

THE *SN* FOUNDATION, INC.
THE LECTURESHIP PROGRAM

PROBLEMS OF CHANGE

IN

URBAN CENTERS

INSTITUTE OF REGIONAL AFFAIRS
WILKES COLLEGE
WILKES-BARRE, PENNSYLVANIA

ARCHIVES
HT153
S751



LIBRARY

WILKES-BARRE
PENNSYLVANIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
IN
STANFORD
ERENYI ENDOWMENT FUNDATION
LIBRARY

1965
University of California, Santa
Wilkes College
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

PROBLEMS OF CHANGE

IN

URBAN CENTERS

SPERRY & HUTCHINSON FOUNDATION

LECTURESHIP PROGRAM

1967

Institute of Regional Affairs

Wilkes College
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

ARCHIVES

HT153

5751

THE S&H FOUNDATION LECTURESHIP PROGRAM

The S&H Foundation Lectureship Program was established in 1960 as part of the Sperry and Hutchinson Company's Program of Aid to Education. These lectures, in the field of public affairs and the social sciences, have a dual purpose: first, to enrich established undergraduate and graduate curricula by bringing public and scholarly experts into direct contact with faculties and students; second, to extend and strengthen the influence of the sponsoring school, through its constituency and the nearby community, by the presentation of at least one public lecture by each distinguished visitor.

In 1966-67, grants for visiting lectureships were made to thirty-nine institutions. Six private universities and twelve state universities, thirteen private colleges and two state colleges, one state junior college, one municipal college, one service academy, one professional institution, and two programs with several institutions participating were beneficiaries of the Lectureship Program.

The lectures published in this volume were made possible by the Sperry and Hutchinson Company as part of its aid to the educational program at Wilkes College.

79100

Gift 7-31-67

INTRODUCTION

Change may take away from the city of the future the need to concentrate populations for production and consumption. But there may be values associated with city life important enough to mankind to make imperative the continued existence of the city. It is not the size of the city that makes the difference, but the level and intensity of cultural life within a geographical region.

Moreover, as the role of government in providing goods and services expanded, the capacity of the family to care for its own needs was scaled down. Our society has moved away from remedial measures to preventative measures and to emphasis upon optimal rather than upon minimal standards of social services. The implications of this new orientation and redefinition of need in health, education, recreation, and welfare are far reaching especially since they become both social and political issues. What then, is the role of urban centers in the development and implementation of new social standards?

The organization of government in the metropolitan regions is a major problem of democracy. While everyone recognizes that with size we cannot have direct democracy but must move to representative institutions, people do so with nostalgic regret. We still measure big democracies with the yardstick of the town meeting and test their democratic validity by Jefferson. How can we develop a clear philosophy for large scale democracy instead of ending in frustration? The tests for ideal self-government in a large population wide-spread geographically, but knit together in a new structures web of economic, social, and communicational existence - must be radically different from the tests for small scale democracy.

The growth and decline of a city have an economical rationale. We must understand better the factors to which a city and region respond, the part played in the location of economic activity by resources, markets, and social overheads. The city is usually both economically determined and an economic determinant. The city is usually born in response to economic stimuli - a rich hinterland, concentration of natural resources, the logical terminus of a transport network. But after reaching a certain size, the city grows of itself, becomes self-generating. It becomes a growth center, a magnet attracting to itself further growth. As one economic base for the existence of the city fades, can others take its place?

In considering whether the total burden that society might bear will be greater than the cost of economic salvage of the city or region, we apply the economic principles of cost versus benefit. How important, then, is the city in determining its own economic existence? The underlying idea is to understand the part that the city plays in the economy of a region, and the part that economics plays in the life of the city.

The preceding questions and problems are discussed by our three speakers. Because of the complexity of the questions posed, and the complications involved in their solution, the speakers present no pat answer, but provide a series of guidelines that could be instrumental in the solution of the problem. Their background, knowledge and experience should provide a valuable insight into the problem of change in Urban Centers.

Hugo V. Mailey, Director
Institute of Regional Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"The S&H Foundation Lectureship Program" ii

Introduction iii

"Changing Values in Today's Metropolis"
by Dr. John Middleton 1

"The Political and Governmental Response to
Metropolitanism" by Dr. Alan K. Campbell 14

"New Directions for the City's Economy"
by Dr. John H. Nixon 28

CHANGING VALUES IN TODAY'S METROPOLIS

by

Dr. John Middleton, Chairman
All University Department of Anthropology
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
New York University

I.

A fundamental viewpoint of anthropology is that social groups and institutions are comparable, indeed that they may best--perhaps only--be understood by comparative analysis. Obviously, all cities, like all men, are unique, in a certain historical sense; but, equally obviously, all are cases or types of a single phenomenon. Indeed, if we could not perceive patterns and structures behind the diversity, there would be no history, anthropology or any other social science. I take it, therefore, as basic that any city of this country is comparable to any other city, in any country and at any period of history. Clearly, the degree of comparability will vary: there are always certain unique events and characteristics which determine the peculiarities of any city. But one of the weaknesses of so much of the usual study of urban problems has been precisely that we tend to see our cities in isolation, as though they had unique problems of their own. But, in fact, these problems are common to all cities.

Let me give an example. I have done field research in an African city, Lagos, Nigeria. It is a city of over a million people, in all, and comparable in size with many American cities. It is the capital of Nigeria which has over fifty million people. Its ethnic, racial composition is very heterogeneous, with several dozen tribal groups being represented in its population. There is remarkable variation in occupation, income, education, marital stability, length of stay in the city, and so on. People live in families, of many different types according to tribal origins of the members, and above them there is a King, (whose traditional powers are today much diminished), an elected city government, factories, large and small business firms, churches, sects, markets, schools, bars, all the other centers of local groups that we expect in a modern city. A

marked form of organization is the association, a grouping of people of the same tribe, but of different class and residential area, occupation and education standards. They have social, religious, economic, and occupational functions, as did similar associations that were found in the early days of European and American cities. The associations are linked with the country areas, with much movement to and fro, and they provide the means by which new values and ideas from the city spread to the countryside, and also means by which values spread from the countryside to the towns.

The problems of Lagos are those of our own cities: poverty, crime, corruption, good or bad government, and so on. The main kinds of organization are similar to our own--family, neighborhood, factory, church, association, and the like. But they each have different degrees of importance in the everyday lives of the population, and by comparison of these with our own we can, I think, find some valuable leads to an understanding of our own cities.

For me, then, Lagos and a Western city are very similar. Their cultures are different in the sense that American culture is different from Nigerian culture. But we know that despite the cultural differences, the basic principles of social organization are similar. The question naturally follows: Is urban culture something different from non-urban culture, or is it a form of, or in some way an extension of, rural or traditional pre-urban cultures? I should say that urban culture has everywhere certain unique features, but these are the same differences as are found in the wider national cultures. That is to say, Lagos culture is a sub-culture of Nigerian culture, and New York culture is a sub-culture of American culture. But beneath this level, all cities have similar basic principles of organization, which are peculiar to urban systems.

Cities are also comparable in their histories. We can recognize historical and universal phases of urban growth and development, from the first cities of prehistory to New York. We can see that certain factors make for stages in city growth. Some of these are external to the city--a changing environment, the appearance of trade routes and centers, and the like. Others are internal--the heterogeneity of population in terms of its ethnic origins, or the development of banking and credit institutions and social groups to deal with such matters. We can observe the concomitants of the developmental phases: the growth of class or prestige structures of various kinds, the increasing dependence on central governmental agencies rather than on the family for welfare purposes, the growth of extra-familial but non-governmental associations, and the like. With these go the social "problems" that loom so large in any modern city, but also in cities such as Lagos and those of the Middle Ages--delinquency, prostitution, drunkenness, crime, and psychological

illnesses. There are some obvious dangers of interpretation here. The evolutions of cities is never a single uniform process. But none the less, if we can observe a pattern in the historical growth of cities, and I think that we can, then the task of understanding the present and its problems, and perhaps those of the future also, becomes much easier.

My point here is that we talk a great deal about the problems of "culture change" and "social revolution" in the city. But it seems clear that "social revolution" refers mainly to the moving from one stage of development to another. It is not a unique historical event that affects only New York and its surrounding urban centers, but something that affects all cities during their growth. These days the rate of growth is very fast, and the disruption of former ways of life is also very rapid, especially among those inhabitants who have recently moved into the city-- whether New York or Lagos--from the surrounding hinterland and who have not yet adapted themselves to the many elements of the urban culture that is so new for them. However, the social problems that are such a feature of cities today are not due merely to disruption of traditional ways of life. Some are so, but there is far more to it than that. They are due also to the very nature of urbanism.

I shall not try to define a "city" here. It is clearly more than a lot of buildings, streets, people and cars--although it is those things alone to many people such as traffic planners, sanitary engineers, and all too often to architects and city planners who should know better. We know that when we speak of a city we refer basically to an area of population of very high density, with permanent dwellings. Usually a criterion is that it is a center for trade or industry, or both. But many cities, such as those of West Africa, have a large proportion of their population making their living from agriculture, so that occupation is not of much value as a criterion. I think also that we must extend the meaning of the word to cover an entire region. This, of course, has been widely recognized, and sociologists and others speak of a metropolitan region. The earliest cities of which we know anything, and most of the mercantile pre-industrial cities of the non-Western world, were not and are not solidly built up areas of streets and houses. They extend into the surrounding countryside. In the sense that we find in many African cities--there often over half of the population are farmers, who commute out to their farms beyond the suburbs, where they grow produce for sale in the city's markets. The limits of the "city" are rarely, perhaps never, the limits of its system of government, of taxation, or sanitation, or whatever may be the formal criterion for definition. Social ties, those of kinship, marriage, friendship, personal trade, and so forth, cross these boundaries, and many of our modern difficulties in city government arise from this discrepancy between formal and social boundaries.

II

I come now to the concept of "social values." I think I may best approach this question by mentioning some of the problems of actual research into urbanism. It is clear that there are some areas of which we have a considerable knowledge, and there are others about which we are still very ignorant in any detail, although, since we live in cities we all have some experience of them. But experience of everyday life is not, alas, necessarily understanding of it.

In some areas we have a great deal of knowledge. They are mainly those of directly ascertainable fact, such as matters of demography. We know such things as the age and sex composition of a city such as New York; we know details of the ethnic origins of its populations, of how long individuals and individual families have lived here and where they lived before; we know how much they earn and how much they spend, and so on. But note that our knowledge of these matters is almost all based on the assumption that the unit of study, of counting, is either the individual or the conjugal family or domestic unit. This is not to say, of course, that this is in any way methodologically or philosophically wrong. But I do think that it is in many ways inadequate as a means to understanding of urban culture.

A culture--by which I mean basically merely a way of life, in all its aspects--is not something individual. It is collective, belonging to a society or a community; which, indeed, it defines. A society, and a city is one form of society, is composed of a network of relations between persons. After all, one cannot actually see a society or a city, apart from its streets and buildings. In many ways we may say that a society, the urban society also, is a construct of ideas and values held by the people who consider themselves and are considered by others to be its members. Here I come to the areas, not of knowledge, but of relative ignorance. We know a good deal about the psychology of the city dweller, but again, almost always as an individual; we know very little indeed about the cultural values that mark off one culture or sub-culture from another, and which give its members a sense of identity and of unity vis-à-vis the outside world of which they are a part. We know a little of what members of one culture think of members of another culture. We know, of course, that they may like, or more usually dislike, them, and since we are all members of one culture or another we know what it is like to do this. What we know so little about are all the implicit, underlying ideas, symbols, values, ideals, notions of right and wrong, of good and evil, of honor and shame, and so on. We take them for granted because we are all socialized human beings who have to take them for granted if we are to live in any sense of security.

We are here, essentially, dealing with what anthropologists studying small-scale non-Western societies usually call religion. We us-

ually say that values are of two kinds, moral values and cosmological values; but I think there can be no real distinction made between them. They are basic to an understanding of any culture. The French anthropologist, Marcel Mauss, wrote that the primary aim of anthropology is to understand the systems that men construct in order to conceptualize their own experience, both that of their own social lives and that of the relation of society to nature. The basic unit of the religious system is the symbol. So that when we are studying values we are really studying symbolic systems in which men conceive of themselves in society and in the wider world. This may sound a long way from problems of municipal government, but I think it is in fact very relevant to it.

Men's values, aims, beliefs and so on may be both conscious and unconscious. We know a certain amount about our conscious aims, ambitions and fears, although it is a good deal less than we like to think it is. But we know very little about the unconscious values held by members of various cultures in any part of Western society. I include under the rubric "unconscious values" such things as notions of space between people, between rooms in houses, and between houses and streets, and between different kinds of buildings; or they may include notions of pollution and food habits; there are many other areas of ignorance which are obvious to us all. These are all elements in symbolic systems, and, being symbols--and, of course, social symbols held by aberrant individuals--they by definition symbolize something. Arguing from comparative studies of symbolic systems, we may say that they usually represent forms of social relations: those of power and authority, between young and old, between men and women, between members of different classes, and the like.

Let me briefly say a little about the two examples I mentioned: space in housing and food. Many architects assume, like Le Corbusier, that a house is a machine to live in. It seems to me that nothing could be further from the truth. A house is a symbolic structure in which are expressed the complex patterns of authority between men and women, parents and children; the relations between members of a family and the different networks of kin of the individual members; and between the family, its neighbors and the wider world of the class and prestige systems. The same applies to larger arrangements of residential areas and clusters of houses and streets.

If we analyze the social significance of food, we can see that choice of foods is rarely made on rational grounds of health. Far more weight is given to foods as symbols of class status and ambition, of different roles of men, women and children, and the like. All societies recognize certain foods as dangerous, highly prized or polluting; these foods mark changes in status that any person goes through in the course of his

life. What I am getting at here is that these various symbols represent patterns of social relations and of change in those relations. These relations vary from one community to another, even in the same city, rural community, or other group.

In a tribal society, of the kind that anthropologists have traditionally studied, all people conceive of their society in the same way, with perhaps slight differences between men and women and between young and old. But the population of a city, whether in this country or in Africa or Asia, is almost invariably extremely heterogeneous in origin, with great variation in length of stay in the city, in occupation, wages, political power, and so on. One of the defining features of an urban society is that its basic form of organization is--it would seem has to be--a fluid one. It allows movement, both into and out of the city, from one part of it to another, from one occupation to another, and also up and down units in a ranked hierarchy of positions. This latter system is, of course, a central one in Western cities based on an industrial economy, and is the class system. There is no need for me to discuss this concept here, but concept it is--it is not a clearly definable structure, but is rather a construct in men's minds by which they conceive of the world in which they live. It is fashionable in many circles to assume that there is something bad, or something undemocratic or old-fashioned, in a class system. But to say this is to misunderstand its nature. A class system is one of many kinds of social classification, of systems of values and concepts. It is subjectively defined rather than being an objective phenomenon. People regard class differences in different ways. In England, for example, which I know better than the United States, men tend to see the class system as consisting of two different and opposed groups--the "upper" and "lower" classes--whereas women see it as consisting of several levels. Men see it in terms of conflict, women as a system through which one should rise in class status. And again, people who call themselves either upper or lower class tend to see the system as unchangeable and filled with conflict, whereas those who say they are middle-class tend to assume movement as an integral part of it. In the United States the notions of class held in, say, Boston, the Midwest, the Deep South, or Southern California, are all very different from one another, as are those held by people of different racial affiliations.

A very similar classification concept is that of race or ethnic group. There are, clearly, racial and ethnic affiliations, but their definitions vary from one society to another (or even within a single society) and there is certainly nothing very objectively correct or universal about them. Again, they are rather means by which people conceive their experience, and in terms of which they ease their aspirations, ambitions and fears.

III.

I wish here to say something about social change. As I have said, it is continuous, and the conflicts and contradictions I have mentioned are a necessary part of it: social change involves change in systems of values, and so individuals are caught up in continuous conflict in their values. Some social groups change as cities develop, others remain, others come into being as new kinds of groups.

We know something about the general outlines of comparative urban development: the increase in ethnic heterogeneity; the increase in the importance of achieved status in place of ascribed status; the necessity of new forms of educations for new roles and skills, especially in an industrial society, which cannot be taught in the family and other small groups as was much pre-industrial education; the increase in social mobility, in both territorial and class and prestige terms. Yet, with these, many of the traditional needs have still to be met: the arrangement of marriages, socialization of children, care of the old, ways of conceiving human experience in ritual and myth, and the like. The tasks are always there, and social groups are formed in order to do them. They are not always done by the same groups, in different societies: the work of anthropologists on "primitive" societies has shown us that. In the West we have very few groups that have any permanence: we have the nation-state, and larger corporate groups such as businesses and colleges. We do not have many others. At the lower end of the scale we have the conjugal family, a very short-lived unit of a man, his wife and children, which ceases to exist as soon as husband or wife dies or leaves. In most societies of the world this small family is only a part of a wider family, the joint family of several generations, which is seen by its living members as only part of an everlasting descent group founded by an ancestor. Such a group is concerned with ownership of land and livestock; it is a political unit, and a religious one; it is concerned with education of children, with arranging marriages, with care of the old and sick. It is a close-knit, face-to-face group, giving its members a great sense of identity and security. Tradition is all-important, and heresy is not tolerated. Knowledge of the outside world, in either space or time, is limited.

Social morality is defined largely in terms of basic organization. For example, we find that if inheritance of rights and property is through men alone, then legitimacy of children becomes important. Marriages tend to be arranged; divorce, adultery and extra-marital relations are frowned upon. If inheritance of rights and property is through women only, as it is in many parts of the world, then legitimacy in our sense does not matter--a child is legal merely by having a mother. As a consequence, we find that marriages are usually personal matters, divorce

is unimportant and easy, illegitimacy, adultery and extra-marital sexual relations are not worried about. The missionaries in various parts of the world who found societies of the first type considered them as sexually moral people; those who found the second regarded them as sexually depraved and immoral people. Yet presumably the individuals are the same kind of people in each case; I have worked among both types and could never see any real differences. I could mention many more examples of the relationship between moral values and social organization--but the principle may be accepted as valid.

In our own society, and in rapidly industrializing societies of the non-Western world, the family loses importance as an economic, political or religious group. With earned rather than inherited wealth being important, the family becomes more like the second kind I have just mentioned. People must be mobile and must have ambitions as individuals. Specialists in education, politics and other fields take over from the family: they have to, since the skills needed to run our kind of society are so great that a family cannot provide them all. The basic principle of organization is no longer that of descent but is the fluid and competitive class system. Inheritance becomes of little importance, and so does marriage and legitimacy. There is no longer a need for elaborate initiation into adulthood. The consequence, of course, is what we tend to think of a "breakdown" in family strength and in sexual and other morality. Individual people find that they cannot live their lives primarily as members of large family groups--unless they happen to be wealthy so that inheritance becomes important. We regard these developments as right and good, naturally: we recognize the freedom given to individuals to decide their own choices. And we recognize also--or should do--the cost in psychological disturbance to those who cannot live without the sense of security given by stable social groupings. Our society is only one type out of many, and like all of them has its advantages and disadvantages.

A city does not consist merely of large numbers of individuals: it is composed of many networks of relations, any one person holding many positions with regard to other people, and holding positions in many networks. I use this word here to refer to what might be called communities, except that a community has the implication of being a more clearly definable cluster of people than does network; I mean here to refer to networks of people who are in one way or another in communication with each other. Some networks may have formal or informal structures and be clearly defined; others may not. These networks are in many respects the basic groupings of our society.

The relevance of this to what I am saying today is that people accept various sets of values, ideas, concepts, ideals, ambitions, hopes and so on; each set belongs to a particular network, and indeed is often its main defining criterion. Some of these networks and the values that

go with them are clearly defined and fairly easily describable: those composed of members of a family or a neighborhood, or of a ward political party branch, of a particular church or sect, or of a juvenile gang. Others may be less clearly defined and there may be little agreement about what are their aims, ambitions and values: examples are the networks that comprise teenagers, or school drop-outs, or middle-aged women without much education, or people who read the same newspaper, or even people who hold various views about the world without ever being very clearly sure of the identity of others who may share those views. Much depends on the degree of recognition given to the network by the press and other outside agencies, much depends on numbers of members, and on obvious factors such as degree of neighborhood affiliation or ethnicity.

A person may, as I say, belong to many of these networks (he must, unless he is either insane or in prison), and he changes his actual role from one to another according to a particular situation in which he finds himself. To some extent the sets of values which any one person accepts must be fairly congruent, not too much at variance; but, as we all know, it is remarkable to what degree a person can maintain sets of values which are often in logical or even actual conflict or contradiction to each other. Many of these contradictions are, of course, situational--one should not kill, but may do so in time of war, and so on. Presumably, and I am not a psychologist, if the contradictions become too obvious then the person concerned is overwhelmed by sense of strain, tension and frustration, and becomes neurotic or even insane. But we all have to suffer contradictions of this kind to some extent, unless we happen to be members of a very exclusive and all-prevalent network, such as a monastery.

I am, of course, saying that a person behaves according to the values he may hold in any given situation; if they are too greatly at variance with a majority set of values held by the society at large, he may, if he acts upon them, be regarded as committing a crime or a sin. We might argue that often a criminal or a sinner, in this particular sense (and there may be other kinds of criminal and sinner, I will realize), is aware of the fact that he is acting against the majority values of a society but this is irrelevant to my argument here. But it is clear that often a man may be unaware that he is behaving criminally or immorally; this is true especially when he is behaving correctly according to the set of values which he himself, his family and other networks, to which he feels himself particularly bound, happen to accept. The sexual behavior of many lower-class immigrants and marginal groups is an obvious example.

We may suggest that the greater the degree of disparity of sets of values, of cultures and sub-cultures, in a city, the greater is the

likelihood of criminality or deviation from accepted moral norms of behavior. Now put like that it is often factually incorrect--there may be less criminality and delinquency in tight-knit communities with marked sub-cultures, such as the inhabitants of a Chinatown or a Jewish ghetto. We must add to it. The disparity becomes more significant the greater the degree of economic, social, or political interdependence between the members of these various networks. And this is particularly so if there is one, or are a few, generally accepted networks which have greater power than others, and whose values are therefore accepted as being jurally or morally the most acceptable and right, and those markedly different from them accepted as being worthless or wrong, by almost all members of the total society. The most obvious case of this situation, of course, is when the "networks" correspond to classes or sub-classes, which are by definition closely linked into a single class system and all share the same main set of values as to the nature of that system.

Another point is that there are, in any system of sets of values such as I have mentioned, some areas where the values are ambivalent or uncertain, where the people who hold them would like to attain others or have considerable uncertainty as to the validity of their own values. I refer, as an example, to what is often said about people who regard themselves as being "middle-class", who are ambitious to attain higher class status but find themselves in an ambiguous and uncertain role in a great many situations. We know that such people tend to have higher rates of suicide, and neurosis, in very general terms. They may not express the contradictions in their roles so much in criminality (which they see as a primarily "lower class" activity), but they still provide difficult social problems for a city.

When we say that people find their values are uncertain or ambivalent, we are saying that they find it difficult to conceptualize their experience. If we look at the work of the French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, we find that "primitive" societies use what they find about them in nature--the "bric-à-brac", the raw material of "bricolage"---in order to give meaning to the forms and organization of their society, their social experience. The simplest form of this is the religion known as totemism, by which society and nature are brought together into a single system. The control of any part of this system, by sacrifice or ritual drama, is thought to give control of all its other parts. It also gives understanding of the whole. Lévi-Strauss suggests that this is a universal necessity, that all men have a need for classificatory order. This is as true of a city-dweller as of anyone else. But it would seem that the urban environment, by continually changing, in some way or other prevents a sense of order from being satisfied. We call this by many

terms--rootlessness, shiftlessness, psychological isolation, and so on. There is not the space here to continue this argument, but it would repay investigation.

V.

If the situations I have mentioned were in some way or other irrevocable, if by being inherent in any urban context they were unchangeable, then of course we could do little or nothing about them. Certainly I consider that they are intrinsic to urban life. All known human societies have inherent conflicts and points of tension in them, which are dealt with in various ways--by jural acts, by the performance of ritual, by wars, and so on. It would take us too far afield to document this statement here, but no society of which we know anything is a stable one, without internal stress and conflict--the young grow older, the old die, men have ambitions and hatreds. There are always change and conflict. But most small-scale pre-industrial societies have worked out adequate and satisfying means of resolving such conflicts. We have not yet got very far along this road in our cities and in the wider communities centered upon them. The very rate of development and growth has meant that there has not been time for generally acceptable solutions to have been worked out and tried; also the urban structure is a complex one, and solutions are all the more difficult for this reason.

Much conflict and uncertainty arise in situations in which the sets of values that compose sub-cultures are themselves indeterminate and ambiguous. Indeterminacy and ambiguity seem likely to be important especially in situations of rapid change and social mobility. So that rapid economic change and progress, for example, are likely to lead to greater conflict in roles and to its expression in crime, delinquency, and neurotic behavior.

We may assume that this kind of uncertainty will become more widespread. Besides uncertainty in the general structure of social relations, there are uncertainties as to the basic roles of members of urban societies: the roles of old and young, men and women. As we know from anthropological research outside our own culture, even these basic roles are variable and defined differently from one culture to another, in the sense that they are differently related to occupation and specialization. As occupations become more and more specialized, people in marginal occupational roles not clearly linked to age and sex (and these roles become ever more frequent) find themselves in an increasingly indeterminate position. They have no certain social personality, no firmly accepted values as symbols for their social experience and their social

aspirations. An urban, "faceless", man becomes an individual, not a person. He has no social experience of any stability, and, as we all know so well, must acquire one, or at least the signs of one, by whatever means he can, however, frustrating and destructive to his own sense of order and security this may be. The faceless men wear masks.

I wrote above that we have not yet tried many solutions to these problems. But some have been tried in recent urban history, although not all have been deliberate or very conscious. Some are based on the premise that one can hardly quarrel with people who hold different sets of values if one does not come into contact with them; hence the move from the center of cities to the suburbs. This is not, of course, the only reason, nor even the main reason, why people move to suburbs, although it is certainly often an important and conscious one--to escape the threat of criminals, to escape what people see as education shared by children of different value-networks, and so on. But it is one obvious way of moving from one network to another. Similar is the historical attempt to put people of different values in different parts of the city, as today with immigrants from the south (whether white, Negro or American Indian) who come to a city such as Chicago. They may be forced into ghettos, but they may also acquire security from their very segregation. Others have been in the political sphere--the alignment of party branches and party leaders with particular ethnic groups, so as to canalize discrepant values and ambitions through safer channels into a single overall political system. The same may be said of religious sectarianism. I am here not referring to conscious, purposive action, but to the social function of certain activities which may have quite different overt motives.

One thing that we can do, although as yet we know very little about it except what our personal experience and hunches tell us, is to discover where are the points of possible and probable contradiction and what are the forms in which they are likely to be expressed. Here the whole field of social symbolism that I have mentioned becomes relevant, and it is here that we need more research, of a kind that is peculiarly suitable for anthropology.

We also need research into some of the basic concepts I have mentioned. An example is the measurement of economic, social or political interdependence between networks of people that I have suggested as a relevant factor in understanding the organization of a city. There is, of course, much work already done on this kind of problem, mainly by sociologists and psychologists. But too often the work has been ethnocentric, referring only to particular American cities, and being of little value in understanding the universal processes or urban growth. I return here again to the question of what is the unit. It is not an individual, nor even an individual family, but the network, as I have called it. We

know very little about the value systems of the various networks which compose our cities--ethnic, class, sex, age, occupational, and many others. We know very little about the social symbols they employ to distinguish themselves from others and to define others. Of course, we know something--that people of various ethnic origins march in annual parades to national heroes, that they use certain languages and dialects. But these are only the obvious ones. We need to know far more about the values set upon spatial and temporal separation of people and groups, upon ambition, upon honor and shame, upon religious truth, and so on; these are the things that act as motives and which stir powerful emotions and lead to open conflicts and criminality.

I have been struck often by people who wish to deny that these differences exist within our population. But they do exist and we should recognize them. To recognize that people hold different sets of values is not to deny the rightfulness of their cause, in any human sense, nor to accept poor living standards, or to refuse to improve the material basis of society. It is rather to recognize the rightness of human life, to recognize that cultures are different but that they are all equal in value and in the sincerity with which they are held. We must recognize that the people who hold them have the right to do so, as well as having the obligation to live in peace with others.

Dr. John Middleton holds a Doctorate of Philosophy in Social Anthropology from the University of Oxford. He is presently the head of the All University Department of Anthropology in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at New York University. His teaching experience includes the University of London, the University of Capetown, Rhodes University, and Northwestern University. His field research has been done in Uganda, Zanzibar, and Nigeria. Among his publications are Tribes Without Rulers, 1958; Witchcraft and Sorcery in East Africa, 1963; and Zanzibar, Its Society and Its Politics, 1964.

THE POLITICAL AND GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSE TO METROPOLITANISM

by

Dr. Alan K. Campbell
Professor of Political Science
and
Director of Metropolitan Studies Program
Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University

From Rural to Metropolitan

The United States is, today, a metropolitan society; it is not, as everyone knows, rural; nor is it, as many do not realize, urban. The distinction between urban and metropolitan is not as clear-cut as that between rural and urban but is not, because of that fact, any less important.

The significance of the urban-metropolitan distinction is enhanced by the nature of the American system of local government. This system was designed originally for a rural society, then adapted to serve an urban society, and is only now undergoing adaptation to serve a metropolitan society. Since the changes which are taking place are incremental rather than full-fledged, they are not readily apparent nor easily understood. For these reasons the implications of the governmental and political response for metropolitan policy are perceived dimly, if at all.

To examine the implications of metropolitanism and its governmental structure for public policy and political leadership requires at least a brief summary of the economic and social characteristics of metropolitanism, for it is these characteristics which define the new society.¹ Metropolitanism is a result of the dual movement of people, jobs and economic activity from countryside to city and from city to suburb. The result is a redistribution of all of these things, creating a new pattern; a pattern which is spread rather than compact. In the redistribution there is a sorting-out of both economic activities and people.

In the case of economic activities, retail services and commercial activities tend to follow their customers to the suburbs. Manufacturing moves outward, taking its tax base and its jobs with it as it searches for more space--space appropriate for a technology which demands a horizontal rather than a vertical production process. Remaining in the central city are personal and retail services for the new and remaining population, as well as highly specialized services (medical, legal, recreational, etc.) for the entire metropolitan area. In addition, the central city has become the home for the central offices of America's major businesses. The net result of this shifting of economic activities is an absolute or, at least, a relative decline in the economic position of the central city.

Simultaneous with the shift in the location of economic activity, but often for quite different reasons, is a shifting in residences. The common picture of a central city of the very poor and the very rich, with a suburbia made up of middle- and higher middle-income people, is oversimplified but for the largest metropolitan areas, and particularly for those in the Northeast, it is basically true. Added to redistribution for income is an ethnic separation with central cities becoming increasingly populated by Negroes, while there is a relative decline in the suburban Negro population.

Social and Economic Interdependence and Governmental Autonomy

This redistribution of economic activities and people has not eliminated nor even decreased the economic and social interdependence of metropolitan areas. People and goods flow back and forth throughout the area, and this economic and social interaction is the lifeblood of every region. Thus, all residents of a metropolitan area have a common interest in the social and economic health and vitality of the entire area.

It is this common interest which has prompted many students of metropolitanism, as well as civic leaders, to suggest that overlying this area of economic and social interdependence should be a common government--a metropolitan government. Despite the believed rationality of this proposition, only two metropolitan-wide governments have been established in the United States. First, was the federated government for metropolitan Miami, with Dade County being used as the structural framework for the area-wide jurisdiction. Nashville and Davidson County followed the Miami example with an even stronger metropolitan government created by a nearly complete consolidation of city and county.

Many efforts have been made to provide some kind of common governmental jurisdiction for other metropolitan areas, but all have failed. The failure normally has come at the referendum stage. Many explanations have been offered for this refusal of the voter to endorse metropolitan government, but perhaps Norton Long summarizes the reasons as well as anyone when he says, ". . . much history, especially where people have become accustomed to living under different governments with different values and resources, underscores the painful fact that common problems may do little more than produce common quarrels."³

The rejection of metropolitan government should not be taken as evidence that local governmental systems have not responded in anyway to the realities of metropolitanism. Many adaptations of the system have taken place. These adaptations range from informal agreements among governmental officials of adjoining jurisdictions to undertake cooperative action, to the much more fundamental change of establishing a metropolitan or nearly metropolitan-wide special districts for the performance of single functions. The function may be water supply, or sewerage disposal, or transportation, or parks, to mention only a few. Ranging between these two types of adaptations are many others, including formal contracts among jurisdictions to provide jointly a common service, the contracting of one jurisdiction with another for the supply of a service, the establishment of small special districts for the performance of particular functions in particular areas; as well as occasional annexations, a practice more common in the South than in the rest of the country.

These adaptations do not necessarily move metropolitan areas in the direction of fewer governments or less governmental fragmentation. Many of them increase the amount of both functional and jurisdictional fragmentation. In 1957 there were 17,984 governments in America's 212 metropolitan areas, in 1962 there were 18,442, an increase of three percent. Even these figures, great as they are, omit many units of governments which the Census Bureau does not count because they are organized as dependent units, i. e. units governed by other governments.

Maintaining Basic Services

The adaptations of this vast and complex system of local government to the reality of social and economic interdependence has made it possible for the governments in metropolitan areas to continue to keep house. Water continues to flow, sewerage, although it may lead to pollution, is disposed of, highways are built; and despite traffic jams, cars and trucks do eventually get to their destinations. Policemen patrol, fires are

extinguished, public health is protected, welfare checks are mailed, and children, after a fashion are educated.

Is this ability of the present governmental system to maintain services all that is needed? Apparently the voters, in most of America's metropolitan areas, believe it is. There are a few scholars who find a positive virtue in the present system. In their judgment it optimizes the range of choice open to people seeking particular combinations of public services and taxes.

Is this housekeeping function a sufficient role for local government? There is no right answer to this question. It is clear that if this is all local governments are able to do, certain consequences inevitably will follow. Some kinds of problems will simply not be solved and others will be pushed to other parts of the total governmental system for solution, primarily to the federal government.

It does appear that the hardware problems of metropolitan areas are, in part, being met. The difficulty lies much more in the social field. The concentration of the disadvantaged in the central cities is one source of these problems. It has become abundantly clear that education and social services are increasingly difficult to provide with either adequate scale or adequate quality. The central cities simply do not have sufficient tax resources to provide these services at a level needed to bring the disadvantaged into the mainstream of American society. To the extent that the present central city tax base must be depended upon to provide these services, adequate services will simply not be provided.

In addition to the difficulty of matching fiscal resources to service needs, is the question of controlling and directing metropolitan growth and change. Under the present system there is no over-all planning for metropolitan areas. There are, indeed, metropolitan-wide planning agencies but they are only advisory. Without metropolitan-wide planning controls the present dispersal of city population will continue. It is possible that this is as it should be, but the present system provides no choice. One result is the tremendous expense in providing government services, particularly capital plant. Sewerage systems, water systems and highway systems must follow the population. It has been calculated, for the New York metropolitan area, that the capital cost of providing these public services for each new home in a suburban community is \$16,800 per home.⁴ Such cost would be reduced if a decision were made to promote and encourage compact communities. The issue, however, is not the relative merits of compact versus spread cities, but rather than the present governmental system does not provide means for the issue even to be considered. The present system of government makes the spread city inevitable.

The Politics of Governmental Reorganization

This inability of the present governmental system to meet the social and planning needs of metropolitan areas, raises the question of why local voters refuse to adopt a government structure which will at least increase the possibilities of these problems being met. There are genuine conflicts of interests within metropolitan areas and a majority of those who vote on reorganization proposals believe the present system serves their interests better than a new one would.

Careful study of voting behavior in reorganization referendums indicate fairly well who opposes and who favors such proposals.⁵ Suburban interests tend to oppose consolidation with the central cities. This is true particularly of suburban real estate developers and dealers, suburban newspapers and governmental officials in suburban jurisdiction. Within the central city there is also opposition. In many instances the central city mayor will oppose consolidation. If the political parties are active at the local level they will oppose or favor on the basis of the calculation as to their ability to control the newly created governmental jurisdiction. Very often the central city Negro will see the establishment of a broader jurisdiction as simply one more effort to dilute his political strength. About to acquire majority status in the central city, and just beginning to have his demands responded to by central city officials, he now sees the system about to be changed in a way which will reduce his political influence.

Favoring consolidation are good government groups, including academic people, League of Women Voters, and other civic groups. Other support often comes from the area-wide media, that is the central city newspapers, and television and radio stations. Major downtown business interests often favor such consolidation, too.

Of interest, but perhaps not of great importance, is the fact that metropolitan government has become a whipping boy of the political right-wing. They believe it to be a part of an alleged international Communist conspiracy. Speaking to those who champion metropolitan government, one publication of this political movement says:

Their darling project of the moment is the establishment of what they call "metropolitan government" which they "sell" to the local citizenry under the false label of home rule. The greatest project of 1958 is the creation of such a metro for the six counties surrounding and including Chicago. Their greatest achiev-

ement to date was the actual establishment, in May, 1957, of such a metro for Dade County, Florida in which the city of Miami is located. Perhaps the choice of the word Metro is coincidental as a name for this type of regional government, since the underground railway which connects Moscow with its suburbs also is called Metro.⁶

The State and Federal Response

At the moment it appears that the forces opposing metropolitan reorganization are stronger than those favoring it. There are, however, responses in other parts of the governmental system which may affect this reluctance for change at the local level. Much of the adaptation to modern metropolitanism has come at the federal level of government, and to a lesser extent at the state level. States, in fact, have only reluctantly concerned themselves with the special kinds of difficulties created by metropolitanism. It may be argued, as Meyerson and Banfield do, that in the case of Massachusetts ". . . it is hard to see how the Commonwealth (the state) can fail to become the equivalent for all practical purposes of eight or more metropolitan governments."⁷ Although this remark is pointed to Massachusetts it is relevant to most states. The states do have responsibility for their local government systems. They have the power to assume functions which are now performed locally; they could adapt their aid system to the facts of metropolitanism and they could adjust the boundaries of local governments to fit current realities.

These powers and responsibilities have been exercised sparingly, if at all. In the case of state aid, state legislatures show, in general, a suburban bias. For example, the average expenditure in central cities is \$185.49 per capita compared to \$159.83 per capita in suburban areas, a difference of \$27.66. Despite these differences in expenditure levels, state aid is higher to the suburban areas than to the central cities--a per capita state aid to suburbs of \$23.05 per capita, compared to \$17.84 per capita for the cities. The result, of course, is higher taxes on a per capita basis in the central city than outside the central city--\$109.07 compared to \$85.78--despite higher personal income levels in the suburbs.⁸

It appears that the earlier bias of state legislatures for rural areas has now been translated into a bias in favor of suburban areas. There was a time when such a rural bias was justified by the distribution of taxable resources. The wealth of the country was concentrated in the urban areas and if minimum levels of government service were

to be maintained in the rural areas, aid was necessary. However, the redistribution of taxable resources within metropolitan areas between central cities and their suburbs certainly does not justify the current suburban preference.

Just as the aid systems of most states have not been adjusted to fit current conditions, the states have assumed few functional responsibilities which were once local. In some states, highways and welfare have become a major state responsibility and a few municipal higher education institutions have been taken over by the states, but there has been no major reshuffling of responsibilities.

About all that can be said for states is that they have passed permissive legislation making inter-local cooperation possible, but they have not undertaken any major overhaul of local government. This behavior is in direct contrast to that of the Canadian provinces which have actually established some metropolitan governments.

The actions of the federal government are in sharp contrast to those of the states. The federal aid system, for example, through such programs as Urban Renewal, Aid to Education and Anti-Poverty, is adjusting its aid programs to the problems of cities. The evidence is strong that as resources become available, more and more federal programs will move in this direction.

In effect, the refusal of the local governmental system to adjust itself to metropolitan reality has resulted in the federal taxing power being used to take resources from high income suburban taxpayers for the support of central city education and social services. It may be that the suburban taxpayer prefers to make his contribution to the solution of central city problems in this way rather than directly. If he does, the implications for the nature of American federalism are great.

The reason for such federal aid is not the inadequacy of local resources. The wealth of America is concentrated in its metropolitan areas. With two-thirds of the population living in these areas, over eighty percent of payrolls are paid there and most of the country's bank deposits are located there, as is most of the country's non-agricultural property. The difficulty is not that the metropolitan areas do not have the resources but rather that the resources and needs are mismatched by the local governmental system.

The federal government is beginning to move beyond the provision of aid. More and more it is showing concern for the system of local government. This concern became evident several years ago when many federal aid programs--highway aid, airport aid, open-space aid and

others--added the requirement that the project for which aid was sought must conform to a general comprehensive plan for the entire area. In the Housing Act of 1966 this comprehensive planning requirement was generalized. After June 30, 1967 any local government jurisdiction seeking federal aid for physical improvements will have to advance its aid request through a metropolitan planning agency. In the words of the Act:

All applications made after June 30, 1967 for federal loans or grants to assist in carrying out open space land projects, or for the planning or construction of hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works highways, transportation facilities, and water development and land conservation projects within any metropolitan area shall be submitted for review to any area-wide agency which is designated to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the area within which the assistance is to be used. (Title II, Sec. 204).

The provision in the 1966 Urban Development Act culminates a long effort by Senator Muskie to encourage metropolitan-wide planning. Although the Act does not require the regional planning agency to approve a local jurisdiction's application for grants, it can comment unfavorably on it and when it does, the application goes back to the jurisdiction which originated it. When this occurs, the jurisdiction may either change the application to meet the criticisms or it may simply pass it on, with the unfavorable comments attached, to the appropriate agency in Washington. That agency, according to the Act, shall review the comments and recommendations "For the sole purpose of assisting it in determining whether the application is in accordance with the provisions of federal law which govern the making of loans or grants." In other words, if there is no requirement for comprehensive planning in the specific federal grant program under which the local government is applying, the Washington agency has no legal power to consider the recommendations of the metropolitan planning agency. Even with this limitation, however, a significant power grant is made by this Act to a new metropolitan jurisdiction. Not only do many specific federal programs have comprehensive planning requirements but, even more importantly, the Act will result in the establishment of a permanent new metropolitan governing institution. This new agency will compete for power with other units and, on occasion, will win.

It is not known, of course, what kind of policies such regional planning jurisdictions will adopt. They may try to slow down the dispersal of urban population and urban activities or they may simply try to produce a better arrangement. Their significance, however, does not rest with the policies which they adopt, but rather with the fact that a jurisdiction with power to make such decisions has been created. Since this jurisdiction will be directly related to the programs of the federal government, it will have the power inherent in that relationship. This encouragement by the federal government of region-wide planning is consistent with its recently adopted financial support of metropolitan areas of San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Detroit, Philadelphia, Atlanta, and Washington, with a moribund agency in the New York metropolitan area.

These councils are not real governments. They resemble more international organizations like the United Nations. Nevertheless, it is possible to foresee a bringing together of the regional planning agencies with these regional councils. Out of this combination might grow a genuine new metropolitan-wide governmental jurisdiction.

Who Speaks for Metropolitanism?

This description of the current situation demonstrates beyond question that the most significant leadership role relevant to metropolitanism has been taken by the national government. Why should this be the case? The functional problems involved are state and local responsibilities. The state and local governments have long argued that the federal government has undermined them and, yet, by their own refusal to act they have prompted this new and vigorous role for the national government. Is there something inherent in the nature of American federalism which dictated that policy initiative must come more and more from the national government, or can this trend be reversed?

Is it likely, or even possible, that more initiative will be taken by the state and local parts of the system? In other words, what is likely to be the source of metropolitan leadership in the future? Will it be mayors, councilmen, county executives, or will it more and more be the President, his bureaucracy and Senators like Muskie, Kennedy, Clark, and Ribicoff?

Although there have emerged, at the local level, some central city mayors who have become spokesmen for cities, men like Lindsay of New York, Lee of New Haven, and Cavanaugh of Detroit, they do not

1

speaking for their entire metropolitan areas. In fact, this partisanship on behalf of cities often leads them to take anti-suburban positions.

As more and more urban counties adopt a new form of strong executive government, it is possible that the chief executives of these units will gain in power and influence and thereby provide some new metropolitan leadership. But counties still perform a limited number of functions and in many cases tend to see their role as anti-city.

The fact is that local governmental leaders within the present structure of metropolitan government will inevitably speak but for a part of the total area. Their constituency is limited and therefore their concern is limited. Further, there are genuine conflicts of interest within metropolitan areas and these conflicts are not completely a product of the fragmented governmental system. Differences and conflicts of interest would remain even if there were a single governmental jurisdiction. The middle-income suburbanite, for example, is never going to be enthusiastic about paying taxes for welfare purposes. His views will not be altered by a change in the governmental system. A single constituency, however, would require the political leadership of the new unit to balance these interests and to develop out of them a policy compromise which is the least likely to prevent his reelection. He might, therefore, speak for this new interest at the state and national levels. However, as long as the governmental system remains fragmented such a development of local metropolitan leadership is impossible.

There are a variety of private interest groups within metropolitan areas which do have concerns that extend across jurisdictional lines. Occasionally these interests produce non-governmental area-wide institutions. In a number of cities, business groups have combined to promote the interest of the entire area. Their primary concern has been with physical redevelopment and transportation. They tend to have a downtown orientation and normally support the renewal of downtown areas. They are concerned, too, with efficient and effective movement of goods and, therefore, tend to aid in the development of an area-wide transportation system. It is out of groups like this that strong leadership has developed in cities like Pittsburgh, New Haven, and perhaps to a lesser extent Boston. Through these groups some area-wide activities have found a voice. The result is often a development of area-wide policy even though there is no area-wide government. The combination in Pittsburgh of the Mellon interests and Mayor Lawrence produced one of the most effective area-wide leadership groups in the country. Its role, however, appears to have been short-lived.

Many of these business-oriented groups have been debating recently whether they should broaden their interests from physical redevelopment to include social problems. In some cases they have decided, after considerable debate and controversy, to reject such involvement. In other cities the issue is still a live one.

It seems unlikely that this private section leadership can ever effectively replace governmental leadership. Private concern, inevitably, will be only with those public sector activities that are directly relevant to their interests. Further, to be effective they must work through the regular governmental machinery. Since that machinery is fragmented its response will always be limited.

Within the present system it seems highly unlikely that metropolitan leadership will emerge at the local level. There will be suburban leadership, there will be city leadership, there will even be some private interest leadership which will have concerns that are area-wide. There is, however, no governmental institution available to bring these leadership groups together, to hammer out those compromises necessary to create a genuine area-wide public policy.

As already noted, the state level has not produced strong metropolitan leadership. It is possible that reapportionment will tend to move states in this direction but there is no guarantee that it will since the greatest increase in representation will go to the suburbs, not the cities. Since the suburbs already have an advantage in state legislatures, this change may merely confirm and accentuate suburban favoritism. It is possible that state legislatures from cities and suburbs will come to see that they have at least some common interest. If this mix of coalition should develop, it is possible that a genuine metropolitan leadership will emerge at the state level. Perhaps Meyerson and Banfield will eventually be proved right when they argue that the states are the natural governments of metropolitan areas.

Governors, of course, have a state-wide constituency and thereby provide a better potential for metropolitan leadership than state legislators. Thus far, governors have not provided this kind of leadership. Valiant efforts have been made by Brown of California and, to a lesser extent, Rockefeller in New York, but a state-metropolitan policy has not emerged in any state. There are state programs which are relevant to problems within metropolitan areas, but even these do not deal with the really difficult metropolitan concerns. State aid to education, for example, has given little recognition to the need for massive aid to ghetto schools. States have shown small concern or interest for the problems of mass transit, or poverty, or urban planning, or local governmental organization.

Other examples of state failure could be cited but these are sufficient to illustrate that thus far, neither state legislators nor state governors have been able, nor apparently have they seen it as politically wise, to act as metropolitan leaders. Even though Banfield and Meyer-son argue that "The Governor should be the chief executive in metropolitan area matters . . ."9 they have not played that role.

The chief response to metropolitanism has come from the national government. Within that framework, chief initiative has been taken by the President. It is Presidents who have introduced urban renewal legislation, mass transit legislation, open spaces legislation, airport aid legislation, and now, just this last year, comprehensive planning legislation and model cities legislation. Congress has modified and criticized but generally has accepted the presidential recommendations and some independent initiative has been shown within Congress. It was the Senate, for example, which provided the chief support and leadership, through Senator Muskie and others, for the comprehensive planning legislation.

Why has there been this federal willingness to move while states and local governments have been unwilling? A President has a national constituency. He is capable of balancing favorable interests and unfavorable interests in a way which makes policy innovation much easier than is true of the narrower constituentcies at the local and state levels. A President is capable of overlooking a pocket of opposition in a way that a local government official cannot, for the President can balance such opposition groups with favorable groups. Further, he does not necessarily lose the support of any segment of the population on the basis of a single program or a single action. In contrast, a local official may lose support of a significant group by a single action. In the next election that group of voters may decide to vote against him on the basis of that one issue. Such voter reaction is much less likely at the federal level.

Equally important is the flexibility and productivity of the federal revenue-producing system, based as it is on a progressive income tax. Despite this strength of the federal tax system, the major increase in fiscal burden in the United States since the end of World War II has occurred at the state and local level. Their expenditures have increased by 128 percent in the last decade, while federal expenditures have increased by only 25 percent.

These increases at the state and local level have been necessary just to maintain traditional functions. The result is often tax politics rather than program politics. State and local political campaigns are very often arid debates about whether taxes are too high and who is re-

sponsible for making them that way. In national political campaigns, much more emphasis is being placed on programs, and their worth, rather than the question of taxes, per se.

It is a combination of all these factors which push metropolitan problems to the federal level. The people want the problems solved and state and local governments, for all the reasons given, cannot, or will not, respond. Consequently, the federal government has.

Can this pattern be reversed? It cannot, unless a conscious effort is made to do so. Whether there is a demand with sufficient political muscle for such a reversal is not clear. It seems highly unlikely, on the basis of past evidence, that local communities will, on their own initiative, create governmental institutions able to respond to area-wide problems. Adaptations will occur, but it seems unlikely that new area-wide institutions will be created unless incentives are provided by other parts of the governmental system.

There is national concern, today, about the quality of state governments. National committees with foundation support to improve these governments have been created. Many states are moving in the direction of the adoption of new constitutions. Out of all this activity, a new role for the states may emerge. Reapportionment, although suburban-oriented, could help since it may improve legislative understanding of the interdependence of city and suburb. It might also provide governors with a better legislative base from which to lead.

The national government may, itself, make a contribution to local initiative through its efforts to use its present aid programs to create area-wide local institutions. If the federal government takes the further step of providing general aid, as has been advocated by the Heller-Pechman Program, rather than just categorical aid, there will be created at the state and local level a fiscal flexibility which will make available the resources necessary to meet some of the emerging problems.

The exact future political response to metropolitanism is by no means clear. Nevertheless, America is a metropolitan society and such a society will have problems which are metropolitan in character. Some part of the governmental system will respond. The nature of the American federal system will be determined by the character of this response.

Dr. Campbell serves as Professor of Political Science and Director of Metropolitan Studies Program in the Maxwell Graduate School of Syracuse University. He received his Doctorate from Harvard University in Political Economy and Government in 1952. Among his many publications are Anatomy of a Metropolis, (contributor), Harvard University Press, 1959; Case Studies in Government (co-editor), Prentice-Hall, 1962; "National-State-Local Systems of Government and Intergovernmental Aid," Intergovernmental Relations in the United States, THE ANNALS, May 1965. In 1947-48 he was Volker Fellow at Wayne University, and in 1951-52 he was selected as a Sheldon Traveling Fellow at Harvard University.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Metropolitan Social and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs. (January 1965)

Alan K. Campbell and Seymour Sacks, Metropolitan America: Fiscal Patterns and Governmental Systems (New York: The Free Press, 1967), Chapter I.

² Edgar M. Hoover and Raymond Vernon, Anatomy of a Metropolis. (New York: Anchor Books, 1962).

³ Norton Long, The Polity, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1962), p. 156.

⁴ Regional Plan Association, Spread City: Projections of Development Trends and the Issues they Pose: The Tri-State New York Metropolitan Region 1960-85. Bulletin 100, September 1962, p. 3.

⁵ Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Factors Affecting Voter Reactions to Governmental Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas, 1962.

⁶ Don Bell Report, February 21, 1958, Long Beach, Florida, p. 3.

⁷ Martin Meyerson and Edward C. Banfield, Boston: The Job Ahead, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 24.

⁸ Campbell and Sacks, op. cit., Ch. V.

⁹ Op. Cit., p. 23.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR THE CITY'S ECONOMY

by

Dr. John H. Nixon, Director
Area Development for the Committee
for Economic Development

It is an honor and a pleasure to appear before you this evening as a foundation lecturer on the economy of the city. It is a privilege because Wilkes College stands in the midst of a region which has faced one of the most difficult problems a city or a series of cities can face-- the readjustment of its economic base. It has faced the problem with courage and devotion and has met the challenge.

I will consider two problems. First, a brief examination of the readjustment of a metropolitan area's economic base. How well are we prepared as a nation to handle the readjustment in economic base of many communities which may occur at the time of the cessation of hostilities in Viet Nam?

Second, our current prosperity has revealed there is a general problem in our metropolitan areas. The poor in the inner city are experiencing unemployment rates double or more than double those of the rest of the metropolitan area. Why? What public policies would enable them to enjoy employment opportunities equal to those for the area as a whole?

I. The Economic Base and Its Readjustment

A metropolitan community is a place for earning a living. Population settles or expands primarily because of job opportunities. Private investment occurs because of the income earning opportunities. The existence of any urban area at a particular place, and its growth or decline, depend on the expansion or contraction of opportunities for employment and investment.

The economic base of a community consists of the activities which produce and sell goods and services to markets outside the metropolitan area. This may be called the "export" section of the economy even though only a small portion of the sales may be outside the nation. These are the activities which often cause the original establishment of a community. They may involve the extraction or processing of raw materials, such as minerals, agriculture products, or forest products. They may involve the operation of port facilities or railroad shipment facilities serving a very wide area. Manufacture of products for sale elsewhere is the most common form of economic base. Hotel and recreational services of recreation areas contribute. So do the educational facilities of centers of higher learning which attract students from all parts of the region.

These activities provide the basic income with which goods and services are purchased elsewhere. Since no community can be self-sufficient, the export industry links the urban area to the rest of the world in a positive way.

The export sector depends for its prosperity on its ability to sell in regional or national or world markets in competition with other sources that supply the same products or services. In part, the prosperity of the export sector is dependent on the national level of prosperity. The more prosperous the nation, the more prosperous the export sectors as a whole. This prosperity is spread locally through wages, salaries, profits, rents and interest which in turn are largely spent in the local service sector.

Prosperity in the export sector of a community also depends upon its ability to compete with other firms, other areas, and with other technologies. This competition goes on continuously despite high levels of national prosperity. Technological progress produces new products and new techniques. As a result some changes in the export sector go on continuously. For example: when oil and gas replaced hard coal as the major source of home heating, the export base of Northeastern Pennsylvania was seriously affected.

Communities have been faced with the problem of readjusting their economic base since the beginning of recorded history. Many communities have never been able to make the adjustment and they have expired. Many others have found ways to make the adjustment and they have continued as stronger and richer and more thriving communities. Some communities accept some reduction in their economic base, accept some out-migration, and then reach a stable level which provides a satisfactory living for those who remain.

In our free society businesses are free to choose where they will establish new plants and individuals are free to move and live where they find the best opportunities for themselves. This free market process is an important part of a readjustment.

Adjustment from one export industry to another probably works best in metropolitan areas with reasonable diversification of industries serving national markets, and a labor force with a variety of skills. If there are varying rates of economic growth for the several industries and there are facilities for workers to transfer from one firm to another as economic opportunities change, then the loss of jobs in one firm is counterbalanced by increases in employment opportunities in others. The industry serving a local market continues to function without any substantial decline in demand. Such a condition prevails in most large metropolitan areas within the United States.

For many communities, however, the adjustment process has been extremely painful and difficult. It has meant prolonged unemployment, loss of values invested in homes, loss of the community tax base, loss of the community ability to maintain its water and sewer lines in efficient condition, decline in the quality of its schools and recreational facilities. It may create a community atmosphere of drabness, discouragement, and despair.

To speed and facilitate readjustment, a large number of local non-profit, voluntary development organizations have been established. Leadership in these organizations generally come from the major service industries in the community, such as the utilities, the railroads, the banks, retail establishments, and real estate interests, with some sprinkling of civic leaders from other walks of life, academic, religious, and trade unions. The local government itself is very involved because its tax rate depends on replacement of the export industry.

This local organization is able to deal with interested companies that are looking for new plant locations. It has detailed information on land availability, skills of the labor supply, wage rates, electric utility rates, water supply, waste disposal facilities, zoning regulations, credit facilities, and a host of other questions for which a businessman must get concrete answers. A local community that has prepared itself to answer these questions has taken an important step toward the road to readjustment.

The importance of an effective local leadership group working on economic adjustment has been apparent to many small communities which have had a very narrow economic base. Over the past two decades its importance has become clear also to the business leadership in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and finally even in New York City. In November 1965, 26 leading businessmen of the City, many of them top executives of nationwide corporations, organized the Economic Development Council of New York City. Despite their national interests, these men had come to the conclusion that they must also give serious attention to the economy of the city in which their corporate headquarters were located.

In your own community you have had excellent leadership from such local development organizations. Results are seen in the current unemployment rate for this area of 3.6 percent, which is below the national average.

As you well know, human faith, courage, and resourcefulness are vital elements in developing a new economic base to replace an old. Sometimes these qualities must be foremost for a period of a decade or more before an adjustment is complete. This community is to be congratulated on its achievements.

The problems of readjustment, however, have been greater than many communities could handle by themselves. State government assistance has been recognized to be essential. The State of Pennsylvania was among the leaders in recognizing that state assistance through guidance, professional services, public works, and special credit facilities was necessary to help local communities achieve a readjustment. Most states now have effective development organizations.

In the mid-1950's, however, it was apparent to a number of legislators, including Congressman Flood from this district and Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, that Federal efforts were needed to supplement those of states and of local leadership in the communities most hard hit by the problem of economic readjustment. Their efforts resulted in 1961 in the Area Redevelopment Act. This program was supplemented by the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962, and in 1965 these were replaced by the Public Works and Economic Development Act which established the Economic Development Administration.

This Agency is now able to provide cities suffering high and persistent unemployment matching grants for public works, loans for public works, and loans to businesses which cannot borrow effectively in the private market, and technical assistance. Training for depressed communities can be provided through special funds of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

For broad, largely rural regions of the country which have lagged behind, such as the Appalachian Mountain Area, the Upper Great Lake States, and the Ozark Area of Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas, there is now provision for Regional Planning Commissions to help spur the readjustment process and to bring people in these areas up to the general level of prosperity of the country as a whole.

The Federal government provides aid to build on the existing resources of the readjusting communities. Local labor supply, transportation connections, sound industrial buildings, effectiveness of local government, adequacy of its utilities, and of its school system, and its

hospitals and its recreational facilities are all essential elements in the attraction of a new economic base. These factors are links in the chain from the community to new jobs. If only one link is missing, the Federal government has a relatively easy task in replacing it. . Frequently several links are missing and Federal assistance must come in with public works to build access roads and skill centers, with training, with low interest business loans, and with technical assistance. If too many links are missing, however, it becomes very difficult to reconstruct the chain.

In such a case, out-migration of some part of the population may occur. This out-migration generally takes place in the ages from high school graduation to the middle thirties. For the local community this is a serious loss of able young talent. In terms of the welfare of the individuals, however, it means going to places of greater opportunities. It has been part of the American tradition to look on migration as an effective individual solution to ones own economic needs. Young people should be provided with enough training so that they are equipped to make such a decision if it becomes necessary.

When hostilities cease in Viet Nam readjustment in some communities will probably be necessary even with effective fiscal policies to help maintain full employment. That readjustment will then test the effectiveness of our local non-profit leadership groups and the effectiveness of the state and Federal programs to assist the communities with the greatest difficulties.

As individual communities, as states, and as a nation I believe we are better prepared to meet that period of readjustment than we have been at any time in the past.

II. The Separation of the Urban Poor from Job Sources

We have now gone through a year in which unemployment has been four percent or less for the nation as a whole and for most metropolitan areas. This relatively low level of unemployment has revealed that most metropolitan areas have an economic sore spot, a residential area of the very poor in the inner city where unemployment rates are at least double the area's average. These sections of our inner cities have been called poverty areas, they have been measured by the Census Bureau and the Office of Economic Opportunity. The trends in the location of new industrial jobs, however, is to the suburbs and away from the poverty areas. This is making the problem of job location for the poor more and more difficult.

Poverty areas are the inner city slums. They generally surround the central business district but there are also isolated patches somewhere between the central business district and the suburbs. The majority of the poor in these areas are white but only 10 percent of the white population of the metropolitan area live in these poverty areas. Forty percent of the population of the poverty areas are Negro and a majority of Negroes in our metropolitan areas live there. Unemployment among inner city Negroes is about 10 percent compared with four percent or slightly less for the nation as a whole. The percentage of participation in the labor force is smaller in these poverty areas. Many people who have failed time and again to get jobs have just stopped looking.

These areas have been the receiving centers for the poor coming from our farms, from small towns, from Puerto Rico, and for Negroes coming from the South seeking greater opportunity. The out-migration rate for Negroes in the South has greatly exceeded that of whites.

While these people have been entering our central cities over the past two decades seeking opportunities, industrial jobs have been moving out. A recent Labor Department study revealed that from 1960 to 1965, sixty-two percent of the new industrial buildings erected in U. S. metropolitan areas went up in the suburbs. In Chicago the suburban share was 77 percent. This continues a trend which has been going on essentially since the end of World War II. The highway systems which have been building over the past quarter century have given industry access to suburban locations where land costs are lower, where taxes are lower, and where it is easier to construct large one-story factories with unobstructed floor space areas for straight-line operations. In some cities experts believe that the growing incidence of crime in industrial neighborhoods and the general deterioration of the areas from which unskilled labor comes contribute to this out-migration of industry.

There exists here something of a vicious circle. High unemployment rates lead to high welfare costs and to crime, and to a deterioration of residential neighborhoods. High welfare costs and high cost of police and fire protection raise inner city taxes. High taxes and higher incidence of crime help induce industry to locate outside the central city. This still further aggravates the unemployment problem of the inner city and we go downward around the spiral once again.

Failure to give serious attention to providing permanent productive jobs to the poor in our cities will mean higher unemployment, higher welfare costs, higher crime rates, higher sickness levels, generations raised on welfare, and the two and three generation welfare families. This is not the American dream. It is currently the American nightmare.

Equal opportunity for all is an American goal which can guide solutions to this problem. For the disadvantaged children growing up in poverty area neighborhoods, one of the most important things we can provide for them is an employed father. For a child to have an unemployed father over a long period is indeed a great disadvantage. If the father can have a job it lays the basis for improvement of the whole social environment in which the child grows up. From this the child will develop a more positive view on life. The father's respect for himself, and the child's respect for his bread-winning father, are essential to a healthy society. They indeed are a part of the American dream.

III. Some Steps Toward Solution

Fortunately the Congress and the Executive Branch of the government as well as business and civic leaders in many areas, have become increasingly aware of this situation. A number of steps are being taken, and more can be taken, to equalize for the inner city poor the opportunity to find employment. Information, training, transportation, and even migration to the suburbs each play a role.

Information about the availability of jobs frequently passes by word of mouth from people employed in plants and offices to their neighbors and relatives. The word-of-mouth route generally works best where plants and offices are fairly close to the residential neighborhoods of workers. As the distance between residence and employment increases, the flow of this information declines. Workers in the inner city lose touch with employers and employers lose touch with potential workers.

Some steps are being taken to remedy the situation. A nationwide organization of blue chip corporations, Plans for Progress, is working in many metropolitan areas to increase the flow of information to Negro residential areas about the availability of jobs in industrial plants. Personnel managers in these plants are working with the vocational counselors in the vocational high schools in the poverty areas of the inner city to make sure that the vocational counselors are aware of new opportunities. In some cases, skilled men from the plant are coming into the high schools to give instruction on modern machinery. The Labor Department and the Economic Development Administration have both been giving assistance to this basically private effort.

Community information centers in the poverty areas are being established under the Poverty Program to provide a more easily accessible source of information about job opportunities or training programs. By the end of 1966, 165 youth opportunity centers had been set up by the U.S. Employment Service in 127 metropolitan areas. These centers pro-

vide vocational counseling, and are new sources of information on jobs and training. They are helping to fill the information gap.

Serious attention to training the unemployed, and particularly adult unemployed, in distressed areas started with the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. The program was broadened to cover non-distressed areas in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. These programs reach people already qualified to receive advance training. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the so-called Poverty Program, established programs to help provide elementary skills in reading and arithmetic to people whose basic education was really inadequate for urban society. For young people, the local Neighborhood Youth Corps provided a new source of vocational training and job experience. The Job Corps program which trains young people in camps away from home, has provided training outside the urban environment for many young people. In all, there are about a dozen different Federal training programs for unemployed or out-of-school youth.

The Economic Development Administration participates in several ways in providing adequate training. In areas of substantial unemployment, public works funds from EDA have been used to help construct skill centers. These centers must offer programs not only for regular high school vocational students, but also for high school drop outs and for adults who are unemployed or who wish to upgrade their skills in evening programs. The EDA helps to administer a section of the Manpower Development and Training Act which specifically reserves funds for training programs in redevelopment areas. Our technical assistance program occasionally is called on to help design a training program.

The commitment to adequate training and retraining, I believe, is now quite firm at the National level. Local government officials are increasingly accepting important responsibility for coordinating and directing such programs in their own communities. We are still perfecting the mechanisms. I believe by the end of the 1960s we will see that a major improvement has occurred during this decade in the public measures to help unemployed and disadvantaged qualify for jobs in our urban society. In Sweden, one percent of the labor force is retrained each year for new skills. This would not be a bad goal for the United States.

With information about jobs, and with training for available openings, a worker still must be able to get to work. Suburban plants largely depend on workers driving to work, but a large share of the poor in our inner cities do not own automobiles. A study recently completed in Detroit, the automobile capital of the world, revealed that no car was available in 25 percent of the households in the City of Detroit. The Census of

1960 revealed that in cities of over 250,000 population, 37 percent of the households did not own automobiles. The inner-city poor are to a very considerable extent dependent on public transportation or on walking for the journey to work.

At the same time that industrial plants have been moving to the suburbs, service on public transportation has been steadily declining. The decline has been a reaction to the wide spread increase in the ownership of automobiles and increasing losses on public transportation routes. The number of passengers carried on mass transportation dropped 50 percent between 1950 and 1962. From 1954 to 1961, 77 different transit operations were abandoned with no replacement. To cover costs fares have been steadily rising; the most common fare on public transportation increased from 10 cents in 1950 to 25 cents in 1963. In some places it has gone up to 30 and 35 cents. All these developments make it more difficult for the inner city poor to get to work.

Public transportation routes from low income inner-city areas to outlying industrial sections have been circuitous, and service often infrequent. From the Watts area of Los Angeles to major employment sources in Los Angeles area public transportation may require a 2-hour journey each way. In Pittsburgh, travel from the Hill District, a low-income Negro residential area, to O'Hara Township industrial park, a rapidly developing industrial area, by public transportation required two hours travel time in each direction. By automobile the trip can be made in 20 minutes.

Fortunately, increasing attention is being given by city officials and by the Federal Government to the need for adequate public transportation as an essential link between workers and jobs. The Department of Housing and Urban Development administers funds for research and experimentation in transportation programs and has some funds to contribute to the capital cost of necessary public transportation systems in metropolitan areas.

A local subsidy to public transportation may increase the number of people in low income areas that can have jobs. This, in turn, would reduce welfare costs and probably reduce crime rates. Skilled urban researchers are approaching the time when they can actually compute the trade-off between the cost of the transportation subsidy for a particular line and frequency of service and the benefits to society from increased employment, reduced welfare costs, and lower crime rates. Such a comparison of costs and benefits should be developed as an integral part of decision-making with regard to public transportation service. Then city government and local transportation authorities can have a solid basis for determining whether it is wise to subsidize the operation of a particular transportation route or frequency of service.

Another suggested solution to separation of the poor from jobs is migrating from the inner city to the suburbs in order to be close to jobs. The Department of Labor has been experimenting with subsidizing the cost of moving workers from inner city ghetto areas to suburban and fringe communities where jobs are available. The results to date are not encouraging. Most inner city residents do not want to leave their friends and familiar neighborhoods. Suburban communities do not want them. The integration of our suburban areas is something which we must accomplish for moral and economic reasons. But it will be at least a generation, if not two, before this offers a full solution to the employment problems of the inner city poor.

IV. More Jobs in the Inner City

All of the measures I have discussed -- providing better information on job openings, better training opportunities, somewhat improved public transportation to employment locations, and a small degree of migration from the inner city to outlying areas for employment -- will help. But they will not solve the problem.

So long as the trend of job location is toward the outer fringes of the metropolitan areas, and so long as we have large numbers of poor living or moving into the inner city, unduly high unemployment rates in the inner city will continue.

The direct solution is to face the problem head-on -- to hold and develop more jobs in the inner city itself. To do so requires giving a very high priority to the problem.

Let me illustrate what I mean by priority. A few years ago a New York State community with high unemployment had one good industrial site left. This level tract of land was adjacent to the railroad, had good highway connections, and was adequately served by utilities. Did the community hold it for a new industry? No. It built a public housing project on the plot. The priority assigned to new jobs was too low.

A high priority program can draw on the experience of local areas in readjusting their economic base. It would involve conscious utilization of the advantages of the inner city, positive steps to correct disadvantages, development of effective voluntary leadership among business leaders in the inner-city areas, and it may require active Federal participation.

The advantages of a central city location include joint use of many services and facilities that are more available there than elsewhere;

among these are middlemen and distributors, bankers, legal experts, accountants, advertising services and market analysts; and also transportation facilities, water works, sewage plants, and other massive overhead investments. In many large cities there is also the availability of research facilities and technicians concentrated in universities, libraries, and laboratories. The joint use of these many facilities reduces their cost to all users -- these are external economies of aggregation.

An important advantage of inner-city locations is the unused labor force. Currently many metropolitan areas are experiencing the most critical labor shortage since World War II. The training programs now underway and in prospect can train many of these unemployed for jobs in labor intensive industries. Training programs also provide an opportunity to upgrade existing labor force to handle jobs with higher skills. Companies searching for an additional labor supply will find the inner city a source.

There are also disadvantages -- high land costs, traffic congestion, higher crime rates, and higher tax rates. Specific programs can reduce each disadvantage.

The answer to high land costs is more intensive utilization of land. Land costs are higher because more people want to use it and for a greater variety of purposes. Industrial parks developed on the outskirts of urban areas generate an average of 8 to 10 jobs per acre. This acreage includes that devoted to parking space, streets, and protective shrubbery. In the inner city a much greater utilization rate is possible through the use of a number of devices.

Experimentation with new designs of high-rise industrial buildings is appropriate. Such buildings would have modern elevator facilities, truck loading ramps to at least two floors, and use of some floor space on roof tops for parking. A much smaller percentage of workers will drive to work, reducing the need for parking space. The use of modern construction materials may require readjustment of local building codes to achieve savings in construction costs.

A further suggestion is that a modern multi-story building combine light industry on the lower floors, with parking decks on upper floors, and above that with high-rise, low income housing. The costs and benefits of such a proposal deserve exploration for possible use in the inner city of densely populated areas.

Some will take strong exception to such a proposal, claiming that it mixes residential and industrial uses. Urban planning requirements generally call for a separation of residential and industrial uses.

In the older parts of our city industrial buildings and workers residential areas have grown up side by side. This made it possible for workers to walk to work. If the industrial plants were smoky, noisy, or smelly, then obviously it created a poor living environment. If streets were filled with heavy trucks, they would be dangerous for children.

A great deal of modern industry, however, is no longer smoky, noisy, or smelly. Proper street design and traffic controls can separate children from the heavy truck traffic. The advantages of walking to work are then important. Some careful mixing of industrial land use in poverty areas will provide jobs for the poor.

The urban renewal program -- in which the Department of Housing and Urban Development shares costs with cities in redeveloping slum neighborhoods -- can help create jobs, but it may also eliminate jobs.

Up to thirty percent of the Federal contribution may be used for renewal of industrial and commercial sites. Assembling land for industrial use in the inner city can help solve the problem of high land costs, and a related factor, the multitude of small parcels.

In the process of tearing down slums to create better residential areas, however, some places of employment have also been torn down. A three-year study indicates that only 60 percent of the businesses forced to relocate have continued within the inner city. While the 30 percent may have been small marginal businesses, they still represented an income for owners and jobs for workers. These jobs lost represent a cost to the community in potential increased welfare costs and everything that goes with it.

A high priority for jobs for the urban poor would require a full accounting for the value of jobs lost in comparison with jobs gained and other benefits. An effective cost-benefit analysis would make such a comparison. The new Model Cities program quite properly calls for such a careful cost-benefit analysis of proposed projects. The Model Cities program also calls for consideration of more than one design of a project so that alternative ways of meeting a basic problem can be judged. Some methods may save or create more jobs for the urban poor than others. City officials need such information.

City governments that give a high priority to jobs for the inner-city poor will find much to do. The City of Chicago, for example, used some technical assistance funds from the Economic Development Administration to find what it could do immediately to help industry in mid-Chicago. These are its conclusions:

1. Reinforce police protection for industrial areas.
2. Review real property and personal assessments for companies who believe they are being improperly assessed.
3. Review building regulations when new methods or materials are proposed for construction of new industrial buildings.
4. Review zoning regulations for industrial building or expansion.
5. Improve traffic control through changing regulations and the redesigning of streets.

Other city governments, such as Milwaukee, are beginning to give intensive attention to their role in holding jobs in the inner city.

In the readjustment of the economic base of metropolitan areas we have learned that private non-profit leadership groups, largely drawn from the business community, play a vital role. The same will be true in holding and expanding jobs in the inner city. Such leadership is forthcoming in increasing degrees as businessmen realize the stakes. I could cite the efforts of the Southeast Pennsylvania Economic Development Corporation or the North City Corporation in Philadelphia. The Economic Development Council of New York City is now giving serious attention to industrial development in Harlem. In South Chicago the Norcine Community Improvement Corporation, a federation of industrialists, has undertaken to improve an area of approximately seven blocks immediately adjacent to the stockyards. These and similar groups are giving attention to the planning and zoning requirements, the building code provisions, the traffic requirements, the urban renewal programs, and other methods of working with city officials. At the same time they have been working with private capital to increase industrial investment in these areas. This partnership of local business leaders and city officials proved effective in securing the readjustment of the economic base of small urban areas. I believe it is an essential partnership for readjusting and providing an adequate economic base for the inner city areas.

One final significant problem remains. That is the relative tax burden between the inner city and the suburban areas. Because the inner cities are carrying most of the welfare loads for the metropolitan area, and because they are dealing with problems of density of use which serve the entire metropolitan area, their tax rates are much higher than the tax rates of suburban areas. This provides a real incentive to companies to locate in the suburbs.

Central cities have no margin to cut tax yields. Central city per capita costs for welfare, health and hospitals, police and fire protection run two to six times the per capita costs in the suburban areas. Cities also need revenues to cover the public costs related to effective industrial reuse of land -- reconstruction of street patterns, water and sewer lines, and participation in renewal programs for industrial purposes.

We have no metropolitan-wide system of taxation which can redistribute the welfare and crime and other costs evenly across the metropolitan area. State governments are caught between the interests of the inner city and the interests of the suburban areas. Moreover, a number of major metropolitan areas extend across state lines.

There is essentially no over-arching source to redress the balance between city and suburbs on costs of industrial locations, except the Federal government. At this point I believe only some form of Federal assistance can break the vicious cycle.

V. Summary

A discussion of this length can best be concluded with a summary.

A city develops because it has an economic base. There is some relation between the size of the city and the diversity of the economic base. Modifications or changes in the export sector occur from time to time due to technological change, governmental decisions, and the course of history. The decisions of private businesses as to where to locate, the decisions of people as to where to live, the active efforts of the city government, the informed and skilled efforts of local voluntary organizations, and, in cases of difficulty, the assistance of state and Federal governments. All participate in the readjustment. We have now developed machinery at all levels of government which should make possible a reasonably rapid adjustment in the economic base of any large city during periods of high national employment.

Currently we have such a high level of national employment. It has, however, revealed another problem common to all major metropolitan areas and many other cities. That problem is the high level of unemployment for those poor and ethnic minorities remaining in the inner city.

The problem of high unemployment in the inner cities is at least in part a result of the out-migration of industry from the inner city to suburban locations over the past two decades and the in-migration of poor

people from farms and smaller communities with low skill levels, and in many cases, with little urban working experience.

We need to adopt, as a nation, a high priority program to enable such people to find gainful employment, largely in private enterprise. A partial solution to the problem can be achieved by the provision of adequate information to employers about the availability of potential employees in the inner city, and provision to inner-city people about the availability of jobs in suburban areas, by adequate training programs to prepare inner-city residents for such jobs, and by improving public transportation from inner-city residential areas to the sites of industrial growth. Such a combination of programs could be put into place in a fairly short time. Migration from the inner city to the suburbs is a very long-run solution. A full solution will require the location and expansion of more industry in the inner city.

Participation by city governments and private non-profit groups is required to stimulate an adequate response from the free market. Some additional form of Federal assistance may be required. Such programs do not get carried out in a hurry. If we are to make the American dream available to all our citizens, I believe they are essential. I believe, also, that this goal is attainable.

Dr. Nixon received his Ph. D. from Harvard in 1953. He has taught economics at Harvard and the City College of New York. Since 1959 Dr. Nixon has served as Director of Area Development for the Committee for Economic Development, a privately supported business organization which advocates politics to promote economic growth. He directed research on the economic growth of cities, states, and regions. In March of 1966 he joined the Economic Development Administration as Assistant Administrator.

79100



1000151541

WIKES COLLEGE LIBRARY



