

Notes for a talk to the associates of VGA

Tuesday, February 13, 1962

When during our last associates' lunch I volunteered to open with a talk to you, a discussion of our design, planning, and architectural philosophy, I thought that this would be a simple and easy task for me. After all, I have given over the last few years maybe fifty speeches, lectures, and addresses before universities, architectural schools, planning groups, and laymen and, to talk to you as my friends and collaborators, I felt would be easy. But the more I thought about it, the more I concluded that it was easier to tell outsiders about what we are thinking, planning and implementing than it is to discuss this, so to speak, with the family. With some of you I have worked as long as twenty years and with others only for a short time and occasionally. It seems that whenever we work on a project we get quite easily together on basic approaches and concepts. There is in existence undoubtedly a basic philosophy which permeates all of our work. But it is quite possible that if we try to put our finger on the principles and tenets of this philosophy, we might find disagreement and we might touch some sore spots. It is also true, and I feel very strongly about this, that though to the outside world we may talk about our views and findings with a certain amount of authority, we ourselves must be aware of the fact that we are still seeking and learning. I regard the fact that our concepts and our philosophy are still in flux as a most positive factor. The fact that each new project gives us the opportunity to get new insight not only into the physical planning problems alone but also into the sociological and political implications and our willingness to broaden our knowledge of this basis is what I believe we all feel is one of the things which makes our work worthwhile. If we are able, as I believe we have demonstrated in the past to be, to formulate from our practical experience general principles and philosophical tenets, then we can reach a rather rare position. Between those in the architectural and planning field who are only "doers"

page 2.

And those who are only "contemplators." It is the tragedy of our times that such a deep gulf has developed between the "thinkers" who critically write or lecture about environmental problems and those who perform the services as architects, planners, or engineers and whose actual influence on the shaping of the human environment is therefore decisive. The gulf is so deep that the so-called thinkers have lost all contact with reality and in most cases the so-called doers are either too busy or too disinterested to do any thinking. Only by doing as you think and by thinking as you do can this gulf be bridged and I feel that our role as bridge-builders between the theoreticians and the actual shapers of the man-made environment is a most significant one.

I would thus like you to understand that what I will have to say tonight, and what I hope we will discuss in the future meetings, not as an attempt of shaping a doctrinary kind of "party" program for VGA but rather as an effort to lay the ground-work for questions which we will have to develop further and discuss further as our experience broadens and widens.

You may all have noticed that, on the pages of architectural magazines and during professional meetings, the crisis of architecture is being discussed and bemoaned. The general judgment is that architecture in our days is in a state of confusion and frustration and that the clear direction which seemed to be visible during the days of the architectural revolution at the beginning of the century is lost. All you who are approaching my own ripe age will remember the exciting days in the 1920's when, starting in the Bauhaus and in Holland and in Austria, the architectural revolutionaries marched under the banners "form follows function," "down with the ornament," "long live the machine for living." like all revolutions, it started out with the destruction of the old order which

page 3.

In the case of this architectural revolution meant the Doric order, the ionic order, the destruction of everything which was a heritage of antiquity to which up to the Victorian age we tried to cling. This revolution was nothing else but a necessary acknowledgement of the industrial revolution. It was needed and overdue.

But now, forty years later, with modern architecture having reached the age of respectability and affluence, an important problem starts to be recognized. Although we have been extremely successful in tearing down what the past has provided, we have not been as successful in shaping the new which is to take its place.

The state of confusion is well described in an article in the September Vogue magazine, with the title "Are you illiterate about modern architecture?" in which Peter Blake tries to explain to the layman what architecture in the U.S.A. is all about. He manages to increase whatever confusion existed beforehand, as the following quotes will illustrate: after explaining that (a) many modern buildings are not architecture; and (b) modern architects may build with almost anything from prehistoric rock to irradiated plastics, and their forms and spaces may recall anything from the piazza at Vigevano to twenty-first-century science fiction; (c) modern architecture is not particularly cheap; and (d) modern architects do not think that ugliness is necessarily synonymous with goodness, he states it is much harder to say what American architects do believe. His answer is that many good architects now seem to have a fixation about expressing structure and he goes on to say that this fixation has produced some very odd results. He talks about Victor Lundy's fabulous acrobatics with laminated wood arches and concludes that many architects have begun to decorate their buildings with symbols that are

Page 4.

meant to "express structure" but in truth have little to do with it. He refers to Philip Johnson's Fort Worth Museum as a "lovely piece of outdoor decoration" with sculptured arches that look like formed concrete but consist actually of Travertine fitted around steel pipes. He continues in saying that Mies van der Rohe has been doing this thing for some time and that this "cult of expressing structure" through applied pilasters and porticos is about to receive quite a workout in New York's Lincoln Center. That Philip Johnson takes an almost sadistic delight in applying his eclecticism before his more purist and utterly infuriated contemporaries. He then speculates that some of the early pioneers of the movement must be turning in their graves and refers to Auguste Perret, who was Le Corbusier's teacher, and who said "decoration always hides an error in construction."

On occasion, the cult of expressing or symbolizing structures, Mr. Blake confesses, takes an almost surrealist aspect resulting in structures that look like graceful concrete shells but in reality violate every known principle of engineering.

He mentions the outstanding exponent of the approach to "express services." Rather than structural form as being Louis Kahn, who adorns his buildings with towers which symbolize and dramatize utilitarian services like air conditioning and ventilating shafts in a way that no cost accountant could possibly justify. Indeed, Mr. Blake speculates we may soon see buildings with mail shoots, telephone wires, pneumatic tubes, and soft drink dispensers, all applied to or expressed on the outside. Taking on Edward Stone, he refers to him as a beauty seeker, quoting some modernists as criticizing his buildings as pretty rather than beautiful. He mentions that the Edward Stone school is referred to as the ballet school of architects or as exterior decoration. In contrast to this he says Louis Kahn states that a building is to have "character" rather than beauty, an argument which Mr. Blake feels has been brazenly stolen from the sisterhood of spinsters.

The credos of the "New Brutalists," according to Blake is "beauty is ugliness" but he says the "New Brutalists" in Japan have spoiled everyone's fun because their craftsmen cannot build anything imperfectly and thus the work of the "New Brutalist" architects in Japan turns out to be rather pretty. And then Mr. Blake comes to the surprising conclusion which I feel we have at a long time ago: "but the central problem of American architecture is no longer the individual building, but the entire city and its environs. Recently one American critic started to talk about 'Chaoticism' as a movement in architecture in this country. 'Chaoticism' is, of course, not a movement—it is a non-movement. It is the by-product of an apparent absence of civilization". . . More and more architects of the younger generation in this country (and this obviously means us) are trying to do something to halt this blight, to create a civilized, even beautiful American townscape. The first step to them is simply to create a sense of order without which neither civilization nor beauty seems attainable. He concludes his article with these words: "the new American architects (in spite of difficulties which he describes before) continue with the zeal of missionaries. It has been said that it took this country close to 200 years to create a workable political system and the next step is to create a civilization. These new architects have that sense of historic mission and men with that sense are dangerous and hard to stop."

I believe that the foundation of our planning philosophy is indeed this conviction that architecture in the second half of the 20th century has the historic mission of creating a higher order within the man-made environment. This strong emphasis on environmental architecture which is not based on a denial of the importance and values of architecture for the individual structure but, quite the contrary, on the conviction that architecture as a creative expression will die if we cannot create conditions with which it can be meaningful.

page 6.

1. There is little sense in exhibiting paintings in a room that is pitch dark.
2. It would be rather foolish for a virtuoso to play a violin solo on the runway of a jet airport,
3. There is just as little sense in placing brilliantly designed buildings into an atmosphere of danger, noise and fumes which an unworkable, hostile environment creates.
4. If we, as architects, wish to create structures which can be enjoyed within and without, then we have to create, before all else, conditions conducive to their contemplation.
5. As things stand today, there are usually, in the history of a building, only three men who look at it attentively: the architect who designed it; the architectural photographer through his view finder; and the architectural critic appraising its aesthetics. All others are kept too busy watching for traffic signals, for cars swerving out in front or pushing from the rear, or for onrushing traffic from all sides when crossing the streets as pedestrians.
6. It follows that we have but one choice: that is, to use our energies, knowledge and talents, our imagination and perseverance, towards the aim of creating those environmental qualities in our cities, in our metropolitan regions and out in the countryside, which will allow structures and environmental elements to serve best,

Why have the environmental qualities of our urban and suburban areas deteriorated? What is the cause of the urban crisis, the existence of which is no longer doubted by anybody? The cause of the crisis is the time lag between rapidly-moving developments in technology, science, sociology, and political systems, on the one hand, and our lack of ability to adjust our thinking, our planning and the implementation of such planning with respect to the physical forms of the public environment. We have been unsuccessful in adjusting ourselves emotionally, intellectually, spiritually, to the advances, changes and inventions.

The last 50 years have brought with them scientific and technological developments powerful enough to change our dictionary. New words like automation, atomic energy, television, jet propulsion, astronaut, intercontinental missile, supersonic speed and so on, have been added to our vocabulary, signifying the impact of such changes on our daily lives. Sociologically, we are experiencing a population explosion; spreading of the wealth from the few to the many; mass production; mass consumption; shrinkage of the rural population because of technological progress in agriculture and, as a result of it and of the general population increase, explosive growth of population in metropolitan areas. New words have also been added to the vocabulary with regard to the development of metropolitan areas outside of the cities'. Suburban sprawl, freeways, cloverleaves, are just a few of them. Significantly, the urban vocabulary itself has not been enriched. We are still working with the old terms of streets and squares, of slums and blight, of streetcars, buses, subways; and this stunted urban vocabulary indicates our impotence with regard to city life and urban culture.

In our fast moving times there are only two choices: progress or retrogression. There is no such thing as standing still in the atomic age. If we are not able to improve the appearance of our cities, we will have to face their disappearance.

page 8.

A disappearance not of the physical structures nor of the political entities, but of Urbia as a dynamic force in our culture and civilization; of its disappearance as an effective tool for implementing direct communication between people; as a tool for the exchange of ideas and goods; its disappearance as a cradle of human progress in all fields of human endeavor.

There are today those who, because of the deterioration of the appearance of the city, are inclined to believe that its disappearance would be no great loss; who feel that in an era in which indirect human communication by telephone, radio, television has vastly improved, in a time when individual mobility by automobile has become possible, the city is no longer necessary and that decentralization of human settlement in sprawling form all over the countryside is the pattern of the future. There lives in this country a whole generation who, having never experienced the benefits of truly urban life and having never seen a well functioning city - that means one of good appearance - wouldn't shed a tear if all our cities would disappear.

This negative attitude about truly urban qualities is not just restricted to those who are downright hostile to the city but has affected those who try to save it and who are working on plans for its reorganization as well. Their minds have become confused and they are trying to help the city by imitating the sub-city or suburbia; by injecting into the urban body foreign and destructive ideas like low density residential areas, mass transportation by private automobile, and compartmentalization of land uses. Suburban values and urban values mix as poorly as do water and fire. It is exactly this well-meaning but schizophrenic type of planning which may destroy Urbia .

page 9.

Because as a nation we have become wealthier and because this wealth has been spread in a short 60 years from the thousands to the millions, we have as a nation attained many of the characteristics of the nouveau riche, and one of these characteristics is a concentration on egocentrically-motivated raising of the private living standard and; as a side effect, the neglect of the public living standard. This neglect of the public environmental qualities drives us even further into concentrating our efforts on our immediate personal surroundings. In escapist fashion, we are running away from the upsetting dangers and ugliness of the overall environment: the detached house, the private swimming pool, the fenced-in garden, are expressions of this trend. We have taken over from the British, and enthusiastically, the slogan "my home is my castle." we have gone a step further and made it a fortified castle, fortified with curtains to keep out the ugly vistas, with air filters to keep out the spoiled air, with front yards to move us away from the street, and we are trying to cut down all connections with the outside world, relying on the telephone, on radio and television for communication with the outside world.

But here we come in conflict with the nature of man as a gregarious beast and with The economic necessity, at least for most of us, to earn one's living. We are forced to make sorties and forays, and, whenever we do so, we encounter the hostility and dangers, the ugliness, and chaoticism of the overall urban environment, and it goes even further than that: we find out that in some respects our fortifications, whatever we do, are insufficient. Smog robs us of the enjoyment of our garden, and the neglect of our public environment creates catastrophes which our little fortress cannot withstand. Just think of the recent fire, floods, landslides, which we experienced in Los Angeles.

It is inherent in human nature to run away from things unpleasant. Finding that our escape from the city to the suburb was futile, we now are looking hopefully to the stars, and the suburbanization of the moon seems to be our next goal. Most people are worried for fear the Russians will get there first.

However, I happen to have reliable information from a friend of mine who is a space salesman that in fact an expedition of American astronauts has already been on a Faraway planet and has successfully returned to earth. The reason that this historic event has not become public knowledge is that the information brought back by our astronauts is threatening our national economic security and therefore must remain top secret. What i am telling you now is strictly confidential and I rely on your discretion not to relate it to anybody outside of this room.

This is what our astronauts found. There is in existence another planet with a civilization similar to our own but much further advanced. Unfortunately, by the time our astronauts reached the place they found that all life was extinct. From records which were found, it appears that the planet is called "The Star of Motorius"; the outer space beings living on it referred to themselves as "Motorists".

The planet "Motorius" is crisscrossed by ingeniously engineered 36-lane expressways which intersect over cloverleaves 18 stories high. This expressway network covers 92[^] of the planet. The slivers of land remaining between the expressways are utilized for service stations which dispense gasoline and a fuel for the upkeep of the inhabitants, called "Motrocal."

Before the final catastrophe on the star occurred, all the expressways were filled with mechanical vehicles moving slowly from one service station to the other, where each of the vehicles stopped for a short time and where the Motorists gave a short order in their native language which sounded something like "Fill 'er up." This applied not only to the machine but also to the occupants inside. The inhabitants who, due to the population explosion of their mechanical vehicles, had to demolish all of their buildings in order to make space for their highways, finally lived, slept and procreated in their machines. This wonderful civilization was destroyed - as a diary which the astronauts found revealed - when a blow-out in one tire in one automobile occurred; the tire change was rather inefficiently handled and thus, within one hour all traffic on the entire planet stopped.

Death by starvation, of the entire motoristic race, was the sad result. You will understand why this information must remain strictly between us. Any kind of leak of this news might have disastrous effects on the progress of the national freeway program, on the employment situation in Detroit, and on garage construction projects.

This secrecy which is imposed on us is probably unwarranted as we here on earth, being intellectually a highly superior race, of course immediately realize that these space men made space monkeys out of themselves by allowing their machines to become their masters instead of functioning as their servants. They were foolish enough to allow mechanical beings to take over the surface of the entire planet.

From all what I have said before, it follows that the home beautiful or the structure beautiful in the city terrible is an unworkable paradox. But our cities are not only dangerous, ugly, and chaotic, they also fail in providing us with social and cultural inspiration. They have lost their meaning as urban centers. Maybe this was best expressed once by Gertrude Stein, who, visiting Oakland, California, was asked how she liked it there. "there?", she said. "there is no there there."

We, as environmental architects, have dedicated ourselves to the task of reshaping the existing and to the one of creating new human environments better able to serve the purposes for which cities were founded and have existed since historic times: the purpose of promoting the exchange of human ideas and the exchange of goods, promoting freedom of individual expression and providing the greatest attainable amount of choice between solitude and privacy on the one hand, and sociability on the other.

From the consideration of these overall goals develop a few conclusions. First, we should not desire to transform our anarchistic urban pattern into a dictatorial one. Though we believe that order is one of the basic prerequisites for any environmental organism, we do not believe that order alone represents a solution. Take, for example, a look at a large theatre. It must provide order so that people can be seated, aisles and exit doors designed in order to avoid dangers in case of fire. It must have a well-engineered and designed stage with all the necessary equipment, lighting, etc. But all this order would be useless if it is not activated by the creativity of the writers and performers and if an appreciative audience is not assembled to echo the creativity.

To bring about the type of order in the human environment which will not only make possible but encourage, the creative performance of individuals necessitates the endowment of the man-made environment with a framework so designed that the greatest amount of variety and versatility can grow within it without exploding the frame.

We believe it to be impossible to shape such a structural framework of the urban environment without fully understanding and appreciating the three-dimensional expressions which will have to grow within it and out of it in order to give it content and life.

Our insistence that there is a unity of architecture, engineering, and planning is a logical conclusion of this belief. We work in the fields of architectural design, interior design, graphic design, economics and all types of engineering, because we are convinced of the indivisibility of all these activities from each other and from the activity of designing and planning the man-made environment.

We are deadly opposed to specialization because it brings about inbred skills directed toward segments—and know-nothingness about the overall problem.

We are steadily striving through actual work to learn more about the working of environmental elements, about office buildings, apartment houses, churches, museums, shopping centers, small shops, interiors, industrial plants, because our task as environmental architects would be removed from the knowledge of human needs, of economic factors, and would become sterile without this working knowledge.

We grew into the activity of environmental architecture by a process which time-wise and scope-wise follows a logical pattern. Until 1948, we worked nearly exclusively on the designing of stores, shops, and interiors. Between 1949 and 1950 the scope of these projects grew, and the first department store assignments came our way. During the war years, however, when we had little work, we dreamed of greater things. The *Architectural Forum* published in an issue called 194x an article written by us in which we described a new building type to come: the integrated shopping center and in 1950 we got a chance to translate that dream into reality. Northland shopping center in Detroit, still regarded as one of the best, was our first chance to express our notions on environmental architecture. The principles which we on this project evolved still give direction to our work and that of many others. Foremost under the principles expressed on the northland project is the separation of mechanical usage areas (roads and parking lots as well as trucking and service areas) from human activity areas, represented in the pedestrian environment of the courts and malls, the creation of a strong architectural framework and our insistence for allowing within this framework the individual expressions of store fronts meeting the requirements and tastes (even if not so good) of the individual store owners, our insistence on filling the public

environment of the pedestrian environs with life and content. We always were against the slogan of "grass on main street" and we regard the environmental space between buildings as basically urban areas equipped for convenience with colonnades, rest benches, and enriched by planting flowers, and for the first time in projects of this type, with the works of creative artists.

And though Northland was a rousing success! We never looked at the planning of suburban shopping centers as constituting the final aim of our efforts. Northland Was hardly completed when the *Harvard Business Review* published an article of mine in which it was stated that the large suburban regional shopping area was basically a symptom of the urban crisis and not its cure; that it was, however, our hope that the impact of the planned regional shopping center would have a double effect! The one of shocking downtown interests into action and the one of providing us with the experience and methods by which the problems of the downtown core could be solved.

As a direct effect of this article, we were called upon to develop a plan for the revitalization of downtown Fort Worth. This project gave us an opportunity to translate the planning principles of the suburban shopping center into the urban vernacular. This effort, though it did not lead to the implementation of the Fort Worth plan, did lead us as a firm to dozens of large-scale environmental projects and had an acknowledged national and international impact with regard to city planning generally.

Everything we have worked on since then, whether shopping center projects, building groups, plans for new communities, redevelopment plans, downtown revitalization plans, was a process of continuous seeking, learning, and experimenting influenced by our first projects in environmental design! Northland, Southdale, Eastland, Fort Worth.

After 12 years of working as environmental architects, I believe we are in a position to hammer our findings into a philosophical structure — a planning philosophy. Before I try to describe the tenets of this planning philosophy, I would like to ask you to widen your views beyond the consideration of the specific community which you know best, Los Angeles. This is the same request which I always make when I speak to audiences in New York. I personally have the privilege and the problem of living and working in these two most extreme expressions of urban organization, Los Angeles and New York. The contrasts in urban character in living and working patterns are so great that it is sometimes hard to apply the identical term "city" to both of them. Working in dozens of other cities, we realize, of course, that between these two extremes there lie the characteristics of other American cities.

In spite of being personally and immediately exposed to these contrasting patterns, I have found nothing to discourage my belief that basic attitudes about environmental design are applicable to the extreme/and all the variations of the themes which lie between them.

The downward trend of our urban culture is due to two types of sins: sins of commission and sins of omission.

broadly speaking, the sins of commission consist of our actions to separate from each other all those urban elements which, if it is to work, belong in intimate commingling with each other. The sins of omission consist of our neglecting to separate from each other those activities which disturb and destroy one another.

The sins of commission and the sins of omission are causally interrelated. We are separating activities which belong together from each other because our omission to separate those which are disturbing to them makes it impossible to operate otherwise.

Let me attempt to explain this paradox in greater detail. I said that we are committing the sin of separating urban elements from each other which belong together because they depend on each other. We are separating retail areas from residential areas though obviously it is people who buy things. We are separating buildings serving cultural and artistic pursuits from residential and from retail areas though obviously people would visit these institutions more frequently if they weren't far away from their residences and though obviously the success of retail establishments would be enhanced by the shoppers' traffic generated by such institutions.

We are separating working places, that is, office buildings whether they are governmental or private, high quality industrial enterprises, from all formerly mentioned categories, thus forcing long and tedious trips to and from work. We are doing so in spite of the fact that through technological progress most industrial activities have lost those disturbing qualities such as smoke and smell which in the early days of industrialization made this separation necessary.

We are separating government workers from other workers, putting them into ghettos called civic centers where they are removed from the life of the normal citizen, and where they can meet only their own kind. We are doing so in spite of the fact that office work for the government is in character identical with office work for a private corporation, and that by doing so we are creating unnecessary trips for the civic employees as well as for those who have to visit governmental offices.

We are further separating, by careful compartmentalization, the rich from the middle classes, the upper middle class from the lower middle class, and all of them from the economically least successful. By doing so we not only create a highly prejudiced society but we are making it extremely difficult for those with higher incomes to obtain the services of those with lower income, and for those who

render domestic services to reach their places of work.

We are separating theaters and places serving cultural and recreational needs from all other categories and by doing so we are not only isolating them from urban life but also impoverish the general city by extracting facilities from it which give it life and zest.

To illustrate the degree and effect of this craze for compartmentalization, let us look, in contrast, to the older European cities like, for example, Paris. Here, the Opera sits in the middle of a district devoted to retail, to residences and to government buildings. Going to the opera or leaving it, you enjoy window-shopping and you have a choice of visiting hundreds of restaurants and cafes. A few steps from the Opera and you find large department stores and hundreds of specialty stores, from luxury shops to 5 and 10 cent stores. Above the stores and shops are residences of all types: luxury apartments, small apartments, hotel rooms. Dozens of other theaters, office buildings, governmental buildings, are sprinkled all over the urban environment. The President's Palais fronts one of the busiest shopping streets, and I have watched M. de Gaulle's comings and goings from the entrance vestibule of a little millinery store.

The Academy of Fine Arts is surrounded by buildings which contain living quarters on the upper floors, and bistros, cafes and antique shops on the ground floor. Whenever I visited the offices of friends or clients in Paris I found, right around

the corner, a wide selection of places where one could have a cup of coffee or a meal. Around the Church of the Madeleine there is a flower market, apartment houses and, on their ground floor, again, stores of every description including the most mouth-watering delicatessen stores. Some of the buildings contain elegant apartments; others cheap ones. The effect of this intimate intermingling is vibrant urban life, admired by hundreds of thousands of American tourists who cross the ocean at great cost and walk their feet off in order to participate in an urban experience which has become a rarity in our country.

Paris is an old, organically and slowly evolved city. Now that it is exposed to the benefits of twentieth century technological developments like congestion by automobiles, frictions are occurring and newer developments around Paris are beginning to reflect a spirit of separation and compartmentalization similar to that which we find in our own cities. Western Europe, generally, as an effect of its present prosperity, starts to show the effects of the sins of commission which I touched on before.

I say that the sins of omission consist of our neglect to separate those activities which have a destructive influence on human activities. This second type of activities can be classified as utilitarian and mechanical in character. At a time when these utilitarian and mechanical features were less complex than they are today, we managed to remove them from the surface stepwise as urban civilization progressed. It is an earmark of a civilized city to remove its sewage from the gutter and put it underground. Likewise, the moving of telephone wires, electrical wires, water lines, gas mains, is accepted as good

urban policy. Even when the railroad was invented it took us only a comparatively short time to realize that trains on Main Street were an utter nuisance and we removed their rails from sight, hearing and smell. The advent of the airplane found us relatively well prepared and though early airports were close to the city, pretty soon we moved them to the outskirts.

But one technological event has swamped us with such vehemence that we have surrendered urban life and urban values to it without a struggle. That is, the advent of the rubber wheeled vehicle, the private car, the truck, and the trailer, as a means of mass transportation. Their threat to human life and health, as the yearly figures of killed and maimed demonstrate, is as great as that of the exposed sewer. Their disruptive influence on the street pattern is greater than that of the railroad train on Main Street, which at least operated in accordance with a schedule.

The suddenness of the attack by an army of machines which, growing at a faster birth rate than the human population, having now reached a population of over sixty million, may explain in part our failure to act as we

did with regard to other utilitarian functions; but it doesn't excuse us from taking action now if we want to rescue our cities which, because we have neglected the problem, are threatening to go to pieces. And when I say pieces, I mean just that. When I described our sins of commission, I described our tendency towards a piecemeal pattern. The causal connection is obvious. Because we have not been able or willing to separate utilitarian and mechanical functions - and most of all mass transportation by automobile - from our human activity areas, we have had to adjust our human activity areas to "serve" the automobile.

Nobody wants to live, any more, above stores and shops, because nobody can survive the disturbances which the automobile and truck traffic engender.

Working places which have to offer parking space for their workers must move into areas where they can provide such space at a lower cost. So, to an even higher degree, do industrial plants.

Families with children flee the melee of men and machines, into the suburbs, and when they do so in

sufficient numbers they create identical conditions in outlying areas and then flee even further, recreating the problems. People with enough money buy lots of land in the suburbs and exurbs in order to protect their lives, their health and their privacy and thus, depending on the economic status of the citizen, we experience suburban sprawl neatly compartmentalized into subdivisions of varying lot sizes determined by the size of the pay check.

Retail organizations follow their customers, settling either in s trips along suburban highways or in shopping centers. Metropolitan areas spread further and further, eating up landscape and countryside at an alarming rate, until they flow together into an amorphous, disorderly, un-urban conglomeration for which the name Megalopolis has been coined.

With the growing distance from the original urban core, it becomes increasingly difficult and inconvenient to reach it. Surrounded by blight and slum formation it languishes economically and there is a danger that our metropolitan regions will soon resemble gigantic doughnuts .with all the dough on the outside and a hole in the middle

tools for greater concentration and for the defining of dynamic urban areas, and of setting them strictly apart from restful nature.

Before we are able to apply the tenets of our planning philosophy successfully, we will have to rid ourselves from some deeply-ingrown beliefs, misconceptions, and prejudices. Let me just enumerate a few of them. We have to throw overboard the prejudice that high density is in all cases a devil and low density, therefore, in all cases angelic. Where low suburban density is arrived at by placing detached houses with useless wide yards in land-wasting manner on a subdivision, it can be diabolic. High density, on the other hand, is a prerequisite for concentrated activity areas. Our greatest efforts must, therefore, go into the direction inventing and developing methods of multiple land usage by which the highest practical density of the land can be obtained without infringing on the supply of air, light, mobility, and privacy.

We must forget about the idea that it is virtuous to separate human activities from each other and that it is bad, as the conventional planning books state, to "let one encroach on the other." the "encroachment" if properly planned, is exactly what creates urban interest, variety, and dynamism, ease of communication. "encroachment" can be the spice of life. The compartmentalized city is dull, unworkable, unlivable. The filing cabinet principle is not applicable to human life.

We must throw away the old wive's1 tale that a "free choice" must be given everywhere to everybody between using land-wasting private transportation and land-saving public transit. Within highly developed urban areas. This is just like stating that there should be a free choice between making an honest living or stealing from society. Wherever land is in short supply, it is an irreplaceable natural

Resource and misusing this resource is, like stealing, immoral.

I do want to repeat, before closing, what I mentioned in the beginning. I have not attempted to hand you an inflexible program for our professional efforts. What I was after is to establish a basis from which discussion, thought, and development may grow. But on one thing I believe we can agree: planning for the renewal of our languishing cities must emanate from the realization that cities are for people and not vice versa and that, therefore, technology has to serve the people and the city and can never be allowed to tyrannize them.

Settlements which enslave and degrade humanity are: not cities. They are—I wanted to say for the birds, but that would be unfair. Any self-respecting bird would rather become extinct than settle on the land spoiled by the human-made mess.