

are also the retreat for business and industry—I hear they are courting even more of it, in the interests of sound economic planning. Of course, they want the best kind—research and development and other activities that do not corrupt the air or the streams and that, by and large, employ “the better people.”

By this process, the central cities are left with a poverty of leadership and of income at the same time that they are given greater and more difficult socio-economic problems to face. The new towns will help to reverse this process only if we are tough minded about developing them—and I doubt that many, or perhaps any, can or will be that tough.

Certainly, new towns will take minorities—the “good people” among the minorities. They will take the middle class or the aspiring middle class—those who are or intend their children to be professionals in the community. Thus, they will further rob the minority communities of central city of the leadership they so badly need.

What new town is going to install a planned slum—an essential transition quarter for integrating the lowest income people into the community? How can any new town resist the dollar advantage of appeals to exclusiveness that now make their real estate advertisements in metropolitan dailies read like a guide to advancement in social class and social structure? What new town will ask for its fair share of the dregs of human society—the despised poor, the huddled masses, the criminals and the delinquents who populate the worst sections of central cities and constitute their greatest problems? Frankly, I doubt that many or any will.

The only hope that new towns may be significant for and help to do something about the problems of the central city is in new town development by the central cities themselves. This is a possibility for which Mr. Gladstone made a rather persuasive case. I think it could be made more strongly and hope we will get back to it—perhaps to talk about a specific possibility in Oakland, Calif., known as Oakland East. However, even this possibility will present problems unless the leaders of the city are willing to accept the fundamental responsibilities involved in planning these new communities in relation to central city needs and problems and engage, not just in planning, but in large amounts of control to make sure that the plans work out the way they were intended.

The new towns will at best be irrelevant and at worst a negative influence so far as the central city's problems are concerned. They will become another way of turning away from those problems, ultimately to the detriment of us all, including the new towns, themselves. After all, the only reason the new towns can have it as good as they seem to be able to, is that the cities have it so bad.

* * * * *

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

(By Melvin F. Levine, Chief Planner, Downtown Progress, Inc.
Washington, D.C.)

After the statement by Mr. Stover, even though I do have the most formal downtown identity here, I feel moved to defend the suburbs. My problem is that I don't live in the suburbs. I do happen to live in an urban renewal area, specifically in the Southwest urban renewal area in Washington.

Now, I like central city living. I think one of the problems that follows from some of Mr. Stover's remarks is that, if the central cities are, indeed, made more livable, as Southwest has proved, so many people will want to live in the limited central city area, that I won't be able to afford to live there anymore and I'll have to go to the suburbs.

I do not have a formal presentation, because at the last minute I was asked to comment as well as to report. So let me run through a list of things I have written down in reaction to some of the remarks you've heard and also in extension to some of the ideas that were introduced, especially the one that Bob Gladstone cited and that Mr. Stover ended on, which is the if-you-can't-beat-'em-join-'em idea for getting the central city to have some responsibility for developing new communities to try to solve some of the problems of urban life.

SEMANTICS

First of all, as a reaction, a semantic problem cropped up. I discovered we are talking about “new communities” rather than “new towns.” This implies to me that we are not talking about independent political units but sort of well-