

all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States."

The value of a new communities policy in our urban areas is potentially enormous. We can discover ways to obtain these values without sacrifice of major objectives in the public interest. Central city areas could become constructively involved in the creation of new communities. There is both challenge and opportunity in the present situation. I would urge members of NAHRO to explore the potentials of new community policies and programs for your own localities as well as for the Nation.

* * * * *

COMMENTS ON MR. GLADSTONE'S STATEMENT—FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF
THE CENTRAL CITY

(By Carl F. Stover, Director, National Institute of Public Affairs, Washington,
D.C.)

"New towns" discussions always remind me of a country lady I once encountered. She had led a very active life—by the age of 35 she had 14 children and showed some of the spread that I understand can result from having that many children. One Sunday morning she dressed all of them up for church, which, as you recognize, is quite a task. Just as they were about to leave, the 2-year-old little girl dashed out of the front door, down the steps, and fell full-face into a mud puddle. The mother threw up her hands, exclaiming, "Lawsie, it's going to be just as easy to go and make a new one as to get that one cleaned up."

I take it that I am here as spokesman for the interests of the central city. This is not a subject about which one can be as optimistic as about the new towns. The new towns are a very promising experiment. If properly done, they can afford an occasion for us to show just how good communities can be.

By contrast, the central city is typically a stinking, rotten place to live. Except, of course, for the very rich, who can afford to get above, or to wall off, the stench and the decay. The new towns could, as Mr. Gladstone has implied, help the central city but I am not sure that I see quite as clearly as Mr. Gladstone does the way that this will work out in reality.

Before going too far, I must declare quickly that, as a spokesman for the central city, I am a fraud. I don't live there. I would like to live there, but I cannot afford the price in property, or in taxes, or in private schools for my children, which the central city so often demands. I am not wealthy * * * but neither am I poor, so I don't have to live in the central city as many of the poor do. I can afford to live in the suburbs—or in a new town, if I choose to. Yet, I am not happy with the suburb in which I live.

My suburb, although relatively better than central city, is a sterile environment. Its face is white; its caste is middle-class professional; its ethic is materialistic; its style is mediocre; its flavor is bland. It lacks color, contrast, and variety—all of the things that enrich life and make it worthwhile. Still, my suburb is not a tract. It has trees, different styles of houses, hills and winding roads, a park and a stream—many of the kinds of things I hear about being put into the new towns. By accepted standards of planning, my suburb is a fine place. It simply seems to me that it is not a good enough place for people to live. It is artificial. People, especially children, can learn too little of life there. It is a hot-house * * * and I am afraid that the new towns may become like my suburb—falling somewhat short of the grandiose plans that are laid for them.

I am also afraid the new towns, like my suburb, will continue to rob the central city of those juices that might restore its vitality. Of course, I am much encouraged by Mr. Gladstone's recognition of this problem in his good statement but I am not sanguine about the possibility of realizing in practice what he describes as the development of new towns in the context of the needs of the total metropolitan area. Neither Reston nor Columbia, good as they will be for those who are there, are likely to do much to help deal with the problems of central city Washington and both may do something to hinder.

The way new suburban communities and new towns have sapped the central city in the past is all too familiar. They are the retreat for the wellborn, the wellmade, the well to do, and the well educated. In almost every case, white. This leaves the central city to the relatively ordinary poor and the ignorant—in too many cases, Negro or Puerto Rican or Oriental or Mexican-American. They