

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers

Special Collections and University Archives

1-18-1973

"Land Use Planning versus Urban Chaos"

Harvey S. Perloff

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers>



Part of the [Urban, Community and Regional Planning Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Perloff, Harvey S., "Land Use Planning versus Urban Chaos" (1973). *Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers*. 157.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers/157>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Harvey S. Perloff, "Land Use Planning versus Urban Chaos"
Portland State University
January 18, 1973

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives
Oregon Public Speakers Collection
<http://archives.pdx.edu/ds/psu/11419>
Transcribed by Julian Younger, May 22 - June 1, 2020
Audited by Carolee Harrison, July 2020

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives presents these recordings as part of the historical record. They reflect the recollections and opinions of the individual speakers and are not intended to be representative of the views of Portland State University. They may contain language, ideas, or stereotypes that are offensive to others.

DR. GREGORY WOLFE: [recording begins mid-sentence] ...on a subject of vital concern to all of us who pretend to live in and contribute to the development of the urban area humanely, as well as professionally. So I hope you will join with us—not only this evening but throughout the series—in making better, more progressive contributions to our own development, intellectually, politically, and socially, possible.

It now gives me great pleasure, as an institutional representative, and as a person fortunate enough to have known our speaker for some years, to present him to you. Dean Perloff, as you know, is now serving the school of planning and architecture at UCLA. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, and holds a doctorate from Harvard University. The list of distinctions and services that he has performed as planner, economist, and contemporary renaissance man are too numerous for me to really take his time to tell you about. His fields of interest really transcend any of the disciplines in which he is a competent professional. Political science, economics, planning, international affairs have all commanded a portion of his time and enabled him to make profoundly important contributions to scholarship, to practitioner-manship, and to the advancement of human understanding and the enjoyment by many people in many lands at many levels of life, of the fruits of competent, professional performance, of which he is both an example and an advocate.

So, this evening, to speak to us on land use planning, or land use, excuse me, planning versus urban chaos, it is my pleasure to present Dean Harvey Perloff from the University of California at Los Angeles. Dean Perloff.

[applause]

DEAN HARVEY PERLOFF: Dr. Wolfe is a very dear old friend, and only a dear, old friend can do what he just did, which is to give the kind of introduction where you have nowhere to go but down! [laughs] Thank you, Greg, for those very kind words. One gets invited to this sort of affair supposedly as an expert, and if you're not careful, you may get the idea that as an expert, you really have some answers. One of the ways I use to avoid that particular trap is to think of a story, which I love dearly, which is the story of a doctor who received a call one morning from a patient who said to him: "Doctor, I have an arthritic pain in my elbow, I was wondering what I ought to do about it." The doctor said "Well," [quietly] ...is this on? "take an aspirin, and put on a cold pack." Then he said, after that, he said, "Call me tomorrow morning and let me know how you're making out." Well, the next morning, the patient called back to the doctor, and he said "Doctor, I feel very much better, I followed the first part of your advice..." Doctor said, "What do you mean you followed the first part of the advice?" He said, "Well, I did take the aspirin, but my mother told me to put on an ice pack..." I'm sorry, a cold pack, my God! I'm really messing that one up. "My mother told me to put on a hot pad," [laughs] is what I wanted to say. The doctor said to his patient, "That's strange, my mother always says put on an ice pack!" [laughs] That was my way of trying to convince myself as an expert that I ought not to think that I have all the answers.

Well, I've been here at Portland State University for two days. It's my first visit here, and I must say it's a very impressive place to be. I've had a chance to meet with both faculty and students, and the spirit that I've found here is truly delightful, it's very upbeat, very different than the situation I've found at many of the Eastern universities, and it's truly delightful. Very nice, indeed.

Well, today we're going to talk about land use planning. To many people that seems like a way-out subject. I should mention that it's likely to be one of the hottest subjects of the next decade. Those of you who are students are looking for thesis topics: this is a great one. Also, I might give you a hint on this: a lot of foundation money is gonna be attached to this. I've discovered that the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others are ready to support work in land use planning, it's a great field, come on in, the water's fine! [laughs]

Now, the topic I've chosen is "land use planning versus urban chaos," and I'm going to try to explain what I mean by both of those terms. The question I'm asking is, can both of the following be true: Private developers and builders claim that it is ridiculously difficult to get anything built in the United States today. The laws and regulations which impact on urban development are fantastically complex, often contradictory, and unnecessarily rigid. Permission

to build has to be obtained from an endless array of public agencies, and delays are interminable. The various boards and commissions and other agencies from whom permission for building has to be obtained often have contradictory views of what can and cannot be done, and how it can be done. The individual officials who pass on plans often treat similar proposals in quite different ways, so that it is hard to know just what can be done. Many of them simply refuse to recognize the problems involved in development and building, including the great difficulties associated with the rapid increases that have been taking place in the cost of all building elements, including land, labor, building materials, and money. People in public agencies, they claim, often act as if the economic calculus is no concern of theirs, thus posing terrific hurdles for the developer and the builder. "It is a wonder that anything at all gets done," they would say, and it's little wonder the results are as chaotic as they currently are. New laws and regulations are suddenly introduced without any thought to the impact on future development, and without any concern for long-established property interests. In the last few years, this tendency has reached a peak, with the newfound interests in ecology and the environment, so that development is more difficult than ever. The most recent court decisions and legislation, net legislative enactments in fact, may well threaten the whole structure of the construction industry, and urban development in general. This, as I said, is what one might expect to hear from a developer or a builder.

At the very same time, conservationists and many plain citizens claim that the urban development process is essentially controlled by the private builders and developers, who are concerned with their immediate profits, and who give little thought to the general interest. It is next to impossible to get strong land and building control laws on the books, except when people get feeling almost desperate; and when they do get on the books, all too often, execution of the law is blunted by the private builders and developers, so that the basic public objectives of the legislation do not get achieved. "We really do not have any meaningful land use planning and control," they insist. As a result, the central city is permitted to decay, to the point where many sections of the city are being abandoned. The suburbs spread out endlessly, in an inefficient, un-economical, and unattractive way, while the countryside gets despoiled by hit-or-miss development and abuse of our land and water resources, and our very precious natural amenities. "No wonder," they claim, "that the situation is as chaotic as it currently is."

Now, can both of these seemingly contradictory views both be true at the same time? The answer, it seems to me, unfortunately, is that not only can they be, but they actually are. And if that is so, one can truly say, "No wonder things are as chaotic as they are!" It would seem that we're using the poorer features rather than the better features of both the private development system and the public planning and control system. We in the United States have concocted a very unstable and unsatisfactory approach to urban development. Can anything be

done about this unhappy situation? Can improvements be made which would permit us to achieve a sound rate of construction, geared to a satisfactory type of urban development, resulting in satisfactory patterns of urban living?

It seems to me that a good starting point in trying to take hold of this very difficult issue is to appreciate the fact that the developmental planning and control process we are using is fully and totally built into our socio-economic political system; the system through which we carry out our activities. It is not as if something accidentally happened and we went off the track, thus calling merely for a repair job, but rather the present urban chaos is a direct result of a very well-established system; and if this is correct, then clearly no simple solution to the problems of land use is likely to be found. There is no point in looking for some magic formula that will save the day for us. In fact, this is the area par excellence where we should apply what one might call the new wisdom in urban affairs, derived from our unhappy experience with government programs during the 1960s. This new wisdom suggests that if we want some genuine improvements, we really have to know what the problems are. We have to get below the superficial outer form of the problems, and get as deeply as possible into the underlying causes. Also, the new wisdom suggests that if we want to get substantial improvements, we have to be ready to make relatively extensive changes when these are called for, and apply resources adequate for the task we have set for ourselves. Without the willingness to make the needed changes, and apply needed resources, all we can expect is further deterioration and more and more frustration. Another part of the new wisdom is to appreciate the fact that you have to know where you're going in order to get there. Without relatively clear-cut objectives and purposes, nothing very meaningful is likely to happen.

Now, what does all this add up to when we look at the issue of land use planning and control? The first thing to note is we have come to associate some of our fondest and, I might add, fuzziest hopes and dreams with land use planning and control. Nothing short of a pleasant and healthy environment and a happy and satisfactory urban life is to be achieved through land use planning and control, according to the traditional view—a view, which I might add, goes back some 75 years in the United States, to the beginning of the urban planning movement. Look at the preamble of any of our land use planning or control laws, and note how many of the good things of life are to be achieved through the few tools that are provided in such laws. But how serious are these objectives really? Actually, we can look into this one rather precisely. It is not hard to prove that we do those things that we really want very much to have done. Recognizing that when I say “we”, in this case, the “we” can be either the majority of the residents, or the elite powers that be in a community. The important point here is that land use planning and control are neutral tools of government that can be used for any number of ends equally well.

They can serve any master or masters, and as a matter of fact, they do serve different masters at different times and different parts of the United States.

Yogi Berra is reputed to have said, "If people don't want to go to ball games anymore, you can't do anything to stop them." Following this wisdom of the sage of Brooklyn, I might suggest that if people don't want to use the power of land use planning and control, you can't do anything to stop them. When they do want to use this power, and know what they want accomplished, they sure can and do. Thus, because people are concerned about buildings not falling down, and about their safety in fires, they see to it that strong building codes are passed and carried out. In fact, they are willing to put up with quite rigid codes which add to costs and reduce the flexibility of building, because they don't want to take any chances. Or, note the use of exclusionary zoning in suburban communities: an outstanding example of residents really knowing what they want to do, and carrying it through with land use planning and control. But when people are not clear as to what they want accomplished, or when they don't want to use the power, it simply doesn't get used. Or, and this is even a more common occurrence, when the objectives are not clear, or are contradictory, the powers get used to satisfy those who know just what they do want and are willing to pay the price to get it done. Namely, it becomes an excellent tool for special interests.

Of course, this provides an extremely simplified picture of a very complex situation. But, as a relatively simple and abstract model, it does help to suggest what is taking place at the present time. Where purposes and objectives are fuzzy, or contradictory, you have tools lying around up for grabs, ready to be used in the service of those who are interested in using them. Apply this to what you know about the urban planning picture, and make a note of whose interests are being served at the present time in the situations with which you are acquainted. Note also, that vague purposes are just great for those special interests. When we establish as the objective of land use planning and control something as vague as "the improvement of the environment," we are getting ourselves into just this kind of situation. What in the world does that mean? The builder who gets a land right down under urban renewal to remove some poor families and build for upper income families, surely can claim that he is improving the environment. So can the suburban developer who builds on land that has remained empty for years and has been gathering nothing but weeds, even if he builds monotonous and poorly serviced tract developments. So can a handful of wealthy families who have moved into some beautiful lake or mountain area for their second homes. They can certainly claim that keeping out all of the developers is to the interest of a better environment. These illustrations help to make the point that a vague objective like "a better environment" can readily be used in many different ways for many different interests.

Well, maybe we should give up such vague, general concepts, and turn to the more technical concepts that the professional city planners can provide. Let's try a specific example here. One of the most common of the traditional city planning rules suggests that we get a better environment when different uses of land are not mixed together. On first blush, this would seem to be both specific and helpful, but a closer look suggests that all this has been able to accomplish over several decades is to create nice, clean, sterile environments in residential areas, cities which are dead in the evening, people forced to travel great distances from home to work, and communities which provide a fine setting for crime. Also, this has created a situation where those who prefer a highly urban, urbane, and interestingly mixed environment are denied the possibility of choosing that particular way of life. So, let's face it: except in the case of exclusionary zoning, we're hung up on our objectives. We're not at all clear about what we would like to achieve.

And that's not too surprising. Just about everything we do gets done in the land, and we certainly want to do a lot of different things as urbanites. Land use planning and control have somehow to resolve all of the many alternatives and conflicts. But isn't that the job of the planning commission and the planning technicians? No, I would answer, resolution of conflict is a political job par excellence, almost the very meaning of politics. But, you might ask, isn't that exactly what's happening today? We are resolving our land use issues through politics. Isn't that correct? Yes, but it's not an informed or enlightened process, as is, say, the resolution of our national economic issues. In the case of economic issues, by contrast, we find the following: a large amount of agreement on the major objectives; the use of well-established indicators and accounts which can help record costs and benefits, gains and losses, advantages and disadvantages; and in general, a continuing flow of information from the government, from the universities, and from private organization, which does make it a relatively informed and enlightened process.

But if we do accept the idea that sharply focused concepts and broad agreement on these concepts are essential, if urban chaos is to be avoided, is it possible to conceive of widely accepted objectives for land use? What, in other words, are the goal equivalents for land use of the goals that guide economic policies such as full employment, relatively stable prices, and rising national income? Clearly, objectives for land use, as in the case of other basic objectives, have to be evolved through the political process. But if we can define a fruitful approach to the evolution of such objectives, the process of arriving at operational objectives might be speeded up. That is, if we can better understand some of the basic purposes that have already surfaced, we might be able to define the operational equivalents, in the sense that the full employment concept provides an operational goal in the economic realm.

I would suggest, then, that the logical starting point for trying to close in on appropriate objective for land use planning are three very basic goals: first, efficiency in land use; secondly, equity in land use; and third, amenity. Let's test these out and see if we can carry them any distance. What we want is to establish the foundation for reasonably wide areas of agreement, so there is a basis for positive action with clearly understood rules of the game. Let's take the last one first: Amenity. Do we have any substantial area of agreement here? Surely, just about everyone would agree that we should—in fact, we must—conserve the particularly rare and precious natural resources, that is, those resources which, once changed, used differently than their established natural way, are lost forever, as well as the environmentally most vulnerable areas. These are sometimes called areas of critical environmental concern, such as floodplains and wetlands. It would not be an overly difficult task to establish exactly which areas in a state fall into this category. If we had established this principle years ago, and followed it through, surely we would have had a very long and extremely beautiful coastal zone along the Pacific coast—and, I might mention, along most of our river basins—but, of course, there is still time on the basis of the principle “Better late than never.”

In general, a great deal can still be done to identify the most precious of our amenity resources and to preserve them for the future. Can we extend the same principle to open space? Clearly, this is a more ubiquitous resource, and involves more complicated problems. Should we establish open space in every urban community in the form of a green belt, as is so often proposed? What we want is a certain amount of attractive open space, some of it merely for breathing purposes, and other parts for active use. Green belts do provide such space, but they tend to cause prices of land and housing to go up, and with substantial growth, to go up substantially. If that is not a preferred solution, could we then provide what might be called open space equivalents? That is, relating open space to specific urban development, with so much space—a specific amount of space—set aside per thousand persons, but in any logical form the developer proposes.

Here, the Planned Unit Development—what is fondly called by planners the PUDs—come to mind; but it is also evident that such open space can be provided in different forms, and standards can be set so there can be agreement among a number of developers rather than relying on one developer as in the case of most PUDs. In this way, we can achieve the breathing space and play space we want, and adjust it to what we are willing to pay, by establishing standards that relate cost to objectives. A key point in this approach to one of our most critical objectives is that the rules of the game would be relatively clear, and we would achieve what we want while at the same time providing the private developer and builder the flexibility he needs to meet changing physical and economic conditions. This type of approach to amenity resources would fit particularly well the idea of New Town Building and the building of Planned

Unit Developments in outlying areas, but would serve equally well in suburban areas and even in the built-up city, as a standard for redevelopment and rebuilding.

Now, the main point here—and I'm going to keep repeating that—is that you can only expect to get sensible, reasonable development when you have understood the rules of the game, and that's a point I'm going to keep on stressing.

Well, what about the equity objective? This is a really tough issue. Is there any place to start that represents a relatively broad area of agreement, and is at the same time operational? It is well to recognize immediately that we have a long distance to go with regard to this objective, and yet we must also recognize that unless we make some progress here, all our efforts in environmental planning are likely to falter politically and socially. In the past, land use planning and control have been used to no small extent as a weapon against the more disadvantaged part of our population: whether in urban renewal that is actually minority removal, or in exclusionary zoning, or, as is most often the case, in simple benign neglect. Clearly, land use planning and control have to contribute to creating a more equitable situation in our urban life if it is not to be thought of as an exploitive tool.

Interestingly enough, there are some features in the amenity picture I've described earlier, which might be borrowed to fit the equity situation. First, it is necessary to accept the fact that the more disadvantaged—let's say, the families in the lower quarter of the income scale—deserve to have special consideration in land use planning and control in the spirit of creating some form of equalizer. Thus, it makes good sense to picture the economic activities: the plants, the shops, the offices, and so on, that supply jobs and income for the low and moderate income groups as being socially critical resources. That is, as in the case of precious natural resources, where such plants, shops, and offices get special consideration. Following that principle, we would design rules of the land use game which would give such plants and shops high priority in regard to overall access to low and moderate income workers. This could be achieved by rules which permit letting such enterprises have land at written-down cost, close to the transportation hubs most accessible to such workers. Or, the same objective may be achieved by providing for low and moderate income housing close to such economic activities, particularly in the outlying areas where land costs are relatively low to start with. Private builders and developers would surely be happy to supply the needed lower and moderate cost housing near places of work, both in inlying and outlying areas, if the rules of the land use game permit such buildings to be reasonably profitable.

This is not likely to happen, however, until the equity principle is established as one of the most critically important purposes for land use planning. I have suggested, finally, that urban

efficiency can be and should be one of the key objectives underlying our land use planning and control activities. The concern here, it should be noted, is not single plant efficiency: each economic unit is best able to make its own decisions through outgo and income calculations. Rather, what is involved here is the efficiency that comes from an effective combination of the various urban functions. That is, effective in terms of the greatest overall social returns compared to total social costs; a combination of the work function with the housing or residing function, and in turn, with education, recreation, and the other urban functions.

Here, as in the other two cases already discussed, we have to identify the critically important items or relationships that provide a base for clear rules of the land use planning and control game. This calls for a design framework of regional networks—networks of transportation, communication, power, water, and sewers, or what are known as the major regional flow items—which make up the backbone of our urban regional activities. Once these networks are planned for the urban region as the framework for longer-run growth and change, the cellular, the smaller units, the ubiquitous units such as housing and the basic public services, can be tied into the networks in a variety of ways, in fact as many different ways as developers and builders can conceive and still sell or rent their products to the consumers. The main point here is that the backbone of framework has to be established through extensive regional planning of a system analysis type. Such planning would specifically seek to make it possible to have many different kinds of communities tied in with the backbone or framework in as many different ways as there are different patterns of living.

Now, note the common features in what has been suggested here for the various objectives. First, the identification of the critically important assets as the rare and precious amenity resources in one case, or the regional backbone network in the other. Secondly, what is required is the establishment of a set of operational principles which permit maximum scope for the development of communities to fit realistic limits or constraints—that is, economic, physical, political, and social constraints—and at the same time, to permit private builders and developers to reach out for new possibilities that new technology and new ideas provide. There is yet a third feature to what I've suggested: the generation of political support for the land use rules of the game once they have been specified. Thus, the key requirement in the evolving firm rules of the game is to convince the major interests that they will gain on net if there are widely accepted rules of the game.

Now this is exactly what has happened in our economic policy, where business, labor, consumers agree on the basic objectives where we develop the kinds of firm rules of the game which permit us to have a fairly reasonable and sensible political dialogue. I'm clearly not proposing a pat formula; objectives such as the three discussed, particularly in their operational

form, are not declared all at once and certainly not agreed on all at once. They need to be worked on from both the technical standpoint and the political standpoint; the latter, as suggested earlier, to resolve the inevitable built-in conflicts. Rather than a pat formula, what I am suggesting is the basic idea of establishing understandable, identifiable rules of the land use game so that public agencies can carry them through with at least some assurance of general support, and so developers and builders can proceed with some assurance that public purposes are being served while carrying through their activities for private ends. There are other implications of the objectives which have been discussed. These involve the principle that the planning and control units—those political units that carry out the planning and control—have to be appropriate to the objectives involved. This is far from the case today, and we suffer bitterly for this lack.

Let us review again the issues which we have discussed in the proposed overall objectives for land use planning and control, and note what they imply for the appropriate political jurisdictions that should be involved. In the first case, in the case of amenity resources used by urbanites, the requirements are clearly statewide in scope and, in the more detailed view, metropolitan and region-wide in scope. If plans for preserving amenity resources and open space are to be developed and carried through, we need statewide and region-wide planning and control to cope with the issues involved. In the case of the second objective—in the case of the equity objective—there are statewide and regional considerations when we consider the need for low and moderate income housing to accompany economic activities in the outlying areas. By the same token, the problem for the inner city where most of the disadvantaged population lives is clearly a problem for city planning and land use control. Here it is well to note that to date, equity considerations have played a very small role indeed in land use planning and control, and the question as to whether existing city planning mechanisms are adequate to the task is a very real one. We may need a quite different approach to city planning than the one we've had in the past—one which, for instance, can closely relate economic development efforts, manpower training efforts, and the provision of low and moderate income housing, in a new kind of joined planning and action arrangement—which, as you can recognize, is very different from the situation we have today. On the last item discussed, the objective of efficiency, it is evident that the networks to be planned for are in some case regional in scope, and in other cases are statewide, as in the case of water, power, and some forms of transportation. However, a great deal remains to be done by local communities in relating what I've called the cellular, or ubiquitous activities, that is the housing, schooling, shopping, the activities everybody's involved in, to the regional network in an effective manner. This is very different from the more traditional local agency planning and control activities, closely tied to the kind of zoning which has as its objective the prevention of mixed uses, the

maintenance of property values, and, in all too many cases, exclusion of poor and minority families.

Little of what I've said here is really new. What I'm trying to do is to put the familiar into a framework where the tasks ahead might be better understood. At the present time, we are approaching the current ecological or environmental thrust, with all the potential for change in good and bad directions in it, in the same way we did the poverty program and all the other social planning programs in the 1960s. We are still doing everything essentially in an ad-hoc, patchwork fashion. We do not try to clarify our objectives so that we really know what we're trying to get done. We have not undertaken to create appropriate technical and political arenas where the issues involved can be carefully studied, and where conflicting positions can be resolved or reconciled in an enlightened manner, as where strong political support can be generated for specific rules of the game. It is evident, then, that if we cannot learn from the errors of history, we are condemned to repeat them. I sincerely hope that will not be the case in our future approach to land use planning and control. Thank you.

[applause]

WOLFE: Earlier today, Dr. Perloff said he had never been invited anywhere where he had worked any harder than he had at Portland State, and it seems to me that the equitable thing to do, and perhaps the efficient one, too, in this exercise in land use and trying to be humane about it, would be to give him just a moment to rest before he faces a panel of experts who will be reacting to his remarks, before you get your chance at him. Of course, if you like what the reactors say you'll call them reactors, and if you don't then you'll call them reactionaries. In any case, to preside over this part of the program and to help get more deeply into those aspects the reactors want to examine—and perhaps you will too—I'd like to present to you Dr. Lyndon Musolf, director of the university's Urban Studies Center; and because it's so rare that the president can give a colleague on the faculty standing room audience only, I'd like to give you, in terms of equity, efficiency, and humaneness, a chance to stand as you greet Dr. Musolf. Dr. Musolf, would you like to stand for us? [laughs]

[applause]

DR. LYNDON MUSOLF: I wish to thank Dean Perloff for getting our series off to such a great start. We think it's going to be a good one, we hope that you all will not only bring others, we can always get more chairs. We have a very good panel tonight, who will react briefly to Dean Perloff, but we've changed the format for the evening somewhat in order to give you a better opportunity to ask your own questions. We decided that the chief attraction was Dean Perloff,

and therefore instead of breaking into workshop sessions after the reactor panel has finished, we thought we'd open it up to questions from the floor and stay in general session, and you can ask either the reactor panels or Dean Perloff whatever you wish. Because we want to get to that part of the program, I am asking the panel members to hold their remarks to five minutes, which I know is always difficult when you have a captive audience, and I'll try to do my part and hold the introductions to a very few brief remarks, if they don't mind. That way we can hear these reactions and you can be thinking about what your questions are.

I'd like to start with the far end of the table and just move along, I think it's the most fair way to go. Professor Judah Bierman is there for our first panel member. He objected to being first because he is not familiar with the technical aspects of this field, and I reminded him that we're emphasizing the humanist aspects. Jud is also the head of our University Scholars program and a professor of English, and interested in many areas. Jud.

JUDAH BIERMAN: Thank you, Lyn. My test in starting out is to provide a model by being even briefer than five minutes, and to serve the function of leading off, is to provide a short summary of what the speaker thought he was saying. Seems to me Dean Perloff began by describing the chaos that results now when we use the poorer features of both private development and public planning and control dominating the decision making process. He seems to argue that this chaos is the result of the system and not a result of malfunctioning, and the solution, if that's the term, begins by recognizing that we have to identify problems, understand a need for continuing change, learn to know what a goal is, and how to choose our own. And on the way to outlining three very attractive critical goal areas—amenity, equity, efficiency—Dean Perloff notes, almost parenthetically but not quite, that land use planning and control are the neutral tools of government: they can serve any master here or there. In fact, now are serving masters here, there, and everywhere at different times and places; anyone who wants to pick them up can use them. It's that, I want to come back to that. In the rest of the paper, Dean Perloff, seems to me, very properly urges us to clarify our objectives, find the kinds of tools, operate the kind of decision process, to reach them. We have to work out a kind of political rule game so that we can sort out the objectives, and all the players will then realize that everyone will get the best share if we all play by the rules of the game. Now, it's planning that seems to be the special way in which we play this game; it's sort of at the center of the ground rules. Now I would agree that planning is better than no planning, characterized by the fact that the biggest mouths gobble up the biggest pies.

The question I think I want to raise out of my own study is whether or not an effective ad-hoc pattern, which he decries so strongly, and not very righteously, is not really our only approach, perhaps the thing that we can do best. I suspect that planning may well end up a desperate,

more than an enlightened, tool. We may not be able in our own society to do anything, except at the last moment. The alternative that we are now worshipping, long-range planning, may end up to be the worst of all possible worlds. All of human intelligence, or the best part of human intelligence, marshalled towards a goal which I think everything in history tells us will be outmoded and a prison for us by the time we get to work out the details by which we can impose it on the rest of the people that we've sworn to accept. After all, the world does change as it revolves. A half of me is quite convinced that we have to find some kind of working formula of the kind Dean Perloff suggests; his is probably better than any other we can find. Certainly it envisages a more humane use of what space is left, but I would like to add one, and conclude with, one small humanist caution: planning is now become the familiar god, especially in the mouths of the intellectual advisors to the king, whether he's the guy being crowned this week or the beast that is called a democratic society. It's a neutral servant, it serves them all, and I'd like to suggest that we have to be as beware of worshipping familiar gods as we are warned against worshipping strange gods.

[applause]

MUSOLF: Very good for a non-technician. [laughter] I should tell you that we had Dean Perloff scheduled so tightly today that it's a real tribute to his vitality that he's still with us, and I want to thank him again for the time he's taken to meet with our students, our faculty, with the news people, to tape a program, and a whole series of things. The second panel member, it's very difficult for me to hold this introduction down but I'll make every effort, because he's a long-time friend and someone I think very highly of. Mr. Clifford Campbell, I'm just going to introduce as an educator, a planner, and a long-time troubleshooter for the Ford Foundation, and a real gentleman. Cliff.

CLIFFORD CAMPBELL: Thank you, Dr. Musolf, our speaker, Dr. Perloff, members of the reactives panel, ladies and gentlemen. First, I would like to say that I think that the dean presented to us this evening a very excellent paper that was very tightly drawn and set forth the key issues that those of us interested in planning would expect to hear. I have read the paper several times now, and in reading it for the first time I was looking through my window at the Sheraton Hotel, where there was meeting a group of social planners dealing with some of the critical problems that they see drawing to a head in the Pacific Northwest. The subject of that [...] meeting centers around these few words: "And then came revenue, and then came revenue." And I wonder, as I continue to leaf through Dr. Perloff's excellent presentation, why the gap continues to remain between what social planners are thinking and doing, and that which we expect of physical planners because of history. Fortunately, our speaker wears two hats: he is schooled and disciplined in the physical planning area, but he also has a feel, a knowledge and

understanding of the importance of the role of social planning in the total planning process. I am sure that the subjects that are being presented here tonight, the discussions and the like, would find a common thread with what's going on at Sheraton Inn. I am of the opinion that planning is too important a subject to be left to the panels alone. I think the educators said this a few years ago—they haven't gotten around yet to making it work—and Dr. Perloff sets up certain examples that he would like to suggest we use in developing a model; oh, what a word. But, you know, the big question comes: where do you start, and with what do you start? He cites the importance of developing the concept for regional planning. No one would quarrel with this; in fact we would support it. The interesting thing is that throughout his presentation he made one reference, only one reference, to metropolitan, and you didn't use the word planning. He's right up to date on what is taking place in the planning world. He brought us round to appreciate, I think, and accept, perhaps, the importance of the regional concept being developed in the years that lie ahead as one of the best means of employing new techniques associated with the comprehensive planning process for the region.

And he points to the city planning role, and certainly in Portland we appreciate that. He points to the importance of the Department of City Planning, or the Commission of City Planning, as being fundamental if change is to take place that will affect the have-nots, the people who live on the outer fringe of economic security. I'm sure we would agree that the tools presently available to us will not do the job. I am pleased that the social programs of the 60s tested rather thoroughly and effectively. The thesis that if people are given a chance to participate in the planning process, that they will be able to make a contribution—a lasting contribution, hopefully—and that they will be able to move from those issues affecting them in education, jobs, and the like, and get into the comprehensive planning that will bring about change in the complicated and overcrowded city. Yes, I think it was a good paper. I think we have a lot to chew upon and to interpret. It was good to be here.

[applause]

MUSOLF: Thank you, Cliff. Our next member of the panel is Mr. Neil Kelly, who is a builder and developer who I know best as a specialist in making a real effort in the redevelopment of homes in, pretty much, the deprived parts of the city; and he's done a good job of it, and done it so well that he's provided good housing for people who couldn't otherwise afford it. When some of our better builders do this, I think we ought to recognize them. I want to hear what he has to say. Neil.

NEIL KELLY: Thank you, Lyn. Dr. Perloff, panel members, ladies and gentlemen. Is a humane view possible? I think it is when a slum landlord is invited up to talk to a group like this.

[laughter and applause] All slum landlords have to get a start somewhere. I really haven't minded being a slum landlord because I always told my kids that a slum landlord was somebody who was inspired by the Lord to clean the slum off the land. I really started out—you have to have some kind of a background and I'll tell you a little bit of that, because you have to have a few dollars to start out to be a slum landlord—and I started out as a remodelling contractor. After I got a few dollars, I bought a house, an old house, and eventually I ended up over in the north end of town in the Albina area, and I could buy a house for less over there, so I thought this must be a pretty good deal. So I bought some houses in the north end, and my only experience was—this was a way back, I think I bought the first one over there about 12 years ago, and before they had any programs or any Model Cities or Portland Development [Commission] or anything—but I had the experience of, and probably a different experience than other people have, most people buy houses in an area like that and buy them for less are maybe retired people that want to get an investment to finish out their years, get a little income, but I bought it and being that I knew how to fix it up, I fixed it up. Most of the houses, some I didn't fix up, but most of them I fixed up and fixed up pretty good because I didn't know any better [laughter], but I [...] put in a good bathroom and a good kitchen, and insulated, and do things that you can't even see, and move people in there, and it changes their whole way of life. You really, you just have to live with it to experience it.

Then I lived through the 60s, and I really got a little bit turned off of planning, because the people that had gone through this, some of the planning has worked out good. I think probably the Portland Development Albina rehab has been a good thing, I think probably the Housing Authority has worked good, and my experience has been good with them, the houses that they've rented and subsidised to people, but much of the planning, I felt, was very poor. They had planners probably figuring something out for the slums in New York or Los Angeles or Pittsburgh or someplace that didn't have anything to do with our small area, or it didn't have anything to do with our contractors in Portland. And, I think sometimes as planning gets way out of hand, probably it could get back to the local, possibly even the contractor or somebody that's, some businessman that could keep the cost down in the long run. And I have an idea that you could take an area, for instance like Albina or the Model Cities area, and you need an overall plan, you need somebody to tie the whole thing together, but if you could get a developer in there, say like a farm, for instance, and he'd have that area, and I think that if you gave him maybe a subsidised financing of say, prime rate, 100% financing, he could go in and develop that area, and the other thing you'd have to have, of course, is good city codes that were enforced, and not only city codes for cleaning up the inside of the house and putting in light plugs and one thing and another, but also something that would take care of your neighborhood and keep the old cars off the street, I think you could change a lot; and one man I believe could do this by setting up a pattern that other contractors could follow, I think we

could get away from a lot of this high cost; of course you have to have, besides the local government participation, you have to have the mortgage people, and I think the local government can help the mortgage people get interested in this, particularly if you're 100% financing, and I think another thing that the taxes would have to be frozen after you rehab the house, probably, for five years, I think there's some bills coming up in legislature like that now, and probably I think that the thing that would really be the clincher if the developer would sign on the mortgage, and this would be a guarantee that he wasn't just fixing up a bunch of houses and kind of taking the cream off the top. If he had enough financial stability and the courage to go on with this, he would win with getting a penny going in and getting a dollar coming out, because somebody like I am that have houses in that area, it would appreciate the houses if we could develop the whole area. Now, there's practically no appreciation there, it's probably at a standstill. For a long time it was going down and down and down, but now it's at a standstill, but if the area could be developed and lifted up, the houses that are there now would start appreciating with the rate of the rest of the houses around town. I think that there is a new wisdom, maybe, and maybe the new wisdom will be tied in with private business to hold it. Thank you.

[applause]

MUSOLF: Thank you, Neil. Next panel member is Professor Carolin Keutzer, from the University of Oregon, from where she also has her Ph.D. She's in the department of psychology there, and perhaps I can best characterize her by saying that she is a humanist despite also being a psychologist [laughter]. Carolin.

CAROLIN KEUTZER: Only in moments of very high fever do I think I understand the complexity of the problems we're talking about. I have to be completely delusional to think I have any solutions. But I've tried very hard to digest what Dean Perloff has said, I've read the paper a couple of times, and there are two things I understand that I agree with very strongly. One is that we have to begin to take a systems analysis viewpoint of any kind of problem, urban crisis or any other. And secondly, that we have to have some kind of redefinition of the problem and perhaps bolder dreams and broader perspectives if we're ever going to have any kind of unifying vision to bring us together.

The part that I'm most confused about, and I'm sure it's not you but me, is where you stand, Dean Perloff, in relationship to a notorious figure in my field, a person now I think in the public domain rather in the field of psychology, and that's B.F. Skinner, who has written a book recently that has incited riots across the country, a book entitled "Beyond Freedom and Dignity." I think the original title of this whole series was something like "Freedom with

Dignity,” and I thought perhaps that we were gonna have a chance to collectively attack Skinner, but I see not [laughs]. But Skinner has a rather modest proposal [hesitates, audience laughter], which states that we have all had an illusion, or perhaps a delusion, that man is autonomous, and that man has any kind of freedom or free will or dignity of any kind. And he’s saying that the time has come to abandon this destructive kind of viewpoint of man. Skinner is also saying that we are in agreement, and I think he’s right here, that we must do something to bring about three broad goals for mankind in general: we have to have enough food for everybody to eat; we have to wipe out nuclear catastrophe, certainly; and we want a cleaner environment. And those three goals sound very plausible and something we can agree on. They very much strike me as the kind of goals Dean Perloff presented as something we could agree on: his efficiency and equity and preservation of amenity resources.

The problem for me comes not in defining the goals, because I think we can agree with Dean Perloff and with Skinner, the problem for me comes with what is the second step? How do we go about implementing these goals? Now, Skinner would say, since we have no free will, since we have no creativity, originality, or any resources to act in a constructive way, that we have to have behavioral technologists and managers to decide for us and to bring about conditioning procedures to make us want what we should want. And I am wondering what Dean Perloff would propose as a way of bringing about our desire to obtain these goals for a nice, urban environment. So, I guess I will leave with that question; perhaps he will have time to clarify his standpoint on this.

[applause]

MUSOLF: Our final panelist really needs very little introduction, because she ran such a whirlwind campaign for the legislature that everyone got to know her. I first knew her back in the ‘48 campaign, and I’ve been watching her progress politically and in other areas since then; she really has taken this community by storm and I understand she’s now taking the state legislature by storm. In one sense, she’s representative of our new legislature, which is young, and for a change democratically controlled, and Vera Katz is one of Portland’s best representatives there. Vera.

[applause]

VERA KATZ: During the entire campaign, I never considered myself to be political or a politician, but in this crowd tonight [laughs] somehow I feel very political. I’m going to admit something that I’ve never admitted to a public group: that four or five years ago, when we had the ecological mania around us, my gut reaction was “Crap, that’s a middle class copout.” We

haven't solved the problems of poverty, we haven't solved the problems of racism, we haven't solved the problems of hunger, housing, health, or war, and now we've latched on to another problem, a problem of clean air, clean water. And my question was then, you know, poor people don't really give a damn how dirty the water or the air is when they don't know where the next meal comes from. And they're the ones, that when we talk about land use and planning, they're the ones that in the majority of the cases become the victims of urban renewal. They get moved out of the environment that they know and feel comfortable, displaced into an entirely new environment, and still face the same problems of poverty, racism, hunger, housing, and health; and somebody else, now, has a nice, little community that's been well planned. South Auditorium, for example, where business and industry have nice, physical structures built for them, and where the three towers, or now the four towers—I think it's the fifth tower coming up—is not for the poor people that's been displaced, but for the middle and upper class. [applause]

And now I'm in Salem, and one of my committees is [laughing] environment and land use planning. No. It is a problem. I'm concerned about it, but I never was quite as concerned about that as I was about the others that I mentioned, and I think will commit myself and my time to those problems I mentioned that have not been solved and are with us for many generations; but I have some questions, I have some questions that we're gonna be facing in the '73 legislature. Who sets the rules? Who enforces the rules? We've got the state making some demands upon critical areas, critical activities. We've got regional government that's going to make some decisions as far as the regions in this state. We've got local government, cities, counties, that are not going to sit quietly while the CRAG or the COGs or the state planning groups make decisions, and now we have something else, we have neighborhood groups. DPOs, district planning organizations, neighborhood planning organizations, neighborhood associations, cropping all over the cities, at least in Portland. They want a piece of the action. In addition to that, we have agencies that all have to approve a plan. We've got the water resources board, we've got the Port of Portland that makes approvals, we've got the Oregon Highway Commission, TriMet, CRAG, and you know we can go on forever, and you've got layers of bureaucracy one on top of the other, and I'm afraid may mean a lot more delays and a lot costlier to the contractors and the developers, and I'm not quite sure that's the answer; though I'm sympathetic to the need, I'm not sure that it's the answer.

You mentioned another point in your paper, that we're going to need generations of political support for the rules, so that the rules cannot change; and yet, I've been down in Salem for two weeks, and we've got seed growers coming in, threatening that in 1975 they're going to come in and ask for an extension 'til 1979 for the field burning ban. We had a bill that we heard today that requested that scenic rivers designation be made by the legislature instead of the

governor; and we have a bottle bill that was passed in the '71 session, the first one in the country, and we're gonna get pressure—pressure is beginning to build, it's a little early—to repeal our bottle bill. And so I am very pessimistic [laughs] about setting rules without changing them from one political season to another, and if the Democrats control, we might keep the rules the same. If we don't, we might lose them.

I have another concern about change, and the need to focus on a problem before change can occur, but the question is: whose problem is it? Is it our problem that the coast is being, as... what is it, Governor McCall called it "Coastal Condomania" destroyed, or the Willamette Valley being eaten up. Whose problem is it? You talk to the people on the coast and they say they need highways, they need the condominiums, and they need industry. Out in the valley, or out in Washington County, you've got developers who've purchased land, who farm on it part time, who are speculators, and here we are in the city making demands of those people who actually live in the area that you want change, and that's conflict. It presents a conflict, it's a political conflict, and when you have political conflicts you try to resolve it, and when you resolve it you've got compromise, and when you've got compromise, usually you don't have a very strong plan. And that's another concern that I have.

And finally, I only say that if you're really interested in land use planning, we have a bill that's been introduced by Senator Hallock, Senator from the West side, with Senator Gordon... I'm sorry, Hector Macpherson from the valley, House Bill... Senate Bill 100. It's being heard now, and when I left Salem at 5:30 they were still reading the sections they started at three o'clock. If you're interested, now is the time to come down; it might get dumped on in the Senate, because of the political realities. Many of the people sitting in the Senate come from coastal areas and are concerned about urban concern for coastal planning and agricultural planning, and if it gets dumped on it's going to come into the House, and we need your support. Come down, listen, testify, and participate in the political process. Thank you.

[applause]

MUSOLF: Thank you, Vera. We were supposed to have a floor mic out there by now, I don't see it yet... And, as if by magic, it appears. There are some people here who are in classes who are disappearing, and others need to go, but I hope you will—as many as possible of you—will stay and raise questions. Are the mics working over there? [to somebody offstage] Are those mics working? Yes. [voice off mic: Trust me. I think so.] [to audience] So, you have not only Dean Perloff, but the entire panel of which... of whom you can ask, raise questions, and I know Dean Perloff will want to say a little more in summary a little later, but he feels, too, that we ought to

give you people, the audience, a chance right now. So, who's first? Go ahead, come right up to the mic.

SPEAKER: Ladies and gentlemen, dear panelists, my name is Chester Young. So, you want us to ask [...] a few questions, come in here, and try to answer you. My English is speaking very poor, because I only here a few years in English school. So therefore, my problem is called urban renewal. To my self, what I call them, sounds wonderful things for the paper. To me, to call them Robin Hood: rob the poor, give the rich. What it mean it? I can pull the meaning by this speech by the Portland Development urban renewal. What it mean, Portland urban renewal, they try to cheat the people. I only want to live in the urban area. That's the first opportunity I come up to speak to all of you. Therefore I speak, try to all of you because only, the reason, I impress. How impress are you? Lot of person don't know. Because only, I know what I know. Only I know, let me say what they call urban renewal is prison association. Lot of [...] been go to the court. What the court say, now listen: your house too old, you only cannot love the bargain value, you just only here to buy four thousand dollar with your house, that's it, if you move. Then they say, "Oh, we need more room for more job for more people." Do I see more job for more people? No, sir. They are only here about two bulldozer, here four people go bulldozing with their bulldozer a nice house, they bulldoze it down. What you call it? That's what they call urban renewal so far. [applause] So, if you come and tell me how it's a problem, I sooner later within about a month, may now be in court. When I'm in court, I say you moved me with dignity. I hear the dignity, I fight for Second World War with this United States with the battle and the Germans. So, therefore, what I fight for this country, what we believe and feel, I buy the house, what I stand, what I live in. But you rich people, talk about sitting here, saying "Now we need the land, we want to build a better house!" Who believe it? Only for the rich people live there. [raising voice] But where the poor people can go? What we live in? "Oh, you can build a place for you, sit down here, garbage dump." [audience laughter, applause, cheering] Everybody knows what I talk about now!

MUSOLF: [clears throat] You have a question, sir?

SPEAKER: Yeah, I have a question. There's the question, to: what kind of urban renewal [...] Do you like to answer that?

MUSOLF: Does anyone here care to defend the Portland Development Commission? [laughter] I think we have sympathy for what you're saying, you're...

SPEAKER: Sounds wonderful!

MUSOLF: I'm not sure that anyone here wishes to, uh...

SPEAKER: I understand that, my name [...] Ho Chi Minh, they tell me. [laughter]

MUSOLF: Does anyone wish to respond to whatever the question was?

SPEAKER: The question is: Do the urban renewal is good for the people or bad for the people? My question is.

MUSOLF: Well, I think urban renewal is mentioned by several of the speakers, including the main speaker, and I think each of them pointed out the great difficulties that we've had with it. Despite some, perhaps, beautiful new sections of the city, when you look at what's happened to those who've lived in those sections in the past, it's a very sad story. And, it's perhaps one of the things that the approach and system that Dean Perloff is talking about might remedy. Can we have some more questions from the floor before some of the panel members may wish to ask further questions? Mr. [Jacques] Brown.

BROWN: Can you hear me? Or shall I... well, this will work. I thought something in your speech, Dr. Perloff... you were about to quote Jane Jacobs, one of my favorites, but you didn't do it, and I almost thought one of your goals was going to be diversity. And I just recently returned from New York, and out here New York is regarded with... we can't imagine a more terrible place, and when I got there I was prepared for the worst, but I liked it very much. And when I left, I... [laughs] I had the feeling that it was totally out of control, but the reason it was so vital was because it was, and... I can say that with impunity because I don't have to drink their water, but I uttered a little prayer that maybe they wouldn't ever get it under control. I wonder if in the future, if you see any way of revitalizing sort of, well, the diversity and the market, and so forth, in cities that that's been kinda beaten down by planning. Do you have any ideas about that, do you think it's possible?

PERLOFF: That's almost a whole new subject, we'd need a whole evening for it. You may have come across a proposal of mine, it should become part of the federal law, actually, for new towns in town. Very much at the heart of the proposal for new towns in town is a community which is very vital, very urban, very mixed, very diverse. Now, creating those cautiously, with good features, while you retain diversity... I think we've been so desperate, worried about slums and dirt and all the other middle class hangups, that we're willing to pay a very high price just to get rid of them. That's a negative approach to it. My feeling is, and I think you expressed it in the form of your question, that sound planning is really planning for excitement and diversity, and you know, all the other good things. So, if you're asking me personally how I feel

about it, I think it's almost the opposite of planning to have the kind of urban renewal that we've had a lot of, the kind of public housing we've had, almost everything else we've done. I like to point out that one of our basic problems is that we did so well for several hundred years during the agricultural era that we hate to give up, and here 75% of the people in the United States are living in urban communities. Everybody's fond hope seems to be to live in a rural setting. Some of you might have come across a recent Gallup poll, which pointed out that people across the whole United States, asked what they prefer most, the overwhelming majority said they prefer to live in suburbs, or a small town, or villages, and only 13% of the people in the United States said they'd prefer to live in cities. See now, that's quite a problem for an urban nation. [laughs] Until we're willing to recognize we're an urban nation, and plan, you know, for urban people, we're going to have the kind of idiocy we've had for a long time. So, I couldn't agree with you more.

[voice off-mic] Anyone else?

SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, Dean Perloff, members of the panel, my name's Dave English, and I'm a member of the Portland Citizens' Ad-Hoc Planning Committee. And I want to thank Professor Bierman when he used that word, ad-hoc. We feel that planning is too important to be left to experts and so-called experts. Myself, I live in a community here in Portland called Irvington, and I might bring this into context with Mr. Campbell. If you're from Detroit, it's something like Indian Village, and with Dean Perloff, if you know the San Francisco/Oakland area, it's something like Piedmont. It's an area of large homes encroached by an area of high density single family dwellings. In other words, the community there that started the single family dwelling feature has been encroached on. It was deteriorating, the citizens grouped themselves, formed a citizens' planning—or rather a neighborhood association—sought the aid of Model Cities, and have re-zoned streets and gained low-cost loans. It's also, as I understand it, I'm only... I'm new to Portland, I've only been here two years. I understand Irvington is the only area in the city which has re-zoned commercial areas back to single family dwelling areas. We have a little problem. Some of the residents of Irvington...

MUSOLF: You have a question, sir?

SPEAKER: Yes, and I'll get to it in a minute, if you'll bear with me. The question I have is... the experts of Model Cities in Portland, and the experts of the staff members of the Portland Planning Commission have concluded that halfway houses and similar uses are dependent on residential neighborhood location in which to effectively carry out their program, and that these facilities need not have any negative effect on the neighborhood. Now, I didn't have a chance to hear Dean Perloff's paper, I read the account in the newspaper; but it's my

understanding that zoning of residential areas is the keystone to vitalization of a city and revitalization of a city. And I'd like to have the Dean and members of the panel comment on whether or not they feel that... I'll give you a little more specific institution, one that I know; it's 23 heroin addicts and convicts in my block. And I'd like to have your thoughts on whether you think that's going to aid the residential character of that neighborhood, or whether it's gonna detract and offset this vitalization of the city, because folks are talking about rushing to the suburbs as fast as you can imagine. Thank you.

PERLOFF: I'll let one of the local people answer that one.

MUSOLF: Vera, you're in.

[laughter and applause]

KATZ: [laughing] I always thought it would be safer to know where 30 drug addicts are, and where they're located, than to roam around the street not knowing where they're going to come from. [laughter] I sat at a commission hearing... it wasn't a commission hearing, it was a land use planning conference, and somebody asked—it was a Portland planning commissioner asked, "Please raise hands if you would not mind having a halfway house in your neighborhood." And in that room, 99% of the people raised their hands. I think the problem, though, that other neighborhoods are seeing, as Irvington, is that they're complaining that most of the halfway houses are located in the Northeast or in the Southeast section. And until we have some halfway houses in the Southwest and in Dunthorpe, you know, I can understand the rationale for the complaints, but only on that basis. Not on the fact that there are ex-drug addicts or young juveniles in trouble with the law living in the community. I have no sympathy for that argument.

[applause]

[audio cuts out and resumes erratically; audio quality after this point is poor and often indistinct]

MUSOLF: Let's give someone else a chance out here.

SPEAKER: Sure. If you'll excuse me, I'll wait for a planning or a zoning [...] to comment on my questions because I know what our legislature...

MUSOLF: Neil?

SPEAKER: I have a question concerning a landlord and the problems of state taxation on property. If a property owner's valuation goes down, doesn't the tax go down? Why should he improve his property, paint it and making sure it's free of rats and things like that if it's only going to increase his taxes?

MUSOLF: Well I think that they're talking about getting a bill in the State's legislature, [...] now that would hold the taxes, a moratorium on the property taxes, if you bought a house, for instance, for five thousand dollars and spent ten thousand dollars remodeling it, that they'd hold the original tax evaluation for five years. This is particularly [...] sold or rented or leased to low income [...]

KATZ: Or a tax credit for repairs, so that you can deduct x amount of dollars per year for repairs on your homes. You would not be penalized for making the repairs. There's another concept: tax the land rather than the real property, therefore you would not be hurt by repairing your real property. There's some inherent problems in that concept of taxation, but people are beginning to talk about it and expressing that idea.

MUSOLF: Back to Henry George, eh?

SPEAKER: [...] to think that in Dean's remarks, he mentioned the need to develop institutions that can resolve conflict, and then spoke of the need for some of these kinds of institutions in the region, and also of course the institutions of the cities and the counties. I wonder if he would comment on the kind of institution that he visualizes as needed at the region to resolve regional conflicts and to resolve conflicts between the more local area and the region.

PANELIST: We should add, Dean Perloff, that the questioner is also the assistant executive director of the local COG.

[laugh]

PERLOFF: The problem with trying to solve anything by way of playing around with institutions is that you really can make institutions do almost anything you want to. It's a bit circular, you've got to have the will to achieve a certain end before the institution is going to do it. I could see regional agencies set up all over the country within the next few years, getting very little more done than has been done in the past. The reason is that, as logic tells you, that unless you want to make them work, they just won't work. I was very struck by the situation in Toronto, which is very close to home, in a sense, people with a similar background to those in the United States.

For reasons I don't fully understand, I wish I did, they decided to take hold of some of their urban problems, and those of you who've been to Toronto know that they've done a pretty decent job. While they were doing this, they set out to build a metropolitan organization, and it kinda works. In other places, where the metropolitan organization was built, but there wasn't that kind of drive to really take hold of their urban problems, it didn't work. So that it seems to me there is an answer to the question. I think it matters relatively little just what form it is, it's the... more important part of it is that it is part of the total set of instrumentalities, what you call the systems analysis that I was trying to stress. It's got to be part of a whole system, which is going to make it work. I think we're going to be very frustrated in the next few years, as I said, I want to stress this: if we put our hopes merely in setting up a new kind of organization without the rest of it. And yet I'm very much for it.

SPEAKER: Do any of the rest of you care to comment on that question? Cliff?

CAMPBELL: As you talked, I was reminded of a recent experience in New York City, where I had an opportunity to observe a messenger service, employees of which were rehabilitated addicts, and they were located on the Lower East Side of New York, and they carried fur coats, bonds, stocks and bonds, valuable articles they picked up in one place and delivered to another. This was being handled by the [...] people in the city of New York. The system manager of this service was, or is, a rehabilitated addict, and he was receiving ten thousand dollars a year to operate this business. And they had very few rehabilitated people to go outside of the cold. And they made a point of this when we were looking over the operation. So I think it behooves all of us to keep an open mind on what the result will be. Certainly no operation is going to bat one hundred percent, but it is also true that based upon the limited evidence available to us that these kinds of programs are paying off.

PANELIST: Do we have any further questions? We have a last question, go ahead.

SPEAKER: I'm Jerry Burrell, an architect. I'd like to first compliment Dean Perloff on a well-prepared speech. I have, also, a high regard for the panel. In my opinion, it's a very good panel, and the diversity is refreshing. And therefore, I would like to ask the panel to comment, if possible, individually, on two points. Everyone that had been to Europe would comment on the lack of slums, as we know our cities are plagued with. Secondly, the majority of the cities in Europe have density far greater than ours, and it also works very well for their transportation, as well as for distribution of amenities. Now, why the diversity in our country? Why we are striving for the opposite and still not achieving it?

[laughter]

PANELIST: You understand the question?

KEUTZER: I was reading something very interesting today, there was something about... there's distinct cultural differences in the amount of density that can be tolerated, and in Hong Kong, builders allow something like 36 square feet per person. And someone was asking, "What would you do if you had more space than that to allot each person?" And they said, "Gee, I don't know, they would probably sublet." [laughter]

PANELIST: We have another question.

SPEAKER: This is something that's occurred to me already, I noticed... I don't know if anyone up there has had any anthropological training, but there's a book written called "Slums Are For People," and it's about some of the slums that exist in Manila. And they've tried several programs, none of them very well planned, to help those people move out, and they found that people kept moving back in. Sometimes they just destroyed them, sometimes they'd build other housing, and one of the things that was lacking in all of that planning was, what did those people want? The Congresswoman there is talking about participation, and I'd like to know, because I see that as the key, I don't think, generally, American cultural habits don't lead people to participate, and so you get individual people coming up here to ask questions: "Why is urban renewal doing this to me?" You have all these people coming up individually and complaining, but as yet, the cultural habit hasn't come around yet to saying people have to form groups on their own, and should be encouraged by the government to form groups on their own, to solve their own problems. You might be lucky enough to have a man like Mr. Neil, who can have a little capital and do his own thing, but most people aren't in that position. I'd like to know, is an awareness coming about, perhaps more so in the state of Oregon, but is it coming about where people are being encouraged to form their own groups and start making suggestions? And when they are doing that, they shouldn't be encouraged to do it quickly, because efficiency is one of the last things you want when you're trying to resolve a conflict. You don't want an answer, you want a right resolution to the conflict.

PANELIST: I think that's a good question.

KATZ: Yeah, I really think that there is a movement on. And I can't speak for any other place except Portland, but I really sincerely believe that there is a commitment by our new city council, especially our new mayor, to start developing neighborhood associations, and they've cropped up on their own, even before the new administration; they've cropped out on their own because they had to resolve conflict. They were forced either by urban renewal or by

freeways to pull themselves together to go fight “city hall.” They’re being encouraged to be developed; the problem is that they’re not being given the power to act, and they’re not being given the funds, and without money, you have no power. So, that encouragement is there, the groups are forming. What you’ve got to demand now from city hall, at least, is some monies, so that you can function, so that you can hire independent research people. I remember we were looking for a traffic consultant to see if we could develop a new freeway route, but there was no money, there was no talent in the state of Oregon, and if we wanted to pull somebody in from another state, we needed some funds, we didn’t have any. That’s the key: money, power. Encouragement, now, is not enough.

PANELIST: Anyone else wish to tackle that one? Dean Perloff, would you like to make a few final comments?

PERLOFF: Well, I was very impressed with the very intriguing questions that were asked by the panel. I think at this late stage it wouldn’t be appropriate for me to try to cope with them individually, but just to sum up what I think is really a very important thought, and I wanted to share it with you. In one sense it’s very simple and in another sense it’s very complex, you have as many answers as I do. For some reason which I don’t understand at all, and as I’ve suggested before, maybe because we had such a successful past: we did so well as a nation of farmers and during the manufacturing era, we really somehow rather don’t want to take hold of this period we’re in today. I feel a lot of the gloom, a lot of the discouragement that’s going on right now, is all tied up with this. The White House, the administration has almost said in so many words: “We’re giving up the city.” And I’ve travelled around many cities in the United States, and the mayors say that “I really don’t think I can get anything done.” Here’s a nation that is the richest country in the world, has done so many remarkable things, and what’s behind that? Well, of course we know that the war’s had a lot to do with our sense of discouragement. There’s something beyond that, even. And that is that we are just not willing to use all our arenas of debate and discussion, and say “What really are we?” you know, “What kind of a nation are we? What do we want to get done? Do we really want to go back to the rural era by going out there in the countryside, or are we going to realize someday that we’re an urban nation?”

Whether we live in high density or low density is an important thing. And when you have an urban nation, you’re going to have a lot of complex problems. A lot of things are not going to be done individually, decisions just can’t be done by every individual the way it can when you have farms out there, you’ve got to do an awful lot of things through government. If we’re not willing to take hold of that thought, if we’re not willing to reform—I mean *really* reform our local governments to the point they begin to function—if we’re not willing to face up to the fact our traditions of private property use simply are going to have to be given up, it’s a wrench for

countries that [have] that almost as its basic tradition, we're gonna have to give it up, it won't work! Cities won't work unless we have very extensive controls and public ownership. The more you think about it, the more you'll come to realize it, the Europeans began to realize it fifty years ago and have been acting on it. It's not all that painful, you know, it can work, but we're not willing to give it up, we're not willing to *rethink* our basic property rights. We're not willing to *rethink* the functions of a local or regional government. We're not willing to rethink the fact that our traditions with regard to race just simply can't work in a crowded society. You don't run away from the inner city problems by going to the suburbs, they follow right after you.

Now, I don't know the answer, I do know—and this is the point I'm trying to make—until we're clear about what we want to get done, we're going to continue to have urban chaos and urban crisis—use whatever term you want—we're going to have a very sad and unhappy nation. I think that we're going to really take hold of these things when we begin to build as we always have, begin to invent, use new forms, you know, really get going. So if you have any bright ideas for how we're going to get ourselves turned around, that would be marvelous. I just know that we've got to do it. Thank you very much.

[applause]

WOLFE: Thank you, again, Dean Perloff, for spending the time with us and giving us those thoughts, and I wish to thank each of the panel members for their contribution, and to thank all of you and to hope you'll be back with us again next month.

[program ends]