his life'. This is probably where we need to go to begin developing an appropriate 'neo-civics' for our time, and the associated 'eco-logic'.

Of particular importance for this offering, Geddes' experiences in India have generated a rare integrally-informed assessment of the man, that does not seem to have been picked up by others that might have been expected to take notice. Ferreira's 'Introduction' to *The Outlook Tower* essays (Ferreira and Jha, 1976) reflects distinct integral sensibilities, and directly addresses what is termed Geddes' 'integral vision'¹⁹. It is clear that Geddes intrigued his Indian observers, but they also seemed to make a particular effort to discern the essence of Geddes, to make sense of him, in unusual respects. In our terms, they begin to convey some of the 'integral' that was at work in Geddes, that seemed to be coming out more clearly in India. For example, Ferreira reports on some reflections by, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, the University of Bombay Vice-Chancellor who appointed Geddes to the post of Professor of Civics and Sociology:

'Professor G is so unlike and beyond the standards of humanity that it is a patient study to learn to know and appreciate him. Everything about him – his dress, his manner, his self-absorption – is so uninviting that the ordinary man is never able to gauge his real worth and value; but when you come to know him intimately it is difficult to find anywhere the depth and variety of knowledge equal to that he carries in his head. It is also difficult to find anywhere the extent of human kindness or the sense of humour that is inborn in him. And his energy – the hard work he does and wants to do – is simply marvellous!' (Ferreira, 1976, x)

The editor of the *Indian Journal of Sociology*, commenting on his appointment in 1920:

'He has an artistic temperament which continually manifests itself not only in his architectural and other designs, but also in his sympathetic appreciation of the symbolism of the peoples with whom he comes into contact in the course of his activities. His language has often the beauty of the poet allied with the strength of the reformer. Contrary to a not infrequent impression, Professor Geddes is a practical man... His idealism is not... something impractical. It can only be considered such by those who are not prepared to give to their realization the energy and the organized cooperation which his schemes undoubtedly require' (xi).

Radhakamal Mukherjee - a well-known sociologist, greatly influenced by Geddes, stressed:

'... above all the example of his own life of self-forgetful and inspired devotion to the cause of truth and goodness'... made the intellectual circles in India look upon him as an Indian *rishi* of old. Nor was this veneration misplaced. For Geddes served India ardently with his mature wisdom and experience, dedicating to her some of the most active years of his fruitful intellectual life' (xii).

Rabindranath Tagore (poet and Nobel Prizewinner), in his foreword to Amelia Defries' *The Interpreter Geddes* (1927), indicates:

‘What so strongly attracted me in Patrick Geddes when I came to know him in India was, not his scientific achievements, but, on the contrary, the rare fact of *the fullness of his personality rising far above his science*. Whatever subjects he has studied and mastered have become vitally one with his humanity. He has the precision of the scientist and the vision of the prophet, and at the same time, the power of the artist to make his ideas visible through the language of symbols. His love of Man has given him the insight to see the truth of Man, and his imagination to realize in the world the infinite mystery of life and not merely its mechanical aspect’ (xiii) (emphasis added).

Ferreira, drawing especially on Tagore’s intuition, zeroes in on:

‘... two aspects of the man Geddes which were fundamental and inter-related in him, and which serve (to some extent) to dissipate for us the apparent confusion of his numerous activities, to unify in our minds the variety of his interests, and to unveil the secret of his high-powered energy and continuous creativity: *the fullness of his personality, and his realization that life is not a mere mechanism but an infinite mystery*. To this can be added the fact that Geddes is on record to the effect that men are everywhere suffering from incompleteness or, in other words, from betrayal of themselves’ (xiii)(emphasis added).

Ferreira sees reinforcement in an observation credited to Philip Boardman, in a February 1935 article in *Progressive Education*:

‘Geddes endeavoured to utilize most of his days to the fullest for more than 50 years; his life was characterized by a fruitful combination of inner- and outer-world activities, consisting of a constant interaction between dream projects and manual labour, between observation of nature and the world of ideas’.

Ferreira also observes that:

‘In trying to live up to his ideal of self-completion, of integral life, Geddes even conceived the idea of ‘simultaneous thought’ and maintained that ‘we are all geniuses’, thereby fusing the democratic sentiment with the notion of the highest achievement conceivable, that of a genius’ (xiii).

Such observations lay the basis for an even more in-depth assessment of Geddes, in terms of ‘his personality and life-style, his ideas and his activities’, which amounts to some of the best biography on Geddes from an integral perspective. There is too much to do justice to it in the space available here, but some summary characterizations may communicate some of its nature. Geddes is assessed to be ‘a neo-vitalist and synthesist’ (xiv), and ‘an open-ended unifier’ (xv). There is reference to ‘Geddes’ integral and evolutionary scheme of things’, and the telling comment that: ‘Like Proteus changing his forms in an endless variety, Geddes went on changing his roles and interests without losing the gains accruing from his earlier pursuits or connections with them’ (xix).

Ferreira specifically notes that ‘Geddes’ integral vision of nature, life and society is also exemplified by his approach to education and the role of the university’ (xxii). And it was in India, in his 1918 report, for the Durbar of Indore, in the part making proposals for a new ‘University of Central India’ that Geddes expands on his signature notion of ‘eutopia’ – with the university perceived serving as this ‘foundation of a fuller life in the future’.

‘Eutopia, as Geddes says, is: To spiritualise and moralise, that is to civicise; to

intellectualise, that is to synthesise, and to respecialise; not in dis-specialisms, but as con-specialism, toward application in life' (Ferreira, xxiii)

Here we see Geddes at his most perplexing - head-scratching, mind-bending, soul-stirring – best, demanding our best unpacking efforts, but with a call for as much integration as differentiation, for a valuing of synthesis and the associated synergy, in the fundamental wholeness-seeking. His bias was action terminology, and application, in a focused ‘making’ of the future; here we see – fuelled especially by his India experiences - his ‘spirit-in-action’.

Geddes’ Trajectory: Emergence and Spirit-in-Action?

With the virtue of hindsight it is possible to suggest that Geddes’ evolution was morphing into emergence, with a combined focus on presencing and becoming, in-the-moment presencing of what is being willed to come into being. This in itself may have felt very spiritual – it was, but it was also natural. It emerged from his focus on life - and its processes, and purposes. It was perhaps then a secular spirituality at work - that has since further evolved to confer a post-secularity, to house the spirituality that we ourselves might now wish to embrace, and emerge.

The evolving spirit at work in Patrick Geddes may now be calibrated as an integral, evolutionary, post-secular spirituality that merits more conscious integration in our own current practice. This is the spirit, and spirituality, I find at work in myself, as I seek to occupy a more integral perspective on planning and design (Wight 2005; 2011; 2012). I have been led, like Geddes, to emphasise the prefix ‘re-’: a re-thinking of planning and design as place-making, and a re-positioning of the ‘making’ as well-being by design. Together, both represent essentially ‘whole-making’, aiming for the ever-more-whole, in terms of an ever-more exquisite integration of truth, goodness and beauty.

Patrick Geddes has proved of enduring significance in underpinning much of the rationale for critical movements in our own time, most notably ‘sustainable development’ with the associated maxim ‘think globally, act locally’ (Porritt, 2004). His influence has also been at work in such diverse causes as: regeneration (Young, 2005), advancing the notion of the public interest (Lloyd, 2006), designing with nature (Wakeford, 2007) as well as transition towns (Rob Hopkins), food security (Carolyn Steel), cities for people (Jan Gehl), and resilient communities (Dyan Currie) – to name but a few that have been featured recently in a commemorative lecture series²⁰. In education circles his advocacy of experiential learning is receiving increased attention again, along with service-learning. And he may be considered a source of support for those seeking to restore the ‘heart’ piece to higher education (Palmer and Zajonc, 2010).

In his valuing of subjective and inter-subjective experience, Geddes was linking thinking and feeling – the emotional was as important as the intellectual. This sentiment has found form in current concerns around the importance of emotional and social intelligence (Goleman, 2005; 2007); in time this will probably be mirrored in similar attention to the importance of spiritual intelligence (Wigglesworth, 2012). There is also an emerging interest around inter-spirituality (Teasdale, 1999) - that can be located in a trajectory emanating from Geddes. The time also seems right to cultivate a neo-civics, led by a new cadre of pragmatic eutopians. These are all cues – or clues – for re-engaging with Geddes today, and seeking to draw his ideas forward into our own time. This might include a reframing of his ‘thinking machines’ work, to more consciously integrate feeling and intuiting, to transcend the mechanical to embrace the organic – perhaps into the realm of new metaphors, such as gardens - for culturing, ecologically. Our planning and design could be the better for it, and we might just feel better in ourselves – if we can better tap our own spirit, with Geddes as our gardening, guardian guide.

From an activism perspective especially, the evolutionary spirit at work in Patrick Geddes may be identified as his spirit-in-action, which can also be our spirit-in-action, especially where we sense that Geddes' spirit is at work in us, extending his trajectory. In a sense, Geddes' spirit has been at work within myself in this offering, and I have noticed it in others, especially scholars of his work, who pursue their scholarship in tandem with their ongoing professional practice. Perhaps the best 'case study' of a modern-day 'pragmatic eutopian' that I have come across in this project is Graham King, who had this to say as he wrapped up his book review of Volker Welter's *Biopolis*. I offer it as an inspiring example of Geddes' 'spirit-in-action':

“As a town planning practitioner who has drawn sustenance from Geddes' nostrums for many years, I still find him remarkably relevant today. His emphasis on the imagination, on the spirit of place, on the soul of the city, has been a helpful antidote to modern rationalism; his bio-regionalism foresaw the advent of sustainable development; the need for participation and partnership now underwrites modern planning practice; with the revival of urban design we now begin to see again through the “two eyes of art and science”; civics is back on the school curriculum; the intuitive intelligence is at last gaining respect as the co-ordinating function of the mind; while the existential notion of “eutopia – the actual and the ideal seen increasingly as one” – mirrors the idea of “emergence” in modern management science. And so on.” (Graham King, 2004, 234).

And so on. G.T.B.

References:

Beauregard, Mario, G.E. Schwartz and L. Miller 2015 *Manifesto for a Post-Materialist Science*. <http://opensciences.org>

Boardman, Philip 1976 'Patrick Geddes and His Many Worlds', Chapter 1, pp 1-11, in J.V. Ferreira and S.S. Jha (eds) 1976, *The Outlook Tower: Essays in Urbanization in Memory of Patrick Geddes*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Boardman, Philip 1978 *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes: Biologist, Town planner, Re-educator, Peace-warrior*. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London.

DeKay, Mark 2011 *Integral Sustainable Design: Transformative Perspectives*. Earthscan: London, England and Washington, DC

Ferreira, J.V. and S.S. Jha (eds) 1976, *The Outlook Tower: Essays in Urbanization in Memory of Patrick Geddes*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Ferreira, J.V. 2012a 'Patrick Geddes's Integral Vision of Nature, Life and Society', Ch 11, pp 186-209, in Pflug, B. and S.M. Michael (eds), 2012. Originally published as 'Introduction', J.V. Ferreira and S.S. Jha (eds) 1976, *The Outlook Tower: Essays in Urbanization in Memory of Patrick Geddes*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan (vii-xxx)

Ferreira, J.V. 2012b 'Towards a Philosophy of Integralism', Ch 1, pp 46-50, in Pflug, B. and S.M. Michael (eds), 2012. Originally published in *The Radical Humanist*, Vol. XIV, No. 32, 13 August, 1950, 376, 382.

Ferreira, J.V. 2012c 'Towards Integral Man Through Integral Anthropology', Ch 5, pp 85-103, in Pflug, B. and S.M. Michael (eds), 2012. Originally published in *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol. XVI, No. 2, September 1967, 77-93.

Friedmann, John and Clyde Weaver 1979 *Territory and Function: The Evolution of Regional Planning*. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Geddes, Patrick 1915 *Cities in Evolution: An Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics*. Williams and Norgate: London.

Goleman, Daniel 2005 *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ* (10th Anniversary Edition). Bantam Books: New York.

Goleman, Daniel 2007 *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships*. Bantam Books. New York

Hamilton, Marilyn 2008 *Integral City: Evolutionary Intelligences for the Human Hive*. New Society Publishers.

Hamilton, Marilyn 2010 'Integral Spirituality in the Human Hive: A Primer' *TRIALOG* 107, 4/2010, 10-11.

Hochachka, Gail 2010 'Integrating Spirituality in a Post-Secular Approach to Development' *TRIALOG* 107 4/2010, 27-32.

- Hysler-Rubin, Noah 2009 'The changing appreciation of Patrick Geddes: A case study in planning history'. *Planning Perspectives* 24 (3), 349-366.
- Hysler-Rubin, Noah 2011 *Patrick Geddes and Town Planning: A Critical View*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Jarvis, Bob 1995 'The Arts of Town Planning'. *Planning Practice and Research*, 10 (2), 111-119.
- Jacobs, Jane 1994 *Systems of Survival: A Dialogue on the Moral Foundations of Commerce and Politics*. Vintage Books.
- King, Graham 1990a 'Patrick Geddes and the Art of Memory' (Town Planning, Information Technology and the Art of Memory, Part One). *The Planner*, 9th February, 1990, 11-14.
- King, Graham 1990b 'The Meaning of Patrick Geddes' (Town Planning, Information Technology and the Art of Memory, Part Two). *The Planner*, 9th March, 1990, 11-16.
- King, Graham 2004 'Biopolis: Patrick Geddes and the City of Life' (Book) Review (of Welter, Volker M. 2002). *Planning Perspectives* (19) 2, 233-234 (April 2004)
- King, Graham 2005 'Patrick Geddes in India: From Synthesis to Integration' (essay)
<http://www.environmentalplanningwales.com/reports/Patrick%20Geddes%20in%20India%20by%20Graham%20King.doc>
- Kitchen, Paddy 1975 *A Most Unsettling Person: An Introduction to the Ideas and Life of Patrick Geddes*. Victor Gollancz: London.
- Lloyd, Greg 2006 'Planning and the Public Interest in the Modern World' RTPI Scotland 2006 Sir Patrick Geddes Commemorative Lecture, Edinburgh,
<http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-scotland/events/sir-patrick-geddes-commemorative-lecture/>
- MacDonald, Murdo 2009 'Patrick Geddes and the Scottish Generalist Tradition' RTPI Scotland 2009 Sir Patrick Geddes Commemorative Lecture, Edinburgh, May 20th 2009
<http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-scotland/events/sir-patrick-geddes-commemorative-lecture/>
- Mairet, Philip 1957 *Pioneer of Sociology: The Life and Letters of Patrick Geddes*. Lund Humphries: London.
- Meller, Helen 1990 *Patrick Geddes: Social Evolutionist and City Planner*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Palmer, Parker J. and Arthur Zajonc, with Megan Scribner 2010 *The Heart of Higher Education: A call to renewal*. Jossey-Bass/Wiley: San Francisco.
- Pflug, Bernd and S.M. Michael (eds) 2012 *Integral Anthropology: Selected Anthropological Writings of J.V. Ferreira*. Rawat Publications: Jaipur, India.
- Porritt, Jonathan 2004 'Sustainable Development – Past and Present' RTPI-Scotland 2004 St

Patrick Geddes Commemorative Lecture, Edinburgh,
<http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-scotland/events/sir-patrick-geddes-commemorative-lecture/>

Robson, B.T. 1981 'Geography and Social Science: The Role of Patrick Geddes', in D.R. Stoddart (ed) *Geography, Ideology and Social Concern*, 187-201.

Sandercock, Leonie 2006 'Spirituality and the Urban Professions: The Paradox at the Heart of Planning', *Planning Theory and Practice*, 7 (1), 65-67 ['Introduction' to an 'Interface' section: pp 65-97]

Sandercock, Leonie and Maged Senbel 2011 'Spirituality, Urban Life, and the Urban Professions', pp 86-103 in Beaumont, Justin and Christopher Baker (ed) *Postsecular Cities: Space, Theory and Practice*. Continuum: London and New York.

Scott, John and R. Bromley 2013 *Envisioning Sociology: Victor Branford, Patrick Geddes, and the Quest for Social Reconstruction*. SUNY: Albany, NY.

Small, Mike 2013 *Scotland's Local Food Revolution*. Argyll Publishing: Glendaruel, Argyll, Scotland.

Teasdale, Wayne 1999 *The Mystic Heart: Discovering a Universal Spirituality in the World's Religions*. New World Library.

Tyrwhitt, Jacqueline(ed) 1947 *Patrick Geddes in India*. Lund Humphries: London.

Underhill, Evelyn 1915 *Practical Mysticism*. E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., New York (Dover edition, 2000; Dover Publications: Mineola, NY)

Wakeford, Richard 2007 'Wanted: Visionary Planners to Apply Levers for a Sustainable World' RTPI Scotland 2007 Sir Patrick Geddes Commemorative Lecture <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-scotland/events/sir-patrick-geddes-commemorative-lecture/>

Welter, Volker M. 2002 *Biopolis: Patrick Geddes and the City of Life*. The MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass; London England.

Wigglesworth, Cindy 2012 *SQ21 The Twenty-One Skills of Spiritual Intelligence*. SelectBooks: New York

Wight, J.B. (Ian) 1985 *The Territory/Function Dialectic: A Social Learning Paradigm of Regional Development Planning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Aberdeen, Scotland

Wight, Ian 2005 'Place-making as Applied Integral Ecology: Evolving an Ecologically-Wise Planning Ethic', *World Futures* 61: 127-137.

Wight, Ian 2009 'Joining-Up the Spiritual and the Professional in Planning Education: Exploring Interfaces (for more spiritually-activist professing?)' Paper presented at AESOP 2009 Liverpool (Track 3: Planning Education).

Wight, Ian 2011 'Planning by Design in Community: Making Great Places?' *Plan Canada*, Summer 2011, 29-32.

Wight, Ian 2012 'Place, place-making and planning: an integral perspective with wellbeing in (body) mind (and spirit)', Chapter 15, 231-248 in *Wellbeing and Place*, edited by S. Atkinson, S. Fuller and J. Painter, Ashgate Publishing.

Wight, Ian 2013 'Ethics in Professional Planning Practice (Part 2): Navigating Our Ethical Obligations – Jane Jacobs' *Systems of Survival*' *Plan Canada*, Fall 2013, 38-43.

Wilber, Ken 1998 *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion*. Random House.

Wilber, Ken 2000 *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy*. Shambhala: Boston and London.

Wilber, Ken 2006 *Integral Spirituality: A Startling New Role for Religion in the Modern and Postmodern World*. Integral Books: Boston and London.

Wilber, Ken 2007 *The Integral Vision: A Very Short Introduction to the Revolutionary Integral Approach to Life, God, The Universe, and Everything*. Shambhala: Boston, Mass.
http://www.mcs-international.org/downloads/085_the_integral_vision.pdf

Woiwode, Christophe 2010a 'Urban Development and Spirituality: Treading on New Ground' *TRIALOG 107* 4/2010, 53-37.

Woiwode, Christophe 2010b "'Urban" Spirituality Grounded: Some Selected Case Studies' *TRIALOG 107* 4/2010, 4-9.

Young, Raymond 2005 'Cities in Devolution' RTPI-Scotland 2005 St Patrick Geddes Commemorative Lecture (by the Chair, Architecture + Design Scotland) Edinburgh,
<http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-scotland/events/sir-patrick-geddes-commemorative-lecture/>

Zander, Rosamund S. and Benjamin Zander, 2000 *The Art of Possibility: Transforming Professional and Personal Life*. Penguin Books

Endnotes:

¹ This envisioning of Geddes' wish for us, to cast ourselves as artists of possibility, is inspired in part by the practices featured in *The Art of Possibility* (Zander and Zander, 2000), allied with the perspective on 'the ancient art of Memory' in Geddes' work, offered by Graham King (1990a, 1990b). King clarifies that the 'memory' reference (invented by the Greeks), should be read today as 'imagination', and was 'a way, a method for not only classifying knowledge, but for also imbuing it with significance and meaning... an essential part of the whole traditional art of rhetoric before it fragmented in the advance of modern rationalistic thought' (King, 1990a, 13). How this might manifest today in professional education terms is explored by Jarvis (1995), in his consideration of 'the arts of town planning' (with a particular focus on rhetoric, mythology, draughtsmanship and choreography).

² For example, it is not picked up or developed in major recent biographies or critiques, such as Meller (1990) and Hysler-Rubin (2009; 2011). Welter (2002), an architectural historian, is much more attentive to the spirituality aspects in Geddes' theory of the city, but Welter's own apparent materialist bias limits consideration of the spirit at work in Geddes himself, and he misses especially significant implications for current planning practitioners, as King (2004) underlines in his review of *Biopolis*.

By contrast, richer veins of inquiry for those curious about the spirit at work in Geddes include Scott and Bromley (2013) and Ferreira (2012a), the latter being a reproduction of the editorial 'Introduction' to the 1976 collection: *The Outlook Tower: Essays in Urbanization in Memory of Patrick Geddes* (Bombay: Popular Prakashan). Consideration of this particular, quite detailed and in-depth assessment, perceptively addressing Geddes' time in India, is noticeably absent in the works of Meller, Hysler-Rubin and Welter.

³ Wilber is one of the more recent pioneers of an integral perspective, which has a lineage stretching over many centuries and continents. His own thinking has evolved noticeably in his own lifetime; his 'integral' phase is considered 'wilber-4', and his current phase is probably 'post-metaphysical'. Geddes scholars might notice considerable resonance in *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion* (Wilber, 1998). Wilber has also furnished the basis for the more in-depth consideration of integral spirituality featured in the sub-section, *Discerning Spirituality (in its many facets)* (Wilber, 2006). Integral perspectives on city planning, community development (in international contexts), and sustainable design are well-developed, respectively, in Hamilton (2008, 2010), Hochachka (2010), and DeKay (2011).

⁴ Recent scholarship on the work of Patrick Geddes, with Victor Branford - in the context of 'envisioning sociology' and 'the quest for social reconstruction' - clearly indicates the absolutely fundamental role of 'the spiritual' along with 'the temporal' in Geddes' operative theory of society (Scott and Bromley, 2013).

⁵ The significance of Geddes as an exponent of the Scottish generalist tradition, and the associated attraction of interdisciplinary synthesis, is well-established by Murdo MacDonald (2009) in his 2009 Sir Patrick Geddes Commemorative Lecture. This generalism feels like a close cousin of today's integral perspective, especially in its positive regard for the Platonic essentials, Truth, Beauty, and Goodness, which rate 'Big Three' consideration in Wilber's own integral philosophy (along with science, art and morality, for example).

⁶ I have been exploring a more integrally-informed planning ever since encountering the integral perspective (as conveyed in the work of Ken Wilber), and have been particularly inspired by the synthesizing that is featured, the integration of large themes – sense and soul, science and religion (Wilber, 1998) – and the pointers to the importance of interior considerations, individual and collective. I have, for example, sought to ‘join-up’ the personal and the professional, through the spiritual (Wight, 2009), have articulated the notion of place as an integration of physicality, functionality, conviviality, and spirituality (Wight, 2005; 2011); and have linked place-making and well-being as whole-making endeavors, as potential professional spirituality-in-action (Wight 2012). It is these experiences that are allowing me to make the claims here about the enduring importance of Geddes, as a potential spiritual guide for practitioners interested in better tapping their own spirit, and in realizing their own planning as an interior/exterior balancing act.

⁷ For a sense of what Geddes might say now, we may note the observations of a Geddes aficionado, social ecologist, and social activist, Mike Small, in a book review, probably around 2004:

“Geddes has been hijacked by the planning fraternity who have - in preserving his name from oblivion - also narrowed it into a space in which it cannot breath. Gone is the pioneering ecology, the arguments for self-management, mutual aid and decentralization, and in its place an insipid and technocratic paternalism. The glaring contradiction between the crimes that have been done by planners, who still claim Geddes as their inspiration is breathtaking” M. Small (undated), Review of *Lewis Mumford and Patrick Geddes: The Correspondence* (edited by Frank G Novak, Routledge, London, 1995) <http://hodgers.com/mike/patrickgeddes/books2.html>

Porritt (2004) includes this reference in his 2004 ‘Sir Patrick Geddes Commemorative Lecture’. Small is possibly one of the best examples of a current ‘neo-Geddesian’, that would have almost certainly attracted the approval of Patrick Geddes, for his work on the Fife Diet for example, among other efforts to encourage Scotland’s ‘local food revolution’ (Small, 2013)

⁸ Applying the ‘find’ (word/phrase) tool to the 1915 edition of *Cities in Evolution*, in strict ‘whole-word’ count terms (excluding chapter title references) ‘spirit’ (44 mentions) is employed more than the use of the word ‘plan’ (43) and almost as much as other key terms for Geddes, such as ‘place’ (50), ‘work’ (62), ‘art’ (50) and ‘evolution’ (51). It is not as prominent as ‘civics’ (77) but is much more prominent than ‘utopia’ (11), ‘eutopia’ (11), and ‘region’ (25) (though not ‘regional’ (69).

⁹ An internet search will quickly indicate this connection, even though the exact phrase does not appear in *Cities in Evolution*. The most-cited ‘source’ is from p. 397:

‘Local character’ is thus no mere accidental old-world quaintness, as its mimics think and say. It is attained only in course of adequate grasp and treatment of the whole environment, and in active sympathy with the essential and characteristic life of the place concerned’.

It may also be of interest that the Geddes Institute at the University of Dundee features ‘Think Globally, Act Locally’ as its strap-line <http://www.dundee.ac.uk/geddesinstitute/>

¹⁰ It should be acknowledged that – possibly more for book marketing purposes - his by-line on the cover of the 1915 edition of *Cities in Evolution* is as ‘Member and Honorary Librarian of the Town Planning Institute, and Director of the Cities and Town Planning Exhibition’.

¹¹ It is acknowledged that this may not be appealing territory for ‘modern’ urban professionals to want to engage. This was certainly my own inclination, or disinclination, before encountering an integral framing, and realizing that – among other things – this might help me more ‘comfortably’ engage with my own spiritual dimension, and bring it to bear in my own professional work. It can be a lonely experience, as Geddes must have felt many times, but there are more and more fellow travelers emerging in some literature (for example, Sandercock et al 2006; Woiwode 2010a, 2010b; Hamilton 2010; Sandercock and Senbel, 2011).

¹² The main integral academic journal, the *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice* is sub-titled ‘A Post-Disciplinary Discourse for Global Action’
<https://foundation.metaintegral.org/JITP/About>.

¹³ Scott and Bromley (2013, 87) convey how Geddes and Branford, adapting the ideas of Comte,

‘took the view that any society, ‘social formation’, or ‘socio-sphere’ is a super-organic system comprising two analytically distinct subsystems or ‘hemispheres’, which they call the ‘temporal’ and the ‘spiritual’... Temporal systems are those through which economic and political powers are structured as a political economy and that organize the directive and executive functions relating to work and social control. Spiritual systems comprise the culture spheres of thought and expression that constitute the social inheritance and are the basis of forms of power that relate to the social expression of subjectivity and emotionality....’ (87).

‘Spiritual power is rooted in the creativity of civic process... the creative and imaginative effects that a people are able to bring to bear through their work. The spiritual or subjective aspect of social life is the means through which there is the emotional formation of active imaginative personalities able to formulate personal and social purposes’ (89).

¹⁴ “Instead of writing J.H.V.H. or I.H.S. or other sacred names of other faiths, I think of G.T.B. (Good True Beautiful) in the old Platonic way and see this Unity (of Trinity) as having been variously so far personalized and socialized also, throughout history, and so far in our very imperfect present; so why not yet more in the future?” (Geddes, writing to Amelia Defries in April 1930; in Boardman (1978, 451) [J.H.V.H. is a representation of God in the Old Testament; I.H.S. is a ‘Christogram’, a form of monogram, for the name Jesus].

¹⁵ This is offered here as a working hypothesis, with an ‘integral biography’ of Geddes in mind, and prospect; observations and opinions from other Geddes scholars are very much invited, to support further inquiry, on this and other tentative assessments of Geddes in relation to these various definitions of spirituality. In the case of this particular definition, it would be interesting to have assessment of any stages in development of Geddes’ spirituality, perhaps building on hunches communicated by his main biographers, and perhaps especially by those biographers who had met Geddes, and spent time with him.

¹⁶ According to Kitchen (1975, 19) she took this appellation from Patrick Abercrombie, commenting on Geddes' exhibition and commentary at the 1910 Town Planning Exhibition and Conference at the Royal Academy:

“It is from Abercrombie's description of Geddes at the Royal Academy exhibition that I have taken the title of this book. He recalled the ‘nightmare complexity’ of Geddes's exhibit, ‘a torture-chamber to those simple souls that had been ravished by the glorious perspectives... shown in those other ample galleries. Within this den sat Geddes, a most unsettling person, talking, talking, talking...’ ” (Kitchen, 1975, 19).

¹⁷ This assessment of Geddes as proto-integral, is also shared by Marilyn Hamilton - an integral scholar/practitioner and author (Hamilton 2008, 2010), based mainly on her close reading of Scott and Bromley (2013) (Personal Communication, June 2015).

¹⁸ Graham King a well-seasoned professional planner, and a devoted Geddes scholar, has offered the perspective, in a personal communication (May 2015), that may go some ways to capturing part of the spirituality at work in Geddes:

‘Growing spirituality means a deepening of the soul; a recognition that nature both sustains us and needs our respect; the assimilation of personal suffering to foster empathy with the less fortunate, yet offering tough love rather than false sentimentality. It's the combination of left hemisphere thinking with right hemisphere feeling, enhancing the intuitive intelligence traditionally known as common sense” Graham King, ‘On the spiritual life’, June 2011.

¹⁹ Encountering this work for the first time, I had a clear sense of Ferreira seeing what I feel I have been seeing, looking at Geddes through an integral lens. Ferreira was primarily an integral anthropologist (Pflug and Michael, 2012), and a native of India, but part of a Roman Catholic minority family reaching back several centuries. His integral exposure appears to date to his doctoral studies in Vienna in the 1950s, and included German-Austrian influences, possibly featuring Jean Gebser's integralism. He may also reflect a line of integral thinking sometimes associated with Latin American liberation theology. Ferreira may merit closer scrutiny by Geddes scholars: selected anthropological writings are featured in Pflug and Michael (2012), including a reprint of the 1976 ‘Introduction’ in Ferreira and Jha (eds)(1976), and early integral writings (Ferreira 2012b, original 1950; and 2012c, original 1967).

²⁰ Information on the lectures and presentations may be found on the RTPI-Scotland web-site <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-scotland/events/sir-patrick-geddes-commemorative-lecture/>

The most in-depth lecture examining Geddes, and assessing his relevance today, is that by Murdo MacDonald (2009). A particularly telling comment relates to Geddes knowing the value of specialization, but understanding that disciplines depend for their origin on interdisciplinary thinking:

“They emerge from the interaction of earlier formulations of study. They come from the spaces in between. The irony is that as they develop into disciplines, their interdisciplinary origins are often no longer seen as relevant and the significance of their relationship to other disciplines may no longer be perceived. Indeed, it will be in the

interests, both financial and professional, of the practitioners of any new discipline to demarcate it clearly from other disciplines. Thus the geographer Brian Robson (1981) refers to Geddes' 'diluted legacy' in planning, geography and sociology and comments that too often it was 'the bare bones, not the spirit' of Geddes' work that was taken up. That lost spirit was, in large part, his generalism - his interdisciplinary - and it is this that I think we must revisit in all our thinking about Geddes" (MacDonald, 2009, 12).