

# REBUILDING AMERICA: THE NEXT NATIONAL PRIORITY

EDITED PROCEEDINGS OF A TWO-DAY DISCUSSION BY URBAN EXPERTS AND PRESS CONFEREES AT ARDEN HOUSE, HARRIMAN, N.Y., MARCH 29-30, 1971, UNDER THE SPONSORSHIP OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, AND THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

## **CONTENTS AND PROGRAM**

Summary by Jack Patterson, Cities Editor, Business Week

### **A. URBAN LAND USE IN AMERICA** FIRST SESSION: MARCH 29, 1971

William L. Slayton, Executive Vice President, AIA, Chairman

1. **The Past:** Urban Land as Resource and Commodity, John W. Reps, Professor of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, and Planner and Historian
2. **The Present:** Who Really Decides How Urban Land Is Used Today? James D'Orma Braman, former Mayor of Seattle, recently retired as Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, Department of Transportation
3. **The Future:** A National Program for Coherent Urban Growth and Settlement, Rep. Thomas L. Ashley (D., Ohio), Chairman, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Urban Growth, House Committee on Banking and Currency

### **B. NEW PATTERNS OF PLANNING** SECOND SESSION: MARCH 29, 1971

Mr. Reps, Chairman

1. **The Past:** The New Responsibility of the State for Urban Growth, Robert McCabe, General Manager, New York State Urban Development Corporation (now Executive Director, Detroit Renaissance Program)
2. **The Present:** Metropolitan Government Acquires New Powers, James Hetland, Chairman, Twin Cities Metropolitan Council
3. **The Future:** Planning for the Suburban Majority, James Rouse, President, The Rouse Company, Developer of the new town of Columbia, MD

### **C. THE SICK CITY** THIRD SESSION: MARCH 30, 1971

DOES IT HAVE A FUTURE? Mr. Hetland, Chairman

1. **The Past:** Beating the System, Archibald Rogers, FAIA. Chairman of the Board, RTKL Inc., Baltimore, MD
2. **The Present:** Rebuilding the Inner City-Why? For Whom? Melvin Mister, Exec. Dir, Redevelopment Land Agency, D. C.
3. **The Future:** Donald Canty, Editor, City ters - The Rise of Urban Advocacy, Eugene Brooks, Executive Director, Urban Workshop, Los Angeles, Calif.

### **D. THE PRESS** FOURTH SESSION: MARCH 30, 1971 TECHNIQUE AND RESPONSIBILITY Mr. Abel, Chairman

1. **The Past:** Daniel Schorr, Columbia Broadcasting System
2. **The Present:** Ian Menzies, Associate Editor, The Boston Globe
3. **The Future:** Donald Canty, Editor, City magazine

## PRESS REPRESENTATIVES

**Donald Canty**, Editor, City Magazine Washington, D. C.  
**Jack Claiborne**, Editorial Writer, The Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, North Carolina  
**Ronald E. Cohen**, News Editor, United Press International, New York, New York  
**Brian W. Dickinson**, Reporter, The Providence Journal-Bulletin Providence, Rhode Island  
**James D. Dilts**, Urban Affairs Writer The Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Maryland  
**Evan Frances**, Special Projects Editor Ladies Home Journal, New York, New York  
**Juanita Greene**, Urban Affairs Writer The Miami Herald, Miami, Florida  
**Thomas Griffith**, Editor, Life Magazine New York, New York  
**Philip Herrera**, Associate Editor, Time Magazine, New York, New York  
**Ada Louise Huxtable**, Architecture Editor, The New York Times New York, New York  
**Monroe Karmin**, Urban Affairs Writer The Wall Street Journal, Washington, D. C.  
**Dick Kleeman**, Urban Affairs Writer The Minneapolis Tribune, Minneapolis, Minnesota  
**Peter Kohler**, Director of Editorials WCBS-TV, New York, New York  
**Wolfgang Langwiesche**, Roving Editor Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, New York  
**George McCue**, Art & Urban Design Critic, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Missouri  
**Ian Menzies**, Associate Editor, The Boston Globe, Boston, Massachusetts  
**Owen Moritz**, The Daily News, New York, New York  
**Thomas Morris**, Newsday, Garden City, Long Island, New York  
**Ron Nessen**, Urban Affairs Correspondent, NBC News Washington, D. C.  
**M. W. Newman**, Architecture Writer The Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Illinois  
**Jack Patterson**, Urban Editor Business Week, New York, New York  
**Bruce Porter**, Associate Editor Newsweek, New York, New York  
**Fred Powledge**, Author, Brooklyn, New York  
**Don Ridings**, Urban Affairs Editor The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky  
**Sharon Rosenhouse**, Urban Reporter The Bergen Evening Record Hackensack, New Jersey  
**Daniel Schorr**, CBS News Washington, D. C.  
**Michael J. Sniffen**, The Associated Press, New York, New York  
**Marcia Spires**, Executive Editor Living Now, New York, New York  
**Richard Todd**, Associate Editor The Atlantic Monthly, Boston, Massachusetts  
**James Welsh**, Urban Affairs Writer The Evening Star, Washington, D. C.

## OTHER PARTICIPANTS

**Wayne Barrett**, Interracial Reporting Fellow Columbia University, New York, New York  
**David Bowes**, Account Executive Henry J. Kaufman & Associates Washington, D. C.  
**Muriel Campaglia**, Administrator, Public Relation, The American Institute of Architects Washington, D. C.  
**Howard Cayton**, Director, Urban Renewal Demonstration Program HUD, Washington, D. C.  
**Robert Denny**, Vice President Henry J. Kaufman & Associates Washington, D. C.  
**Robert F. Hastings**, FAIA, President The American Institute of Architects Washington, D. C.  
**William L. Slayton**, Executive Vice President, The American Institute of Architects Washington, D. C.  
**Christopher G. Trump**, Assistant Dean Graduate School of Journalism Columbia University, NY, NY

## SUMMARY

Last March, the American Institute of Architects and the Columbia University School of Journalism assembled several dozen experienced urban affairs practitioners and writers at Arden House, the university's mountaintop conference center near New York City. The host organizations set before the group a sweeping topic for discussion: Rebuilding America-The Next National Priority.

No one was surprised, of course, when the two-day meeting concluded without any firm plans or definite timetable for accomplishing this ambitious task. Yet, a central theme of considerable importance did emerge from the proceedings. Early in the meeting, Rep. Thomas L. Ashley, author of the new-communities legislation that is part of last year's housing act, told the group: "A national policy for coherent urban growth has become a live possibility." He explained his optimism: "There is a growing awareness that the deterioration of our cities, the sprawl of our suburbs, the desolation of our rural life is a matter of legitimate, indeed compelling, public policy."

If the Congressman's assessment is correct, and the evidence suggests that it is, then the AIA conference takes its place as part of an essential public debate over what is without question the most critical piece of public business before the country: How to guide future growth to reverse the dissolution of our present cities, to order the mindless spread of our cancerous suburbs, and to do both in ways that will give the 60 million to 70 million new people scheduled to join us by the end of the decade a wider range of social and environmental options than we ourselves have enjoyed.

To allow full ventilation of the complex issues on which the nation must soon reach a consensus, authorities from several disciplines-architects, planners, public officials, a private developer - presented papers which fellow experts and members of the press proceeded to dissect. The discussions, spirited and informed, reflected not only the impressive expertise of the urban professionals but also the rising competence in reporting urban matters. In the past few years, national news and business magazines, a national newspaper, the TV networks, and many distinguished local newspapers have perceived the importance, and the intricacies, of urban affairs and have assigned well-qualified journalists to probe beneath the shifting surface of the day-to-day news for the meaningful underlying trends.

Not surprisingly, in view of the qualifications brought to it, the conference generated a wealth of valuable insights into the country's urban plight and what is being, and should be, done about it. Belief in its usefulness has led the AIA to publish this edited version of what was said. The Institute is confident that reading the account that follows will bring to

people concerned with the urban future a rewarding mixture of information, experience, and knowledgeable judgments about the central city and its suburbs. Meantime, a preliminary summary and a few observations might be helpful.

Talk of a national growth policy, darkly ominous with threat to the ingrained principle of land as a speculative commodity, hinting at heavy-handed public interference with the private market, rings in many ears as distinctly un-American. Professor John Reps launched the conference by showing, in absorbing detail, that this impression is totally false. Arguing for creating public land banks to control future urban growth, he described how numerous U.S. cities, including Washington, D.C., and many state capitals, were founded by public bodies which acquired land and carried out physical planning and development. Failure to maintain this active public role, Professor Reps asserted, has undercut legitimate public interest in the urban environment.

With this historical perspective before them, participants then heard and questioned:

James D'Orma Braman, who contended that an integrated transportation network can provide a rational framework for regional urban development.

Rep. Ashley, who made a case that his new legislation, Title VII of the Housing Act of 1970, provides the nucleus for the evolving national growth strategy.

Robert McCabe, who described the work of the Urban Development Corporation, a New York State agency that is one of the nation's most innovative mechanisms for shaping urban growth.

James Hetland, who told about the successes of the innovative Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, which comes as close as any organization in the country to mobilizing the resources of a multi-county area for overall planning goals.

James Rouse, the country's most dedicated and persuasive business voice for rational urban growth, who told how lessons learned building his new town, Columbia, Md., are being transferred to central city problems.

Archibald Rogers, FAIA, who again opened historical vistas, this time from the architectural tradition, with a provocative case for creating "parallel institutions" that can carry out the work of rebuilding society at a time when many existing institutions are stalemated.

Melvin Mister and Eugene Brooks, who shared their experiences as development official and advocate architect, respectively, working in inner-city communities on opposite coasts. Each argued eloquently that, given resources, black leaders and citizens can bring a new and unique cultural vitality to the cities the whites are leaving behind.

At the end, the experts fell silent, and the journalists, primed by co-professionals Elie Abel, Daniel Schorr,

Ian Menzies, and Donald Canty, spent the last few hours taking their own pulses, assessing what had been said, and examining how better to play their undeniably influential roles in helping to shape public attitudes toward the emerging urban growth policy.

As matters of pride and tradition, newspapermen cultivate tough-mindedness and skepticism toward facts and motives, especially those of people with schemes for bettering society. Throughout the conference, the steady thunder of this professional attitude was heard. Journalists will not lose sight of the fact, for example, that the kind of new proposals heard during the conference, whatever their merit, run smack against hard-set political attitudes. The reporters would not let Mr. Braman forget that his carefully worked-out transportation network for Seattle was rejected by voters, just as similar mass transportation plans in other cities have been turned down. (Washington, D.C.'s Metro is a conspicuous exception.) On another front, some reporters worried that big, powerful organizations like the Urban Development Corp. might trample down the struggling movement for community participation. Concern for the central city ran high among the journalists. Repeatedly they questioned whether regional rapid transit, and especially new towns, really offer new hope for inner-city residents or simply give suburbanites new escape hatches from the burdensome troubles of the city.

The conference underscored, in this respect, possibly the most critical dispute in the national urban growth policy debate: How to resolve the city-suburb face-off. Clearly, it poisons efforts at coping with all sorts of specific problems. Suburbanites seek to withhold resources from the central city. Central city officials, in turn, seek to block any program not touching directly on their needs. In a country where public money flows from the push and shove of politics, this conflict seems inevitable. But the conference spotlighted clearly-and this might be the most significant single conclusion to emerge-that the city-suburb conflict must somehow be merged into a concern for the larger metropolitan wide city, and doing this must be the task of a national urban policy.

Not everybody was happy with the scope of the meeting. A few reporters complained of neglected issues-drugs, jobs-and even the lack of that essential contemporary ingredient, relevance.

Some of this feeling, to offer a personal interpretation, came from the implacable weight of the complexity of urban problems. It never seems possible to include everything. Daniel Patrick Moynihan says that "urban planners are traumatized by the realization that in urban affairs everything is related to everything else." If experts buckle, why not journalists?

Probably this unease, though, stemmed more

from the nagging awareness that the country lacks a genuine commitment to coping with urban ills, especially the impacted troubles of the inner city, on anything approaching the necessary scale. Many reporters at the conference expressed fear that readers and listeners are bored hearing about the problems of the city. The conference, then, as Ada Louise Huxtable pointed out, "has reflected reality in that Americans are more preoccupied with escaping the inner city than staying there, Congress is more interested in subsidizing the dream of suburbia than the rebuilding of the inner city."

For years, the uncomfortable feeling that much talk would produce little action has given many of the meetings on urban affairs a dispirited and futile air. Dispirited and futile do not describe the Arden House conference. Yet, as Elie Abel commented, "All the things we care about here are somehow made to appear frivolous in our official set of priorities." The informed and sophisticated people who gathered at this conference knew that, in magnitude of purpose and in distance from the contemporary national scene, this goal of a comprehensive national urban strategy, backed with adequate resources, can appear so visionary as to approach fantasy.

**Thus, the unasked question fed the feeling of irrelevance for some: What reason is there to suppose that a country that will not feed all its hungry, shelter all its homeless and wretchedly housed, care for all its sick, minister to all its neglected children, a country that turns most of its unimaginably vast resources to destruction, a country where the tireless pursuit of private gain shoulders aside the most urgent public needs - what reason is there to suppose that such a country will move to repair its unraveling social fabric, restore and rebuild its cities to greatness, fulfill the suburban promise of greenness and openness, and create a just and humane environment for all its citizens?**

The conference offered no better answers to this disturbing question than those implied in two remarks. One came from architect Archibald Rogers: "Our architecture, our cities are with us for all our lives, for better or for worse. We must hope it is for the better." The other came from Elie Abel: "How do we devise a strategy under which somehow the prestige of America and the pride of Americans in their country can be attached and related to the kind of country we live in, the kind of cities we live in, the kind of schools our children go to, the kind of air we breathe?"

It comes down, then, to hope, based on the self-pride of Americans weary at last of slums, disease, dirt, noise, ugliness; weary of running away, ready to start the job of rebuilding America in some form equal to its ideals. The Arden House conference provided much information that can be useful in getting this long overdue job underway.

# A1. THE PAST: URBAN LAND SOURCE AND COMMODITY

JOHN REPS, Professor of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University

Our present system for shaping the development patterns of urban regions does not work. It is not the case of an *occasional* lack of success. Instead, we have a record of complete failure. Not one metropolitan area in America-despite all the plans and planning agencies -has developed according to official, comprehensive, long-range proposals.

In brilliant and marked contrast to this very clouded record shine the achievements of such European cities as Oslo, Stockholm, Hamburg, Rotterdam, and The Hague\_it is difficult to distinguish between the modern map of Amsterdam and the great master plan .for that city prepared in 1934. All of these cities, and scores of others, mainly in northern Europe, are currently guiding their expansion according to carefully formulated plans, looking forward a number of years into the future. Built into the system are procedures for revision at appropriate intervals, or in response to changed conditions or changed opportunity.

The difference between there and here is not, I submit, in technical planning ability, but in the location of decision making power over the place, the tempo, the sequence, the pattern of urban development. Here that power rests mainly in private hands. It is motivated primarily by profit and personal gain, and it is modified only slightly by public controls.

There, the power rests in public bodies charged with promoting the general welfare and under conditions that make private economic goals secondary to social benefit. These European cities owe their success almost entirely to a policy of acquiring, well in advance of need, virtually all land that is to be developed in the future. They then sell or lease land to private, public, or institutional builders, subject to detailed land-use regulations incorporated into the deed or as part of the leasehold agreement. The uses permitted, the conditions established, and the timing of development' follow and implement the community's long-range development plan.

Those of us who advocate this system for American cities were gratified to have it strongly endorsed in 1968 by the Douglas Commission, by the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty, and by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

We waited expectantly, but in vain, for the present Administration to follow these carefully studied recommendations -proposals based on impressive findings that the present system of urban growth and controls had failed.

The Ashley-Sparkman Bill, enacted late last December in modified form as Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, is a major achievement. It concentrates, however, on what I believe to be only a special aspect of a much broader

urban land policy. Title VII provides a variety of financial aids and incentives to state and other public land development agencies, or to private corporations, for planning land acquisition and construction of utilities and other essential services for completely new communities.

The National Committee on Urban Growth in 1969 called for creating 110 new cities, with a total population of 20 million, by the year 2000. I am an advocate of new towns, but it seems wildly optimistic to project accommodating from a fourth to a third of the expected population increase-60 to 80 million in entirely new cities and towns. I think we might as well face the fact that at least four-fifths of all newly urbanized land in the next three decades will lie at the fringe of existing communities. It is in these areas of urban expansion that we should apply the techniques of development control based on public ownership of urban land, now employed so successfully in Europe, used in a few Canadian cities in the northwestern provinces, and being experimented with under the American flag only in Puerto Rico.

Federal, state, and local legislation should be drawn with this as the principal concern, rather than focusing narrowly on new communities. These laws should make it possible for public bodies to initiate a variety of forms of urban growth at all scales, from the very smallest to completely new cities.

Above all, this legislation should allow public metropolitan development corporations to purchase or condemn fringe and outlying land 20 years or more in advance of need, lease it back to its present or other occupants temporarily, and hold it in public ownership until it is required for urban purposes.

This proposal to substitute public for private initiative in land development at the urban fringe might appear to be radical and un-American. Radical it may seem in the modern context, but public initiative in planning new towns and managing urban land domains was once a firm part of the American tradition.

A decision was once made to undertake a major project of city development, one carefully planned in advance. The site was large, more than 5,000 acres, all privately held by owners who hoped to enrich themselves out of the project. As a result of the vision of two men, themselves large landowners - one widely experienced in land speculation, both ardent supporters of political democracy and free enterprise-the entire site was acquired by the government. The responsible public agency designated the lines of streets, reserved generous sites for public buildings, and set aside large areas of open space. Lots were then sold to private developers, subject to controls limiting the height of buildings and the materials to be

used.

This project is one of the great city planning achievements of the world. Thousands of visitors each year marvel at its unique character, unaware that what made its physical plan possible was public ownership of its site. Of course you recognize the city-Washington, D. C. The two men responsible for its planning and development as a planned city on public land were George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. Among the active supporters of the legislation authorizing the project was James Madison.

Un-American land socialism? Three Presidents testify to the contrary.

While one might like to credit the Founding Fathers with invention of this enlightened urban land policy, they were merely continuing a practice with deep roots in the Colonial period. Eighteenth century statute books contained dozens of laws directing county authorities to establish new towns, providing for public acquisition of the land-by purchase if possible, but by eminent domain if necessary-specifying the public sites to be reserved and authorizing sales of lots to purchasers with stipulations governing size of buildings and other features.

Baltimore had its origins in 1729 in this manner.

Both Virginia and Maryland created new towns in wholesale quantity. Centuries before the British New Towns Act of 1946, there was British new-town legislation in these two colonies. Virginia's act designated 20 sites. Maryland followed Virginia's lead with a half-dozen new-town acts on the same pattern, designating in all some 60 locations. Virtually all of the towns on Maryland's eastern shore, and some on the western, were founded as a result of this.

Two superbly planned towns date from this period at the end of the 17th century. Both were capital cities. They were planned by the same person. Each was the result of public initiative through the technique of governmental acquisition of land. Francis Nicholson, Governor of Maryland in 1694, moved the colonial capital from St. Mary's to a site on the Severn River which he named Annapolis. And there he used principles of European Baroque city planning, with radial streets entering two great circles, the larger reserved for the statehouse, the smaller for the church. There was also a market square, a public landing, and a great residential square modeled after and named for Bloomsbury Square in London.

Then Nicholson duplicated this achievement when he became governor of Virginia and, in 1699, moved the capital from Jamestown to a site midway between the James and York Rivers, then named Middle Plantation, later renamed Williamsburg. Only public ownership of the site provided the degree of control necessary to create Williamsburg's elegant composition of urban order and beauty.

This wise urban land policy was followed in many states after the Revolution in the development of new

capital cities. Two things stand out as significant: First, the plans of these cities were superior to those with more conventional origin. Public ownership made possible a more imaginative plan, more generous provision of open spaces, wider streets, more numerous sites for public buildings and uses than those originating in private ventures in urban land speculation.

Second, these cities represented conscious efforts to create an urban environment of outstanding quality, to symbolize the very best that could be achieved in community building. Those who associate governmental enterprise with mediocre results should be aware that it was not always so in the past, and need not be so in the future.

Raleigh, N.C., dates from 1791, when a commission was appointed by the legislature and empowered to select and acquire a site for a capital city and prepare its plan.

Tallahassee, Fla., was planned in 1824 under similar circumstances.

The power of eminent domain had to be used when the capital commission of the Republic of Texas set about creating its national capital - the city of Austin - in 1839.

Many other state capitals had identical origins. Not only capitals, but other cities as well, were planned on land acquired by public agencies for that purpose. Allegheny, Pa., now a part of Pittsburgh, was established by the state at the end of the 18th century. Chicago began through a similar experiment in public initiative.

Now, let's compare two examples of American cities and their quite-contrasting experiences in managing the disposal of great public land domains according to plan.

Most New Yorkers do not know that the municipality once owned most of Manhattan Island. The 1686 charter not only extended political jurisdiction over the entire island to the infant municipality, but conferred title to all land not previously granted. Then, under the Act of Confiscation following the Revolution, Loyalist lands were declared forfeit and came into public ownership, and were thus added to the city's already extensive holdings.

A 1796 proposal would have put half of the public land up for sale, and retained the other half, to be leased out. That policy, if followed, would have made New York the wealthiest city in the world. Coupled with wise decisions on physical growth patterns, it could have made New York the best planned city in the world.

Instead, long-range goals were sacrificed to immediate gain: All land was put up for sale without any restrictions what ever. Further, the physical plan adopted by a commission that reported in 1811 established a system of a dozen north south streets and 155 cross streets. This provided an almost endless grid, virtually devoid of open spaces, totally

ignoring topography, lacking even the most elementary planning features that would have given the city focal points for variety in design or opportunities for civic beauty.

The commission's surveyor, in public defense of the plan, could find little more to say about it than that it was admirably suited for the buying, selling, and improving of real estate. He was correct, and New Yorkers have been paying the price ever since.

By contrast, let's look at the American example that best supports the argument for a workable future land policy in this nation.

Savannah, Ga., whose history unfortunately is little-known and ill-appreciated by students of American urban development, was planned by James Oglethorpe in 1733. The town consisted of four wards, each centering on an open square. Each ward contained 40 house lots and, fronting on the square, four sites for public or semipublic uses. Beyond the town proper were garden lots. Each settler received a 60-by-90-ft. town lot, a 5-acre garden plot, and a 45-acre farm.

By the end of the Revolution or perhaps earlier, the city government had been entrusted with ownership of the common surrounding Savannah on three sides. It was municipal ownership of this area, together with an enlightened policy adopted by the city government that made possible a unique achievement in American urban growth.

George Santayana's famous observation that those who are ignorant of history are condemned to relive it was directed at those great human errors of previous generations. We can rephrase this idea for our own use. Those who are ignorant of our past achievements are condemned unnecessarily to seek solutions to problems that we have already faced and solved.

PETER KOHLER, WCBS-TV, New York, NY.:

What are the main impediments, governmental or otherwise, to bringing about the kind of land policy you advocate?

MR. REPS: About every impediment one could list. There is certainly a financial one, but as European experience demonstrates pretty conclusively, once started this thing is not only self-financing, but could be operated at a profit. The Dutch began their program in 1902; the Swedes in 1904. I'm sure that in The Netherlands money was as much of a problem in 1902 as it is for us at the present. I don't think a municipality or a metropolitan land corporation or the state land development agency can lose money on this proposition.

There is obviously a lot of political resistance. There is a kind of doctrinaire opposition that it is un-American that's why I waved Jefferson and Washington and Madison at everyone.

Still, the political opposition is substantial. It does not, in my opinion, come from developers who have explored this issue. There's a lot in it for the small de-

veloper who is being squeezed out of the market these days. If he can buy land that is fully serviced, he can get his building permits the day he buys it. There's no long waiting, no performance bonds, no subdivision-control approval to go through.

MR. KOHLER: Could you give any idea of what it would cost to achieve this nationally, or in a metropolitan area?

MR. REPS: I don't know; there's a question about the scale of the operation. Do you acquire, as the Dutch and Swedes do, virtually all the land there is to be developed? Or do you try to get certain strategic areas, which may lock in others and give you more leverage than you might have based on sheer percentage of ownership?

The land is going to be developed anyway, by someone who invests money. Therefore, a public agency with public credit rates, the ability to wait longer, and the ability to operate at a nonprofit or break-even point, has a great advantage over private developers who are buying very expensive land and developing presumably at a profit.

WILLIAM L. SLAYTON, Executive VicePresident, The American Institute of Architects: This could be financed with private capital formation; it doesn't have to be done by government bond. It can be a federal guarantee for the acquisition of capital, which could be raised in the private market.

MR. REPS: There is one possible legal problem, and that is the constitutional issue about the ability of a community to buy land, not for a traditional public purpose, but simply to hold without a specific use being designated in advance. The Puerto Rican land administration embarked on such a program about five or six years ago. They spent something like \$50 million on somewhere in the neighborhood of 18,000 acres of land in Puerto Rican metropolitan areas. They were hailed into court; lost in the lower court; won in the Puerto Rico Supreme Court. The landowner appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and they declined to hear the case for want of a federal question, which suggests to me that perhaps there is no fundamental legal objection.

ARCHIBALD ROGERS, Chairman of the Board, RTKL Inc.: Isn't one of the most serious political impediments to public land banks the fact that the municipality is surrounded by other political subdivisions?

MR. REPS: Yes - the fractured system that makes our present land-use controls unworkable. My proposal would put these powers into the hands of an agency with metropolitan wide jurisdiction. I'd prefer to see a metro government of some kind, but I'm a realist. I don't think we're going to see many of them for some time; so I would say a single-purpose metropolitan land development agency, or perhaps a state agency that has decentralized itself into

individual metropolitan districts. The New York State Urban Development Corp. might have almost enough legal power now to do that kind of thing.

JAMES WELSH, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C.: Do you see the New York State Urban Development Corporation moving in the direction that you want it to go? And if you don't, What's wrong with that corporation?

MR. REPS: I'm trying to push Bob McCabe and [UDC President Edward J.] Logue in this direction. I've been writing letters to that effect. If they don't do it, they're wrong.

MR. WELSH: Are any states at all marching in the right direction, as you see them?

MR. REPS: They may be marching in the right direction, but they've got a long way to go down the road yet. Puerto Rico comes close. They're buying land without designating specific public uses. They're going to hold onto it, and later on there will be a plan prepared, and the land, if it is appropriate, will then be released.

We have some federal legislation the Ashley-Sparkman Bill - that begins to make considerable movement in this direction. It does not go as far as I would suggest, but it's a very good first step.

There are one or two sort-of-freak examples. In the March issue of *City* magazine there is an article about Silver Spring, Md., buying a 150-acre farm with no specific public use in mind. They are going to hang onto it for awhile and see what they want to do with it. It's an idea, I think, whose time has come.

The truly remarkable thing is the unanimity with which such urban task forces as the Douglas Commission, ACIR, and others in 1968 and 1969 came down very firmly on the side of this policy. They said, in effect: Let's stop tinkering around with zoning and land subdivision regulations; that really is not doing the job.

I don't know if everyone who signed the ACIR report, *Urban and Rural America*, read it; but it contains some very strong recommendations and

includes some people I've always thought of as quite conservative. They signed that report, and what they recommended is very far-reaching. Now we ought to begin to implement it.

JUANITA GREENE, The Miami Herald, Miami, Fla.: My concern is with the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

MR. REPS: They're a lot better than they were 15 or 20 years ago when I began to do some planning. I think they can be sold on the wisdom of this policy, because there's a great deal in it for them.

One of the virtues of the system that I propose is that it would counteract the present situation in which - often in times of pressing need for land to be developed - there is no land available. Land is held off the market for a variety of reasons: It's tied up in an estate; there is some problem about taxation; it may be better federal tax strategy not to sell this year but wait until next year; an owner is simply unresponsive to market demand or for quite arbitrary reasons says, I won't sell.

This system that I propose would provide a steady flow of building sites to the housing market. I think it would provide land at lower prices. It would provide land in better places, for contiguous development rather than this leapfrog, expensive kind of sprawl. The steady flow to builders would be a very important thing to them financially.

As it is now, someone borrows a lot of money and buys a site or gets an option on the site. Then he has that usual year and-a-half to two-year round of getting rezoning, subdivision approval. He's got to hire a designer. He has to arrange with contractors to put in site services and all the rest. This thing would bypass that. When the developer becomes, let's say, the successful bidder or successful purchaser on a lot or a block or a whole neighborhood in one of these growth areas, he could get his building permits tomorrow and start to build. That's money in the bank for him.



## A2. THE PRESENT: WHO REALLY DECIDES HOW URBAN LAND IS USED TODAY?

**JAMES D'ORMA BRAMAN**, former Mayor of Seattle, recently retired as Assistant Secretary for Environment and Systems, Department of Transportation

From the beginning of the development of our country, communities came into being in almost all cases because of some favorable factor of transportation. There may have been a railhead or a station, a good landing on a waterway, an overland trail station, or a good coastal anchorage. From these small starts grew many of our present great cities.

As population expanded, the early roadways, constructed first to serve settlers, were gradually improved, and in many instances became arterial roads and streets. Thus the cycle reversed itself and, in more modern times, urban transportation has *followed* growth rather than *leading* it. This growth has been largely unplanned, and it has resulted in our present strip development and urban sprawl.

As the size of urban communities continued to expand, a new element of land development and speculation came into the picture. A factor which encouraged this was the low tax status of farm and undeveloped land outside, but within the growth orbit of, an expanding community. This encourages the acquisition of much of this land by speculators or developers, who are able to hold it as an investment for future action. During the last two decades, however, exploding population growth, along with skyrocketing tax assessment, have forced the development of this land.

Although many entrepreneurs have conscientiously tried to develop their land in a manner consistent with present concerns for environmental and social values, the total result has been a hodgepodge of unrelated and often incompatible single-family and apartment communities. This explosive growth has created vast problems of congestion, lack of adequate mobility, and serious collateral consequences such as air and noise pollution. The only available means to provide some degree of mobility to all of these people has been an increased reliance on roads and highways.

The state and federal gasoline-tax programs have provided the funds for the use of this mode. The basic system, consisting of 42,500 miles of high-standard roads, is well along to completion. This Interstate program, which performed so well in its original concept, falls down badly, however, when the same approach is attempted within the crowded precincts of our cities.

The inordinate use of valuable land, the disruption of social and family patterns, the major responsibility for the serious air pollution plaguing our cities - all cry out for a better solution. Any new effort to construct major streets and highways to meet the demand of the morning and evening peak-traffic periods will be deadly destructive to life in our cities. Balanced traffic systems must be developed and constructed to

provide a proper mix of all available modes designed to fit the peculiar needs of each community.

Efforts to control land use by the traditional method of comprehensive plans and zoning laws have not been adequate. The failures of the past have arisen from too narrow a concept: lack of imagination and vision, and almost total reliance on zoning laws to carry out the plans.

Zoning laws are too transitory in nature to warrant full reliance. The pressures of economics, of owners and developers of land, coupled with the always present need for an expanding tax base, often influence legislative bodies to agree to changes in the zoning maps. Each single change is probably not too serious in itself, but taken in the aggregate over a period of time, such changes often either destroy the objectives of the comprehensive plan or seriously damage it.

I believe the only really effective tool we have to guarantee a successful land-use plan is a preplanned transportation system designed to direct growth into a planned pattern. To me, the first step toward this goal is for planners and public officials to look beyond the admittedly demanding need for immediate solutions and determine how they want their regions to develop in the future. What kind of community do they want to provide for the generations to follow? How do they propose to house and serve the millions who will join us in the next three or four decades?

I am convinced the first priority must be given to doing a better job of restoring health and viability to both the central business district and the existing residential areas surrounding it. An unprejudiced look around us in almost any city will disclose that much progress has been made in this direction, perhaps more than most of us would believe. I believe that the most important key element still missing is an imaginative, socially acceptable public transportation system, capable of responding to human needs.

The next level of priority should go to the development of satellite new towns situated outside, but well within the orbit of central cities. If such new towns can be brought into being as planned, they should provide exciting options to the confusing and irritating urban sprawl now existing. Such communities are already in existence in several countries, prime examples being those surrounding Stockholm. The key there, and I am sure the key necessary here, is the expansion of fast, comfortable rail transit to the center of a planned area *before* the area has been developed. Imagine, if you will, a community centered around a rapid-transit station with commercial and service facilities and surrounded by tasteful multifamily residential structures. Outside this core would be a fan of single-family residences

served to the central station by a computer-programmed small bus system, providing almost doorstep pickup. This is technically possible right now. Such an approach requires vision and great courage on the part of public officials, citizens, citizen-leaders, and ultimately the people themselves.

JACK PATTERSON, Business Week: I'd like to open an issue concerning the question of who plans for whom. People in New York, for example, dealing with the Port Authority, are somewhat less than enthusiastic about the idea of creating large public planning bodies that inflict trade centers on unwilling cities. And we have groups in this country who are trying to get into the decision-making process - blacks, the poor, and others.

My question is this: How do you organize a body that is sufficiently powerful to carry out public charter and not be stymied by every objection that arises, and at the same time is accountable and responsible to diverse elements or segments of the population or system?

MR. BRAMAN: The only tool that I see at the moment is the development of more federations of existing municipalities. In my opinion, no matter how much we provide the resources at the federal level, and no matter how much our academic community or the community of such organizations as the AIA and the American Institute of Planners and others may be able to develop the techniques, we cannot expect this kind of regional planning to be done at national levels. It must be done at the local level, through an organization in which the people will feel that they have some voice, through the officials they elect. I think the vehicle is there, the means are there, the mechanism is there. It needs to be refined, and it needs to have a great deal more strength built into it, either by vote of the people or by legislative action.

FRED POWIEDGE, author, Brooklyn, N.Y.: What city is farthest along the way of achieving the sort of transportation network you're talking about?

MR. BRAMAN: That's an embarrassing question to answer. Aside from the education of the population, I'm quite sure Seattle is. We have a plan. It's a complete, integrated plan. It includes all modes of transportation. It's fully developed as far as the details of the construction drawings are concerned. It's well backed-up by believable cost estimates and believable operating revenue, and the only thing we need is an affirmative vote of the people to authorize the local funding.

MR. POWIEDGE: But they voted it down, you say. Why?

MR. BRAMAN: The principal reason was economic conditions. I think you've all heard of our problems with the Boeing layoffs and so forth. And the timing of a plan that had been two years in development. It takes a long time to build civic momentum to bring

something like this to a vote. Nothing we could do convinced them that this was the proper time to launch this massive public-works program.

PETER KOHLER, WCBS-TV, New York, N.Y.: Is it your assumption that rapid transit and a more livable urban environment are compatible? I raise that question on the basis that - and this may be a questionable assumption-where rapid transit has been introduced in a metropolitan area, it has inevitably led to denser development, to bigger and bigger cities. If we accept that hypothesis, is there an optimum-size city, and can rapid transit in effect make the city or the urban area too big?

MR. BRAMAN: I think that danger always exists. And I think you have to weigh the equities. As I asked, Are we willing to abandon existing cities and rely entirely on the possibility of developing totally free-standing new towns? If we're not, assuming that we're going to have new towns as a way of absorbing some of this enormous growth in population, then we still have to be contemplating what we do about the existing towns.

And I think one of the things that we need to do to make our existing residential communities more viable is to give people a way to move freely in and out without the problem of being tied up on an endless parking lot.

OWEN MORITZ, New York Daily News: How much of a constituency is there for mass transit? The cities in the South and California, for example, do not really want mass transit. Don't they want more highways because people want to drive their cars and they simply do not want any other kind of system?

MR. BRAMAN: No. That's a premise I think is being exploded almost daily. We could not have gotten our public transportation act through Congress if there was not a nationwide mood toward a better solution for the movement of people, particularly during the morning and evening peak periods.

MR. MORITZ: In the sprawling cities where there is not the density you have in New York, isn't the feeling that the economics of mass transit would not work, and what they need is some kind of speedier highway system, maybe at most a bus system? In other words, they want more on wheels?

MR. BRAMAN: No, I found that the strongest supporters we had were people, including mayors, from Denver, Houston, Dallas - these plain cities. It's true that many of these cities are not at the moment ready for it, are not contemplating rail transit. But they are contemplating private right of way rather than more lanes for private cars so that express buses could serve the same purpose in the less densely populated environs of these cities as rail would serve in the more compact environs of the other cities.

MR. MORITZ: Assuming you do get mass transit in

every city, don't you run the risk of simply polarizing the city. Those who can afford to buy houses are now moving out of the city because they have the transportation to get in, and those left behind in the city are those who cannot go out to the suburbs.

MR. BRAMAN: No, this is where one of the most prevalent misconceptions comes in. When we talk about public transportation, we're not talking about mass transit *per se*. We're talking about public transportation for all classes of people, consisting of all modes of public transportation.

MR. MORITZ: You're not stopping at the city limits, are you?

MR. BRAMAN: Oh, of course not.

MR. MORITZ: Then you're opening up the suburbs to more people.

MR. BRAMAN: Of course, and we advocate satellite cities as an option, and here's where we come to land use. The thing that John Reps was talking about is practical around most of our central cities if you go a little farther out where you can consolidate the land under public ownership and develop it the way you want to develop it. But you've got to have a way to get those people from that point to wherever they want to go, whatever direction they want to move.

MR. MORITZ: Wouldn't those with low incomes be left behind in the city?

MR. BRAMAN: There is no reason they should be. It hasn't worked that way where this kind of system exists.

MR. ABEL: This is an audience of journalists, and I wonder to what degree you could tell us about the role of the press and the other media in Seattle. For example, to what degree have they contributed to the defeat of the proposition on the ballot?

Further, you spoke with some force of the ring of blight that surrounds the business centers of most American cities, and then you went on to talk about transportation to the satellite areas, the fringe areas. Surely the worst blighted areas in our biggest cities have rapid transit, and as a matter of fact, don't need it all that desperately. That has been no solution. The blight is there. How does building a better transit system deal with the problems of the blighted areas in the inner city?

MR. BRAMAN: Taking your first question, as far as the media were concerned, we could not have asked for better support. All of the newspapers, all of the radio and TV stations were doing everything they could to promote the program. It just shows that when you're up against people who are hurting economically, there is nothing you can do. Given another time and another set of circumstances and that kind of support, we'd have sailed through with 70 percent. I'm confident of it.

As for blight, I don't think I can take a specific question of that nature and detail the answer clearly. But what we're talking about is not the antiquated transit systems of the late 1800s. Manhattan couldn't exist without the subway, bad as it is. But you go into some of the more modern systems such as the ones in Toronto and Montreal and even rejuvenated older systems in London and Paris, and you find that people of all economic classes are using them. Once you get the mix of people using a mix of modes and a mix of opportunities, then I think you break down some of this polarization.

IAN MENZIES, Boston Globe: Did Seattle put any planning into their transportation system related to a limitation of population within a certain area? Was the Seattle plan designed for increasing density, numbers?

MR. BRAMAN: No.

MR. MENZIES: Could you be swamped, even with your mass transportation plan?

MR. BRAMAN: I guess you could.

MR. MENZIES: You said, Okay, this is a normal population for the City of Seattle, a livable population. We will try to superimpose upon this a transportation system to take care of it comfortably, which is a service. Is that correct?

MR. BRAMAN: Yes. I think this was the concept and the desire. Whether or not it could be carried out without some stronger mandatory controls, I don't know. But I am still going to say that given the right options for transportation, these things will more or less adjust themselves.

JAMES WELSH, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C.: I prefer to talk about the powers of government rather than transportation *per se*. Is it true that the federation of governors does very well on something like transportation, but when it comes to questions of the use of land in a metropolitan area, the whole thing falls apart?

MR. BRAMAN: I think I agree with you. I'm not advocating a total area wide government unless we can somehow get over the barrier and expand our local government jurisdictions to include cities and counties in what should be one metropolitan area. We're not there yet.

RON NESSEN, NBC News, Washington, D.C.: Why are you convinced that your mass transit system was rejected because Seattle was having a hard time economically? What leads you to believe it's not the fact that a lot of people just can't imagine themselves riding the bus or the train and always tend to drive their car downtown?

MR. BRAMAN: A number of things, and I guess you have to use the devices that have always been used to try to make some judgments. One was polls,

the kind of poll that was taken just before the election, which asked four basic questions. The most basic was: Do you want this kind of a system?

Almost 75 percent said yes. This was a comprehensive poll. It covered people in all areas of the city, all economic levels outside the city. The next question was: Would you still vote for it if it required a vote for a certain type of financing program? The level dropped down about ten points as you went down the scale. When you got into the area of property taxes, the support plummeted. So to me the vote was based entirely on the cost of financing, not on the principle.

The best indication we got was that this was going to sail through with 70 percent. There was nothing but enthusiasm from the press. Everybody was for it—until everybody got tight pockets. They were just scared silly, and they wouldn't vote for anything that cost them a nickel.

**ROBERT F. HASTINGS, FAIA, President of AIA:** You talked about giving people options as you took your poll. What bothers me is that we often don't give them options that haven't been tried before. Have you tried the concept of automated highways on people? I have a strong feeling that the average American, if asked whether he would prefer an individual form of transportation, would say yes, provided it isn't the present individual transportation system where we've all got 20-foot automobiles congesting our highways. Have you explored the possibility of getting into a little bug and going over to the main highway and putting it on an automated system and reading the paper as you go into town?

**MR. BRAMAN:** Automated highways, no. Practically speaking, we did not contemplate automated highways because—I'll be perfectly frank—no one out there had any confidence that this was ready yet.

At one time, five or six years ago, I asked friends of mine in the Boeing Company who have great expertise when it comes to developing systems: What do you see in this so-called great breakthrough in public transportation that's just around some kind of a long corner? Would we be justified in going ahead with the most sophisticated type of system based on proven techniques, or should we wait for this breakthrough?

They spent about six months on a confidential and private report. They analyzed every system that had been talked about, including automated highways. Their conclusion was that while some of these may have future potentialities, none are close enough to

be practical. If you need a system, you had better move on what you have—the highest state of the art.

**DICK KLEEMAN, Minneapolis Tribune:** I just wondered whether you agreed with the proposition that I always thought was fairly commonly accepted—that everybody is willing to vote for a mass rapid transit system for someone else, as long as he can keep on driving his car.

**MR. BRAMAN:** To some degree this is a human reaction, true. But, historically, where these systems have come into being, we have found that people do leave their cars at home. In Seattle, as a stopgap, we have established what is called Blue Streak. It's not unique; there are others around, but this one I happen to know about.

A large parking lot was developed ten miles north of the center of the city in a very heavy traffic-generating area. People park their cars there, and transfer to a Blue Streak bus. At the earliest possible point it gets on the freeway, travels in a semi-restricted lane, and exits on a completely restricted exit ramp. It takes 19 minutes from the farthest outreach of this system to the center of downtown. It has been a spectacular and phenomenal success.

I'm just as convinced as I could possibly be that public transit is the answer and that it will work, and we can guide the destiny of our cities by this means.

**MONROE KARMIN, Wall Street Journal:** Professor Reps was proposing a land bank with public ownership of sites for future development. Early in your remarks I thought you were sort of endorsing the idea, and later on you used terms like "socialization." How acceptable would that idea be in Seattle and its environs?

**MR. BRAMAN:** I think I'd have to try to separate my two points of view: I am in accord with his approach. The only place that I mentioned the question, and probably we're not there yet, would be to consolidate land in already congested, expensive, high-value areas. Certainly in the area of the satellite city, I'm all with him. This is what we ought to be doing.

**MR. KARMIN:** Would public ownership be acceptable in Seattle, do you think?

**MR. BRAMAN:** I think it might be. It's one of those kind of things that would take a lot of imaginative selling to change public concepts. In Seattle we would have to change our constitution, by action of the legislature, placed before the people by referendum and voted on. That isn't easy either.

### A3. THE FUTURE: A NAT'L PROGRAM FOR COHERENT URBAN GROWTH & SETTLEMENT

**REP. THOMAS L. ASHLEY, (D., Ohio), chairman, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Urban Growth, House Committee on Banking and Currency.**

A national policy for coherent urban growth has become a live possibility not because of any new-found wisdom in Washington, but rather because there really is a growing national awareness of the catastrophic consequences of our past failure to plan and develop a decent living environment, especially in our rapidly growing urban areas.

Faced with the disintegration of city life, the formless sprawl of our suburbs, and the desolation of much of rural America, we are finally ready to acknowledge that where people live and how they live are not the exclusive domain of private enterprise but in fact are matters of legitimate, indeed compelling, public policy.

Even so, it will be no easy task to establish rational patterns of growth in place of entrenched economic and political interests and the social attitudes identified with the present development process. In my view, success will depend upon our ability to define a positive national urban growth policy, our readiness to support the new-town concept, and our willingness to insist that community development take place on a metropolitan wide basis, as distinguished from the emphasis we have given to categorical programs directed to the city.

Title VII of last year's housing act does, for the first time, provide a mechanism for an evolving national growth policy. It requires the President to submit a detailed report to Congress every two years -and we specify the areas to which he must address himself, including, of course, specific policy recommendations and proposals for legislative and executive action.

This part of the Act contains eight guidelines that a national growth policy should meet in terms of the quality of urban development, where growth and development should occur, and whom it should serve. Taken in context with the statement of findings and purposes, it is quite clear that what is intended, indeed mandated, is the assumption of federal responsibility for the first time for the formulation of explicit policies to shape future patterns of growth in a rational way.

Title VII also gives considerable emphasis to new communities as an important component of urban growth policy. For the first time it provides for greatly increased federal assistance to public as well as private developers, a real departure from the past. The Congress has largely limited its assistance to the private development sector. Now, for the first time, we're saying that it is legitimate public policy for public bodies, such as the New York State Urban Development Corporation, to engage in new-communities development.

The act also breaks new ground by authorizing special planning grants to state and other public

bodies to guide future growth.

It also provides for the acquisition of land to be held from development in order to protect new or existing communities from undesirable land usage. Granted, this is not a very bold step in the direction of public ownership in advance of use, but it certainly is the first such legislation that we have seen on the books in our history.

To meet the problem of a cash-flow shortage during the early years of a new-community development, loans are authorized to cover interest payments on guaranteed obligations for up to 15 years. There's a whole array of grants, including grants for planning; for meeting the cost of health, safety, education, and other public services for up to the first three years of the life of a new community; grants for equalizing the difference between the tax-exempt and non tax-exempt rates of the obligations which provide the funds for land acquisition and development.

Title VII really contemplates four different types of new communities: 1. Developments within metropolitan areas as an alternative to urban sprawl. That's exactly the way it's stated. There is no pretense about this. 2. Additions to existing smaller towns that have unusual growth potential. 3. New towns in town. 4. New, free-standing communities.

The Act lists eight requirements that must be met to qualify for assistance, with emphasis on economic feasibility, social and economic balance, good land use, architectural design, and other inputs that contribute to a good living environment.

Evidence today indicates a surprising interest and readiness on the part of both public and private new-community developers to make use of Title VII. And the enthusiasm on the part of HUD for a program that it did not fully support five or six months ago is surprising.

I suspect one reason for this is the hang up of the Administration over integration of the suburbs and the belief that dispersion can best be achieved through new communities in which racial balance is built in from the very start. In any event, I foresee new towns as a principal component of an evolving national urban growth policy. I think they will be greatly superior in every respect to alternative suburban development, and I think that they will certainly provide a very badly needed relocation resource, especially in metropolitan areas with a large central city.

For the first time, I believe, new communities offer an answer to the question of where to locate many of the 26 million new and rehabilitated housing units that we pledged to build in the decade ending in 1978. For many millions of Americans, I am

convinced that they offer the only viable opportunity for a suitable living environment.

Finally I think that a national program for coherent urban growth requires that the use of block-grant funds should be governed by broadly stated, congressionally established goals to be implemented by specific mechanisms on a metropolitan wide basis. I do not support the view that there should be minimal restraints on the use of block grants for development purposes. This view is predicated on the notion that our growth patterns are a matter of national concern and national policy, and that the center city and the surrounding metropolitan area can no longer be considered distinct from each other.

To achieve the national goals that we have set for ourselves, Congress must insist that local planning, development, and housing strategy-consistent with federal guidelines-be formulated on a broader geographic basis, and that performance be reviewed on an annual basis as a condition to ongoing funding.

BRIAN W. DICKINSON, Providence Journal-Bulletin: Congressman, your espousal of the new-town concept is pretty sweeping. I favor it myself, as most of us do, I guess. But there's a risk, I submit. With a finite financial capacity, you will possibly risk letting the older cities go down the drain completely.

REP. ASHLEY: I don't really think so. I think that what we'll find is that the only possibility of saving our older cities is to construct new communities in metropolitan areas. I think that while our resources are finite, we have pledged ourselves to meet a housing goal of 26 million units. We simply have to have that many. That probably was understated. So, all we're saying is, What kind of environment are we going to locate these 26 million new and rehab units in?

It's really an infrastructure cost as much as anything else. We know that the housing is going to be there. The question is, in what kind of environment? And how much more costly is a decent environment than an unplanned, raunchy kind of environment that we are confronted with through our present development process?

BRUCE PORTER, Newsweek: I don't understand at all how you're going to get this racial mix in new towns. What is it that is going into the new towns to prevent them from establishing the same mix we have now in housing, a very low proportion of low income, a very high proportion of middle income?

REP. ASHLEY: In the first place, this is a matter of national policy. We have said in the preamble to the legislation itself and the statement of findings that the support to new-community developers is predicated on a deliberate policy of the development to make provisions for housing families of different incomes. Once you do it for different incomes, the color has pretty much taken care of itself.

What happens is that, instead of a private developer being the beneficiary of the escalated

value of land that is purchased by the acre and sold by the foot, your public body or private developer who is operating under the act must capitalize a portion of that appreciated value in a way that makes possible the housing of families of lower income, which otherwise simply wouldn't be possible.

ROBERT McCABE, General Manager, New York State Urban Development Corporation:

Congressman, we have seen in the past exciting, creative legislation come out of the Congress. We think in the Urban Development Corporation that Title VII is a very creative piece of legislation and we intend to use it. But what evidence is there, Congressman, that the Administration will fund the program on a sufficient scale to have any impact whatsoever?

REP. ASHLEY: The indicators are not *conclusive*, of course, but they're pretty conclusive, of course, but they're pretty strong. HUD is excited about this program. The interest of not only your corporation and other public bodies, but of a considerable number of large private corporations, has resulted in firm applications to date and projected applications which will probably number close to 100 by the end of the first six months of the program.

MR. DICKINSON: Congressman, when you open up this land for development, don't you run the risk of inviting industry from inner cities and really in a sense eroding their tax base?

REP. ASHLEY: Yes, but let's face it, that's happening anyway. Our demographic studies, which have been confirmed now by the census, indicate that more and more new industry is locating in the suburbs.

MR. DICKINSON: Aren't you hastening the process though?

REP. ASHLEY: How can you hasten a process that is almost 100 percent already?

MR. DICKINSON: The point is, you are hastening a natural process, perhaps doing more damage to the city than otherwise.

REP. ASHLEY: On the contrary. I think that what is happening is that you are going to get rational locational decisions with respect to industry. I think that they will be attracted for a variety of reasons to well-planned, well-conceived new communities. But I still don't think that there is going to be an exacerbated push on the part of industry to get out of the center cities and to relocate in new communities. There are a whole variety of reasons, of course, that tend to support the proposition that much of industry located in the center cities finds it in their best interests to stay there, and this is particularly true, as we've discovered in the testimony given us with regard to various types of industrial and commercial activity.

ADA LOUISE HUXTABLE, New York Times:

Congressman, would you clarify something for me? The original requirement, I believe, was for 26 million new and rehabilitated units. How does this call for rehabilitation tie in with your emphasis on new communities? I feel one of our basic problems is the abandonment of housing that could be rehabilitated in the cities and on the fringes of cities, and I think that this must be terribly prominent in any attempt to bring some kind of urban regeneration to this country. And my question, I suppose, really is: How does your emphasis on new communities tie up with any effort to do this, since the original mandate did include this consideration?

REP. ASHLEY: My emphasis on new communities and the need to rehab existing units are not mutually exclusive at all. What we are going to have to do about those abandoned units, I'm afraid, is to establish some kind of public mechanism that can acquire those units, that will rehabilitate them and the entire neighborhood.

MRS. HUXTABLE: The next bill, I hope.

REP. ASHLEY: Right. This will be coming up in this year's housing bill. We certainly are planning to tackle that, but it has got to be on that kind of broad basis, because just simply to acquire a given apartment building is not the answer. You really have to go after square block after square block so that you can preserve an entire neighborhood once it has been rehabilitated.

THOMAS GRIFFITH, Life: If I understand President Nixon's definition of forced integration of suburbs-and I'm not sure I do-isn't that contrary to the stated aims of Title VII?

REP. ASHLEY: Yes, it is.

MR. GRIFFITH: Then, I'm a little lost in your declaration of support from HUD.

REP. ASHLEY: I think that Nixon has taken a very conventional view of suburbia. I think *he* considers it the old established suburbs just outside of a metropolitan center city. What people have come to realize is that, for definition purposes, the suburbs are the entire metropolitan area in an SMSA, exclusive of the center city. It's perfectly clear that if federal dollars aren't going to be used to force integration in the suburbs and we define suburbs broadly, then the result is going to be continued impoundment-the ghettoization of the poor and the black within the center city.

What happens is we're getting two expressions of policy from the Administration, because the President himself called for a national urban growth policy and also for increased assistance for new communities. I don't think there is any way in the world that we are going to see a concerted effort to bust the existing suburbs. I think that they are end-running around that

difficult, thorny situation by seizing upon new communities as a viable alternative.

RON NESSEN, NBC News, Washington, D.C.: I want to ask you a question that has to do with the political realities of trying to set up regional or metropolitan area governments. As a politician can you suggest any way to overcome the political realities that are stopping this? Can you imagine Baltimore County going into Baltimore city?

REP. ASHLEY: No. Nor Warren, Mich., going in with Detroit. I think that we're reduced to the old tricks, as it were. I don't think there is any real substitute for dollar incentive to behave well. So I would support the broader geographic development process with federal dollars and I would, through a point system or otherwise, apply penalties to the broader geographic areas that do not plan in a coherent and legitimate fashion.

MR. NESSEN: You'd bribe them to do it?

REP. ASHLEY: Yes, I would.

PETER KOHLER, WCBS-TV, New York, NY:

The interstate programs have provided part of the impetus to the sprawl of the suburbs. Is the federal transportation fund working in concert with the policies that you support, or is it working against them?

REP. ASHLEY: They are so scattered at the present time. This is one of the problems that Dorm, I think, alluded to. How many committees in the Congress have jurisdiction over mass transit? Public Works does. Banking and Currency does. It's almost impossible to rationalize a growth process with the important components-transportation being certainly one of the most important.

But we aren't organized along functional lines. Here I think the President is entirely right, that it's going to remain very difficult, very elusive, until such time as there is reorganization not only at the Executive level but, God knows, where it's equally badly needed, and that is at the congressional level as well. We simply aren't organized to cope with complex national problems of considerable scope. We have 19 standing legislative committees, and we take a national problem and dissect it and fling off the parts to the various committees, hoping that somehow the legislative product will be returned, permitting some kind of an overall solution. It just doesn't happen.

IAN MENZIES, Boston Globe: Congressman, I wonder if you could perhaps say a little more about new towns in town. It doesn't seem to have come out too much in the press. Are you talking about self-contained new-town communities, or are you talking about more of a citywide renewal?

REP. ASHLEY: We took a dual approach to new towns in town. We said that they would qualify for the

guarantees, the loans, and the grants, the same as the other types of new communities that I described. We also modified and liberalized urban renewal to say that an area within a city need not be blighted, which is the present requirement for assistance under urban renewal, but that it only need be economically obsolescent in order to gain approval for renewal. What this means is that the railroad yards, stockyards, these types of areas, do become available for this rather considerable federal assistance in terms of land acquisition and development.

What is envisaged is not so much either demolition or rehabilitation more demolition if anything-but that there be a change in use from industry or commerce, where that's not profitable, to residential, particularly for families of moderate income.

MR. MENZIES: With a test industry, if possible?

REP. ASHLEY: Yes, yes.

WILLIAM L. SLAYTON, Executive Vice President, AIA: Whatever plan is best for that area.

REP. ASHLEY: Yes. That's included in the language of the law itself with emphasis on that.

MR. SLAYTON: This will require in a good many instances the changing of state urban renewal laws to broaden the scope of urban renewal in the state. This really means a federal grant can be given for that kind of urban renewal.

JACK PATTERSON, Business Week: The President, speaking of forced integration of the suburbs, did say also he would enforce the law. I think the policy of the Administration is very confusing. I haven't the faintest idea what it is. Do you?

REP. ASHLEY: In all truth, I can say that what Governor Romney has suggested is that there is going to be an assertion of congressional courage here. This is really very funny, as a matter of fact. The Administration has said that it wants to go to a regional basis, the broadest geographic basis, for planning and for infrastructure development. But it is absolutely silent with respect to housing. As a matter of fact, Romney said that there wouldn't be any change in the thrust of our housing program. So what we're faced with is the anomaly of planning and putting an infrastructure on a metropolitan wide basis, but withholding housing.

Says Romney to us privately: If you think that this is anomalous, then legislate yourself out of the box. Let there be an assumption of political responsibility on the part of the Congress. It would certainly be respected by the President.

MICHAEL SNIFFEN, Associated Press, New York: Congressman, you said there were a hundred applications under Title VII thus far?

REP. ASHLEY: I think there will be that many

within the first six months on the basis of the interest to date.

MR. SNIFFEN: Of those thus far, do you know, by any chance, what percentage of the new towns are in town?

REP. ASHLEY: Very small.

ROBERT F. HASTINGS, FAIA, President of AIA: Related to the same question, I understand that city studies have been made in the Detroit area, outside of Detroit. Economically they had to come to the conclusion that the new city outside of the existing city-in other words, on raw land-could be justified by private enterprise quite easily so that there was a reasonable return on investment and so forth. But the new city in town or in the city that would be paired with it could not be justified economically and that therefore the new city out on raw land would have to really support the construction and redevelopment of the new city in the old town.

This seems to be quite unrealistic. I wonder if there was any attempt to address yourselves to plus advantages for those who want to tackle the problem within the city. It just seems unrealistic to even do anything to our cities until it becomes economically sound for private enterprise to spend their money there.

REP. ASHLEY: I don't think as things stand it's ever going to become profitable for private enterprise to attack large scale development in the cities. The land has already appreciated so greatly that there is no money to be had there, and the profit on construction just isn't worth the dollars involved.

MR. HASTINGS: Could rules be modified through national programs that would make it economically sound?

REP. ASHLEY: Yes. In other words, there would be a different treatment new towns in town from new free-standing communities. This probably will be one of the first areas where we try to sophisticate the current legislation. But there is no question in the world that you have touched a critical point, because we realize that our inner-city redevelopment, whether it be new towns in town or rehabilitation, is so costly as to really preclude the private sector from being interested.

JAMES WELSH, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C.: Are the applications you were talking about in this bill heavily skewed, as I suspect, to the suburbs around metropolitan areas, especially high-growth areas like California?

REP. ASHLEY: Yes.

MR. WELSH: If so, does this fit in with the kind of urban growth policy you had in mind?

REP. ASHLEY: No, it doesn't. We're a little bit in advance of ourselves, because we're saying that we



really are pretty confident that new communities are going to be an important component of a national urban growth policy, which has yet to evolve. There is no question about that. It may well be that assistance to some new communities in advance of a thoughtful, evolving national urban growth policy may be somewhat premature.

I would suppose that the HUD corporation would be in at least some kind of position, even in the absence of a defined growth policy, to establish certain criteria for location.

MR. GRIFFITH: May I ask whether primary support for new cities comes from a theory that they can do the most to bring about racial integration?

REP. ASHLEY: No, that's a consideration, but, in all truth, support evolves from two considerations. In the first place, that we are going to have to accommodate greatly increased growth in the immediate years ahead. And, secondly, that planning, good design, will make it possible to create one hell of a lot more viable, attractive living environment than our really wretched existing cities and suburbs give us now. We can just plain do better. The state of the art is there.

ARCHIBALD C. ROGERS, FAIA, Chairman of the Board, RTKL Inc.: I would like to just state one caveat to your statement, Congressman, about the economic unfeasibility of new towns in town. It seems to me that it's not that they're uneconomic-you could make them economic-but you have to go to such densities and eliminate so many amenities that you can create new problems.

REP. ASHLEY: Right, very true. Absolutely so.

DICK KLEEMAN, Minneapolis Tribune: Has there been a successful resolution of the chicken-and-egg proposition of who goes first into the new communities, the labor force or the industry?

REP. ASHLEY: I think so. I think that on the basis of very considerable testimony on that point there really is agreement that they go hand in hand. You really can't have your residential very far in advance of your industrial location possibilities. I must say in all honesty that a good deal of this comes from the European experience, which a number of us have studied, as well as the limited experience with Columbia, Md., and so forth.

## B1. THE NEW RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE FOR URBAN GROWTH

**ROBERT McCABE, General Manager, New York State Urban Development Corporation**

It is, in great measure, the responsibility of the states or the lack of their exercising the responsibility for urban growth that has led us to many of the problems of urban growth in our society these days. And, of course, the states have a great part of the responsibility for bringing order out of this chaos in the future.

Because the states have not planned for urban growth sufficiently or not at all, we find ourselves with a spaghetti bowl of jurisdictions that regulate everything from our affluence to our effluence. The lack of planning and regulation by the states has permitted air and water pollution to go unchecked. It has allowed the best land suited for open space to become built up. It has allowed and even fostered the migration of growth aiding facilities without taking into consideration the development opportunities and their consequences.

This century has seen a mass migration from farm to city and the spread of the city outward. While most of the land remains open or rural, society itself is now urban. The striking thing about this transformation is that it happened without an overall plan or perhaps too many and conflicting bits and pieces of unrelated plans. More important, it happened without the commitment of any level of government to implement such an overall plan, had one existed.

Of all influences on urban development, the state, I believe, is in the best position and has the broadest interest in setting regional and statewide goals and helping to control the various forces necessary to achieve these goals. In the New York plan, the state has both direct and indirect methods to affect the actions of other governments, private groups, individuals, and the state government itself.

At present the state's powers fall into five broad categories: coordination, land-use control, the location of public facilities, advice and education, and fiscal incentives. Direct state action for implementing a statewide development plan is a prerequisite to attaining a desirable pattern of development. The success of any state development plan is determined by the decision-makers who implement it.

Indirect state influence in land use is also desirable to attain the broad patterns proposed in both the state plan and its future revisions. Obviously it would be almost impossible politically to take all of the land-use powers and all land-use determinations out of the hands of local government, and it may not be necessary. The plan has set up a broad statewide settlement in land-use pattern, leaving the detailing to local government. By this approach the state relies on local land-use control that ensures that detailed patterns do not conflict with the statewide pattern. Local governments can enact and administer the controls needed for implementation. At the same

time, however, state control is maintained and strengthened in limited critical areas to ensure statewide interests in important resources, such as transportation facilities and historic or public buildings.

Not only does New York State now have a comprehensive planning program, but it has created an important new agency for carrying out major parts of this plan. This is, of course, the New York State Urban Development Corporation, which was created by the New York State Urban Development Act of 1968 to carry out combined state, local, and private development programs on a large scale throughout the state.

UDC is a public benefit corporation and an agency of the state. Our basic purpose is to deal with problems of physical and economic blight, unemployment, the shortage of housing, and the lack of civic facilities in cities and towns across the state. We have the power, money, and flexibility to act quickly and effectively, while other state and local government agencies are limited in their scope.

UDC can purchase land, design and build low- and moderate-income housing, commercial, educational, recreational, and cultural facilities, and industrial parks. And it can sell or lease its projects to private investors.

Since UDC was created, now nearly three years ago, we have started the construction of approximately 7,000 units of housing in 11 cities, and of one downtown commercial project. We are planning to start another 11,000 housing units this calendar year. On the drawing boards and under discussion are such diverse plans as modular construction for several developments, both upstate and in New York City, and a variety of nonresidential projects, including a convention center, parking garages, industrial parks, two new towns—one outside Buffalo and one outside Syracuse—and one new town in town: Welfare Island in the East River, New York City.

UDC has sold \$250 million in bonds under its \$1-billion bonding authority. It is working closely with local governments throughout the state to help meet their urban development needs, and with the State Office of Planning Coordination to help implement the plan.

Further, quite apart from planning and development agencies, the state has within its other operations enormous influence over the quality and direction of urban growth. Its landholdings grow each year, some by way of acquisition for highways and other public works, others through its recreation land acquisition program. \$75 million was authorized for this program in 1969, and 70,000 acres were acquired. An additional \$25 million to purchase more land has now

been authorized.

If aimed at lands in the path of urbanization, such a program could be the most direct and simple way of curbing urban sprawl. By taking open land off the market or keeping it off in the case of existing holdings, the state government can effectively guide urban growth.

Three important and immediate tools available to the state to curb urban sprawl are: First, the meshing of state capital construction, which accounts in New York State for approximately 20 percent of all construction with state growth objectives. Second, an aggressive, selective open-space program. And, third, effective methods of preserving prime farmland. Used carefully, a strategy employing these tools could help arrest incipient problems of sprawl in newly developing areas.

But what of future population growth?

How and where can it be accommodated to improve the quality of life, bring economic growth to areas of need, introduce new technologies to housing and community service systems, and stop the pollution of the natural environment?

We believe in New York the most obvious answer to these questions is greater state involvement in new-communities development. In addition to using all the powers and devices at hand to remedy the past and prepare for the future, Governor Rockefeller has proposed a new article for our state constitution which would provide constitutional scope for a comprehensive, integrated approach to community development and, to quote the Governor, "would allow the state to become a greater catalyst and a closer partner with the private sector and local government in meeting community needs."

If given second passage by the legislature during the current session and passed by a statewide referendum this fall, this article will make it possible for the State of New York to undertake urban development not only to overcome blight and meet the most pressing housing needs in our existing cities, but to assume its proper responsibility in building the new urban fabric for the future.

**FRED POWLEDGE, author, Brooklyn, N.Y.:** What assurances do we have that your organization won't become a monster like the Port of New York Authority or the World's Fair or Transit?

**MR. McCABE:** It seems to me that the best assurance you have is to realize that UDC is a creature of the state, a creature of the legislature. What the legislature gave, of course, the legislature can take away. Therefore, it seems to us prudent politically to make the UDC responsive to state needs. And I believe that the experience of the last three years would clearly indicate that in a great many areas we have found enormous support for using the powers and resources that the corporation has. We will continue to be responsive to these needs, and that to my mind is the best assurance.

**JACK PATTERSON, Business Week:** UDC has to go to the private market for money. The Port of New York Authority always invokes the safety of bondholders to justify its avoidance of any loss operations. How would UDC deal with this issue? You have to carry the debt service on these bonds; you have to have revenue-producing projects. Are you going to be turned away from low-income housing toward projects that produce revenues for more and more bonds and become another Port Authority?

**MR. McCABE:** I think there are two ways perhaps that I ought to answer that. The first way is to say that we have had generous financial support from the legislature for the beginnings of our operation. This has been very important to our ability to take risks and to provide early financing. The fact that the legislature has given us \$8 million of seed capital to run our business, if you will, has given us an important leg up in being able to take risks. Had we not had that kind of legislative support, I think clearly we would have had to take fewer risks than we have taken.

We have said to the legislature in two previous sessions that it is in the state's interest that the Urban Development Corporation be a risk-taking enterprise and that the state therefore would be well advised to provide continued financial support, at least to the extent of giving us hard dollars so that we don't have to take all of our administrative expense out of the project. We have been successful so far in convincing the legislature that that is a desirable course. We are before the legislature again this year. Whether it will support us remains to be seen.

We said to them, There isn't a great deal of money to be made in the low-to moderate-income housing business, and if this state is really to perform seriously this kind of function, then it is in the state's interest to provide a subsidy to the extent of paying our overhead expenses. That's what we're trying to do. It is clear that there are others who think that we ought to become self-supporting as quickly as possible. We'll try and balance this.

**WILLIAM L. SLAYTON, Executive Vice President, AIA:** Does the corporation have the power of eminent domain to acquire raw land for community development?

**MR. McCABE:** We have the authority to acquire raw land for low- and moderate-income housing. One of the reasons why constitutional change is so important to us is that we do not believe that under the constitution today we could acquire land, hold it, and sell it off for conventional housing. We have to have low- and moderate-income housing as our end product in non-blighted areas.

**BRUCE PORTER, Newsweek:** I was wondering how you reconcile the operations of a monolithic organization like UDC, which gets its power from a

group of state legislators, with the whole movement toward advocacy planning and local grassroots involvement. For example, with the office building on 125th Street where there was a great deal of controversy.

MR. McCABE: I think you reconcile it by building on it. The corporation, in the two years and two months that I have been with it, has actively worked with local community groups to bring about projects that they felt were very important in their community. Across the state, we have worked not only with existing groups, but we have also created our own community advisory groups involving citizens in what they want to happen in their communities and the kind of projects they want to have. I think that we have reconciled this.

MR. PORTER: You establish these advisory bodies—is that correct?

MR. McCABE: Yes, we make the appointment. But we also work with existing groups. If there is, for instance, a model cities advisory group or an urban renewal advisory committee that the community has set up, we have no hesitation making that our community advisory group. We try to build upon existing groups and add to them, if necessary, to provide the kind of community input you're talking about. They're not irreconcilable in our operation.

OWEN MORITZ, New York Daily News: Once you get going, you will still need a considerable amount of federal subsidy for these projects.

MR. McCABE: It is clear that we need urban renewal subsidy if we are to build in the inner city the kind of subsidy that you get from having the federal government manage an urban renewal program that provides relocation assistance. We also need the interest rate reduction from HUD.

MR. MORITZ: My question is, If there is going to be just so much money allocated by Congress, when New York gets its allotment, isn't it simply taking the same pie, dividing it up into smaller portions for New York City and for the rest of the state? Don't we run the risk of everybody appealing for the same amount of money and not getting anything more than they had before?

MR. McCABE: The evidence does not so indicate. As a matter of fact, by our ability, by the flexibility we have and the initial seed money that we have had, we have been able to generate federal support that would not otherwise have been forthcoming.

MR. PORTER: Are you saying then that your agency gives New York State a greater edge in getting subsidies?

MR. McCABE: You had better believe it. It is clear that when we go to HUD we have plans in hand, we have the land, we are ready to start construction as soon as we get the 236 subsidy. And

that has led, in my judgment, to a greater allocation of 236 funds than we otherwise would have had.

MR. MORITZ: In effect, aren't you taking away powers from the local governments because your ability to raise money, which is more efficient perhaps, is giving these areas less control over things?

MR. McCABE: No, I don't think so. Our first calls for help from the cities of New York State were from mayors who had grown weary of seeing undeveloped land in their city, land that in some cases had lain fallow for up to 14 years, where private enterprise would not come in and make the investment. We came in, and in 18 months, in some cases, we had developments rising out of the ground.

I think it is possible to suggest that a UDC could very well provide support for such regional groups, as we now do for local subsidiary corporations of UDC. In the Monroe County area, we have created a local subsidiary corporation and provide funding and support to that corporation to carry out a program. To the extent that you did this on regional basis, I see no reason why again UDC would not support that kind of activity.

DICK KLEEMAN, Minneapolis Tribune: Am I correct that in what you build you are empowered to discard local building codes and restrictions?

MR. McCABE: That is correct.

MR. KLEEMAN: How important an element of power is that? How much is being used or was used?

MR. McCABE: There is an important point that should be made. We have these powers, but we are not given authority to use them willy-nilly. It is suggested by law that we may override local codes and ordinances if necessary to carry out the project. There have been instances in the design of our projects when we have had to use the state instead of the local building code. There have been instances when we have had to override local zoning ordinances to get the kind of density that made the project economically feasible. And so we have used those powers in several instances. Yes, they are important, and that's how we've had to use them.

GEORGE McCUE, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: If a UDC in New York State and a UDC, for example, in New Jersey or Connecticut were to come up to a stateline with a proposal, for instance, of an industrial park in New York State and a park, period, in the adjoining state, how would you resolve the differences of concept in the use of the land?

MR. McCABE: You could do it, I suppose, by interstate compact, which has been used for this kind of regional across-state-line planning in the past. That's the only way I know you could do it.

MR. McCUE: Would there be a regional authority

or would it have to be by a voluntary consolidation of efforts?

MR. McCABE: I suspect that it should be a regional authority.

(Unidentified Speaker): Of the 7,000 housing starts that you've made, how many of them are low income, and what exactly do you mean by low income?

MR. McCABE: We have developed a policy of essentially building projects of mixed economic groups. We have really developed a formula which suggests that our projects have 70 percent middle-income housing, 20 percent low-income housing-, 20 percent being the public housing statutory limits-and 10 percent elderly. And in most cases our projects are divided 70, 20, 10. We have undertaken some scattered-site housing projects for the elderly, but we do not believe in building just low-income housing projects.

MR. DEREK: In terms of the question that Bruce [Porter] raised earlier about community participation in the decision making process, have low-income communities been willing to agree with the construction of housing for 70 percent middle income?

MR. McCABE: We have had support in all the communities in which we are using that formula.

MONROE KARMIN, Wall Street Journal: Can you discuss a little bit some of the other states that are interested in UDC, and what are the realistic possibilities that they would achieve agencies with power such as yours?

MR. McCABE: I have met with legislative leaders in Minnesota, Florida, Michigan; Ed has met with them in Pennsylvania. My own experience is when we get down to discussing the powers that we have, they run scared. The minute you say condemnation, that's a frightening concept and they frankly admit it.

I had a group say, "Well, we might be able to do some of this, but the chances in our state of really acquiring through legislation all the powers that you have are zilch."

MR. KARMIN: Forty-eight UDCs is a kind of zilch idea, too. You don't really expect that to happen!

MR. McCABE: I don't expect it to happen, but I would encourage it, by all means. I think the fact that the legislatures find it difficult does not mean that we shouldn't work with them to find ways in which this kind of technique can be used by others. When I spoke about its being international, the government of El Salvador asked me to come down and talk about how they might use this kind of technique in a small urbanized republic, and they introduced

legislation. Whether they will pass it, I don't know.

MR. SLAYTON: I'd like to make a follow-up comment on this. In the early days of urban redevelopment a lot of state legislatures talked about taking land in blighted areas and turning it over to private developers. The chances of getting that were zilch too. It took a long period of time. Eventually all 50 states adopted the enabling legislation for urban renewal. So, I think the fact that it may appear difficult in the early days, does not indicate that it's impossible. Federal money presumably could overcome the qualms of the legislatures.

MR. McCABE: I think that our existence, any success that we have, will have an influence on this. It's a fact that we did get the Title VII legislation to include public agencies. At the present time we may be the only state public agency that can use Title VII and the kind of fiscal incentives that Rep. Ashley talked about. The carrot that you have may very well steer more states into realizing that, to get the kind of infrastructure, the kind of educational, school, and water development that outlying areas need so desperately, they may have to go in this direction.

MR. KARMIN: My impression is that many states are moving toward some more limited form of this for housing development. Is that so?

MR. McCABE: There are now about 14 states that have state housing finance agencies that do the kind of Mitchell Lama programming that we have, but none that have the development potential.

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, (D., Ohio): Title VII isn't limited to any particular kind of public body. Just so long as there is authority from the legislature for whatever kind of public body it is to permit them to engage in development, they qualify. In the new communities going up outside of Toledo, it is the county itself that is developed under specific authority from the legislature of Ohio. But there is very deliberate flexibility with respect to the kind of public body that can engage in this activity.

JOHN REPS, Professor, Cornell University: One of the great virtues of an agency like UDC is one I've seen from the standpoint of a resident of a small town and a member of the planning board of that small town. We tend to take forever to reach decisions. UDC comes in and says, Here are issues, here are possibilities; now, let's talk about it. There's ample time to talk about it, and then UDC says, Gentlemen, the decision is going to be made to go or not go this week. And then we decided to go. I think that can be very useful. It can be very disconcerting to small-town minds, but I think it's a very, very healthy thing.

## B2. METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT ACQUIRES NEW POWERS

**JAMES HETLAND, Chairman, Twin Cities Metropolitan Council**

There is, in fact, a real urban area in our metropolitan regions and it is truly the real city. Yet whenever anybody begins talking about local government, you automatically make a transition back mentally to the established units of government, be they municipal, county, township, school district, or special-service district. The concept of those political devices tends to transcend the need to accomplish metropolitan-level services and provide real governmental services to people.

One of our state's more distinguished legislators said that he was getting sick and tired of people talking about levels of government and talking about questions of other levels of government. He said the problem is that we're all government. The only question is, what are we trying to serve with this government? And I think in those terms perhaps I can explain why the Twin Cities experiment is working. We have made a great deal of progress since 1967, and I think a part of the reason is that we call ourselves a non-government. We have been defined as a unique form of local government. We have a mechanism for resolving question at the local level, but under the auspices of state legislation.

To give you a quick physical summary of the Twin Cities area: We're a population of 1.8 million at the present time. We have seven counties that surround two major core cities. Put in those terms, it is not a great problem to think of beginning to pull the regional organizational problems together. But we carry democracy to the ultimate. We have 320 separate taxing units in those seven counties. And we have 3,000 square miles of physical territory. We have intensively developed about 20 percent of it, and we have scattered developed another 20 percent. We have a lot of area yet to be developed.

Our population is likely to double, I think, beyond any question. We have half of the state's population. We have two-thirds of the economic money potential for the State of Minnesota. We have a tendency in the metropolitan region-or had a tendency up to '67-to create special-service districts, independent districts to solve regional-level problems. Every time a new problem came up we'd create another special-service district. We have a transit commission, an airports commission, a mosquito control commission, several library commissions, several hospital commissions. We have all sorts of commissions, each of which was created to solve a special regional problem and then, having been created, lost any kind of public appearance and kind of went underground and continued to perform its thing. And all of a sudden you realize that you're being governed by a whole system of unrelated hidden governments.

But, more important, we have taken the process of the general units of government out of the whole

mechanism of solving regional problems. The generalist became a lost art, and there was no tying all the special services together.

In 1967, many of our civic groups decided that we no longer should continue to create endlessly these independent special-purpose districts at the regional level. There was general consensus that we did have some regional functional problems. We went through the process of saying, How do we put it together?

The councils of government that are in vogue across the country were considered and rejected, primarily on the ground that you cannot have representation when you have 320 governmental units. You can't expect to get anything done when consolidation is voluntary and you have to act by unanimity and you have to beg for dollars to support your function.

We took a look at the city-county mergers and thought of the political trauma in trying to evolve that kind of merger, particularly with the historical distrust between Minneapolis and St. Paul, our two major core cities. By and large, most of the mergers have been in too small a geographic area; we couldn't encompass a large enough area by a city-county merger to make it worthwhile.

A second feeling was that if you go that route, you're really creating a government and the likelihood is that you'd split the State of Minnesota into two sections, because this would be the population of half of the state and two thirds of the economic wealth. All of a sudden you have created something that perhaps is more important than the state itself. At a minimum, it would be difficult not to give it traditional home rule power. And one thing that has been quite vital is that we do not have home rule power. We are a creature of the legislature and we have to sell our programs to them.

We decided to take a middle ground. The thing that we are trying to do is to stitch across regional functions. We are trying to preserve the municipal and county units of government. Our municipalities were going broke. They still are. But they were in worse shape then because they were trying to perform regional-level functions inefficiently by having the two core cities kind of opt out on an agency basis, providing services for suburban units of government and doing it rather poorly and at unnecessary levels of cost.

The municipalities were wise enough to see one major thing: If you have a tight budgetary problem, you can increase taxes and get more money, or you can get rid of some of the functions. And if the purpose is not to get rid of the municipality, but to get rid of some of the uneconomic functions that can be performed elsewhere, you have evolved a way in which those cities can begin to survive better and use

their resources for those things that they really can concentrate on. So, our municipal league, the metro section of our league of municipalities, was one of the major supporters of the council concept, because it defined the function at the metro level. The legislature defined 20 such functions.

Why did the legislature buy it? The legislature was getting sick and tired of trying to resolve county and municipal problems for the two core cities and the seven counties every legislative session. They spent half to three-quarters of their time listening to pleas for local legislation, and the local legislation by and large involved conflicts between municipalities, and there was no way that in 120 days, every two years, our legislators could effectively resolve that kind of conflict.

What they were looking for was a spokesman, someone who could listen to and resolve the conflicts between local units of government over what is needed at the regional level and bring a consensus to the legislature for purposes of adoption. And they said for that we can have a non-government.

Both political parties are wise enough to realize that the political game is going to be fought out in the urban areas, particularly in the suburban areas, and the political parties that have shown some concern for how the urban and suburban areas relate to each other are going to be the parties of the future. So, the political parties have bought it quite readily.

The big fight in the 1967 session was not, Should we create this form of regional, functional implementation? but, do you have an elective body or an appointive body? If you have an elective, the thing becomes government. If appointed, it's closer to an administrative agency.

A decision was made to make it appointive. It has turned out to be a very wise decision. It removed immediately the fear of politicians, both at the state and the local level, that you created something that is going to usurp their traditional functions. It permitted the creation of a board of directors that was sophisticated enough to begin to move rather quickly with a solution to meet its problems. It permitted the creation of some very necessary and talented staff persons rather quickly.

The legislation, very briefly, states three powers. One, total money control over the special-purpose districts; the right to veto their capital plans. This is highly important. We have done this with the airport commission twice. We have said, Thou shalt not. We have no right to say affirmatively, Thou shalt. That's the weakness in our law, no affirmative power.

Two, we are the review agency for federal funding and state funding purposes. This gives us a great deal of authority, because the constituent units of government need federal funding on almost everything except schools and welfare.

Three, we have a right to mediate inter-municipal disputes. This takes care of the questions of inconsistent municipal boundary planning and

comprehensive plan conflicts. Then, fourth, we were asked in '67, Come back in 1969 and tell us what should be done.

So, the council in 1969 considered six major pieces of proposed legislation and bought all six. Two relate to the sewer system. We're in an area of high water table. Therefore, the way in which we dispose of our sewer effluent is highly critical to the health and to the quality of our water resources. We were polluting our major lakes. The legislature had spent three unsuccessful legislative sessions previous to 1969 trying to resolve a method of treating and disposing of sewer effluent in the seven-county region. Our thought was that if you try to sell the sewer treatment system on the basis of cost efficiency, everyone has a sharp pencil and someone is going to win or lose. You sell the question of sewer treatment on the basis of water quality, upgrading the question of water table quality, and make those involved in using the sanitary sewers pay for it on a volume basis. You stand a reasonable chance of selling the legislation.

So, we have created in effect a metropolitan utility in which the council has only two basic powers. It was decided at that time and we hold to it. In this legislative session we have not varied from it. The council should not own or operate anything. It shouldn't be a government. What we need is effective plan implementation, and for that you need only two things: the right to create the master plan, budget, and the dollar control to ensure that the plan is in fact abided by.

With regard to the metropolitan sewer board, which now far out shadows the council in economic resources and people and all sorts of things, we have adopted the master plan that they have to follow. This decides when and where the new interceptors are pushed out. It gets ahead of development. It's a way in which you can begin to make some sense out of your second-, third-, fourth-, and fifth-tier suburban development.

Second, we have the right to say yes or no on their budget, but more important, we have the right to put items into their capital budget because we deem something to be of higher priority. We issue metropolitan bonds to finance it, so no taxes will ever be used to pay for it.

The second piece of legislation that I will discuss is the question of airport noise and land use around airports. The Twin Cities area, as with every other major region in the United States, suffers from an airport that is too close to the residential areas, and jet noise is now raising Cain with 250,000 people. It's clear that we're going to have to do something in the very near future.

Our airports commission is a special purpose district, highly qualified, and excellent advocate for air transportation needs. They made a recommendation for the creation of a second major airport. The Metropolitan Council said, if you're going to build a

new airport, you want to make sure you don't repeat the mistakes of the past. There is no sense in building a new airport and having people and inconsistent development move in, so that when you finish you have the same problems riding on the perimeter of your airport as caused the original airport to become functionally disabled.

So, the legislature adopted a piece of airport legislation that gives to the council the right to determine consistent land use within three to five miles of the perimeter of the two major airports, and authority for whatever the noise cones may be under the new major airport off the edges of the runway.

The implementation is by the local units of government within the permissible land use. Backup authority is with the council. And that piece of legislation has worked very well, except that we haven't located an airport yet. For ecological reasons we bounced the airport a second time, and we're still back in the process of finding a suitable location. I think it will ultimately be done.

We have adopted legislation regarding sanitary sewers, solid waste disposal, and parks and open space. We have a metropolitan transit commission over whom we now have tight budgetary control. We have adopted a plan of major urban centers. We have adopted a housing proposal, and we have the airport legislation.

We've got 14 persons who will represent districts-not units of government -on a one-man, one-vote split. One of the better things that ever happened is that we got away from this delegate representative of subunits of government. We now have people deciding questions on a district basis, all right, but at a regional level.

We have our own budget in the sense that we tax seven-tenths of a mill across the seven counties and produce \$1.6 million. We're in the process of determining whether to become elective this session. My personal prediction is it's not likely to come about. And everything sounds hunky-dory, I guess, in the sense that we have come a long way in three and a half years. But what's the real bind?

The real bind, and the key to all of these 'urban questions, is the fiscal disparities. We have proposals into the legislature to resolve fiscal disparity. What's a fiscal disparity? This is the competition between the local units of government for development because they win or lose in total terms on the basis of whether or not a particular type of development takes place within their taxing jurisdiction.

So, we find within our metropolitan region almost cannibalistic competition for commercial and industrial locations between our municipalities and our school districts, because commercial and industrial locations do not have children to be educated and no growth services being demanded.

We have competition for large-lot, high-quality residential development, because that is also rather easy to service. And we have a trend developing

whereby a poorer community and our unincorporated areas are now getting the low- and medium-income housing and the mobile-home housing, and they are being located five and ten miles past the existing development.

The reason is that each community has a real estate tax base which permits it to service or not service certain governmental functions well. We have a beautiful program on transit, but it's not likely to come about because our communities are concerned about who gets what level of transit service first, and this is deemed to affect their capacity to attract commercial and industrial facilities.

So, the thing that we're trying to do is to break the bondage of the metropolitan tax dollar. I doubt seriously if we're going to be successful in this legislative session. We have two major proposals involving an aid formula. We are realistic enough to know that you can't take tax base away from communities where the tax is already being used and relied on.

But you can take away future tax base, and you can share future commercial and industrial growth because no one knows where this will take place. And since it is the result of public investment, it seems reasonable to use that as a method of beginning to equalize between school districts and municipalities. This has to be done. It's a traumatic decision.

The reason that we're not likely to be successful is not related to this program. It's related to the same thing that New York is aging through. Everything in our state legislature this session is turning around the economic woes of the state in balancing the state budget.

We have some very excellent housing development legislation. We'll come fairly close to a development corporation, if adapted, that would give the type of authority that's highly desired in our urban region and in the state. But this too may be last in the throes of trying to balance a budget.

So, with that I say that our program is successful. We have accomplished the physical rather well. I think that any urban region can do so if it has the desire to do so. Almost every region has single-purpose, special-service districts, and they give to them authority that we wouldn't even ask our legislature to give to us because we don't think we could get it. But as long as you don't call that a metropolitan government, somehow or other these districts evolve and get the authority.

The answer is that they're always single-purpose, and there's never a stitch across, and it's when you need the generalist to come in and make the decisions as to how these all relate together that you get into the serious question of how to pull all of it together well. And for the same reason our urban areas have refused to take that next step, and I think it has to be done. I think the councils of government must take the next step or our urban areas are likely to find



that they're losing control of their own destiny.

IAN MENZIES, Boston Globe: If you were suddenly invited into Massachusetts, how would you get rid of single purpose authorities?

MR. HETLAND: I wouldn't get rid of them, I'd coordinate them. All you need is the right to say no, thou cannot; that's all the legislature has to say.

MR. MENZIES: Would you tell me just a little more about what you mean by coordination in that sense?

MR. HETLAND: We have a right to review a plan of an independent district on two bases: It either conforms to the metropolitan plan or it's not consistent with overall social and economic development. We have been saying no to the medical service district on the latter basis. If it is not consistent with overall social, physical, and economic development, the plan is suspended.

This gives you the right, obviously, to negotiate on what you want. And if they will come back with something you think is desirable, you can say yes. If you say no under our legislation, the appeal is to the state legislature, which meets every two years and is not a particularly effective remedy.

MR. MENZIES: What about the bonding authority that they have constitutionally?

MR. HETLAND: The bonding authority is only the right to spend public funds. And since each of the independent districts is legislatively created, if someone says that they can only spend consistent with the overall good—namely, the urban plan—there is nothing inconsistent about that. They just have to get approval before they can act.

MR. MENZIES: How big a professional staff do you have behind the 14 people?

MR. HETLAND: We have a staff of about 60 professionals and about 40 nonprofessionals. We have a budget of \$3.2 million.

MR. SLAYTON: Do you have a right to say no to the state highway department in terms of where they are going to locate a major highway?

MR. HETLAND: We do not. We have pending legislation and that. It is part of a revised transit plan program to put the transit commission under the council, and to require that all road building be consistent with overall plans. We need this very badly. We do not have it now except for federal fund review.

MR. SLAYTON: Do you have that on sewers, major sewers, major waterways?

MR. HETLAND: Yes, and an open space.

JACK CLAIBORNE, Charlotte Observer: I wonder what you see as the future of your council. What do you see it evolving into? Will it one day be a

government?

MR. HETLAND: I hope that we never really do become a government. The reason that we decided as we did with the sewer board was that you had to have someone with time enough to think in government. And we go through the processes at local government levels of trying to put up restraints to make sure that people don't rob the till and do not engage in all sorts of undesirable functions, with the result that the mechanics of government, the processes of bid and all the rest of this junk, prevents the generalist, by and large, to think as a body.

Our feeling was that if we could get all of the bids and the operating questions down at a level with boards to make these decisions; we then could preserve at the metropolitan level a body that had the capacity to worry about the basic questions, and hopefully we can hew to that.

JAMES WELSH, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C.: Regional bodies like your own are usually much more successful in building sewer lines and getting transportation and so on than they are in confronting the issues of where people ought to live, work, and play. Do you think your council has a handle on this latter thing, or are there other things you're going to have to do?

MR. HETLAND: Our primary limits now on low- and medium-income housing are not racial or economic. Low-income people tend to have children and children have to be educated, and it's there that we reach the situation of large-lot zoning restrictions. Our feeling is that if you can do something about the fiscal disparities, you hit it first and most directly.

We assign a lower priority in the review of federal fund requests to municipalities whose plans and ordinances do not provide for low- and moderate-income housing. That has already been adopted as a formal policy of the council after public hearing and much hue and cry.

If the federal government will back us up, then we can now get our local community plans to include low- and medium-income housing. I think it can be done, because this is a problem of the young and the elderly in our area. And it's pretty hard for municipalities, when they are faced with no federal funds, to say that they don't want young people or aid people.

So, I think we can begin to make it disappear. I'm not sure that other urban areas could do likewise.

MR. WELSH: You seem so dependent on the legislature giving power to you. Could you find an agency in a place like Philadelphia, as you say, a metro area, or even worse, the Washington area?

MR. HETLAND: I think that the split urban region, where you've got an interstate compact requirement, is the most difficult. Yes, it can be done. But I think that it's difficult to get two legislative bodies to be realistic.

DANIEL SCHORR, CBS News, Washington, D.C.:

It seems to me that the premise for the success of metropolitan development has to be a certain consensus about goals, and that these are best achieved in the relative absence of tension-racial and otherwise. Given your fortunate situation in that respect, do you think it will be very difficult to use the same plan in a lot of cities where there is distrust about goals, where the tensions rise racially, economically, and otherwise? Is there a scientific way of ascertaining goals, like the transfer of income in order to balance your school districts? Can you get it down to a scientific basis that would be generally accepted without becoming a political football?

MR. HETLAND: My general advice is to talk functions. If you start talking functions and not government, and how you are best going to handle certain things, and how you are best going to coordinate them, you begin to get a pretty good grasp on it.

The have and have-not communities are in general agreement that certain things have to be done. After all, sewage has to be treated and disposed of. Transportation has to be provided. Solid waste has to be disposed of.

The questions of the large minority core cities, in my mind, are perhaps the most important. I am very fearful about leaving the core cities to the minorities and throwing up the barriers. By and large, they want this at the present time, and it's unfortunate. They want that independence, they want that political clout, and in five years there may not be anything to clout about or with.

I would hate to face the black community and the others, having fooled them again. We left them with all of the problems of society, namely the core city. Unless we begin truly to talk functions, I don't think there is any way in which we can begin talking about pulling together, because the haves and have-nots never think in those terms.

MR. SCHORR: When you talk functions, do you get a response?

MR. HETLAND: Absolutely. And that's frankly the way in which this was sold in our area in 1967. We had communities that were somewhat reluctant in the sense that they had it made. On the other hand, they couldn't build a sewer system by themselves. They had to get it from somewhere. And if you have a few sophisticated legislators, they are in a position to make this happen. This is why I think they're so critical.

THOMAS GRIFFITH, Life: I'm not clear on your geography out there. Is the new town of Jonathan inside your territory?

MR. HETLAND: Yes.

MR. GRIFFITH: And is Jonathan consistent with the overall social, fiscal, and economic development?

MR. HETLAND: Yes. This was in fact the first community that was totally planned; it was planned,

in large measure, with the cooperation of our metropolitan planning commission, which is a predecessor of the council. Its entire program has been made to jell with that of our overall urban plan. It's a good operation there.

RON NESSEN, NBC News, Washington, D.C.:

I'm not clear on how this tax equalization works.

Are you saying that some district with a lot of factories in it that creates a lot of property tax writes out a check and gives it to the district?

MR. HETLAND: It just loses the right to tax all of the increase. You're going to have some growth that will occur. It's going to occur in different places. Assemble that tax base. Apply some mileage to it. Don't let the underlying units of government tax that portion of the base. Now you have created a fund, and you distribute the fund back on a basis different from where it came from.

MR. NESSEN: You're collecting those taxes?

MR. HETLAND: It really isn't even a new tax; it's just a distribution, because it's based on what would otherwise go into these municipalities unevenly. It's a sharing of tax base.

FRED POWLEDGE, author, Brooklyn, N.Y.:

Who are your enemies? Do they tend to be communities or do they tend to be individuals or a class of people?

MR. HETLAND: Our enemies today have tended to be a class of people, conservatives who have been sold on the idea that somehow or other we're a plot. There's a substantial number with that kind of mental process.

MR. POWLEDGE: The same as those who oppose fluoridation?

MR. HETLAND: They oppose almost anything, yes. Also, we're being opposed right now by the very poor communities who feel that our decisions are depriving them of their tax base, because we are saying no to the location of things that in the long run will be disadvantageous to them and expensive.

They feel that they would like to have them. Mobile homes and unincorporated areas sound good to a town board that has a tax base of maybe \$50,000. When they start thinking about the cost of providing total municipal services to a new 1,500-2,000-unit development, that base is gone immediately. That distinction doesn't hit home when somebody tells you I'm going to give you another \$50,000 of tax base.

Others that oppose us are the have communities. All of a sudden we have accomplished the physical junctions, and the next layer of questions are social. We're in the health business, the criminal justice business, and the housing business. And those in the have communities aren't particularly happy with us.

ROBERT DENNY, Public Relations Counsel,

AIA: Your state of Minnesota is one of three belonging to the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission-an interstate compact with a five-year plan for unified transportation planning, industrial development, and tax credits for industry. Could you comment on the relationship, if any, between the Metro Council and that compact?

MR. HETLAND: So far, there really hasn't been that much relationship. We keep track of each other at the staff level. Their planning function, frankly, is in the northern reaches and we're more in the south-middle part of the state. Our prime contact right now is across the St. Croix with Wisconsin, where development decisions between Wisconsin and Minnesota have to be made consistently. The Great Lakes Region is turning out to be a help to us on that issue.

MR. DENNY: Do you perceive that type of interstate compact as doing the kind of thing you're doing on a broader level?

MR. HETLAND: Yes. That one has its origins at the federal level and needs state implementation. I think it would be just as easy to start with the state implementation, and if we need some federal funding to induce it, fine. But I really think the issue should be state legislatures.

MONROE KARMIN, Wall Street Journal: Could you just list for me or simplify what you think your major accomplishments on the whole development pattern of this area in the past three years have been?

MR. HETLAND: We have taken sewage treatment plants off of two major lakes and off of the smaller streams. That means we have eliminated roughly 15 smaller sewage treatment plants and have created a metropolitan system which we are treating at a higher level. All of our lakes and all of our streams, the Mississippi and Minnesota, will have a swimmable quality of water, and these are the two rivers that are the sole recipients of our sewer effluent. So, in water quality cleanup, massive results have been established.

In the solid waste area, we have now finished approving a plan for a 15-year sanitary landfill. So now St. Paul, for instance, has no landfill area in its

municipal boundaries; it has a place where it can get rid of garbage and trash and refuse. This is true throughout the seven county region.

Third, we have acquired three pieces of close-in open space with the \$2 million allotted to us for that purpose in the last biennium. This could not have been done except by the council forcing coordination on those issues.

Fourth, we have prevented an airport in a location that could have caused some grave problems.

Fifth, we have induced the commissioner of highways and his staff to contribute about \$800,000 to the Metropolitan Council and to the transit commission to have joint powers -it's an informal coalition- on transportation planning. Their moneys are being used for a travel behavior inventory update which, correlated with the census, will give us the first good planning data of any major region in the United States.

But, most important, it is forcing the highway engineers and the transit engineers and the general planners to all work together in the same room, and they have been doing it together for a year and a half, and all of a sudden the transportation plans are making more sense. We have adopted distances on urban interchanges, on levels of road service, and all sorts of things. I don't think we could have done if we hadn't had that working.

PHILIP HERRERA, Time: Can adjacent counties join the council?

MR. HETLAND: No. The legislature has to bring them in. So far it has been limited to the seven. There is a possibility of adding an eighth, but I don't think it's going to occur this time.

MR. HERRERA: Did the eighth ask to get in?

MR. HETLAND: Yes, it would like to get in, but frankly if we're going to add something, we should really go across to the Wisconsin side. It's there that the problem exists, not on the Minnesota side.

## B3. PLANNING FOR THE SUBURBAN MAJORITY

**JAMES ROUSE, President, The Rouse Company, Developer of the New Town of Columbia, Maryland**

There really isn't any such thing as planning for the suburban majority. The suburban majority that's there is there. It's living there and that's it, and there's not much planning going on for them.

The planning that goes on within the suburban areas relates to that dramatic growth that's occurring. It isn't the growth of the suburb; it's the growth of the metropolitan area, of which the suburb is a part. People are coming from everywhere into the metropolis and flowing out everywhere, and this dynamic game of musical chairs keeps going on all the time. The suburbs grow, not because of blight, but because of movement and growth in the city.

We'll add 70 million people to the American metropolis in these 20 years that we're in. The census just published the Baltimore-Washington regional figures for 1960 to 1970, and we added to Baltimore and Washington just over a million people. The region grew from four million people to five million people, or a 25-percent increase. That's a big city, bigger than either Baltimore or Washington, that has been added to the Baltimore-Washington region in those ten years, just a decade. Surely it will be substantially exceeded in this decade when we are getting the tremendous growth of new family formations following the rush of marriages after the war.

This tremendous growth occurs by sheer whim and chance and accident, and creates what is called sprawl. Sprawl is the product of the growth of the metropolitan area.

The title of this conference, "Rebuilding America," is the focus that one has to hang with if he's going to talk about any part of it. You really can't talk about a new town without talking about the inner city, without talking about the whole range of problems and opportunities of the metropolis.

I guess all of us bring a bias to what we say, and my bias emerges out of what we're doing in our company. We are building a new small city or new town in Columbia-110,000 people, to be built over a period of 13 years. We're now about 13,000 people and we grow at a little better than a thousand a month.

This has been a very important learning experience for us and a very important experience in exploding a good many myths that relate to the urban growth process. We were able, despite conventional wisdom to the contrary, to assemble land without the powers of condemnation. I'm not degrading the powers of condemnation in an urban development law at all, but it is possible to do many things that we could stand around wringing our hands waiting for new powers to do. We have assembled 18,000 acres of land. That's 195 separate farms and parcels. We were able to finance it. We were able to zone it for a new city in a

very conservative area that had its hands up to resist all urbanization.

We have been able to create what I think is perhaps the most truly unselfconscious interracial community in America in a county that voted for George Wallace for president in 1964, voted against the public accommodations bill as recently as 1966. There is not a token black population but a substantial black population. Of the 13,000 people there I would guess that 2,000 are black. And despite all of the dire predictions to the contrary, the market has been unaffected by this. The market has been strong and gotten stronger. People are not turned away by this fact.

We have seen a rural school board that had no desire for city that was very satisfied with its educational system that had 13,000 kids when we came there, faced with the prospect of adding 40,000 kids in ten years. We have seen it respond to that situation with a creativity that has resulted in a whole new system of public education, maybe the most advanced in America. Beginning from kindergarten through high school, the entire system is focused on the development of the individual child, open classrooms, team teaching, ungraded, no marks, kids at 7, 8, and 9 off doing independent work.

A remarkable thing has happened. It's not we who did it at all. The prospect of city opened up the establishment in the form of the educational institution to really create change.

We have seen the same thing happen in the health system. A great old institution like Johns Hopkins, again responding to the prospect of city, has worked out with Connecticut General Life Insurance Company a program of comprehensive health care so that any family in Columbia can pay so much a month and buy group medical practice, hospitalization, psychiatric care, paid for on a monthly payment basis. The city is the group. Anybody entering the city is immediately eligible for the full benefits of the plan.

We have seen the churches abandon their sovereignties and combine the Protestant denominations, the Catholics, and the Jews into the formation of interfaith centers. Together they own an interfaith housing corporation that provides housing for low- or middle-income families.

These things are important. They may be the most important things happening in Columbia, because they have revealed that when a development is undertaken on a scale that allows rational city planning, then established institutions begin to open up their minds to it. New energy is released, and thinking is released, and new forms come out for dealing with the process of life. These new forms themselves create an environment that makes the city

marketable and causes the whole economic process to be stimulated. In fact, it is more profitable to build a city in which these issues have been dealt with than to try to develop land without dealing with them.

There have been some interesting spin-offs from this. We said at the outset that we felt we would have an experience which we would be able to apply in other places. We meant to be in the new-city building business, not just to build a new town or new city in Columbia. But we really didn't expect the reactions to come as swiftly as they have in ways different and beyond what we might have hoped.

We did believe that lessons learned in the building of a new town would have real application to the remaking of the old city. The experience in which we're now engaged in Hartford, Conn., stems directly from Columbia, is more important than Columbia itself, and is a direct product of Columbia.

The major business corporations of the Hartford region, some 27 of them, have committed themselves to a sum of \$3 million as a result of which we are now engaged, and have been since last July, in a process that will carry through until July of 1972. And it is our purpose under this process to examine the totality of life of the metropolitan region.

There are 29 towns, 700,000 people, 650 square miles. We want to examine, with the people of Hartford, with private agencies, government, and business, all of the institutions of life, the school system, health system, the churches, the ingredients of community life, employment, transportation, welfare, law and justice. We are working from the belief that the city can be made to work, and by city I mean the metropolis, not geographical and political boundaries.

We believe the city can be made to work, not that we have to engage forever in the process of patching up nonworking cities or compensating for conditions about cities that don't work. We have to believe that with the affluence and management capability that exist in this society, it is possible to produce a working urban environment. And if we could, what would it be like? We believe that it's possible to ask that question and chase down answers until you come up with a rational image of a city that works.

What would a school system be like that works if there were also a health system that worked and a welfare system that worked and a law and justice system that worked and they all worked at the same time?

We're very aware of the unfavorable results of schools and health and crime and unemployment not working or of those aspects of life being malfunctions. But what might happen if no child in the metropolitan area of Hartford entered school with a remedial physical defect? Suppose that was a standard and the health system was built to accomplish that, and then the educational system proceeded on the premise that this was occurring.

What might be the favorable interactions of systems that worked? What kind of economies are

there in government from stripping out the malfunctions and substituting functional systems of urban life? What might happen to the physical environment under these circumstances? What might happen to the tax base?; to the tax revenues? What might happen to the whole arithmetic of cities if cities were working institutions instead of nonworking institutions?

What would this kind of examination of health and schools and law and justice and welfare say about, the physical formation of the old city? The north end of Hartford is the slum-ridden, riot-torn part of the city. What would happen if, in order to make these systems work, the physical plans were focused not on simply building a new housing project or closing a street or opening a street, but creating a community that had the kind of internal dynamic services that produced a working environment for the life and growth of her people?

We propose to find out. We propose to plan it. And we propose to cost it, schedule its development, and measure its impact on the budgets, on revenue. We propose to do that through a series of four models, one of which is of the inner city of the north area of Hartford. The City of Hartford is about 135,000 people, and what we call the north end is 35,000 to 45,000 people, so it's a big part of the inner city. And to develop a new community development model, we seek to plan and organize, with the people of Hartford, the new north Hartford.

Similarly, to take an older town that is growing and do the same thing with respect to its future growth. Third, to plan an entirely new city which would be brought into existence. Fourth, to build a regional model which contemplates the regional tasks of ecology, environment, transportation, sewer, water, and growth, and extrapolates from the individual model the data to project a regional model and to project growth for the Hartford region over the next ten years.

There have now been created in Hartford two new instruments important to this process. One is a nonprofit organization called Hartford Process Inc. We think that what the city has got to be engaged in is not making a plan but producing a process. Our people are now the staff of Hartford Process, but by the time we leave in the summer of '72 the hope is we will have left behind people who then move on, continually engaged in this process.

Believing that one of the great devils of planning is the absence of a development corporation or a developer to carry out the results of good planning, there has been created the Greater Hartford Development Corporation, which will be a private corporation owned by Hartford Process Inc. It is to be a public interest focused developer of the plans produced by Hartford Process Inc., working with the local governments.

The business community has pledged \$1.5 million in initial capital for Hartford Process Inc. Good people

have joined this effort. It's a powerful team of people. It's a high risk, and we're very conscious of the fact that what we are attempting to do hasn't happened before. But we believe we really won't be coming to grips anywhere with the problems of the American city until in at least one city we have produced an image of a city that works.

DANIEL SCHORR, CBS News, Washington, D.C.: A model city.

MR. ROUSE: Yes, it could have been called that if the words hadn't been bastardized.

We believe that if you take hold of city on a large enough scale, both in land area and in the whole fabric of activities that go on in a city, there is brand new opportunity released. We were employed by the City of New York to do a feasibility study of a large land area on Staten Island. Here is the geographic heart of the biggest, most dynamic, and maybe the most troubled city in the world. We studied 10,000 acres of land with 12,000 owners. Forty-five percent of the land was taken back by the city for delinquent taxes. Only a few thousand people are living there. We were asked to examine the feasibility and make a report and recommendation, and we did.

We recommended to the city, and I believe we have proved to our satisfaction, that on that land it could build a city of 450,000 people, a new city with a quality of life superior to anything that now exists in the New York metropolitan area, with a viable economic base in terms of business and industry to cover the cost of deficit services, such as schools.

Twenty percent of the land can be preserved as open space feeding through the city. It can create the opportunity for New York to explore new systems in education and health and the urban life-support systems that it's now almost impossible to do, and this can be done without a dollar of subsidy from the city, without ever pledging the credit of the city. It can return, over a period of 22 years, an excess of tax revenues over per capita government cost of over a billion dollars.

To me this is the most dramatic expression I've ever seen of the potential for capturing values for the benefit of the city through comprehensive planning and development as against the piecemeal squandering of land that we're now doing.

I think the same thing is exactly true of the central city. The urban renewal program at its very best is a tiny, piecemeal thing. The model cities program-what-ever its hopes may have been-just isn't big enough in physical area or in its intention to really examine and bring forth out of the basic life-support systems new ways of providing an adequate urban life for the people who live there.

I think we're in a new period in American urban history. I believe that for a long, long time we walked through a period of apathy when no amount of exhortation really produced any very significant results. We then were awakened by the riots.

I do not defend or support the riots. I regard them as unjust and irrational. But no matter how that may be, the riots were the most creative force to hit the American city in a hundred years. They awakened the American public official and the American business executive to the real seriousness of American urban life. They really said, as nothing else could, that people were rejecting this society in such bitter, sullen, hostile terms that whole damn cities would burn down if we didn't begin to take it seriously.

There followed a stage of panic about the American city. People were variously motivated to run or to throw up their hands. There was despair and there was a frantic period. It has quieted down. Now I think we have entered an important new period in dealing with the American city.

It is a responsible awareness of the seriousness of the problem and a very high expectancy that things have got to change, an expectancy of people in the heart of the city but also on the part of public officials, business people, and social leaders. There's a new understanding that this thing is just wrong, and that it's wholly inappropriate to our civilization that we allow the continuance of life as we do in the American city today or that we continue to support this incredibly reckless sprawl that reaches out from the city.

We have some tough issues to face. We've got to face the issues of race and poverty in ways that are far beyond poverty programs and patch-up, fix-up sponging of the problem the way we are doing now. The quickest way to deal with the problems of race and housing is a massive enforcement of our laws against discrimination on a metropolitan-area basis, on a scale that we have never been willing to undertake.

I think we also have to go one step further. I think we've denied a choice for so long that there are many people in the central city who need a special form of assistance in approaching the housing market, of knowing where to go and how to buy and how to negotiate and how to finance. We have made them the victims so long of an unbelievably complex system of just high jacking people that we really don't have any idea of what the crippling impact has been.

In Baltimore, a Catholic priest and a black leader took an area of a square mile in which a thousand houses had changed from white to black in one of those breakthroughs that occurred in a period of a year. And they really took the time to go back and identify every single purchase that was made and every sale was made to an ultimate homeowner in that block. They found that these thousand dwelling units were purchased by 13 companies. The average price that the white homeowner had paid was \$9,000. The average price that was paid by the black home buyer was \$13,000. That was a \$4-million write up in the course of a year.

The population of the area was, of course,

increased enormously because the high price was supported by a financing system of taking back short-term mortgages by the speculators who sold them. These mortgages were discounted at our finest banks as collateral for loans. The monthly payments were, of course, enormously high. Therefore, there had to be renting of second floors and all the things we know to be slum-generating. All of the schools and public services were jammed by the new population. The level of services went down. And from that one square mile went \$400,000 a year in excess mortgage payments above the fair value of those houses the year before it happened.

This is the price we pay for closed markets in the metropolitan area. It's a fantastic system for creating slums, for forcing slums to come into business. A real opening up of the entire metropolitan market to people, whether black or white, would have more to do with central-city problems than almost any other single force.

MONROE KARMIN, Wall Street Journal: This morning we heard Mr. Ashley talk about new legislation for urban communities. Can you give us your opinion about what impact that will have on your own plans and the new communities?

MR. ROUSE: I think that we need terribly to enlarge the development capability in America to undertake big, comprehensive new developments, new towns, new cities. I think it is a right choice that there be a strong federal program of support for the building of these new communities, and I think that Congressman Ashley's bill provides this, and that this already has stimulated the aggregation of land on a larger scale.

I also think that the image of the New York State Urban Development Corporation must be projected through the country, with powers of condemnation when you can get them. I would settle for relinquishing the power of condemnation in order to get an urban development corporation that had the power to finance and the power to take the initiative. This is the thing that is really needed.

I would see federal loans and grants to local community development corporations at the city and county level. The main thing we need is large-scale development initiative. The initiation, planning and bringing forth of new communities requires a development initiative on a scale that the country is not now prepared for. Yet we face this enormous growth. So I think that Congressman Ashley's bill will be a very positive force.

MR. KARMIN: Do you, sir, plan to use the bill? If so, why? And if not, why not?

MR. ROUSE: The why, if we did, would be because it made money available at lower rates and therefore improved the economics of the acquisition and development process. If we elected not to, it would be because we found money available without government insurance and therefore free of what

inevitably must be some greater controls.

JACK PATTERSON, Business Week: In your Staten Island plan you gave the city two choices: One, a new public benefit corporation, the other to use the Urban Development Corporation, and you recommended that the city create a new public benefit corporation. My questions are: Why did you recommend a new public benefit corporation instead of using the existing Urban Development Corporation? And what's the status of the new corporation?

MR. ROUSE: We regarded it as our job to study and make proposals regarding feasibility and methods of carrying it out, and therefore we felt we had to deal with alternative solutions. We then signed a second-stage contract with the City of New York in which it has been our job for the past several months to attempt to educate the people on Staten Island to the potential of this new city. I feel very much encouraged by the response on Staten Island.

Our second assignment is to computerize the economic models that were a part of our feasibility study in such a way that they can be readily responsive to all kinds of variables that will be introduced over time. That we have about finished.

And the third was to design legislation that could create a system for carrying this forward.

That's where we are right now. That has been done and there are some differences of opinion between the people in the City of New York and the people in Staten Island and the people in state government. This would involve the creation of a new corporation. I think that this is necessary primarily to relieve anxieties on Staten Island.

MR. PATTERSON: In other words, you're saying the Urban Development Corporation would frighten people in Staten Island, so you come in with a new public body.

MR. ROUSE: I haven't disaffirmed what you just said.

OWEN MORITZ, New York Daily News: We have been criticized by people like Jane Jacobs and some others who say new towns simply cannot create history, and that the purpose of cities to have a sense of history. How do you cope with this, new towns with no history at all?

MR. ROUSE: I certainly would agree that it's difficult to create history. I think that there is a peculiar quick jump that occurs in people's thinking. Here is sprawl. Here is massive abuse of the land, a perfectly silly building of clutter along the highways of houses and apartments and schools and churches and stores with absolutely no relationship to one another. And anybody can look at it and say it's bad, that you've got to be able to do better than 'we do in this metropolitan-area growth.

So then you take on the task, which would seem to

be a modest task, of saying in Columbia, we ought to be able to take hold of a hundred thousand people and make this growth rational in uses and in the wider spectrum of incomes and produce a better life. Then when we do that, it's no longer compared with the sprawl and the massive mess of the suburban areas. Then the quick jump is: Yes, but what about the inner city?

No amount of new towns alone is going to provide relief to the inner cities. We want to play some kind of checker game in which we build something here and pick up everybody and move them out there. First of all, all those people don't want to move. So I really find it difficult to deal with that criticism.

MR. SCHORR: In your unselfconscious racial mixing in Columbia, do you make any self-conscious effort to maintain a racial balance? Is there a tipping point, and if so, how do you avoid it?

MR. ROUSE: I was called into a conference in Washington not long ago, and it was the first time I had heard the expression *tipping point*. We had a determination at the outset that we would not have a strategy about race other than that we were genuinely open. We would do nothing to stimulate it. We were told we must, that black people really wouldn't come unless we made special arrangements to bring them, and we said that we didn't believe it if it was really open.

And then there were people who said we would be inundated if we didn't control it. And we really have done neither at all. If you really say you are going to be color blind, you've got to have a strategy about being color blind or you will be unselfconsciously racist without even knowing it.

When we opened our exhibit building, there were black hostesses as well as white, and the pictures all through the exhibit building contained black children as well as white children, and we said to a black person arriving there, we mean it in all those ways.

We had instructions to every real estate broker and leasing salesman that they could not reveal the race of a person in another apartment who had bought a lot or a house. There could be none of this business of: Is my neighbor black? He had to take his chances. And we said that if we heard of it, the salesman would have to be fired. It never happened. We really never had an example of that happening.

We held our breath. We had black and white people in the first ten families, and it has been an amazing experience. We did get worried that there were some locations in which we found that people bought houses on lots without knowing who was there and therefore four or five black people wound up alongside one another. We were worried that this would look like we had manipulated a ghetto, and we tried to develop some kind of 3-way of dealing with it. But it just faded. We just really don't have any quota, we don't impose any limitations, and we don't do anything to stimulate it.

MR. SCHORR: Considering the limited opportunities elsewhere, it's remarkable you weren't inundated.

MR. ROUSE: Again, the whole answer is scale and pace. If this was a subdivision, we would be inundated. It would be black. When we finished assembling our land, there were 15 subdivisions within our boundaries and 7,500 people living there. So we have built this city in and around an existing population that was an important part of the population of a county that voted for George Wallace for president. And yet there has really been no objection whatsoever from Howard county.

THOMAS GRIFFITH, Life: You indicated that assembling Columbia without condemnation gave you some freedom from control. Just what do you want to do that controls hamper you from doing?

MR. ROUSE: I believe that if we had had to acquire the land from an agency that had the power of condemnation, that power automatically would have carried with it a responsibility for visibility, an announced plan, announcing in advance exactly what you were going to acquire, for what purpose, with public hearings. The price of the land would have skyrocketed.

Having no power, we were operating in a free market. We were simply negotiating for land.

MR. GRIFFITH: It's not later controls that you're worried about, just the prices going up.

MR. ROUSE: Actually I think when I made that point about government controls, I wasn't dealing with condemnation. I was dealing with the issue of using Title VII for the purpose of financing land acquisition, and I don't know what those controls might be, and I don't know that they would be offensive at all. I only know that the government, perfectly naturally in administering a law of this kind, has the responsibility of seeing that congressional purposes are fulfilled. And in the doing of that there have got to be regulations, conditions fulfilled that we just might not want to go through the red tape and the reporting system that would be involved.

RON NESSEN, NBC News, Washington, D.C.: You spoke very forcefully about the need to make all housing in the metropolitan areas open, I think, and teach people how to bargain and get mortgages and avoid blockbusting. Do you have any idea how this is going to happen or do you think it is?

MR. ROUSE: It's like so many things in America. We really have an extraordinary herd instinct. If something leans over there, we tend to follow. If I were the federal government, I would focus in on one metropolitan area-at enormous political peril, I'm sure-and draw out the sum total of the laws available to the federal government under open occupancy legislation.



For example, all federal mortgage insurance can be withheld until there is an open market. And if this were supported by special lawyers who were following up every single sales refusal, the market would really be open. I really think it would be a comfort to most people and to most businesses.

Everybody is of the frame of mind I'm not a bigot, I don't mind having black people in my neighborhood at all, but it's my neighbors I'm worried about. And this really is true. Nobody wants to be alone. No subdivision wants to be an island. No homebuilder wants to be selling his houses differently than other homebuilders. No apartment management wants to be running their apartment different from others. They're afraid of just the kind of thing Dan Schorr asked. If it's a little island and it's opened up, then it's going to be inundated.

So I really think there would be a welcome of massive enforcement by the largest number of homebuilders and apartment owners and even by the preponderance of people.

MR. NESSEN: Did you ever talk about that with anybody in the government?

MR. ROUSE: Yes. That was at the tipping-point conference that I attended. That was my recommendation, that tipping points be forgotten about, that there be really concentrated, massive enforcement of the laws to create open markets.

WILLIAM SLAYTON, Executive Vice-President, AIA: What has been the situation as Columbia has developed, and the citizenry has become larger, and they have begun to express some ideas about how the city might develop differently from the way you have developed it? I assume you have read something in the papers that people have come up with some ideas that are somewhat different from your original plan, and I just wondered how you handle that.

MR. ROUSE: On that particular point I don't think we've yet had any problems that I can identify. But we do have a citizenry that's saying, This is our city; you're the developer, but it's our city. And this is creating a whole new experience in participation and involvement, and it's a very good experience.

We have created a kind of private government in Columbia which is one of the major issues. All of the land is subject to basic covenants on land use and so forth. But it is also subject to a co-tenant by which all the property pays what amounts to a special tax of 75 cents per \$100 of assessable base for the Columbia Park and Recreation Association, which builds the path system and the lakes and the tennis courts and the swimming pools and runs the transportation system and the child care centers, really providing the additional amenity level not provided by local government. We're part of Howard County, which supplies schools and police and so forth.

So it really is an experience in private government.

It has no power but collecting money and administering it to provide amenities. It's done under a nonprofit corporation, which we have controlled wholly from the outset. We lend it all the money to do these things. And we lend it its deficits every year. It operates under an economic model in which you project the increases in assessable base and it becomes self-sustaining in about 1974 or 1975. We provide that every 4,000 families elect a member to the Board and that in ten years they take over, no matter what. We have ten years to fulfill our promise, so to speak, to the people coming to the community.

We also have created a system of village boards that are just there to create an opportunity for people to focus their attention on whatever problems there may be. And the combination of the village boards and the Columbia Park and Recreation Association has created some real tensions over all kinds of things. An overhead power-line is now a big problem.

We are turning over more and more things to the community ahead of the time that we have to. For example, this past year all of our budgeting on the Columbia Association passed through every village board. They had to identify every single item on the budget and approve it. We only developed the budget with the full approval of the community.

We have had the problem of some very vocal critics whom one in a cynical mood might call demagogues and others might call great Columbia patriots. We have been rapped pretty hard. But none of them ran for office this time, and we now have a prevailing mood of goodwill that's almost frightening.

PETER KOHLER, WCBS-TV, New York: Do you agree generally with the Urban Development Corporation's idea about a 70-20-10 split of middle-income, low-income and old people?

MR. ROUSE: How do you determine what's lower, what's middle, what's upper? I think the main thing is that it's vitally important that there be mixed communities. Our target is ten percent. I don't feel very satisfied with my answer, but I don't know how to answer it.

MR. KOHLER: Are new communities that earmark a substantial amount of their space for low-income families viable? And are they viable if they allocate any space for welfare tenants?

MR. ROUSE: I think the answer to both questions is yes. But I think the proportions are very sensitive, and I also feel that preoccupation with this really shows our classic assumption that we can't make the city work as it is, that we've got to get everybody out of there.

The truth is that if the central city really were working, it probably would be the most convenient place for a vast number of low-income families. Transportation is easy, jobs close. The real issue is that the damn thing doesn't work. They get a lousy education. There is miserable health care. There

aren't any jobs. And all this is translated into a housing issue. It's not a housing issue essentially. It's essentially a way-of-life issue. Suppose we went back into the inner city and really made it a viable place. Suppose it was serving people, and men who were underemployed were being trained for jobs, and husbands weren't kicked away from their families because the mother was on aid to dependent children. And there was a whole new concept of the policeman as a neighborhood friend instead of somebody who beat you over the head.

If you assume it's a legitimate target of our society for people to move out of low-income status, then I think we would have a very favorable environment for that transition to occur.

And, on the other hand, it can be very brutal to a low-income family to lift it up and say, Here's where your housing unit is; and take them out to a new town out in a distant area where there are no jobs for which they are equipped and where they have lost practically all of their environmental associations and friends. It's not a right way of thinking.

JAMES WELSH, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C.: Is it possible for a place like Columbia to be too successful? I say that on maybe two assumptions I'll challenge you with. One would be that if it's such a great place to live, in a few years in your first villages the resale prices on houses will jump to a point where it will distort the balance of income. And, number two, which may be more serious, if you're growing at such a rate, and not only residentially, but are bringing in a plant like GE with its 12,000 employees, then Columbia is generating a satellite to Columbia and the kind of suburban sprawl throughout Howard County which you said you came there to fight.

MR. ROUSE: I think both your questions are very valid. On the first one, we can't build up to the market. We were very proud of the fact that we managed to get some wonderful little houses built, three-bedroom town houses to sell for \$15,000, including lot, \$147 a month. Those houses resale now at \$24,000.

But I think this is a transitory thing. As we keep supplying the market, this will moderate.

The business of a good new town creating its own sprawl is a matter of national land policy. And we've got to deal with it. There is absolutely no excuse that the entire area between Baltimore and Washington is left to chance, when there are magnificent rivers, stream valleys, forests. And we ought to have a national land policy that takes a variety of actions to preserve the areas that ought to be preserved and identifies the areas that are appropriate for development.

MR. WELSH: Has Howard County or the State of Maryland or 'anybody come to grips with this problem?

MR. ROUSE: There is no national land policy whatsoever, and there are very few states that have policies. I was encouraged by the \$2 million of open space land that was acquired in the Minneapolis area. There are little things happening.

One interesting thing is that the Columbia plan has now had an impact on the Howard County comprehensive plan, and they have now developed a new comprehensive plan for the county that calls for future growth of the county in neighborhoods and villages, scaled in the manner that Columbia itself is. That's a very heartening response.

REP. THOMAS L. ASHLEY, (D., Ohio): I'd like to know what you think the future of new communities is in, say, the next ten years. How much of a role can they play in the development process?

MR. ROUSE: I was giving a talk in New York the other day on a panel where this came up, and I made the absolutely unreliable guess that, ten years from today, better than 50 percent of all the housing built in America will be built in new towns and new cities, and that may have been an underestimate.

There's a watershed that I think we're going to reach quicker than people may know. It will begin the minute it becomes proven that building new cities is economically feasible.

If we really can show that we are making the money we think we're making by building a better city, there is no question we can build the biggest market in the region by doing it. It's going to have a hell of an impact on the development business.

As that begins to repeat it becomes more and more difficult for a homebuilder to go out and buy a hundred acres of land and risk the fact that he's got to deal in competition with new cities that are providing all kinds of amenities.

It's fascinating so far that Columbia has not stimulated a single competitor around its boundaries, and we really have a humping market. I think we'll sell or lease between three and four thousand units in these 12 months. And anybody could buy land adjacent to Columbia and build a house at the same price and sell it for like \$12 to \$15 less a month because of the extra charge that you pay for the private government's benefits. So far nobody has thought that was a wise risk, and that says something, I think, along the line of your question. Let that become established, and I think homebuilders will become city builders or homebuilders who build only in new cities.

# C1. BEATING THE SYSTEM

ARCHIBALD ROGERS, FAIA, Chairman of the Board, RTKL Inc., Baltimore, Maryland

I think we ought to start with the question of whether there is a system to beat.

It seems to me that, by any test, we have produced something pretty poor in the way of a physical environment. And I believe that we really haven't a system, and that what we have is physical chaos produced by a non-system. I think this may be due to a rather unthinking reliance on adversary proceedings. Adversary proceedings, I suppose, have their roots in the old medieval trial by combat, but they do come down to us out of English common law, and in the judiciary they are rationalized by judge and jury. In theory, I think, it's a proper concept for a free society. But if we look beyond the judiciary in our society, I believe we have assumed certain rationalizers which aren't there.

There are two. One is the ballot box to rationalize the political adversary procedures, and the other is conventional marketplace economics—supply and demand—to rationalize the private economic and social adversary proceedings.

I believe one of the real difficulties we see today is that these rationalizers really aren't working very well. Elected officials, with some exceptions, have lost control of the administrative institutions that presumably are delivering goods to be consumed by the stockholders and the public. Yet today it seems increasingly clear that there is no way of measuring what goods and services are really demanded, no way of these pretty autonomous, uncontrolled institutions having a connection with their consuming public.

I have a personal feeling that a great deal of the blind frustration that led to the riots in our cities was not so much the rats, leaking roofs, and police nightsticks, as it was simply a blind frustration resulting from a totally unresponsive public mechanism.

As to marketplace economics, I think these, too, aren't working very well today. Clearly, when we see the kinds of arrangements that are made—I'm very conscious of the building trades unions and their stranglehold not only on costs but on personnel—we see that the whole business of supply and demand as a rationalizer of competition within the marketplace is not working very well either.

The mechanisms, therefore, that are producing our physical environment are not terribly relevant to those who occupy this environment. I submit that the community, whether it's community at the scale of a family in a dwelling unit or a neighborhood or an entire region, is the ultimate client for whatever is done both by the architect and the client who provides his fees and gives him direction.

We see the tremendous effect of the tax structure, both the real property tax and the games you can play with the income tax, on the end product. This

affects the densities of buildings, the provision of amenities or the non provision of amenities, and the fact that you can, by going the conversion route in an inner-city situation, not only increase the revenues from your property but decrease the taxes because it begins to physically deteriorate.

We see also the effect of public investment in the infrastructure—sewers, water, roads. More, I think, in the outlying areas, the suburban areas, than in the inner cities, this tremendously important tool says what property will and what property won't be developed and at what densities. It is not used in a *leading* role, but in a following role. It, in effect, is provided by the public as a convenience to the speculator.

I am not a communist or a socialist. But I have some grave doubts about what we mean by private enterprise when we see the speculator taking the courageous gamble of buying a farm and then turning to the public to bail him out. This is very conventional in terms of zoning. Zoning itself as a mechanism in lieu of planning is a great sacred cow stretched throughout our country. I guess one of the few exceptions is Houston. I honestly can't say, looking at Houston, which has no zoning or planning, and looking at Baltimore, which has had both zoning and planning for generations, that Baltimore is any better than Houston. In many ways it's worse.

I can say that zoning is perhaps the most corrupting influence in our political life, particularly in the expanding suburbs. It's a fragile field, used often for wrong purposes, such as the denial of access to minority groups, and it's subject to a very crass, buy-sell process at the level of county politics.

I look upon suburbia as pretty much the direct product of some anonymous official or officials who sat down and developed something called minimum property standards, which would be the basis of FHA guarantees of mortgages. Who these anonymous people are I don't know, but they come very close to being the architects for most of the urban environment that has been built since World War II.

They very clearly had an idea in mind, a physical idea, having to do with the privacy assumed for a house in the middle of a green plot, side yards, front yards, cul-de-sacs, and all the rest of it. And you go to the average homebuilder and say, Gee, can't you do better than this?

And their answer is, No, this is what the market wants.

Why does the market want this? "Be cause that's what they're buying."

What options are you giving them? The answer is, none.

It's as though the only car being produced in the United States was a Mustang, and by the test of who

bought the Mustang, it would be a smashing success. But I see very few options being provided to fit the actual market demands. And we have had some instances where, by providing town houses and things of this sort, we tap a market that really is looking for an option.

So I believe what we're facing is-I guess I have to use the word-crisis. We have an institutional crisis in our country. And I believe it perhaps has a precedent in the 14th and 15th centuries, which was the time of the collapse of the medieval society and the church and the birth pangs of the Renaissance.

I think if we look at the historic perspective, where we are, why we are having this institutional crisis, we could make a case for its happening.

First of all, over the trend of 50,000 years of civilization, you can plot on a horizontal and vertical scale, something called civilization power. And you will discover that for each phase of civilization, the hunters' revolution, the farmers' revolution, there is an increment in power greater than the prior increment within a shorter period of time. So think of the urban revolution as perhaps beginning in 6000 B.C., which is when cities were invented, and running to about 600 B.C.

It was followed by the civic revolution, because if you invented cities you then had to invent citizens. This brings us to Greece and Rome from, say, 600 B.C. to 600 AD. Following that came the Industrial Revolution, or Mechanical Revolution, from 1800 to perhaps 1930. You get some feel of great changes occurring in this evolution of history, first in thousands of years, then in hundreds of years, then in decades. And it really plots out so that your power curve becomes vertical, which is critical mass, explosion. And this focuses on the United States, because we are today the first post-industrial society.

On top of this and coincidental with it is Western Civilization. If, indeed, you can think of this evolution of civilization as a tide, on top of this tide is the wave of the west, conventionally thought of as Greece and Rome, followed by the Dark Ages from 400 to 800 AD., the medieval period from 800 to about 1350 or 1400, and the Renaissance starting then and I think, in fact, dying today.

I think what we're seeing today is the death of Renaissance values, and it's a very agonizing period. This becomes then, by Toynbee's definition, a time of trouble, again focusing on the United States, because we play the role of Duke of the Western Marches for western society as did England and Italy and Spain perhaps prior to the revolution. But it's not hopeless.

If, by creative response, we can meet this challenge, we then have the opportunity in our nation, in our time, for our first golden age. We have never had one as a nation.

But we also run the risk of collapse. The strains at this time are incredible. They're expressed by a pace and scale of change that are totally new. In prior generations one major change might embrace four or

five generations. Today, you find four or five radical, wrenching changes within the space of one generation, and they are very great changes.

The institutions are the focus of this strain. I think they are obsolete. We are faced with four basic alternatives, only one of which, I believe, makes sense today. One, of course, is simply resisting -put it down, maintain the old traditions and the old forms. This is essentially what the medieval church tried to do, and it failed. It's not a very creative alternative.

The second alternative is to adapt to change. It seems very logical, because this is what the institutions have, by and large, done in the past and are trying to do today. And yet I have a scary feeling about that, because I think our pace has changed so greatly that even with the most rapid of adaptations, the institution is always going to be ten laps behind.

The third alternative is to simply destroy the institutions. I think it's irrational. You don't destroy until you're ready to put something in its place, and you can't very well expect the institutions to self-destruct.

The fourth alternative, then, is the only one I think is valid, and this has been called the parallel institution approach. I call it the lifeboat approach: the developing of new institutions from scratch, untrammelled by traditions, rules, regulations, hard-earned experiences, loyalties, et cetera, to perform largely identical services that are being performed by traditional institutions.

This is valid in two respects. One is that for the first time it provides some basis for bringing back marketplace economics into public service production. This is really competitive: Which will do the job best, cheapest, most responsibly? And, second, it provides the essential opportunity for experiment. Experimenting within our existing institutions is very difficult, but you can experiment with new lifeboats, if you will. You're going to lose some of them, and that's going to be too bad. But some of them will begin to float and move, and they become very graceful mechanisms into which the old institutions can bail out if their ships go down.

This leads then to a look at a new mix of parallel institutions responsible for developing, rebuilding, and rehabilitating our physical environment for the rest of this decade. One of these is the design team, experimented with in a number of cities on urban freeway projects. Instead of the conventional highway engineering firm doing these designs, they were broadened to become corridor urban designs involving engineers, architects, planners, sociologists, economists. This was funded-and I think this is a real breakthrough-out of the highway trust fund at a 90-10 ratio.

In Baltimore, some \$8 million was taken from the highway trust fund to do some very sophisticated corridor planning by a design team. Whether in fact the designs will ever be built remains to be seen. It has also been experimented with in Chicago and

Brooklyn.

In New Orleans a very fascinating experiment sponsored by Mayor Berman's office when he was in the Department of Transportation involved the creation of a political model for solving regional transportation issues and a mathematical model for evaluating technical impacts.

But a design team absolutely requires a decision-making team, and this has to be multifaceted. It becomes then a grouping of all agencies, public and private, which are to be involved with or impacted by a proposed change at any scale in the physical environment. And this is very difficult. Here is where you get the institutional problem, because it requires that each agency so involved have a plenipotentiary on that team.

All agencies are willing to have observers, liaison guys, clerks to carry messages back and forth. That's fine. But at the level of making a decision, each representative on such a team has to make a decision that is in fact committing resources from the agency to the implementation of that decision.

The final and third leg of this three-legged team of teams is a community team. The community does have the fundamental power, the power to ratify or not ratify. If we're honest in describing our democratic processes, the community as the true client should be brought in from the beginning to guide the whole process, to enlighten it, even if it forces the design team to do things that are not quite up to snuff esthetically, even if it requires the decision-makers to expose their ways of making decisions to the public view.

Here is one of the great opportunities for the media to become involved in the beginning of these studies, to look at them as opportunities for bringing back information from the communities and feeding it out to the community, to discipline themselves a little bit so that they don't go the headline route in terms of chasing rainbows or conversely highlighting the inevitable uproar.

Whether these lifeboats are really going to explode, I don't know. But there have been some interesting spin-offs. For example, in Baltimore the opposition to the freeway system was not concerned so much with, Gee, can you do a better freeway and can you put schools and housing and parks in and around it? They simply said no freeway at all. And this resulted in a citywide coalition, which has had considerable staying power.

I think it's fair to say that this is the only issue on which all of these disparate groups have been able to come together, at least in my memory. They have come together on a negative basis, but the point is having come together, having organized, having invested a lot of their time and money in this. Isn't this the beginning of a new mechanism that could be used from here on out in Baltimore for positive, mutually beneficial purposes?

Will not the institutions really listen to a coalition of

this sort? Will not the politics of our city be responsive to it? I believe the answer is yes.

This, then, is simply one aspect of a new quiver of institutions, parallel institutions, to be developed. This has to do essentially with what we are really looking at today as opposed to what is in our assumptions. Certainly the FHA architect -and I'm sure he was an architect-who did minimum property standards clearly understood what the American dream was, and had a physical way of expressing it. And if you follow that through, one of the premises that have been guiding us has been that the constitutional guarantee of the pursuit of happiness is to be expressed in the form of our evolution toward a homogeneous society, an egalitarian society, a monolithic society, which would indeed properly express itself in the homogeneous, uniform environment we see today.

The contrary proposition could be that the Constitution is expressed in a different way. The guarantee of the pursuit of happiness is precisely to provide options so that everybody is free to pursue happiness within his own particular and often peculiar physical arena.

Another proposition could be that the constitutional guarantees do not imply an egalitarian classless society free of poverty and wealth, but rather a society that does have an economic social ladder, and that the function of the guarantees is to be sure that everybody is really free to move up or down this ladder. This is not a very popular view, and yet I think that it is a very arguable view.

The point here is not to say who's right or who's wrong, but to suggest that the very point of departure for thinking through and designing and building a new environment is to get back to some of these premises that have not been examined.

I have mentioned the pace and scale of change. Not the change itself but the pace and scale is unique to our time. And this has to be recognized as one of the new threads to be designed into and built into our urban environment. Along with change, there is mobility, both in a vertical economic social sense and in a horizontal geographic sense, mobility such as no society has known until this time.

Perhaps most important to the new environment is the question: What is our mission as a nation? Supposing you were asked to come in as the master architect to design the physical environment for the United States up till 1980. Your first question is: Okay, what's the purpose? What's the function of it? And you'd be told: We don't know, just go ahead and design it.

You say, But if you design a building, you have to tell me what it's going to be used for. It is a school, a house, or what?

No, no, go ahead and design it.

I think we do have to address what our mission is, and I think there's a way of getting at it. We have had an evolving mission that you can express in presidential terms, starting with Washington's presidency

and running through to Andy Jackson. The essential mission was, first of all, our survival as a very young and vulnerable nation.

Then, next came sorting out our functions-the whole business of the franchise. That was followed with the advent of Jackson, going through to Lincoln, where the mission was simply taking the West, staking out our continental arena.

Then this was followed by the third phase of our evolving mission, from Lincoln to Teddy Roosevelt, in which the mission was exploiting the West to provide raw materials for the growing country. This was followed by the fourth phase in 1900, running through to 1932: the melting-pot issue, the need to bring in the labor force to run this machine. This led to the kind of social implications being brought into it for the first time in 1932, best expressed, I think, by saying that the mission of the nation was to provide the highest possible standard of living per capita. But the description of this standard of living was quantitative. I believe that this has run out in 1972 and we may now be addressing a new mission or a new phase, which is the description of our standard of living per capita *qualitatively*.

This has some interesting implications. You can think of rationing resources in terms of the quantitative issue, being sure that limited resources are distributed fairly. When you get to the qualitative statement, you may also have to ration resources in order to prevent indigestion-a totally new concept.

I am not convinced that Lyndon Johnson was a great esthete. Perhaps Lady Bird was. But he was a consummate politician. And when he could speak to the quality of life, the beauty of our highways, I think he was speaking to a new sort of chord within the electorate, and I think this is perhaps forecasting a new form of politics, a new form of political rhetoric, where it's not the promising and the doing that's going to count so much as the being. There is a new ball game politically. There is obviously a new ball game in the cities. You will be hearing about this in terms of the advocacy movement.

What will this do in terms of physical form? It's hard to say, and because it's hard to say, it's best to suggest that not very much be done, that we try to create a malleable environment, space that can be self-adaptive, self-decorated, self-created, and that this sort of non-architecture, designed by non-architect design teams, would be rationalized by a very magnificent skeleton or armature. This is the place where the public investment is. It moves all means of goods and people by all modes of transportation. This, under our frontier philosophy, has conventionally been the meanest of our architecture. I think in this newly evolving milieu it can and should be the most magnificent of our architecture.

Where are we going to store this tremendous increase in people that we're anticipating? Obviously some of them at the fringes of our existing metropolitan areas. Certainly, some of our existing

suburbs will be obsolete economically in a very short time. Some of them are already applying for Title 1 renewal. I think we can look to the unused air-rights development in the cities, the conventional inner city where up to 30 percent of the geography is in fact in the public ownership of streets. This suggests the platform city.

But I think the main thing is simply going to be a new look at the architecture of our skeleton or armature. It is permanent, it organizes urban growth even on a regional scale. It means a frank down-grading of the architecture of the flesh around it.

Finally, I hope, that we not lose sight of one word that hasn't been mentioned so far in this meeting. What we're about is the creation of art. Architecture is an art, even though the architect, to paraphrase Churchill, is an artist surrounded by a professional and wrapped up in a businessman.

Architecture, agglomerated into communities, is art. Community architecture agglomerated into metropolises is art in potential. I believe, and I derive this belief from reading Maritain, that art is not as it has been viewed in a Renaissance context. It is not optional, the icing on the cake, consumed when everything else needed is provided, the province of an elite which produces and consumes it.

I believe with Maritain that artwork is an offspring of a wedding between time and eternity. I believe it has a fundamental purpose in terms of communion with those who sense, touch, feel, and dwell in it. I believe that this communion is a mysterious language. Maritain calls it poetry with a capital P, that flows between the words of a poem and between the notes of music, within the spaces of buildings and communities.

I therefore believe art is an essential part of our daily bread, hungered for by society far beyond the elite, even though this society is inarticulate and may express its hunger in strange ways simply by not vandalizing that which it loves.

If this personal view of art is correct, then of all the arts, the art of architecture and communities is the most powerful. A book you can open or close, a record you can put on or take off, but our architecture, our cities, are with us for all of our lives, for better or for worse. We must hope that it is for the better.

DANIEL SCHORR, CBS News, Washington, D.C.:  
I'm having trouble with your presentation. I think the reason I am having so much trouble with it is that you have a very well-thought-out scheme and system of thought which you have tried to condense into a series of headlines for us, and I have to ask you for a couple of the stories behind a couple of the headlines. Otherwise I won't exactly understand you.

For example, when you talk of the U.S. as the first post-industrial society, I have to know what you mean, whether it's something qualitatively or only quantitatively different. When you say that the community is the natural environment, I have to

understand a little better what that means, because it could mean that the decision-making function is on the community level, because it is their community. If so, are you philosophically in conflict with Jim Hetland in what's happening in the Twin Cities area where some solutions have been found in terms of breaking down traditional community geographical control in favor of the sharing of functions among communities?

Are you saying that that is not the way we have to go?

I have to ask you, when you schematically outline four alternatives in terms of changing institutions, whether you think these represent real choices or are they simply empirical descriptions of what happens in life?

Are you omitting a third possibility of a kind that John Gardner has outlined, of institutions that are kept supple and flexible enough to be in a state of constant change? Are you simply presenting us with the alternatives of destruction of institutions and their replacement with parallel institutions, which is simply a kind of way of destroying institutions?

I had trouble at times following you because you condensed a great deal of thought. In the end I don't understand where you're going.

MR. ROGERS: The post-industrial society, of course, is out of Galbraith, and it presumes a generally affluent society as opposed to the sort of affluent islands that were characteristic of the industrial society. What we see here is general affluence in our nation at least. To fight a war on poverty during the depression would have been a nonsensical proposition. To fight a war on poverty today is not.

Second, it presumes an increasing shift in the gross national product from industrial products to service products. This is a very clear and rapid shift, and implies a whole new economic base for this post-industrial phase. I think it's clear that we are going to less and less hours spent per week in manufacturing employment, hypothesizing at some point in time maybe like the Garden of Eden where nobody really has to work anymore, although they have to be able to consume.

So I believe we're talking about something that's specific here, that's real, that there is evidence around us, clues, mice in the bushes, that we begin to see.

Regarding the second question having to do with the statement of the communities, I think here we have to think of the community at different scales. The community is often thought of as the small scale, the neighborhood. But I don't really believe this is necessarily true. At the level of an interstate freeway system in Baltimore one of the problems that arose there was that the community was very narrowly defined as the affected community in the corridors.

The fact of the matter was that the entire metropolitan region was the community. When you're

talking about the regional community as the client for regional projects, such as the jetport and things of this sort, I find no difficulty in supporting Jim Hetland's point.

I do say, however, it's a new ball game. The community has been dealt out of the decision-making process at any scale. It is in rebellion. Whatever we mean by political design or the political decision making processes, they have not been very responsive to community inputs. Therefore it falls back on the very negative: Whatever it is you propose, we veto. So I think if the decision-making team becomes the patron or the sponsor, and the design team becomes the new architect, the post-Renaissance architect, then the community must organize itself to be a good client, to give its insights, its aspirations. The two other teams have to respond by opening up and letting the public come in and participate creatively in it.

As to the question of the four alternatives for the institutional reactions to the changes that stay, I really think that this is not a hypothesis. I think you see institutions reacting in all four ways right now.

MR. SCHORR: I didn't mean to say it was a hypothesis. What I meant to say was that you can, post facto, describe how it's gone at different times and in different places. This is not to say that you can sit down and say, Let's do it this way. Frequently you don't have the power to control the process but only to describe it after it has happened.

MR. ROGERS: The point I am making is that the power rests in our institutions today. These are the potentates. These are the agencies that make up a decision-making team. All of us are both part of a community and part of institutions. Obviously there is beginning to be an impact from the ecology issue on the decision-making processes of private industry. The stockholder is saying quite clearly, I regard profit as being more than conventional dividends or capital gains. What can you do as a spin-off in terms of helping me survive in this environment?

So, when Gulf Oil Company can say in the face of falling profits per share that there's going to be less next year because they're going to add 45 million bucks to their environmental effort, the stockholders just applaud. This is part of a new institutional structure.

The idea of an institution that is simply a non institution is like Mr. Hetland's non-government, which to me sounds very much of a government. I think institutions are inevitable. I just have a very personal view that this is the only way we can go in restructuring our institutions.

JACK PATTERSON, Business Week: I want to ask a question but it really comes out in the form of a statement. I'm having difficulty relating what you say to the problems of the inner city. While it is true that we are thinking more in terms of quality of life, there

is a very substantial percentage of the population today, both in the cities and in rural areas, to whom this would be a meaningless concept because they are worrying very much about quantity. There is a lot of poverty in this country. They are still worried at the level of just the gross delivery of resources for their needs. Housing is an example.

How do these new institutions relate to this? An institution could be a mob of people running down the street burning up things. This is an institution that says, Do something for us; this is what we want. How do you relate to the specific question of what you do about people who are not eating enough, who are living in squalor?

MR. ROGERS: I think one of the best ways to illustrate this is a public housing program. The public housing program is defined very much quantitatively and has been for many years. And under the old description of standard of living, obviously as long as you had such things as square feet of space in bathrooms, this was what you were after. And look at the fights over public housing. This little Metro North experiment in Harlem where the community really was talking about quality, was saying, Sure, we need quantity, a hell of an injection of public housing, but we do not need 22-story towers; we want a better way of living.

I think they finally wound up at ten stories. I don't know if that figure has changed. But it was an interesting exercise by an underprivileged community needing quantitative resources but speaking for the first time of the qualitative implications.

I think there are other examples of this. Certainly the freeway revolt is an implication of some sort. Until this occurred, it was always conventional wisdom to extrapolate the number of cars and the number of trips and everybody's origin and destination, and put it into a computer and out comes the concrete. That solves the problem.

I think this is illustrative. I think the qualitative issue is very much at the heart of our poverty areas as well as non-poverty areas.

EVAN FRANCES, Ladies Home Journal: I would like to ask you to reduce to specifics your elegiacal and somewhat abstruse wave of the future, including malleable environment, space that can be decorated, and magnificent skeleton or armature.

MR. ROGERS: I would take the last first, which is to say that under our frontier philosophy, which I think prevailed until very recently, it was assumed that the public investment, the investment at the tax dollar, would be done under the most severe economic

constraints. I target whether it was Mr. Cannon who said "Not one penny for aesthetics" some years ago. He was saying what the electorate expected. The result, of course, is that our street systems in most of our cities and for that matter, with the possible exception of some of the non-urban freeway systems, our parkways, are pretty crummy bits of architecture.

So I think we now have an emerging milieu to begin to reverse this and suggest that our public architecture should be that which is the most magnificent, the most generous, the most heavily funded.

Beyond that, public investment is the most important tool, more so than public ownership of land, for determining the future form of urban areas.

As to the malleable flesh, it seems to me that this should be very under-controlled. It seems to me that we have spent an awful lot of time and effort with zoning, building codes, architectural design, competitions-on the flesh-and have created at one point in time a very carefully programmed straitjacket for functions without recognizing what the changes in these functions might be.

If we're honest, I don't think we can really look more than two or three years ahead and say what these changes may be. And if we're really honest as designers, what we should then do is to create multipurpose, universal spaces where a school space today could become a manufacturing space tomorrow, a commercial space years after, so that you have this idea of preserving the economic life of the investment by not programming it, by making it very loose,

Similarly, at the level of the dwelling unit, it seems to me that we cannot assume that everybody is going to enjoy a conventional apartment or home layout. There are different life-styles, different families move in and out, or families go through their own phases of evolution in which their life-styles change. Again the honest thing, I think, is to provide totally flexible space where room arrangements can be made by the occupants, decor by the occupants, even though they may have atrocious taste.

This is simply to say that we have to create something that works with change, adapts to unforeseeable change, is deliberately designed to accommodate change. This may be the most important new factor of whatever it is we're in today, this very troublesome time.



## C2. REBUILDING THE INNER CITY-WHY? FOR WHOM?

**MELVIN MISTER, Executive Director, Redevelopment Land Agency, District of Columbia.**

I'm both honored and a little bit angry to be on the program today. Honored to be one of those urban experts selected to participate in this conference with distinguished urban-suburban writers, practitioners, and journalists. Angered because I don't see one black journalist in the audience, and until Gene Brooks and Vernon Williams arrived today, I felt like I was the conference black.

The riot commission described the movement toward two Americas, one black and one white. The discussion at this conference with no black journalists and with our other two friends arriving today, is illustrative of the type of problem that I think our country faces. Black journalists and black urban experts are carrying on a vigorous discussion about these very issues, and I would have certainly preferred that more of them were a part of this conference and this session, and I sincerely hope that future conferences of this kind will, by the nature of the people attending, help to reverse this movement toward two Americas.

My job is that of a bureaucrat in Washington, not a philosopher. But as one of the conference blacks, I would like to state several propositions that I hope will generate some discussion of some fundamental issues which go beyond the highly important and illuminating technical, financial, and political considerations that we discussed most of the time yesterday.

My first proposition is that the salvation of the 48 cities that have 80 percent of all the Negroes who live in cities, 50 percent of the urban poor, and half of the five million substandard urban housing units is our most important domestic problem. Urban growth, the environment, crime are related and secondary considerations.

The late David Danzig, a long-time scholar and one of the most perceptive social analysts in America, commented to me on one occasion that this country's capacity to be a pluralistic society is only now being tested. In the colonial period, entire states were settled by one religious group. As our economic and social systems became more complex, with so many interdependencies, it was more, and more difficult to maintain homogeneous neighborhoods. It has been possible, however, to exclude the undesirable, such as the poor and the black, with the resulting concentration of problems faced by these 48 cities.

If our country is to continue to stand for those things upon which it is supposed to have been based, this intolerable situation in these 48 cities must be brought to an end. Of course, this is not a new problem. It's the same problem that Gunnar Myrdal talked about in 1944, in "The American Dilemma", and I think it's a problem that many white youths face, living in suburbs with nice houses and large lots, two

cars, and boats and summer vacations in Europe. They read in the newspapers of places like Washington where our infant mortality rate is going up and where recently half the doctors that provide emergency service at our only public hospital quit for more money. I think that is a problem for many people. It's a moral problem. It's a problem of where they stand and who they are and what the country is all about.

Many blacks don't have that same kind of problem, because they never really got enchanted with the system. It's difficult for them to become disenchanted with something that they never really were enchanted with. But I think that dilemma, that crisis, the American dilemma, is the reason why this country has to try and save the inner city.

Despite all the laws of the sixties, despite all the riots of the mid and late sixties, despite new organizations such as the Urban Coalition, despite extraordinary increases in local taxes and indebtedness, the nation as a whole, in my judgment, is not committed to solving the problem of concentrated poverty and deprivation in those 48 cities. And those cities don't have the votes to capture the needed federal resources on purely political grounds.

My second proposition is that the federal government must provide the money and the standards to solve the problems of these 48 cities. Most of the funds should go directly to the cities which should have the principal administrative responsibility for tackling these complex problems.

In 1930, cities were keeping about 50 cents of every tax dollar, with the federal government getting about 33 cents. In 1970, cities were keeping a nickel and the federal share was 67 cents. Local and state tax receipts and indebtedness increased six-fold during the postwar period, while, since 1950, federal taxes have not been increased significantly.

We must look to the federal government for the protection of minorities. It is unreasonable for me to think that states and metropolitan areas will ever see it in their self-interest to take on the problems of the central city in addition to their own growing concerns about growth, sprawl, crime, and drugs.

I don't think it's naive to look to the federal government for answers in view of the commitments that were made during the sixties, the resources that became available to cities, such as the antipoverty program, the elementary and secondary education act, and urban renewal.

It is essential, however, that flexible performance standards be established and periodic assessment be made of a city's progress towards doing what it says it will do. I don't think the federal government ought to determine what cities do, but I think they

ought to see that cities do those things they commit themselves to do and condition further money on performance.

The need for urgent action in these 48 cities leads me to conclude that money should be put where the need exists, and efforts to retool existing government machinery accelerated where that is needed. States have important rule-making authority and significant administrative and financial control over important issues, such as transportation and schools. Their role should be supportive, not primary, however, with regard to solving the critical problems in these 48 cities.

The need is to pull together existing resources in a coherent fashion under local, politically responsible bureaucrats like me.

Finally, the federal government through its monetary and fiscal policy, has a more powerful effect on what happens in these cities than anything they could possibly do, regardless of how many resources are put into them. Discussions about inflation and unemployment have more effect on the possibility of these 48 cities surviving than anything they can possibly do. When we decide that a 4 percent or 5-percent level of unemployment is acceptable for the time being, what that really means is that there are a lot of young blacks who don't have any jobs. When the government decides that they want to cut back on the summer program money, it means that we've got a lot of unemployed kids.

Every year we go through the same cycle. The mayors went up there this year to talk to President Nixon about restoring some summer money, and apparently they were successful in persuading him to release some of that money. We go through this cycle every year as though it's a new experience.

My third proposition is that the black middle-class leadership holds the key to solving the problems of the ghettos. Harlem, South and West Side Chicago, Hough in Cleveland, Shaw in Washington-all are low-income black ghettos.

No matter what we do for the next five years, cities are going to get blacker. Even if Jim Rouse's success at Columbia does get accepted by other people, and does begin to make an impact, it's going to be some time off in the future. Right now we have a critical problem in the cities. It is possible, I think, that the new black political leadership can mobilize ghetto residents in a new way to begin turning things around. Success will depend on getting money. If new black leadership can deliver, the ghetto residents may become a positive force for change and improvement, rather than a liability. Ghetto residents know that their fate is closely tied to the fate of the city. This new leadership group of black elected officials has the gut knowledge of ghetto problems that is essential for pulling middle-class blacks and whites together in a coalition that could have potential for saving the cities if resources are made available.

Overcoming the distrust and disbelief that exists in ghettos can only come about through delivery. In Washington we have a renewal project called the Southwest Renewal Area, near the Capitol. It's a terrible area. There were 23,000 people, 75 percent of whom were black, living in that area. They're all gone. They were all displaced, and the land sat idle for many years. What we have now is an integrated upper- and middle-income community with some public housing around the urban renewal area. For many years in Washington people looked on that as the classic example of Negro removal.

Today, in Washington, inner-city people are developing plans for urban renewal and they're arguing for support of those plans before the planning commission and our city council, on the grounds that this federal program has the potential of bringing about some change in their lives in the way they would want that change to take place.

It's not all sweetness and light, to be sure, and people still don't have trust in urban renewal. They don't have trust in bureaucrats, black or white. But at least we have a chance, and I don't think that chance is going to last for very long. Unless we are able to get the resources to do the things that folks want us to do, we will never have that chance. When we get a handle on the sprawl problem, hopefully through the success of people like Jim Rouse, we won't have the capacity to solve the problem of the inner city. We will have abandoned it.

I think the next four- or five-year period in our cities is going to be a critical time. Most of the people who live in these areas are black and they are also young. The median age in cities among blacks is about 22 years. Half the people are below 22 years old. In trying to prepare for this session I ran across a poem which I'd like to read. The title of it is "Life Is Too New." It is written by a young woman by the name of Angela Jackson.

"Do you ask too much of me, Black?  
For us we're young and life is too new.  
Eighteen, 20 years young.  
I want to sing, dance, and smile,  
Only I want to love gaily.  
It is expected, brothers and sisters,  
The young will lead, build something beautiful.  
Eighteen, 20, I want to sing, dance, and laugh  
With love. It is expected. Our inheritance.  
This responsibility has been passed to us.  
Is this the same old buck passing from Generation  
to generation?  
Who can I pass this to?  
Eighteen, 20, and life still so new,  
And you, Black, expect so much."

I think that expresses some of the sentiment that exists in some of our inner-city ghetto neighborhoods. This leads me to my fourth proposition, which is that black culture will be an important element in efforts to

rebuild inner-city neighborhoods and hopefully help to save these 48 cities. And that's one of the reasons why I'm quite disappointed about the fact that we didn't have more black writers, journalists, at this session, because there is a great deal of debate going on, and we'll hear some more about it by the urban design people, I hope. There is a lot of debate going on about black art and culture and poetry.

There are even now black publishing firms that are having some success. There are several other firms around now that are having some degree of success -community design centers, neighborhood museums, community art centers, organizations like the Negro Ensemble. In Washington we have something called the New Thing for Art and Architecture. All of these efforts can have a vital effect on people living in the inner city, and they can release a lot of creative energy, especially among the young, to do the kinds of things that I think Arch Rogers was talking about earlier. Once again, resources and a gut understanding of the black community are essential to unleash that creative energy.

My fifth proposition is that the salvation of these 48 cities will depend on a new kind of political coalition in the Congress between central cities and other urban areas with similar problems. This proposition is the one I'm frankly less confident about, in part because I am a bureaucrat, not a politician. It seems to me that unless we create a new kind of coalition, we are never going to be able to solve the problems of the cities, and I think this is the area where the people who are here as journalists can be the most helpful in trying to solve the problems of the inner city.

The question in my mind is whether it will be possible for people from those urban areas to join together with people in the central city to get more money into the urban areas and to fight out their problems. If those can be fought out with more resources, it may be possible to solve them in a more rational and more humane fashion.

It seems to me the Congress-and this very political Congress-is going to be trying to address all of those questions, and people in urban areas outside of the central city are going to be trying to decide politically what is in their self-interest to do. I think it's in their self-interest to get some legislation passed.

I also think it's in their interest to get as much money flowing into those metropolitan areas as possible. If, on the other hand, we get into a fight between the suburbanites and the central city, both of whom need money to solve problems of pollution, housing, transportation, we could end up with no legislation. It's very easy to happen, and all of the discussion in Washington and all the little groups who are trying to figure out what kind of legislation to propose are trying to grapple with that problem.

I'm going to close with a benediction from Langston Hughes: "Dear God, we ain't what we ought to be, we ain't what we're gonna be, we ain't what we wanna be, but thank God we ain't what we was."

ELIE ABEL, Dean, Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University: On this matter of not enough black faces at this conference, I find that embarrassing, but I find it also an unfortunate reflection of the real situation in the news media. If this was not explained earlier, let me now explain that with the exception of one or two people on this list, everyone is here because his news organization designated him to come here. So I think there may be some problems inside your own news organization to resolve in this matter. At any rate, maybe we have learned something out of it.

ROBERT McCABE, General Manager, New York State Urban Development Corporation: I'm wondering whether you figured out in Washington, in terms of what you said today about the need for resources, what special revenue sharing might mean to your resources.

MR. MISTER: It's quite clear that we would be worse off in terms of moneys received for urban development. Under special revenue sharing, the urban development or community development category involves urban renewal, model cities, water and sewer grants, and rehab loans and grants. I'm convinced that we will be worse off as a result of special revenue sharing.

DANIEL SCHORR, CBS News Washington, D.C.: Could I ask you a question in that connection? Aside from the absolute amounts that you would get by the consolidation of grants that would come through special revenue sharing, there is an enormous debate about whether it is better for you to have flexibility in the use of the money or whether you really are better off with a categorical approach. I've heard both sides. But I've heard even people in cities say to me the advantage of a categorical grant is that it forces us in some cases to be doing the things we should be doing and relieves us of the local pressures not to be doing the things that we should be doing.

Maybe I have tilted the question a little bit from my own prejudice. But is special revenue sharing necessarily better for a city than a categorical grant?

MR. MISTER: I think that a consolidation of related grants and more flexibility within the categorical grant programs are highly desirable. A city that has a budget of \$1 billion and gets \$20 or \$30 million from the federal government ought to have some discretion in how it spends that money without a lot of rules and regulations about it, as long as the expenditures are related to some end product. These categorical grant programs over time have been very narrow, and even within that narrowness there have been rules and regulations applied that restrict the local administrator from doing an effective job.

As far as the risk of cities taking money that they would otherwise use for long-term objectives and deflecting that money for some short-term gains, I

must admit that I would prefer to take that risk.

The other reason that I think it's better to give the cities a little more flexibility is the local budgetary process. One of our problems right now in administering these categorical grant programs is that the timing and scheduling of them is on a completely different track than the regular budget process of the city. Renewal ought to be tied in very closely with the city's capital budget. It may be that if the city doesn't get the money it needs from its local capital budget process, maybe it ought to have the authority to deflect some of this urban development special revenue sharing to fill a very critical gap. So I think the risk that I would opt for is giving cities more flexibility within defined areas to achieve certain spelled-out objectives.

MR. SCHORR: You speak from the point of view of the District, which is very special, the only city that has a direct relationship with the federal government. Would you generalize? Would you feel the same way if I asked you about Philadelphia or Jackson, Miss" or cities that are going to have to depend on the tender mercies of the states to pass through the money and see that it gets to the cities to do what it should be doing?

MR. MISTER: Under special revenue sharing-at least the urban development special revenue sharing part-the money would not go through the states. The cities themselves and the other jurisdictions within a metropolitan area would get a check from the federal government directly.

Under general-revenue-sharing proposals there is a state pass-through. Once again I think one of the most controversial issues with respect to both general and special revenue sharing has to do with federal performance standards. I think they are going to be determined in a very political fashion in the Congress, and I think there have to be federal performance standards that go beyond just No Discrimination. We've got to have some additional kinds of federal standards. All I'm saying is that I'm vigorously opposed to the notion of giving all states and cities a check and having an auditor come around with a green eyeshade to make sure that nobody has put the money in a shoebox.

At the same time, I think that the kinds of rules and regulations that have been encrusted on these programs as they have developed over time are too much, and where the line gets drawn in between is an important political matter that is going to be debated extensively in the Congress.

WILLIAM L. SLAYTON, Executive VicePresident, AIA: I would like your prescription for rebuilding the inner city, the 48 cities that you talk about. You pointed out that they have heavy poverty, and of course a high percentage of blacks in the inner city. You have from such groups a heavy demand for low- and moderate-income housing. How do you handle

the pressure to keep building low-income housing in the inner city and not to build middle- or upper-middle-income housing in the inner city, so that you continue to perpetuate and in fact intensify the concentration of blacks and low-income families in inner cities?

MR. MISTER: I can't give a prescription, but I think I can answer your question. We don't want to build any more low- and moderate-income housing. We want to build housing that is of good quality and in good urban environments. And we would like to have ways of subsidizing people so that they could live in that housing. One of the big issues we're fighting about right now in Washington in our renewal program is the extent to which we can get the proper kinds of subsidy so that we can build good housing that can be marketed to anybody and provide the income subsidies that are needed to make it possible for some low-income people to live in good urban environments.

At the same time, we also have parts of our renewal program where we think we can get public support in ghetto communities for non-subsidized housing. We think we can do that in and around our downtown area. One of the biggest issues that we had to fight on that question, however, involves taking some expensive land and commercial land, and transforming that land into housing, and it's a terrific cost per square foot for the federal government to do that. And that's part of the issue of resources. We think in Washington that we can't continue to build large public housing areas for families. We think low income people ought to be distributed throughout the city in standard housing that people who can pay market rent live in.

That's an architectural issue and it's a cost issue and it's a federal government subsidy issue, and that's why the resources question in federal policy, I think, is critical.

ADA LOUISE HUXTABLE, New York Times: Congressman Ashley said yesterday that it was just too expensive to rebuild the inner city. Unless I'm misinterpreting him, as a result of that belief his legislations is directed away from the inner city toward the development of new communities. How do you feel about that?

MR. MISTER: Congressman Ashley's legislation, both in the declaration of purpose and in two sections of it, does provide grant money and loan money for doing things in the city, the new town in town, as well as taking areas that are economically obsolescent, I believe is the phrase, and redoing those areas in the city.

I think Congressman Ashley may be right in the long-run. We may not be able to come up with the money to do it. But my concern now is what are the things that we can do in Washington over the next five years to try and transform the sentiment, the attitude, and the feeling of hope on the part of a lot of

people living in the inner city?

You asked the question the other day about rehabilitation. We have been able to rehabilitate some great buildings which look just like Georgetown buildings in Washington, and low-income people are living in them. When we did that and the first person got his grant, got his low-interest-rate loan, got his house rehabilitated, and was paying the same amount or in some cases less money per month, it had an electric effect on the immediately surrounding areas.

People said, I want one of those grants too; I want some of that money to fix up my house.

Unfortunately most people don't own houses in these low-income neighborhoods. So that's another kind of problem. But what I've got to do, it seems to me, is to create a spirit and a climate of progress and hope until the time when we get some relief outside of the city. I think we have to get that. We're not going to get it in the next five years. I think the next five years are going to be very, very critical.

JACK PATTERSON, Business Week: There is one thing I think that we have sort of fallen into. We are talking about suburban development one day and inner-city development the next and not bringing these two things together very well. I haven't heard anybody talk about jobs here. You made a very eloquent comment on the possibility of black culture within the cities and how it could save them. But there is an eroding economic base in the city. If creating housing in the cities is difficult, job creation is even more difficult. The white-collar office jobs have kept the cities going. Now they are moving to the suburbs, to office parks and so on. What are the people staying in the city in all this new housing going to be doing for a living?

MR. MISTER: Let me comment on that a little bit. We're building a subway system in Washington. And our downtown area, between the White House and the Capitol, is today still in the metropolitan area of Washington, which is one of the wealthiest and one of the most rapidly growing in the country. It still has larger retail sales than the next two or three suburban shopping centers combined.

There are about 85,000 jobs in downtown Washington. A high proportion of those jobs are held by blacks. A high proportion of them are in unskilled or semiskilled categories. If we can achieve over the next ten years the kind of development in downtown that we think we ought to achieve, that number could go from around 85,000 to about 180,000.

That's why the inner-city people are so concerned

about that. That depends upon a lot of public investment. It depends on building the subway system not only through Washington but throughout the metropolitan area. It depends on getting some private investors to come into downtown and build something around the subway stops downtown. There will be 180,000 people a day coming out of the subway stops. We've got several subway stops that have great potential for jobs.

I live in an area in Washington that is like a suburban community in town. Some private investors are going to take an old area called McLean Gardens, and they are going to put up some major development there. If it didn't go there, it would go out in the suburbs. Most people in Cleveland Park are opposing that, because it's too dense, it's going to create traffic problems, it's going to create pollution problems, it may widen the major street.

But for the very reason you indicate, for taxes and jobs, I'd much prefer to have that development there than to have it out in the suburbs. And that's wrong. It's wrong in terms of planning. It's wrong in terms of environment. But we're in a crisis situation in the city, and we've got to accept that kind of thing.

MR. PATTERSON: I just wonder if anybody in the black community is developing a job strategy. I have often thought, just to make a comment, that maybe the blacks ought to take over a profession, like the Irish took over the police and the Italians took over the barbering and the Jews took over the teaching. Maybe you'll find an area to take over and serve.

MR. MISTER: The strategy involved, in terms of jobs, is to use this renewal process as a device. We spend a lot of money in urban renewal. We just entered into a contract with a black planning firm for \$230,000, and they're going to hire a lot of community people who were originally paid with Ford Foundation money and then got paid with urban renewal money, and these guys are now probably some of the best urban planners in terms of inner-city work in the country. They understand urban renewal very well. They teach me things about urban renewal. At the same time, I have a commitment to not have Washington be an all-black city. But we can't change the situation. We've got to move some low-income black people, and right now they are not going to move from their turf unless they can see some visible changes taking place in their surroundings. Until they do that, see that, and can feel it and touch it, they're going to fight as hard as they can to control that turf.

### C3. COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTERS: THE RISE OF URBAN ADVOCACY

**EUGENE BROOKS, Executive Director, Urban Workshop, Los Angeles**

Urban advocacy is a label only, and it's not really sufficient to identify the process, the activity that's going on within the central cities. What's taking place there is the attempt to develop resources and capacities to cope with urban problems, with growth, with matters of health care, with matters of housing, with the ability to make decisions. And at the center of that activity we're trying to come to grips with the arts and sciences, the notion of the environmentalist, the architect, the urban planner.

It comes down extremely hard on those of us that are trying to grapple with what that function should be. Will we be able to generate the resources in order to save the central cities? Or, better yet, will we be able to curb what the economists call the spiral of disinvestment, the continual erosion of the central cities from a viable socioeconomic, societal base?

I am disturbed, appalled, and frightened at our inability to cope with these problems. I sum it up as ignorance about some of the most critical problems that face us today.

Initially we have the dilemma of the environmentalist as an individual, the young practitioners in the profession frankly without real opportunities and real options with which to come to grips with any of these problems. When we leave the university, the educational process begins. Certainly this is true in my own experience.

I found that the corporate structures the architectural profession and the planning profession serve for the most part offered no real opportunity. We have lost, in my opinion, the reason for being. I hope that I speak for the young practitioner, the young men that are really faced with the problems that are upon us. I think our problems are the Year 2000 problems, whereas Mr. Rogers pointed out we're dealing with problems that are collections from the 15th-century Renaissance.

Maybe a second dilemma becomes that of the redefinition of architecture. It becomes necessary to seek out new approaches, new organizations, and new institutions. The community design approach too is inadequate. I prefer the use of the term "community planning entity." The idea is that we are attempting to assemble at the community level those necessary skills-art, architecture, law, technology, research-to focus on problems. Therefore, we raise some very serious questions about the notion of architecture as it has existed, the notions of planning as they exist and as they will continue to exist.

We're talking about a new breed of professional, and we're attempting to draw from our experience daily in communities. We're learning from intimate experience, we're learning from people, we're drawing from our own backgrounds, which are often

indigenous, whether it's Watts, Hough, the Hill District of Pittsburgh, Central City Seattle, Roxbury in Boston. We have seen and we have experienced in these individual communities a very important series of lessons: The community is not a vacuum. It has great potential through new institutions, through private industry, through local, regional, and national government, to begin to take a new direction. Hopefully we have that direction, and that is to begin to solve problems within the marketplace, within the communities, within the central city.

I can only hope that this is begun. The activities of the Community Design Centers are certainly embryonic. The maximum effort goes back less than ten years. The approach has been one of advocacy again-of attempting to identify the problems that exist in the community, and then seeking to resolve these problems.

Let me give you a case in point. Following Watts '65, there was a great commitment of energy-it may have been a bogus commitment of energy-to the solution of problems in South Central Los Angeles. South Central Los Angeles has a central city community, 97 percent black, approaching one million in population.

But here, following '65, we had the whole array of what the national government could bestow. We had job training programs. We had city planning programs. We had economic development. You name it, we had it, to the tune of 200-plus organizations. Two and a half years later, I doubt seriously that five organizations were effective.

So there is no change, except that we have destroyed what commercial activity existed on 103rd, which happened to be called Charcoal Alley No.1. We used a mechanism that's very familiar. It's called urban renewal, and at last count we had razed the buildings on 100 acres of land that provided the only commercial service base for the community.

I use it as an example because I've seen it repeated in many cities. I'm only able to point out that in Los Angeles we have hopefully started on a new direction. I hope that we will generate the necessary resources to continue to understand the problems within the central cities, really regional and national problems, and to continue to direct ourselves toward definable goals.

Consider two possible contrasts provided by the American city: The high-rise tower versus the vertical slum. The pretty flowers in Rockefeller Square or the broken bottles within the urban renewal area. The quality of open space versus the erosion of what were stable communities. The contrasting patterns of a suburban new town with its carefully developed spaces and the loss of vitality within the center of the

city.

We have learned that there can be change, there can be rehabilitation. But the resources are scant. We have been given governmental programs from New Dealism through the current model cities program. The basic fallacy seems to be that of seeking to encourage speculation and the profit motive without developing the skills at the community level.

Model cities is the most recent of these and points out a kind of token approach to providing for a "quality of life" within the central city.

Yet the cities remain the same and people are struggling with the tools without the necessary knowledge or resources to move ahead, and this is where the linkage is very important. There remains then this encapsulation, the colony or the cage within the central city.

Yet there is a new hope, a new vision, a sense of organization evolving at the community level. There is a new expression on the faces of many people, new leadership, hopefully new alternatives, and a new dedication.

Yet the great chasm that exists is between the government and the people. The community development entity has then the potential to form a linkage from the local level to the national and to create a mechanism that begins to make the maze of governmental projects coherent. It can proceed toward a conscious approach that often involves direct inter-reaction with people, involves the ideas of people, the needs of people, around the experience of the planner, the architect, the scientist, the researcher, the bureaucrat. This way the plans, the projections, the expectations are more closely aligned with the needs of a community. It can recycle the process at the community level so that the often misunderstood academic and alien process of planning becomes a more familiar basic thrust and concern at the community level, as is the concern, let's say, for welfare rights. For the first time, the so-called skills or expertise could be at the fingertips of the community, so that the ability to focus on problem areas becomes a continuing process. Therefore our community development centers represent a diversity, the ability to assemble skills, because no man in his given lifetime will have the necessary skills to focus on all of the problems in any given community.

I think that the message and the lesson here is that we're beginning to expand what the profession is about, and I think, therefore, we'll hear over the next few years a few proposals that we think are exciting, that really begin to expand that definition of who practices what and for whom.

In Philadelphia, for example, we have some rehabilitation of existing housing. The Workshop [Design Center] was able to create an alternative. The alternative was to save the housing rather than destroy the housing. I'd like to expand that up to the

level of saving the community rather than destroying the community around the notion of making it better.

And almost anywhere in the country these are the choices that the young practitioners are learning to make, whether to save a junkyard, how to save the junkyard, how to take on the local jurisdiction, how to fight the zoning and planning laws, and how to produce a product.

In the Cleveland Design Center, major projects have to do with Operation Rehab. I think that it's probably the largest single activity in rehab represented by the development centers that we are familiar with.

There is nothing tremendously new about approaches to, let's say, garden apartments or single-family town houses, but it is particularly exciting when the community becomes involved in this process. As a matter of fact, the ideas go back to Clarence Stein during the twenties, and I think we're hopefully about a new cycle of activity with housing and a sense of community development.

The client is the community or the constituency. The Cleveland Design Center has a broad community board and that board then sets the policy for its projects.

In New York, ARCH, I think, has been very successful as a community development entity for Harlem. They have worked to gain new membership on the city planning commission, and this is another kind of activity that grows out of development activity, and it's an integral part of that process.

Another one of their projects happens to involve open space. They intend to close one or more streets and develop more internal space.

The Uptown Chicago center cuts across the full gamut of ethnic groups. They were able to inter-react with the local planning process, and that made a statement about providing housing within the community and stabilizing an area within Uptown. And they were able to take this statement, virtually lift it out of the comprehensive plan, and make it work and reinterpret it around the needs of the community.

Another part of Uptown is the training activity where they take a number of young men, I believe '12, through the local state department of employment and give them technical training. In other words, they try to get young men into the system of training and develop skills -again increasing the community capacity.

At the Urban Workshop in Watts, the shop that I may be blamed for, we practice somewhat differently. I use the word *practice* in that, as an architect, I believe that the community-based entity is one of the most important alternatives available to us. Take the King-Drew complex in South Central Los Angeles, for example. Although it represents the activity in a specific community, it has an important lesson nationally. Here questions are being asked about services within a 30-square-mile area of half a million population. And the basic question is: What should

be the structure of community medicine? The notion of community medicine here is to service the 12 or more communities within South Central Los Angeles and to provide much needed services.

We were successful as a community-based organization in linking up with some of the more established firms in order to provide those services. You can see that one of the dilemmas of a small - scale organization such as ours is: How can you gear up in order to take on the kind of activity, the scale of project, that's measured in millions of dollars over ten or more years?

So, essentially, we have taken a six-man shop and linked it with a 3,000-man organization. It gets down to individuals who are willing to cooperate, who are willing to focus on problems. And from there we hope to develop a plan or a component of planning that has to do with community medicine. Of course, we have to define community medicine along the way. But that's one of the dilemmas.

JAMES WELSH, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C.: I would ask you to clear some things up for me. You mentioned the failure of programs in Watts, following Watts '65, and said you're now hopefully on new directions. Why don't you spell out what those directions are?

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let me go back to touch upon the failure of some of these programs. In my view, coming from the direction of the physical-developer mentality as opposed to what I call the social-work approach, there's a very basic failure with the idea that one could generate programs without enough of the hard skills and resources. The idea was that somehow these things were going to happen because we were all feeling good or guilty, without putting in the hardware that makes an entrepreneurial activity work.

In other words, it has taken Gene Brooks, upstanding environmentalist, half a lifetime to learn some of these skills, and I will admit on any day to some extreme inadequacies on my part. To expect overnight to have these fantastic resources and skills generated within a central city when we have been involved for 50 years or 100 years is just absolutely appalling. That's a very basic reason.

On your second point, the idea about where we are going: First of all there is a kind of uneasy overlay at the community level right now. I think it is related to the present administration, to economic notions, to the idea that people don't like to get killed particularly, to the idea that rhetoric is no substitute for the capacity to get something done. Aging rioters have gone on to new games and a new generation is now emerging.

So, that means then that we're struggling with the residue. We've boiled it down to those persons who are basically committed, who are expert on street corners. And no amount of expertise at the national level can really set that aside. They can deal and get

the job done.

IAN MENZIES, Boston Globe: Do you feel it's important, even from the point of view of survival, to have an increase of middle-income whites in the inner city, and should the blacks take any initiative in that? The previous speaker said the cities are going to get blacker. So I'm trying to throw the reverse in. How do you feel about it?

MR. BROOKS: I think someone pointed out recently that our greatest lack isn't the need for black leadership. It might be very clearly a need for white leadership. And I'd like to think that there are a few courageous middle-income whites who live somewhere other than San Fernando Valley or Orange County or Scarsdale, who can come to grips with their lifestyle, their guts, and their direction to join those of us who are fighting it out in the arena of the central cities. I don't spend too many of my waking hours looking for that phenomenon.

OWEN MORITZ, New York Daily News: I don't know if communities expect to have a single voice. How do you go about getting a consensus of opinion? Take the state office building at 125th Street in Harlem. Who in the community should determine how that building should be used?

MR. BROOKS: Number one, I don't think we should look toward that convenient, happy consensus of opinion. Surely the greater involvement of people leads to the fact that the community may make wrong decisions. But I would rather increase the ability of the community to participate in that project than to continue to deal with plans and approaches that are really controlled from the top of this inverted pyramid.

MR. MORITZ: My question is, when a plan comes from the community, who determines or how does anybody determine that that plan represents that community? Should there be a form of decentralization that says, Let us have a community planning board; we'll have seven members from the community, and if five of these seven members say let us have this plan, then this is what the community wants. In other words, how do you determine what a community wants in this case?

MR. BROOKS: I don't have any of the pat answers, but my own view is that, when you've really done the job of attempting to gain a cross section of the community, then I'm comfortable if that cross section can inter-react with the best alternatives set before it. In other words, that's process. And I guess one of the things that may be implied in what you're saying-and I may be doing a disservice to you to make this comment: Don't you remember the ritual about who speaks for the black community?

MR. MORITZ: I prefaced it by saying they never have a single voice. The reason I mentioned this is that it's very easy in suburban communities to say no.



It's really a negative thing. But if you are talking about change, how do you go about determining who makes the change? Do they really want this change? Do they want jobs perhaps, or do they want housing on a particular site, or do they want commercial use? What is the mechanism in the community to determine what should be built on a particular site?

MR. BROOKS: You're talking about a mechanism that doesn't exist. But to the extent that it does exist, the community planning entity, the community organizations, the community constituency, are parts of that potential mechanism. It's really an assemblage of community skills-starting with the local planning entity that has the basic legal responsibility for making those decisions, combined with a cross section of that community to lead to alternatives and decisions in an inter-reaction.

MR. MORITZ: Do you think decentralization is the answer perhaps, with a given amount of powers to a neighborhood? Do you think that's the direction we ought to go to get some change in different areas?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, I believe so. I'm not saying that that moves from a lack of local governmental structure all the way over to a total capacity to perform a governmental function at the community level. I just think it's overcommitted at the other end of the scale.

ROBERT DENNY, Public Relations Counsel, AIA: How many CDC's are there in this loose national network of community design centers? What, in your opinion, is the most useful function they perform? And, finally, what is the prospect for their continued survival?

MR. BROOKS: Approximately 70 centers have been identified at this point. This includes those that are at early stages of operation and those that have been in operation over five years.

The most important cluster of services that may be provided by design centers is to expand the base of community planning and decision-making, and to develop community knowledge and skills related to that spectrum that are necessary at the community level but don't exist.

Design centers are in a very early stage of development. If we take a long-term view-and we have the problem of survival-the critical problem is one of being able to develop enough resources in order to carry on these kinds of skills. We are not a part of the basic entrepreneurial family. Therefore, there is no particular profit to be made in such in-

volvement at the community level. Maybe we can conclude that that's our greatest dilemma: We are attempting to combine professional skills and resources and focus on problem areas that stand outside the rules of our economy which says that bucks must be made.

MONROE KARMIN, Wall Street Journal: As a community-based black spokesman, how do you feel about metropolitan government that sacrifices black political power in return for access to more resources, and urban development corporations that sacrifice community initiative for the advantage of a powerful state organization that can get things done on a broader and more efficient basis?

MR. BROOKS: It seems to boil down to a matter of quality. If a local government or a regional or metropolitan government develops the capacity to respond to its community and its constituency, then I believe that it can be successful. In the communities that we deal with, we have as many as four jurisdictions that produce individual planning entities and a multiplicity of conflicts. Therefore, within the metropolitan planning notion is an attempt to focus on a large enough area so that you can finally get at the problems of a community which often are cut up in X different ways. So, I see that as a very real potential. But that's also hardened by the reality that any government that is not responsive, as it boils down to people, and isn't relating and has no commitment, is useless.

MR. KARMIN: But you would be willing at this point in time to sacrifice the powers that go to electing a black mayor over a dying city, like Dick Hatcher says, "So what have I got?" in Gary, to test out a metropolitan approach?

MR. BROOKS: Yes. I see it as part of institutional development, and the plight of Mayor Hatcher is echoed by the mayor of Compton, which is the only city west of the Mississippi with a black majority. So it's a very real issue, and I think we have to explore it.

## D. THE PRESS-TECHNIQUE AND RESPONSIBILITY

DANIEL SCHORR, Columbia Broadcasting System

IAN MENZIES, The Boston Globe DONALD CANTY, City magazine

**1. MR. SCHORR:** In 1966, I came home from many long years as a foreign correspondent. In a fundamental sense the main reason I came home was that the accent was shifting from foreign news - not counting Vietnam, which is hardly foreign news to us anymore - to our domestic problems. The result was that they wanted talent, as we laughingly call it, to move from Europe where you couldn't get on the air anymore, to the United States where there were big problems, where there were beginning to be riots and a whole revolution seemed to be taking place.

But in the course of being called home, I immediately found that covering news at home was very different from covering news abroad. The first thing I found different was that you couldn't use the same kind of freewheeling language that you would use in describing foreign events.

For example, if I was in Germany - as I was, God help me, for six years - and I could get on the air and I'd say, Crusty, cantankerous old Konrad Adenauer today criticized President Kennedy for this or that. Well, you came back, and if you happened to find that Johnson on a given day was crusty and cantankerous and you wrote a script which was really transferring the same kind of style and said Crusty, cantankerous President Lyndon Johnson today, the house fell in on you, and you very quickly became conscious that as long as you were dealing with foreign events and a lot of remote characters over there, you could pretty well say what you wanted. But when you were dealing with characters in this country, everyone of them had a constituency, the power to make life difficult for you or for your network. It got to be a rather different and more sensitive kind of ball game.

When I came home, I faced the purely pragmatic problem that, since we had a very good diplomatic correspondent and a very good White House correspondent and a very good Pentagon correspondent, if I wanted to come back I had to figure out what I was going to be covering. So I invented an assignment, not knowing what it meant, but I said, "Why don't I cover the Great Society?" And Fred Friendly said, "What is that?"

I said, "It's all those things that nobody is covering. But I'll put them together - the poverty and the urban stuff and all that, environment."

Fred Friendly, genius that he is, took one minute to grasp what I was talking about and then wheeled his chair around and looked out of the window and said, "Great. Get me press information." And he called press information. He said, "Look, I want to put out a release saying that after a great deal of thought, we are bringing home Schorr, a senior correspondent who has covered the postwar renewal of Europe, to

address himself to American renewal<sup>1</sup>." And all of a sudden the thing had a rationale, which I had not been able to give it up to that time. It has been a very, very hard job.

With all the best will in the world, we suffer from two basic handicaps. One is that most of what we're doing today is television, which is a pictorial medium and which works best if you provide some kind of confrontation. You need to polarize things in terms of this guy against that guy.

Lots of urban problems don't fit that. Lots of urban problems are very muddy things, having a lot of fairly anonymous people. It helped at a certain time when those anonymous people picked up torches or rocks and made themselves less anonymous by doing something quite dramatic. You could then apologize for the lack of leading figures by saying that there were enough figures doing quite dramatic things that you didn't have to have a Johnson or a Kennedy or a Nixon in the picture because of the sheer drama of what they were doing.

We then got into a very dangerous syndrome, and I think everybody who has dealt with urban problems is aware of the syndrome, and I guess it becomes a kind of a *mea culpa* thing for me to say it right here. The syndrome was, you go into a situation and somebody says you ought to look at what we're doing in this area.

The next question is, How close are you to a riot? You have a spokesman who will threaten a riot. You have somebody who says unless this happens this city will go up in flames. And we got into a cliché where things would get on the air if accompanied by a threat that was dire enough to get some middle-class white people scared out of their skins.

And that leads me to my second point: Aside from the necessity for confrontation, our second problem was that, without wanting to be wrong or irresponsible about it, we were dealing with what we consider news values. News values have to be set by executive producers, editors, or people who have nothing really more to rely on than what interests them. And since the vast majority of the people who make these decisions are white and middle class and do not live in the ghetto, a great many stories that we tried to bring to their attention would be answered by, "It doesn't grab me; it may be interesting but I don't really see it as a story."

What they were really speaking for was the same majority that maybe Agnew speaks of, if not for. And the problem is: How do you impose what are basically problems involving minorities on a medium which does its best work speaking for, from, and to a very large and fairly settled majority?

Clearly, you don't want to do it only by scaring

them. We've got over the scare tactics. It got to be such a cliché that we began to recognize it as a cliché-and a rather dangerous one.

There still remains the residual problem that things happening in this country that are frequently important cannot be told in terms of one politician against another famous politician. I will admit to you that I sometimes try.

There really isn't much that people outside the field can do to help. They can help some. But I think it is undignified to say, Present your problems to us; tell us what you're doing in a way that would be interesting. I do think that it is basically our problem to find out what they're doing and how to make it interesting. I think it helps some to come and be fertilized with a couple of ideas in a couple of days at a meeting like this. I knew about Columbia, Md., but I didn't know about it in the terms in which Rouse presented it yesterday. There were other problems that were presented which may, if I can figure out who's against whom and sell it on that basis, I will someday get on the air.

Meanwhile, I have only to say that I think we're still working and fulfilling our own responsibilities. I have no big appeals to make to non-journalists about how they should be doing our work for us. To the extent they can talk about it and articulate it, it helps, but we'll be trying to do better.

**2. MR. MENZIES:** During a year of traveling and looking at new towns and governments in Europe, and then coming back, I began to look at our city room for which I had responsibility over the last six years. The damn thing wasn't working. There was no question about that. There's the same-nasty word - polarization within a newspaper city room as there is within a university or anywhere else. We have always had an egghead team, as we called it: medicine, science, education in a grouping. Why not do away with the whole city room? Have no city editors, no assistant city editors. Have teams geared to issues. Have six circles with maybe six reporters in each, each one interacting, each one thinking of the total issue.

Each one would have a team leader. This would be a writing team leader. He would, in a sense, if we needed the analogy, be an assistant city editor. But he would be out in the street, and this is the important thing, I think, today: Get somebody out seeing things. We don't expect people to come in with great stories. Okay, what's the alternative? We have to go out. And shouldn't the director of the news stories go out with them? This is one approach.

I want to run over just a couple of other points. On coverage: I think when you do have a team, the chances are that you won't try to get in the day-to-day stuff. You won't try to do it as one single item, somebody said something somewhere. So that perhaps we come back with a couple of stories a week. Perhaps we do a more thorough roundup on a

Sunday story.

Take your problems with schools. Is it enough to send out an educational team and hope to get a good story? Law and order is mixed up. Do the cops come in or don't they? What was the reason for it? Was this a welfare problem? So all these things have to interact.

On techniques, I think all of us should endeavor to get in our newspapers somebody writing a column on the cities. I'm using cities in the broadest sense of the issue we're talking about. We all know that not everybody has accepted advocacy journalism as such. In our paper it actually works. If a bunch of guys get mad, they get a chance to write opposite the editorial page.

The wire services, I think, have got to fill a new role, because not every paper can cover everything in the city issue. So what are the wire services going to do? I think they should be able to supply brilliantly concise explainers on what Title VII is, what it is about, and how it is going to affect people in various states. Hopefully this will trigger some reaction from within the paper itself to follow up.

One other thing, I think, should be done. I happened to be at the beginning of the NASA campaign. I was at that time a science writer. NASA was really very cute. They brainwashed M.E.s and publishers right from the start, and the whole science bit soared in newspapers. They understood it, they were invited to then Cape Canaveral, and it got off the ground.

The question now is, how do we do this for our present managing editors and publishers? How is it going to be done? I think it's important, because it is going to set the trend of how much they'll be willing to spend really to hire people that will cover this.

**3. MR. CANTY:** We heard this morning about parallel institutions. One of the very interesting things on the urban scene in recent years, I think, has been the development of parallel institutions of journalism. In fact, I would even dignify City magazine by this phrase. I like it better than *kept press*.

City came into existence because it was felt there was a job to be done that perhaps wasn't being done by the then-existent institutions of journalism. Its role set out to supplement what those institutions were doing.

Similarly we have had the growth of underground, over-ground, and middle-ground newspapers all over the country, often to give voice to those who are seeking change in our urban society. I think the development of these parallel institutions has something to do with the fact that part of the healthy and traditional skepticism of the press has been skepticism about reform and reformers. I would suggest perhaps, that the reformers are singled out for a little heavier dose of skepticism than those who man the institutions of society.

Local magazines have grown up to supplement

local newspapers, often because they can do better in the way of display. The magazines long before Earth Day took up environment, both natural and built environment, as one of their areas of concern, and I think again provided a valuable supplement to local newspapers. And right now we're seeing the development of cable television, which has enormous potential to do things that television perhaps is not now doing in relation to urban, social, environmental issues.

The development of these parallel institutions reflect what we must all acknowledge to be shortcomings in the existent institutions. And one of them, I think, was dramatically evident in these last two days. We were talking about perhaps the greatest unacknowledged story so far in the 20th century: the pattern that our metropolitan areas have taken in the postwar to mid-century years. Their physical patterns, social and racial patterns, their jurisdictional patterns went virtually uncovered while it was happening.

To be sure, each event that contributed to each pattern was reported as an event -a subdivision in the real estate page. Perhaps the political developments were well covered. But this enormous piece of history itself we're only now beginning to catch up with.

Rather than go into the why, I would suggest that that might be the subject of more general discussion. I do have a few hunches about it. If I had to use a single phrase to cover the why, I'd say it's because these events were presented in total lack of context, of ideas, relationships to other events, and above all of time or history. And I would suggest that this tells us a little bit about how we might readjust to cover similar events that may even be now happening, perhaps slightly unreported.

One approach could be tried, and I intend to try it, although it means lighting candles instead of cursing the darkness. It is to put events in the context of what it means to you, and by events I mean events in this whole area of urban problems and urban development. To try to establish relationships between these events and the self-interest of the reader or viewer.

I think in many cases it can be done, if we're willing to go far enough into the future and willing to project the event and its consequences far enough, we can perhaps see that it has some self-interest for the person out there. I'm not speaking now about a special population, such as the poor minority, but for good segments of the general population. I would suggest that this means, in terms of the practitioners of journalism, an increase in self-confidence.

I guess if I have any message for colleagues it is: For God's sake, trust yourself. Trust yourselves to form a context in which to place and interpret events. The so-called experts are not doing much of a job of it.

So I would suggest that the task of urban journalism is not simply translation but the building of

bridges between events, between ideas, between efforts, between problems, so that they take on a coherence, and to communicate some degree of this coherence.

This may take us beyond the traditional limits of journalism, but I would welcome the journey.

ELIE ABEL, Dean of the Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University: It does occur to me that there is a kind of common thread here. I spent the better part of 15 years in several intervals in Washington, covering primarily the foreign and national security side of things. I used to wonder over many of those years how it was that, year after year, in spite of other pressing needs, the manipulators of public opinion managed to get out of the Congress \$50 billion, \$60 billion, \$70 billion for defense, whether there was a real danger of war on the horizon or not.

The idea took a long time to penetrate -that with projects of that kind or projects like the space program that Ian Menzies mentioned, it's really a very simple proposition. You relate that expenditure to patriotism, pride, prestige. This is how you buy those things; this is how you sell them. You wrap the appropriation in the American flag and you make it seem somehow a subtraction from patriotism even to entertain any doubts about this kind of expenditure.

I think when we talk about rebuilding America-the next national priority-I suppose the real question is, How do we devise a strategy under which somehow the prestige of America and the pride of Americans in their country can be attached and related to the kind of country we live in, the kinds of cities we live in, the kinds of schools our children go to, the kind of air we breathe? All the things that we care about here somehow are made to appear frivolous in our official set of priorities. Maybe the SST vote is an example- perhaps the first one I can think of-in which that pattern maybe has been broken. We have heard all the appeals to prestige and to national pride, and yet the Congress voted against this expenditure. Maybe we are entering a new era.

OWEN MORITZ, New York Daily News: I'm disturbed about two things, Mr. Canty. You talk about the underground press. Let me ask, Whom are they reaching? Are they going to reach the same people who share that opinion to begin with?

And when you talk about the TV networks and newspapers, don't they have the single advantage of going out to suburbia to those areas we do want to influence? And when you talk about cable TV and parallel institutions, it really is digging up the old ground rather than touching the granite I think all of us want to reach. I don't know how you feel about it. That's the way I feel.

MR. CANTY: Yes, it relates to something I was going to say this morning about parallel institutions and lifeboats. One danger is not that the normal institutions disappear but that they continue in the same hands and on the same course. We wind up in a

lifeboat of a parallel institution, but the battleship is still being manned by the enemy. So I agree completely, and I didn't mean to set these up and say they were the waves of the future, but I think their existence tells us something about the deficiencies in the present institutions.

MR. MORITZ: You are dealing with the suburban majority, and I submit, if you read the daily newspapers, the big circulation magazines, look at TV, you have to work through these media in order to reach them. Any kind of energy you put elsewhere you're merely distracting from putting your energy in one direction.

MR. ABEL: I wonder, though, whether there isn't perhaps a marginal utility in the effect the alternate media are having on the editors of the mass media.

MR. MORITZ: I wonder if the editors ever really see underground newspapers.

MR. ABEL: I think they do.

MR. MORITZ: I still submit the editors do not see those underground newspapers on such a scale where it would have any influence on them.

ADA LOUISE HUXTABLE, New York Times: Just one comment on whether the press reads the parallel institutions. I know they are read quite avidly at the Times. I know that the city editor never misses the Village Voice.

I don't know whether it is of interest or not, but I came to a very large and important newspaper about eight years ago when this type of coverage was very, very new. And I came in a peculiar capacity, as a critic, which meant not just news coverage but analysis and appraisal of a comparatively new field for the daily press. In fact, that little term, an appraisal, was invented for some of my first pieces because they really didn't know what to do with them. They didn't know what to do with me. I ended up writing my most serious pieces, and they were pieces about national issues and about local issues, in the arts and entertainment section back with the rhododendron articles.

What I'm trying to say is that I found in a great paper-and I'm sure this is true of many papers-a state of paralysis, wanting to handle the urban subject but without slot. There had to be a slot. If there wasn't a slot, they had to make one. They have made one, even if it's something called an "Urban Cluster" which is a group of very competent employees handling the news, and I think doing a very good job of it.

If I bring in a story today, the questions are routine. You could almost anticipate them. Is there something political? Or is there a trend? This gives me the willies. So that I don't think we're making great progress in terms of adapting the institution to the need. I think we are making some progress. I think the most important thing is that we have urban writers, and I think we are all working on our editors all the time.

FRED POWIEDGE, author, Brooklyn, N.Y.: I have an idea that a change for the better could be made if

some device could be found for making editors feel that they had some good reason to spring reporters loose for a good chunk of time to work on the sort of stories that we've been talking about here these past couple days.

How many of these stories can you do in one day? Even if you have been keeping up with the progress of an issue and it goes through political channels and is criticized and so forth, even if you have a nice clip file, you can't touch a story of the kind we've been talking about in less than a couple 50 weeks. But editors by and large have not yet found whatever it is, the courage or the will or the money - usually they say it's money - to spring people loose like that. Does anyone know how to do that?

MR. ABLE: I have the impression it's happening more than it did four of five years ago. What you're really fighting there is habits of mind - an established bureaucratic way of doing business. One participant here was telling me some days ago about having wanted to come and having had in effect to get clearance from three different executives on the paper in question before coming, even though the paper is in no sense opposed to the purposes of this kind of conference. But it does mean detaching a body for, in this case, two days. That seems horrendous, I suppose, to the guy who has that list of every reporter and where he is assigned for that day.

MR. MENZIES: You're absolutely right. This is a key problem, to get the release time. I am trying to sell this idea of a team approach because I think this may be the way to change the structure, and therefore to change the man at the top and therefore change the thinking and attitudes.

MR. POWIEDGE: I should have said that I see it happening too. It's like at the AP for which I worked a long time ago when you couldn't take longer than ten minutes on a subject. They now have several people who can take long periods of time to work on it.

MR. MENZIES: Just to add one thought that I meant to mention originally. Nobody talks government, even the best newspapers in the country generally talk politics, but not government. This is what I think a group of four or five or six people, talking to each other, producing their individual stories but with knowledge of what the guy next door is doing and on occasion getting together, can achieve sensibly. Obviously it has to be attractively written on government, but I don't see why it can't be done, because it affects people and it can be written by and about people.

EVAN FRANCES, ladies Home Journal: In this group I may be in the fortuitous position of not having to come back with a grabbing headline, because I'm with that neanderthalic institution known as a woman's service magazine; so, they will settle for less than a headline. And the less than a headline that I will come back with is still worthy of the attention of my 14 million readers, and it is simply this: I will try to tell them a story about a black family,

a white family, with reasonably similar demographics in Columbia, Md. Now, it may not startle anybody, but for years I have been covering new towns outside of Scottsdale, Ariz., and in Massachusetts, and in none of those had I got the message that Jim Rouse has given us. I've got it now and I'm going to tell them about it.

PETER KOHLER, WCBS- TV, New York: I wonder if Mr. McCabe might respond to this. The basic assumption is that if you can bring light to urban problems - and that is indeed what the news media can do - you can help to solve some of those problems. Yet Congressman Ashley yesterday talked about the low profile that he sought to maintain while trying to get Title VII through - low profile meaning, I guess, not much publicity about it. And also I think the problems of referenda as they come up in states regarding housing, their dismal record, particularly in New York.

The question I would like to raise in a specific way, Mr. McCabe - Would you like to see the community development article in the constitution of New York very fully explained to voters?

MR. McCABE: Yes, yes. I say as passionately as I can to you that I really think that if you get the message across to the people in depth and over a long enough period of time so that they understand, they will support a community development bond issue and a community development article. At the present time they are scared by taxes; they are scared by other people; they are scared by all kinds of things. The approach that Elie Abel talked about, a little bit of pride and the flag and patriotism and what the country stands for and where it goes - we don't give people enough of that nor enough explanation of why these things come about.

We in UDC started in the very beginning. Whenever I had occasion to speak with people, I applauded it because I believed in it. I think it's terribly important for the future of the state. And I think you guys ought to cover it and say so too.

BRIAN W. DICKINSON, Providence Journal-Bulletin: I have a question about the problems of the smaller papers that are the only source of printed information for a great many million readers. Most of them, I expect, cannot afford to hire a full-time specialist and give him this kind of leisure to go out and study development problems in depth. What alternatives do they have, if they could do a decent job in this area?

MR. MENZIES: I mentioned one: the fact that UPI and AP have got to put out brilliant, concise explainers from Washington.

RONALD E. COHEN, UPI, New York: I agree with what Ian said, and it's great to place a burden on UPI and AP. Believe me, we'd like to fulfill that burden, but there is one thing we ran into that kind of took us by surprise. Last year we sent a senior editor out. He did a six-part series on urban problems, starting with transportation and going through housing and crime

and just about every facet of urban life you could imagine. He took six months to do this project. He traveled thousands and thousands of miles at expense I'm sure still makes our bosses blanch. He did a fine job of writing, and the story got almost no play. A great many papers were small dailies that had absolutely no interest in the rebuilding of New York City and Boston and Philadelphia and Chicago. They couldn't care less. They're in Green Bay, Wis., and they're in Dalhart, Tex., and they haven't got the room or the inclination to handle the story dealing with problems of large cities. They've had it up to here.

A large city paper that picked this up said, Gee, this is great; we'll put it in our files. The next time we want to write a local story, we'll have something to go by.

So we're running into this dilemma of having spent a lot of money on a project and finding that it gave us no return as far as use by the nation's newspapers is concerned.

MR. MENZIES: I feel sorry, but I think the AP and UP made two mistakes with these lengthy series. Just sheer length; it is almost impossible to cope with. I'm talking about relatively short pieces with relevance to the particular small town.

For instance, in the ideas of categorical grants, some of these small towns are sort of hip-deep in mobile libraries, they call them, so that you have a perfect example to show them the difference between a categorical grant and revenue sharing that could come in directly to them where the money could be good for whatever the priority in the particular town was. I realize this takes quite some time; it takes a whole breed of reporter who can be developed to see it from both sides.

MR. COHEN: For how many years have we at the wire services been getting blamed for handling things in 400 words when we should be going out and doing things in 5,000 words?

MR. SCHORR: I used to be a newspaperman once myself, and I've been listening with great interest to what sounds to me like an effort to discuss a very important issue but in rather technical terms. And as I listen to the technical discussion of it, whether a 400-word story can be sold more easily than 5,000 word series or how do you get the resources of a small newspaper to bear the way the Boston Globe or the New York Times can, I just want to add one comment: Elie said earlier that the Pentagon had great success in keeping its budget high because it associated it with patriotism and pride and prestige, and Why can't we do that in this field? The answer is that you can make something patriotic and prideful and prestigious when it is a national effort that represents a large-consensus issue.

A great many urban problems are not consensus issues. Their issues are polarized and, unfortunately, in the polarization the newspaper ends up on one side, usually with the side of either the majority or the vested interests or the interests that tend to ignore

minorities.

For example, take one urban issue, if you can call it that-environment. That has been sold more successfully in newspapers and other media than most others only for the reason that it immediately involves majorities, and air pollution has been better sold than water pollution with more people suffering from bad air than bad water.

But relatively few people suffer from the poverty of a slum, and relatively few people suffer from what happens if you don't get enough money into certain programs.

In an era when poverty has been reduced statistically from one-third of a nation in Roosevelt's day to ten percent of a nation today, the smaller the minority becomes, the harder it is to maintain focus on its problems. The real problem is: When does this question of pride and prestige and patriotism get translated into doing something not of immediate benefit to yourself but to solving a problem that represents a shrinking but very pained minority group of people?

MR. ABEL: One could even argue, I think, that the real danger this country faces is not that of external aggression; it is the disintegration from within. That is, I think, why so many of us are here and so interested in this subject.

JACK PATTERSON, Business Week: Mr. Schorr raised what I wanted to get into. Someone once asked T. S. Eliot what it took to be a critic. He said the first requirement was to be very intelligent. In many ways this is true of this field. When I began reporting the urban area, I was appalled by the complexity of the issues I had to deal with. No sooner do I think I have a conclusion than something else happens and I realize that I don't.

We are talking about a big hunk of American society. We have talked for two days about ways metropolitan areas and cities develop almost as though it is a kind of accidental thing, that it just happened this way. The fact is that things happen the way they do because it is to someone's interest that they happen that way rather than some other way. Some people win and some people lose. When we write about these things, we are treading on people's toes. We are saying, If you develop society this way, this group of companies wins. If you develop it another way, another one wins.

I think what I am really asking for is a comment on a new form of the age-old question as far as the press is concerned: How free are we to write about power? This is really what we're talking about. Some entities in our society are more powerful than others and inflict their interests on society as a whole. For example, we write about highways. Let's face it. We're writing about the automobile industry, about the concrete industry, and about the best organized lobby in Washington. If we say, we've got to stop building so many roads and build mass transit, they don't like that.

MR. MENZIES: Looking at this from the outside, I think magazines like Business Week and others are not saying just this. I think they are doing a hell of a job compared with the newspapers. You're not putting it together as well as we both think we ought to be doing. That's the real problem. Whether you can somehow get a generalist who can put the transportation and the housing and the whole bit together in the magazine each week, I don't know.

MR. SCHORR: I think it is not an accident that some of the best journalism today is being done by national newspapers-as opposed to local newspapers, and I make a lot of very important exceptions-by national magazines, by national television as opposed to local television. I think the Wall Street Journal can go into a place and sit there and write a story. It may not be pleasant to the city fathers in that place. The Wall Street Journal doesn't care. It's national and will rise above it.

HOWARD CAYTON: Could I comment on something Mr. Cohen said? I've been brooding about this story he worked so hard on and none of his papers used.

I recently was in Rock Springs, Wyo., population about 11,000, and I attended a meeting of the city council. It was the first time in my whole life that I ever attended a meeting of the city council of a town of that size. But I was astonished to find, although I've been in this business for 25 years, the subjects that they were discussing - air pollution, solid waste disposal, traffic, parking, juvenile delinquency, noise, and water service.

MR. COHEN: Did it make the local paper the next day?

MR. CAYTON: Yes.

MR. ABEL: I think what you've just said is confirmation of what I think we all know, even though it hasn't been stated here: America is an urban society, and even small towns run into precisely the same kind of problems that the very much larger cities do. Some of them at least have a little space, a little margin for error. They can move around a problem, build around it. That's very much harder to do in New York City. But it seems to me that in this whole area of quality of life, yes, it has come to Rock Springs, Wyo., too. There is no place to hide anymore.

WAYNE BARRETT, Interracial Fellow, Columbia University: I have been disturbed over the last couple of days about the real nature of this conference. I think it has something to do with the questions we're talking about now and the role of journalism in dealing with urban problems. We first of all gather a group of white journalists to talk theoretically about urban problems, and we spend one entire day discussing mechanisms to escape the city-new communities, fringe areas, mass transit. They all serve the people whom government programs have always served. Very few are going to serve the people in the inner city where there are very few programs actually

working on their behalf.

I don't even think that today we really got into any of the substantive issues that actually exist in the cities. We haven't talked about drugs. We haven't talked about jobs, as Mr. Patterson raised this morning. We really haven't dealt with the question of low-income housing. We really haven't even begun to ask the question of how we're going to provide it. The best we've heard is that Mr. McCabe can offer a program that gives us 20 percent low-income housing. If this is the way we as journalists think about urban problems, it seems to me that we are thinking ourselves away from them rather than coping with them. If what we've been talking about for two days is suggestive of what we're going to go out and write about, it's a pretty dismal prospect.

MRS. HUXTABLE: I don't completely agree. I think that this has been, like all conferences, not perfect, certainly not totally coherent. It hasn't tried to do a unified job. It certainly hasn't tried to solve problems. I think that it has reflected reality in that Americans are more preoccupied with escaping the inner city than staying there. Congress is more interested in subsidizing the American dream of suburbia than the rebuilding of the inner city. So I don't think in that sense we have been that removed from reality. I also, more as an historian than as a journalist, like to see things in some kind of context. I think one of the most controversial things this morning was Archibald Rogers' quite brilliant historical dissertation. You could argue with it in six different ways, but you could not argue with the insights into the basis of the urban problem today that he was attempting to give us.

I think this is what we as journalists need. I think we're terribly aware of the reality of the problem. Nobody is more aware of it than we are.

MONROE KARMIN, Wall Street Journal: I probably fit the role as much as anybody of what some people have been talking about earlier. I really write perhaps two stories a month, major stories, and I do not have a great deal of spot news to worry about. So I am free, and I have money and time, and I travel. The question always becomes: What do you write about? And that is the difficult thing.

Each person here talks about the urban problem, and implicit in the discussion is the definition of what the urban problem is. And the way I guess I resolve it for myself is I strive somehow to pick out what someone called the trend, where are we moving, where are we going, which may be quite different from what most people are talking about at that moment as the urban problem.

JAMES WELSH, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C.: I'd like to follow that theme a little bit. Dan Schorr commented about our talking to and possibly for the majority. Ten years ago this year Haynes Johnson was working for the Star and made the astounding proposal to the editor of the Star that he write a serious piece about the black population in Washington. It had never been done before. And at

that time what Dan says was perfectly true: The newspapers did direct every bit of their material to a white population, a middle-class population, with no thought of what was going on in the other part of the city.

There has been enormous change. There is an enormous amount of material written about the inner city, one subject after the other, one issue after the other, urban renewal, the school system, the formulation of black politics in the town, anything you can name. I think that since about 1968 that has hit a plateau. So I think it has gone about as far as it can go.

I might add too that I think most of this, given the constraints of white middle-class reporters, many of whom live in the suburbs, even given that constraint, just about all we did was written in the most sympathetic terms, keeping constantly in mind that about 70 to 80 percent of the readership of a paper like the Star is in the suburbs. I think there is possibly a counter danger here of turning people off. It may well have happened. It may be that what we need is more selectivity in the kinds of news that we present and the amount of news that we present about the city itself and about each of these problems.

MR. ABEL: Are you suggesting that we may have been overloading the circuits?

MR. WELSH: Not overloading, but I don't think that in a town like Washington we can go any farther than we've gone.

MR. SCHORR: Washington is one of the great exceptions to my broad generalization.

MR. KARMIN: As a Washingtonian who is not writing for a Washington newspaper, I would say if the Washington newspapers were subject to criticism, it would be for their lack of coverage of the suburban area at this point in time.

MR. CANTY: I'll be personal. I came into this with what you might call the Kerner focus, and I've retained it: The most critical domestic problems we have can be found concentrated in the slums and ghettos of the cities. I have not been convinced otherwise. But what has happened to me in looking at all this is that the scale gradually increases until in my mind, at least, such things as metropolitan decision-making, suburban responsibility, even state operational capability in areas such as housing become extremely pertinent. That does not, I hope, reflect in me a fudging of my own focus on where the gut problems are.

I think one thing that can be done quite consciously is to look for what you might call convergence issues. We were talking this morning about the need for jobs in the inner city, and no mention was made of the so-called public service job creation program that the President vetoed last session but which has now reemerged. But I happen to think this is a major issue. It would create jobs where the need is greatest. It would make a bigger pie to cut up.

Similarly I think John Reps' issue of public land



acquisition has all the kinds of pertinence we talked about in relation to urban growth, but I also personally feel it has a great deal to do with unlocking the housing situation in the central city.

MRS. HUXTABLE: I just want to say that my editors would tell me--and I think most of your editors would tell you --that that kind of bland story has no sex appeal, and how do you get it in?

MRS. FRANCES: I want to tell a story of what happened to me last year. I hop-skipped in a small plane 15 towns in the United States. There were such electric towns as Lamoille, Nev.; Wyola, Mont.; Caruthersville, Mo.; and Dyersburg, Tenn. I was checking into the activities of women's clubs. What I discovered and what I reported in the Journal: A lady in Lamoille, Nev., who was the wife of the wealthiest rancher in town said, "I don't know how you Eastern Seaboard journalists feel about black militants, but we're grateful to them because they got our Indians started demanding their rights."

And a lady in Commerce, Tex., said, "There existed in the South a silent majority that was very grateful for the Supreme Court decision until Mr. Nixon eroded it."

And then in Wyola, Mont., a woman replied to a question by a colleague of mine who asked, "Do the whites and Indians intermarry here?" She said, "Oh, indeed. My daughter is marrying a Sioux who's at the University of Montana in Missoula, and we're very proud of him. He's an honor student." And someone said, "Well, how do your relatives and how does the family feel about it?" She said, "Everybody is delighted with the whole thing except my mother who objected. And I said, 'Mom, here in Wyola, Mont., we practice what we preach or we don't preach it.' "

I went back and I wrote the report of these stories and these conversations in very human terms. We were inundated by the response. It was just a one-page story, and I assure you it was not done in my most mellifluous prose, which is never mellifluous anyway. But the point of the matter is that we had thousands of letters applauding us.

BRUCE PORTER, Newsweek: Mr. Welsh was talking about how the Washington papers had maybe over-covered housing and other problems of blacks. I would submit that the volume of coverage doesn't mean anything when blacks really aren't covered at all. They never are born. They're never married. They never die. They are covered as a kind of rolling disaster unit, and they're rolling along in this cloud of drugs and crime and they're never covered as people who exist and have lives that have meaning apart from bad housing and crime-ridden areas. The papers I think have scared whites to death about blacks because of the way they have been covered.

We're trying to get started a weekly newspaper in Bedford-Stuyvesant. A black living in Bedford-Stuyvesant sees himself mirrored in the white press as a problem, as a murder victim, as a murderer, as a dope addict, as an undesirable person. And the white

press has totally missed him as an individual. I think we should start addressing ourselves to this.

GEORGE McCUE, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: I think the value of the conference has been simply to offer insights and opportunities for exchange in this kind of conversation. We could be in session permanently and never deal fully with all the urban issues. But perhaps we have learned to identify some urban issues that we weren't quite familiar with before.

I think the exposure we have at a meeting such as this is to sharpen up our determination to ask better questions and to present a better identification of issues.

I think we can gradually develop a kind of adroitness in giving a story a certain turn the way we feel it should be, rather than to take time to educate editors. They're in much too big a hurry and under much too great a load most of the time by the nature of things. We can simply develop a technique of reporting the things that need to be reported.

Most of all, we need to clarify all we can, to ask the best questions that we can, and to occasionally analyze and be willing to make ourselves a little ridiculous by venturing a bit in this.

MR. KARMIN: A lot of us were saying that when you do get around these big city problems and some of these other things, you get a coalescence of concern--urban, suburban, black, white, low, middle. I find a concordance here.

DICK KLEEMAN, Minneapolis Tribune: I'd hate to see the conference end leaving hanging and apparently unanswered the charge that the monolithic white press treats the blacks badly. It simply isn't true. I don't think it's true of the good newspapers in Washington and in New York or of the good newspapers around the country. That's a charge that may have been justified 10 or 12 years ago. I don't think it is anymore, and I don't think it will be.

MR. WELSH: We should be looking ahead for new kinds of things in the seventies, a new kind of selectivity in what we write about, to the point where we don't write exclusively about politicians and poor people, and that probably the people we have missed most, whom we have almost ignored, are both the black and the white working class.

How to sell the editor on the story about what these people do and who they are, I think is maybe one part of that selectivity process.

MR. SCHORR: There has been a constant juxtaposition that has begun to bother me. It is as though if you give proper coverage to the black, let's not forget the white. If you give proper coverage to the central city, let us not forget the suburbs. Is any of this mutually exclusive?

The fact of the matter is, around Washington now the problems of the suburbs are not that much different in many cases from the problems within the District. In Prince Georges County and the other counties you're also getting problems of

discrimination, segregation, breaking down housing patterns, drug problems. Aren't we going off on some kind of a wrong track in saying we have to do more coverage of this because we have neglected it so therefore let us now start neglecting something else?

MR. MORITZ: We have progressed in time. Areas change, You had the South at one point. Then you started moving north to the big cities. I'm submitting now you're in a different area, we are talking about the suburbs. Just as you moved from the South to the North, I'm saying it's now the suburbs as an additional area of coverage that have to be taken into account.

MR. MENZIES: I think Dan is right. First of all, what has been said by both the Star and the Journal I agree with, We have done at times too much of one thing and not enough of the other. Then are we just going to swing the other way?

MR. MORITZ: I submit there is a different degree of intensity. I think it's more of a pressing problem in the ghetto than it is in the suburbs.

MR. ABEL: It may occur in a different form. Let me give you an example of the kind of thing I mean. We all know about the high cost of medical care, We know it in its most naked form, with those who are unemployed and have no hope. But think for a moment of the man who has worked hard all his life, white or black, it doesn't matter, who has paid his bills and is now living on Social Security and his savings, such as they are, are eaten up by inflation, and he gets a catastrophic illness. This happens all the time. People live longer and they get subject to strokes and heart attacks and it stretches on for years. It is not alone a ghetto problem. I grant you the form may differ. But it's a major burden for most Americans who are not wealthy, and most of us are not wealthy.

MR. MISTER: I feel impelled to say that this discussion disturbs me, because I think we're talking about a lot of false dichotomies. It's almost as though, despite all that we have learned, we are still trying to pigeonhole these little issues, And if there is anything that I think we can do during the next decade, it's to stop doing that because until the country begins to look at these problems as urban problems we're in trouble. And urban doesn't necessarily mean central city ghetto and it doesn't necessarily mean white preserve in the city. As long as we keep making these little cellular charts and trying to pigeonhole things in them, we're going to be in trouble.

THOMAS GRIFFITH, Life: I would just like to say before we adjourn that I think it has been a very damn good conference, And I think that part of the difficulty that some of us find with it is because we have been under a focus of journalists. There could be a lovely discussion about what should we leave out of papers and leave out of magazines and leave out of television budgets, Then we'd have a lot more room for this sort of thing.