Selected Essays

Richard LeGates and Frederic Stout

Early Urban Planning

Volume I

EARLY URBAN PLANNING
1870–1940

EARLY URBAN PLANNING

Edited by Richard LeGates and Frederic Stout

VOLUME I: SELECTED ESSAYS
edited by Richard LeGates and Frederic Stout

VOLUME II: TOMORROW: A PEACEFUL PATH TO REAL REFORM
Ebenezer Howard

VOLUME III: MODERN CIVIC ART
Charles Mulford Robinson

VOLUME IV: CITIES IN EVOLUTION
Patrick Geddes

VOLUME V: PLANNING THE MODERN CITY
Nelson P. Lewis

VOLUME VI: NEW TOWNS FOR OLD
John Nolen

VOLUME VII: THE NEIGHBOURHOOD UNIT from the *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, Volume VII, *Neighbourhood and Community Planning*
Clarence Perry

VOLUME VIII: TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING
Patrick Abercrombie

VOLUME IX: OUTLINE OF TOWN AND CITY PLANNING
Thomas Adams

SELECTED ESSAYS

Edited by Richard LeGates and Frederic Stout

Routledge/Thoemmes Press

First published 1998
by Routledge/Thoemmes Press
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Transferred to Digital Printing 2006

Typeset in Baskerville by Routledge

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0–415–16085–5 (9-volume set)
ISBN 0–415–16086–3 (hbk)
DOI: 10.4324/9781003101048

Publisher's note

These reprints are taken from original copies of each book. In many cases the condition of these originals is not perfect, the paper, often handmade, having suffered over time, and the copy from such factors as inconsistent printing pressure resulting in faint text, show-through from one side of a leaf to the other, the filling in of some characters, and the break-up of type. The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of these reprints, but wishes to point out that certain characteristics of the original copies will, of necessity, be apparent in reprints thereof.

Printed and bound by CPI Antony Rowe, Eastbourne

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

Richard LeGates and Frederic Stout

INTRODUCTION

The end of a century naturally invites exercises in retrospect and prospect. This publishing project, which brings together classic texts of early modern urban planning, is just such a work. In the years since World War II, urban planning has made enormous advances but has, at century's end, reached a plateau and now faces an uncertain future. A review of writings on urban planning from the late nineteenth century up to World War II permits us to evaluate the history of urban planning as one of the great, indeed paradigm, characteristics of modernism and lays the groundwork for reasonable speculation about the future of urban planning in a fast emerging new world that will be characterized by postmodernist social and cultural norms.

Urban planning and modernism

In 1947, Paul and Percival Goodman wrote, "Of the man-made things, the works of engineering and architecture and town plan are the heaviest and biggest part of what we experience. They lie underneath, they loom around, as the prepared place of our activity." We hardly realize, the Goodmans go on, "that somebody once drew some lines on a piece of paper" and that "now, as engineer and architect once drew, people have to walk and live."

Urban planning has preoccupied kings and cardinals, mayors and burghers, for thousands of years. But it was only in the modern period that urban planning became an accepted profession and a well-defined field of study. Modern urban planning – no less than modern art or modern family life – was born of the fundamental transformations of economic, social, and political life that grew out of the Industrial Revolution.

The origins of the modernist movement lie in the Renaissance rediscovery of classical learning and the Enlightenment attempt to impose a rational order on both external nature and the social nature of humankind. That project gained added momentum with the rise of the modern city, and beginning in the latter part of the nineteenth century, a movement in response to the squalor and disorder of the industrial city arose that eventually became what we now call

urban planning. In Europe and North America landscape architects, settlement house workers, public health officials, land use lawyers, philanthropists, local elected officials and business leaders began to ask what could be done to make cities more healthy, beautiful, efficient, governable, just, and humane. How, they asked, might cities be related to their natural environments and to other cities in their regions?

Of all the contradictions which the burgeoning European and American cities of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century presented none was more striking than the contrast between the astonishing advances in technology, engineering, science, business, and industry and the disorder and distress in the cities themselves. The huge wave of urbanization in the developed world during the Industrial Revolution is one of the characteristic macro-cultural realties of the modern period. Most nineteenth-century cities were unhealthy, ugly, inefficient, poorly governed, unjust, and inhumane. With few exceptions there was little or no relationship between any city's built environment and its natural environment or between one city and other cities in the region.

Modernism and the Industrial Revolution

Manchester, in the English Midlands, has long been considered the prototype city of the rapid urbanization process that accompanied the Industrial Revolution. Early industrial Manchester was observed in minute and critical detail by Friedrich Engels in *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*. Engels' book is a devastating critique of unrestrained capitalist social aggression and a call to arms in support of the oppressed workers. Engels describes the environmental pollution caused by unregulated industrial enterprises and grossly unsanitary conditions caused by a total lack of municipal sewer and water-supply systems; the overcrowding that leads to various forms of ill health and moral depravity; the sense of personal alienation and social anomie that results from the hubbub of modern urban life; and how specific planning interventions – such as the uniformity of façade treatments along the long boulevards that run from the central city to the outlying suburbs – psychologically separate the classes by quarantining the hovels of the poor from the sensibilities of the privileged.

The period of modernism witnessed the development of radically new technologies of power generation, mechanics, production, transportation, and communication. Although many benefits flowed from these new technologies, there were negative effects as well. Threats to hygiene, environmental degradation, urban ugliness, lack of public and private amenity, isolation from nature, alienation, poverty and inequality were all present from the beginning of the industrial period. What follows is that the history of urban planning, both in its physical and social dimensions, is intimately associated with modernism itself. One of the great lessons of Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class*, literary critic Steven Marcus has said, is that the "historical experience of industrialization is not to be separated from that of urbanization."

Modernism also witnessed extraordinary transformations and upheavals in the social realm. Among these are the dislocations of communities associated with internal and transnational immigration; the emergence of the industrial working class and a persistent urban underclass; an unequal global division of resources between the industrially advanced nations of Europe and North America and the less developed countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa; and the development of new political and economic systems – communism, democratic socialism, welfare-state liberal capitalism – aimed at planning and regulating the potentially explosive social reality associated with the modern bureaucratic state. Insofar as urban planning has, in one form or another, addressed all of these issues and concerns, the classic texts of early urban planning history often seem surprisingly modern.

The view ahead

Today, a new *post*modernist era is dawning. Postmodernism is far more than an architectural style or that congeries of novel analytical theories and methodologies that so excites contemporary academia. Postmodernism, as used in this essay, refers to the compelling and widely felt sense of profound cultural change that currently grips the imaginations of people worldwide. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War have swept away an old "world order" without clearly defining the terms of a new one. An invigorated global marketplace calls received notions of nationality and polity into grave question. And the rapidly developing, ever newer technologies of computing and telecommunications herald the coming of a postindustrial, information-based economic system that is rushing toward us, ready or not.

In this transformational context, the theory and practice of modern urban planning are called into question. Historians of urban planning are faced with a series of inescapable questions. In a postmodern, postindustrial world, what will urban planning look like? What will be its new challenges? And what will be its broad cultural purposes as the activity that shapes and defines "the prepared place" of human activity?

EARLY URBAN PLANNING MOVEMENTS

The major movements of early urban planning play on enduring urban planning themes that predate them and remain important today: the need for health, beauty, efficiency, social justice, community, effective governance, and urban/rural balance. And many approaches common to modern planning can be found in the early writings.

One reason to study urban planning history is in order not to repeat the errors of the past. Nelson Lewis' bald assertion that "the fundamental problems of city planning are engineering problems" may strike the modern reader as remarkably naïve about value conflicts and the politics of planning. But equally powerful

faith in scientific solutions to urban planning problems dominated planning during "the systems revolution" of the 1960s and "city scientific" planning is alive and well among many transportation engineers, environmental planners, and computer analysts today.

Because they deal with fundamental and recurring issues in urban planning many ideas in the volumes which follow have a strikingly modern ring. Soria y Mata's vision of a linear city predates by a century American architect/planner Peter Calthorpe's ideas for stringing pedestrian pockets along light rail lines. John Nolen's 1927 arguments in favor of incorporating vernacular, traditional aspects of American towns into human-scale new towns anticipates today's neotraditional "new urbanism" movement in architecture and planning. Patrick Geddes was teaching his students to "design with nature" a half century before his countryman Ian McHarg's book by that name, and Benjamin Clarke Marsh was practicing advocacy planning long before Paul Davidoff coined the term.

European and North American planners were a small and close-knit band. They knew each other's work and writings. Americans traveled to Düsseldorf and Letchworth to learn about German zoning and British garden city planning. Europeans visited New York and Chicago to study Olmsted's and Burnham's park and city beautiful projects.

International perhaps, but not very inclusive in terms of gender, class, or race. During the early planning period, women participated in urban planning and policy of their cities primarily in unpaid, voluntary roles in civic clubs and the Municipal Arts movement or in the important, but poorly paid, helping professions such as Jane Addams' settlement house work. Only a few pioneering women, such as Harlean James and Theodora Kimball Hubbard, published books on city planning. By contrast in the housing field Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, Katherine Bauer, A. D. Sanderson Furniss, Marion Phillips, Edith Elmer Wood, and other women played a major role as theorists, generators of policy, and practitioners. While African–Americans such as W. E. B. Du Bois, St Clair Drake, Horace Cayton, and Franklin Frazier contributed important studies of urban blacks they were not included in city planning *per se*.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century had many ideological and political currents far more extreme than those which entered mainstream urban planning discourse: Marxists who advocated the elimination of private property and state planning on a grand scale, anarchists who advocated elimination of the centralized nation state, utopians calling for the total restructuring of social and economic relations and the physical form of cities which grew from them.

It is helpful to conceive of the belief systems of the early urban planners and their contemporaries as a core surrounded by concentric rings. At the center is a core of mainstream planning ideas which were progressive in context, but conservative when viewed from the perspective of more radical currents of the time or from the more inclusive vantage point of the late twentieth century. Surrounding this circle is an accepted fringe of more extreme ideas – borrowing from anarchist, socialist, and utopian thought, but often presented in different

terminology without reference to their politically unacceptable sources. Both of these rings exist in an environment of more extreme communist, anarchist, and utopian ideas which enriched and informed early urban planning.

URBAN REFORM MOVEMENTS

Among the most notable movements which grew up to address the appalling urban conditions in the latter part of the nineteenth century city were movements related to the provision of urban parks and recreation, municipal health, and projects to create entirely new healthy, attractive, efficient, socially functional "linear" and "garden" cities.

Frederick Law Olmsted and the parks movement

The parks movement was one of the earliest responses to the social and environmental issues raised by industrial urbanism. Landscape gardening had existed as a sub-category of architecture long before urban planning came into being as a named and defined profession. Landscape architects saw beyond the design of individual buildings to a larger canvas on which to paint an environmental context for human social activity. Beginning in the Renaissance, monarchs and aristocrats had begun to open up and embellish dense medieval cities with formal squares and gardens. The Medicis built magnificent gardens adorned with sculpture, artificial grottoes, pools, and fountains for the enjoyment of the Florentine nobility. By the time of Louis XIV the grounds of Versaille were larger than the entire city of Paris. Early parks served a variety of functions: London's Hyde Park was originally a hunting preserve; Kew Gardens functioned as a conservatory and botanical garden for specimens collected by Captain Cook; London's Marylebone Gardens were in the eighteenth century an urban oasis for lawn bowling, costume balls, and concerts. Eventually the practice of park building evolved in more democratic directions. In 1844, the city of Liverpool engaged the gardener Joseph Paxton (1803–1865) to lay out Birkenhead Park as the first urban garden, complete with recreation areas for sports, open to the general public. In London Victoria Park was opened in 1845 and in 1872 it was enlarged to encompass more than 200 acres of gardens, walkways, ponds, meadows, and woods. In Paris, the extensive demolition and redesign projects of Baron Georges Haussmann (1809–1891) also involved extensive landscape design elements. Although an ambitious 1859 project to encircle the entire city with a greenbelt was defeated, Haussmann's broad boulevards and tree-lined avenues brought well-tended greenery into the city and connected both existing suburban parklands such as the Bois de Boulogne and the Bois de Vincennes and new parks such as Montsoris and Buttes-Chaumont to within the reach of the city's burgeoning population.

In North America, the man who transformed landscape gardening from a skill in service to the landed aristocracy to a vehicle of democratic social reform was

Frederick Law Olmsted (1822–1903). In 1811, the City of New York published a plan for the eventual development of the whole of Manhattan Island. Although the inhabited city only occupied the tip of Manhattan at the time – with the rest of the island given over to farms, grazing lands, and a few isolated villages – the Commissioners' plan proposed an unrelieved gridiron platting that extended from Wall Street to the northernmost tip of the island and from the East River to the Hudson. Almost immediately the Commissioners' plan was opposed by public-spirited community leaders, and over a period of three decades the opposition coalesced into an organized popular movement to build a great Central Park for the citizens of New York. Eventually Frederick Law Olmsted and his partner, the young British architect Calvert Vaux, won the competition and together began work on Central Park in 1857.

As it neared completion in 1863 Central Park was recognized as a masterpiece. It remains today one of the most successful examples of the enhancement of urban space by the intervention of artfully designed nature. Composed primarily in the naturalistic English landscape tradition, Central Park also contains formal gardens and elegant esplanades. It mixes spaces meant for picnics and baseball with spaces meant for solitary walks and quiet contemplation. Even more significantly, Central Park pioneered the use of a multi-level transportation network that separated pedestrian traffic from carriages and that permitted cross-town traffic to transverse the park unobtrusively. In addition, Olmsted designed Central Park to be an integral part of the great Croton Reservoir system that provided fresh water to the whole of Manhattan.

From the Civil War years and on through the 1890s, Olmsted built more than eighty parks in the United States (including the parklands around Niagara Falls and the grounds of the Capitol at Washington), laid out the campus of Stanford University, and designed innovative park-like suburbs such as Riverside, Illinois, outside of Chicago.

The papers of the Olmsted firm are voluminous, but the single best statement of Olmsted's planning theory is to be found in an address he gave to the American Social Science Association meeting at Boston in 1870. That address, published as "Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns", included in this series, demonstrates the extraordinary breadth and richness of Olmsted's understanding of urban life in all its dimensions – the physical, the social, the political, and the cultural – and of the interconnectedness of those aspects of the urban whole. Olmsted offered his listeners in Boston a wealth of information about the planning of parks, the layout of tree-lined streets, and other details of physical urban design. But he also demonstrated a keen interest in larger social and moral issues that created the surrounding context of all planning projects. Long before Kingsley Davis and other urban demographers, Olmsted spoke of the inexorable "townward drift" as the defining characteristic of modern civilization. He was fascinated by the possibilities inherent in the latest technologies such as forced air heating systems, the telegraph, and networks of pneumatic tubes for the dissemination of letters and small packages.

For Olmsted, parks and good urban design also meant the nurturing and preservation of social morality. The park was to be a vehicle to control vice and provide healthy outlets for the city's poor and working class populations. In his view the park would exercise "a distinctly harmonizing and refining influence upon the most unfortunate and most lawless classes of the city." Offering both active recreational opportunities (baseball) and passive entertainment (concerts), the urban park would be an alternative to the grog shop.

Utopia and urban planning

Although Olmsted was in many respects the most practical of planners, a certain element of romantic utopianism attaches to his designs. And utopian visions played an important role in the history of urban social and environmental reform. Despite the impossibility of achieving perfection – in city design or any other human activity – the imagining of perfect worlds and perfect societies has guided the purposes of urban planning almost from the very beginning.

During the Renaissance – and with increased urgency during the Enlightenment and the Age of Revolutions – grand schemes for the progressive reorganization of human social life ran parallel to the transformations of urban social life. Thomas More's *Utopia* of 1516, Johann Andreae's *Christianopolis* of 1619, Francis Bacon's *The New Atlantis* of 1627, and Tomasso Campanella's *The City of the Sun* of 1637 – all proposed new ideals of political, educational, and communal order. And a number of pre-Marxian social reformers – Robert Owen in Britain, Charles Fourier and Etienne Cabet in France – outlined the physical layout of space for new communal societies in elaborate, sometimes even stultifying, detail. Building on the success of his industrial and educational reforms at New Lanark beginning in 1816, Owen tried and failed to construct paradise on earth at New Harmony in Indiana. Fourier's phalansteres – which look remarkably like industrial adaptations of Versailles and which combined under one roof the functions of living, working, child-rearing, and communal social life – excited a great deal of interest in the 1830s and 1840s, and one, Jean Baptiste Godin's familistere at Guise, continued in successful, collective operation until 1939. Cabet's *Voyage en Icarie* of 1839 envisioned a great communist metropolis, built on a strict geometrical plan and ringed by grand boulevards, that he hoped would be constructed by a band of pioneers on the plains of Texas.

Many of the nineteenth-century utopias, emphasizing the social crisis of industrial urbanism, called for "cooperative commonwealths" and social systems of perfect human equality. Among these precursors of welfare-state social engineering were *Looking Backward, 2000–1887* (1888) by Edward Bellamy, *A Traveler from Alruria* (1894) by William Dean Howells, and *Equitania* (1914) by W. O. Henry. Other literary utopias saw social reform as an end that could be best achieved through physical planning and design.

Planning for public health and hygiene

Even more important than recreational outlets for the congested nineteenth-century city and utopian visions was concern for public health aspects of urban planning. Cities have always had higher mortality rates than rural areas – largely because of epidemics and disease caused by the crowding together of large numbers of people in unhealthy conditions. But the enormous increase of urban populations in the nineteenth century and the misery entailed by the Industrial Revolution greatly compounded urban health problems. Before Baron Haussman's transformation of Paris in the 1850s and 1860's, cemeteries within the city limits leached into the aquifer, tens of thousands of households were crowded into cellar tenements without running water, and city sewers emptied into the Seine – upstream. Conditions in London, Manchester, and the other industrial centers of England were worse. In Europe and North America cholera and yellow fever epidemics periodically killed large numbers of people, leaping across class boundaries to spread terror to middle and upper class sections of cities as well as the slums. The new generation of city dwellers brought up breathing air heavy with coal dust, drinking polluted water, living in lightless, airless tenements, subjected to long hours of physical labor without concern for occupational health and safety were increasingly found to be unfit for military service or any form of work.

One of the most interesting statements on planning for improved municipal public health was *Hygeia, City of Health* (1876) presented by the English physician Benjamin Ward Richardson (1828–1896) to the Health Department of a Social Science Congress held in Brighton, England, in 1875 and reprinted in this series. Richardson saw disease and ill health as the principal curse of modern industrialism, and he sought to discover "the conditions which lead to the pain and penalty of disease" and design a city that would achieve "the co-existence of the lowest possible general mortality with the highest possible individual longevity." In his imaginary city of Hygeia, a new city of 100,000 people on 4,000 acres, there would be a total prohibition of alcohol and tobacco, elaborate technologies to eliminate air pollution from chimneys, "ozone generators" to purify the water supply, public laundries and slaughter houses, and a public health system overseen by a duly qualified medical man as principal sanitary officer to "watch over the sanitary welfare of the place." Each house would be built on arches of solid brickwork with subways through which the air would flow freely, and all currents of water would be carried away. As a result of these hygienic designs, Richardson was convinced that the moral health of the community, especially its children, would be improved along with its physical health. "Gutter children are an impossibility," he wrote, "in a place where there are no gutters . . . instead of the gutter, the poorest child has the garden."

Arturo Soria y Mata and the linear city

Another important utopian planner of this period was the Spanish engineer and liberal politician, Arturo Soria y Mata (1844–1920). Soria's linear city is one of the most interesting – and, indirectly, one of the most influential – city plans of the late nineteenth century. Soria never published a summary of his ideas on the linear city and the selections included in this series provide the first English language translation of his key writings. The linear city proposal called for a community arrayed along a central roadway/railway that could theoretically extend for any distance whatever, perhaps even obliterating national boundaries by running, in one notable flight of fancy, all the way from Barcelona to St Petersburg! The linear city would provide residents with rapid transportation, sanitation, steam heat, electric lighting, and communication infrastructures while keeping farmlands and the open countryside within easy walking distance from the city's homes, factories, and commercial enterprises.

Given the central role played by the rail line, Soria is widely thought of as a transportation engineer, and the linear city is seen as a kind of transportation utopia. Many parallels can easily be drawn between Soria's vision and the TODs (Transit-Oriented Developments) situated along light rail lines that characterize so much urban/suburban planning today. But Soria actually thought of modern transportation technology merely as an instrumentality for achieving larger social and environmental ends including improved aesthetics, provision of recreation and open space, and improved public health.

Ebenezer Howard and the garden city ideal

Marx and Engels had included the "gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country" as one of their basic goals in *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848. For Soria, the key to improved public health was an urban plan that eliminated congestion and kept the open countryside close at hand, and a very similar solution was proposed by the Kansas eccentric Henry Olerich in *A Cityless and Countryless World* (1893). But of all of the nineteenth-century urban utopias that sought to reintegrate the urban and the rural, the garden city plan of Ebenezer Howard (1850–1928) is far and away the most important, both as a unified vision addressing the full range of urban development issues and as an initiator and formulator of urban planning as a profession.

Howard was a modest man who worked tirelessly and selflessly for three decades to make his dream a reality and lived to see two of his garden cities, Letchworth and Welwyn, actually built. A parliamentary stenographer by trade, Howard was caught up in the heady spirit of radical reform and borrowed freely from other visionaries and activists. Referring to himself only as "the inventor of the Garden City idea," he never claimed originality for what he called his "unique combination of proposals."

Howard's plan was first published in 1898 as *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* and is included in this series. It was republished, in 1902 and subsequently,

as *Garden Cities of To-morrow*. The book begins with the observation that the one question "on which all persons, no matter of what political party, or of what shade of sociological opinion, would be found to be fully and entirely agreed" is "that it is deeply to be deplored that the people should continue to stream into the already over-crowded cities, and should thus further deplete the country districts." Howard explained this movement from the country to the city – and the basic premise of his proposed solution – by reference to his now-famous metaphor of "The Three Magnets." The attractions of the Town Magnet are high wages, social opportunity, and places of amusement, along with high rents, foul air, and social isolation. The attractions of the Country Magnet are natural beauty, low rents, and fresh air, combined with long hours, no amusements, and a lack of society. Only the Town–Country Magnet as found in the garden city will combine the best of both urban and rural – low rents, high wages, beauty of nature, social opportunity – and attract the people to a new, more healthy, more self-fulfilling way of life.

In Howard's original vision, the garden city would consist of 6,000 acres – a town of 1,000 acres surrounded by a permanent greenbelt of 5,000 acres – supporting a population of 32,000. All land would be collectively owned, with start-up loans retired over time from yearly municipal revenues. Eventually, Howard argued, the municipality should capture the increment in land values achieved from buying land at its agricultural value and creating value by successfully building the garden city. The city itself would feature a complete array of municipal services and amenities: parks, public gardens, tree-lined boulevards, hospitals and asylums, and an enclosed, centrally located Crystal-Palace-style emporium. And although the garden city would be connected to a larger system of "social cities" by rail lines and canals, it would be economically self-sufficient, with its own factories and workshops, not a bedroom suburb for commuters or a satellite to an existing urban center.

Howard attracted a cohort of dedicated followers, including Raymond Unwin and Patrick Geddes in Britain and Lewis Mumford, Henry Wright, and Clarence Stein in America. He also found financial backers for his movement, although many compromises were made before the first garden cities were actually built and, as described more fully below, after World War I garden city ideals were redirected to the building of garden suburbs quite different from Howard's vision.

With the participation of clergy, philanthropists, and reformers Howard formed the Garden City Association of America in 1906 to advise industrialists on how to build new towns following his principles. The Association made ambitious plans for hundreds of American garden cities, but none came to immediate fruition. Garden city thinking did permeate many of the most innovative community building efforts of the twentieth century.

THE CITY AESTHETIC

"Beauty," wrote Nelson P. Lewis in 1916, "Has been the chief aim of American City Planning." By the last decade of the nineteenth and the first decade of the twentieth century concern with the "adornment" of cities, with "civic design", "municipal art," and "the city beautiful," supplanted parks and public health as the dominant concern in city planning. This trend was strongly influenced, of course, by the work of Baron Haussmann in Paris, particularly his grand public buildings and boulevards lined with neoclassical and neo-Baroque apartment buildings. This model was widely imitated throughout Europe, for example in the formalist designs of the Viennese architect Otto Wagner (1841–1918). But another branch of the aestheticist movement was equally strong: the neomedievalism that was exemplified in Britain by the art history of John Ruskin, the romantic utopian fantasies of William Morris, and the Arts and Crafts movement. On the continent, this tendency reached its peak with the brilliant writings and designs of Camillo Sitte (1843–1903). In 1889, Sitte published *Der Stadte-Bau nach seinen kunstlerischen Grundsatzen* (translated as *City Planning According to Artistic Principles*) in which he carried out a systematic spatial analysis of existing historic cities. Sitte paid special attention to buildings as parts of a larger compositional arrangement and to the way streets flowed into squares and plazas to form a pleasing, interconnected whole. Sitte contributed to the planning of a number of cities in Germany (Dessau, Munich, Mainz), but his real influence was in Britain where his work was taken up by Patrick Geddes and Raymond Unwin. And, although Sitte has been criticized for promoting goals that were purely aesthetic, his feeling for the total fabric of urban space was a significant contribution to the urban planning movement.

Daniel Burnham and the City Beautiful movement

Late in his career, Frederick Law Olmsted accepted a commission to lay out the grounds of the World's Fair that was to be held in Chicago in 1893. Called the Columbian Exposition in commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the European discovery of America, the Fair became an immediate and compelling symbol of the United States as it was coming of age as a world power. The design of the fairgrounds and its pavilions, extravagant with neoclassical splendor and Beaux-Arts pomposity, attracted some of the most talented designers, architects, and planners in the United States: in addition to Olmsted, men like Louis Sullivan, Dankmar Adler, Charles McKim, and, most especially, Daniel Burnham (1846–1912).

The "White City" on the city's lakefront was both an outstanding achievement in integrated design and a clear expression of the new capitalist order's sense of self. In a city where Jane Addams of Hull House ministered to the poor and where Upton Sinclair was to find the inspiration for *The Jungle*, a gleaming temporary urban fantasy was constructed that attracted worldwide interest. Here the United States displayed its power and its technological achievements:

telephones, electric lights, horseless carriages, and even a prominently placed "Hygeia Fountain." Millions of visitors from North America and abroad marveled at this image of how beautiful a city might be. "Why," asks Frederick Howe, voicing the thought of many of the 21.5 million visitors to the fair, "should we not live in cities as beautiful as this fugitive play city?"

The plan of Chicago

The principal sources of City Beautiful design were Haussmann's Paris and L'Enfant's Washington: strong axial arrangements, magnificent boulevards, and impressive public buildings. Burnham was to repeat the broad outlines of this style in a series of successful commissions: a redesign of Washington in 1902, the Cleveland civic center project in 1903, an audacious but never built proposal for San Francisco in 1905, and neocolonial layouts for Manila and Baguio in the Philippines. But the culmination of Burnham's career, his crowning achievement as a designer of cities, was the Chicago plan of 1909.

Burnham's Chicago plan featured an elaborate system of public parks and lagoons, including the lakefront grounds of the 1893 World's Fair and parks that had been designed by Olmsted years earlier, an imposing civic center, harbor improvements, diagonal streets, a stately yacht harbor, and transit and open space connections throughout the metropolitan areas. It had little to say about the city's slums and teeming immigrant working class quarters.

Lewis Mumford (1895–1990) called Burnham's Chicago plan "magnificent in its outlines, narrow in it social purposes," and this has remained a familiar judgment on much of the work of the City Beautiful movement. In part, the judgment is correct. Burnham's work places too much emphasis on the pomp and parade of elite public space and too clearly serves the interests of the rich and powerful. But other aspects of City Beautiful planning deserve more respect, especially the emphasis on city planning as a comprehensive and unified process. Burnham is famous for the motto, "make no little plans for they have no magic to stir men's blood." But it was not just bigness that characterized Burnham's grand conceptions, but a truly visionary sense of the city as a metropolitan whole. Charles Mulford Robinson had complained that before the City Beautiful movement, there had been "no system, no orderliness, no idea of gaining an aggregate effect that should be more impressive than any series of individual results could be." Featuring a carefully thought-out regional transportation system tied to an efficient circulation system within the city itself, and carefully balancing the city's need for order and the community's need for amenity, the 1909 Chicago plan was decades ahead of its time. While housing and poverty did not feature prominently in Burnham's thinking or in the Chicago plan the plan does advocate imposing restrictions on overcrowding, enforcing sanitary regulations, limiting the amount of a lot tenements could cover, and goes on to advocate municipal housing for slum dwellers as housing of last resort – an idea

which did not gain real currency in America until Catherine Bauer's *Modern Housing* twenty-five years later.

Walter D. Moody, a professional salesman, worked with Burnham to promote the plan. Moody convinced the Chicago Board of Education to make a summary of the Chicago plan, titled *Wacker's Manual*, mandatory eighth-grade reading. Fifty thousand copies of *Wacker's Manual* were printed and through it Burnham's vision was imprinted on the minds of a whole generation of Chicago school children, many of whose parents saw a slide show or film on the plan. Moody is important in the history of city planning for two reasons. His extraordinary public relations skills made Burnham's ideas on city planning widely known and broadly accepted. Moody helped Burnham develop the position that essential and integral elements in "city planning" were politics, public relations, and advocacy. Long before Aaron Wildavsky and Geoffrey Pressman convinced American planners and policy makers that they needed to consider implementation at every stage in the development of a plan, Burnham and Moody had imprinted this concept on turn-of-the-century planners. The clearest statement of this position is in chapters on "City Planning" and "How to Go about City Planning" in Moody's 1919 book, *What of the City?* included in this series.

The Chicago plan was also enormously influential as a model for the City Beautiful movement worldwide. Published by the prestigious Commercial Club, *The Plan of Chicago*, co-authored by Burnham and his assistant Edward Bennett with illustrations by Jules Guerin and Jules Janin, is an extraordinarily elegant book and a classic document of the City Beautiful movement.

Charles Mulford Robinson and civic art

If Burnham was the City Beautiful movement's creative avatar, the journalist Charles Mulford Robinson (1869–1917) was its chronicler, its theorist, and the principal popularizer of "civic art" as an allied endeavor. Robinson wrote a self-published treatise on "the practical basis of civic aesthetics" titled *The Improvement of Cities and Towns* in 1901. This book proved wildly popular with "civic art" societies throughout the United States – a number of which hired Robinson to prepare plans for their city.

Robinson saw "the flowering of great cities into beauty" as "the sure and ultimate phase of a progressive development." He advocated "adornment" of public space – sculpture, fountains, signage, and what would today be called "street furniture."

By 1903 Robinson reports upwards of 1,200 local improvement societies and over 2,000 by 1906. These local associations formed the National League of Improvement Associations in 1900 which merged in 1904 with the American Park and Outdoor Art Association to form the American Civic Association.

All of the major project elements of the City Beautiful and Municipal Art movements are detailed in Robinson's second book, *Modern Civic Art* (1903), which is included in this series: the architecture and street plan of the business districts, the layout of residential areas, the importance of magnificent train stations with plazas in front to dominate a city's land approach, and, of course, the necessity of creating truly impressive and dramatic civic centers for the administrative and ceremonial functions of government. "To the buildings of the government," he urged, "there ought to be given not merely a central location . . . but all the additional emphasis and conspicuousness that site can offer."

The City Beautiful and Civic Art movements were an extraordinary conflation of aestheticism and commercial power. Robinson summed up the ideals of the movement by quoting the motto of the Municipal Art Society of New York – "To make us love our city we must make our city lovely" – while at the same time arguing for the hard-headed practicality of its goals: " . . . civic art is not a fad," he wrote. "It is not merely a bit of aestheticism. There is nothing effeminate and sentimental about it . . . it is vigorous, virile, sane." He argued that civic art "has ever attained its largest victories when cities were mightiest," and wrote, "today, the spirit of the time is commercial and industrial, and our modern civic art reveals itself in forms that commerce and industry comprehend."

Robinson's interest was not solely with urban grandeur and ruling-class magnificence. He argued for efficient rapid transit in modern cities, systems that would decongest the central districts and facilitate urban expansion. And he also identified the tenements of the slum districts as a focus for City Beautiful concern and attention, if only because in the slums "smolders the fire which breaks forth in revolution."

THE GARDEN CITY MOVEMENT BEGINS

Within a few years of the publication of *To-morrow*, Ebenezer Howard had attracted not just followers, but financial backers as well – the influential lawyer Ralph Neville and two prominent industrialists who had themselves built model company towns, chocolate and soap magnates George Cadbury and W. H. Lever.

Letchworth and Welwyn

Working together, Howard's backers bought up some 3,800 acres in Hertfordshire, not far from London, and began to build Letchworth, the world's first garden city. Success, however, came at a price. In order to make Letchworth a sound investment opportunity, Howard was forced to abandon some of the more radical elements of his original plan including publicly owned land rented with thousand year leases and housing provided by co-operatives. The greenbelt was kept as a planning element, but greatly reduced in size and function.

Raymond Unwin (1863–1940) and his cousin and lifelong collaborator Barry Parker, two young architects who had been influenced by the utopianism and arts

and crafts aesthetics of William Morris, were chosen to design Letchworth. Parker and Unwin created an intelligent and sensitive interpretation of the Howard model. Housing styles suggested a medieval English village, and factories and workshops were placed in a separate zone near the railway. By 1904, the first residents had moved in.

Howard hoped that the Town Planning Law, passed by Parliament in 1909, would spur the construction of dozens of new garden cities, but it was not until after World War I, in 1919, that land for Britain's second garden city, Welwyn, was purchased and construction begun on a bland neo-Georgian plan by the architect Louis de Soissons. But if the movement began slowly, it had nonetheless begun.

Raymond Unwin and the Garden Cities movement

In 1909, Unwin published *Town Planning in Practice*, a beautifully reasoned and lavishly illustrated city planning text which expounds garden city principles. This was followed in 1912 by a publication which is included in this series – the influential pamphlet *Nothing Gained by Overcrowding*. Here Unwin argued persuasively that landowners could earn higher returns building much better housing at relatively lower densities if their designs incorporated public space and reduced costly and land-consumptive streets. While the mathematics of Unwin's seminal article is detailed and the cost figures dated, the essential idea is clear. Roads consume land which could otherwise be used for residential development sold at a profit. Fewer roads not only make more land available for residential development, they also save the developer the cost of building the roads. An overall design that had less land devoted to roads, has somewhat lower overall densities, and devotes most of the land not used for roads to larger private yards and public open space will produce a much more attractive development, and – essential to the developer – if Unwin's math is right can be done without sacrificing profits. The density standards and design ideas of *Nothing Gained by Overcrowding* were incorporated into many public and private developments in Britain. The standards were introduced to America by Thomas Adams and Catherine Bauer and had a major impact on American city planning. Unwin's writings were a signal event both in his own developing career as a world-recognized authority on urban planning and in the history of urban planning as a movement and a profession. It was the agitation for garden cities more than anything else that helped create the town and country planning movement in Britain, and the building of garden cities – and, later, new towns – became a standard element of modern urban planning practice worldwide. Though Unwin was associated with the garden city ideal throughout his life, his own thinking departed from Howard's and his greatest impact was in stimulating garden suburb or satellite town development in England.

Even before World War I, Unwin had become an advocate of satellite towns. In 1918 he convinced the Tudor Walters Committee to adopt this approach for

Britain's massive postwar housing program, which, as described more fully below, eventually led to the construction of more than a million housing units during the 1920s and 1930s. Rather than a system of hundreds of true garden cities, Britain actually built hundreds of garden suburb extensions to existing towns. This development often incorporated Unwin's design principals, and was undoubtedly better than it would have been without the infusion of garden city thinking. But it was a far cry from Howard's vision or from the reality of Unwin's earliest and purest garden city design at Letchworth.

PROGRESSIVISM AND THE CITY EFFICIENT

Planning in the age of business

During the years before and after World War I, American politics witnessed the rise of a new, activist philosophy of government. In part, Progressivism, as the movement was called, grew out of "good government" reformers who battled the corruption and managerial inefficiency of big city, immigrant-based political machines. Often frankly representing middle class social and economic interests, the Progressives sought to apply the best scientific thinking – including new social scientific theories of education, welfare, and social work – to the management of American cities. One of the clear voices for the new, technocratic activism in urban affairs was Frederic C. Howe (1867–1940). A political scientist and a lawyer, Howe served as the Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York from 1914 to 1919 and saw many of the problems of a burgeoning industrial city firsthand. His experience made him a strong advocate of programs that would support the working class population, and he wrote convincingly about both American and European planning movements. A believer in city life, which he called "the hope of democracy," Howe was a particular advocate of Denmark's system of democratic socialism. In *The American City and its Problems* (1915), Howe described planning in Europe as a model to be emulated in America. The chapter from this book on "City Planning in America" emphasizes the weaknesses of American local government. The companion chapter – "City Planning in Europe" – describes the extent of power many European cities had to regulate private property, acquire land, and undertake building projects. Howe describes in glowing terms the effective use to which many European cities put these powers. Both chapters are reprinted in this series.

With the rise of the new social ethos of Progressivism, City Beautiful concerns about urban aesthetics during the early urban planning period gave way to an emphasis on making the modern city function efficiently. George B. Ford's address to the Fifth National City Planning Conference in 1913, titled "The City Scientific," and Nelson P. Lewis' 1916 book, *Planning the Modern City*, both reprinted in this series, are exemplary of city scientific thinking.

The "City Scientific" movement shared boundless faith in the power of rational, scientific decision making to determine the one best solution to any

urban problem and the applicability of uniform standards across cities. The Bureau of Municipal Research had worked out methods of handling even law, finance, and administration capable, in Ford's view, of securing the greatest efficiency with the minimum cost wherever they were applied.

City Scientific planners did not believe value conflicts about competing urban visions were important. They believed in a unitary "public interest" that planners could easily determine as the basis for "best" end-state plans. If an optimum solution to move the highest volume of traffic from point x to point y at least cost appears from an analysis of transit data this is, for the City Scientific planner, the *best* solution even if it might displace thousands of low income and minority residents or irrevocably damage a fragile ecosystem. Nor did Ford believe that planning solutions required much adaptation over time. He thinks in terms of end-state plans in which a given solution will be implemented and the problem will then be permanently solved.

Other writers concerned with efficiency focused attention on the nature of *planning itself.* Among the most important are Frederick Law Olmsted Jr, the son of the great park planner. In an address titled "A City Planning Program" to the Fifth (US) National Conference on Planning in Chicago in 1913, Frederick Law Olmsted Jr laid out a remarkably subtle and visionary city planning program looking ahead to what city planning might become. Olmsted's address is reprinted in this series. Olmsted imagined city planning as it might exist in fifty years. He saw the city plan as

> a live thing – a growing and gradually changing aggregation of accepted ideas or projects for physical changes in the city, all consistent with each other and each surviving by virtue of its own inherent merit and by virtue of its harmonizing with the rest .

He distinguished between *real* plans which actually express the collective will of the community and nominal paper plans. He envisaged a "city plan office" fulfilling three main functions: a custodian of ideas, an interpreter to make the plan consistent, and an amender of the plan. Influenced by Burnham and Moody, Olmsted emphasized the need to concurrently win public support for the plan. He emphasized the importance of "translating the plan into facts;" what is today called plan implementation. But Olmsted was less of an elitist than Burnham. He relished a "vigorous democracy" and thought "unofficial busybodies" *should* disturb the processes of complacent bureaucrats.

THE ORIGINS OF THE US CITY PLANNING PROFESSION

Benjamin Clark Marsh (1879–1953) played a brief, but influential, role in the creation of modern city planning. As a young man Marsh led the "congestion movement" during its heyday from 1907 to 1911, organized important conferences on population congestion in 1908 and city planning in 1909, and helped organize the first national conference of US city planners in 1909.

Marsh's confrontational style and radical ideas burned bridges between planners, housers, and social activists that have had a profound impact of the evolution of American city planning.

The moralistic son of missionaries, Marsh saw population congestion as a prime national evil. During 1907 and 1908 Marsh worked to organize the Committee on Congestion of the Population, based in New York City, and their exhibit on population congestion at the American Museum of National History in March, 1908. Marsh was the principal organizer of a city planning exhibit put on jointly by the Committee on Congestion of the Population and the New York Municipal Art Society in 1909 and the author of a superficial and opinionated book titled *An Introduction To City Planning* (1909).

Marsh's concern for what is today termed equity planning is best expressed in a 1908 article in *Charities and the Commons* titled "City Planning In Justice to the Working Population." Noting that City Beautiful projects have little effect on the daily lives of working class people, Marsh argued that all public improvements should be scrutinized with a view to the benefits they will confer upon those most in need. While many of Marsh's ideas, such as zoning districts for factories, residential height limits, increased public transportation, and more parks were quite conventional and he did not embrace Marxist or anarchist ideas his advocacy of a land transfer tax and excess condemnation were too radical for most of his peers.

Marsh's most important contribution to American city planning was organizing the First (US) National Conference on City Planning which took place in Washington, DC, in May, 1909. The forty-three attendees included not only city planners like Frederick Law Olmsted Jr, John Nolen, and George Ford, but leaders of the housing movement including Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch and Lawrence Veiller, and leaders of the "city social" movement such as Jane Addams.

Marsh's personal style helped splinter the participants in this important first national meeting. The professional planners did not care to be associated with Marsh's amateurish book, brash style, and single tax ideas. When they organized a second and subsequent annual conferences they dropped problems of congestion from the conference title and the issue of congestion from the conference agenda. Thereafter annual national conferences on city planning occurred.

Lawrence Veiller and Robert Deforest were also alienated from Marsh and formed the National Housing Association. Beginning in 1910 this group held a separate National Housing Conference. Thus, Marsh played a major role in creating an artificial split between city planning and housing.

Marsh went on to a long, active life as a self-styled "lobbyist for the people" on peace, consumer protection, anti-trust and other causes – but not congestion or city planning.

EARLY HOUSING REFORM

Lawrence Veiller, Director of the National Housing Association and a leader in annual National Housing Conferences which began in 1910, is exemplary of early housing reformers' injection of social justice concerns into planning discourse.

As the largest city in North America with some of the densest neighborhoods in the world, and with a massive immigrant population, New York had particularly notorious tenements. By the end of the Civil War many of the 25 ft x 100 ft lots originally laid out for single family homes in 1811 were occupied by huge five and six story tenements covering virtually the entire length of the lot with only a few feet on each the side before the next tenement. New York passed its first tenement house law in 1867, but with little effect.

During the last two decades of the nineteenth century "dumbbell" tenements became the dominant form. In 1878 the winning entrant to a competition for an improved form of tenement house sponsored by the *Plumber and Sanitary Engineer* magazine was for a tenement with an indentation in the middle of each side for light and air so that, viewed from above, the tenement looked like a dumbbell. Dumbbell tenements were still five or six stories high, still ran the entire length of the block and the indentations provided little light and air. More than 100 people would usually be crowded into a dumbbell tenement building with long, dimly illuminated "railroad flat" rooms. Lawrence Veiller lead a successful effort to regulate tenements and in 1901 New York prohibited the dumbbell tenement.

Veiller wrote passionately about the deplorable housing conditions facing slum dwellers in New York and other American cities, but his suggested remedies focused on symptoms rather than causes. In an important article titled "Housing Reform Through Legislation," included in this series, Veiller noted in 1914 that municipal housing in the United States was unknown, but he did not advocate government subsidies to produce housing for even the dependent poor. He noted that government in the United States had done nothing to reduce congestion and make less expensive outlying land available for workers' housing, build garden cities, or address housing problems through tax policy, but did not advocate any of the solutions which Benjamin Clark Marsh had advanced in "City Planning In Justice to the Working Population". Rather, Veiller emphasizes the United States' "one distinctive contribution" to the control of slums and bad housing – regulation to eliminate underground cellar units and other unsafe and unsanitary housing units. His approach is negative government action to prevent abuse in the private market rather than pro-active positive government action.

Women on both sides of the Atlantic brought to urban planning a concern for social justice – not only for women, but for poor and working class households and households with special needs. A. D. Sanderson Furniss and Marion Phillips' *The Working Woman's House*, published in England just after World War I and reprinted in this series, illustrates how the confluence of British Labour party Progressivism and feminist concerns helped nurture government intervention to subsidize municipally owned housing for the working class. Not until the Great

Depression and New Deal legislation of the late 1930s did the US government become involved in housing even to a more modest extent than Britain did after World War I.

Prior to the Great War housing reform in Britain was closely allied to the urban health movement. Most efforts were focused on regulating slum housing to reduce disease, life threatening physical danger, and excessive overcrowding. Legislation passed in 1890 permitted local authorities to build housing, but only 18,000 units had been built in all of England – mostly in London – in the twenty-four years prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

World War I brought new housing production to a virtual standstill. In 1915 rents were frozen throughout England to prevent wartime rent gouging. By the end of the war England needed more than 600,000 units just to catch up with prewar demand. Lifting wartime rent controls in conditions of such shortage was political dynamite. A military officer, Captain Richard Reiss, added additional pressure for a national building program by persuasively arguing that returning servicemen deserved "homes fit for heroes."

A government committee headed by Sir John Tudor Walters was charged with developing postwar housing policy. Raymond Unwin was appointed to the Walters Committee, and many of the principles of the Garden City movement and *Nothing Gained by Overcrowding* were written into the report.

The Walters Committee argued that local authorities, supplemented by public utility societies formed by groups of large employers, should play the lead role in home building after the war with direct Treasury subsidies to keep the houses affordable. Private developers should, they argued, play a much smaller role. In 1919 England passed legislation to carry out the recommendations of the Walters Report. *The Working Woman's Home* represents a well-thought-out and progressive vision to infuse feminist concerns into this massive home building project.

Furniss was the secretary of the women's housing committee of the Labour party and a member of the housing council of the British Ministry of Health; Phillips, the chief woman officer of the Labour party. As Britain embarked on the home building program of the 1919 Act to house returning soldiers from World War I and their families, Furniss and Phillips worked hard to incorporate the concerns of women – particularly working class women – into the program. They distributed more than 50,000 surveys asking women what they perceived to be wrong with their current housing conditions and what sort of house they wanted in the future, organized discussions of housing policy among women, and worked to secure representation by women in local housing planning.

Like Veiller's writings, Furniss and Phillips' book is progressive for the time but illustrates the boundaries conventional planning placed on debate. Furniss and Phillips accepted the popular imagery of returning (male) war heroes and the role of women as primarily in the home. They do not mention more radical ideas of the late nineteenth century utopians, materialist feminists, socialists, communists, or anarchists. Based on the survey results, Furniss and Phillips

advocated bigger, airier, lighter houses with more hot water, abundant cupboards and no miserable, male-designed sculleries. They advocated reduced housework, but not housework shared by men; co-operative house management, but not payment for housework. They advocated shared appliances, restaurants where nutritious meals could be had at cost, and "home helps" during childbearing and when children were sick.

British housing policy between the wars proceeded in fits and starts as control of government passed from Labour to Conservative control. Eventually more than 1 million homes were built by local authorities subsidized by the Treasury – more than ten times the number of units built between the wars under the US public housing program and related New Deal Housing programs.

NEW TOWNS AND REGIONALISM

While much early city planning thought focused on a single city as the unit of analysis some theorists and practitioners were concerned with entire regions. In this framework new towns became building blocks for a broader restructuring of society.

The contribution of Patrick Geddes

The construction of Letchworth and Welwyn, along with the important advocacy and implementation work of Raymond Unwin and others, established garden city planning in the mainstream of British urban planning practice. But other important tributaries of planning thought were soon to join with the Garden City movement to create a truly balanced and comprehensive approach to urban planning theory and practice. Much of this new thought came from a brilliant, eccentric Scot named Patrick Geddes (1854–1932).

Geddes was a biologist who lectured on botany and zoology for almost four decades. As early as the 1880s Geddes had begun to take an interest in urban problems and civic affairs in Edinburgh and to turn his talents and energies to issues of sociology. In 1890, he bought the remarkable Outlook Tower property in the city and turned it into what he called a "sociological laboratory" as well as a regional museum. His work in Edinburgh lead to the three major innovations in urban planning practice that are associated with his name – the process of "survey before plan," the preparation of elaborate "city exhibitions" to bring the widest possible public participation into the planning process, and regional planning of the built and natural environment.

Geddes outlined his theories of urban development and planning in *City Development: A Study of Parks, Gardens, and Culture Institutes* (1904) and most comprehensively in *Cities in Evolution: An Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics* (1915) which is included in this series. The subtitle of this second book, with its explicit conflating of physical planning and social civics, is particularly revealing of his approach to urban issues. Geddes fully developed the

regional vision that was implicit in Howard's system of "social cities" and brought the abstraction down to earth. Before any changes could be made to a city or its neighborhoods, a survey would place the city within the environmental context of its region's surrounding ecosystems. Water supply and climate, for example, would be analyzed in terms of watersheds and recurring weather patterns. The survey would also encompass the human history of any targeted urban place – the city's growth over centuries, the unique social characteristics of its people – and all this information, both natural and social, would be combined into graphic public displays which would constitute the City Exhibition. That these innovations seem second nature to planners today simply confirms how important and long lasting the contribution of Patrick Geddes has been.

New towns for America

Of the many disciples that Geddes attracted, perhaps none was more brilliant and influential than Lewis Mumford (1895–1990). Mumford first read Geddes' work when he was only 19. Almost immediately, he wrote to Edinburgh seeking information on how to enroll in courses at the Outlook Tower. What followed was a correspondence and friendship that spanned eight decades. Mumford often addressed Geddes as "Master," and he and his wife Sophie named their son Geddes.

Mumford carried the ideas of both Howard and Geddes into his own philosophy of urban development and helped to popularize those ideas in America. Mumford saw that the power of transportation and communication technologies did not need to be used to facilitate urban sprawl, but could actually permit decentralization of population and industry throughout regions. At the center of a small, but extremely influential group of intellectuals called the Regional Plan Association of America – a group which included Clarence Stein, Henry Wright, and Benton MacKaye – Mumford developed a powerful vision of regional planning that would, they hoped, turn existing urban development away from megalopolitan sprawl toward a clearer, more humane pattern of small cities that would fit harmoniously within the greater New York region. This group's publications in the May, 1925, special issue of *Survey Magazine* are seminal works in the field.

In "The Next Twenty Years in City Planning", written in 1927 and included in this series, Mumford's emphasis on the comprehensive treatment of cities within an entire region is already evident. Also evident is the basic humanism that informed and motivated all of Mumford's extensive writings on cities. As he argued so persuasively in "What Is a City?" (1937) and demonstrated so clearly in *The Culture of Cities* (1934) and *The City in History* (1960), cities have played a key role in the ongoing evolution of the human personality. Mumford argued that the most important task of urban planning was to create physical and social environments that would contribute to "the urban drama" and enlarge the possibilities of the human spirit.

The RPAA's first important project was Sunnyside Gardens in Queens, New York, where Mumford and his family lived for six years, begun in 1924. This was followed by the even more ambitious Radburn, New Jersey, project begun in 1928. In 1938 and 1939, Mumford wrote detailed planning documents for Honolulu and the Pacific Northwest region, and his critiques of other plans – including the Regional Plan of New York and the Greater London Plan – were important contributions to urban planning practice. But Mumford's real significance was never as a planner *per se*. Rather, he was a theorist, a historian, a public philosopher, and a passionate advocate for the cultural potentials of urban life. Mumford's first book, *The Story of Utopias*, appeared in 1922. For thirty years, he wrote the influential "Sky Line" column for *The New Yorker*, and he appeared on the cover of *Time* magazine in 1938. A shrewd critic of American art and literature, he wrote sensitive studies of Melville, Thoreau, and Emerson. He was an important historian of technology – completing his Technics and Human Development series between 1934 and 1970 – and in *The Transformations of Man* in 1956 he produced an impressive philosophical synthesis of human cultural development. Mumford was also one of the founders of the environmental movement, influencing Ian McHarg and an entire generation of planners who would seek to maintain an ecological balance between urban and rural communities. Indeed, it is difficult to find any aspect of American urban development from the 1920s onward that was not touched by Lewis Mumford and that did not benefit from that influence.

The plan for New York and environs

Concerned with the nature of development in the New York region, the Russell Sage Foundation invested in a number of city planning and housing programs and in 1922 funded a monumental nine-year study of the New York region, inspired by banker Charles Dyer Norton (1871–1923). Norton had been active in the Chicago Commercial Club and became deeply involved in Burnham's 1909 Plan for the City of Chicago and subsequent planning projects which grew out of the plan. When he moved to New York, Norton brought his experience with the Chicago plan to bear on the New York region. As chair of the Russell Sage Foundation's Committee on the Regional Plan of New York and environs, he advocated a monumental planning effort, outlined what it should be like, convinced other members of the Russell Sage Foundation board to fund this effort on a massive scale, and recruited planning talent. Norton envisaged a multi-year set of studies culminating in a plan for the physical, legal, social, and housing future of the New York region. Norton died in 1923 before any of the eight volumes of background studies or two volumes of the plan itself were published. The person who came to head this regional planning effort is one of the most influential of twentieth-century planners: Thomas Adams (1871–1941).

Adams worked as a young man with Ebenezer Howard and Raymond Unwin on Letchworth and other British garden city projects and was general manager of

Letchworth. He served as the first chair of the British Garden City Association and became the first president of the British Town Planning Institute in 1904. From 1913 to 1921 he was the town planning advisor to the government of Canada and in this capacity developed the first real regional plan in North America for the region around Niagara Falls.

Adams assumed the position of general director of plans and surveys for the New York regional planning effort in 1923. From this base, Adams hired many of the best known figures in American city planning to work on the plan for the New York region, including Frederick Law Olmsted Jr, John Nolen, George C. Ford, Harland Bartholomew, Nelson Lewis, Clarence Perry, Edward M. Bassett, Flavel Shurtleff, and other American planning luminaries. He hired Raymond Unwin as a consultant to the committee.

One of the most celebrated conflicts in planning history occurred when Lewis Mumford and other members of the RPAA attacked the completed plan for the New York region. After poring over each sentence in the massive Graphic Plan for the New York Region – the core plan document the Committee for the Regional Plan for New York and Environs produced – Mumford declared that he found little of value in the whole exercise. He dismissed the plan as an essentially conservative document which dodged hard choices, accepted continuation of the status quo as inevitable, and failed in its goal of providing a real vision of the development of the New York region. The plan talked about garden cities, Mumford said, but it really was a prescription for more congestion; it had Clarence Perry's splendid background study of the neighborhood unit, but really called for more chaotic land subdivision; it proposed standards for more light and air, but really would permit more overcrowded land development. Adams lashed back at Mumford as an impractical sociologist–aesthete, dogmatic in his own concept of planning, whose attack was riddled with errors.

NEIGHBORHOOD AND HOUSING PLANNING IN THE 1920s AND 1930s

While American notions about regional planning and new towns were being debated and experiments in regional planning and new town development were undertaken during the 1920s and 1930s, other American planners focused their attention on how to create functional neighborhoods in an auto-centered society and how housing should be built to house the depression poor.

Planning neighborhood units for the automobile age

Clarence Stein and Henry Wright in their influential plan for Radburn, New Jersey, and Russell Sage Foundation community planner Clarence Perry (1872–1944) in his planning and writings on neighborhoods for the Russell Sage Foundation, developed theories of neighborhood planning and influenced

developments which set new standards for neighborhood planning appropriate to an increasingly auto-centered society.

Clarence Stein and Henry Wright developed "the Radburn plan" for Radburn, New Jersey, in 1928. They proposed a city using "superblocks" in place of the characteristic narrow rectangular block, roads for different uses (service lanes, secondary collector roads, main roads, and parkways), a complete separation of pedestrian and automobile, houses turned away from the street to face a series of parks forming the backbone of the community. The Radburn plan and other Stein/Wright ideas and achievements are discussed in Stein's 1950 book *Towards New Towns for America.* Clarence Perry took the ideas of human-scale development further and thought deeply about how to design neighborhoods which would function well in the automobile age. His thoughts are summarized in "The Neighborhood Unit" (1931) published as a background study for the *Plan for the New York Region* and reprinted in this series. Perry envisaged the school as the centerpiece for the neighborhood, performing a role in the community well beyond educating primary school children and argued that the neighborhood should have sufficient population to support one elementary school.

Perry gave a good deal of attention to the relationship between the neighborhood and streets. He suggested that neighborhoods should be bounded on all sides by arterial streets for through traffic, but internal street systems should be almost exclusively for use by the residents. The use of cul-de-sacs and careful separation of streets from pedestrian ways would harmonize transportation with living space. Perry saw the residential environment's character as an extension of a person's personality. Local shops, neighborhood-serving parks and playgrounds, and skillful landscaping would make a most humane living environment.

Modern housing for the depression poor

Visitors to the headquarters office of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington, DC, encounter a bronze statue of a remarkable housing reformer – Catherine Bauer (1905–1964) – just inside the first floor entryway. Bauer's influential 1934 book *Modern Housing,* portions of which are reprinted in this series, and her political accomplishments profoundly affected American housing and urban development policy in the 1930s and 1940s.

Upper class, Vassar-educated Bauer based her ideas on extensive on-site studies of postwar European housing completed during the early 1930s, including one trip accompanied by Lewis Mumford. Bauer held up to American readers a stark contrast between 4 million "modern" postwar housing units built in Europe between the end of World War I and the beginning of the Great Depression which met a long list of her standards and the paltry parallel American record of no more than 10,000 comparable units completed during the same time which met her "modern" housing standards.

While not as flamboyant a modernist as Le Corbusier, who defined a house as a "machine for living," Bauer was a true modernist with a faith in large-scale

rationalized housing using new scientific building methods and modern building technologies and materials – cement slabs, glass, and iron. Central to her thinking was the importance of scale. "The complete neighborhood" she wrote, "not the individual home or apartment building, must be the unit of planning, of finance, of construction, and administration." Influenced by the Tudor Walters Committee and British practice, Bauer urged large-scale development on cheap land on the urban periphery. She saw housing units as intimately related to schools, shops, laundries, public open space for recreation, and gardens. She even included a café as a required minimum for inclusion in a neighborhood unit!

Bauer illustrates the continued close relationship between planners on both sides of the Atlantic. She studied the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century European planners and visited their developments. A section of her book is titled "nothing gained by overcrowding" where she quotes at length from Raymond Unwin's (updated) essay by that title. Bauer draws heavily on Lewis Mumford's ideas, and was an active participant in the RPAA.

Bauer's *Modern Housing* was timely and it drew her immediately into an important role in US housing policy. Bauer was aware of the role Furniss and Phillips and others associated with European unions had played in shaping national-level housing policy and getting it implemented at the local level. At her urging, the National Association of Housing Officials brought Raymond Unwin and other European housers to the United States in 1934, and Bauer played a lead role in the National Conference that worked with the Europeans to formulate a housing program for the United States. The American Federation of Labor hired Bauer as a lobbyist, and in 1935 the East Coast patrician stumped the nation, organizing local labor-based housing committees in seventy-five cities in thirty-one states. In this role and as executive director of the Labor Housing Conference she helped mobilize national-level labor support for housing legislation and played a leading role in formulating and securing passage of the critical US Housing Acts of 1937 and 1949 which created the US Public Housing and Urban Renewal programs.

VISIONS FOR THE MODERN PERIOD

Utopian modernism

Between 1899 and 1901, a young French architect named Tony Garnier (1869–1948), the winner of the prestigious Prix de Rome, designed a new kind of urban utopia that he called une cité industrielle. Although Garnier was a contemporary of both Ebenezer Howard and Arturo Soria y Mata – and although his proposed city would have a population of 35,000, comparable to the original garden city proposal – the cité industrielle was designed not as an alternative to industrialism but an embrace of its underlying principles of efficiency, mass production, and collective social order. Exhibited in 1901 and 1904, and finally published as *Étude Pour La Construction Des Villes* in 1917, Garnier's plan was enormously influential.

Rejecting any trace of medievalism or neo-Baroque splendor, Garnier envisioned a strikingly modern, machine-age community of factories and hydro-electric facilities, streamlined harbors, aerodromes and highways, impressive public buildings, and residential districts – all strictly segregated by function. Advanced construction techniques based on reinforced concrete would be used throughout, and the project was depicted not as an abstract diagram or a romantic townscape but as a totally realistic urban plan occupying a believable site in the south of France.

If Garnier was the pioneer of twentieth-century modern urbanism, Walter Gropius (1883–1969) and the Bauhaus group were the godfathers of twentieth-century design. Gropius himself began his career as a member of the Deutsche Werkbund. Established by the industrial architect Peter Behrens in 1907, the Werkbund was a home for many of the most advanced artists and industrial designers of the time, and here Gropius developed the revolutionary glass curtain wall style of construction well before World War I. After the war, he created the Bauhaus, a combination school and research and development center which helped to transform the practice of design and production worldwide. First at Weimar in 1919, and later at Dessau in 1926, the Bauhaus brought together a stellar array of artistic and design talent – Lyonel Feininger, Paul Klee, Wassily Kandinsky, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Josef Albers, Marcel Breuer, and many others – all dedicated to combining the arts of design with the latest modern technologies and integrating a new artistic vision into the conduct of everyday life.

As twentieth-century urbanization proceeded at a headlong pace, and as the theory and practice of urban planning became increasingly professionalized, the actual patterns of city development seemed to follow a course of their own. Characterized by hyper-development in the city centers and suburban sprawl at the urban margins, these urban development patterns had been clearly foreseen by two great utopian visionaries, both of whom had been influenced by both Garnier and the Bauhaus group and whose contributions to modern urbanism can scarcely be overestimated: Le Corbusier (1887–1965) and Frank Lloyd Wright (1867–1959).

Le Corbusier and the cult of the modern

Born Charles-Eduouard Jeanneret in provincial La Chaux-de-Fonds, Le Corbusier took his famous pseudonym as a young man in Paris engaged in painting, criticism, and cultural revolution in the name of a triumphant modernism that would sweep before it all that had come before. In 1920, he began publishing *L'espirit nouveau*, announcing that "A GREAT EPOCH HAS BEGUN," and in 1922, he proposed "A Contemporary City for Three Million People." This was a breath-taking, totally modern vision of spare, undecorated skyscrapers, evenly spaced in a park, that astonished the people of Paris and that still seems futuristic today.

Le Corbusier was an accomplished provocateur and brilliant publicist. By announcing that his city would house 3 million people – about 100 times the population of Letchworth – he consciously flew directly in the face of the garden city advocates while, at the same time, advocating many of their own ideals: simultaneously decongesting cities while maintaining their density. By proposing the use of skyscrapers, he incorporated a new element associated with the crass business culture of the United States as a solution for European urbanism. And in 1925, he boldly announced a new version of the Contemporary City plan, the Plan Voisin, that was to be built on a site in the middle of Paris, previously cleared and leveled by bulldozers! The response was, of course, outrage, but Le Corbusier became instantly famous, a spokesman for a new, uncompromising modernism.

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, Le Corbusier sought backers for his bold new vision in what became a long, mostly unsuccessful series of supplications before the various thrones of twentieth-century power – capitalists, fascists, and communists. It was only during World War II – when he secured a few commissions from the Vichy government of occupied France – and after the war – when Corbusian principles were adopted by governments worldwide as a quick and easy response to the demands of reconstruction – that Le Corbusier became accepted as a true prophet of modern urbanism. Today, the skyscraper in the park – as often as not reinterpreted as the skyscraper in the parking lot! – is one of the standard and ubiquitous realities of modern cities everywhere.

In 1950, Le Corbusier was invited to design Chandigarh, a new city in the Punjab, his only major commission as an urban planner and one which is widely regarded as a failure. But although none of Le Corbusier's major plans – the Plan Voisin of 1925, the Ville Radieuse of 1935, the 1942 plan for Algiers, the postwar plan for Rio de Janeiro – were ever realized, his legacy is everywhere. In Marseilles, Brasilia, Teheran, Moscow, Istanbul, London, and New York, the Corbusian office-and-residential tower, similar to the Unité he constructed in Marseilles in 1945, is a modernist commonplace. A technocrat and a syndicalist, Le Corbusier believed wholeheartedly in the eventual triumph of rationality and order. He also dedicated one of his major plans "To Authority." Perhaps simply because Le Corbusier embraced bureaucracy and the command-and-control functions of political and economic elites everywhere, his style has truly become the international style of our time.

Frank Lloyd Wright's vision

If Le Corbusier was the prophet of high rise downtown commercialism and command-and-control bureaucratic states of all political persuasions, Frank Lloyd Wright was the prophet of middle class urban flight and automobile-based sprawl suburbia. An older man than Le Corbusier, Wright had already begun a distinguished career as an architect when Louis Sullivan was creating the White City for the 1893 Chicago World Fair. By the 1920s, he had achieved a celebrity

unequaled by almost any architect before or since. Assiduously cultivating his dramatic personal eccentricities and his reputation as a universal genius, Wright advocated a naturalistic architectural style totally at odds with Le Corbusier's hard-edge cubist conceptions, His conceptions of urbanism were diametrically opposed to those of the French visionary.

Announced as early as 1932 in *The Disappearing City*, Wright's Broadacre City allocated a minimum of one acre per person, with no large urban concentrations whatsoever. Wright the individualist proposed a "new community" that would not be dominated by the urban "mobocracy" but which would give free rein to personal self-creation. Broadacre City would be family based, and Wright designed an extraordinary small house with an attached carport – the Usonian house – that subsequently became the model for millions of suburban houses in the decades following World War II. Broadacre City was decried as an anti-city, as no city at all, and Wright was happy to proclaim his distaste for cities in general and modern cities in particular.

Clearly, Frank Lloyd Wright would not be pleased by what American suburbia became in the last half of the twentieth century: the lots were too small, the lives of the residents too conformist, to match Wright's Jeffersonian–Emersonian standards. And Corbusian reality never really achieved the purity and sublimity of the Corbusian utopia. But the regionalism and decentralization proposed by the garden city advocates now faced two rival approaches that would help to define the urbanism of the twentieth century and the traditions of modern urban planning.

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF MODERN URBAN PLANNING

A growing number of city planners, a regular annual city planning conference, legal recognition of the legitimacy of city planning institutions and plans, the proliferation of professional consultants, and academic coursework and texts devoted to city planning all helped to advance city planning as a profession. At the turn of the twentieth century there were no standards concerning what a city planner was or what he or she should do. By World War II planning had become a recognized profession.

Planning consultants and planning lawyers

John Nolen estimated that 176 comprehensive planning reports were produced in the United States between 1905 and 1926. Firms of just six consultants – Frederick Law Olmsted Jr, John Nolen, Charles M. Robinson, George B. Ford and E. B. Goodrich (under the name of the Technical Advisory Corporation), M. H. West, and Harland Bartholomew – produced two-thirds of these plans. A dozen were prepared by citizen committees and boards. Thirty-one other planning consulting firms produced the balance. Harland Bartholomew and

other planning consultant firms continued to develop plans during the 1930s and 1940s.

Lawyers were another professional group which contributed to the development of city planning. A few pioneering lawyers developed the legal basis for zoning and other regulations, formulated legally defensible ways of implementing comprehensive city plans, and devised planning and zoning legislation and defended it in the courts. Among the most important were Flavel Shurtleff, who at Olmsted's urging and with Olmsted's assistance published an influential book addressed to lawyers titled *Carrying Out the City Plan* in 1914, Edward Bassett who developed and defended New York City's pioneering 1916 zoning law, and Alfred Bettman, an Ohio attorney who wrote the brief for the 1926 US Supreme Court case which held zoning constitutional: *Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.*

City planning teaching and texts

Urban planning achieved the status of an academic discipline with planning courses initiated at the University of Liverpool and at Harvard in 1909. Texts published in the 1930s by Leslie Patrick Abercrombie (1879–1957) and Thomas Adams show how much the field had developed since the late nineteenth century.

Abercrombie was drawn from architecture into town planning as the recipient of a research fellowship established at the University of Liverpool by soap magnate William H. Lever shortly after the first courses in urban planning were established by Lever there in 1909. A brilliant student, Abercrombie was appointed a professor of civic design at the University of Liverpool in 1914. In that position and as editor of *Town Planning Review* he established a reputation as Britain's leading academic planning theorist. Abercrombie was also a practitioner who developed many town and country planning schemes culminating in the monumental 1944 Greater London Plan.

Abercrombie's text, *Town and Country Planning*, published in London in 1933 and reprinted in this series, is a masterful synthesis of the best theoretical and applied material on planning through that time. By "country" Abercrombie means region, so this is a book on city and regional planning. Abercrombie drew upon his academic experience and knowledge gained editing the *Town Planning Review*. *Town and Country Planning* incorporates Howard's ideas on garden cities and Geddes regional planning ideas. It foreshadows the regional approach Abercrombie successfully advocated for planning postwar London and satellite postwar new towns. Abercrombie developed a philosophy of planning responsive to democratic impulses, but which would given the state power to implement plans which had been democratically arrived at, a formula which was adopted by the postwar Labour government. He argued that in a democracy,

> The plan should not be in the hands of the drill sergeant nor should the city be under the domination of the muddler who will talk about the Law of Supply and Demand and the Liberty of the Individual. Town and country planning seeks to proffer a guiding hand to the trend of natural

> evolution, as a result of careful study of the place itself and its external relationships. The result is to be more than a piece of skilful engineering, or satisfactory hygiene or successful economics, it should be a social organism and a work of art.

Drawing on the earlier public health and City Beautiful movements, Abercrombie saw planning as serving the famous triad of "beauty, health, and (commercial) convenience."

Abercrombie became the architect of the most important regional plan of all time, the 1944 Plan for the Greater London Region, which articulated not only a vision for London itself, but for the entire British postwar New Towns program.

While in his position with the New York Regional Plan, Thomas Adams maintained a city planning consultant practice on both sides of the Atlantic, lectured at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (and headed their city planning program), and continued a stream of influential writings. Adams' *Outline of Town and City Planning* (1935), included in this series, was the standard American textbook for the emerging profession during the 1930s and 1940s.

Edward Bassett and the master plan

As American city planning matured, consultants and staff of city planning departments developed master, general, or comprehensive plans for many cities. But the rationale for these plans and what they should contain was not well articulated until Edward Bassett sought to define what a general plan should contain and its relationship to the processes of city government.

Bassett's answer about what the master plan should be, articulated in *The Master Plan* (1935), was a general, flexible document, adopted by the local planning commission, but deliberately not adopted by the local legislative body. The portions of *The Master Plan* in which Bassett lays out his argument are reprinted in this series. The plan would consist of both map and text. The text would be organized in relation to a small number of plan elements. The plan need not be consistent with existing zoning. He emphasized physical land use planning, not social or economic planning or strategic or program planning. Bassett distinguished between a plan, which he felt should be easy to change, and an official map of, for example, streets and parks which would be much more permanent. The plan, he felt, should have a certain visionary quality.

At the time that Bassett wrote, the idea that a plan should be divided into "elements" was not new. But how many elements there should be and what they should consist of was far from standard. Bassett proposed seven elements and gave them functional, rather than area, definitions. He emphasized streets and other public infrastructure and the "fixing of boundaries," not public control of private property as the defining feature of planning. Bassett made zoning a plan element, not a plan implementation device. Bassett had gained the ire of housers by convincing Thomas Adams to take the position in the *Plan for New York and Its Environs* that there should be no subsidized housing at all; that all housing should

be "economic housing." He was known for a conservative stance on the relationship between land use planning and housing. Bassett took the position that the master plan should not be concerned with private housing in any way.

CITIES AND THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the example of the Soviet Union was a powerful force in planning theory. There, few real innovations were accomplished in the area of urban planning, but planning that directed the entire society and economy, including the provision of great public works and new community development, was incorporated into a series of sweeping Five Year Plans. In Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, fascist regimes put into motion enormous public works programs that helped to glorify the power of the state and the ruling regimes. Mussolini's historic preservation projects in Rome, Rhodes, and elsewhere sought to rekindle imperialist sentiment in the Italian people. And in the United States, Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal included a Public Works Administration that constructed thousands of post offices, courthouses, and hydro-electric dams throughout the nation in an impressive and uniform federal style.

In all the capitalist democracies, the Great Depression of the 1930s called for a fundamental re-evaluation of the relationship between government and the existing social order. Faced with near-total economic collapse – and properly alarmed by the rising tide of totalitarianism elsewhere – democratic governments in Europe and North America sought new ways to stabilize themselves, to protect the lower strata of their populations from utter destitution, and to invest in massive new programs of social reform and infrastructure development. This was a climate in which urban planning – indeed all forms of planning – made major strides.

Rexford G. Tugwell and New Deal planning

Rexford Guy Tugwell (1891–1979) was an original member of Franklin Roosevelt's "Brain Trust." His influence as a policy advisor touched on nearly every aspect of New Deal reform. Trained as an economist – he received his Ph.D. from the Wharton School of Finance in 1922 – Tugwell was a strong advocate of social planning and government regulation of the economy. Plucked by Roosevelt from his position as a professor of agricultural economics at Columbia University, Tugwell served in a number of roles in the first Roosevelt administration. As under-secretary of agriculture, Tugwell initiated the policy of paying farmers not to grow crops, and as head of the Resettlement Administration he oversaw the Greenbelt Towns project, the very limited US attempt at a national garden cities program. He was also an ardent supporter of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the most important regional planning effort in the United States.

Although Tugwell claimed his goal was to stabilize the capitalist order threatened by the economic collapse, many conservatives suspected "Rex the Red" of socialist, even communist, tendencies, and some of those suspicions seem to be confirmed by Tugwell's own writings. The arguments Tugwell advanced in "The Fourth Power" (1939) – that the American system of government needed to be fundamentally reorganized to incorporate a "directive" planning branch which would tell the legislature how much money to appropriate and order the implementation of policies through the executive – demonstrate just how far the pretensions of rational elitism and expert planning had gone in response to the challenge posed by the Great Depression. "The Fourth Power" is reprinted in this series.

Viewed by his many critics as arrogant, naïve, and rigid, Tugwell was always the center of controversy. By the end of Roosevelt's first term he was seen as a political liability and resigned from the Roosevelt administration. As the first chairman of the New York City Planning Commission, he fought with power broker Robert Moses. Ironically, it was Moses himself – the man who had a special genius for crafting planning legislation and who built the chairmanship of the Triborough Bridge Authority into a virtual empire – who elevated the political practice of planning into something very close to the all-powerful "directive" force that Tugwell had envisioned. Tugwell himself was later appointed governor of Puerto Rico and became the head of the graduate planning program at the University of Chicago. He ended his career at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, California, where he helped draft and promote a new US Constitution.

The Barlow Report and postwar British planning

While Tugwell's "fourth estate" never gained real currency in the United States, in Britain national-level urban planning was accepted in national discourse during the 1930s and national-level planning achieved almost the status of a "fourth estate" after World War II.

Neville Chamberlain had long supported regional planning and garden cities. When he became prime minister Britain was reeling under the impact of the depression and fearful of the targets overly concentrated industry could present for German bombers. Chamberlain immediately appointed a Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population, popularly called the Barlow Commission, which between 1937 and 1940 undertook a monumental review of the location of industry throughout all of Britain. While the commission's concerns were to develop fundamental policy for industrial location that went well beyond immediate strategic concerns, it was the danger of industrial concentration at the outbreak of the war and the perceived need for strong, centralized planning for postwar reconstruction that made national-level city and regional planning possible in Britain after World War II.

Based on testimony by Abercrombie, Unwin, Osborn, and other champions of regional planning and garden cities, the Barlow Commission documented social, economic, and strategic disadvantages of concentrating industry and the industrial population in large towns and particular areas of Britain. The Barlow Report discusses problems of health, population congestion, loss of open space, inadequate recreation, traffic, air and water pollution, and other of the fundamental concerns early urban planners had been struggling to remedy. While conditions had greatly improved during the twentieth century, and concentrations of population afforded some advantages for education and culture, the commission concluded that large conurbations in the South, Northeast, and Midlands, and the greater London area in particular, presented problems requiring concerted national action. They concluded that high land values raised the costs of manufacturing, putting the entire nation at a competitive disadvantage. The commission took the position that the disadvantages of concentration could be remedied or greatly reduced by good planning.

POSTSCRIPT

A review of early urban planning contains both surprises and confirmations. If the concerns of the early planners, and even some of their solutions, strike us as remarkably modern, urban planning proceeds through several distinct stages of development – from the first attempts to control and beautify the industrial city, through the gradual evolution of a vision of comprehensive physical planning, to the eventual merging of the goals of physical design and social control. As with other forms of evolutionary development, many of the characteristics of full maturity were present even at birth.

Planning since World War II

The Barlow Report was not issued until January of 1940, and wartime priorities made any further work in the area of urban planning virtually impossible. In 1944, however, as the war in Europe was coming to a successful conclusion, the need for concerted policy to rebuild the war-shattered nation was of great urgency. The great premises and programs of the Barlow Report were reiterated in Sir Patrick Abercrombie's historic Plan for Greater London. The Abercrombie plan called for the creation of new towns outside of a decongested, greenbelted London. It became the centerpiece of the new Labour government's social policy. Although other aspects of that social policy – the nationalization of key industries and the expansion of the welfare state – were much debated and modified in subsequent Conservative and Labour regimes, the urban development policy remained largely intact until the 1980s. So it was in Britain, not the United States, that something like Tugwell's "fourth power" in planning at the national level developed.

In Britain and elsewhere in Europe, Howard, Unwin, Osborn, Abercrombie, and other planning pioneers saw new towns policies and parallel increases in welfarism that helped in the rebuilding process that was the inevitable work of postwar reconstruction. And in the United States, the 1949 Housing Act, strongly influenced by Bauer, called for an expansion of public housing and instituted urban renewal. Major new efforts at inner-city redevelopment were undertaken under this important legislation. Large-scale reconstruction projects borrowed heavily from Le Corbusier's ideas. Postwar prosperity brought an extraordinary expansion of suburban tract–home communities, borrowing the energy and focus of wartime mobilization and applying them to domestic needs. Broadacre city became Levittown.

Beginning in the 1960s the conceptual and political underpinnings of democratic socialism and welfare-state liberalism began to erode significantly. Major new urban programs were initiated as a part of the War on Poverty and the Great Society, but increasingly the politics of resistance and opposition to urban planning initiatives imposed from above supplanted an earlier faith in the glories of a scientifically planned future. Later, as the Soviet Union stumbled toward eventual collapse, and as new communications technologies created the preconditions for a new world order and truly global economy, conservative regimes exemplified by the administrations of Margaret Thatcher in Britain and Ronald Reagan in the United States retreated from social welfarism, and many of the accepted truisms of modernism were called into question.

The future of urban planning

Thus, as the twentieth century comes to a close – and as the culture of modernism gives way to a widely felt and anxiously anticipated, if still poorly defined, postmodernism – a review of urban planning history discloses both continuities and discontinuities. The discontinuities are perhaps the most strongly felt, especially at a time when one great historical period is giving way to another. The collapse of the Soviet Union calls into question many of the postulates of command-economy socialist planning. The emergence of new economic and geo-political forces such as the Islamic world, a revivifying China, and a worldwide marketplace dominated by truly multi-national corporations suggest the possible development of a new global system of cities. And new telecommunications technologies along with their associated information-based economies prepare the way for fundamentally new relationships between city and citizen, self and society, identity and community.

But even as it seems clear that the future will be defined by a whole new array of social, political–economic, cultural, and technological norms, the continuities of human social existence persist. Men and women will need healthy housing and efficient transportation, meaningful jobs and life-enhancing amenities, access to community and access to nature, a sense of individual self-worth, and a sense of collective participation. These have been the concerns of urban planning

from the beginning of the modern period and will certainly continue to define both the practice and the purposes of urban planning in the future.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors with to thank Peter Hall, Bartlett School of Planning, University College London, and Jay Stein, Department of Urban Planning, University of Florida, for their thoughtful comments on our initial lists of books and articles to include in this series and their review of the Editors' Introduction. Brooke Wirtschafter, a San Francisco State University History MA student, worked diligently helping us collect material for this series, and Marcos Diaz Gonzalez, a Stanford Urban Studies BA student, obtained and translated the material from Soria y Mata which is included in this series.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON URBAN PLANNING HISTORY

General histories of city planning

Boyer, Christine, *Dreaming the Rational City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986).
Hall, Peter, *Cities of Tomorrow* (London and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 2nd edn, 1995).
Krueckeberg, Donald A., *The American Planner* (New York: Methuen, 2nd edn, 1994).
Reps, John, *The Making of Urban America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965).
Scott, Mellior, *American City Planning* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969).

John Reps Website of History of City Planning Document 1774–1918

http://www.library.cornell.edu/Reps/DOCS/intro.htm

Other works

Abercrombie, Patrick, *Town and Country Planning* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1933).
Adams, Thomas, *Outline of Town and City Planning* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1935).
Adams, Thomas assisted by Harold M. Lewis and Lawrence M. Orton, *The Building of the City*, vol. II (New York, 1931).
Addams, Jane, *Twenty Years at Hull-House: with Autobiographical Notes* (New York: Macmillan, 1910).
Bassett, Edward, *The Master Plan* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1938).
Bauer, Catherine, *Modern Housing* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1934).
Bellamy, Edward, *Looking Backward: 2000–1887* (New York: Ticknor, 1888).
Booth, William, *In Darkest England and the Way Out* (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1890).
Boyer, Christine, *Dreaming the Rational City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986).
Burnham, Daniel and Edward H. Bennett, *Plan of Chicago* (Chicago, 1909).
Chandler, Tertius and Gerald Fox, *Three Thousand Years of Urban Growth* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).
Committee on the Regional Plan of New York and its Environs, *The Graphic Regional Plan* (vol. I, New York, 1929).

Drake, St Clair and Horace Cayton, *Black Metropolis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945, revised edn, 1993).

Du Bois, W.E.B. *The Philadelphia Negro* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1899).

Engels, Friedrich, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (New York: J. W. Lowell, 1887; London: Allen and Unwin, 1936).

—— *The Housing Question* (New York: International Publishers, 1935).

Ferriss, Hugh, *The Metropolis of Tomorrow* (New York: Ives Wasburn, 1929).

Ford, George B., "The City Scientific," *Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference On City Planning* (1913).

Frazier, E. Franklin, *The Negro Family in the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932).

Furniss, A.D. Sanderson and Marion Phillips, *The Working Woman's House* (London: The Swarthmore Press, 1919).

Garnier, Tony, *Une Cité Industriel* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1989).

Geddes, Patrick, *City Development: A Study of Parks, Gardens, and Culture Institutes* (Edinburgh: Geddes and Co., 1904).

—— *City Surveys for Town Planning* (Edinburgh: Geddes and Associates, 1911).

—— *Cities in Evolution* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1915).

Goodman, Paul and Percival Goodman, *Communitas: Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947).

Hall, Peter, *Cities of Tomorrow* (London and Cambridge, MA: 2nd edn, Blackwell, 1995).

Hayden, Dolores, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Houses, Neighborhoods and Cities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981).

—— *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984).

Housing Officials Yearbook, *A Housing Program for the United States*, (1934).

Howard, Ebenezer, *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1898).

Howe, Frederick C., *The Modern City And Its Problems* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915).

Hubbard, Theodora Kimball and Henry Hubbard, *Our Cities Today and Tomorrow* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929).

James, Harlean, *The Building of Cities* (New York: Macmillan, 1915).

Kropotkin, Peter, *Fields, Factories and Workshops: or Industry Combined with Agriculture and Brain Work with Manual Work* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913).

Krueckeberg, Donald A., *The American Planner* (New York: 2nd edn, Methuen, 1994).

Le Corbusier, *The Radiant City* (New York: Orion Press, 1967).

—— *The City of Tomorrow and Its Planning* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971).

Lewis, Nelson P., *The Planning of the Modern City* (New York: Wiley, 1916).

Lubove, Roy, *The Progressives and the Slums: Tenement House Reform in New York City 1890–1917* (Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, 1960).

Marsh, Benjamin Clark, *An Introduction to City Planning* (New York: B. C. Marsh, 1909).

McHarg, Ian, *Design With Nature* (New York: Doubleday, 1969).

Moody, Walter D., *What of the City?* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg, 1919).

Mumford, Lewis, "The Next 20 Years in City Planning," *Proceedings of the Nineteenth National Conference on City Planning* (1927).

—— *The Culture of Cities* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1938).

—— *The City in History* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1961).

New York City Congestion Commission, *Report* 40 The City Record (1911), pp. 1830–1903, March 7.

Nolen, John, *New Towns for Old* (Boston: Marshall Jones, 1927).

Olmsted , Frederick Law, *Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns* (Boston: Riverside Press, 1870).

—— "A City Planning Program," *Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference on City Planning* (1913).

Osborn, Frederick J., *Transport, Town Development and Territorial Planning of Industry* (London: Fabian Society, 1934).

Peirce, Melusina Faye, "Cooperative Housekeeping II," 22 *Atlantic Monthly* (December, 1868).

—— "Cooperative Housekeeping III," 23 *Atlantic Monthly* (January, 1869).

Perry, Clarence, "The Neighborhood Unit," from *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs, Volume VII, Neighborhood and Community Planning* (New York, 1931).

Reps, John, *The Making of Urban America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965).

Richardson, Benjamin Ward, *Hygeia* (London: Macmillan, 1876).

Riis, Jacob, *How the Other Half Lives* (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1890).

Robinson, Charles Mulford, *The Improvement of Towns and Cities: Or, The Practical Basis of Civic Aesthetics* (New York: G. V. Putnam's Sons, 1901).

—— *Modern Civic Art, or The City Made Beautiful* (New York and London: P. G. Putnam's Sons, 1903).

Royal Commission on The Distribution of the Industrial Population, *Report* [The Barlow Commission Report] (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1940).

Sinclair, Upton, *The Jungle* (New York: Doubleday, 1906).

Sitte, Camillo, *City Planning According to Artistic Principles* trans. C. C. Collins and G. R. Collins (New York: Random House, 1965).

Soria y Mata, Arturo, *The Linear City*, Marcos Diaz-Gonzalez, trans. of 1892 original (Stanford, CA: Program on Urban Studies, 1997).

Soule, George, *A Planned Society* (New York: Macmillan, 1934).

Sussman, Carl (ed.), *Planning the Fourth Migration: The Neglected Vision of the Regional Planning Association of America* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1976).

Symkhovich, Mary Kingsbury, *Here Is God's Plenty: Reflections on American Social Advance* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949).

Tugwell, Rexford, "The Fourth Power," *Planning and Civic Comment* (Harrisburg, PA: J. Horace McFarland, 1939).

Unwin, Raymond, *Nothing Gained by Overcrowding: How the Garden City Type of Development May Benefit both Owner and Occupier* (London: King, 1912).

—— *Town Planning in Practice* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993, reprint of the 1909 original).

Veiller, Lawrence, "Housing Reform Through Legislation," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (1914).

—— "Slum Clearance," *Proceedings of the Tenth National Conference on Housing* (January, 1929).

Wacker, Charles H., "The Plan of Chicago", *American City* (1909).

Weber, Adna F., *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1899).

Wright, Frank Lloyd, "Broadacre City: A New Community Plan," *Architectural Record* (1935).

American Social Science Association.

PUBLIC PARKS

AND THE

ENLARGEMENT OF TOWNS.

READ BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION AT THE LOWELL INSTITUTE, BOSTON, FEB. 25, 1870.

BY

FREDERICK LAW OLMSTED.

PRINTED FOR THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION,

1870.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003101048-1

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

PUBLIC PARKS

AND

THE ENLARGEMENT OF TOWNS.[1]

THE last "Overland Monthly" tells us that in California "only an inferior class of people can be induced to live out of towns. There is something in the country which repels men. In the city alone can they nourish the juices of life."

This of newly built and but half-equipped cities, where the people are never quite free from dread of earthquakes, and of a country in which the productions of agriculture and horticulture are more varied, and the rewards of rural enterprise larger, than in any other under civilized government! With a hundred million acres of arable and grazing land, with thousands of outcropping gold veins, with the finest forests in the world, fully half the white people live in towns, a quarter of all in one town, and this quarter pays more than half the taxes of all. "Over the mountains the miners," says Mr. Bowles, "talk of going to San Francisco as to Paradise," and the rural members of the Legislature declare that "San Francisco sucks the life out of the country."

At the same time all our great interior towns are reputed to be growing rapidly; their newspapers complain that wheat and gold fall much faster than house-rents, and especially that builders fail to meet the demand for such dwellings as are mostly sought by new-comers, who are mainly men of small means and young families, anxious to make a lodgment in the city on any terms which will give them a chance of earning a right to remain. In Chicago alone, it is said, that there are twenty thousand people seeking employment.

To this I can add, from personal observation, that if we stand, any day before noon, at the railway stations of these cities, we may notice women and girls arriving by the score, who, it will be apparent, have just run in to do a little shopping, intending to return by supper time to farms perhaps a hundred miles away.

[1] A paper prepared as a contribution to the popular discussion of the requirements of Boston in respect to a public park; read at the request of the American Social Association at the Lowell Institute, February 25, 1870.

It used to be a matter of pride with the better sort of our country people that they could raise on their own land or manufacture within their own households almost everything needed for domestic consumption. But if now you leave the rail, at whatever remote station, the very advertisements on its walls will manifest how greatly this is changed. Push out over the prairie and make your way to the house of any long-settled and prosperous farmer, and the intimacy of his family with the town will constantly appear, in dress, furniture, viands, in all the conversation. If there is a piano, they will be expecting a man from town to tune it. If the baby has outgrown its shoes, the measure is to be sent to town. If a tooth is troublesome, an appointment is to be arranged by telegraph with the dentist. The railway time-table hangs with the almanac. The housewife complains of her servants. There is no difficulty in getting them from the intelligence offices in town, such as they are; but only the poorest, who cannot find employment in the city, will come to the country, and these as soon as they have got a few dollars ahead, are crazy to get back to town. It is much the same with the men, the farmer will add; he has to run up in the morning and get some one to take "Wolf's" place. You will find, too, that one of his sons is in a lawyer's office, another at a commercial college, and his oldest daughter at an "institute," all in town. I know several girls who travel eighty miles a day to attend school in Chicago.

If under these circumstances the occupation of the country school-master, shoemaker, and doctor, the country store-keeper, dressmaker and lawyer, is not actually gone, it must be that the business they have to do is much less relatively to the population about them than it used to be; not less in amount only, but less in importance. An inferior class of men will meet the requirements.

And how are things going here in Massachusetts? A correspondent of the "Springfield Republican" gave the other day an account of a visit lately made to two or three old agricultural neighborhoods, such as fifty years ago were the glory of New England. When he last knew them, their society was spoken of with pride, and the influence of not a few of their citizens was felt throughout the State, and indeed far beyond it. But as he found them now, they might almost be sung by Goldsmith. The meeting-house closed, the church dilapidated; the famous old taverns, stores, shops, mills, and offices dropping to pieces and vacant, or

perhaps with a mere corner occupied by day laborers; but a third as many children as formerly to be seen in the school-houses, and of these less than half of American-born parents.

Walking through such a district last summer, my eyes were gladdened by a single house with exceptional signs of thrift in fresh paint, roofs, and fences, and newly planted door-yard trees; but happening as I passed to speak to the owner, in the second sentence of our conversation he told me that he had been sticking his place up in hopes that some city gentleman would take a fancy to it for a country seat. He was getting old, had worked hard, and felt as if the time had fully come when he was entitled to take some enjoyment of what remained to him of life by retiring to the town. Nearly all his old neighbors were gone; his children had left years ago. His town-bred granddaughters were playing croquet in the front yard.

You know how it is here in Boston. Let us go on to the Old World. We read in our youth that among no other people were rural tastes so strong, and rural habits so fixed, as with those of Old England, and there is surely no other country where the rural life of the more fortunate classes compares so attractively with their town life. Yet in the "Transactions of the British Social Science Association," we find one debater asserting that there are now very few more persons living in the rural districts of England and Wales than there were fifty years ago; another referring to "the still increasing growth of our overgrown towns and the stationary or rather retrograding numbers of our rural population;" [1] while a third remarks that the social and educational advantages of the towns are drawing to them a large proportion of "the wealthy and independent," as well as all of the working classes not required for field labor.[2]

When I was last in England, the change that had occurred even in ten years could be perceived by a rapid traveller. Not only had the country gentleman and especially the country gentlewoman of Irving departed wholly with all their following, but the very embers had been swept away of that manner of life upon which, so little while ago, everything in England seemed to be dependent. In all the country I found a smack of the suburbs — hampers and packages from metropolitan tradesmen, and purveyors arriving by every train, and a constant communication kept up with town by penny-post and telegraph.

In the early part of the century, the continued growth of London

[1] *Transactions*, 1864. [2] *Transactions*, 1861.

was talked of as something marvelous and fearful; but where ten houses were then required to accommodate new residents, there are now a hundred. The average rate at which population increases in the six principal towns is twice as great as in the country at large, including the hundreds of other flourishing towns. So also Glasgow has been growing six times faster than all Scotland; and Dublin has held its own, while Ireland as a whole has been losing ground.

Crossing to the Continent, we find Paris absorbing half of all the increase of France in population; Berlin growing twice as fast as all Prussia; Hamburg, Stettin, Stuttgart, Brussels, and a score or two of other towns, all building out into the country at a rate never before known, while many agricultural districts are actually losing population. In Russia special provision is made in the laws to regulate the gradual compensation of the nobles for their losses by the emancipation of the serfs, to prevent the depopulation of certain parts of the country, which was in danger of occurring from the eagerness of the peasantry to move into the large towns.[1]

Going still further to the eastward, we may find a people to whom the movement has not thus far been communicated; but it is only where obscurity affords the best hope of safety from oppression, where men number their women with their horses, and where labor-saving inventions are as inventions of the enemy.

There can be no doubt then, that, in all our modern civilization, as in that of the ancients, there is a strong drift townward. But some seem to regard the class of symptoms I have referred to as those of a sort of moral epidemic, the crisis and reaction of which they constantly expect to see. They even detect already a growing disgust with the town and signs of a back-set towards rural simplicity. To avoid prolonged discussion of the question thus suggested I will refer but briefly to the intimate connection which is evident between the growth of towns and the dying out of slavery and feudal customs, of priestcraft and government by divine right, the multiplication of books, newspapers, schools, and other means of popular education and the adoption of improved methods of communication, transportation, and of various labor-saving inventions. No nation has yet begun to give up schools or newspapers, railroads or telegraphs, to restore feudal rights or advance rates of postage. King-craft and priestcraft are nowhere gaining any solid ground. On the contrary, considered as elements of human progress, the more apparent forces under which men have

[1] *Nation*, vol. x. p. 161.

thus far been led to gather together in towns are yet growing; never more rapidly than at this moment. It would seem then more rational to prepare for a continued rising of the townward flood than to count upon its subsidence. Examining our own country more particularly, it is to be considered that we have been giving away our public lands under a square form of division, as if for the purpose of preventing the closer agricultural settlement which long and narrow farms would have favored, and that we have used our mineral deposits as premiums for the encouragement of wandering and of forms of enterprise, individual, desultory and sequestered in character, in distinction from those which are organized, systematized and public. This policy has had its day; the choicest lands have been taken up; the most prominent and easiest worked metallic veins have been seized, the richest placers are abandoned to Chinamen, and the only reaction that we can reasonably anticipate is one from, not toward, dispersion.

The same policy, indeed, has had the effect of giving us, for a time, great command of ready money and easy credit, and we have thus been induced to spend an immense sum — say two thousand millions — in providing ourselves with the fixtures and machinery of our railroad system. This system, while encouraging the greater dispersion of our food-producers, has tended most of all to render them, as we have seen, independent of all the old neighborhood agencies of demand and supply, manufacture and exchange, and to educate them and their children in familiarity with and dependence on the conveniences and habits of towns-people.

To touch upon another line of argument, we all recognize that the tastes and dispositions of women are more and more potent in shaping the course of civilized progress, and we may see that women are even more susceptible to this townward drift than men. Oftentimes the husband and father gives up his country occupations, taking others less attractive to him in town, out of consideration for his wife and daughters. Not long since I conveyed to a very sensible and provident man what I thought to be an offer of great preferment. I was surprised that he hesitated to accept it, until the question was referred to his wife, a bright, tidy American-born woman, who promptly said: "If I were offered a deed of the best farm that I ever saw, on condition of going back to the country to live, I would not take it. I would rather face starvation in town." She had been brought up and lived the greater part of her life in one of the most convenient and agreeable farming countries in the United States.

Is it astonishing? Compare advantages in respect simply to

schools, libraries, music, and the fine arts. People of the greatest wealth can hardly command as much of these in the country as the poorest work-girl is offered here in Boston at the mere cost of a walk for a short distance over a good, firm, clean pathway, lighted at night and made interesting to her by shop fronts and the variety of people passing.

It is true the poorer work-girls make little use of these special advantages, but this simply because they are not yet educated up to them. When, however, they come from the country to town, are they not moving in the way of this education? In all probability, as is indicated by the report (in the "New York Tribune") of a recent skillful examination of the condition and habits of the poor sewing women of that city, a frantic desire to escape from the dull lives which they have seen before them in the country, a craving for recreation, especially for more companionship in yielding to playful girlish impulses, innocent in themselves, drives more young women to the town than anything else. Dr. Holmes may exaggerate the clumsiness and dreariness of New England village social parties; but go further back into the country among the outlying farms, and if you have ever had part in the working up of some of the rare occasions in which what stands for festivity is attempted, you will hardly think that the ardent desire of a young woman to escape to the town is wholly unreasonable.

The civilized woman is above all things a tidy woman. She enjoys being surrounded by bright and gay things perhaps not less than the savage, but she shrinks from draggling, smirching, fouling things and "things out of keeping" more. By the keenness with which she avoids subjecting herself to annoyances of this class, indeed, we may judge the degree in which a woman has advanced in civilization. Think what a country road and roadside, and what the back yard of a farm-house, commonly is, in winter and spring-time; and what far-away farmers' gardens are in haying time, or most of them at any time. Think, again, how hard it is when you city people go into the country for a few weeks in summer, to keep your things in order, to get a thousand little things done which you regard as trifles when at home, how far you have to go, and with how much uncertainty, how much unaccustomed management you have to exercise. For the perfection and delicacy — the cleanness — with which any human want is provided for depends on the concentration of human ingenuity and skill upon that particular want. The greater the division of labor at any point, the greater the perfection with which all wants may

be satisfied. Everywhere in the country the number and variety of workmen, not agricultural laborers, proportionately to the population, is lessening as the facility for reaching workmen in town is increasing. In one year we find fifty-four new divisions of trade added to the "London Directory."

Think of all these things, and you will possibly find yourself growing a little impatient of the common cant which assumes that the strong tendency of women to town life, even though it involves great privations and dangers, is a purely senseless, giddy, vain, frivolous, and degrading one.

The consideration which most influences this tendency of women in families, however, seems to be the amount of time and labor, and wear and tear of nerves and mind, which is saved to them by the organization of labor in those forms, more especially, by which the menial service of households is simplified and reduced. Consider, for instance, what is done (that in the country is not done at all or is done by each household for itself, and, if efficiently, with a wearing, constant effort of superintendence) by the butcher, baker, fishmonger, grocer, by the provision venders of all sorts, by the ice-man, dust-man, scavenger, by the postman, carrier, expressmen, and messenge 's, all serving you at your house when required; by the sewers, gutters, pavements, crossings, sidewalks, public conveyances, and gas and water works.

But here again there is every reason to suppose that what we see is but a foretaste of what is yet to come. Take the difference of demand upon invention in respect to cheap conveyance for example. We began experimentally with street railways twenty years ago. At present, in New York, one pair of horses serves to convey one hundred people, on an average, every day at a rate of fare about one fiftieth of the old hackney-coach rates, and the total number of fares collected annually is equal to that of the population of the United States. And yet thousands walk a number of miles every day because they cannot be seated in the cars. It is impossible to fix a limit to the amount of travel which really ample, convenient, and still cheap means of transportation for short distances would develop. Certain improvements have caused the whole number of people seeking conveyances in London to be doubled in the last five years, and yet the supply keeps nowhere near the demand.

See how rapidly we are really gaining, and what we have to expect. Two recent inventions give us the means of reducing by a third, under favorable circumstances, the cost of good McAdam

roads. There have been sixteen patents issued from one office for other new forms of perfectly smooth and nearly noiseless street pavement, some of which, after two or three years' trial, promise so well as to render it certain that some improvement will soon come by which more than one of the present special annoyances of town life will be abated. An improvement in our sewer system seems near at hand also, which will add considerably to the comparative advantages of a residence in towns, and especially the more open town suburbs.

Experiments indicate that it is feasible to send heated air through a town in pipes like water, and that it may be drawn upon, and the heat which is taken measured and paid for according to quantity required. Thus may come a great saving of fuel and trouble in a very difficult department of domestic economy. No one will think of applying such a system to farm-houses.

Again, it is plain that we have scarcely begun to turn to account the advantages offered to towns-people in the electric telegraph; we really have not made a beginning with those offered in the pneumatic tube, though their substantial character has been demonstrated. By the use of these two instruments, a tradesman ten miles away on the other side of a town may be communicated with, and goods obtained from him by a housekeeper, as quickly and with as little personal inconvenience as now if he were in the next block. A single tube station for five hundred families, acoustic pipes for the transmission of orders to it from each house, with a carriers' service for local distribution of packages, is all that is needed for this purpose.

As to the economy which comes by systematizing and concentrating, by the application of a large apparatus, of processes which are otherwise conducted in a desultory way, wasteful of human strength, as by public laundries, bakeries, and kitchens, we are yet, in America, even in our larger cities, far behind many of the smaller towns of the Old World.

While in all these directions enterprise and the progress of invention are quite sure to add rapidly to the economy and convenience of town life, and thus increase its comparative attractions, in other directions every step tends to reduce the man-power required on the farms for the production of a given amount of the raw material of food. Such is the effect, for instance, of every improvement of apparatus or process in ploughing, mowing, reaping, curing, thrashing, and marketing.

Another tendency arising from the improvement of agricultural

apparatus, which will be much accelerated when steam shall have been as successfully applied to tillage as already to harvesting and marketing operations, is that to the enlargement of fields and of farms. From this will follow the greater isolation of rural homesteads; for with our long-fronted farms, it will be long before we can hope to have country roads on which rapid engine-transit will be practicable, though we may be close upon it wherever firm and smooth roads can be afforded.[1]

It should be observed that possession of all the various advantages of the town to which we have referred, while it very certainly cannot be acquired by people living in houses a quarter or a half a mile apart, does not, on the other hand, by any means involve an unhealthy density of population. Probably the advantages of civilization can be found illustrated and demonstrated under no other circumstances so completely as in some suburban neighborhoods where each family abode stands fifty or a hundred feet or more apart from all others, and at some distance from the public road. And it must be remembered, also, that man's enjoyment of rural beauty has clearly increased rather than diminished with his advance in civilization. There is no reason, except in the loss of time, the inconvenience, discomfort, and expense of our present arrangements for short travel, why suburban advantages should not be almost indefinitely extended. Let us have a cheap and enjoyable method of conveyance, and a building law like that of old Rome, and they surely will be.

As railroads are improved, all the important stations will become centres or sub-centres of towns, and all the minor stations suburbs. For most ordinary every-day purposes, especially housekeepers' purposes, these will need no very large population before they can obtain urban advantages. I have seen a settlement, the resident population of which was under three hundred, in which there was a public laundry, bath-house, barber's shop, billiard-room, beer-garden, and bakery. Fresh rolls and fresh milk were supplied to families before breakfast time every morning; fair fruit and succulent vegetables were delivered at house doors not half an hour after picking; and newspapers and magazines were distributed by a carrier. I have seen a town of not more than twelve hundred inhabitants, the streets and the yards, alleys, and places of which were swept every day as regularly as the house floors, and all dust removed by a public dust-man.

[1] *Slow freighting* over earth roads is practicable; 500 locomotives are now in regular use on common roads.

The construction of good roads and walks, the laying of sewer, water, and gas pipes, and the supplying of sufficiently cheap rapid, and comfortable conveyances to town centres, is all that is necessary to give any farming land in a healthy and attractive situation the value of town lots. And whoever has observed in the French agricultural colonies how much more readily and cheaply railroads, telegraph, gas, water, sewer, and nearly all other advantages of towns may be made available to the whole population than under our present helter-skelter methods of settlement, will not believe that even the occupation of a farm laborer must necessarily, and finally exclude his family from a very large share of urban conveniences.

But this opens a subject of speculation, which I am not now free to pursue. It is hardly a matter of speculation, I am disposed to think, but almost of demonstration, that the larger a town becomes because simply of its advantages for commercial purposes, the greater will be the convenience available to those who live in and near it for coöperation, as well with reference to the accumulation of wealth in the higher forms, — as in seats of learning, of science, and of art, — as with reference to merely domestic economy and the emancipation of both men and women from petty, confining, and narrowing cares.

It also appears to be nearly certain that the recent rapid enlargement of towns and withdrawal of people from rural conditions of living is the result mainly of circumstances of a permanent character.

We have reason to believe, then, that towns which of late have been increasing rapidly on account of their commercial advantages, are likely to be still more attractive to population in the future; that there will in consequence soon be larger towns than any the world has yet known, and that the further progress of civilization is to depend mainly upon the influences by which men's minds and characters will be affected while living in large towns.

Now, knowing that the average length of the life of mankind in towns has been much less than in the country, and that the average amount of disease and misery and of vice and crime has been much greater in towns, this would be a very dark prospect for civilization, if it were not that modern Science has beyond all question determined many of the causes of the special evils by which men are afflicted in towns, and placed means in our hands for guarding against them. It has shown, for example, that under ordinary circumstances, in the interior parts of large and closely built towns, a given quantity of air contains considerably less of the elements

which we require to receive through the lungs than the air of the country or even of the outer and more open parts of a town, and that instead of them it carries into the lungs highly corrupt and irritating matters, the action of which tends strongly to vitiate all our sources of vigor — how strongly may perhaps be indicated in the shortest way by the statement that even metallic plates and statues corrode and wear away under the atmospheric influences which prevail in the midst of large towns, more rapidly than in the country.

The irritation and waste of the physical powers which result from the same cause, doubtless indirectly affect and very seriously affect the mind and the moral strength; but there is a general impression that a class of men are bred in towns whose peculiarities are not perhaps adequately accounted for in this way. We may understand these better if we consider that whenever we walk through the denser part of a town, to merely avoid collision with those we meet and pass upon the sidewalks, we have constantly to watch, to foresee, and to guard against their movements. This involves a consideration of their intentions, a calculation of their strength and weakness, which is not so much for their benefit as our own. Our minds are thus brought into close dealings with other minds without any friendly flowing toward them, but rather a drawing from them. Much of the intercourse between men when engaged in the pursuits of commerce has the same tendency — a tendency to regard others in a hard if not always hardening way. Each detail of observation and of the process of thought required in this kind of intercourse or contact of minds is so slight and so common in the experience of towns-people that they are seldom conscious of it. It certainly involves some expenditure nevertheless. People from the country are even conscious of the effect on their nerves and minds of the street contact — often complaining that they feel confused by it; and if we had no relief from it at all during our waking hours, we should all be conscious of suffering from it. It is upon our opportunities of relief from it, therefore, that not only our comfort in town life, but our ability to maintain a temperate, good-natured, and healthy state of mind, depends. This is one of many ways in which it happens that men who have been brought up, as the saying is, in the streets, who have been most directly and completely affected by town influences, so generally show, along with a remarkable quickness of apprehension, a peculiarly hard sort of selfishness. Every day of their lives they have seen thousands of their fellow-men, have met them face to face, have brushed against them, and yet have had no experience of anything in common with them.

It has happened several times within the last century, when old artificial obstructions to the spreading out of a city have been removed, and especially when there has been a demolition of and rebuilding on a new ground plan of some part which had previously been noted for the frequency of certain crimes, the prevalence of certain diseases, and the shortness of life among its inhabitants, that a marked improvement in all these respects has immediately followed, and has been maintained not alone in the dark parts, but in the city as a whole.

But although it has been demonstrated by such experiments that we have it in our power to greatly lessen and counteract the two classes of evils we have had under consideration, it must be remembered that these means are made use of only with great difficulty — how great, one or two illustrations from experience will enable us perhaps better to understand.

When the business quarter of New York was burnt over, thirty years ago, there was a rare opportunity for laying out a district expressly with a view to facilitate commerce. The old plan had been arrived at in a desultory way; and so far as it had been the result of design, it had been with reference more especially to the residence of a semi-rural population. This had long since passed away; its inconvenience for commercial purposes had been experienced for many years; no one supposed from the relation of the ground to the adjacent navigable waters that it would ever be required for other than commercial purposes. Yet the difficulties of equalizing benefits and damages among the various owners of the land prevented any considerable change of the old street lines. Every working day thousands of dollars are subtracted from the profits of business, by the disadvantages thus reëstablished. The annual loss amounts to millions.

Men of barbarous habits laid out a part of London in a way which a thousand years later was found to be a cause of an immeasurable waste of life, strength, and property. There had been much talk, but no effective action, looking toward improvement, when the great fire came, and left every building a heap of ashes. Immediately upon this, while the fire was still burning, a great man, Sir Christopher Wren, prepared a plan for avoiding the old evils. This plan, a simple, excellent, and economical one, he took to the king, who at once approved it, took a strong interest in it, and used all his royal power to have it carried out. It was hailed with satisfaction by all wise and good men, and yet so difficult was it to overcome the difficulties entailed by the original rural laying out of the

ground, that the attempt was finally abandoned, and the new city was built with immaterial modifications under the old barbarous plan; and so it remains with only slight improvement, and that purchased at enormous cost, to this day.

Remedy for a bad plan, once built upon, being thus impracticable, now that we understand the matter we are surely bound, wherever it is by any means in our power, to prevent mistakes in the construction of towns. Strange to say, however, here in the New World, where great towns by the hundred are springing into existence, no care at all is taken to avoid bad plans. The most brutal Pagans to whom we have sent our missionaries have never shown greater indifference to the sufferings of others than is exhibited in the plans of some of our most promising cities, for which men now living in them are responsible.

Not long since I was asked by the mayor of one of these to go before its common council and explain the advantages of certain suggested changes, including especially the widening of two roads leading out of town and as yet but partially opened and not at all built upon. After I had done so, two of the aldermen in succession came to me, and each privately said in effect: "It is quite plain that the proposition is a good one, and it ought to be adopted; the city would undoubtedly gain by it; but the people of the ward I represent have less interest in it than some others: they do not look far ahead, and they are jealous of those who would be more directly benefited than themselves; consequently I don't think that they would like it if I voted for it, and I shall not, but I hope it will be carried."

They were unwilling that even a stranger should have so poor an opinion of their own intelligence as to suppose that they did not see the advantage of the change proposed; but it was not even suggested to their minds that there might be something shameful in repudiating their obligations to serve, according to the best of their judgment, the general and permanent interests committed to them as legislators of the city.

It is evident that if we go on in this way, the progress of civilized mankind in health, virtue, and happiness will be seriously endangered.

It is practically certain that the Boston of to-day is the mere nucleus of the Boston that is to be. It is practically certain that it is to extend over many miles of country now thoroughly rural in character, in parts of which farmers are now laying out roads with a view to shortening the teaming distance between their wood-lots