

Washington University Law Review

Volume 1963
Issue 1 *Symposium: Land Use Planning*

1963

Social and Physical Planning for the Elimination of Urban Poverty

Herbert J. Gans
Institute for Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview



Part of the [Land Use Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Herbert J. Gans, *Social and Physical Planning for the Elimination of Urban Poverty*, 1963 WASH. U. L. Q. 2 (1963).

Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol1963/iss1/2

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

tive values by which land can be most productively employed and within which an essentially urban society can flourish.

It is in this context that "land law" has returned to the legal profession. The contributors to this symposium have examined various aspects of land use planning and have each leveled criticisms. It is the function of this symposium to focus the interest of the legal profession upon some problem areas in land use planning.

SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL PLANNING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF URBAN POVERTY*

HERBERT J. GANS†

I.

City planning has traditionally sought community betterment through so-called physical methods such as the ordering of land uses and the rearrangements of buildings. This paper deals with a new planning concept which places greater emphasis on economic and social methods of improving community life. In some places it is called human renewal; in others, community development; in yet others, social planning. Although none of the names is quite appropriate, the programs to which they refer are of crucial importance to the future of the city, for they seek to do away—or at least to decimate—urban poverty and the deprivation that accompanies it. If these programs succeed, they are likely to have a lasting impact on city planning and on the other professions concerned with planning matters, including the law.

The fight against poverty is not new, of course, and, in fact, the elimination of urban deprivation was one of the goals of the founders of modern city planning. The planning movement itself developed partly in reaction to the conditions under which the European immigrants who came to American cities in the mid-19th century had to live. The reduction of their squalor was one of Frederick Law Olmstead's goals when he proposed the building of city parks so that the poor—as well as the rich—might have a substitute rural landscape in which to relax from urban life. It motivated the Boston civic leaders

* Expanded and revised version of a paper prepared for the 1962 conference of the American Institute of Planners, Los Angeles, October 17, 1962, and read at a panel entitled: "Cities as Places to Live and Work: How Much Improvement?"

†Institute for Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania.

who first built playgrounds in the slums of that city, and the founders of the settlement house movement, such as Jane Addams, who argued strongly for city planning. It also sparked the efforts of those who built model tenements to improve the housing conditions of the poor. And Ebenezer Howard had this goal in mind when he proposed to depopulate the London slums through Garden Cities.

Most of these planning efforts were not aimed directly at the reduction of poverty and deprivation, but sought to use land planning, housing codes and occasionally zoning to eliminate slums and reduce densities in the tightly packed tenement neighborhoods. The apotheosis of this approach—slum clearance—followed upon the arrival of the newest wave of poor immigrants: the Southern Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexicans who came to the city during World War II and in the post-war era. After a decade of observing the effects of the federal slum clearance program, however, many planners became concerned because while this method was eliminating slums, it was not contributing significantly to the improvement of the slum dwellers' living conditions.

In some cases, faulty relocation planning had simply forced them into adjacent slums; in other cases, further immigration had created new slums while old ones were coming down. But perhaps most important was the gradual recognition that rehousing poor people in decent low-rent dwellings, whether private or public, did not solve other—and equally pressing—problems such as unemployment, low income, illiteracy, alcoholism, family disintegration and mental illness and that rehousing alone could not do away with crime, delinquency, prostitution, illegitimacy and other deviant behavior. In short, it became clear that by themselves such physical changes as urban renewal, good housing and modern project planning were not enough.

As a result, planners and "housers" began to look for non-physical planning approaches.¹ In this process, they made contact with other professions that are concerned with the low-income population, for example, social workers. Working in tandem with them and others, they have developed new programs, bearing the various names I have mentioned. Most often they have been referred to as social planning, a term that had been coined by social workers to describe the coordination of individual social agency programs carried out by such central planning and budgeting agencies as the United Fund.²

1. Another impetus came from the fact that several cities scheduled urban renewal projects in their skid row areas, and programs to "rehabilitate" its residents were developed as part of the relocation plan.

2. The term has also been applied to plans which attempt to outline social—that is, non-physical—goals for the entire society, a procedure that would be more aptly called *societal* planning.

Although the term has already received considerable attention in city planning circles, I prefer to use another term. Insofar as the programs seek to aid low income people to change their fortunes and their ways of living, they are attempts to guide them toward the social and economic mobility that more fortunate people have achieved on their own. For this reason, the programs might best be described as planning for *guided mobility*.

Such programs are now underway in many American cities. Some are designed as programs in juvenile delinquency prevention, which have come into being under the aegis of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and work mainly with young people.³ Others are oriented toward low income people of all ages, and since planners have been most active in these, the rest of the article will deal primarily with such programs.⁴ Although most of the programs are just getting started, some overall similarities between them are apparent. Needless to say, any generalizations about them are preliminary, for the programs are likely to change as they progress from initial formulation to actual implementation.

The guided mobility plans and proposals which I have examined have four major programmatic emphases:

- (1) To develop new methods of education for children from low income and culturally deprived homes, so as to reduce functional illiteracy, school dropouts and learning disabilities which prevent such children from competing in the modern job market in adulthood;
- (2) to reduce unemployment by new forms of job training among the young, by the retraining of adults and by the creation of new jobs in the community;

3. Of these, the leading program is New York's Mobilization for Youth. This is described in Mobilization for Youth, Inc., "A Proposal for the Prevention and Control of Delinquency by Expanding Opportunities" (New York Dec. 1961, mimeographed).

4. Examples of the many such plans are: Action for Boston Community Development, "A Proposal for a Community Development Program in Boston" (Boston, Mass. Dec. 1961, mimeographed); Action Housing, Inc., ". . . Urban Extension in the Pittsburgh Area" (Pittsburgh, Pa. Sept. 1961, mimeographed); City of Oakland, "Proposal for a Program of Community Development" (City of Oakland, Cal. June and Dec. 1961, mimeographed); Community Progress, Inc., "Opening Opportunities: New Haven's Comprehensive Program for Community Progress" (New Haven, Conn. April 1962, mimeographed); and Department of City Planning, "A Plan for the Woodlawn Community: Social Planning Factors" (Chicago, Ill. Jan. 1962, mimeographed). My comments about the plans below are based on a number of published and unpublished documents which I have examined, as well as on discussions about existing and proposed plans in which I have participated in several cities. My description of these plans is, in sociological terminology, an ideal type, and does not fit exactly any one of the plans now in existence.

- (3) to encourage self-help on an individual and group basis through community organization methods that stimulate neighborhood participation; and
- (4) to extend the amount and quality of social services to the low income population. Among the latter are traditional casework services, new experiments for giving professional help to the hard-to-reach, multi-problem family and the provision of modern facilities and programs of public recreation, public health and community center activities.

The educational phase of guided mobility includes programs such as Higher Horizons, which attempt to draw bright children from the culturally restrictive context of low income environments, and to offer them the academic and cultural opportunities available to bright middle class children. There are also programs to help average and backward youngsters, using remedial reading and other devices to guide them during the early school years, so that they will develop the skills and motivations to stay in school until high school graduation. The occupational phase of the plans includes job programs which will employ young people in useful community projects, and in quasi-apprentice programs in private industry, as well as various vocational training and retraining programs for young and old alike. Meanwhile, added effort is scheduled to attract new industries, and thus to bring new jobs to the community.

The extension of social services, and the community organization phase of the programs use decentralization as a means of reaching the high proportion of low income people who usually abstain from community contact. The provision of social services to the hard-to-reach will be attempted by bringing programs to the neighborhood level, with neighborhood directors to supervise the process. In addition, the social agencies plan to coordinate their services, so that individual agencies working with the same individual or family know what the other is doing, and duplication and contradictions can be avoided. More neighborhood facilities will also be established, including community schools, public health clinics and recreation centers, sometimes grouped in a "services center," so that people will be encouraged to come there when they need help.

The decentralizing of community organization activities is intended to create a sense of neighborhood and an interest in neighborhood self-help. Community organizers will work in the neighborhood for this purpose, and will try to involve "natural leaders" living in the area, who can act as a bridge between the professionals, the city and the neighborhood population.

This is a very general description of the programs. In actuality, each community has a somewhat distinctive approach, or a different empha-

sis in the selection of programs, depending partly on the lineup of sponsoring agencies. But some city planners who have become interested in guided mobility programs are still preoccupied—and sometimes too much so—with traditional physical planning approaches, notably the realization of the neighborhood scheme, and the provision of a standard “package” of local public facilities.

The concern with neighborhood is of course traditional in city planning, and even the new challenge of finding non-physical ways of helping the low-income group has not diverted the planner from it. In some cities, guided mobility plans are thus almost appendages to physical planning programs, based on the traditional belief that the rebuilding of the city into school-centered residential neighborhoods modeled after Clarence Perry’s scheme is a proper solution even for poverty. Elsewhere, the program may be an appendage of urban renewal activities, the main intent still being the upgrading of the physical neighborhoods. Thus, guided mobility is used partly to organize the neighborhood into undertaking—or helping the city with—this task. But in most cases, the neighborhood emphasis is based on a genuine concern that one of the causes of urban deprivation is to be found in the poor quality of neighborhood life.

The provision of public facilities is also a traditional planning emphasis, dating back to the days when the planner was an ally of the reformers who were fighting for the establishment of these facilities. Out of this has come the belief that public facilities are crucial agencies in people’s lives, that up-to-date facilities and programs will encourage intensive use of them and that this in turn will help significantly in achieving the aims of guided mobility planning.

Despite the intensity of the planner’s belief in neighborhood and public facility use, there is no evidence that these two planning concepts are as important to low income people as they are to planners. Consequently, it is fair to ask whether such concepts are as crucial to the elimination of urban poverty and deprivation as is signified by their appearance in some guided mobility plans. The answer to this question requires a brief discussion of the nature of contemporary urban poverty.

II.

The low-income population may be divided into two major segments, which sociologists call the *working class* and the *lower class*.⁵ The former consists of semiskilled and skilled blue collar workers, who

5. The nature and extent of urban poverty is described in HARRINGTON, *THE OTHER AMERICA* chs. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 (1962). For a good summary of recent sociological research on the two low-income classes, see Miller & Riesman, *The Working Class Subculture: A New View*, 9 *SOCIAL PROBLEMS* 86. See also GANS, *THE URBAN VILLAGERS* ch. 11 (1962).

hold steady jobs, and are thus able to live under stable, if not affluent, conditions. Their way of life differs in many respects from those of the middle class; for example, in the greater role of relatives in sociability and mutual aid, in the lesser concern for self-improvement and education, and in their lack of interest in the good address, cultivation and the kinds of status that are important to middle class people. Although their ways are culturally different from the dominant middle class norms, these are not pathological, for rates of crime, mental illness and other social ills are not significantly higher than in the middle class. This population, therefore, has little need for guided mobility programs.

The lower class, on the other hand, consists of people who perform the unskilled labor and service functions in the society. Many of them lack stable jobs. They are often unemployed, or forced to move from one temporary—and underpaid—job to another. Partly because of occupational instability, their lives are beset with social and emotional instability as well, and it is among them that one finds the majority of the emotional problems and social evils that are associated with the low-income population.⁶

In past generations, the American economy had considerable need for unskilled labor, and the European immigrants who performed it were able to achieve enough occupational stability to raise themselves, or their children, to working class or even middle class ways of living. Today, however, the need for unskilled labor is constantly decreasing, and will soon be minimal. Consequently, the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican newcomers who now constitute most of the American lower class find it very difficult to improve their condition.⁷

Guided mobility planning is essentially an attempt to help them solve their problems and to aid them in changing their lives. This makes it necessary to find out what causes their problems, what they themselves are striving for and how they can be helped to achieve their strivings.

The nature of the problem is not difficult to identify. For economic reasons, and for reasons of race as well, the contemporary lower class is frustrated—if not barred—from opportunities to hold well-paid, stable jobs, to receive a decent education, to live in good housing or to

6. An excellent description of lower class culture may be found in Miller, *Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency*, 14 J. SOCIAL ISSUES 5 (1958). The everyday life of the lower class is portrayed in LEWIS, *FIVE FAMILIES* (1959), and LEWIS, *THE CHILDREN OF SANCHEZ* (1961). Although Lewis' books deal with the lower class of Mexico City, the picture he presents applies, with some exceptions, to American cities as well.

7. For an analysis of the occupational history of the European immigrants and the more recent immigrants, see HANDLIN, *THE NEWCOMERS* (1962).

get access to a whole series of choices and privileges that the white middle class takes for granted.

In addition, some lower class people lack the motivations and skills needed to participate in contemporary society, and more important, which are necessary to accept the opportunities if and when they become available. Moreover, the apathy, despair and rejection which result from lack of access to crucial opportunities help bring about the aforementioned social and emotional difficulties.

There are a number of reasons for these reactions.⁸ When men are long unemployed or underemployed, they feel useless, and eventually become marginal members of their family. This has many consequences. They may desert their families, and turn to self-destructive behavior in despair. If male instability is widespread, the woman becomes the dominant member of the family, and she may live with a number of men in the hope of finding a stable mate. The result is a family type which Walter Miller calls female-based, which is marked by free unions, illegitimate children and what middle class people consider to be broken homes.⁹ Boys who grow up in such families may be deprived of needed male models, and are likely to inherit some of the feelings of uselessness and despair they see in their fathers. In addition, the children must learn at an early age how to survive in a society in which crisis is an everyday occurrence, and where violence and struggle are everpresent. Thus, they may learn how to defend themselves against enemies, and how to co-exist with an alcoholic parent, but they do not learn how to read, how to concentrate on their studies or how to relate to the teacher.¹⁰ Those that do must defend their deviant behavior—and it is deviant in the lower class—against their peers, who, like peers in all other groups, demand that they conform to the dominant mode of adaptation. Also, many children grow up in households burdened with mental illness, and this scars their own emotional and social growth. Out of such conditions develops a lower class culture with a set of behavior patterns which is useful for the struggle to survive in a lower class milieu, but which makes it almost impossible to participate in the larger society. And since the larger society rejects the lower class individual for such

8. For a more detailed analysis, see GANS, *THE URBAN VILLAGERS* ch. 12 (1962) and Institute for Urban Studies, *Social Planning: A New Role for Sociology* (Philadelphia 1962, mimeographed). See also Mobilization for Youth, Inc., *op. cit. supra note 3* and Miller, *supra note 6*.

9. Miller, *supra note 6*. This family type is particularly widespread in the Negro lower class, in which it originated during slavery.

10. The educational and other problems of the lower class child are described in more detail in SEXTON, *EDUCATION AND INCOME* (1961) and RIESMAN, *THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED CHILD* (1962).

behavior, he can often develop self-respect and dignity only by rejecting the larger society. He blames it for his difficulties—and with much justification—but in this process rejects many of its values as well, becoming apathetic, cynical and hostile even toward those that seek to help him.

This overly brief analysis is at present mostly hypothetical, for we do not yet know exactly what it is that creates the lower class way of life. We know that the nature of family relationships, the influence of peers, the kind of home training, the adaptive characteristics of lower class culture, the high prevalence of mental illness and the need to cope with one crisis after another are all important factors, but we do not yet know exactly which factors are most important, how they operate to create the way of life that they do and how they are related to the lack of opportunities that bring them about.

Similarly, we know that lower class people are striving to change their conditions, but we do not know exactly for what they are striving. It is clear that they want stable jobs and higher incomes, and there is considerable evidence of an almost magical belief in education and high occupational aspirations for the children.¹¹ The lack of opportunity and the constant occurrence of crises frustrate most of these aspirations before they can be implemented, but they do exist, especially among the women. On the other hand, the failure of settlement houses, social workers and other helping agencies to reach the majority of the lower class population suggests that these people either cannot or do not want to accept the middle class values which these professionals preach and which are built into the welfare activities they carry out. Such programs attract the small minority desirous of, or ready for middle class life, but they repel the rest. A number of social scientists suggest that what lower class people are striving for is the stable, family-centered life of working class culture, and at least one delinquency prevention program is based on such an assumption.¹²

These observations about the nature of lower class life have many implications for guided mobility planning. As a result of the sparsity of knowledge, much research, experiment and evaluation of experience will be necessary in order to learn what kinds of programs will be successful. It is clear that the most urgent need is to open up presently restricted opportunities, especially in the occupational sphere. The guided mobility programs which stress the creation of new jobs, the attack on racial discrimination, education and occupa-

11. For the most recent example of this finding, see Kleiner, Parker and Taylor, "Social Status and Aspirations in Philadelphia's Negro Population," Commission on Human Relations (Philadelphia, Penn. June 1962, mimeographed).

12. Mobilization for Youth, Inc., *op. cit. supra* note 3.

tional training as highest priority items are thus on the right track. Even so, new ways of bringing industry and jobs to the community must be found, for conventional programs have not been sufficiently productive. Then, ways of channelling lower class people into new jobs, and keeping them at work even if their initial performance is not as good as that of other people, or of labor saving machines, must be invented. Racial barriers will also have to come down more quickly, especially in those spheres of life and activity most important to lower class people, so that they can begin to feel that they have some stake in society. This too is easier said than done.

Not only is desegregation difficult to implement, but the most successful programs so far have benefited middle class non-whites more than their less fortunate fellows. For lower class people, access to jobs, unions and decent low cost housing is most important, as is the assurance of fair treatment from the police, the courts, from city hall, storeowners and helping agencies. The integration of high priced suburban housing, expensive restaurants or concert halls is for *them* of much less immediate significance.

Finally, methods of encouraging motivations and skills, and of maintaining aspirations in the face of frustration must be found. If the matriarchal lower class family is at fault, ways of providing boys with paternal substitutes must be developed. Where the entire lower class milieu is destructive, children may have to be removed from it, especially in their formative years. Treatments for mental illness, alcoholism and narcotics addiction that will be effective among lower class people have to be discovered, and the causes of these ills isolated so that prevention programs may be set up. Schools must be created which can involve lower class children. This means that they must teach the skills needed in a middle class society yet without middle class symbols and other trappings that frighten or repel the lower class student.¹³

These program requirements demand some radical changes in our ways of doing things. For example, if lower class people are to find employment, there will need to be economic enterprises not geared solely to profit and to cost-reduction, but also to the social profits of integrating the unemployed. In short, eventually we shall have to give up the pretense that 19th century free enterprise ideology can cope with 20th century realities, and learn to replan some economic institutions to help the low-income population, just as we are already redesigning public education to teach its children. Likewise, if lower class people are to become part of the larger society, there must be changes in the way the police, the courts and political structures treat them.

13. See SEXTON, *op. cit. supra* note 10 and RIESMAN, *op. cit. supra* note 10.

To cite just one instance, lower class people must be represented more adequately in local party politics, and their needs and demands must receive more adequate hearing at city hall than has heretofore been the case. Similarly, the professions that now seek to help lower class people will have to be altered so as to be more responsive to how lower class people define their needs, and this may mean the replacement of some professionals by skilled nonprofessionals who are more capable of achieving rapport with lower class clients. Changes such as these, which require redistribution of power, income, privileges and the alteration of established social roles, are immensely difficult to bring about. Even so, they are necessary if urban poverty and deprivation are to be eliminated.¹⁴

III.

Proper guided mobility planning must be based on methods that will achieve the intended goal. If the hypotheses about the causes of urban deprivation are correct, the basic components of guided mobility planning must be able to affect the economy, the political and social structures that shore up poverty and racial—as well as class—discrimination, the foci of lower class culture that frustrate the response to opportunities, notably the family, the peer group, the milieu in which children grow up and the helping agencies that now have difficulty in reaching lower class people, especially the school. Any programs which lack these components, and cannot bring about changes in the position of the lower class population vis-à-vis the institutions named are unlikely to contribute significantly to the aim of guided mobility.¹⁵

The list of basic components does not include the two that have been especially emphasized by planners: the belief in neighborhood and the importance of public facilities. This omission is not accidental, for I do not believe that these two concepts are of high priority. Indeed, it is possible that they may divert guided mobility programs from the direction they ought to take.

By focusing programs on neighborhoods, planners are naturally drawn to what is most visible in them, the land uses, buildings and major institutions, and their attention is diverted from what is hardest to see, the people—and social conditions—with problems. It should be clear from the foregoing analysis that the program must

14. See also Duhl, *Planning and Poverty* and Marris, *A Report on Urban Renewal*, in *THE URBAN CONDITION* (Duhl ed. 1963). Earlier versions of these papers appear in *NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE, THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM*, 1961 100 (1961) and in *28 JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS* 180 (1962), respectively.

15. For a more detailed critical analysis of current guided mobility plans, see Gans, "Social Planning: A New Role for Sociology" *op. cit. supra* note 8.

concentrate on the people and on the social and economic forces which foster their deprivation, rather than on neighborhood conditions which are themselves consequences of these forces.

Moreover, too much concern with neighborhoods may cause the programs to seek out the wrong people: the working class segment of the low income population rather than the lower class one. This may happen for two reasons. First, the planner often finds it difficult to distinguish between areas occupied by working class people, and those occupied by lower class people, mainly because his concept of standard housing blinds him to differences between low rent areas, usually occupied predominantly by the former, and slums, which house the latter.¹⁶ Also, working and lower class people sometimes live together in the same planning area, especially if they are non-white, and a neighborhood focus makes it difficult to reach one without the other. This is undesirable because—as I noted earlier—the working class population does not need guided mobility planning, whereas the lower class population needs it so badly that all resources ought to be allocated to it.

Even so, these drawbacks would not be serious if neighborhood planning could achieve the aims of guided mobility. But this is not the case, mainly because people's lives are not significantly influenced by the physical neighborhood. The important aspects of life take place within the family, the peer group and on the job, and the neighborhood does not seem to affect these greatly. Moreover, although middle and working class people do sometimes participate in neighborhood activities, this is not true of lower class people.¹⁷ Not only do they shy away from organizational participation generally, but because of their great transience they do not spend much time in any one area. More important, since life is a constant struggle for survival and an endless series of crises, lower class people are often suspicious of their neighbors, and even more so of the landlord, the storeowner, the police and the local politician. They harbor similar feelings toward most other neighborhood institutions and local public facilities.

Thus, the lower class population's involvement in the neighborhood

16. Gans, *The Human Implications of Current Redevelopment and Relocation Planning*, 25 JOURNAL OF AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS 15 (1959) or GANS, *op. cit. supra* note 5, at ch. 14.

17. Generally speaking, middle class people participate in formal neighborhood organizations to a much greater extent than other classes, although their social life often takes place outside the neighborhood. Working class people are less likely to participate in formal organizations, but most of their social activities take place close to home. For a discussion of working class attitudes toward the neighborhood, see Fried & Gleicher, *Some Sources of Residential Satisfaction in an Urban 'slum,'* 27 JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS 305 (1961).

is at best neutral, and more often, negative. Yet even if it were more positive, the components of neighborhood planning and the provision of the entire range of modern public facilities can contribute relatively little to solving the problems which concern lower class people the most. To a poverty-stricken family, the separation of car and pedestrian traffic, or the availability of park and playground within walking distance are not very crucial; their needs are much more basic.

This is not to reject the desirability of such planning concepts, but only to say that given the present condition of lower class life, they are of fairly low priority. The location and equipment of the school is much less important than the presence of the kinds of teachers who can communicate with lower class children, and a conventional public health facility is much less vital than an agency that can really help a mother deserted by her husband, or a person who must cope with mentally ill family members.

The standard neighborhood-and-facilities planning package cannot even contribute significantly to the improvement of the lower class milieu. The significant components of this milieu are other people, rather than environmental features, and until these other people are socially and economically secure enough to trust each other, the milieu is not likely to improve sufficiently to prevent the perpetuation of past deprivations on the young people growing up within it.

Similar comments can be made about zoning. Zoning has been used as a tool for neighborhood planning, although in America, it functions mainly to isolate the residences of higher income groups from those of low income ones, and from the non-residential land uses which cater to or employ the latter. Zoning has sometimes been invoked to attack one of the primary problems of the low income population—residential overcrowding—but without much success. Given the chronic shortage of cheap housing in most American cities, a legal device which tended to reduce the supply of such housing even further could not be enforced.

In short, it seems clear that the kind of neighborhood scheme sought through traditional planning and zoning methods cannot be implemented among lower class people until the basic components of guided mobility programs have been effectuated. A stable, peaceful neighborhood in which there is positive feeling between neighbors assumes that people have good housing, the kind of job that frees them from worrying about where the next meal or rent money will come from, the solution of basic problems so that the landlord, the policeman or the bill collector are no longer threatening and the relief from recurring crises so that they can begin to pay some attention to the world outside the household. Similarly, only when people feel themselves to be part of the larger society, and when they have learned the skills needed

to survive in it, will they be able to take part in school or community center activities, or to develop the ability to communicate with the staff of a health clinic. In short, the programs which the neighborhood planner proposes cannot come about until more basic problems have been solved; they are consequences of the elimination of urban poverty rather than devices for it.

IV.

The incompatibility of traditional city planning aims and the basic components of guided mobility programming is not to be blamed on one or another set of planners, nor indeed is it a cause for blame at all. Rather, it stems from the history and nature of modern city planning, and from the basic assumptions in its approach. The description of two of these assumptions will also shed some light on the relationship between social and physical planning and their roles in the improvement of cities.

The first of these assumptions is the belief in the ability of change in the physical environment to bring about social change. Planners have traditionally acted on the assumption that the ordering of land uses, and improvements in the setting and design of buildings, highways and other physical features of the community would result in far-reaching improvements in the lives of those affected. The validity of this assumption has been seriously questioned in recent years, and indeed, the rise of what has been called social planning is one expression of this questioning.¹⁸

But the traditional city planning approach can also be described in another way, as being *method-oriented*. By this I mean that it has developed a repertoire of methods and techniques which have become professionally accepted, and which distinguish planning from other service-giving professions. As a result, the planner concerns himself largely with improvements in these methods. In this process, however, he loses sight of the goals which his methods are intended to achieve, or the problems they are to solve. Thus, he does not ask whether the methods achieve these goals, or whether they achieve *any* goals.

This concern with method is not limited to the planning profession; it can be found in all professions, including law. The attempt to maintain and improve existing methods is useful if the goals are traditional ones, or if the profession deals only with routine problems. But it does not work as well when new goals are sought, and when new problems arise. As I have already noted, improvements in neighborhood planning and zoning techniques cannot contribute significantly to the new

18. *E.g.*, Rosow, *The Social Effects of the Physical Environment*, 27 JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS 127 (1961).

problems of the city, or to the new goal of eliminating urban poverty.

What is needed instead is a *goal oriented* or problem-oriented approach, which begins not with methods, but with the problems to be solved or the goals to be achieved. Once these are defined and agreed upon, the methods needed to achieve them can be determined through the use of professional insight, research and experiment until the right methods, i.e., those which will solve the problem or realize the goal, are found.¹⁹ This approach was used in the foregoing pages, in which I questioned the usefulness of traditional planning methods and proposed instead programs to cope with the problems of the lower class population—and their causes—as well as programs which would lead toward the goals this population was seeking for itself.

This approach is more difficult to implement than a method-oriented one, because it does not respect accepted methods—unless they work—and because it rejects the claims of professional traditions or professional expertise that are not supported by empirical evidence. It may require new methods and new approaches, and thus can wreak havoc with the established way of doing things. However much the goal-oriented approach may upset the profession in the short-run, in the long run it improves its efficiency and thus its expertise and status, because its methods are likely to be much more successful, thus reducing the risk of professional failure. In an effort as pioneering and difficult as guided mobility planning, a problem and goal-oriented approach is therefore absolutely essential.

The conception of method-oriented and goal-oriented planning can also aid our understanding of the relationship between physical and social planning. In the professional discussions of this relationship, the subject has frequently been posed as social planning *versus* physical planning. Although it is not difficult to understand why the subject has been framed in this competitive way, the resulting dichotomy between social and physical planning is neither meaningful nor desirable. There are several reasons for rejecting this dichotomy.

First, social planning is said to deal with the human elements in the planning process. When planners talk of the human side of renewal, or of the human factors in planning, they are suggesting by implication that physical planning is inhuman, that in its concern with land use, site design, the redevelopment of cleared land and the

19. This approach is currently receiving considerable attention in planning literature. My discussion is based on an initial formulation by Martin Meyerson, and is treated in more detail in studies conducted by him, John Dyckman and this writer which are now being prepared for publication. For a summary statement of this approach, see Davidoff and Reiner, *A Choice Theory of Planning*, 28 JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS 103 (1962).

city tax base, it has no concern for the needs of human beings. I would not blame physical planners for objecting to this implication, and am surprised that they have not done so.

But even if this implication is inaccurate, the dichotomy has led to another, even more unfortunate implication, which has some truth to it. Every planning activity, like any other form of social change, creates net benefits for some people, and net costs for others. These may be non-material as well as material. Whether intentionally or not, physical planning has tended to provide greater benefits to those who already have considerable economic resources or political power, be they redevelopers or tenants who profit from a luxury housing scheme, central business district retailers who gain, or expect to gain, from the ever-increasing number of plans to "revive downtown," or the large taxpayers who are helped most when planning's main aim is to increase municipal revenues. The interest in social planning is a direct result of this distribution of benefits, for it seeks to help the people who are forced to pay net costs in the physical planning process. Too often, these are poor people, for example, residents of a renewal or highway project who suffer when adequate relocation housing is lacking. Needless to say, this political bifurcation, in which physical planning benefits the well-to-do, and social planning the less fortunate ones, is not a desirable state of affairs either for the community or for planning.

Finally, in actual everyday usage, the dichotomy refers to skills possessed by different types of planners. Physical planning is that set of methods which uses the traditional skills of the city planner and zoning official; social planning, that set favored by sociologically trained planners, by social workers and by other professionals concerned with welfare aims. Yet if the planning activities of each are examined more closely, it becomes evident that the terms social and physical are inaccurate labels. Zoning is considered a physical planning method, but an ordinance which determines who is to live with whom, and who is to work next to whom is as much social—as well as economic and political—as it is physical. So is a transportation scheme which decides who will find it easy to get in and out of the city, and who will find it difficult. Conversely, social planners who urge the construction of more low-rent housing, or argue for scattered units rather than projects, are proposing physical schemes even while they are ostensibly doing social planning. Since all planning activities affect people, they are inevitably social, and the dichotomy between physical and social methods turns out to be meaningless. Moreover, in actual planning practice, no problem can be solved by any one method, or any one skill. In most instances a whole variety of techniques are needed to achieve the goal.

The social-physical dichotomy is a logical consequence of viewing planning as method-oriented, because when methods are most important, there is apt to be competition between the people who are skilled in one method rather than another. All successful professions want to apply the methods they know best, for this permits them to maintain their power and social position most easily.

If planning is conceived as goal-oriented, however, goals become most important and methods are subordinated to the goal. In such a planning process, in which a large number of different methods are used in an integrated fashion, any single method loses its magical aura. Moreover, no goal can be defined so narrowly that it is only physical or only social. In a goal-oriented approach, then, there can be no social or physical planning. There is only *planning*, an approach which agrees upon the best goals and then finds the best methods to achieve them.

This way of defining planning has a number of implications for the future of the professions concerned with planning matters, as well as for the improvement of cities. If professionals continue to emphasize traditional method, when and where it is not applicable, they can easily lose their usefulness, and their professional prerogative for participating in programs of community betterment.

But it is not only the methods which must be reconsidered. Even the goals which are built into these methods are turning out to be less important today. The neighborhood concept has received little support from the clients of planning; the same is true of the planner's insistence on a reduction in the journey to work, which has not been accepted by the journeying populace. Also, in an age of automation and increasing unemployment, the need for economic growth, even if it is disorderly, is becoming more vital than the ordering of growth, and the planner's desire for stability. It is, of course, still important to have efficient transportation schemes, and to locate noxious industry away from residences, but there is less noxious industry than ever before, and for those who are affluent, the inefficiency of the automobile seems to matter little, especially if it is politically feasible to subsidize the costs of going to work by car. And even the concern with land use per se is becoming less significant. In a technology of bulldozers and rapid transportation, the qualities of the natural environment and the location of land are less important—or rather, more easily dealt with by human intervention—and increasingly, land can be used for many alternatives. The question of what is the best use, given topography and location, is thus less important than who will benefit from one use as compared to another, and who will have to pay costs, and how is the public interest affected.

In short, so-called physical planning questions are receding in im-

portance, and socio-economic and political ones are becoming more relevant. This is, of course, why the issue of social and physical planning has been discussed as social versus physical. In the long run, however, it seems clear that the future of city planning lies less in the reliance upon land use plans than in the development of a range of methods that will guarantee the improvement of those aspects of community life that are most in need of improvement.

One of the most important tasks in the improvement of cities is the elimination of urban poverty, and of the deprivations of lower class life. Poverty is fundamentally responsible for the slums we have been unable to eradicate by attacking the buildings, and for the deprivations which ultimately bring about the familiar list of social evils. Moreover, poverty and deprivation are what make cities so ugly and depressing, and they hasten the flight of more fortunate people into the suburbs. And this in turn contributes to economic decline, the difficulties of financing municipal services, political conflict, corruption and many of the other problems of the contemporary city.

I would not want to argue that all of the city's problems can be laid at the doorstep of poverty. There are technological changes that affect its economic health, and result in the obsolescence of industrial areas and street patterns. There are political rigidities that inhibit its relations with its hinterland. And the desire of most families to raise their children in low-density surroundings suggests that suburbia is not produced solely by the flight from the city, and would exist without urban poverty. Even so, many of the suburbanites have come to hate the city because of the poverty they see there, and this in turn helps to create the hostility between city and suburb and the political conflict that frustrates schemes for metropolitan solutions.²⁰

If planners are genuinely concerned with the improvement of cities, the fight against poverty becomes a planning problem, and one that needs to be given higher priority than it has heretofore received. A beginning is being made in the guided mobility programs that are now in operation, but a much greater effort is needed, both on the local and the federal scene, before these programs can achieve their aim. If such efforts are not made, all other schemes for improving the city will surely fail.

20. *E.g.*, GREER, *GOVERNING THE METROPOLIS* (1962).