problems, but rather toward removing intergovernmental barriers to their solution and establishing a sound governmental framework for further action.

A basic consideration is that government action should not be taken to force people to move to particular locations in order to reduce disparities. The proper goals of government action should be: (1) to adjust Federal, State, and local policies to meet problems where they exist; and (2) to broaden the range of choices open to people in jobs, housing, and level of government service.

The implications of social and economic disparities threaten both individuals and their governments. A decline in local tax base, increasing demands for welfare services, increased racial and social tensions, and a breakdown in communication between the poor and the rest of society are all fearful alternatives to vigorous action by Federal, State, and local governments.

Some observers of metropolitan America have taken another view of the differences among localities in population, resources, and levels of service. Edward C. Banfield and Morton Grodzins have stressed the positive aspects of this differentiation among localities: they see in it the values of autonomy, diversity, and maximum choice for people in deciding where to live.[10] Others, such as Robert C. Wood, stress the limitations of governmental processes that rely heavily on local autonomy. As Wood describes the metropolitan scene, local individualism shades easily into self-interest and a failure to come to grips with common problems: "The sense of responsibility of freemen to one another and the recognition of common purposes that constitute a persuasive part of the American creed are lost, and the spectacle ensues of a simple scramble to the top for the best market baskets of local government services." [11]

The advantages of autonomy and local diversity are real and substantial, but many people are unable to enjoy them. In principle, freedom to choose a satisfactory level of community services is available to people both as consumer-voters who influence local government policy and as residents who can decide where they want to live. In practice, there are important exceptions to both methods of choice. The voting process is not available to commuters who spend all their working hours in a city where they do not live; they can express their service preferences only indirectly and often ineffectively through business-employer pressure. The voting process is also unavailable to residents who are affected by the service policies of neighboring communities—by their level of traffic and transportation service or pollution control, for instance.

In addition, many people have very few choices open to them when they decide where to live. The lack of low-cost housing in many communities, combined with racial discrimination, deprives large numbers of people of any semblance of a reasonable choice of places to live, and at the same time reinforces local disparities.

The principles advocated by the Commission respect the values of local autonomy and diversity, but not when they can be obtained only

---

[10] Edward C. Banfield and Morton Grodzins, *Government and Housing in Metropolitan Areas* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958).

[11] Robert C. Wood, *Suburbia: Its People and Their Politics* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958), p. 288.