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PREFACE

What will life in our cities be like thirty years hence? This is an intriguing question and one that stimulates a good deal of speculation and inquiry today—and not a little controversy. Some observers see the flowering of an urban civilization: a "New Jerusalem." Others, the doomsayers, survey the vast problems facing the contemporary city, throw up their hands in desperation, and predict the complete breakdown of the urban fabric and the subsequent collapse of our society, which rests so precariously on the vitality of our great cities. Thus, the city represents paradoxically both the hope and the nightmare of modern America.

Attempts to provide a definitive answer to the question of what the future holds for urban America are purely conjecture; but one thing widely acknowledged is that policy decisions today will determine in large measure the structure and livability of our environment in the future. Because of the nature of our society and the increasing tendency for the major decisions governing our lives to be made in the public sphere—by the Executive, the Congress, and in the statehouses—when we speak of our future we are speaking of the consequences of political acts, or correspondingly, the ramifications of political inaction. In the same way that what we do today is in large part the result of commitments predicated on our previous behavior and decisions, our acts and decisions today will order the future.

As a consequence, in the coming years, political acts relative to America's urban
scene will represent some of the most significant decisions of modern history, and upon these decisions will rest the continued survival, strength, and prosperity of this nation.

In this regard, I will attempt to demonstrate two basic conclusions in this study. First, despite the Harvard heresy of Professor Banfield and his colleagues who would rationalize away the problems of the city, there is indeed an urban crisis which threatens the health, happiness, freedom, and security of all Americans. Secondly, under these circumstances, it is imperative that this nation establish a comprehensive national urban policy, which would be anchored around a massive "new cities" program. Lacking such a policy, the already ponderous urban ills of this nation can only become worse. For the purposes of this paper, I will focus primarily on the question of new cities, with the intent of justifying the great contribution they can make to the solution of our present urban problems and in the building of a brighter future for all Americans. I am convinced that our urban crisis requires forthright action on the part of the federal government; and in this respect, the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy had this to say;

There is still time, if we treat our urban dilemma as the national emergency it so clearly is. There is still time, if our response in concern and resources proves we are willing to rescue our cities from chaos. The chance is there.
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... The city is not just housing and stores. It is not just education and employment, parks and theaters, banks and shops. It is a place where men should be able to live in dignity and security and harmony, where the great achievements of modern civilization and the ageless pleasures afforded by natural beauty should be available to all.

Robert F. Kennedy
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CHAPTER 1

MAN AND HIS URBAN ENVIRONMENT

Technology can be used to subjugate people or it can be used to liberate them . . . . And whoever says that a technician of whatever sort, be he an architect, doctor, engineer, scientist, etc., needs solely to work with his instruments, in his chosen specialty, while his countrymen are starving or wearing themselves out in the struggle, has de facto gone over to the other side. He is not apolitical; he has taken a political decision, but one opposed to the movements for liberation . . .

Che Guevara

We're not only in trouble as a nation; we're in trouble as a species. Man is in trouble, and if you are not filled with foreboding, you don't understand your time . . .

John Gardiner

In 1945, Frank Lloyd Wright, the eminent architect and planner, published a little-heralded book entitled *When Democracy Builds*, more noted in some circles for its bad prose than for its intellectual content. But in that slender volume, reflecting on the impact of architecture on man, Wright stated, "When man builds his buildings, he builds his very life." In a larger sense this is also true of our cities: the structure of our cities is highly deterministic and shapes the lives within them. Thus, we must recognize the great influence that our physical environment exerts on each of us; and this is why extreme care must be taken in the planning and construction of our towns and cities.

1
"The United States was born in the country and has moved to the city," observed Richard Hofstadter. Indeed, this is the age of urban man. Cities are the birthplace for over seventy percent of all Americans, and likewise the place of their death, and in the interim the backdrop for their lives. Moreover, America draws most of its culture, strength, and vitality from its urban areas: this is where styles are set, tastes are manufactured, policies are made, and where the media originates— the decisions that invariably shape each of our lives. Like it or not then, we are all, with very few exceptions, the product of an urban culture whether we live on a farm in America's hinterlands or on East 52nd Street.

"What is the city but the people?" wrote Shakespeare. More accurately, however, each individual is the sum of his environment, and according to B.F. Skinner and others of the behavioralist school, his experiences and conditioning within that environment. In contemporary times, since our environment is predominantly urban, so too are our experiences; therefore, the individual is the embodiment of the city and all it has to offer and to withhold. Thus, contrary to Shakespeare, people are what the city is and what it will permit them to become.

As an illustration of the impact of man's environment on his character and development, perhaps one of the most enduring themes of children's literature is the story of the two new-born infants, one the son of a nameless peasant, the other the offspring of a king and heir to the throne, who inadvertently become switched. The boy of noble birth was raised and conditioned as a rude field hand, and his counterpart of peasant stock was groomed to inherit the throne, clad in silks and
lace, and instructed in the arts of diplomacy and war. No one, so the scenario goes, learns of the switch until the young men are on the threshold of adulthood, when an aged crone volunteers the strange truth. However, because of their different backgrounds, the true prince thought and behaved like a peasant, whereas the son of the peasant, raised as a prince, was clearly the more fit to rule. This ageless story illustrates the degree to which an individual is the product of his environment, and it finds its twentieth century sequel in the dichotomy between the child raised in the ghetto and one given the comfortable benefits of a suburban upbringing. In all probability, disregarding genetic considerations, the two children will behave differently, think differently, and possess different values. The suburban child as he matures will more than likely enjoy more opportunities, will reap more satisfaction out of life, will be less likely to be either the victim of a violent crime or its perpetrator, and will probably contribute more to society. This is not to say that suburban life is in any sense of the word ideal, because surely it is not, but it is compelling evidence of the impact of the environment on the development of the individual.

Although it is not known exactly how man is affected by his environment, the weight of scientific evidence indicates that environmental factors condition human life in its totality. Psychologists, to cite but a few examples, have discovered that conditions within our cities profoundly influence the stability, happiness and mental health of their inhabitants. Sociologists report that environmental factors have an overwhelming effect on the development of the individual, his attitudes and behavior; and some, like David Reisman, see urban society at the
root of the increasing sociological disorders visible in our population.

Thus, it is evident that all aspects of human life, even the smallest nuances, reflect environmental influences. The notion popular in years past that man is the master of his own fate, the captain of his soul, implies absolute freedom for man from his environment, and is more poetic than valid. In this regard, one hundred and fifty years ago the social philosopher and mill owner, Robert Owen, observed that "One of the most general sources of error and of evil in the world is the notion that infants, children, and men, are agents governed by a will formed by themselves and fashioned after their own choice." Owen recognized even at that early date that man was becoming exceedingly powerless to exercise his initiative; and therefore his environment must be constructed with the utmost sensitivity and care lest he be oppressed by it. Likewise, the existentialist tenet that man is his own maker is hopelessly undiscerning of the realities of the twentieth century and not only intimates a "willingness to decide and the courage to be," but implies that man possesses the ability to significantly influence his environment.

In this connection, one of the most conspicuous facts of modern life is the submergence of the individual in the sea of mass society. Today factors far beyond the average individual's reach, and often times his power to comprehend, control his life and personal development. Modern man, it is all too evident, has become a captive of his environment; and this not only calls into question the very efficacy of our democratic system of government, but has grave implications for the future of mankind. Man's impotence would not be so alarming if our cities were of uniformly high quality and demonstrated sensitivity to man's aspirations and needs;
but as we know, this is not the case. American cities are all too often oppressive places in which to dwell, a charge that I will focus upon in a later chapter, and as a consequence, they are producing more and more Americans not only increasingly dissatisfied with their surroundings, but millions irreparably scarred and handicapped by their environment, who often become detrimental to, or wards of, society. This then is the great paradox of urban civilization. The city, the environment which was once the chief force in the civilization of man, has become ever more antithetical to the higher ends of civilization. And as Dahl points out, the very word "city" reminds us of what is "most lacking in the great city: citizenship." In summary, urbanization is inseparable from technology, our culture, and the growth of science and scholarship. It has also conditioned the social and political values which characterize modern societies. The process of urbanization, however, has not only given birth to the city, but has likewise devoured it; and in many parts of the United States, the city embodies the social and political evils which are undermining the quality and security of American life.

Having illustrated that our physical environment has a lasting, and for all practical purposes, irreversible influence on man, we are now in a position to focus on the actual composition of our physical urban environment. The dominant form or component of our cities is that of the building or structure, and

(of) the man-made things, the works of engineering and architecture and town planning are the heaviest and biggest part of what we experience. They lie underneath, they loom around, as the prepared place of our activity. Economically, they have the greatest amount of past human labor frozen into form, as streets and highways, houses and bridges, and physical plant. Against this background we do our work and strive toward our ideals, or just live out our habits...
Few people ever pause to think that our cities are the product of countless human decisions and that they might have been built differently. Cities don't just happen, they are conceived in men's minds as bits and fragments; and the complex lines and plans on drawing boards will one day have to accommodate and sustain human life. But just as surely as architects, engineers and planners devised them one way, they could have devised them otherwise. Unfortunately, most people tolerate their environment as an immutable fixture and do not realize that they would be more productive, healthier, and would enjoy life more if the quality of their surroundings improved. Lynch says that it is hardly surprising that:

Most Americans have little idea of what it can mean to live in such an environment. They are clear enough about the ugliness of the world they live in, and they are quite vocal about the dirt, the smoke, the heat, and the congestion, the chaos and yet the monotony of it. But they are hardly aware of the potential value of harmonious surroundings, a world which they may have briefly glimpsed only as tourists or as escaped vacationers. They can have little sense of what a setting can mean in terms of their daily delight, or as a continuous anchor for their lives, or as an extension of the meaningfulness and richness of the world.

If the city is a necessity, as many contemporary observers maintain, then it is also a possibility. It is something that can be fashioned to serve the highest goals of man and society, or it can become a tyrant that will stifle his sensitivities, creativity, and joy.

Because we are an urbanized nation, the future of society will be determined in our cities; and just as it is important to maintain human life through medicine and proper care, it is important to maintain human life through proper care of our urban environment. Too little attention has been paid to the evolution
of American cities, and as a consequence, today our cities are of universally poor quality, ill-tailored to man's needs and aspirations, and constructed for all of the wrong reasons.

But how did they come to be this way? How must they be altered so as to better conform to the physical, social, and psychological needs of mankind? To understand these and other questions, we must explore the history of urbanization in the Western world.
CHAPTER 1 - FOOTNOTES

1 Che Guevara, address to the International Union of Architects Congress, Havana, Cuba, 1963.


3 Ibid., p. 7.


5 Shakespeare, Coriolanus, Act III, Sc. 1.


CHAPTER II

THE URBAN GENESIS

Industrialized communities neglect the very objects for which it was worth while to acquire riches in their feverish preoccupation with the means by which riches can be acquired.

Richard Henry Tawney

William J. Ewald has written that in the months and years ahead "The urbanization of our nation and the world must be considered part of man's first order of business." But exactly what does it mean to become urbanized and why is it of so much consequence today? Urbanization, simply put, is the phenomenon of citification, the process of change from a rural to an urban environment.

More urbanization has occurred in the past one hundred and fifty years than in the entire previous history of mankind; and today over 18 percent of the people in the world live in cities with populations in excess of 100,000. The urban revolution is being felt worldwide, and though it is most manifest in the developed nations, figures show that the later the urbanization process begins in a country, the more rapidly it progresses. Therefore, the day is not far off when most of the world's inhabitants will dwell in cities.

According to Kingsley Davis, "Urbanized societies, in which a majority of the people live crowded together in towns and cities, represent a new and fundamental step in man's social evolution." Indeed, urbanization and its accompanying ramifications have fundamentally altered man's institutions,
attitudes, behavior, environment, and government, which is to say the whole range of human experience; and aside from technology, urbanization can today be called the most dynamic force of change in the world.

What it Means To Be a City

The first stage of urbanization is the hamlet, which is generally little more than a cluster of houses, and perhaps a shop or two, usually irregularly situated on the landscape. The hamlet may or may not be accessible by means of an improved road. A village, by contrast, is larger and characterized by a more orderly arrangement of structures. Located most often on an improved road or highway, the village is frequently congregated around a dominant structure or principal landmark which gives the village identity, such as a church. The village is generally the smallest unit of urbanization to have some sort of government and local police authority. Much larger than a village, a town is oftentimes situated at a crossroads and is the marketplace for the surrounding area. It normally has a number of streets laid out in grid fashion and structures are grouped according to function, contrary to smaller habitations where they tend to be mixed—a store next to a house, and so forth.

The city is an important town, is large and has political impact. It is often the center of manufacturing, and has a significant well-defined business district, a substantial number of dwellings, and numerous roads leading in and out of it. In most cases it has an airport capable of servicing the most modern planes, a very important consideration today. Perhaps the best contemporary definition of a city is that developed by International Urban Research, an American research
team, which defined it as: "An urban unit containing a population of at least 100,000, being an area embracing a central city or cities, plus adjacent areas with an economic relationship with that city and with 65 percent in non-agricultural activities." 3 In accepting this definition, I have dismissed the dubious effort of William H. Whyte and his colleagues at Fortune Magazine, who decided that the "... city was, simply, what was within the city limits." 4

In contemporary America, however, our vocabulary is really inadequate to speak about the city, its future, and its problems; perhaps because in a sense the city has outgrown words traditionally used to describe it. Indeed, we must use superlatives and word constructs to discuss the city in any meaningful sense; whereas in the past, simple terms sufficed. A glance at any urban journal will verify the proliferation of descriptive urban jargon with the prefixes "macro-," "mega-," "hyper-," and "meglo-:"

In this regard, to speak solely of a "city" today is rare. And if as Hans Blumfield has written, there is little differentiation between city and suburb, concepts such as "city" have lost their usefulness, and therefore it is generally more appropriate to speak in terms of a metropolitan area, signifying the city and all of its surrounding environs. 5 For example, the area that is considered New York City is more correctly a metropolitan region encompassing 550 municipal governments and 990 special districts concentrated under three state governments and a number of special-purpose regional agencies. 6 Indeed, we can no longer speak of some cities as entities of a state, but rather must view them as complex entities of several states; not as a unit encompassed by a local government, but
rather as units of many local governments.

The population crush in our cities has been so great in recent years that we have seen the rise of gigantic urban conurbations, such as the one stretching from Boston to Washington, D.C., covering less than one percent of the nation’s land but containing one out of every six people in the United States. This development has produced a new word in our vocabulary: megalopolis— the supercity, a term coined little more than a decade ago by French geographer Jean Gottman to describe the process of urban growth by sprawl.

The History of the City

The first cities, it is posited, appeared sometime around 3500 B.C. in Mesopotamia. Although the city as a form is over 5500 years old, urbanization on a massive scale is a phenomenon of relatively recent times.

Concomitant with the Industrial Revolution, the world’s urban population began to increase more rapidly than the total world population. Although the transition had already begun, particularly with Abraham Darby’s discovery of the coke smelting process for making cast-iron goods in 1709, 1769 marks the dawn of the Industrial Age in the Western world. Both Jesus Christ and Karl Marx are reputed by their respective adherents to have made the greatest impact by any single individual on the history of the world. In this writer’s opinion, however, this prominent distinction rests ultimately with James Watt, the mechanical instrument maker who, in 1769, applied for a patent for what was to be the world’s first efficient steam engine. This was based on his discovery of the separate condenser four years before. Thus, Watt almost single-handedly launched the
Industrial Revolution by providing a cheap and efficient source of power to drive the mills and factories of Western Europe, and later the United States.

A revolution in a revolution, the emergent industrialism, first evidenced in England and Wales, heralded the rise of urbanism. Soon the once stable relationship between the town and the countryside which had existed for centuries disappeared as countless thousands renounced their impoverished agrarian existence for the fledgling manufacturing centers of Western Europe and the United States, only dusty villages a short time before. Almost overnight the face of the world was changed.

The modern city, then, particularly in the United States, is the undisputed creation of the Industrial Revolution, and has taken the form that the docks, warehouses, factories, railroads, and stockyards lent to it. The focal points of most cities are undeniably commerce headquarters, and over the years, "Fed by the strength of their central business districts, the cities spread." Originally, the site of the city was generally restricted to a river or body of water upon which its commerce and trade could flow; later, cities rose along the railroad tracks and canals. The modern city, therefore, did not develop for fellowship, protection, or spiritualism as had earlier manifestations of cities; rather, it arose in response to the need for a centralized laboring force near efficient and economical transportation facilities. As modern cities grew and became markets for still more products and services, they reinforced the desirability of centralized manufacturing and communications facilities, and contributed to the increased concentration of population in existing urban centers.
The modern city, then, was an irrational creation, constructed not in the interest of the health, personal development, convenience, or happiness of its inhabitants, or even for the sake of beauty. Instead, it arose as the random aggregation of innumerable human decisions generally related to the economic marketplace, notably lacking in planning, foresight, and cohesiveness.

The rise of urbanism in the United States can be separated into three distinct periods, or "waves." The first wave of urbanization, which took man from the fields and placed him in the factory, occurred much later in this country than it did in Great Britain and some parts of Western Europe. In 1790, fourteen years after the birth of the nation and almost 200 years following the first settlement of the colonies, the first federal census was taken. It revealed that this was a predominantly agrarian nation where almost 95 out of every hundred people lived on farms or in towns with fewer than 2500 people. There were only twenty-four urban places (with populations exceeding 2500) in the entire country, and of these, Philadelphia was the most populous city in the country, boasting some 42,444 people, a very modest number by today's standards. Nevertheless, sometime between 1810 and 1820, the Industrial Revolution made its way across the Atlantic and produced a striking transformation in this nation, in which existing cities grew larger and new cities appeared on the map. At first concentrated in the Northeast, within a few years both the South and the old states of the Northwest Territory began to flex their industrial muscle.

Cities grew at a more rapid rate between 1820 and 1860 than at any other time in America's history (see Table I). Charles N. Glaab points out that "while
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>100,000 -</th>
<th>500,000 -</th>
<th>1 million</th>
<th>5 million</th>
<th>Over</th>
<th>Total Major Areas</th>
<th>Percentage of United States Population in Urbanized Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 1/2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>3 1/2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>4 1/2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980†</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000†</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. Data not available
* Counting Delaware Valley (Philadelphia-Trenton-Wilmington) as one area
† Growth in number of areas after 1960 is slowed down by mergers

Source: Historical data compiled from various sources.
the total population of the United States during this period increased 226 percent, 
the urban population rose by 797 percent." The first large cities appeared dur­
ing this era; and where in the year 1800 there were no cities with a population 
approaching 100,000 people, by 1860 there were seven with populations ranging 
from 100,000 to 499,000, one (Philadelphia) with 565,529 inhabitants, and New 
York City, with a population of over one million people.

To most Americans, this rapid urban and industrial growth was associated 
with progress, and they equated freedom from material want with individual liberty. 
Although man enjoyed a higher standard of living in the cities than he had known 
in the often famine- ridden countryside, it was still little more than a subsistence 
level of existence. Moreover, man was to find himself subjected to his harsh new 
urban environment in a manner he had not foreseen.

As a consequence of the rapid, unplanned growth of most American cities, 
and the primitive technology of the era, the new industrial cities were frequently 
grim places to live. Agrarian life had had its hardships and disadvantages but they 
were dwarfed by the alien, inhospitable nature of the early industrial cities. 
Where previously man could always find respite from the pressures and problems of 
his daily existence in the meadows and hills, or by quiet streams flanked by tall 
graceful trees, he was now greeted with the cruelest of landscapes: acres first of 
brick, later of concrete, grey buildings cramped together in grim array and nary a 
blade of grass. Bucolic surroundings were replaced by filth, congestion, noise 
and crime. As Samuel Taylor Coleridge wrote concerning the plight of so many 
city dwellers:
I was rear'd
In the great city, pent mid cloisters
dim,
And saw naught lovely but the sky and stars.

Needless to say, even the "sky and stars" were soon blotted out by the thick pall of coal smoke which choked the narrow streets of many industrial cities and discolored buildings, the predecessor of modern air pollution.

There were few paved streets except in the larger metropolises, and both mud and horse dung conspired against pedestrians. During the dry season, clouds of dust rose behind each carriage and horse, choking passers-by and making it almost impossible for the 19th century housewife to keep her home clean. Animals--dogs, chickens and livestock--scurried about the streets, or lazily grazed in open lots and along the roadways. Although Ben Franklin had initiated both street lamps and garbage collection in Philadelphia during the previous century, few cities prior to the middle of the 19th century had either regularized trash collection or extensive street lighting. Rubbish collected in the streets and alleyways, and most cities abounded with rats and other vermin. Indeed, Glaab notes that in Charleston, South Carolina, "Even vultures were protected by law because of the public role they performed in removing the remains of dead animals."

Sewage facilities were nonexistent and many gutters were open cesspools; scores of cities drew their drinking water from the same fetid rivers that their wastes and those of other cities flowed into. Epidemics, periodic fires, and riots ravaged early American cities; and by the late 19th century congestion made streets jammed with trolleys, buggies, masses of people, carts and horse-drawn vans all but impassable.
in many large metropolises, as early photographs of New York and other cities illustrate. Although it is popular to regard widespread urban crime as a fairly recent phenomena, one finds that in the 1880's whole sections of New York, including its infamous Bowery, were controlled by gangs of thugs, and police dared not enter. Adding to the urban citizen's woes, corruption was rampant in municipal governments, and political bosses controlled entire cities. The plight of the poor was particularly distressing. Packed in crowded tenements and forced to work in sweatshops for subsistence, their lives were hardly the fulfillment of the "American dream;" and if conditions were bad in other parts of the city, they were intolerable in the slums.

Men had come seeking a better life and more opportunity, but the industrial cities of the 19th century were hardly the paradises that the refugees from the farms and the distant shores of Europe had envisioned. Instead, they were inhospitable and unhealthy places to live for the most part, even for the wealthy, and especially for the poor. Only in a few sectors of these cities could one find what would approximate truly pleasant living conditions. And for every individual who found what he was seeking in the great cities, scores were less fortunate.

After 1860—for the next eight decades—a second wave of urbanization occurred as more and more people converged upon cities with populations of 100,000 or more, in what might be called the era of the growth of the great cities. Although the Civil War disrupted urbanization and industrial growth, both accelerated once again following the cessation of hostilities at Appomattox. In 1860, there had been but nine cities in all of the United States with a population of
100,000 or more, but eighty years later in 1940 there were ninety-eight, representing a net growth of almost 1000 percent.

The growth of America's large cities was intensified during this period as millions of immigrants, mostly from Germany, England, Scandinavia and Eastern Europe, landed in America's coastal port cities seeking fortune and opportunity. Largely of lower-class and peasant stock, and therefore generally destitute when they arrived, great numbers of the "uprooted" were forced to end their journeys at their points of disembarkation—doomed to live in the misery and squalor of the teeming cities in which they landed. In similar fashion, as farm production became mechanized and the need for an agrarian laboring force declined, rural population dwindled as more and more people were forced to seek new livelihoods in the cities. Though the second half of the 19th century is notable for the rise of the great cities in this country, it is also significant as the period in which the great slums appeared; and it was in these slums that every conceivable disadvantage of city dwelling was intensified.

Near the end of the 19th century many observers felt that a number of United States cities had reached their saturation points in terms of population. But alas, America's peculiar contribution to architecture was to prove this a grave miscalculation. With the advent of the skyscraper in 1875, and the steel-framed skyscraper in 1883, undreamed of numbers of people could be stacked on one another. Today, as a result, the population density in many of our metropolitan areas is overwhelming, and in Harlem, for example, it exceeds 122,000 people per square mile. To put this in perspective, if all of the people in the country were
packed together as densely as those in Harlem, the entire population of the United States could be accommodated on Long Island, New York. In addition, the development of the hydraulic elevator, the growth of public transportation, and the discovery of electricity all contributed to the escalation of urbanization and mounting population densities.

By the mid-1880's, according to Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., urbanization had for the first time become a dominant controlling factor in the nation's national life. And where population had previously been largely confined to the coastal cities, the "transportation revolution" opened the door to the interior of America and countless new cities were rising in America's heartland, on the Great Plains, and in the Far-West.

A third and final wave of urbanization has been witnessed in the post-World War II period. During the past twenty-five years the rise of the suburbs and the exodus of the middle-class from the central city has been particularly noticeable. Prior to 1920, central cities grew more rapidly than their surroundings, but by 1930, the situation was reversed. Not until 1940-1945, however, did the suburban boom begin in earnest. In the decade 1940-1950, suburban growth accounted for 61 percent of all metropolitan growth; during the 1950's, 80 percent of all metropolitan growth occurred in the suburbs, and today nearly all new growth in our urban areas is taking the form of urban sprawl, or what has been called the "slurbs." 12

This development, which has consumed open land with a voracious appetite, has not provided a solution to our urban ills; and instead, it has only intensified them and made the size and arrangement of our cities even more unwieldy. Indeed,
it should be remembered that suburbanization is still urbanization and not a return to any previous state or condition of rural habitation. Jerome P. Pickard, in an Urban Land Institute Research Project, in 1968 alarmingly predicted that there will be 59,000 square miles of urbanized land in the United States by the year 2000 if present trends continue unabated. This figure represents a 35,000 square mile increase over the amount of urbanized land in 1960, or an increase equivalent to the entire state of Indiana. In figures supplied by the United States Soil Conservation Service, they note that in the past fifteen years, seventeen million acres of the nation's finest farm land has been devoured for non-agricultural purposes, primarily the victim of urban sprawl. By the end of the century this land could be vital to the food production of the United States. In this regard, during the next decade it is estimated that an additional twenty-seven million acres of agricultural land will fall to the bulldozer and the developer; and it is reported that the farm economy of California is in jeopardy because in the next twenty years the suburban advance could rob the state of between one-fourth and one-half of its most productive agricultural land. Thus, as Peter Paul has observed, "land pollution" has joined the ranks of water and air pollution as one of the most serious environmental problems facing man in the years ahead.

This suburban decentralization has been attributed to a variety of causes: the new mobility of the American people, the rising standard of living, state and federal policies pertaining to such things as the construction of new highways, and various technological advances, especially in the field of communications. Indeed, during the 19th century, face-to-face communication among elites was vital for the
functioning of the society and the economy, and consequently jobs and economic activity were concentrated in the central city. However, the development of mass communication, diversified markets, and a multiplicity of new methods of transportation, particularly the post-war growth of the trucking industry, have all eroded the need for centralization.

Substantial economic decentralization has accompanied the movement of population to the suburbs as firms attracted by less expensive land, improved working conditions, and the new growth of suburban capital abandon the central city. Moreover, there has been a transfer of political power from the cities to the suburbs, particularly in the wake of the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions.

The City and its Critics

The urbanization of America was not without its critics, and those who cast an apprehensive eye at the rise of cities, and their offspring, urban man. Thomas Jefferson, perhaps reflecting on his bawdy college career in Williamsburg, regarded the city as a place of sin and corruption and conceived of America ideally as a nation of self-sustaining yeoman farmers. In a letter dated December 20, 1787, to James Madison, Jefferson wrote:

I think our governments will remain virtuous for many centuries; as long as they are chiefly agricultural; and this will be as long as there shall be vacant lands in any part of America. When they get piled upon one another in large cities as in Europe, they will become corrupt as in Europe. 14

Largely rooted in Jeffersonian rhetoric, an anti-city tradition which idealized the farmer and agrarian life, developed during the early years of the fledgling republic and was responsible in part for the creation of the
Democratic-Republican Party which turned the Federalists out of office in 1800.

The French traveler, de Tocqueville, agreed with Jefferson that the urbanization of the United States posed a real danger to republican principles, and he cautioned ominously that the growth of cities might forecast the end of America's noble experiment in democracy. Both Emerson and Thoreau, and later the architectural master, Frank Lloyd Wright, decried the conventionalism of cities; the great humorist Mark Twain lampooned the city and the foibles of its inhabitants; and in the 20th century, philosopher John Dewey lamented the erosion of neighborliness in the city.

Unfortunately, like voices in the wilderness, little heed was paid those with second thoughts about the nature and ramifications of America's headlong urbanization. Instead, the smoke-clogged skylines of New York, Chicago, and dozens of other U.S. cities were praised from the portals of the White House to the pulpits of the nation's churches as visible evidence of the dynamic nature of American capitalism, and progress—damn the price—was enshrined as the first article of faith in the Great American Testament.

However, during the same era in which the great cities emerged in this country, the lure of the frontier captivated America, and according to Frederick Jackson Turner, this gave Americans a profoundly agrarian outlook. America was large enough, so the reasoning went, for a man always to stay ahead of the urban juggernaut: all he had to do was keep moving West. The vastness of their country gave Americans a strange sense of euphoria and optimism, and when problems began to appear in America's cities, rather than face them head-on, men tried to out-run
them by moving west, by charting new trails, by writing new histories. It was not until the decline of the frontier that Americans really had to take stock of their society, to look introspectively at what they had built during a century and a quarter of restless expansion. Many like Upton Sinclair, Theodore Dreiser, and Van Wyck Brooks were not pleased with what they saw, but there was little they could do except rage at the folly of their fellow man.

Its critics have come and gone--most are buried in its environs--but the city remains. Gone is the America of innocence and simplicity, the pre-machine culture of small towns and county fairs, of church socials and lonesome railroad whistles. The behemoth 20th century city transformed America to its very roots, and in the process a new concept of community emerged together with new standards of morality, new cleavages, new perils, and new lifestyles.
CHAPTER II - FOOTNOTES


3 Peter Hall, *The World Cities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 19. The acceptance of any definition of the word "city" is an arbitrary and often confusing matter, however, the definition chosen by this writer would appear to have more practical usefulness than others.


11 Ibid., p. 115.


CHAPTER III

THE TYRANNY OF THE MODERN CITY

How people feel about giant agglomerations
is best indicated by their headlong effort to escape them.

Kingsley Davis

New York City is the largest pay toilet on earth
and a lot of pretty people have learned to crawl under the door.

Hugh Romney

The modern city is a construction in time and space: a vertical and linear construction of fantastic complexity. But not only is the city, like all things present in time, it transcends the confinements of time and gives us insight into man's past as well as a glimpse of his future. Cities provide a vivid record of civilization, and all great civilizations have been characterized by the construction of great cities. Indeed, the history of the world has been in large part the history of man and his cities, and in the words of urbanologist Clyde V. House:

... the rise and decline of historic epochs and empires have been historically inseparable from the history of great cities like Thebes, Jerusalem, Cairo, Constantinople, Peking, Rome, Paris, and Washington. Like people, our cities have purpose, character, and destiny...

Since the dawn of recorded time, city and civilization have been synonymous; and it should be noted that the words are both drawn from the same roots. Likewise,
the terms "polite" and "urbane" are derived from words meaning city, for the city
has traditionally been a place of sophistication and enlightenment in contrast to the
"rude" countryside.

But exactly what are the characteristics of a city? What customarily
makes a city a city, and why have people made their homes there?

First of all, a city has a population density, and this is what sets it apart
from Lone Pine, Montana, or rural Mississippi. A large aggregation of people has
historically had countless advantages such as rapid communication, the ready avail-
ability of markets, the division of labor, the interchange of ideas, and other bene-
fits of cooperation usually denied inhabitants of small habitations and farms.
Because the city brings so many individuals together, it promotes what sociologists
define as "reciprocal social behavior," the most important form of social behavior,
which terminologically become social relationships. Because man is by nature a
gregarious animal the city serves his basic physiological and psychological need to
mingle with others of his kind; and through his liasons with other individuals, his
potentialities, which otherwise might have remained untapped, are more likely to
mature and unfold.

Secondly, over the years cities have offered the urban dweller the grea-
test freedom of choice because they embody kaleidoscope diversity: religions, races,
architecture, cultures, opportunities--the whole panoply of human activity. Every
sort of behavior known to man surfaces at one time or another in the city, and there
is room for both the righteous and the profane. Because cities draw so many diverse
people and elements together, they can potentially offer more to their inhabitants
in terms of services, articles, and activities, and provide their residents with greater social, cultural, and economic advantages. It is where people come together, where things happen, where the action is. Thus, it has always been assumed that urban living gave an individual more opportunity for self-expression and self-fulfillment than other forms of habitation; and as Lawrence K. Frank has observed:

Cities have been the chief, if not the only, laboratory for experimentation in living, for interrupting the continuity of traditions and encouraging new ideas, new patterns, and new expectations whereby human advances have been made. Cities have tolerated deviation from the norms of conduct, have allowed relations not elsewhere permitted; they have encouraged individuality, even permitted ruthless individualism.

Third, one of the great common purposes associated traditionally with the city is the matter of identity. Cities have always been the place where a person goes to make his mark, to gain recognition, fame, and power. There is opportunity in the city; and even the poor would rather subsist in the shadow of the rich than eke out a living in the countryside.

Fourth, the city is the repository of culture and creativity, and is generally the only place with sufficient population and resources to support a fine theatre, a public art gallery, a symphony, or a ballet. The diffusion of culture, therefore, occurs most freely in cities. And for those less high-brow, only a large metropolis can draw enough people together to maintain a professional hockey team, football team, or other professional sporting event. The days of Jack Dempsey and Tom Gibbons meeting for the world's championship heavyweight boxing title in Shelby, Montana, are over; and if Green Bay can support a fine professional football team, it is because of the heavy concentration of people outside the city's immediate environs.
Fifth, cities are central points of authority and the residence of a country's leadership. It is here that the councils of government sit, and the decisions pertaining to war and peace, prosperity and recession, and other great issues of the day are decided. In addition, the city is the storage place for records and is where the bureaucracy works, or as one wag said, where it doesn't work. Cities and their leaders have, for the past century, been the movers and shakers of the American political system, for in the breadth and scope of New York, Chicago, Seattle and countless other cities are millions of votes and tremendous economic resources—the stuff of which elections are made. It should be noted that all modern presidents of the United States have come from the populous urban states; and whenever in recent times an electoral candidate from an urban state has been matched with one from a rural state, the former has come out on top: evidence Nixon (California) over Humphrey (Minnesota), Johnson (Texas) over Goldwater (Arizona), Roosevelt (New York) over Landon (Kansas), and so on.

Finally, only in cities do we ideally have what might be termed as the "great stages" for human existence. In this regard, Elizabeth Geen has written:

The conception of the city as the primary agent in man's culture and civilizations is basic to all the papers. Only in the urban environment, it is repeatedly said, comes man's exposure to varieties of experience, to changing ideas, to cultural excellence that will challenge and inspire him to emulate and surpass the achievements of his fellow men. Moreover, some cities have an intrinsic value that is difficult to assess. There are cities that are simply loved for being what they are and drawing together the people and institutions that they have at a particular time; cities which are often celebrated in verse, song, and literature. Who, for example, can forget
Hemingway's moving tribute to Paris?

If you are lucky enough to have lived in Paris as a young man, then wherever you go for the rest of your life, it stays with you, for Paris is a moveable feast.5

The Urban Wilderness

One thing certain today is that the advantages which over the years have underwritten the existence of the city are now on the decline. There have always been problems associated with city living, and city dwellers have in the past been forced to pay a special premium for the privilege of living where they do. But so long as the benefits outweighed the disadvantages, few objected. Proximity has always been expensive, but in addition, urban dwellers have had to sublimate themselves to stricter controls and authority so as to keep the city functioning smoothly.

Cities have historically been characterized by an interweaving reliance among people on each other; and to keep a city running it takes a vast residue of technology and the cooperation of millions of people. In other words, cities, for all of their brass and bombast, are fragile worlds, and the breakdown of any one part, like the breakdown of a cog in a giant machine, can bring the whole city grinding to an abrupt standstill and adversely affect the lives of all of its citizens. As illustration, recently bridge tenders who operate twenty-six of the twenty-nine movable bridges spanning New York's ship channels walked off the job in a pension dispute, and though they represented a mere handful of the city's population, their walkout snarled the city's traffic arteries and cut off effective access to whole sectors of the city, inconveniencing hundreds of thousands of people. Similarly, during the summer of 1968, New York City experienced a severe power blackout.
Elevators jerked to a stop between floors, lights went out, traffic signals didn't operate, and within minutes the greatest metropolis in the world was paralyzed, not with a bang but with a whimper. Because of the city's vulnerability, based on its technological interdependence, complexity, and sheer size, it is becoming a favorite target of terrorists and political dissidents the world over, and guerrilla movements are finding the city far preferable to the countryside in promulgating revolution and discord. In the contemporary United States, the city has become the chronic "sick-man" of our society, and worrying about its future, according to one commentator, has become the "most fashionable form of self torture" in America. "Sickness," writes Robert Coles, "is often an objective matter that can be observed, measured, declared evident on the basis of telltale signs." In this regard, few would deny that the symptoms evident in cities across the nation are not cause for serious alarm: declining revenues, racial discord, urban sprawl, crime, congestion, blight, pollution. You name it, and our cities are afflicted with it. No one knows where our cities are headed but there are few optimists to be heard. Plagued by every imaginable problem, it is generally conceded that the negative aspects of our urban environment may soon exceed the positive; and "it is accepted implicitly by most of the urban critics that cities are less pleasant to live in than they were before World War Two." The city, which Lewis Mumford tells us was once a place of fellowship and protection, can hardly be considered so today. Instead, at the present time it is all too often a place where crime and unrest stalk the streets, where inhabitants work and reside behind locked and bolted doors. In addition to being overgrown, the city is a place of evil-smelling fumes, dark canyons of murky air,
congestion, stress, and the constant din of unregulated noise. Dahl has labeled modern cities "anti-cities—mean, ugly, gross, banal, inconvenient, hazardous, formless, incoherent, unfit for human beings." 9

The problems of our central cities have mounted without cessation over the past two decades; and today they are a source of national disgrace. The heart of the city has become a rotten core. Blacks and other disadvantaged minorities have moved into the vacuum left by the departing whites—5.5 million blacks between 1950 and 1966—and our city governments have become poorer and poorer as they try to provide the expanded services required by these new residents on declining revenues. This is not to say that cities are poor because of the high concentration of blacks, because, as many social scientists have contended, it may well be that blacks live there due to the fact that cities are poor.

Once the place of the best schools and hospitals, where a work-force could be easily assembled, and the cultural home of man, for too many Americans, especially black Americans, the city is a vast drab concrete prison with too few job opportunities, too few recreational facilities, too little open space, inadequate housing, and inferior schools. It is also a prison for many of the urban aged, states a recent report by the Special Senate Committee on Aging. Fearful of street crime, the report declares that "the elderly, in increasing numbers, stay at home behind locked doors after dark and even during some daylight hours." 10 One New York study surveyed by the report found that of the 137 elderly interviewed, each had been mugged at least once. 11 The spectre of crime haunts city dwellers. Police in Washington, D.C., report that there are sections of that city where a person on
the street after dark has a 100 percent chance of being mugged. The urban landscape has become a jungle far more dangerous than those of the Amazon, and contrary to current assumptions, black residents of the center city are most often the victims of violent crime.

The core areas of our metropolises, moreover, are becoming vast wastelands in many parts of the nation, full of whole blocks of abandoned, crumbling, vandalized structures, looking more like bomb-scarred Dresden than, say, downtown Newark. In New York City, for instance, it is estimated that fully two percent of the housing stock is abandoned, and in St. Louis, the rate is over six percent—the highest in the nation, representing perhaps as many as 30,000 to 45,000 housing units. This problem intensifies the already critical housing shortage facing this nation; additionally, in our urban areas there are approximately four million crowded and generally substandard dwellings—ten percent of our entire urban housing inventory. Millions of other housing units violate building code regulations. And where inadequate housing was once the legacy of the urban poor, today large numbers of middle- and lower-middle class families cannot find decent housing that they can afford in our thronging cities.

Once where the widest range of choices was offered, the contemporary city is fast becoming a place where the function of choice is being eroded, and what choices remain are not available to all, a fact underlined by the seething ghettos where subsistence living precludes all but the necessities of life.

One of the ultimate problems is money, or as New York’s Mayor John Lindsay has written, “the problem of not enough money.” 12 Our major cities are
finding it more and more difficult to take effective measures to tackle their mounting problems because they are on the verge of bankruptcy—if they are not already there—and each arriving plane in Washington brings mayors and other city officials to the nation's capital to plead for federal relief. Four decades ago cities collected more than one-half of all tax revenues, but today they take in less than ten percent of all taxes collected, and the figure is shrinking every day. The Federal Government, already over-burdened by a seemingly endless war in Southeast Asia and by a melange of military and economic commitments girdling the globe, is at a loss to assist cities in any meaningful fashion: and in this connection, cities get back little more than eight percent of the federal budget in aid, a wholly inadequate figure.

The ticky-tacky suburbs and the kinky culture they spawned have not improved city life to a great extent. Indeed, the rise of suburbia has been accompanied by new problems of its own. In a resurgence of the frontier ethos that deterred Americans from finding permanent solutions to their urban problems during the 19th century, the suburbs have provided a contemporary exit from reality for millions of people. The city and its problems are something left behind in the evenings when they journey back to their suburban enclaves. One can only conjecture that if the millions of suburbanites had had no place to escape to, and therefore had to face up to the city's problems, our cities might be measurably better places to live today. As it was, the city became the dumping ground of the disenfranchised, the disadvantaged, and the aged—hardly a potent political coalition for effecting needed changes and reforms. And it was not until long-repressed rage and the pent-up
emotions of the urban poor burst in a long series of destructive urban riots, beginning in September of 1962 in Kinloch, Missouri, that the attention of the nation became focused on the plight of our cities.

Urban Americans are now waking up to the fact that theirs is less than an optimum environment. They are shocked by the miserable unhealthiness of their society; a society that has built urban deserts and called them cities, more out of habit than anything else since few of them display what we have traditionally regarded as the true characteristics of cities. In light of this situation, therefore, Americans must question the very propriety of the continuance of the urban form as it exists today.

The Suburban Wasteland

For too long Americans have operated under the mistaken assumption that the "suburban way of life is the only acceptable goal for all right-minded people." However, the new suburban developments are far from Utopias, and not only do they rarely manifest the traditional virtues of cities, but they have also, in many instances, failed to significantly improve the quality of life in this country. Indeed, the rise of suburbia has been accompanied by new problems of its own.

The symbiosis of urban and rural that we refer to as suburbia has perhaps come to symbolize both the affluence of America on the one hand, and the tastelessness of our society on the other. The peripheries of our cities, with few exceptions, have become sterile worlds of oppressive sameness characterized by mile after mile of muted unimaginative homes, "Little boxes all in a row," interspersed with commercial areas manifesting all of the charm of a "Stop and Shop" parking
lot; hardly the type of physical environment that heightens one's sensitivities. Mass media, which has drastically oversold the suburban myth, together with suburbia itself, are two of the most significant forces shaping the lives of Americans, and today they are producing a numbing conformity in American life styles and habits. One has only to travel through suburbia anywhere to recognize immediately that it is the spiritual and cultural home of the "silent American," who more often than not reflects the mediocrity of his environment in his attitudes, habits and voting behavior. And if, as Dante suggested in his Divine Comedy, the hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who preserved their neutrality in periods of crisis, the Stygian depths will surely be overrun by suburbanites.

Although the suburbs once represented the fulfillment of the American dream, and still do to a large number of Americans, in increasing numbers suburbanites are beginning to have second thoughts about the milieu in which they live. This is a result of two factors. First, the problems which once were relegated to the central cities are now beginning to spread to the suburbs—crime, blight, pollution, congestion, racial disorders—and these have been coupled with other problems unique to suburbs, such as commuting, the bane of the suburbanite's existence. As a consequence, today suburbs have many of the disadvantages of cities, and few of the advantages. Many families moved to suburbia pursuing visions of a semi-rural retreat, but as ever greater numbers of their fellow Americans followed their example, the countryside moved further and further away. Open land which had previously been passed over became filled in by new developments, shopping centers, and highways.
Secondly, there are ever-increasing signs that a grave cultural and social malaise has set in in suburban America. Rootlessness, feelings of alienation and detachment are common psychological disorders often found in suburbanites. Contemporary newspapers are full of stories about suburban housewives with too much time on their hands who become problem drinkers, shoplifters, and lurid thrill-seekers; about the man who works all day at a job he comes to regard as increasingly meaningless in order to pay the mortgage on his suburban "castle"; about the suburban sons and daughters who account for an alarming rise in drug and delinquency statistics, and who are increasingly rejecting their parents' lifestyle for a primitive counterculture. Thus, suburban America is far from an optimum environment; and if there is any lesson to be learned from suburbia, it is that future development in this country must be thoroughly planned.

The question that immediately comes to mind is: why was the suburban revolution not more successful in creating a good environment? Peter Blake, in a passage from his book, *God's Own Junkyard*, gives us insight in this regard:

Suburbia got that way for two simple reasons: first, because the developers who built it are, fundamentally, no different from manufacturers of any other mass produced product: they standardize the product, package it, arrange for rapid distribution and easy financing and sell it off the shelf as fast as they can. And, second, because the Federal Government, through FHA and other agencies set up to cope with the serious housing shortages that arose after World War II, has imposed a bureaucratic straight-jacket on the design of most new housing, on the placement of houses on individual lots, on landscaping, on street planning, and on just about everything else that gives suburbia its "wasteland" appearance.

In addition to the FHA assistance described by Blake, the Federal Government has become a partner in the promotion of suburban development in a variety of ways. Not only did federally sponsored roads and highways make suburbia accessible to the
central city where most people are employed, but also low-interest loans to local public agencies accelerated the suburban boom by underwriting the cost of public facilities as water purification plants, sewer lines, and mass transit. Matching grants have been extended to suburban communities for planning and for the construction of public housing; and the Federal Government has insured "private lenders who provide loans at (or near) market interest to home buyers or to builders of rental housing." Federal regulatory agencies stood by idly while utility companies strung lines to every new development, no matter how small, and transferred the cost to the public in their rate charges. It is obvious, therefore, that the Federal Government, together with state and local governments, acted with little forethought or planning in establishing programs which have, as it turned out, done little more than promoted the dizzy spiral of suburban growth. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that the Federal Government ever considered regulating urban growth so that it would best serve the interests of society. State governments have also been reluctant to apply strict controls to govern urban development; and only recently the New Mexico legislature rejected a proposal to control developers, despite the fact that they are carving up that state's priceless scenery at an alarming rate.

Gans, in his imaginative study, The Levittowners, found that housing was the most important single consideration in peoples' decisions to move to the suburbs; most wanted more space, a single-family dwelling, and were attracted by the reasonable price. Today, however, this generalization is becoming less and less true. Recent studies indicate that many families, particularly second generation
suburbanites, are dissatisfied with their suburban environments and are seeking more than just a house when they search for a place to live. They want aesthetics, safety, convenience, recreation, and a feeling of community. Hence, Eichler and Kaplan see the decline of the "merchant builders," who were interested only in building lower-cost housing in the suburbs than was available nearer the city center, and a trend by developers toward planned parcels of land offering a variety of amenities such as recreation facilities, artificial lakes, community centers, and so on. While this is an improvement to some degree, this writer cannot share Eichler and Kaplan's enthusiasm for these developers, because quite plainly, their innovations represent more "window dressing" than a genuine effort to construct a more optimum environment which promotes the real joys of city living.

The problem, in short, is that we have built our cities in accordance with the demands of business organizations rather than sensitive to the needs of those who ultimately must live in them. This is verified by noted urbanologist Robert C. Wood:

(S)uburbia as a place to live and work was established in the first instance for the bread and butter reasons of the market place. Because Americans traditionally are committed to expansion and material progress, because they have traditionally believed that new land development should go forward under the aegis of the private entrepreneur, suburbs have grown when and where market considerations have directed.¹⁹

One certainty based upon lengthy examination of our stampeding sprawl is that the design and development of our environment is too important to be left to the whims of the market-place and the inventions of avaricious builders. Cities and other habitations must be the product of research, talent, and imagination—not marketing studies; testimonials to individuals who love people, buildings and nature—rather
than those who love the fast buck; constructed by those who pursue their calling
with the dedication and care of old-world craftsmen--instead of new world
economic pirates.
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CHAPTER IV

TO MULTIPLY AND DESTROY: OUR CROWDED CITIES

Woe to them that join house
to house that lay field to
field, till there be no room.

Isaiah 5:8

When Andrew Jackson, seventh president of the United States, was inaugurated, only one billion people lived on this planet and fewer than thirteen million dwelled within the borders of this country. A full century passed before there were two billion people on the earth; however, in the last forty years the population of the world has swelled to three and one-half billion. If present trends continue, "the four billion persons expected by 1975 would become thirty-two billion a century later; in another century and a quarter, by 2200, their descendants would number 500 billion."  

Mankind is locked in an awesome race with crib as a result of what has been termed "the medical revolution:" increased longevity and declining mortality rates due to better nutrition, better hygiene, the development of miracle drugs, the control of killer diseases, and the agricultural revolution.

Today in the United States there are more than 200 million people; and in the next three decades it is projected that we will add another one hundred million. For urban Americans, this will mean longer lines, more crowded public
transit, choked roads and arteries, worsening slums and ghettos, the increase of crime and pollution, and rising mental illness. Rene Dubos has observed that

(Over population can destroy the quality of human life through many mechanisms such as traffic jams, water shortages, and environmental pollution; spreading urban and suburban blight; deterioration in professional and social services; destruction of beaches, parks and other recreational facilities; restrictions on personal freedom owing to the increased need for central controls; the narrowing of horizons as classes and ethnic groups become more and more segregated, with the attendant deepening of racial tensions.

Man, according to Dubos, demonstrates a remarkable ability to adapt to all kinds of environments, from the harshest polar regions to the searing deserts of North Africa, and just as he has adjusted to many of the problems present in our contemporary cities, so we can expect that he will be able to do so in the future as the population avalanche continues. However, it will require considerable sacrifice, perhaps even a lower standard of living, for Americans to adjust to an increasingly crowded nation.

Privacy, for one thing, will probably constitute the luxury of the rich, available only for a substantial premium. Likewise, Dubos, Commoner, and others have warned that unrestrained population growth will require the imposition of greater control on our society, perhaps even regimentation. Indeed, it may even mean a basic transformation of our type of government just to keep our urban society functioning. Not only will controls be necessary just to sustain the metabolic functions of the city, and bring a modicum of order to the urban chaos, but there is the added likelihood that the millions of urban Americans dwelling in the seething ghettos of our great cities will resort to increasingly violent confrontations with the society in the effort to escape their environment and pursue their long
suppressed aspirations. Joseph J. Spengler has written: "When a city grows in size beyond its supercritical mass, the propensity to riot now common to many American cities is believed capable of exploding into organized insurrection." The most dramatic changes, though, may be to human behavior. "The imposition of the world population into cities everywhere," concludes Edward T. Hall, "is creating a series of destructive behavioral sinks more lethal than the hydrogen bomb." Symptomatic of this change, some critics of the contemporary city have pointed to the erosion of social responsibility and the growing detachment of urban citizens toward their fellow man, and they cite the well-known Genovese case as proof in point. In the early morning hours, Catherine Genovese was returning home from a night job in New York City when she was attacked, and repeatedly stabbed over a lengthy period of time. Of at least thirty-eight residents of her comfortable neighborhood who admitted to witnessing at least a part of the attack, none went to her assistance or even called the police.

Another product of the population explosion is what Ida R. Hoos has defined as "anomie," the "psychological isolation that grows as the individual feels himself reduced to a number in a mass society." The growth of data banks and the dehumanizing omnipresence of the IBM card confirm to many people that the individual counts for very little in our modern world and that only multitudes are meaningful or can affect change. It is this discomforting sense of impotence that is alienating so many of America's young today.

The unbridled growth of population, while in itself serious, is intensified by the ever-increasing concentration of people in cities. While population
density is one of the basic characteristics of cities, when it reaches a certain super-
critical stage, it begins to have negative rather than beneficial effects on the form
of the city and on its inhabitants. Indeed, the population density in many of our
metropolitan areas has reached this critical stage, and on a national scale, the con-
centration of population is equally alarming. In 1960, 28 percent of the people in
the United States lived on 0.23 percent of the total land area of this country, and
more than 70 percent on 1.3 percent of the land area. Unless we act now, it is
estimated that by the year 2000, almost 84 percent of all Americans will live on
less than four percent of the U.S. surface land area, leaving much of America’s
interior a vast, empty land. What this means to each of us is best expressed by
Harold F. Dorn:

Past experience indicates that the future increase in population
will tend to crowd into the territory considered most desirable by the
existing population. Increasing density of population in huge urban
centers must inevitably result in loss of individual freedom, irrespective
of the kind of national government.\(^6\)

Aside from the obvious disadvantages and those I have already enumerated,
over-crowding is not healthy, as a recent study by Indiana University demonstrated,
which found that 82 percent of Manhattan’s population displayed various degrees
of mental illness attributable to living conditions there. Likewise, we know that
in addition to the inconvenience and frustration caused by congestion, over-crowding
can cause or contribute to anxiety, hostility, and other forms of anti-social behavior,
including some serious neuroses.

Dr. John S. Calhoun’s well-known experiments at the National Institute
of Mental Health demonstrate that over-crowding has marked effect on rodents. It
is contended that continued concentration of population in this country could produce similar results in people. In Dr. Calhoun's research, rats were placed in well-planned environments with plenty of water, air, food and light--optimum conditions--however, as the population density increased, it was observed that the rats became increasingly withdrawn, listless, and anti-social. "Not only does their mental, but also their physical health breaks down to the point that they can no longer bear children." In other experiments of a similar nature, "The rats appeared confused, almost schizophrenic, a condition that scientists attributed to crowding. Any one of the dozen or so patterns of social behavior that rats might engage in was likely to be disconcerted or interrupted by signals coming from other rats which normally served as triggers for other kinds of behavior. Psychological changes that are associated with a state of shock were found in the rats." Admittedly, rat behavior is far removed from human behavior, but nevertheless, such experiments in the laboratory provide serious food for thought, and correspond to signs of similar behavior observed by sociologists and psychologists in human beings in large cities.

Let us focus now on a different problem associated with extremely heavy population densities. T.S. Eliot once wrote, in what must seem very prophetic words today, that "the world is becoming a stranger." Indeed, the rate of social and technological change taking place in our world has outpaced all comprehension and rendered past understanding inadequate for today's needs. For too many Americans, especially urban Americans, the world has become a stranger: a baffling succession of incomprehensible images, inhospitable people, and
dehumanizing technology. Cities are wildernesses of neon and concrete, people, noise, color, and conflict, every day testing not only man's ability to cope with his environment, but his very ability to survive. In this regard, psychologists have observed a condition they have labeled as "information input overload" among urban dwellers, "a special form of harassment which results from man's being the target of too many 'messages'—too much communication from too many sources." In other words, many people are just not able to handle the complexities and overwhelming number of external stimuli bombarding them in our huge metropolises, and consequently they either withdraw as much as possible from the urban pandemonium—into their homes—or attempt to function within their environment until there is a break-down of their cognitive faculties or they make a miscalculation. Driving in chaotic city traffic is a good example of the problem to which I am referring. This overload has also led to the individual erecting various defenses to screen out environmental inputs, referred to by Stanley Milgram as "social screening devices." These defenses influence how a person will react to a given situation, or whether he will involve himself in the lives of other people. By the same token, in large cities there are a variety of institutional screening devices which operate in the same way on a macro scale, and serve to limit individual access to say, the mayor, before he is overloaded by petitions, complaints, office-seekers, and so forth. Where in most small towns any individual can approach the mayor on the street, relay to him a complaint or simply have a cup of coffee with him, in a large city bureaucracy intervenes between the citizen and the source of decision-making power. Indeed, if permitted the generalization, the larger the city, the greater
number of institutional impediments separating the individual from the seat of
decision-making power.

The size of our cities may well have an over-riding effect on the future of
participatory democracy in this nation. The concept of size as it relates to a
sense of political obligation among citizens to their government, is not fully under­
stood, but some things are known. As Wertheimer has noted, we are obliged to
live in a political community because "It is the only style of life really possible in
the contemporary world." However, residence implies certain obligations,
which the individual, in a large agglomeration is, for all practical purposes,
powerless to affect. True obligation must be a willful act; however, many of our
citizens, believing that they have had little or no influence in making policies,
feel only a minimal obligation in abiding by them. Thus, it is highly questionable
if Democratic government, based upon concepts of voluntary consensus, really
exists in our large cities. As a consequence, the traditional concept of citizen­
ship has been measurably altered. Lawrence K. Frank has written in this connec­
tion:

It is imperative that we recognize the need for a concept of
citizenship that will go beyond the traditional one: that of voting,
political participation, paying taxes, and obeying laws. We must
envisage a citizenship which will be expressed not only in political
patterns but also in and through the activities and relations of indi­
viduals who daily either advance or defeat the aims and goals of a
city by their actions and participation, or failure of participation,
in the shared enterprises of urban living.12

Participation in community affairs and government occurs most freely in small habi­
tations; and people are cognizant that their vote or support can have a decisive
influence in elections. Moreover, they know that if they find a certain policy
disagreeable, it is often possible for them to enlist enough support among their friends and neighbors to defeat it. Politics in large cities is big business, and campaigns are generally multi-media affairs that require sophisticated talent and substantial funding. Only in a small town or city does democracy still flourish to such an extent that the average citizen can contemplate running for public office and winning. Neighborhood government is the only feasible reform which promises to restore some degree of participatory democracy in our great metropolises, however, it is doubtful that it will ever make much headway in light of opposition by big-city mayors and city halls desirous of maintaining their own political power.

As a result of the sheer massness and density of our urban environments, we cannot live on a personal plane with everyone as men did in preindustrial times. Therefore, we objectify people as a matter of convenience, and they become fleeting images that dart in and out of our consciousness. Sociologists refer to the vast number of casual or transitory contacts experienced by man as secondary contacts, as opposed to intimate face-to-face contacts, described as primary contacts.

"Modern urban social structure," writes Christopher Alexander, "is chiefly based on secondary contacts—contacts in which people are related by single role relationships: buyer and seller, disc-jockey and fan, lawyer and client." In order to be happy and healthy, many doctors and psychologists assert that a person must have three or four intimate contacts. Correspondingly, "A society can be a healthy one only if each of its individual members has three or four intimate contacts at every stage of his existence." Although few people in our cities are
physically lonely, thousands know an inner loneliness. Researchers attribute this to the fact that for the average citizen, as the scope of our environment expands and the number of contacts increases, the value and quality of each contact declines. Thus, it is possible for an individual to be socially and psychologically isolated while living in the midst of millions of people. Likewise, the feeling of community becomes diluted in large agglomerations of people. Where previously men and women came to cities for contact, to meet other people and to work cooperatively, despite advances in communications and media, today primary contacts and feelings associated with a sense of community are declining in our large cities.

Thus we must recognize the inescapable conclusion that the freedom to breed is the freedom to destroy. Ideally this nation should take steps to affect a zero growth rate and stabilize our population somewhere around 200 million. But given the lassitudes and venality of our leaders and the presence of powerful medieval institutions within our society opposed to such action, we can in all practicality only hope to retard the growth rate. Hence, one of the greatest challenges before us is how to make America, and for that matter the world, livable as our population continues to expand. Where will these additional people live? How will we provide them with opportunities for a meaningful existence?

The fact remains that if permitted, most of this new population will be absorbed by our current metropolitan areas. This would be disastrous as many of our cities are already simply too large; and this situation is producing new problems every day which increasingly nullify the desirability of urban habitation. In order
to reassert the positive values of the city, therefore, it is evident that we must find new places to accommodate America's burgeoning population. Moreover, if we are ever to come to grips with our complex urban problems, we must likewise reduce the size of contemporary cities in this country.

Controlling City Size

Since antiquity men have realized the advantages of limiting city size and regulating its growth. In the Republic, Plato declared that the polis should be restricted to 5040 citizens, and though the number seems at best arbitrary, it is recognition, even at that early date, that urban growth could not be left unrestrained.

Aristotle, in similar fashion, reasoned that the polis should be limited in size so as to insure the maintenance of order. "Order," he wrote, "is the one thing which is impossible for an excessive number." Aristotle draws an analogy between the universe where there is beauty and order in number and magnitude, and the man-made polis, where, if permitted to become too large, confusion and disorder would reign. Sadly, he notes that the universe is ordered by a divine power, whereas the polis is but the frail creation of man.

Most big-city mayors would surely concur with Aristotle that once our cities become too big, they become unmanageable, and in many cases, literally ungovernable. Former Mayor Ike Davis of Kansas City, Missouri, concluded that when a city gets too big "the cost of providing services increases all out of proportion to total population growth." As illustration, in Washington, D.C., the cost to the city for every additional commuter automobile is $23,000. By contrast,
the total street department budget for an entire year in Fargo, North Dakota—a town of 50,000 inhabitants, is $487,000, and this takes care of all of that city’s transportation needs. Thus, the misallocation of resources tends to be in an inverse proportion to city size: the larger a city the greater the probability of misallocation. Moreover, the tendency to use resources unproductively also increases with city size. It is estimated that the nominal cost of services and rents in cities, for instance, is 50 percent higher than their practical value as a consequence of urbanization (inflated land costs, etc.).

Other disadvantages associated directly with exaggerated city size are inconvenience, jurisdictional ambiguity, and notable lack of a sense of community. In this latter regard, no one has yet demonstrated that the spirit of the city can be decentralized or diffused over an extremely large area.

Research by Kevin Lynch, moreover, indicates that because of their size, many cities lack clarity and cannot be assimilated or comprehended except over extremely long periods of time, or in broken sequences. This often creates an overload in the individual cognitive capacities, which, in addition to rootlessness, confusion, and alienation, can contribute to a number of individual psychoses.

It is apparent, therefore, that any immediate steps to come to grips with the urban problem must resolve the question of city size. What constitutes an optimum city size is largely a matter of speculation, but the figure is probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000 to 300,000 people. More research certainly needs to be done in this area, and soon, because as we design our urban arrangements in the approaching years we must bear in mind that the United States
will require additional urban facilities by the year 2000 equivalent to all those presently in existence just to accommodate the projected population growth of the United States, or as one commentator has put it, "the building of a second America."

We must also find out where and how the projected 100 million new Americans can best settle in the next thirty years; and we must recognize that some urban places are either too large, or in some cases, too small, to permit their citizens to enjoy the good life. If our cities of the future are not limited in size and their growth properly channeled, we can expect that man's opportunities and options will be further reduced, and can anticipate the rise of new evils and discommodities which will further contribute to the oppression of urban man.

The burden is on the United States today to find solutions to the population onslaught because we, more than any other nation, have the knowledge, technology, and resources to do so; and as Dr. Paul Ehrlich has noted in *The Population Bomb*, if the United States cannot put its own house in order, what hope is there for the world?
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CHAPTER V

TRANSPORTATION AND THE CITY

One of the most profound ironies of cities in the United States is that systems of mobility and communications, far from acting as agents of social freedom, have assisted society to move in exactly the opposite direction, to cut off and imprison rather than to free and to integrate; and this tendency to isolation in the city refers, in fact, to all social classes, not simply to the lowest income ladder.

David Lewis

The July, 1898, Scientific American heralded what appeared to be a monumental breakthrough in urban living: "The improvement in city conditions by the general adoption of the motorcar can hardly be overestimated. Streets--clean, dustless, odorless--with light rubber-tired vehicles moving swiftly and noiselessly over their smooth expanse would eliminate a greater part of the nervousness, distraction, and strain of modern life." Unfortunately, by no stretch of the imagination and improvement to the city, and contrary to the inflated predictions of Scientific American, the automobile is today perhaps the single most significant force, aside from population growth, shaping the contemporary city, and it is widely acknowledged to be the greatest "corruptor" of the city form.

In our culture, the automobile is king and has remade the world in its own image. Rene Dubos has written that "the automobile is the symbol of our
times and represents our flight from the responsibility of developing creative associations with our environment for the sake of the future. By all accounts, the automobile is one of the most significant forces to be reckoned with today and in the future by our cities.

First, it has contributed immensely to the "social and civic disintegration" of our cities. The car, which helped to make the central city unliveable, made it possible at the same time for people to flee to the suburbs, there to entrench and await the next onslaught of the metropolis. This new mobility has revolutionized the whole fabric and economic life of the United States, and along with it, the mores of this society. Over 80 percent of all American families own at least one car, and as a consequence, the United States has become a nation of vagabonds. Where in the past an individual was born, raised, worked, and died in the same city, perhaps even in the same neighborhood, according to recent figures, the average family moves about once every seven years. Some psychologists have warned that this lack of permanence is unhealthy, and suggest that it is responsible for or contributes to dozens of individual psychoses, including neuroticism. Moreover, as a result of this transience, many Americans lack civic loyalty and pride, and as a result, do not keep abreast of developments pertaining to their municipal government. This, in turn, produces apathy, a factor detrimental to the successful operation of local government, and responsible in part for the urban crisis which grips this nation.

The automobile is disfiguring our cityscape, and our architecture has in many respects surrendered completely to the car. This is, after all, the era of
the drive-in church, and even the drive-in mortuary. The number of industries and firms that pander to or service the automobile is appalling; our cities contain thousands of service stations, used car lots, motel, and garages, representing collectively much of the worst architecture in the city. Highway advertising cluttered the countryside, and in the metropolitan areas of this nation a jungle of signs and commercial structures (designed so they can be spotted from a fast-moving automobile—not for aesthetic considerations) leap out at the driver, hawking a confusing melange of wares and services.

Every year more and more land must also be leveled to construct parking and service facilities for America's automobiles and trucks, turning once pleasant natural terrain into unsightly pavement. It must be remembered that the amount of pavement within a city increases in direct proportion to the number of motor vehicles in that area. Indeed, over one percent of the total land area of the United States is today covered by roadways, and new freeways are being constructed daily at a staggering cost in excess of $3.7 million dollars per mile. Freeways have carved up the city unmercifully, destroying whole neighborhoods, and it is estimated that 25 to 30 percent of the metropolitan land area is devoted to "keeping the metropolis moving." In this regard, Wilfred Owens, of the Brookings Institute, has said that "one of the most significant factors in the declining tax base of the city is the liquidation of properties being absorbed by major highway projects." However, efforts by cities to accommodate the automobile with more roads, more parking lots, and wider streets have universally met with failure; hence "Say's Law" of accommodation: "Additional accommodation creates additional traffic."
Thirdly, the internal-combustion engine which powers virtually all of
the nation's 90 million automobiles is the greatest single source of air pollution
in U.S. cities; and not only does air pollution blot out the sunlight, decay build-
ings, and ruin clothing, but it is directly linked to the alarming rise of respiratory
disease in our cities. Today respiratory diseases are the main cause of visits to
physicians in urban areas, and in New York City, pulmonary emphysema is the
fastest growing cause of death, up almost 500 percent over the past decade. In
Southern California, moreover, smog generated by the millions of automobiles,
buses, and trucks in the Los Angeles metropolitan area spreads over the country-
side and cuts down the sunlight to such an extent that it has nearly ruined the
once prosperous truck farming industry that surrounded the city. In this same
connection, a recent Public Health Department study stated that New York City
loses 25 percent of its light to air pollution, and Chicago loses nearly 40 percent.

Likewise, as a consequence of the tremendous volume of traffic within
most American cities, urban roads are unsafe and not only are a hazard to drivers
but to pedestrians as well. In the past quarter of a century, 250,000 pedestrians
have been killed by automobiles in this country because of the unfortunate com-
petition between motor vehicles and people on foot in our larger cities.

Yet a fourth discommodity of the automobile relates to the fact that for
all practical purposes the automobile has spelled the decline of urban mass tran-
sit and other forms of public transportation. From 1945 to 1967, the number of
passenger cars increased almost 55 million, and as a result, railroad commuter
passengers tapered off drastically, trains deteriorated, and service has become
sporadic at best. Likewise, the annual number of passengers riding subways, elevated trains, and buses fell from 23 billion in 1945 to 7.7 billion in 1967; and scores of private metropolitan bus companies across the nation have fallen into bankruptcy. Because cars are expensive to purchase, insure, and maintain, the disadvantaged sectors of our society, especially Black Americans and the aged, are hardest hit by the decline of public transportation since fewer than 50 percent of the people with poverty level incomes have automobiles. This problem has been intensified as more and more jobs have moved out of the inner city to the quiet refuge of the suburbs. As Wilfred Owens has noted: "We know that there are jobs that are not taken because they are too far away or too costly to reach." Indeed, it was found that one of the underlying causes of the devastating Watts Riot in Los Angeles in 1965 was the absence of public transportation. Without transportation, the residents of Watts were effectively sealed off from the rest of the Los Angeles metropolitan area--trapped without jobs or opportunity.

The poor are also victimized by freeway construction which uproots neighborhoods and contributes to housing congestion, since it is less expensive to route roads through slums and low-income areas.

Finally, even after they have outlived their usefulness, automobiles are still a nuisance to cities, and to city budgets. Discarded autos are scattered throughout every American city, left abandoned on side-streets or in auto grave-yards that are massive eyesores. To haul derelict autos away and find a place to dispose of them is a costly and time-consuming process, and one that often
outstrips the resources of many city governments in view of their other pressing needs.

In addition to all the other ills which have been enumerated, America's transportation crisis today threatens individual freedom. Not only do transportation inadequacies deprive millions of Americans of equal opportunities, but many of this nation's major cities are so congested that it is difficult, if not altogether impossible, for the young, the old, and the poor, to take advantage of the city's attractions. Even the simple act of visiting friends and relatives is often a chore, and commuting to and from work robs millions of city dwellers of several hours time each day and is costly to boot. In short, metropolitan options are decreasing every day as a consequence of both congestion and inadequate transportation systems in this nation. Summing up, Lewis Mumford has observed that "The American has sacrificed his life as a whole to the motor car, like someone who, demented with passion, wrecks his home in order to lavish his income on a capricious mistress who promises delights he can only occasionally enjoy." Nevertheless, it is unrealistic to speak about eliminating the automobile at the present time for it is too much a fixture both of our society and our economy. Moreover, the state of the art is such that we have nothing to currently replace it with. We can make the automobile smaller, less of a polluter, and safer, but ultimately this nation must come to grips with the essential problem of the car and determine how to best live with it in our cities.

To begin with, the automobile must enter the city on man's terms—not on its own. This does not mean society should construct more and more miles of
roadways "ad infinitum," nor is the development of imaginative alternative forms of transportation a practical solution by itself since such systems are fantastically expensive and will, in actuality, subsidize commuter travel without significantly helping those who currently need transportation most critically.

This is not to suggest that improved mass transit systems and better designed roadways will not aid American cities meet the present transportation crunch, however, it is clear that such answers do not represent permanent solutions to the problem.

What is needed above all else are smaller cities in which homes are situated more closely to places of employment. Since World War II, industry has fled the inner city with increasing momentum. For instance, the U.S. Census of Manufacturers reports that between 1954 and 1963, twenty-seven major cities which contained one-third of the nation's industry lost 6000 factories (net), while over the same period their respective suburbs showed a net increase of 14,000 factories. Not only does this mean that jobs and opportunity moved further and further away from the central city, but the scattered location pattern of post-war industrial development has resulted in a gigantic rape of the metropolitan landscape and has produced a staggering new demand for freeways and other transportation arteries. The flight of industry to the suburbs, in short, stranded millions of jobless Americans in the inner city and, therefore, has contributed significantly to the escalating welfare and unemployment statistics in this country. Moreover, this change has done much to ruin the quality of life in the United States: pollution, wasted hours, tension, the decline
of community spirit, economic waste, isolation, and bodily danger are the by-products of our commuter society.

Thus, it is apparent that public policy must be designed to comply with the goal of eliminating to the maximum feasible degree the need for intra-city transportation. Such a policy would have the complementary distinction of attacking the problems of poverty and joblessness in this nation since it would provide disadvantaged sectors of our society with easier access to employment opportunities. Not only would this broaden the ranks of the employed and result in increased taxes for the support of local governments and declining welfare expenditures, but it would save cities millions of dollars which heretofore have gone for the construction, maintenance, and policing of urban transportation systems, particularly highways. And as Paul R. Porter has written:

Unnecessary transportation and welfare for the able-bodied add nothing to the nation’s wealth. They are overhead costs generated by a society out of kilter. Cutting an inflated national overhead would release funds for creating enduring assets.\textsuperscript{16}

In conclusion, current half-hearted measures undertaken at all levels of government to solve the urban transportation crisis have merely cushioned cities from the impact of their decay; they have not provided, by any stretch of the imagination, real solutions to the problem. Thus, although the solutions proposed here and elsewhere in this thesis may seem radical at best, and hopelessly impractical at worst, it must be emphasized that anything less than a fundamental assault on our urban problems will be doomed to failure.
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The new BARTD rapid transit system in San Francisco will exceed one billion dollars in cost and yet will provide only skeletal service to that metropolitan area.

In this connection, it is unfortunate that despite America's fading romance with the automobile, the Federal Government has not actively promoted the development of alternative forms of transportation. In contrast to several European countries where there are frequent bicycle paths, broad sidewalks with convenient walk-overs spanning busy streets, and modern, efficient and inexpensive mass transit systems to serve the people, efforts to improve and diversify American transportation facilities by the Department of Transportation pale by comparison. Indeed, the present Secretary of Transportation is a former highway contractor once described as a "compulsive highway builder."

What is most tragic is that it has been demonstrated that if better mass transit facilities are provided, the American people will utilize them with relish, leaving their cars home in the garage. As example, in Cleveland a modern four-mile rail extension from downtown to the Hopkins International Airport is being used by 4000 passengers a day, double the number estimated by its builders. Likewise, special express bus lanes where cars are not permitted have been built from the northern Virginia suburbs buttressing the nation's capital into downtown Washington, and as a result of the fact that they cut commuting time in half, they have been met with overwhelming popularity.
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CHAPTER VI

PLANNING FOR TOMORROW

We must plan our civilization or we must perish.

Harold Laski
Plan or Perish (1945)

The revolutionary optimism generated by the rise of industrialism in the 19th century and the accompanying belief held by many individuals that science and technology could save us from problems created by science and technology we know today to be myth. There are no simple solutions to the massive problems of our cities and we engage in self-delusion if we fail to acknowledge the fact. We must therefore continually seek new techniques and ideas for improving our contemporary cityscapes. However, the success of whatever policies and programs we ultimately adopt hinges on a commitment by our government to take a truly comprehensive national approach to the problems of our cities instead of the piecemeal solutions of the past.

The first step which must be taken to resurrect our cities is the acceptance of national urban planning to regulate and direct the growth and development of our urban areas. "Nowhere in this country," declared John Reps in a speech before the National Planning Conference of the American Society of Planning Officials in Houston, Texas, in 1967, "can one find a major city or a major sector of an
important city which in the present era has been developed or planned." Virtually all other industrial societies, nevertheless, have utilized national planning to channel and accommodate urban growth, to manage population densities, and to control change and deterioration in their cities. Unfortunately, this kind of planning has achieved about as much acceptance as public fornication, which is to say some, but not much. As the Committee on Urban Growth Policy put it: "We have been building urban America as if there were no tomorrow."

Planning, it should be noted, is a word which generally provokes a strong reaction in whatever context it is used; people are rarely indifferent to it in the same way they are indifferent to poverty, war, and racism. One thing that always strikes an observer is the depth of feeling that the word releases: people are usually for it or against it, with little explanation and few qualifying remarks. It is certainly not the kind of word one drops in casual conversation and expects the conversation to keep the same amiable tone. Many Americans regard planning as something akin to Bolshevism and regimentation, while others view it as the only salvation of a nation beset by vast and complicated problems. Both claims are exaggerated, however, it is apparent that a managed environment is becoming more and more a reality today, and public policy is increasingly coming to mean public planning.

Ever since the Rand Corporation developed PPBS (Planning-Programming-Budgeting System), an attempt to relate objectives to specific programs which was adopted by America's military establishment under Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, large-scale planning has been utilized increasingly by business and
industry. One technological development which has contributed significantly to the growth of all forms of planning is the computer, which permits planners rapidly and accurately to digest and absorb vast quantities of information and to explore the maximum range of alternatives available to them before making a decision.

Aside from the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget, however, planning in government is still in its infant stage in this country; and although we have a planned economy (with some exceptions), planning in the social sphere has been neither extensive nor very successful. Regarding the public's distrust of planning, Missouri Senator Stuart Symington has remarked that "Planning in business is called genius, while planning in government is condemned and called socialism." Indeed, planning is accepted as a legitimate activity of government nearly everywhere else in the world but is winning only slow and often begrudging acceptance in the United States. One explanation is the traditional American adherence to decentralized government, and the rejection out-of-hand of centralized planning authority. Another reason is simply the outcry over the highly sensitive issue of planning in conjunction with human lives. Where, caution planning critics, does the planning stop and programming begin? Many people in this country also oppose planning because they regard growth as good in itself and cannot imagine any ill effects arising from it. Finally, the peculiar American legacy of anti-intellectualism must be considered, since planners are popularly conceived of as briefcase and pencil experts—vague idealists rather than hard-nosed realists. In short, Americans resist planning in many cases because they still mistakenly believe that they exercise free will and free choice in ordering their lives, and therefore
regard planning as an infringement of that freedom rather than a means of achieving it.

Thus, it is clear that the word "planning" has become tainted and the public, in turn, has grown suspect of it. Although many Americans may find it hard to believe, planning need not imply regimentation, and, quite to the contrary, it is demonstrable that excessive regimentation may be the outcome of too little planning in the future. Perhaps we should find another word to substitute for planning, as in the case of the urbanologist who suggested that much of the local opposition to zoning ordinances could be dissipated if only the positive was accentuated, and they were renamed "permissive development guides." We could call it "constructive organization" for instance.

There are many different kinds of planning; and the word planning can extend from consideration about the size of one's family to the blueprints of a building, or organizing a city, a region, or even a whole nation. Planned change is the central question in any explanation of planning, and therefore planning can be described as an attempt to order the future. In addition, it is a call for comprehensiveness, because effective response to the massive problems of the world today demands recognition of the interrelated nature of our fragile environment, where if one component fails it can jeopardize the whole eco-structure. Writing from a different perspective, Lisa R. Peattie has suggested that planning is the shift from politics to expertise, emphasizing the prospect of a society governed by rationality rather than considerations of expediency and political gain.
Man's environment, argues David C. Loeks, is composed of a number of interacting, yet interdependent dimensions: physical, social, economic, and psychological. Since almost 80 percent of all Americans dwell in cities, urban planners must necessarily be sensitive to considerations pertaining to each one of these aspects. It can be said with a degree of certainty, however, that in the years ahead there will be mounting pressure on planners, particularly city planners, to use their skills and expertise for the planning of social policies. Social planning, when coupled with physical planning and cognizant of considerations relative to both the economic and psychological dimensions of life, promises to be the vehicle we can use to create a more humane environment, one more responsive to man's needs. As I will use the term, social planning refers to planning for the welfare of human beings as members of society, particularly insofar as they interact with other individuals and groups. Although planning has long meant almost exclusively physical planning, only recently social planning has emerged as a separate but related discipline; and as a consequence, there is still a great deal of resistance to many forms of social planning within the planning profession. However, among physical planners there is a growing sensitivity to social values, and some observers like Joseph M. Heikoff stress that planning must have humanitarian motives to be of value. Moreover, it is hard to conceive of any type of planning that is not social in some respects, or which does not affect both the pattern and quality of life in our cities. Today it is evident that as more and more young planners enter the profession, the old monolithic planning goals (namely marketplace
considerations) are being replaced by a desire to promote social justice, human happiness, and improve the quality of life in our cities, and these considerations are demanding public intervention into areas previously deemed the exclusive domain of the private sector, thus giving planners new freedom and opportunity.

Planning, according to Michael P. Brooks and Michael A. Stegman, relates in three ways to urban social problems. First, there is a long-standing relationship between the planner and the social problem arena, and this involves "the geographical location and distribution of social service facilities, such as hospitals, clinics and schools." Planners, it should be noted, have traditionally been too concerned with the physical nature of these facilities, and until recently, not enough with the quality of these facilities or the groups they are designed to serve, and correspondingly, those they don't serve. Secondly, there is a new sensitivity among planners to our man-made environment, and a recognition of the fact that it can affect physical and mental health, human happiness and productivity, social interaction and government stability. In other words, planners are beginning to reverse the notion of environmental determinism, maintaining that with proper planning man can structure his environment to best suit his needs and conform to his goals. Thirdly, "it has become increasingly evident," suggest Brooks and Stegman, "that the planning process, as employed by professional planners, can be applied to social problem solving as well as the solving of physical problems." With the mechanism of enlightened social planning, we may be able to effect a measure of progress in finding solutions to many of our complicated urban ills.
One drawback, writes John W. Dyckman, is that most social planners "have at least a modified 'caretaker' orientation." In other words, the planner tends to regard himself as his brother's keeper, and presumes to oversee the needs of those who cannot adequately take care of themselves, and those whom he feels have misinterpreted their own needs. This latter group often constitutes the greater part of society in the eyes of many planners.

This discussion raises the question of where the planner gets the authority to propose social change. Put another way, how is it that planners impose their will on others? For their part, planners generally cite four different sources of authority "to justify and legitimize their interventions:" 1) expertise, 2) bureaucratic position, 3) consumer preferences, and 4) professional values. Despite acknowledgement of the planner's special qualifications, there is widespread fear by those both in and out of government that the planner's underlying personal biases will creep through into their plans. Dyckman is of the opinion that: "Social planning has long been treacherous ground for the city planner because of the ever-present danger that the expert determination of need might degenerate into the imposition of class and professional values on a resistant clientele."

People must be educated to see their self-interest is best served by planning. Yet, in the end, if planning is to be successful in this country, it will only be if it is receptive to desires and values of those who will be affected by it. "Like politics," stated a Washington Post editorial, "the art of building a good city is, in the end, the art of accommodating diverse and often conflicting private interests so that they best serve the public. The trick is to discover just what
does best serve the public, what is best for the city as a whole." Perhaps the planner should assume the role of a catalyst as well as that of the social activist, for as Pierre Clavel has observed: "A relevant social theory ..., must relate planner stimuli to subject response."

Criticisms of Modern Planning

Various criticisms can be leveled at modern planning and some fundamental changes will have to be made before it can win the public's confidence or really become an effective tool in solving our urban problems. First, much of what goes under the name of planning is merely reflex action in response to problems that arise in our society, and not really planning at all. In the United States, planning is largely defensive and of a remedial nature, utilized to solve problems that already exist rather than an effort to prevent future problems from occurring. In this connection, Americans have entered the era of mass man and the corporate state, inheriting a society far more complex and rapidly changing than could ever have been imagined a quarter of a century ago. E.H. Carr has called this "The New Society," an age of massness as opposed to earlier "individual periods of history." It is imperative in light of the new realities of our time that man no longer just react to his environment but that he strive to structure it in accordance with his own values and needs. He must also anticipate what will ultimately become problems of consequence and then take appropriate measures to solve them before they happen. Another word for this process is simply foresight.

Secondly, perhaps the most common failing of modern planning is that it is often divorced from relevancy and practicality, and this is one of the major areas
of antagonism between blacks and planners. "Planners," assert Stafford and Ladner, "have to recognize that they are close to the urban battlefield, and on the urban battlefield one recognizes only the relevant." Likewise, as Rein notes, "Planning that disregards the question of implementation languishes in academic irrelevancy." Many planners retort that planning is not a hackneyed cure-all for society's ills and instead is an art which should not be solely the handmaiden of function. Granted that it is an art, nevertheless planning cannot any longer be regarded as an abstract field separate from the society in which it operates: it touches far too many lives to be given that luxury.

Thirdly, planning in this country has always implied a rather artificial and unnatural relationship of man to specific parcels of land. Anglo-Saxon tradition and English common law have placed undue emphasis on property rights ("property" in this case meaning land). As a result, we have come to accept that it is permissible for man, despite the fact he is but a transitory visitor on this planet, to do anything he wants to a piece of land so long as he owns it—even make it unproductive and uninhabitable for future generations. Land ownership in the United States implies no attached public responsibilities, with the possible exception of paying taxes. Thus, at a time when this nation has an almost desperate need to determine the best uses of our land, and the wealth and opportunities derived from it, our society rejects the principle of public ownership of land, or alternatively, any type of stringent controls or sanctions applicable to the uses to which land is put. The principal public power which currently exists over land use and development falls into the category of zoning, although
subdivision regulations governing such things as the arrangement of streets and the introduction of public services to an area are becoming more common. Goren Sidenbladh has suggested that Stockholm's "ability to plan its physical, economic, and social development must be attributed mainly to one all-important factor: public ownership of the land." It is apparent, therefore, that the issue of land ownership in the United States will have to be resolved in the direction of more public control before planning can really progress satisfactorily.

Fourthly, it is generally acknowledged by most social scientists that planning is essentially geared to the needs and designs of the elites in this country, and therefore reaffirms the values shared in common by the dominant social groups. As Robert Goodman has observed:

(Planners) deal in words, drawings, programs, and buildings, not guns and napalm. But the kind of 'social change' they usually find themselves dealing with, whether or not they recognize it, is organizing the oppressed into a system incapable of providing them with a humane existence, pacifying them with meager welfare offerings that help maintain the status quo. At best we help ameliorate the condition produced by the status quo; at worst we engage in outright destruction.

This raises the question of what segment of society the planner should serve. Whose goals should govern planning? It should be noted that attempts to accommodate the interests of all segments of society will result in a disappointing plan unsatisfactory to everyone in nine out of ten instances. On the other hand, if a plan expresses only the interests of a single group--business interests or blacks' interests for example--it will surely displease other societal groups. In order to legitimize planning goals and activities in our pluralistic society, it must as a consequence embody a wider range of class, racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds and attitudes than they presently do.
Fifthly, if, as Vine Deloria, Jr. asserts, Indians have been cursed with anthropologists, then blacks have similarly been cursed in the past with planners. Indeed, blacks and other urban minorities have too often been the victims of planning, not the beneficiaries—the only real beneficiaries being the contractors and politicians in too many cases. Planners can be faulted for any number of insensitivities and their conscious or unconscious biases have contributed substantially to the condition of the American Negro today. Some of the discord that currently grips the United States may be traced to this fact. Specifically, to cite but a few examples, planners were partners in the development of exclusionary all-white suburbs, and can also be criticized for their complacency in the face of destruction and dismemberment of whole black neighborhoods to make way for freeways and new developments serving the white public. Planners too often have regarded blacks and other disadvantaged groups as objects for experimentation and manipulation, promoting stereotypes, which, though they are incorrect, are nonetheless accepted as gospel by large segments of the society. Most seriously, in their continued acquiescence to the principle of segregated land use, perpetuated through the mechanism of zoning restrictions, they have propagated a cruel system of urban apartheid as vicious and exclusive as that which is the shame of South Africa.

Planners have often aggravated more problems than they have solved, particularly in the ghetto, and too often "it appears that planning, whether regional, land use or city planning, seems to lead to conditions worse than those the plans were intended to correct." The construction of massive, antiseptic
public housing developments which rapidly deteriorate into high-rise ghettos is one of the most notable failures of modern planners. When confronted with evidence attesting to this, planners most often try to absolve themselves of the blame by exhorting that they had no control over policy, they merely carried it out. Such spurious arguments recall Eichman's defense in Jerusalem when charged with crimes against humanity. The planner can no longer regard himself as a passive technical functionary, and he must accept the responsibility for his actions. If a plan or policy violates his basic moral beliefs or contributes to social injustice or discriminates against a race or ethnic group, then the planner must have the courage to say, "Here I stop. I cannot in good conscience go further."

Lastly, there must be a redefinition of the values which we hold in esteem in our society and which dictate, to a large extent, the form and quality of our environment. One of the tragedies of our modern world is that traditional standards of quality and design have been lost in the quest for inexpensive functionality. As one authority has so aptly put it: "With the Industrial Age came standards of utility and cheapness—that is to say—profitableness." As a result, we in this nation do not live in a quality environment, but rather inhabit a man-made environment where, promoted and perpetuated by tax laws which encourage structures of limited life, and condoned by a largely apathetic society, our buildings and structures are characterized by expediency of design and construction. Consequently, we do not build for the future but only for today—it is just not profitable to do otherwise. Burchard rightly laments that we cannot do our best in constructing our cities so long as the forces of "applied science continue to be
guided only by economics."^{21}

In the end, a city is only successful insofar as the values and social institutions which motivated its inception and design are successful, for the material form is subservient "to the idea which is behind its functional and aesthetic effects."^{22} In this regard, experience has taught us that men of good will will not necessarily create good cities if they create them for the wrong reasons. Thus, we must acknowledge that while commerce and manufacturing are important grounds justifying a city's existence and should by all means be taken into consideration by planners in their work, they should not be permitted to dominate the form and purpose of the city, nor should they detract from the overall quality of the urban environment. This dilemma of converting from a "money economy" to a "life economy" without destroying our traditional free society and undisputedly capitalist economic system represents one of the most troubling problems faced by Americans today, according to Lewis Mumford. However, some observers have suggested that there are indications that Americans are perhaps entering the age of post-materialism; and if this is true, the Philistine determinants which have for so long corrupted the form of the city may finally be supplanted by higher goals and motives. "As to our cities," writes Rene Dubos, "No planning will save them from meaningless disorder leading to biological decay, unless man learns once more to use cities not only for the sake of business, but also for creating and experiencing in them the spirit of civilization."^{23}
The Pursuit of Humanism in the Age of Megalopolis

Planners are central figures in what promises to be one of the most fundamental controversies bearing on the future of the United States: the pursuit of humanism in the age of megalopolis. By humanism, I mean that philosophy or system of thought which places human values, goals, and needs before all others. The conflict between technology and humanism is the prevailing drama of our time, a struggle upon which rests the future not only of our cities, but of our civilization. Observation reveals that our urban problems are, in large measures, the negative feedbacks of industry and technology and the economic system which has ordained that the values society lives by are inseparable from those made in the marketplace. The impact of technology, which we can define as the science of industrial man, as an integral force fashioning our world, was confirmed by a symposium of city planners sponsored by the Athens Technological Institute meeting in the Greek capital in 1963. The opening sentences of a statement of principles drafted at the meeting, entitled the "Declaration of Delos," reflect an emerging awareness of technological oppression: "Science and technology determine more and more the processes of human living."

Technology has had a significant impact on our environment in a number of identifiable areas. First, although technology has produced a profusion of new inventions ultimately designed to make man's life easier and better, many of these developments have been characterized by notable disadvantages as well which have served to further complicate man's existence. The automobile is a good example of this. Indeed, technological developments have been unleashed
on society with little forethought and even less discretion, and like the great arsenals which scientists have turned over to unprepared statesmen to attempt to control, the proliferation of new technological discoveries has overwhelmed both municipal governments and city planners.

This technological bombardment has been spurred on by an infatuation with technology for its own sake, and this has led to what Wolf Von Eckardt has called the "architecture of enormity"—an environment far beyond the scale of man: a world of jumbo jets, monstrous buildings, and immense cities. Our society has been inculcated with the mistaken belief that if it is larger it must be better. As a consequence, we have failed to ask some very basic questions. Is this what man needs? Is this what he desires? Is this a world he can relate to? The answers to these questions, according to Von Eckardt, depend on "what society wants, what it aspires to." And he continues:

Theocratic Egypt is perhaps best remembered for the enormous technological achievement of building the pyramids. Does Democratic America want to be remembered for the World Trade Center and the Sears Building which put the bureaucrats of the New York Port Authority and Sears, Roebuck a higher above a people who have not yet found a practical way to dispose of their garbage.

The question of priorities is not the only consideration, however, for it should be recognized that the world of enormity levies heavy costs on society in terms of congestion, pollution, social disorders, and ugliness.

Secondly, technology is the cornerstone of a consumer economy maintained by mass production in this country. This dynamic economy has fouled our air, rivers, and our landscapes; bastardized our architecture, and depleted our natural resources. Because of the necessity to promote consumer consumption to
fuel the economy, industries seek to create consumer demand, and, as a consequence, billboard advertising and neon have disfigured most American cities.

Thirdly, technological advances in the field of mass communications, particularly television, advanced techniques of person-to-person communication, and modern methods of information storage and data processing have lessened the need for centralization in our cities, and hence have stimulated the growth of the suburbs. Due to mass media and other universal acculturation factors, we now live in what McLuhan has called "the global village," and "electronically-configured world" where man and his lifestyles are becoming more and more uniform. In France there is a saying "chacun à son gout," (each to his own taste), however, media and communications are everywhere wrapping the ancient nations of the globe in the same cultural straight-jacket which characterizes the United States; and within a generation, diversity among people and their environments may be largely non-existent. In the future, cautions Rene Dubos, it may be necessary for planners to interject irregularity and diversity into our environment because it is so genetically important to man's health and progress that it must be achieved at any price.

In conclusion, the ultimate goal of planning must be the creation of a humane environment, an environment created for man rather than in spite of him; cities created for people rather than as showplaces of technology. Such an environment must afford individuals maximum opportunity to work, love, learn, play, and take advantage of the ageless benefits of civilization, and, perhaps above all else, to become unique individuals in a world increasingly paralleling an Orwellian technocracy.
It has long been erroneously thought, as was suggested earlier in this chapter, that extensive planning is antithetical to human freedom. Yet freedom arises from discipline and denial. This is evident in the movements of the ballet dancer: the greater the discipline, the more perfect the form; the more perfect the form, the greater the freedom. This is also true of cities. Physical order and form is necessary to the maintenance of life itself, particularly in a world that every day grows more complex, and without planning the future holds only chaos or regimentation. Those who cry for the unstructured days of the past are out of step with the realities of the world today, and despite their best intentions, they would condemn all Americans to lives of ugliness and wretchedness if their views are permitted to prevail.

In the last analysis, cities are mirrors of their respective societies— their culture, values, and people—and it is important to remember that if we do not like what we see it is because in no small way we are dissatisfied with ourselves. Any basic reform, therefore, of the present urban picture must be preceded by a change in the attitudes and convictions of Americans. "In the end," writes John Ely Burchard, "the human city will depend not just upon the skill and power of the planners but upon how eager the people are for joy; and this in the end depends on how they define joy and how much they will pay for it." Only when the great majority of the American people, especially the middle class, become dissatisfied with their environment and their lives within that context, and thus fervently desire a change, will planning be able to play its proper role within this society.
One word of caution, however. As this nation moves toward national planning, we must take great care never to fall into the trap of setting tomorrow's policy by today's standards, for by doing so we run the risk of becoming the one-dimensional society of Herbert Marcuse where change is forever thwarted by the present revalidating what is as a direction for the future.
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Symptomatic of this problem, this writer recalls only too well traveling a narrow boulder-strewn road to the top of a mountain in the Pyrenees in the tiny principality of Andorra. At the summit I discovered a picturesque stone abbey that had been converted into a rough replica of a ranch, complete with corral, by the caprices of a lanky Frenchman who had obviously seen too many American westerns at the cinema. He greeted us at the gate with a hearty "Bon jour! Je suis en shérif," resplendent in a red vest with a tin five-cornered badge and dime-store guns. Later, reflecting upon the incident, I could not help but be depressed about the strange homogeneity that was being impressed on the world.

CHAPTER VII

THE SEARCH FOR A NATIONAL URBAN POLICY

Concern with long-range policies to accommodate impending urban growth is not a diversion from the present crisis in the cities. Rather, it is a necessary step toward finding solutions to this crisis--and assuring that other, similar crises do not arise in the future.

Report of the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy (1969)

Until philosophers are kings and political greatness and wisdom meet in one . . . cities will never have rest from their evils--no, nor the human race.

Plato

I realize that I have painted a bleak picture of our contemporary cities throughout this study, but the fact remains that we are faced with an urban crisis of considerable magnitude and far-reaching implications. The modern city is a far cry from the city of the Middle Ages which was the only source of light on a darkened landscape, when the only modicum of civilization, freedom, and scholarly enlightenment flourished within its walls. However, this writer recognizes that those cities were by no means perfect either. Thus, the inescapable conclusion that must be reached is that the new environmental and social values of our age should define a new kind of city, one which will provide a solution to our present urban problems and will anticipate future problems.
In the past, many of the critics of the city went so far as to discount the very efficacy of the city form. In 1936, for example, Frank Lloyd Wright was queried during a visit to Pittsburgh as to what could be done to solve that city's urban problems. The puckish architect thought for a moment and then replied to his astonished hosts that "it would be cheaper to abandon it." Indeed, Wright advocated a discontinuation of the city during the 1940's when its problems were of considerably less magnitude than they are today:

... why and for what then are the overgrown cities being held? For militocracy, prostitution, and banking? Do we really need them even for that?¹

Contrary to Wright, however, I do not recommend discarding the city like a worn-out shoe, nor do I advocate a return to an earlier type or form of the city. Today's city is infinitely more humane than its predecessors in many respects; and, according to Raymond Vernon, some urban problems may even have declined from earlier periods, notably crime and delinquency.² Vernon incorrectly suggests, nevertheless, that "things are getting slightly better all the time" in our cities; and one wonders what cities he based this assessment on and what barometer he used to measure this rise in the fortunes of urban America.

Vernon and the other apologists of the city are deluding themselves and the American public when they pooh-pooh this nation's urban problems and offer simplistic solutions for their resolution. Roger Starr has observed in this regard:

For his most depressed moments, the city official can even find a set of critics, led particularly by the members of the faculty of the Harvard-M.I.T. Joint Center for Urban Studies, who will tell him the pain in his head is imaginary.³
Of course Starr is referring particularly to Harvard's Edward C. Banfield, former Presidential Counsellor Daniel P. Moynihan (now at Harvard also), and M.I.T.'s Jay W. Forrester. Banfield, high priest of the revisionist movement, in his controversial and unconventional *The Unheavenly City*, dismisses the urban crisis as a middle-class fantasy which purportedly stems from deep-seated guilt feelings and misdirected altruism. Man came to the city of his own free will, states Banfield, and the city has been good to him: "The plain fact is that the overwhelming majority of our city-dwellers live more comfortably and conveniently than ever before." What are too often labeled urban problems, Banfield concludes, is the lag between our standards and expectations vis-a-vis actual performance. Following this line of thinking, poverty therefore becomes relative deprivation and other urban problems can be disregarded as the consequence of rising expectations. Clearly, Banfield's thesis is indefensible when viewed against the backdrop of our contemporary cityscape, and few city officials subscribe to it. Banfield throws up a convenient veneer which would lull Americans into complacency while their environment crumbles around them, and is more hyperbole than serious scholarship.

We must beware of home remedies for urban cancer, cautions Lewis Mumford. Like Mumford, I find the most serious offender in this category is Jane Jacobs, the bemusing author of *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Jacobs idealizes the ethnic pocket and all of its unsavory conditions, including overcrowding, suggesting that this is what cities are really all about. In Jacobian logic a safe street, for instance, is a well-used street, which may be
entirely true, but it is hardly getting to the root of the problem. Somehow she divines that planners are the source of all of the city's problems, despite the fact that only a fraction of America's cities display any planning at all. What in effect she is doing is crucifying planners for the sins of mankind. Jacobs' book, in short, is an apology for cities, not a solution. Thus, in conclusion, it is my belief that a balance must be struck between the rival antipodes of perpetuating the city as it is today, and iconoclastic approaches that would completely disavow the city altogether: in other words, the future of the city lies somewhere between Banfield and Wright. I am convinced that the concentration of people into cities provides certain advantages absent in other alternatives, therefore, I am inclined toward the "unbuilding" solution proposed by Lewis Mumford, which involves the reduction of our cities into more manageable units, an approach criticized by Jacobs as "oversimplified." 6

In this connection, various writers and urbanologists have over the years attempted to abstract the life of a city into a cycle beginning with the growth of the city and ending with its death. Mumford saw a four-step sequence, beginning with metropolis and progressing through megalopolis, tyrannopolis, and ultimately terminating in necropolis. Henry Pirenne, in his well-known study, suggested that cities grow, spread, flourish, and decline. 7 However, I agree with Gordon Cherry that "it is difficult to draw a parallel between the development of an urban culture and the flowering, maturing, and death of an organism. There is no evidence to suppose that a city will have such a life cycle." 8 Moreover, the city as a form has never really flourished in any optimum sense, therefore, it
is premature to speak of its decline or to imply any retrogressive pattern to it. The modern city, as has been suggested, is a veritable infant on the world stage, and what many observers regard as the death throes of a declining form, this writer is more inclined to view as the growing pains of a form coming of age. There is no reason to believe that the city cannot be substantially improved upon if only we have the will to look for new answers; and perhaps in a sense we have not yet really discovered what a city should be.

The United States: Quo Vadis?

Against this backdrop, let us examine what steps the United States has taken or should be taking in order to change our cities into something worth having, worth living in.

Incredible though it may seem in this complex era, this nation has no formal, or for that matter informal, national urban policy of any kind; and urban affairs are handled on a makeshift or "ad hoc" basis at all levels of the national government. Although there is a cabinet-level department, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, ostensibly designated and empowered to administer the urban sector, it is governed by no clear statement of purpose, and its priorities, as its name suggests, are concentrated in the area of housing rather than oriented toward tackling the broad spectrum of urban problems. Other urban responsibilities, moreover, have been divided up like a jigsaw puzzle among a score of federal departments and agencies, most notably the Department of Transportation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of the Interior.
unfortunately, little singularity of purpose behind the programs and policies of the many federal agencies engaged in domestic affairs, and no high-level board or committee exists to coordinate their wide-ranging activities, with the exception of the nascent Domestic Council (a new fixture of the Institutionalized Presidency) which has been largely quiescent since its establishment on July 1, 1970. Furthermore, there is no single standing committee in either of the two houses of Congress with the sole responsibility of making urban policy or handling public matters affecting our cities. Urban policy, such as it is, is hobbled by conflicting objectives and administered by a complex crazy-quilt of over-lapping jurisdictions where bureaucrats keep one eye zealously fixed on their own limited powers and the other covetously cast on another department's prerogatives. Internecine warfare has flared intermittently for a decade within the federal labyrinth over questions of who should make the policy for our cities and who should administer it, and, as a consequence, an impasse has been reached which has precluded any attempt to define a broad and meaningful national urban policy. To complicate this already seemingly hopeless situation, there is too little cooperation between local, state, and federal authorities in many important urban matters; and as but one case in point, "Operation Breakthrough," a HUD program designed to find innovative and less costly methods of housing construction, was rejected by St. Louis because it conflicted with local building codes.

Thus, in addition to those reasons I have already enumerated, perhaps the principal explanation for the failure of this nation to adopt an overall national urban policy is that, in order to be effective, such a policy must necessarily be of
a revolutionary nature. Previous urban programs which involved reform within the existing socio-politico-economic structure of society, and often were just a sap to the "poverty entrepreneurs," have been acknowledged for what they are today: failures—a fact recognized by urbanologists from Robert Goodman on the Left to Edward C. Banfield on the Right. Manpower training programs, welfare, urban renewal, public housing, urban education, model cities—all have proved substantially less than successful because they failed to transcend the confines of conventional wisdom and institutions. During the 1960's, the urban generals of three different administrations attacked the problem by simply projecting more housing, more schools, more jobs, more of everything until the gaps between the middle class and the disadvantaged were closed. The problem as they saw it was quantitative not qualitative, one of insufficiencies, and few ever doubted for a moment that the very form and complexion of the urban society they were building might be deficient and open to serious reappraisal. Instead of putting forward a policy really designed to undo the wreckage of people and places in this country, therefore, policy-makers gave us halfway measures, justified by half-truths, which were adopted either because they were politically expedient or designed to enrich the "urban-industrial complex." Thus, now that we have finally discovered, as Von Hoffman has so succinctly put it, that the "urban doctor was a quack," and it is time that we do something about it.

It is clear that this nation can no longer put off the establishment of a coordinated and systematic national urban policy similar to that developed by the President's Council of Economic Advisors for the economy. Central to this policy,
we need what Norman Peterson has called for, a national strategy or plan for the next century to solve the problems of urbanization and decay. In 1969, President Nixon created the Urban Affairs Council to assist "in the development of a national urban policy, having regard both to immediate and to long-range concerns, and to priorities among them." Unfortunately, with the departure of Presidential Counsellor Daniel Moynihan from the Administration to resume his teaching duties at Harvard, the prospect of a real national urban policy remains as distant as it did when the Council was conceived. In this regard, it should be remembered that if our leaders persist in perpetuating the present urban stalemate and do nothing, that is still a policy, though hardly an optimum one.

The forces which are rendering the city unlivable have already been discussed. Therefore, any national urban policy adopted by Washington must contain two essential provisions. First, a massive urban "Marshall Plan" should be created which would extend some measure of immediate relief to our existing cities by channeling billions of dollars into rapid transit, education, open space, housing, and other programs designed to improve the quality of life for urban residents. This would be no solution to our urban problems, as I have already suggested, but merely a method by which needed time can be purchased.

Secondly, it has already been demonstrated that our cities should not, and for that matter cannot, absorb the projected growth of the United States in the years ahead. Neither do our rural areas presently provide a place to locate the impending crush of new Americans because in most non-urban regions there is a lack of economic opportunity, and this condition currently stimulates the
migration of hundreds of thousands of rural people every year to our already over-crowded cities. Under these circumstances, as part of a national urban policy, an all-encompassing national land use policy should be formulated which would determine how the land area of the United States could best be utilized, emphasizing an equitable distribution of the wealth and opportunities that are derived from it. In this connection, in 1970, the Public Land Law Review Commission sent to the President their recommendations for the "retention and management" of federal lands, in a 342 page report entitled, *One Third of the Nation's Land,* one of the finest documents commissioned by the Federal Government that this writer has ever seen. In this landmark report, it was recommended that the Federal Government undertake extensive land use planning in order to implement "rational programs for the use and development of the public lands and their resources," Justifying their position, the Commission stated that when "Resources were abundant and demands upon them were relatively free of conflict, the nation may have been able to afford the luxury of an unplanned, crisis-oriented public land policy. But those days are far behind us."14

Complementary to a national land use policy, this nation should develop a national urban growth policy which would guide the dispersal of the present and future populations of this country over the entire suitable land area of the nation, in such a way as to reduce the concentrations of people that presently dwell in our great cities, thus providing a more optimum environment for the future citizens of the United States. This goal would not necessarily represent a decitification of America, but only an effort to break up our cities into a larger number of smaller,
more manageable units, spread out over the American sub-continent.

The question immediately raised is how can we disseminate our popula-
tion without coercive means, since much of it is already entrenched in existing urban areas. In keeping with the best American traditions of free choice and freedom of mobility, an indirect route would be necessary since a massive forced reshuffling of our population would be unthinkable. The answer, therefore, lies in creating better opportunities on a massive scale in rural America. Experience has demonstrated that people will naturally gravitate toward increased economic rewards and an enhanced standard of living. Thus, perhaps the key element of such a national urban policy would be the creation of a vast new cities program in the United States, which would act concurrently as siphons, drawing off population from our high-density conurbations, and catalysts, where a new mode of urban living could evolve.

There is a precedent for such a circuitous route in achieving national urban objectives. In 1953, President Eisenhower, acting on advice from the Defense Department, told his advisors that he wanted 80 percent of all new industry located outside of metropolitan areas for defense reasons and asked them to come up with a way this could be done without resorting to undemocratic methods and in the context of our laissez-faire economy. In response, they proposed to him what later became the Interstate Defense Highway System. This extraordinary program, its goals reworded for public consumption, was extremely successful in accomplishing Eisenhower's objectives, and at the same time it provided Americans with the finest national highway system in the world. Business and industry,
which require, above all else, efficient and inexpensive transportation facilities, followed the advance of the highways, and the heartland of America blossomed with new investment. The amazing aspect of this program was that most of the people in the United States were unconscious of the transformation which this was producing in industrial location and human settlement patterns in this country.

Why New Cities?

In the previous section I introduced the concept of the new city. Needless to say, the concept of new cities is a visionary one; yet these are revolutionary times and call for revolutionary answers to the awesome problems confronting our society. Over the past decade we have witnessed many remarkable changes in government posture and the adoption of both procedures and programs which only a few years ago were publically regarded as little short of heresy in this country, such as Medicare, Urban Renewal, and open housing; and today it is significant that over a majority of all Americans accept the concept of a guaranteed annual income, whereas not long ago most were opposed to the idea. In the same respect that pressure must build deep within the seams of the earth before an earthquake occurs, so too must an idea precede its implementation until enough pressure mounts to force its adoption by the dominant power structure of society. Although it is doubtful that either the American public or the Congress are presently willing to undertake the national commitment in terms of resource allocation and rearrangement of national priorities necessary for the creation of a vast new cities program, this writer firmly believes that with proper sponsorship by leading lawmakers, within a decade and a half, there will be a federally-financed new cities program
of nation-wide scope and magnitude. To date such diverse individuals as Senator John Sparkman, Senator Stuart Symington, Senator Mike Mansfield, and even President Nixon have shown public interest in the new city concept.

The problem regarding a new cities program, as Robert Dahl sees it, is that as a nation "We are very far from having such a vision, and the agony of our cities is so intense and could be so prolonged that if the vision ever comes to us we may no longer have the energy, the will, the confidence to act on it." However, contrary to Dahl, like Lewis Mumford, I am reluctant to view the evolution of cities as a terminal process, and therefore do not believe that the present contradiction referred to as a city will survive indefinitely. Instead, it will be replaced with a more advanced form of urban settlement, of which new cities presently provide, in this writer's opinion, the most attractive alternative emerging in the way of the disintegration of our existing cities.

In this connection, let us now turn to an examination of the specific reasons for adopting a massive new cities program in the United States:

1. The advocates of new cities, while they disagree about much, are in accord on one thing—what might be called the basic premise underlying proposals for new cities—and that is that our current urban problems cannot be solved in the context of our existing cities. Thus, new cities must provide place where we can siphon off portions of our present urban populations so that we can reduce the size of our cities, and concurrently, their problems, to more manageable proportions.

2. New cities promise to provide an attractive alternative to our relatively haphazard national growth patterns, and would furnish places to locate the
tens of millions of new Americans projected in coming decades. And by spreading our population out over the geographical expanse of the country, we could more effectively and efficiently utilize our land area and natural resources.

3. Multiplying urban densities, which I focused on in Chapter IV, is clearly one of the most alarming problems of our world today. New cities will provide a more spacious environment for each individual and in so doing will enhance personal privacy, decrease the likelihood of various mental disorders related to stifling densities, and contribute to a more healthful and pleasant environment for all Americans.

4. Congestion, a major irritant, cost-inducing factor, and thief of time in contemporary cities, will be almost a stranger to new cities because of their superlative design and closely-controlled size. Freedom of movement and circulation within our cities will thus be greatly improved.

5. Much of today's pollution occurs because the wastes discharged into rivers and the atmosphere from our great urban concentrations overwhelm both the natural cleansing processes of nature and man's efforts to control it. With the construction of widely-dispersed new cities and a complementary reduction in the size of contemporary cities, it is anticipated that pollution will be significantly reduced, and at the very least, will be far more controllable. In addition, because new cities will not be permitted unbridled industrial expansion with its accompanying pollution and other discommodities, residents will not be forced to breathe foul air, have their beaches and recreation spoiled by murky contaminated water, or be assaulted by uncontrolled noise. As a consequence, the grim
prophecies of Victor Gruen, Spilhaus, and others about tomorrow's doomed cities and artificial environments can be relegated to science fiction where they belong. It should also be noted that solid waste and refuse disposal will present far less of a problem and will be substantially less costly than it is in our great cities because of the decreased size of new communities.

6. New cities promise to markedly improve the aesthetic quality of our urban environments. Aesthetic regulations—not necessarily aesthetic zoning (which is often just a license to blemish the landscape so long as you do it in the proper areas)—will govern the cityscape. Rather than any attempt to impress one individual's concept of beauty on a whole community, these regulations will consist of common-sense procedures designed to prevent the most flagrant attacks on environmental harmony. Indeed, planning is prerequisite today in order to create and maintain an attractive community, for as John Kenneth Galbraith has suggested: "There is no reason to believe that an unplanned metropolis will have any better chance for beauty than an unmade bed." 16

7. There will be more room for diversity in new cities, and they will provide an opportunity for architectural and planning innovation. The marketplace will not be permitted to govern the design and layout of the city as it has in the past; rather, it will be designed in accordance with the needs and desires of its inhabitants to the maximum feasible degree. It may even be possible for some communities to have themes, and if the residents so desired, they could construct a new city on the order of a colonial Williamsburg or an alpine village, for instance. Rather than permit our environments to become standardized as they are
today, planners can introduce diversity into each new city so that it will be unique from all others. For as Dahl has written, "those who prefer a different habitat ought to have that option."

8. New cities would be more economical to operate and a higher standard of public services could be provided because their tax bases would be more or less uniform since the government will control industrial location patterns, (see below). Because their growth would be tightly controlled, new cities would not be permitted to expand beyond that supercritical mass where metabolic functions and community services begin to take on additional cost factors brought on by increased size.

9. New cities will be far safer and with more healthful environments than those provided by current cities. Not only will they not contain slums, which are breeding grounds for crime and disease, but much of the tension, pressure, and turmoil associated with modern cities will be dissipated. Furthermore, design improvements will relieve many of the present hazards of city life, such as dangerous streets and crowded roadways. And because of the diminished size of the city, break-down of vital services will be more infrequent. When they do occur, they will be less incapacitating and will not constitute as much of a hardship on the community. What street crime there is will also be more easily controlled as a consequence of well-lighted, well-used streets and smaller populations to police. Smaller communities exert more informal controls over their populations than do large cities as well.
10. A sense of community will prevail in new cities because of their more intimate size and various socializers incorporated into their designs, such as common neighborhood greens, public squares, and abundant recreation facilities.

11. Democracy will flourish in a much purer and more inspirational form in new cities, for, as Mumford has suggested: "Democracy, in any active sense, begins and ends in communities small enough for their members to meet face to face." Indeed, smallness may be, as Dahl has also observed, a necessary prerequisite for effective participation in our society and in our government. Therefore, it can be anticipated that because of their smaller size and modern city governments, people will once again feel that their activities and votes can have some impact on making the policies which govern their lives. And when an individual feels that he has participated in making the policies of his society, studies have shown that he is far more likely to abide by them.

12. Rural development, long thought an insoluble problem by many experts, will receive a tremendous boost with the establishment of new cities throughout the nation. Serving as a catalyst for new investment, new communities promise to generate new employment opportunities, and will bring the amenities of urban life to our long-overlooked rural citizens. This should help to reverse the trend of rural-to-urban migration which compounds current urban problems, and will bring new hope to the rural poor, who comprise 46 percent of the nation's poor.
13. New cities will provide us with a flexible new tool with which to combat the scourge of poverty. By dismantling slums and resettling their populations in new cities where there will be more optimum living conditions, better schools and public facilities, and broader opportunities, we may be able to take a giant step in enabling all Americans to share equally in the abundance of our society.

14. New cities will bring the country to the city, and steps will be taken to preserve large tracts of forested land and open space both in and around the community. Extensive efforts must be taken in the planning and construction of the city to preserve natural terrain and pastoral settings which might provide joy and solitude to the residents. Never again must one building be permitted to compete with another to blot out the sunlight.

15. New cities would diversify the nation’s economic base and provide both temporary jobs for those involved in the actual construction of new cities and permanent employment for their residents. This is particularly important today as we seek to alter our national priorities in the United States, and switch from a wartime defense-oriented industrial base to an economy which is committed to solving the neglected needs of the American people. Not only would a new cities program on a massive scale be, very possibly, the most significant national development program this nation ever undertook, but it calls for many of the same skills which are currently being hardest hit in the decline of our defense and space-related industries and, therefore, could employ millions of our unemployed. Likewise, with an eye toward the future, as the completion of the massive Interstate
Highway System draws near, great reserves of men and equipment will be idled. Top representatives of both contractors and unions involved in the interstate project are enthusiastic about new cities as a possible new focus for the construction industry.

**16.** New cities will not surrender to the automobile as have present cities. Instead, one of the chief design goals of the new city will be accessibility. Everything—work, schools, shopping, and recreation—will lie within a reasonable walking distance from resident's homes if at all possible; and if not, they will be only a short commute away on public transit. This will not only reduce dependency on automobiles, thereby lessening air pollution, but it will also promote greater interchange amongst individuals of all ages and walks of life who today are generally separated to a large extent by their different modes of transportation. Pains will be taken in the new city to accommodate bicycles and other alternative forms of transportation.

**17.** New cities will provide a more humane and livable environment on a scale which does not overwhelm its inhabitants. To this extent, the success or failure of new cities will "determine whether the machine shall serve, command, or destroy our civilization."

Thus, in summary, new cities provide the best alternative for contemporary metropolitan life in this country. In this connection, the following chapter will explore this concept in greater depth.
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CHAPTER VIII

NEW CITIES: A WAY OUT?

The right thing done badly is always better than the wrong thing done well.

Louis Kahn

We (should) establish a vast program of creating new cities and in this way thin out megalopolis, replace boundaries of asphalt with boundaries of woods and fields, and learn what surely must be counted among the greatest of the arts, though it is no part of American tradition or consciousness, the art of building great—not giant—cities.

Robert A. Dahl

As people come increasingly to question the desirability of maintaining their obsolete cities, they strive to find something with which to replace them. This study is an attempt to define what this writer believes constitutes a more optimum urban environment than that which we know today, and at the same time, to present a solution to many of the grave problems that haunt our present cities. The creation of a sweeping new cities program as the focus of a national urban policy is central to my theme. I refer to new cities rather than new towns—a much more common usage—because I am convinced that our problems have grown vastly beyond the scope of "towns" and are clearly in the category of "cities." New towns are at best a more comely environment for a handful of people,
pleasant laboratories and conversation pieces where we can observe the effects of
a planned environment on man; but we have reached the point where we must
think and act in terms of nothing less than the creation of massive "totally new"
cities. We are rushing headlong into the future more rapidly and more unprepared,
given the exigencies of our age, than any previous generation in history, there­
fore meaningful proposals to restructure our environment must go far beyond the
scope and imagination of new towns to date.

Admittedly what I am suggesting is an ambitious proposal and will be
costly because of its staggering size; for as Daniel Moynihan has said: "We
must build a new city the size of Tulsa every month for the next thirty years just
to accommodate the population growth of the United States." Continued inac­
tion, nevertheless, in the face of the awesome urban and social problems of the
nation will be even costlier. Thus, if our cities of the future are not to be repli­
cas of past failures, they must be planned new cities.

**What is a New City?**

The epithet "new town" or "new city" has been applied misleadingly to
hundreds of very ordinary subdivisions, as Marshall Kaplan has observed, because
the mystique associated with the term has deceived house buyers into believing
that they were getting something special for their money, when in actuality all
they were doing was buying into another suburban development. On the other
hand, many people, familiar only with some of the brasher new cities with space-
age architecture, generally have highly futuristic impressions of what new cities
are all about, and regard them with "a nice place to visit but I wouldn't want to
live there" attitude. As a consequence, it is evident that the public is under many misconceptions as to what really constitutes a new city.

All bona fide new cities must demonstrate a high degree of planning. This is the essential ingredient by which new cities can be distinguished from cities and towns which grew "organically" from small settlements, manor houses, or fortresses over the course of time. In addition, in modern times new cities have all represented efforts to recast our urban environment into something better, more in accord with ideal images of what a city should be: a place where the potentials of life could be more fully developed.

There are four major types of new communities. A national new cities program in the United States should draw upon all four, and any combination or variation of them in applying the new communities concept to the solution of our urban problems. The first classification, "de novo" new cities, are totally new communities, built from the ground up, and completely self-sustaining. Like all new communities, they have both a sense of purpose and a sense of future. A plot of land is selected, and a city is carefully laid out where previously nothing stood. De novo new communities normally give the planner a blank slate, and generally display the most dramatic innovations and architecture. Brasilia, Cuidad Guayana, Columbia, New Bussa, and Tapiola are all de novo new communities, and I will discuss each in detail below.

Satellite new communities, by comparison, are appendages of another, usually larger city; more often than not bedroom communities linked by an economic umbilical cord to the "mother" city. Most new towns and cities are of the
satellite variety because of the difficulty of attracting enough industry to employ all of their inhabitants. Some satellite communities, however, gradually become self-sustaining over a period of time. Most of the English and French new communities, together with Vallingby in Sweden, fall into this category.

The third type of new community is the "new-town-in-town" (or "new towns intown"), constructed on vacant land within an existing city. This variety can be used to renovate an entire blighted area of an existing metropolis, and "may offer the only recourse to abandoning cities entirely." Because of the failure of many of our current renewal programs, there is a desperate need for a new and better approach to inner-city urban development and rehabilitation. It provides a viable alternative to the current piecemeal efforts to dismantle our slums, and it can "greatly help in transforming the physical environment of the city in keeping with social objectives and human resources needs." Rather than just construct a vast public housing complex, new-towns-intown are totally-planned, well-balanced communities with shops, jobs, homes, schools, apartments, factories, playgrounds, and parks. Many of our large cities today contain similar communities, which function as a community within the context of a larger city and are often separated by distinctive architecture: examples include Old Town in Alexandria, Greenwich Village in New York, Georgetown in Washington, and Old Town in Chicago.

A number of new-towns-in-town are under construction at the present time, such as Ceder-Riverside, a 300-acre new community in the heart of Minneapolis; Welfare Island, being developed by New York State's Urban
Development Corporation on a two-mile-long island in New York's East River; and Franklin Town, a privately financed $400 million, 50-acre project in downtown Philadelphia. Westinghouse Electric Corporation and an international building systems firm called BSI, are considering a project, encouraged by former President Lyndon Johnson, in Washington, D.C., named Fort Lincoln, but no final decision has been reached.

Finally, the fourth type of new community is the "new-town-from-a-small-town" (also called "expanded new towns," "rural new towns," and "refurbished new towns"), which begins with the base of an existing community and after planning, rehabilitation, and redesign, it is turned into a new community. One of the chief attractions of this type of new community is that not only is there a sense of community among the inhabitants (which only time can bring to de novo new cities), but there is an existing city government and most other community facilities (although many will have to be expanded).

New-towns-from-small-towns could provide a tremendous impetus to rural development, and a better way of life to rural Americans. Among the English new communities, Harbour, Redditch, Stevenge, and Crawley were created from existing small towns. And in this country, only the new community of Jonathan, in Carver County, Minnesota, is being built on an existing community base. One of the most notable proposed new communities of this type is Pattonsburg, Missouri, now in the planning stage.
The Utopian Heritage of New Cities

The antecedents of modern new cities can be traced to the idealization of urban archetypes in Western history, and the celebration of what Warren Susman has called "the Eternal City," an ideal city wherein man can realize some modicum of perfection and create a society "with some kind of an infinite future" and relevant past. In this regard, to modern planners the search for urban form and the search for the ideal city have gone hand-in-hand. Indeed, the idea of constructing an ideal polis has captured man's imagination for centuries, and is evidenced in his efforts to create Utopias, real and imaginary. The word "Utopia" itself stems from the publication in 1516 of Sir Thomas More's imaginative masterpiece by the same name, in which he portrayed an ideal island commonwealth frozen in the misty recesses of time. The quest for Utopia can be defined essentially as man's unending search for a better world and a richer life; what philosophers often call the "good life." What actually constitutes the good life is a matter of intense debate and differs widely among classical architects of Utopias; but one thread runs consistently through most of the major early Utopian works, and that is that the Utopia should provide a climate wherein man could "grow to the fullest stature of his species."  

Prior to the 19th century, the Utopia was essentially a saga or "myth, whereby ideal social commonwealths were conceived in imaginary, far-off lands, the realization of which was highly unlikely." To emphasize the imaginative nature of early Utopias, it should be noted that the word "Utopia" is derived from the Greek roots "ou" meaning no or not, plus "topos," meaning place; thus
Utopia = no place, or not a place. In other words, it was an abstract model of perfection which men could aspire to but never really hope to achieve, similar to Plato's ethereal "Forms;" however, insofar as men were successful in incorporating some of the ideal elements of the Utopia into their temporal societies, reasoned the various Utopian writers, their lives would be improved. Early Utopian literature was designed to provide inspiration to men; additionally, some works could be interpreted as critical essays on values and institutions of the day, as well as commentaries on man's relationship to the state. As a consequence, Utopian writing was often punished and restricted. Plato's Republic, More's Utopia, Bacon's New Atlantis, and the Lutheran humanist Johann Valentin Andreae's Christianopolis are perhaps the most significant examples of pre-modern Utopian inspiration. These early Utopian writers, each convinced of his own infallibility, sought to remake man in his own image, and can be labeled social engineers in every sense of the word. Not satisfied with man as he was, they structured rigid, highly disciplined states with little individual freedom, and this accounts for their popularity among certain 20th century totalitarian writers.

This aside, perhaps the two greatest contributions of the early Utopians are 1) the affirmation that Utopia was not something necessarily in the hereafter and that it could be the preoccupation of man in this life, and 2) the early Utopians, most importantly, all believed that the physical arrangement of life determines not only the social life of man to some degree, but the quality of life.

During the early 19th century, in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, the word Utopia was substantially redefined. Prior to the rise of urbanism in the
Western world, Utopias were always conceived of as cities, or city states, urban
in form (Plato, More, Andreae). With the corruption of the city by industriali-
zation, Utopias were soon more often conceived of as existing in the state of
nature (Rousseau, Chateaubriand, Jefferson, Ruskin, Wright). The city became
the reality of one fled. Another school of thought, anchored in 19th century
rationalism, argued that only technology could save man. With the new indus-
trial technology, so the belief went, man finally had the tools with which to
create his ideal commonwealth, a modern urban Valhalla. The futurists such as
Gabriel Tarde, H.G. Wells, and, most notably, Edward Bellamy, author of the
late 19th century best-seller Looking Backward, were spawned by this movement,
and used the device of the Utopian novel to criticize society.

Perhaps a more significant change, beginning with the Frenchman
Charles Marie Fourier, the orientation and aims of Utopian writers changed from
that of trying to modify man's behavior to that of attempting to accommodate it.
Writers were now concerned with satisfying man's needs and making him happy;
a watershed that could be described as the humanization of Utopias. However,
this new social consciousness soon precipitated a break among Utopian reformers
over the question of whether the quality of life could best be effected by altering
the social organization of man or, correspondingly, by altering his physical
arrangements. To Marx and many socialist crusaders, only a fundamental reshuf-
fling of power relationships could appreciably improve man's condition, and by
this they meant social revolution. By contrast, adherents to the so-called town
planning movement which appeared in the late part of the 19th century, principally
in England, maintained that a restructuring of man's physical environment would produce more tangible and immediate results, and perhaps in time even change the social structure of society. Ebenezer Howard, called the "father of new towns," was the chief exponent of this view and precursor of a score of prominent like-minded theorists and planners, including Lewis Mumford and Patrick Geddes. Howard surveyed the gloomy squalor and poverty of English industrial cities and concluded that revolution was inevitable unless significant steps were taken to improve the lives of the workers. Skeptical that anything other than chaos and tragedy could result from revolution, Howard in 1898 published *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path for Real Reform*, which four years later he revised slightly and had reprinted in its popular form, *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*. In his landmark Utopian work, Howard offered an alternative to revolution: the construction of garden cities, a blending of city and country into model communities which would provide better and more healthful environments for the English working class. This achievement, argued Howard, would dissuade the proletariat from seeking more radical escapes from his misery.

Howard represented a departure from the past in that his Utopia had a bricks-boards-and-mortar reality and was not merely an unattainable model of perfection. For the first time man lacked only the will, not the ability, to construct a Utopian environment; and Howard, as chief apostle of the new faith, set out to win converts to his philosophy by actually building a model community of his design.
Howard represents a synthesis of the thinking both of the anti-city forces and the technologists, who believed that the new industrial technology was the key to a better environment. In this regard, Gordon E. Cherry has written of him: "(Howard's) immense contribution was that he assimilated the contributions made by a number of theorists and experimentalists, both contemporary and previous to his day, and reinterpreted the social theme to meet the needs of the time." Howard's garden city culminated over two thousand years of Utopian thought, weaving the diverse philosophic threads of other Utopians into an inspired design which finally could offer something tangible to mankind.

Lewis Mumford has suggested that the search for Utopias has always intensified during periods of turmoil and violence, and certainly the present is no exception. Unfortunately, our disturbed world has produced a new kind of Utopia seeker: the individual who withdraws from society in an effort to reach a private accord with his environment. Where in the past Utopias were collective states, public in character, we have today entered the age of the private Utopia. In our modern world, man escapes to his home, often behind barricaded doors, where he can find refuge from the disorders, tension, crime, and pollution of the outside world, an affirmation of Sir Edward Coke's famous dictum "et domas sua cinque tutissimum refugium" (one's home is the safest refuge to everyone). Indeed, modern man's home has become all that his external world is not—a "demimonde" of his own design; and the more he settles into his suburban shell the more he shrinks from concern about the world outside. To Aristotle, the house and the household were integral parts of the community, but today house
and community have largely become divorced from each other. The issue at stake is not only the decline of public responsibility, but the ambivalence and detachment with which too many individuals regard society's pressing urban and environmental problems as they sit in their antiseptic air-conditioned suburban dwellings. Too often, not until their private Utopias are disturbed, will many of them manifest any concern for creating a more optimum environment embracing society as a whole.

Another obstacle modern Utopians must overcome is government reluctance in this country to encourage, support, and finance efforts to improve our environment and the quality of life. America's national priorities, about which much has recently been written, are seriously out-of-line with the needs of our society; and in this regard, I cannot agree more with Lewis Mumford that a nation or society which uses its science to perfect devastation instead of building Utopias, is a poor society indeed.

In short, it is one of the contentions of this paper that the concept of Utopia is an idea whose time has come. Over two thousand years of Utopian thought lie behind us, requiring only the marriage of technology to theory before Utopian designs could bear fruit. Today the idea of being able to work with a blank slate, to create entire cities where previously nothing existed, is an exciting proposition. In the past such awesome projects were written off as dreams or regarded as the aberrations of heretics, but today this has all changed. We have the resources, the technology, and the need to create total new environments, total new cities, not infected with the mistakes of the past. Where
architecture formerly had to be concerned with loads and supports, the modern architect and planner is virtually freed from these constraints, and today there is no limit to what he can create, given only the will: even Wright’s mile-high skyscraper, Reno Levi’s "superblock"—a "city within a house" accommodating 16,000 people; or Soleri’s fabulous archologies. Thus, we have in our grasp the power to reshape man’s environment, and, consequently, his life—a power unthinkable to the early Utopians. What this means to each of us was perhaps best expressed by Walter Sullivan in his column in the New York Times: "In a world of proliferation—unplanned, uncontrolled technological growth can no longer be tolerated—the world has become too dangerous for anything less than Utopias." 10

The History of New Cities

The concept of building new cities is not new; they have been built for a variety of reasons for centuries. There is evidence that the ancient Egyptians constructed model workers’ communities to house artisans during the arduous erection of the pyramids. Over three hundred years before the birth of Christ, twenty-five new cities rose in the wake of Alexander’s conquering armies, and were designed to entrench the Hellenistic culture in Egypt and the civilizations of the East. During the later Roman expansion, new towns and cities were built with a passion from the rocky coast of England to the windswept sands of North Africa, and shattered Corinthian columns standing throughout the Mediterranean world attest to the Roman ardor for city building. Roman cities were constructed both as garrisons and to encourage colonization in an effort to secure the perimeters of the empire.
For all practical purposes, after the demise of the Roman Empire, the construction of whole new cities lapsed until relatively recent times, the victim of plagues, the fragmented social and political order, the decline of learning, and simply due to the fact that there was no real reason to build them. During the Middle Ages the few places called cities were generally fortified compounds, and not really cities at all. Although the origins of the modern city can be traced to the Carolingian Period and the revival of commerce, few displayed any planning whatsoever. History does record, however, that in 1297 King Edward I of England summoned an assembly of the medieval equivalent of town planners to assist him in "planting" new towns in England, Gascony, and Wales. What is notable about this gathering is that it was an attempt to glean knowledge of the most successful elements of existing towns in order to better construct new ones. Numerous new towns were "planted" in the British Isles during this period, and both Liverpool and Portsmouth have survived to this day. Of course they were not characterized by the same degree of planning we associate with contemporary new cities, but they were a beginning; and as forerunners of Britain's modern new towns, they are a symbol of English preeminence in the new cities movement.

In his treatise, On Kingship, St. Thomas Aquinas counseled the King of Cyprus that, in the words of Vegetius, "The mightiest nations and most commended kings thought it their greatest glory either to found new cities or have their names made part of it, and in some way added to, the names of cities already founded by others." Aquinas thereupon proffered advice on the establishment of new cities which, though largely nonsense, represents one of the first attempts by Western man
to set down specific rules pertaining to the building of cities designed to enhance
the lives of their inhabitants.

With the advent of the Industrial Revolution, not all of the new capitalists turned a cold shoulder to the sufferings of the working class, and a few rare individuals saw in the new industrialism an opportunity to undertake social experiments to improve urban living conditions. Claude Nicolas Ledoux, a French architect, designed a model town for salt workers named Chaux, dating from 1776. And in England at the Falls of Clyde, Robert Owen, after purchasing his father-in-law's cotton mills and the village in which they were located, renamed the factory and sought to make "New Lanark not merely an efficient factory but a well-governed human community based on his ideals."

**Ebenezer Howard and the Garden City**

New cities, however, are essentially the product of the 20th century and the genius of one man: Ebenezer Howard. Howard, whom I have already discussed in the context of the Utopians, was born in London in 1850, and nothing in his early life gave a clue to the genius that would later flower in his soul. At the age of fifteen, he dropped out of school with an undistinguished academic record and after plying time at a number of common trades and positions, in 1871 he left England for the United States to make a new life on the broad Nebraska prairie. Howard took advantage of the Homestead Act, one of the most salient victories of the anti-city movement in this country, and settled down to the hard task of eking out subsistence on 160 acres. Husbandry did not agree with the young Englishman, and Howard, who would later excoriate cities for their
multiplicity of ills, sought refuge from the rigors of pioneer life in the bustling
city of Chicago, where he worked for several years. Howard returned to his
native land in 1876; however, had he stayed in this country one can speculate
that he might have changed the course of American history. Had the United
States instead of Great Britain adopted a national new towns policy, the urban
picture would surely be much brighter today.

Upon his arrival in London, Howard became a court stenographer, and
within a short time he and a companion were contracting stenographic commissions
from the courts and London County Council. This was the first of two significant
experiences which had a great deal of influence on his later accomplishments.
While working as a stenographer, he became well acquainted with the mushrooming
urban problems of London and, in addition, met numerous individuals engaged
in social reform efforts.

In 1882, Howard came under the influence of Henry George, the
American economist, after attending one of his lectures. He then read George's
controversial book, *Progress and Poverty*, in which he asserted that the state must
exercise control over all land so that all members of the community could share in
the advantages that accrue from it. This, coupled with Edward Bellamy's
*Looking Backward* which he read during the late 1880's, marked a turning point
in Howard's life. *Looking Backward* described the experiences on one Julian
West who fell asleep in 1887 and woke up in the year 2000, and was amazed by
the futuristic society which it was his strange fate to behold. Howard recalled in
later years that Bellamy's book helped him to "realize as never before the splendid
possibilities of a new civilisation based on service to the community. . . . I deter-
mined to take such part, however small it may be, in helping to bring a new
civilisation into being."

Over the next decade Howard rose rapidly to the forefront of the socia-
list reform movement in England, and gained a reputation for being an original
thinker. In 1893, Howard spoke before a joint meeting of the Nationalisation
of Labour Society and the Land Nationalisation Society on a subject which had
taken shape in his mind over the past several years: "The Co-Operative Common-
wealth." Precursor of the Garden City concept which he would introduce five
years later, Howard called for a planned community of 30,000 where each family
had its own home and garden, and where all land would be held in common.
Girdling the community would be tracts leased to farmers to provide a green buffer.
Shortly after the meeting, Howard became convinced that he would have to
demonstrate the feasibility of his ideas by creating an actual prototype of his
Co-Operative Commonwealth if he were ever to interest the government in his
program. Thus, he found a suitable 900-acre site near Essex and set out to raise
money to finance his venture. Finding it difficult to publicize plan or to gener-
ate interest in it, he determined to write a book which would enunciate his plan
for the record and would win him converts to the faith. In 1898, he published at
his own expense the first edition of his work, and in 1902, it was reprinted under
the title of Garden Cities of Tomorrow.

Howard argued in his book that it was easier to build new cities than to
restore the old:
These crowded cities have done their work; they were the best which a society largely based on selfishness and rapacity could construct, but they are in the nature of things entirely unadapted for a society in which the social side of our nature is demanding a larger share of recognition . . . . Each generation should build to suit its own needs; and it is no more in the nature of things that men should continue to live in old areas because their ancestors lived in them, than it is that they should cherish the old beliefs which a wider faith and a more enlarged understanding have outgrown. The reader is, therefore, earnestly asked not to take it for granted that the large cities in which he may perhaps take a pardonable pride are necessarily in their present form, any more permanent than the stagecoach system which was the subject of so much admiration just at the very moment when it was about to be supplanted by the railways. The simple issue to be faced, and faced resolutely, is: can better results be obtained by starting on a bold plan on comparatively virgin soil than by attempting to adapt our old cities to our newer and higher needs? ¹⁷

Howard's designs portray his garden cities as satellite communities linked by an "inter-municipal railway" to a larger central metropolis. Although he does not specifically say so, it is obvious that Howard did not intend that his garden cities remain complementary appendages of larger metropolises indefinitely, like storm drains waiting to take the overflow. Instead, it is apparent that he visualized them as alternative forms of habitation which he hoped would eventually supplant existing cities.

Howard believed that, in the past, the failure of communitarian settlements and other efforts to achieve a more idyllic existence was attributable to a misreading of human nature by their proponents. Thus, the key to Howard's bold thinking was summed up in one sentence:

Whatever may have been the causes which have operated in the past, and are operating now, to draw the people into the cities, those causes may all be summed up as "attractions;" and it is obvious, therefore, that no remedy can possibly be effective which will not present to the people, or at least to considerable portions of them, greater "attractions" than our cities now possess, so that the force of the old "attractions" shall be overcome by the force of new "attractions" which are to be created. ¹⁸
It is usually assumed, said Howard, that there are just two alternatives where people can live: in the town or in the country. Both, while possessing some real advantages, are nevertheless characterized by some serious disadvantages which negate the value of residing there. Thus, in Howard’s metaphor, society was being tugged at by three different magnets: the town, the country, and a third configuration, a merging of town and country which would combine the advantages of both and none of their disadvantages. "Human society and the beauty of nature are meant to be enjoyed together," observed Howard. "The two magnets must be made one. As man and woman by their varied gifts and faculties supplement each other, so should town and country." It was clear to Howard that when people realized the marvelous benefits of the "Garden City," they would naturally be drawn to that magnet.

Howard strongly believed that the garden city could not be the product of coercion without undermining its basic foundations. Of what value was it, after all, to substitute political authoritarianism for environmental authoritarianism? Thus, unlike many of the Fabians and other Utopians, consent was all-important in Howard’s scheme of things, and although he delineated in precise detail a blueprint of the garden city, he freely admitted that it was "merely suggestive, and will probably be much departed from." In short, it was a far simpler and less complicated environment Howard envisioned where cities would be designed to ensure greater freedom to their inhabitants rather than robbing them of freedom.
Schematically the garden city, as Howard described it, was a series of concentric rights, together a mile and a half in diameter, partitioned by "six magnificent boulevards" radiating outward from the center. At the center of the complex where the boulevards originated, was a large five and a half-acre garden surrounded by public buildings which he labeled the "central park." The middle rings of the city were where the homes and gardens of the approximately 30,000 people would be located, and this area was bordered by a 420-foot "Grand Avenue," which, in actuality, was a greenbelt. Schools and churches were situated among the foliage. The outer ring of the periphery was the industrial belt, and beyond this lay open fields and agricultural land.

The disintegration of the social community within cities distressed Howard, therefore, the overriding theme of the garden city was a restoration of a sense of community, and the creation of an environment which would promote stable and enduring primary relationships. The city, in Howard's eyes, was ideally a place of "mutual help and friendly co-operation, of fatherhood, motherhood, brotherhood, sisterhood, of wide relations between man and man." Thus, Howard's little book represented a watershed in the history of the city, more visionary than refined, but deeply cognizant of some of the discomforting problems that would overtake cities around the globe within a half-century. Moreover, Howard was almost alone among thinkers of his day in recognizing the degree to which individual freedom had been eroded in the industrial cities of our modern world.

After the publication of Garden Cities of Tomorrow, membership rose by two-thirds in the Garden City Association, which had been formed in 1899 to
promote "the project suggested by Mr. Ebenezer Howard in his book." However, lest the figure be deceiving, it only amounted to a gain of two hundred people. *Garden Cities of Tomorrow* was dismissed by most reviewers as hopelessly Utopian, and the only favorable comments that can be found regarding it appeared in small radical London newspapers which, it can be assumed, offered their praise largely out of charity because of their general subscription to Howard's social and political views. Moreover, Howard was disappointed that his book had seemingly failed to convincingly sell his proposal to construct a model garden city. Indeed, it was not until several prominent individuals such as well-known Liberal politician, Ralph Neville, became interested in the garden city concept that it began to gain momentum. Both Raph Unwin and George Bernard Shaw were also impressed by the far-sighted stenographer's revolutionary ideas, and Shaw said of Howard that he "was one of those heroic simpletons who do big things whilst our prominent worldlings are explaining why they are Utopian and impossible." When Thomas Adams, later an influential city planner in this country, took over the administrative reins of the Association, with Neville as titular chairman, things began to move. "The social enthusiast yielded to the professional . . . and . . . the focus became what could be done rather than what should be done," wrote Stanley Buder.

The Association purchased 3800 acres at Letchworth in 1903, and soon a new town began to materialize. Though inspired by Howard, practical considerations began to modify the original design, and where the residents were supposed to hold common title to the community, a limited-dividend company had to be set
up in order to raise the necessary capital. When completed, Letchworth was but
"a pale shadow of Howard's vivid dream." More a well-organized suburb than a
new community, Thus, in 1919, five years before his death, Howard persuaded
the Association to make a second attempt which would more fully realize the goals
of the garden city, and shortly thereafter another tract of land twenty miles from
London was acquired, and the Welwyn Garden City was built. More successful
than Letchworth, but still by no means a totally faithful rendering of Howard's
ideal, Welwyn has winding streets, lovely brick homes built along shaded lanes,
axel parks, and a pleasant business district. Both communities sustained early
financial difficulties, but gradually over the years they were overcome and today
Letchworth and Welwyn are characterized by high land and property values,
though needless to say, they failed to achieve many of Howard's goals.

Britain's Post-War New Towns

At the end of World War II, surveying the desolation of English cities,
the British government determined not to repeat the mistakes of the past in rebuilding from the war's destruction. Moreover, government planners recognized that
some action needed to be taken to disperse English industry so that it would never again be a "sitting duck" for foreign attackers, congregated in huge metropolises, as it had been during the bombardment by the German Luftwaffe. Coincidentally, England was faced with severe growth problems and, therefore, in 1946, the Committee on New Town (The Reith Committee) was formed to formulate a plan whereby the overcrowded conditions of cities, particularly London, could be relieved by channeling families into a series of planned new satellite communities ringing the
English capital. It became readily apparent to the government that new towns
could also provide a solution to the first two problems: how to rebuild, and how
to disperse the country's industry,

Thus, the final fruition of Howard's philosophy came in 1946 with the
enactment of the New Towns Act (which was revised and re-enacted in 1962).
This act gave the Minister of Housing and Local Government the authority to pro-
pose new towns and establish public development corporations to oversee their
design and construction. The significance of the New Towns Act was that for
the first time in modern history the building of cities became a matter of long-
term national policy.

Each of the public development corporations was empowered to "plan,
build, acquire, manage, and dispose of property; it had access to long-term,
low-interest government funds; it was the recipient of the customary local and
governmental subsidies. Its functions were entrepreneurial, its powers public;
it's term of life limited; its immediate aims: efficient and socially approved
methods of town development." The act gave each corporation eminent domain
privileges, and, under most circumstances, it usually purchased two-thirds of the
designated site of the new town, leaving the remainder to private interests.
Upon completion of the town, control is transferred from the development corpora-
tion to the Commission for the New Towns, until some decision is arrived at per-
taining to their formal disposition.

Twenty-eight new towns have been initiated to date, and over a half-
million people reside in the fourteen begun during the 1940's which are largely
complete today. "The new class of towns," observed Lloyd Rodwin, "was the 'balanced' small city or metropolitan satellite. Features the towns shared in common were modern size, relatively low density, gross unmixed land uses, unified public land ownership, fairly rapid comprehensive development, and the emphasis on more open space: private and public open spaces, playgrounds, playfields, gardens, parks, and countryside." Although the target population of the new towns is between 35,000 and 60,000, one new town on which construction was recently started will boast a population in excess of 500,000. In this regard, it is projected that by the year 2000, the combined population of these twenty-eight communities will be more than three million, or almost five percent of the anticipated population of the country.

The New Towns Act was buttressed by the 1946 Distribution Industry Act (revised in 1965) which was designed to diversify British industrial location patterns and prevent new industry from settling in already overcrowded areas. Industries were offered lush incentives to locate in depressed areas of high unemployment or in areas over-dependent on declining industries. Another significant piece of legislation is the Town and Country Planning Act which gave county councils and city councils of metropolises with populations in excess of 100,000 extensive powers in the area of planning for future growth and development. All but the most minor development plans must be submitted to various planning authorities for approval within urbanized areas.

Another innovative piece of legislation, the 1952 Town Development Act provides government assistance to smaller existing communities for planned and
orderly expansion of sewage and water facilities. Moreover, in a unique arrange-
ment under provisions of the act, large cities burdened with housing shortages and
heavy densities are helping smaller towns provide facilities to draw off their excess
urban populations. This is being accomplished in several ways. Not only are
large cities assisting small towns to raise new revenues and attract new investment,
but they have financed the creation of joint large city-small town development
boards to guide their mutual development, particularly insofar as it is interrelated.
In essence, the program, therefore, involves the enlargement of present towns to
accommodate unwanted population from larger cities. The "expanding town"
concept is similar to the "new towns from small towns" concept that I have already
discussed. Although expanded towns are normally smaller than de novo English
new towns, the government has recently undertaken some sizable developments
of this type.

The Greenbelt Concept

Attention should be given at this point to a most remarkable British pro-
gram that is generally associated with the new towns movement: the acquisition
of land for permanent green belts circumambient to towns and cities. Contrary
to the United States, where both annexation and suburban development conspire
to swell the size of our urban areas, for decades the British have realized the
folly of unguided urban expansion, and in this connection have adopted a restric-
tive attitude toward metropolitan development. The first attempts to control the
growth of London and establish a greenbelt date back to Elizabeth I who, in 1580,
complained that "a city of 'great multitudes' " needs restraints "to prevent crow-
ded housing and great poverty." The idea of a "green girdle" was revived by
the garden city planners in the early part of the 20th century; and as growth problems began to multiply in English cities, particularly in London, the greenbelt concept won an increasing number of adherents. To illustrate the dimensions of the problem, between 1918 and 1939, the area of London doubled, yet the population grew by less than one-fifth, and it became ever more apparent with each passing year that steps would have to be taken to stabilize the expansion of London and other British cities. Being a small country with a large population, Great Britain could ill-afford misuse of her all too limited land resources.

In the 1927 and 1933 reports of the greater London Regional Planning Committee, noted planner Raymond Unwin proposed that greenbelts be utilized to contain urban growth; however, it was not until the adoption of the Greenbelt Act of 1938 that national acceptance was given to the concept. Unfortunately, the 1938 act was, in the minds of many observers, a rather lame approach to a serious problem. Whereas Unwin had recommended planning the orderly development of the urban fringes against a green backdrop, preventing sporadic and wasteful ribbon development by, in his words, "temporary reservation from building use of those lands which are not ripe for planning or for the provision of services," the 1938 act instead concentrated on the acquisition of limited parcels "of green open space against a backdrop of development." In other words, the purpose of the Act became secondary to its effects; and the "experts" that had engineered the proposal, it appears, sought only to enhance growth with greenbelts rather than making any real attempt to control it.
It was not until almost a decade later, in 1947, that the first significant step was taken to correct the inadequacies of the 1938 Act. The Town and Country Planning Act provided for London to begin the procurement of land for a permanent greenbelt around its periphery expressly for the purpose of controlling development. This power was extended to other cities in 1955. As a result of prodigious acquisition, by 1960, it was estimated that six percent of the English land surface was covered by greenbelt proposals, and if the "natural parks, landscape, and other related designations are included, some 29 percent of the country was subject to restrictions on development of one form or another."

In summary, a number of benefits accrue from the implementation of greenbelts, including regulation of metropolitan growth, protection of agricultural land, visual enhancement of the cityscape, furtherance of government policy, and the creation of recreation areas convenient to large metropolises. As a consequence, following Britain's lead, a number of other nations have already or are presently considering adopting such programs.

An Evaluation of Britain's New Towns

It is important that we survey in detail both the successes and failures of the British new towns experiment because if the United States does adopt meaningful new cities legislation, it will surely be patterned to a large degree, it is surmised, after that of her Atlantic ally.

Looking over the economic ledger, the British new towns have been quite successful. Of the eight located adjacent to London, as example, seven have to date shown a profit, and the eighth, which was saddled with abnormal costs due to
extensive rural slum clearance and other social objectives, may yet turn a profit.

Of this group of eight, four new towns are, for all practical purposes, complete, and their combined financial data appears as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New population</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New houses (public &amp; private)</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total jobs</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net capital advances</td>
<td>$242,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rate of interest</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit on general revenue</td>
<td>$1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit on sales</td>
<td>$648,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit on total</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By all accounts, the British new towns have been successful. Surveys indicate that four-fifths of the migrants to new towns are "glad" they made the move. Moreover, it is generally acknowledged that the average resident of the new towns enjoys a higher standard of living than he did before he moved there; he lives in a more spacious and comfortable home, he is closer to his place of work, and recreation is nearer at hand. Because most workers relocated to new towns with their companies, they were not thrust into an alien environment with few acquaintances or reference points. He can still have a draft after work with his familiar gang of associates. Interviews with new town inhabitants also confirm the fact that they like the two-country atmosphere, particularly when they contrast it to their previous living conditions. Thus, based on the salutary results of the initial new communities, the British government is accelerating their new towns program.

Although I have largely discussed the highlights of British new towns, there are nevertheless some weaknesses, in addition to administrative difficulties which will occur anywhere, which have been confirmed and which should be noted:
1. New towns have fallen short of reaching their primary objective: the reduction of population growth in and around the large urban centers, especially London. However, the explanation for this shortcoming is fairly simple. Reluctant to impress new controls on the population, the government has found no effective method to prevent replacement of those drawn into new towns by migrants from rural or depressed areas seeking better opportunities and higher wages. Nor has the government been able to prevent factories in London and other cities from expanding existing plants within those cities.

2. Lloyd Rodwin has stated that a "balanced" city has been the hardest goal to achieve; yet whether this is a legitimate goal is a matter of some controversy. Writers like B.J. Heraud, for instance, have disputed the contention that a socially balanced community should be an objective, arguing that most people are happiest when living in a community composed of members of their same social and economic class. This is the way the great majority of people live in most cities, states Heraud, and, therefore, attempts by planners to alter natural groupings of people produce little in the way of tangible results. Obviously, more research needs to be done in this regard.

3. The relocation of individuals into new towns produces some unusual problems; and it seems that wives suffer more than their husbands from the move. The initial loneliness associated with low density environment bothered a number of women interviewed by one researcher, as did the uncanny quietness of the new town after the din of the city. Many women missed old amenities such as neighborhood shopping areas, local entertainment, and the pervasive excitement of the city.
One of the most common complaints was separation from and relatives back in the city. The move to the new town meant a more home-centered life than they previously experienced, because few had friends in the new community (unlike their husbands) and most felt lonely and detached for at least a year before the natural processes of the community began to draw them into community life. This condition has been called "transitional neurosis" by Willmott and "new town blues" by Godschalk. Steps need to be taken, it is apparent, to make the transitional period easier on residents of new towns. One suggestion that sociologists have made is to move the immediate relatives, particularly aged parents, of each family to the new town.

4. Planners of the first new communities were deeply committed to the neighborhood unit concept, one of Clarence S. Stein's innovations, where dwellings would be grouped in neighborhood units, together with schools and some shops and services. In many instances, residences were grouped together facing a common green or park. It was conjectured that the neighborhood would be a catalyst for friendships and would generate a sense of community. Research in the new town of Stevenage, however, indicates that the neighborhood played a far more minimal role in establishing inter-personal liaisons and in fostering a sense of community than had been anticipated. Thus, planners of Cumbernauld, the well-known Scottish new town, have rejected the neighborhood concept in an effort to encourage inhabitants to take an active interest in the whole community.

5. One of the most difficult problems related to British new towns is the unbalanced age composition of residents. Herbert Gans noted the same problem in
his influential survey of "The Levittowners." New communities, like suburbs, are composed of generally the same age groupings with little variety evidences, and this produces what Willmott has called "social monotony." Not only do both the young and the old have much to contribute to each other, which is denied in such situations, but an unbalanced age composition leads to some rather serious municipal problems for local governing authorities, since each age group requires different services and public facilities. Young couples with children create a need for schools, playgrounds, and child welfare centers, however, within ten or fifteen years the situation will change and there will be an impacted labor market as local secondary school graduates seek employment, creating a whole new set of demands on the city. Because of the controlled size of the community, many of its young people will not be able to find suitable employment and will be forced to leave. Finally, there will come a time when the community will be composed largely of the elderly and retired, with their particular needs of medical care and public transportation. This will be accompanied by a decline of municipal tax revenues, due to the high number of people on pensions and retirement subsidies. Ultimately, the cycle will start all over again with an influx of young people as the old pass away. Thus, it is evident that a balanced age distribution among the population is integral to a well-functioning community, and, therefore, attempts to rigidly limit the population of new towns or to proceed without a balanced composition in the beginning, will result in the stagnation of the community.

In summary, the British new towns program, while by no means the last word in such developments, has served as a guidepost to the rest of the world.
Perhaps the most important lesson that has been learned is that rigid planning is difficult to implement and should be abandoned for what Godschalk has called "evolutionary" planning. In this process, the overall design takes shape one step at a time, and as negative feedback is registered, the plan is modified. There is no attempt to impress a universal design or structure on an unsuitable area or population; rather, plans are tailored to the needs of the people who will ultimately live in the community as much as possible, rather than forcing them to adapt to their environment.

New Cities of the World

In the past two decades, new towns and cities, many of them inspired by the British experience, have been launched throughout the world for a variety of reasons and objectives. Designs have ranged from traditional to revolutionary, and projects have run the gamut from isolated individual towns to complex regional developments composed of numerous units. It should be noted that the trend today is toward these integrated regional settlements. What follows is a brief summary of some of the more salient new community projects throughout the world and a description of their goals, which I have included not only because American legislators and planners will surely be guided to some extent by their designs and procedures in formulating any equivalent new communities program for this country, but also to demonstrate the flexibility of the new communities concept and to illustrate its applicability in a broad spectrum of circumstances and to satisfy a variety of national needs. So important are existing new communities as models, that
recently a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee traveled to Europe to study their progress and problems.

**Brazil: A New Capital**

Brasilia, the new space-age capital of Brazil, is probably the best known new city in the world, and certainly is one of the most dramatic cityscapes to be found anywhere. For centuries most of the population of Latin America has lived on the narrow coastal periphery of the continent, and the vast interior is, for all practical purposes, empty; hence the epithet "the hollow continent." After years of largely unsuccessful efforts to encourage development of the interior and in order to relieve pressures on the crowded coastal cities, the government of Brazil decided to take drastic action. A new capital city was designed deep within the country to supersede the historic capital, Rio de Janeiro, and as soon as it was completed, the government moved lock-stock-and-barrel to Brasilia. Slow to win acceptance in the beginning, Brasilia has produced something of an economic miracle in the interior; and although there is still some grumbling from partisans of Rio, the new capital of Brazil is finally taking on the appearance of permanence. Today Brasilia has a population of over 380,000.

**Venezuela: An Industrial New City**

The government of Venezuela, recognizing the need to diversify the nation's economy from its heavy dependence on oil, embarked on a bold project to 1) open the interior of the country, with its vast natural resources, and at the same time to 2) stimulate economic growth which would benefit the impoverished
natives of that area. On the Orinoco River, 300 miles from Caracas, a new city named Ciudad Cuayana was built in what was once a region of savanna and thick jungle. The development was carried out by a public corporation established in 1959, the Corporación Venezolana de Guayana (CVG), in conjunction with the Joint Center for Urban Studies at Harvard and M.I.T.

A sprawling industrial complex, centered around the large mining operations with ore-reduction plants and foundries, provides the nucleus of the city, which actually embraces several smaller communities. Some miles from the center, satellite centers will rise around an existing steel plant and projected chemical and aluminum plants, as well as a number of smaller factories. Hydro-electric power is generated by a new dam upstream at Guri and by nearby Macagua Dam on the Caroni River, which is spanned by a modern bridge with separate lanes for bicycles and pedestrian traffic apart from the auto lanes. The master plan calls for a broad highway to tie the various sections into a unified composite; and the highway has also given planners an opportunity to create a striking visual setting for the inhabitants of the new city. "Probably no other physical element will show the city's features as effectively as the highway and the planners have given special attention to the avenue's physical and visual aspects. In the design of the road they are considering aesthetics as well as efficiency in the location of the activities it will pass . . . ."

Plans have been made for a splendid cultural center which will one day host a technical college, a library, a hotel, museums, and other institutions. A variety of housing has been constructed, however, adequate housing at reasonable
cost remains the greatest problem of the new city. Expansive shanty towns or "barrios" have already grown up as thousands of poor inhabitants of the countryside swarm into the city searching for jobs.

It is estimated that by 1975, the city will have a population of some 400,000 people, and will provide one-fifth of the total manufacturing output of the country. Crucial to the success of the development is the fact that most of the land on which the city has been built is publically owned.

Cuidad Guayana is now a "boom town" which holds great promise for the future of Venezuela; and is also a vivid example of how new cities can be utilized as a vehicle for regional development.

In Latin America: New Cities and Modernization

Elsewhere in Latin America development of new towns and cities is taking place in a number of countries. One of the most interesting projects is a new town being planned by a Stanford University team on the ruins of a city in the Callejon de Juylas Valley destroyed in 1970 by an avalanche and earthquake. And in neighboring Bolivia, on the northeastern Altiplano, new communities, some very small in size, are being constructed in an effort to modernize the rural hinterlands, fulfilling one of the promises of the 1952 Revolution. The projects are also designed to introduce innovations and opportunities to the natives in response to their rising aspirations for a better life.

In some cases, the new towns have served simply to create a market and thereby draw the people into a money economy for the first time in their lives. It should be noted in this respect that these are a categorically different type of new
town than those discussed elsewhere. Many of the Bolivian new towns are the size of mere hamlets (caserío), in contrast to the impressive new cities of Venezuela and Brazil, and generally consist of adobe buildings plastered with mud and painted in simple pastels. A fortunate few even have tin roofs. Despite these differences, however, the Bolivian new towns demonstrate the adaptability of the new town concept to problems the world over. Moreover, they are of interest because perhaps more than other new town developments elsewhere on the globe, these caseríos are total environments, and many of them are promoting dramatic changes in the traditions and lifestyles of their inhabitants.

**Nigeria: A Resettlement Community**

Today in Africa and in other parts of the developing world where gigantic water resource development projects are being undertaken in an effort to expedite the modernization process or to irrigate parched lands, it is common for great numbers of people to be displaced because their homes lie in the flood pools created by the construction of enormous dams. As a consequence, new towns have been built to resettle the uprooted people; for example, New Daboud in Egypt, designed for the 60,000 Nubians forced to leave their homes because of Lake Nasser, formed by Aswan Dam; Akosombo, constructed to rehouse those displaced by the Volta Dam in Ghana; and New Bussa, a new city in Nigeria built in conjunction with the Niger Dams Project. A dam currently under construction at Kainji Island on the Niger will create a lake eighty-five miles long which will inundate the present community of Bussa in west-central Nigeria. Thus, the Bussawa, the people of Bussa, will be resettled in New Bussa, together with 6000 construction workers expected to work on the dam.
The present construction camp will ultimately be absorbed by New Bussa and will provide numerous amenities for the community when the senior staff and engineers involved in the construction of the dam, who are predominantly European, are gone. The Nigerian government has given the architects and planners a free hand in designing the structures and layout of the new city; however, since the town is largely Moslem, the positioning of many of the buildings vis-à-vis each other is structured in accordance with Moslem social traditions. Nevertheless, the design of New Bussa is far more appealing than the sterile environments of the new Aswan villages, and is a good example of effective land use planning.

It is expected that the creation of the new city will visibly improve the lives of the natives who will be relocated, particularly in regard to their hygiene and sanitation. Most of the criticism that has been heard is directed toward the native authorities administering the project who have little experience in urban government. Examples of poor administration include indecisive action to regulate the influx of squatters, the use of inferior building materials, and decisions which have jeopardized the economic viability of the community. It is apparent that capable administrators need to be trained to take over the city when it is completed, and should be regarded as an important component in the development of new communities in the emerging nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In addition, Brian C. Smith has observed that more attention needs to be paid to the individual and collective needs of the people who will be settled in this project and others of its type since it will involve radical socio-economic and cultural changes. New Bussa, however, remains a unique experiment in rapid urbanization, and the results
France: Planning for Growth

Paris, the fourth largest city in the world is, as any recent visitor can attest, plagued by grave over-population problems as a consequence of the post-war expansion of French industry. The face of the historic French capital is being irreparably altered as businesses enlarge their sales and administrative headquarters in downtown Paris, and as new factories contribute to the sprawl on the outskirts of the city. Traffic congestion has rendered whole sections of the city impassable during much of the day, there is not enough parking, and housing is woefully inadequate to accommodate the tide of migrants from rural France seeking the higher wages and better employment opportunities of the capital. In short, there exists a situation very similar to that which is characteristic of many American cities. The French, though, have sought more imaginative solutions to their urban problems than their American counterparts.

The French government is currently considering a massive decentralization program similar to that undertaken in Great Britain, calling for the construction of eight new cities stretching from Paris toward the Atlantic in a northerly direction. The government has already made inquiries to foreign investors to set up plants in the contemplated new cities. In addition, inducements, which some observers say border on bribery, are already being offered to French industrial concerns to move to the provinces, and the government hopes to accentuate this policy with the new communities program. Efforts are also underway to build up existing provincial towns so that they can accommodate the relocation of industries from Paris.
Attempts to stem the rapid growth of Paris and to decentralize its industry on a voluntary basis have not been widely successful. However, as a consequence, the government is discussing a variety of stringent sanctions to promote its objectives. One recent step was the application of a heavy tax to rents on downtown Paris office buildings in the hope of curbing new construction disfiguring the Paris skyline.

Although there are a small number of intriguing industrial new towns in France, represented by Bagnols-sur-Cèze north of Avignon, Fontenay-Aux-Roses close to Paris, and Mourenx in the Pyrenees, France has by no means been a leader in new town construction. In this connection, G.E. Kidder Smith has rightly observed, in light of the seemingly endless reservoir of talented French architects and the heavy devastation inflicted on many French towns during the Second World War which necessitated extensive rebuilding, that "It is more than regrettable that the tragedies of the war's destruction have not been seized on as opportunities in France . . . ."

Israel: New Towns To Make a Nation

Contrary to other developing nations, the new towns of Israel do not represent efforts to urbanize a rural population, since in 1948 when independence was declared, fewer than one Jew in five lived in rural settlements. Indeed, it was important then, and still is, for people to move to agricultural habitations and to accept the Spartan and dangerous life of the kibbutz in order to make the desert productive. Thus, new towns became a matter of government policy for other reasons. First, at the beginning of Israel's existence, the Jewish population was almost
exclusively concentrated in three cities: Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv, and Haifa. New towns, therefore, represented a method to draw population away from the three large metropolises and to relieve pressure on their municipal governments for housing and public services. Secondly, new towns promised to disperse the population of the country more evenly over the surface land area of Israel. Thirdly, they would be receptacles for the hundreds of thousands of Jews converging on Israel from points all over the globe, many of whom were unprepared for agricultural work. Finally, it is reported that new towns are currently being erected to secure the occupied West Bank of the Jordan River, and to displace the indigenous Arab population; the thinking of the government being that a resident Jewish population would make return of territories lost by Jordan during the Six-Day War more unlikely.

In 1965, according to Israeli government figures, more than one-third of all Israeli cities with populations over 10,000 were new communities. Thirty new towns have been built to date, however, they vary widely in size, design, degree of planning, and type of development; and question has been raised regarding the validity of applying a "new town" designation to some of them. The designation of a new town, it seems, is granted by a government ministry and is much sought after by communities because it earmarks them for preferential treatment in obtaining loans, grants, and other governmental assistance.

**Sweden: Suburban New Communities**

Stockholm is unique among cities of the Western world in that it has manifested a high degree of urban planning for over three centuries. In 1640, after one of a series of conflagrations that left the city--constructed primarily of wooden
structures—in charred ruins, a city planning office was established to oversee the
reconstruction of the community and a master plan guiding the growth of the
Swedish capital was adopted. In recent years, perpetuating this tradition of com­
prehensive planning, new suburban communities, called by Smith "new town sec­
tions," have been built as extension of Stockholm so that it would not become
overcrowded.

The first, Vallingby, which was authorized in 1951 and designed for a
population of 24,000, unlike the British new towns, is not a self-sustaining unit,
but instead a semi-satellite dependent on Stockholm economically. Most of its
population commutes daily to Stockholm to their jobs. Some shopping and cultural
facilities are offered; however, the concept of neighborhood centers as foci of
social interchange was rejected by Swedish planners, and no attempt was made to
diminish the attractions of Stockholm as the focal point and life of the urban region.
"Although Vallingby was designed as an attractive and functional environment,"
writes David R. Godschalk, "its social objectives were directed toward a matter­
of-fact extension of Stockholm, rather than the creation of a satellite town with
expected greater social integration," Moreover, instead of adopting the tradi­
tional garden city form as most other new town developments, Vallingby is a linear
city, inspired by the proposed 1882 design of Arturo Soria Y Mata for Madrid, and
is organized along a mass transit artery linking it with central Stockholm. One
guide-line that governs planning is that no apartment should be located further than
a quarter of a mile from a rapid-transit station, nor should single-family dwellings
be more than a half-mile away. Vallingby is the regional center of a linear
cluster of developments including Racksta, Blackeburg, Grimsta, Hasselby Gard, and Hasselby Strand, with a combined population of 65,000. Other similar strands, grouped like beads along rapid transit lines, emerge from Stockholm in other directions like the spokes of a wagon wheel radiating from the hub. The linear concept creates large green wedges between each strand which provide recreational and agricultural land close at hand for the city's population.

Vällingby was exquisitely planned and executed, and demonstrates a keen sensitivity to form and a unity between architecture and landscape that its residents can take pride in. Automobiles and trucks are relegated in large part to the fringes of the city, and one can reach Vällingby's centrum, notes Smith, from almost any section of the development without ever crossing a road. Contrary to Brasilia, which was largely the design of one man, Vällingby displays the work of a variety of imaginative architects, and some of its structures are quite handsome.

Finland: A Privately-Built New City

Near Helsinki, on an unspoiled 640-acre tract of forested land, lies one of the finest examples of a new community in the world: Tapiola Garden City. Created without benefit of government assistance or Stockholm's superb mass transit system, Tapiola was built by a private housing foundation, Asuntosaatio, supported by six trade unions and social welfare organizations. Of the classic garden city genre, construction commenced on Tapiola in 1952 and it now houses 17,000 inhabitants. The city is composed of three residential zones, each separated by a greenbelt. Ninety percent of its dwellings are privately owned, either individually
or through cooperative arrangements.

Tapiola, in this writer's opinion, is the most beautiful and well executed new city in the world, and is also noteworthy for the attention given to detail by the planners. Its founder, Heikki von Hertzen, has declared in this regard, that Tapiola's primary goal is the achievement of a "socially and, above all, biologically suitable environment for man to live in."

None of the new cities discussed here could be considered ideal; but nevertheless they represent collectively much of the best that is being done today in the world to create more optimum urban environments. For that reason, they merit our attention here in the United States for it is hoped that we can learn from both their mistakes and successes as we plan America's long-range urban future. In the end, however, any national new cities policy adopted by this nation must be consistent with our own institutions and heritage.
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CHAPTER IX

NEW COMMUNITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

... The ultimate test of civilization is whether or not it contributes to the growth and improvement of mankind. Does it uplift, inspire, stimulate, and develop the best in man? There really can be no other right purpose of community except to provide an environment and an opportunity to develop better people. The most successful community would be that which contributed the most by its operation to the growth of people.

James Rouse

We must now conceive the city, accordingly, not primarily as a place of business and government, but as an essential organ for expressing and actualizing the new human personality— that of 'One World Man.'

Lewis Mumford

The new city concept has won widespread acceptance throughout the world except in the United States where it is perhaps most desperately needed. Although scores of other nations regard new cities as the ultimate solution to their proliferating urban problems, the United States is but one of a handful of nations with the actual technology and financial resources to seriously undertake extensive new cities construction.

Despite the fact that the concept is today given little national recognition, the United States, strangely enough, has a long heritage of planned new community
construction. Washington, D.C., the capital of the nation, was conceived by the brilliant mind of the Frenchman Pierre Charles L'Enfant, and built on what previously had been uninhabited swampland. Washington's monumental layout, broad ceremonial avenues, traffic circles, and orderly numbering and lettering of streets are well known to any traveler to the District of Columbia; and although modern expansion and technological developments—especially the automobile—have perverted L'Enfant's original scheme and rendered it inadequate in many respects, Washington remains a distinctive and memorable exercise in new city construction.

Perhaps as an indication of the later disfavor this nation would show to the new cities concept, L'Enfant was never paid for his services and was forced to sue the United States Government. He failed to receive an adequate settlement and died in 1825 leaving an estate valued at $45.

Some colonial cities, notably Williamsburg, Virginia, were planned new communities; and both New Orleans and Savannah began in similar fashion. In the 19th century, Salt Lake City was laid out by Brigham Young in the Utah wilds, based on a plan for the city of Zion given by Joseph Smith to the elders of the Mormon Church in 1833.

Shortly after the First World War, a group of American intellectuals, architects, and planners including Clarence Stein, Charles Whitaker, Benton MacKaye, Stuart Chase, Henry Wright and Lewis Mumford formed an organization called the Regional Planning Association with the acknowledged purpose of promoting new communities and regional planning. Deeply influenced after seeing Welwyn, then under construction in England, one of the group's members, Clarence Stein,
returned to the United States "a disciple of Ebenezer Howard and Raymond Unwin," determined to build a garden city on this side of the Atlantic. In 1924, teaming up with city planner Henry Wright in what was the beginning of a long and successful association, Stein began work on Sunnyside Gardens, a privately financed suburban community project in Queens, New York. At a time when most housing developments were composed of endless rows of unimaginative, cramped, and monotonous row houses, Sunnyside Gardens offered a refreshing alternative. Wright demonstrated, as Unwin had alleged in an English pamphlet, that large amounts of open space in the center of blocks could be left open or landscaped without additional cost to the lots. Thus, large apartment complexes faced on common greens, playgrounds, and tennis courts; and against social conventions of the day, housing types were mixed throughout the development. One of the most interesting aspects of Sunnyside is the introduction of factory-made garage units, one of the first examples of the utilization of mass-produced construction components. Sunnyside Gardens was by no means a garden city, or even a new community for that matter, but it represents a landmark in modern design in the United States and a precursor of things to come.

Four years later, in 1928, Stein and Wright initiated work on Radburn, New Jersey, in an effort to realize their aspiration of building a complete garden city. However, as their plans progressed, they made numerous variations altering their original proposal, and in the process developed what Stein regarded as a major improvement in new town design. Although that may be overstating Radburn's success, nevertheless, the community displayed some notable innovations. First,
inspired by the Dutch habit of building their homes around large enclosed central greens, Stein and Wright conceived the superblock in place of the customary small repetitious block built on a grid. In Radburn, all homes faced inward on landscaped inner compounds perhaps four times the size of a normal block. Cul-de-sac, or dead-end roads, were incorporated into the design; and while they permitted access to the homes, they prevented dangerous through traffic. Secondly, Radburn was the first new town to be designed with the expressed purpose of controlling the automobile and relegating it to a complementary—not a controlling—role in the structure of the community. Roads had differentiated uses, with most traffic circulating only on major arterial roads. Walks were made part of the parks rather than the hazardous streets, and when the two intersected, walks were designed to cross over or go under the streets. In short, Radburn, as Stein remarks, "is above all a town for children;" safe, attractive and interesting, with abundant play-space.

Radburn was never completed because of the Depression; the corporation that built the town fell into bankruptcy. The dream of a new town was lost; and because it lacked a complete greenbelt, after the Second World War, new tract developments were built right up to Radburn's edge, destroying the natural setting of the new community.

As the Depression became more severe, the Federal Government for the first time began to recognize the importance of the health and vitality of our cities to the national economy; and the New Deal introduced programs to promote housing construction, slum clearance, and, most remarkably, the creation of new towns.
Under the enthusiastic direction of its administrator, presidential brain-truster Rexford Guy Tugwell, an ardent supporter of Howard's garden city concept, the Federal Resettlement Administration built three new towns: the well-known Greenbelt, Maryland; Greenhills, Ohio; and Greendale, Wisconsin. A fourth, Greenbrook, New Jersey, never left the planning boards because of local opposition. Unfortunately, none of the three that were completed ever became a truly self-sufficient new town of any size, and all have languished as suburban communities.

Greenbelt, Maryland, a crescent-shaped city with winding streets, surrounded by a verdant greenbelt and bordering an artificial lake on the west side, was the most complete realization of a garden city in America up to that time. Norris, Tennessee, built by the Tennessee Valley Authority during the same period, is today considered by many to be a better and more successful example of a new community.

In recent years, only two new towns have been constructed in the United States, both by private developers, and both in the Washington, D.C. area. The best known is Reston, Virginia, situated on 10.6 square miles of pasture and woodlands in Fairfax County, Virginia, four miles west of Dulles International Airport. Like Howard's garden cities, Reston adopted a circumferential greenbelt to contain growth, maintained by strict local government control. A man-made lake at the center of the project enhances the city both aesthetically and recreationally, and provides a focal point for the community. On its shores are situated many of the residential dwellings of the community as well as a small commercial area with a broad piazza where people can meet and plays and other social events can be held, framed against the lake.
Reston, however, has had economic difficulties from its inception, resulting from--in addition to the credit squeeze--the lengthy commute to Washington, the expensive nature of both apartments and houses (which has excluded many needed service personnel), and the inability to attract enough new industry to provide an independent economic base for the community. As a result of these and other lesser problems, Reston fell into receivership. Under the new ownership of Gulf Oil Company, efforts are being made to remedy these difficulties, but not without some concessions which have detracted from the unique architecture and character of the community.

A more hopeful development is the new city of Columbia, situated in Howard County, Maryland, about an hour's drive from both Baltimore and Washington. In front of the Rouse Company Building in Columbia is a bronze sculpture of highly stylized figures radiating outward from a central axis, the "people tree," which the community's founder and developer, James Rouse, says "symbolizes the theme" of his new city. Columbia, according to Rouse, is an attempt to create a well-balanced community, to bring people together, to revive the concept of the neighborhood, and to cut across racial, religious, occupational, and ethnic differences. Many of Columbia's residents are not even aware of the structural inducements designed by the planners to promote "neighborliness and understanding," such as communal driveways and clustered mailboxes. And although more conventional planners are aghast, a deliberate effort is being made to incorporate all income groups into the community structure by providing public and low-income housing as well as apartments and houses running the whole spectrum of cost and style.
Rouse believes that what "has gone wrong in many cities is neglect of the relationship between people and their physical surroundings." Thus, the architects and planners have striven to create an unusual juxtaposition of nature and architecture in Columbia with emphasis on creating a total environment. In this regard, Morton Hoppenfeld, Director of Planning and Design for the Rose Company, has written: "A good urban environment is not only one of high levels of sensual satisfaction and functional efficiencies, it is also essentially a place of optimum choices where many of the needs and amenities of contemporary life are freely accessible."

Columbia has drawn considerable industry into its fold, and while not completely self-sustaining, it should be so within a few years. In this area, Rouse has followed a philosophy that new industry will follow the dollar. Thus, after he and his associates made a sizable investment in launching the community, and following generous overtures to a score of large industries, their efforts began to pay dividends. In May, 1969, Rouse told a small meeting on new towns presided over by the Vice President of the United States, that in the previous twenty months, twenty-five new industries had located in Columbia and, as a result, the county's taxable base had been doubled.

Thus, while new city construction in the United States has been neither broad-scale nor extremely successful, it is clear that Americans have in the past exhibited idealism and imagination in the design of their cities. As we enter a new era of urban development, we surely must abandon the traditions of the past and seize the "opportunity to engage in creating a new kind of community the
shape of which no expert can foresee and to which every citizen can contribute."

What follows is a national legislative program to facilitate this objective.

**New Cities: A Revolutionary Program**

In his 1970 State of the Union message, President Nixon stated that "the federal government should be in a position to assist in the building of new cities and the rebuilding of old ones." Unfortunately, despite the President's ostensible support, no new legislation has been offered by the Administration or passed by Congress to promote the large-scale construction of new communities in the United States. The only existing legislation, Title VII of the 1970 Housing Act, is essentially the same as Title IX of the 1968 Housing Act; and although it has been designated as the New Community Development Act, it has been largely ineffective in promoting construction of new communities. The Act provides no actual grants or financial assistance to developers, but merely authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to guarantee bonds marketed by developers to finance new communities.

A revolving fund, authorized by the Act, contains only limited appropriations, and therefore, even HUD's ability to underwrite new community construction if it wanted to is severely limited. To supplement provisions of the Act, HUD, under other programs, can extend grants to state and local public bodies for planning assistance, water and sewer facilities, and the acquisition of land for open space. However, these programs all have only limited monies available, and waiting lists at HUD contain more applications than can be serviced in years.
The 1970 version of the New Community Development Act, in one of its few changes over the previous act, extended eligibility to public as well as private new town developments. Unfortunately, the Bureau of Management and Budget, presumably with White House support, is trying to exclude public developments from coverage under the Act through an administrative artifice by refusing to fund the difference between taxable securities and tax exempt bonds. This action, which would cripple new communities construction, has been applauded by conservative elements in this country that maintain that although the government can provide the rules under which private enterprise will operate, it is up to private enterprise to execute national policy. At the present time, the issue of public developers remains unresolved, but it is a conspicuous example of the disinterest that the Nixon Administration has shown in finding lasting solutions to our urban problems. Existing legislation does not really represent a tangible commitment by the federal government to do more than participate superficially in a handful of new community projects.

Thus, this writer is convinced that the impetus for a national new communities program must come from Congress. The concept has broad non-partisan support in both the House and Senate, and last March unlikely proponent Alabama Senator John J. Sparkman, caustic foe of federal waste and overspending, introduced a bill in the Senate which called for an expansion of the present guarantee of obligations for new communities. Sparkman's bill would create a community development corporation in the Department of Housing and Urban Development that would provide up to $500 million in loan guarantees and coordinate other broad
assistance to both public and private new community developers. Rep. Thomas L. Ashley of Ohio has introduced a similar measure in the House, and the only real difference between the two bills is that the House version would permit overall guaranteed obligations of $650 million, $150 million more than the Sparkman bill. Surprisingly, contrary to the past when new communities proposals have generated vicious public opposition, during hearings this year no significant foes came forth. While passage of the Ashley-Sparkman proposal would be a step in the right direction, it would be only a small step. It may well be, as Milwaukee Mayor Henry Maier has called it, "The most far-reaching and most visionary piece of urban legislation that has been offered before the Congress in the history of the country." However, Mayor Maier's statement is more a commentary on this nation's past failure to initiate significant legislation in the urban area than it is praise for the Ashley-Sparkman bill. In this regard, I offer the following legislative proposal to truly implement a national new communities policy and to provide a possible solution to our ever-increasing urban problems:

1. To overcome our highly segregated national approach to urban problems, the creation of a national land use policy in the United States is essential. Planners must determine how the surface land of this country can be most efficiently and advantageously utilized and developed in the best interests of the American people, and with the least ecological damage. In this connection, it must be discovered where the population of the nation can best be located so as to provide our citizens, both present and future, with the most opportunities, the best living conditions, and the highest standard of living possible. As part of this policy, sites
must be selected in every state in the nation for the establishment of new communities.

2. As the cornerstone of a national development strategy, a massive new communities program should be created that would empower the federal government to construct one thousand new communities over the next thirty years with populations varying from 50,000 to 300,000 people. Such a program, admittedly, would cost in excess of one trillion dollars. While this sum is astronomical, nevertheless it is equivalent to total U.S. expenditures for national defense since the end of World War II. A thirty-year expenditure of one trillion dollars beginning today will, because of inflation and economic growth factors, represent a small smaller chunk of our national budget than it did during the period 1946-1971. Thus, in recommending this program, I am calling for a change of national priorities, a subject that has provoked vigorous national debate in recent years. In this regard, any nation which places its foremost emphasis on the creation of sophisticated instruments of mass destruction instead of on improving human living conditions within its borders and throughout the world is a poor society indeed. It is therefore imperative, in light of the new realities of this, the post-industrial era of mass society and the corporate state, that the United States adopt a fresh concept of national security, one which balances military strength with domestic strength. Freedom from attack from abroad means little to people for whom life in our cities is not worth living. This done, we can end the American government’s preoccupation with death and get on with the business of living in this society.
To execute the policy just outlined, a new super-department should be created within the federal government, similar to the Environmental Protection Agency, which would coordinate the efforts of both government agencies and private concerns in the construction of new communities. Although I am generally hesitant to recommend the enlargement of our present bureaucracy, it will be necessary in this instance because such a program will have to draw on the resources and cooperation of all other departments and agencies of the federal government; it is too broad an undertaking to be placed under the control of any one existing department. Once construction is completed on a new community, it will be transferred to the administrative control of a special commission, and ways will be sought to liquidate federal ownership of property and facilities. Residents of each new community will set up local governments to manage their affairs just as anywhere else. However, the commission will continue to have some policing powers over it lest it fail to preserve the original character and intent of its master plan, or fail to comply with national standards.

3. Reston's difficulties underscore the need to attract a viable economic base to new communities. In this regard, I propose a national industrial locator, an agency operated by the federal government similar to that which exists in Great Britain today, except far more extensive in powers and scope. This agency would regulate and review the location of all industrial activity in the United States. For example, any company which wanted to expand or build a new plant would submit a request to this agency, along with its criteria for a location; and, after intensive study, the National Industrial Locator would offer the firm its choice
of perhaps three to ten locations which meet the firm's standards and which would be in accord with the prescribed goals of the National Land Use Policy. Tax incentives and other inducements would be offered companies for moving into less desirable areas. In this method, much new economic growth in this country could be channeled into new communities.

4. I recommend legislation which would establish a national Green Belt program. This program would provide federal matching funds, and some outright grants, to cities and communities, with preference given to new communities, to purchase or acquire easements on land on their peripheries which would become permanent green belts. In addition, the National Park Service and other agencies of the Department of the Interior, such as the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, should be assigned the responsibility of establishing a series of new "urban" national parks, near our great population centers, as part of a country-wide green belt strategy. Such parks would not only relieve the strain on many of our present national parks, but would provide open space and recreation close at hand for urban residents, and would be a particular blessing to center city residents with limited mobility.

5. The federal government should establish a policy of locating federal installations, facilities, and offices in new communities as a spur to their economic development. Likewise, federal assistance should be given in the form of airports and other projects; and whenever possible, new communities should be combined with other federal projects. As example, new communities could be constructed on the shores of federal reservoirs and other impoundments. This would provide
the new community with hydro-electric power (in most cases), recreation, and aesthetic enhancement, not to mention the fact that most reservoirs draw thousands of vacationers and afternoon boaters who would pour money into their economy.

6. Encouragement and attention must be given to those families and individuals willing to move from our urban ghettos to new communities. Subsidized and public housing, family counseling, and job training programs must be available to make the transition smooth and productive, and to insure that they do not become a burden on the new community. To prevent the over-concentration of disadvantaged elements—which would destroy the quality of life in the new city by overloading its schools, social service facilities, and budget—only a specified number of guaranteed income payments (which, hopefully, will have supplanted welfare by that time) will be dispensed to each municipal government. If for some reason a new community has an excess of guaranteed income recipients, then the extraneous families and individuals will be transferred at government expense to other new communities where their quota is not filled.

The program just outlined provides a practical—and perhaps the only real—solution to the overwhelming urban problems afflicting this nation. Not only would its adoption promote stability within this society, but it would make a new level of life possible for urban Americans.
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CONCLUSION

THE URBAN PROSPECT

Speaking before the International Press Institute Assembly in London in 1965, Walter Lippman reflected on the realities of greatness: "A great society," he noted, "is simply a big and complicated urban society." If this is true, it is time that we as a nation begin to weigh whether we are willing to pay the price of transitory, often illusory, greatness. Must we really be "big," "complicated," and "urban?" Is greatness, defined this way, the goal to which Americans really aspire, or are not happiness, enhanced freedom, health, community, security, and beauty—what philosophers call the "good life"—more important to the majority of our people?

It is the contention of this study that the attainment of such humanistic goals is impossible within America's present urban context; and in this connection it should be clear that urban America has gotten out of hand, that it is too large and complex to really relate to the individual, and that our monstrous cities are inimical to the very attributes cities are supposed to possess. As this writer has already observed, tyranny in years past was uniquely human, however, today's tyranny is of a different nature: cold, faceless, plastic, technological. Instead of a harsh sovereign we are confronted with a system that has run amok, and the problem facing us is how to preserve human values in this demoralizing type of society.
We are confronted with a crisis of organization, moreover, of spirit, in America today, and unless steps are taken now to conclusively reverse this trend, the future quality of life in the United States will be seriously affected. Perhaps most frightening of all, there are signs that this urban malaise is already having a disturbing affect on our political institutions, and this in turn is challenging the efficacy of democratic government in America. In this connection, it is not a question of whether our cities will be saved from their inevitable fate, as John Lindsay contends, but whether or not our nation will be saved from collapsing from its own overweening weight and hubris.²

The common functions of the city are still important, and although the city has fallen into a period of decline, it has not been my purpose to suggest abandoning the city form, as this writer noted in an earlier chapter. For if the city is the cause of despair, it is also the source of hope. The same forces which have made the city unlivable can be mobilized and redirected, through the vehicle of comprehensive planning, to revitalize our urban landscape. If modern man can master these forces which currently threaten his very existence, the city can once again provide the means and impetus for mankind to attain its highest aspirations. In this sense, the problem of our cities is largely political, for as Aristotle first observed over two thousand years ago, the form of the city is necessarily the consequence of the type of government which presides over it.³

The specific focus of this study, therefore, has been to emphasize the contribution that the creation of a vast new cities program, as an integral part of a larger national urban policy, could make toward eradicating our urban and other
societal ills. New cities, as they have been described, represent a move toward rationalization of our environment and man's role within that environment; and whereas contemporary America is overgrown, complex, polarized, and characterized by misplaced human goals, new cities would be constructed in an effort to give form and comprehensibility to our environment, to decentralize power and reemphasize human values, and in the end to overcome the dehumanizing policies which have become institutionalized in this nation in recent years. As Robert Dahl has so aptly concluded:

Like oil spilling from some giant tanker, crippled and drifting, megalopolis spreads and threatens life. In order to halt and finally reverse the spread of megalopolis we would have to reject the American booster mania that blindly equates the better with the bigger, whether cars, office buildings, strawberries, or cities. We would have to plan consciously to prevent cities from growing too large and learn how best to do so. We would have to establish a vast program of creating new cities and in this way thin out megalopolis, replace boundaries of asphalt with boundaries of woods and fields, and learn what surely must be counted among the greatest of the arts, though it is no part of American tradition or consciousness, the art of building great—not giant—cities. 4

As is evident, Dahl's conception of greatness is far different from that enunciated by Walter Lippman. Dahl is concerned with how habitable cities are, not how large or complex they are.

It is said that human kind cannot bear too much reality, and this is borne out in criticisms by philosophers no less than imbeciles that the construction of new cities on a massive scale is hopelessly utopian and therefore an inadequate solution to the problems addressed in this study. This writer would be the first to grant that there is a strong normative element involved in new cities schemes, however, the nature of the crisis at hand is such that anything less than what have been
described as "extreme" solutions are inescapably earmarked for failure. Indeed, we must explore all the options that confront us today, regardless of how impractical or questionable they appear at first glance, for in the words of Senator J. William Fulbright: "We must dare to think about 'unthinkable things' because when things become unthinkable, thinking stops and action becomes mindless."  

The problem, as has been suggested, is clearly one of policy, not of ability, for technology has given man virtually unlimited power to shape his environment in accordance with his goals and desires, and hence to eliminate the environmental determinants which in the past often stood between him and the realization of his highest aspirations for himself and his society. Fundamental to this problem is the fact that today the social sciences are bogged down in an overemphasis on systematic analysis and quantification, and this has produced an ingrained resistance to new ideas and led to cynicism instead of resulting in "purposeful and meaningful action." In this regard, it must be remembered that many of the most critical problems facing this nation are non-operational from a methodological perspective, and, as a consequence, many modern behavioralists have to a large degree lost touch with the qualitative changes witnessed in recent years in the needs of man. This is not to say that we must ignore empirical considerations, for theory is and always has been an interplay of realist and normative approaches. It is merely an affirmation that they must be pursued together if we are interested in the attainment of successful political philosophy and meaningful solutions to the problems before us.
"There is too little romance left in the world and too much standardization," writes T. D. Allman, "(a)nd if we manage, somehow, not to wind up napalmed, we surely will find ourselves embalmed in plastic." The grim predictions such as that made by Allman need not come true, however, if only we consciously strive to mobilize the collective frustrations of urban Americans, as Mumford advises, and strike back at the forces within this society which are attempting to remake man in their own faceless image.

The post-war era is over; we have entered a new age characterized by new realities and corresponding demands, and as a consequence, the impact of social and technological change taking place in our contemporary world is so overwhelming as to render past comprehension and understanding inadequate. If we stand still we run the risk of losing any hope of shaping the future. Instead of flailing at what our cities are, or collecting what is too often meaningless data which explains only the obvious, we must set our sights on what our cities can potentially be, seeking inspiration from the classical Greeks who tended to merge, both in their language and their thought, the "is" and the "ought." This study, therefore, is an attempt to provide a goal, and at the same time, a method for realizing a more humanistic society. Although admittedly this kind of study has shortcomings, this author has proceeded along lines first suggested by Plato, who admonished men to inquire into the principles upon which a ship was built if that ship was in danger of perpetually floundering. In this regard, this writer has endeavored to put forth a new blueprint for the next America.
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