TRANSCRIPT

The Planner as Advocate

Paul Davidoff

I am a Congressional candidate, and I must apologize to you that I have not come here with a prepared address, although I have a number of campaign speeches readily available for occasions such as this, and intend to pull a few of them out. I wanted to address myself today, in part to the issue of advocacy in planning, and in part to a very special part of that problem, the role of the planner as politician, or advocate. I do think that that's a very important part of the task of a planner. I wanted to say at the beginning that I am very pleased to be on the panel here with Lou, an old friend from Philadlephia, who played a very active role in shaping Institute policy and moving the planning profession along and with both Dave Craig and Roger Starr on this panel because Dave and Roger are not typical professional planners. They call themselves professional planners, and I am not even sure that they do that. But they are people who have been very closely associated with planning but in a very political way, in effecting the politics of their community, which I think is altogether proper and fitting and I think in a sense our panel least coalesces on the need to bring planning into political framework. Before I get too far into theoretical abstractions of the nature of planning and advocacy, I do want to inform you that I have some campaign literature here, "Why is Davidoff Running," I have some buttons, "Davidoff Says Now," the "now" that I refer to is 1976 essentially at which point the races should be equal in income in housing conditions, health conditions, recreation conditions. I have been urging as a planner that unless there is a possibility of establishing a time period in which a goal is to be achieved, and unless that time period is in fact established, there is very

little progress toward achievement of a goal. We know from the moon shot that the nation can move very rapidly for its achievement of a goal within a decade, and will probably achieve it, or come very close, and I do believe that in fact, if we do set a few periods, put a temporal objective on social dimensions, it will be possible for us to move. But if we don't do that, if we continue to make promises of decent homes, suitable living environments, unrelated to any time periods as to when it should be achieved, the promise will remain as empty as it has been for the pass twenty years, and families will remain ill-housed, and remain in unsuitable living environments. A couple of bumper stickers, and then, finally, for those of you who are not able to attend the fund-raising party yesterday, I did want to let you know that we have a few checks here, and pledge cards, and that it is very necessary if we are going to get across some of the very important issues that I am bringing to suburban New York, and trying to raise in terms of the nation generally, that the campaign have funds. One of the themes that I have been pushing very hard in my advertising, my buttons will be out with it the end of this week, I am sorry I couldn't bring it to you: "Stop the Bombing - Start Building," and that has received a very good reception in the community among moderates, and the other theme where I do need a lot of support, and I would like to have it from AIP and other groups that are giving it for advertising on this score, is for the elimination of exclusionary building practices. I have received very wide support from the builders in my county on this issue - surprisingly enough - and also fair housing people, but the condition is one that most of you are familiar with. Approximately 80% of the vacant land in Westchester County is zoned for an acre or more, one acre, two acres, or four acres. Today, it is impossible, practically, to buy a house under $40,000, and I was told the other day, that there aren't many going at that price. It's Never $50,000, and using FHA's 2.2 ratio means an income of about $20,000, a little more or a little less, depending on the sale

price of the house, in order to buy a home in an area where there is vacant land for development. And in our metropolitan area, even in wealthy Westchester, the consequence of this, is that the police power, the regulatory measure of the state is employed to deprive 80% of the population from gaining access to new housing in most of the area where it is possible to build new housing, and this finding which is true of Westchester, is true of the metropolitan area generally, and it's true from findings in studies that we made for Paul Douglas' Commission.

Hunter's research center did a job for the National Commission on Urban Problems, studying zoning's effect on housing costs in suburbs, in cities, in Minneapolis, St. Louis, Washington and New York, and the effect is disastrous. So I do think it is very important that we make a national issue of suburban zoning, and there are many ready to do it. I do know that the Douglas Commission, or feel pretty certain that the Douglas Commission is going to issue a very strong statement in regard to this issue, and I think it's about time the American Institute of Planners got on the ball, either as an Institute, or as comprised of individual members who want to give support to this issue. But here we have one of our ancient practices, zoning, standing very directly in the way of progress in metropolitan areas of providing decent housing, and it isn't just the low income, or the black families that suffer. The reason the issue is popular and I get support from moderates on an issue such as this, is the fact that the middle income group, certainly the teachers, policemen, the firemen, the bakers, most of the people of the community, find it impossible to get adequate housing for themselves. So, if you are inclined I would like a check for the campaign fund so that we can make this a national political issue.

Now, let's get down to the subject of the day, advocacy planning. There are many definitions of advocacy, but none of them are very good. And it is in

not a very good term to describe a number of actions that have taken place in the last few years in the planning field. We start with probably the widest use of the term in advocacy today, that is, the representation by professional planners of classes of the population unrepresented in planning, or not very well represented. And many of you know that advocacy developed on the part of many planners who were dissatisfied with establishment planning, who were dissatisfied with the role of urban renewal as Negro removal, came to the aid of what we call the bulldozer, in the process, and that we tried to provide alternative plans for slum clearance. We tried to develop plans for community development in Negro communities, alternatives to what urban renewal agencies gave consideration to. I think much of the impetus for the development of Planners for Equal Opportunity arose out of actions taken early in the 1960's on the part of these planners who were dissatisfied with what was taking place in urban renewal around the nation. For many of us our feeling was that rather than American urban planning, and urban development policy being the leading edge, the cutting edge, we were being dragged into the revolution of the 1960's, and that the profession and the practices of the agencies for whom planners worked were instead of leading, following, and were in fact, maintaining typical American values of status quo and maintaining gross differences between groups in our society. So a number of us became keenly involved in a type of planning work which was to propose alternative other than that of the establishment agencies of government agencies proposed. There has grown in the past few years some problems with advocacy of this nature because in the black communities, black citizens are telling us that they will do it themselves, that they don't want whites coming into their communities to advocate for the black man. The black man can do it on his own. That in fact, advocacy on the part of the white is counter-productive to the development of strength on the part of the black community. I think this is very good. We find that in a number of black

communities there are still opportunities for the white planner to come in and work in the community, but it is on a different basis than it was before. It is a type of assistance, but not advocacy for the community. There is an older form of advocacy in planning, the type that I think Roger Starr's organization has been involved with, The Citizens' Planning & Housing Council of New York; the Regional Plan Association of New York. Agencies of this kind have been advocates for city development for many years. They were advocates of special interests in the city. Generally downtown interests. The boards of these central city agencies were comprised of people who had values that were fairly similar. If you look down the list of the people who made up the Regional Plan Association for years, I forget the name of your organization here in Pittsburgh, but generally, the people represented a business interest in the downtown and very often the plans of these citizens' organizations reflected that interest. This was very proper, nothing wrong with it at all. Advocate planning, I think when we think of advocacy most people think of it as the other form of advocacy. Advocacy for minority groups, for blacks, for the poor. I think this is all part of a game in which what we are doing is pluralizing planning, in which we are making it possible for many different interests to have representation in the process for many different interests in our community to have plans. Short-range plans, functional plans for housing, or health, whatever, presented to the public, and some form of discussion opened as between the plans of special interest groups and the plans of govdrnment. I've always thought that pluralization of the planning process was helpful to central government agencies, it informed the central government agency, be it the City Planning Commission, or the renewal authority, of what was believed important by different groups, so that the leadership of the community could in making its plans assess these different contentions as opposed to its own idea and try to strike what it considered the politically astute balance. That is, how much it wanted toreflect the will

of the people, and how much it had a leadership role, and was willing to go against certain themes represented in the community. But in the long run I do believe that pluralizing the planning processs, seeing that there are plans produced for the community other than just the plans produced by the central agency will be very helpful to the central agency and certainly to creating an informed public. A public capable of creating, making better choices with much deeper understanding of alternative that they could select. That's stated all in terms of a very rational theory of how planning should operate. There is still another role I want to speak of in terms of Advocacy.

Lisa Pedie wrote about advocacy and talked about the work that's being done in Boston and suggested another kind of role for the advocate in which the advocate is not representing or speaking for the client, the advocate is representing his own point of view. I think this is a tremendously important role for planners. The planner as a proponent, not as a proponent of what a group he works for thinks is proper, but the planner as a man concerned with the future of the urban world, presenting his own view, and advocating that. We've had utopians, we've had Mumfords, we have Goodman's, not too many, but they've played a very important role. And they haven't been a representative of a client. They have been speaking on their own. And I do hope and wish that more in the planning field would take this task on. I have a bias in this regard, because I think in my job now, running for Congress, this is the role that I'm playing. I'm not speaking for a client group, except the Concerned Democrats of Westchester who elected me to run a local McCarthy office. That may be the nearest thing I have to a client group. I come out of that movement in my politics in Westchester now. But I don't really speak for a client group.

I speak for myself as a candidate for Congress, as a man concerned, as we are here with future urban development policy and its relation to national, domestic and foreign policy. I speak with that background, but not as the representative of any client group. I am not advocating their interest, I am advocating my own position, and I want to tell you this, it is a hell of a lot of fun. I do want to advocate very strongly that you all get into politics and run for public office. There is no finer way that I have ever found to be deeply enmeshed in the problems of the community, to know more about what different groups in the community believe, think, and their basis for their attitudes. The moral choices involved in being a candidate are tremendous and exciting, particularly in a year when one has to chopse whether to run with Hubert Humphrey or not. Or one has to chose whether by not running with Hubert Humphrey, one has to suggest that it doesn't matter that Spiro Agnew could be a breath away from being president. These are very important choices to a candidate, because he's asked to make them publicly. I want to suggest to you as planners, that you get yourselves involved in politics. That you run for office. Because I do believe, if there is anything I have come here to advocate today it is advocacy in politics by planners. We don't have enough urbanists in Congress, or in other legislative bodies. It's here where real power to determine the future of our urban areas is located. It is here that we should have much greater effect than we have ever had as a profession. I do think that our independent planning commissions have been outside the mainstream of American power and politics and have been quite inconsequential, if not irrelevant to what's happening around us today. I do want to suggest your involvement in politics. I think that planning is a part of politics, that we have always been involved in politics, and that every choice we make about what the public should have, what is appropriate, distribution of resources in our community as between different classes is a political choice, whether you make it as a technician, or

a junior planner in your staff's agency, or whether you make it as the director of your agency, or whether you are out acting as a politician, you are involved as a planner social ethics, in making choices about how things should be and these are political determinations. I think it would be much better if we were much clearer about the point,recognize that we were actively involved in politics and that we brought planning more closely in line with the two party political system, and that we tried to bring planning into our parties, tried to see that our parties were involved in the develo ment of plans for their community. We've been lax in this regard. We haven't done that. We haven't tried to make the planning issues the main issuesof our local politics and we haven't done such a good job nationally either. So I want to suggest that there is a very strong role for the planner as an advocate of his own interest, of his own view of what is proper, and that there is an important role for him to play within the political life of his community.

Now I want to talk about one other issue regarding advocacy before coming to some substantive issues. Allan Kravitz of the Hunter College faculty presented a paper to ASPO back last Spring titled, "Beyond Advocacy," in which he called for participatory planning, and I think he called for the right thing. I think Allan was saying, and I think he is here in the room and will defend his position, or present it in better terms than I'm now doing. His major thesis was that the future of planning in America belongs to the public and not to the profession; that planning is something that we are all involved in as citizens; that we are all capable of being involved in the planning process for our community; and inasmuch as a true democratic society involves all of its citizens who are concerned and desire to participate in it, so planning as a part of that political system should be open for all citizens; and that our role is to try to find a way to bring the issues of formulating future development

and policies regarding future development into the communities so that there can be greater participation by the citizen, not in the perfunctory form by which we review plans presented by professionals now, not in the perfunctory manner by which the League of Women Voters holds a conference in the community once a year, or once every three years, on what the planners are doing, not that it isn't important, but that the citizens are actively involved, just as they are in a host of local matters of much shorter range duration, as they are in shcool matters. school budget matters, local budget matters. I do think the future of planning lies very much in its democratization, in its being taken away from the hands of professionals and being placed in the hands of the people of the community. Participatory planning. I think this is the direction in our society. I think it is what we should work towards. What does that mean about the professional? What is his role? I think there is still a great role left for the professional to assist the process. To be able to bring information to bear in the community concerning what the future may be like. To make the projections or predictions of the future community. To inform and educate the public on the nature of a planning process on the basis of making decisions in regard to future choice, in regard to what alternatives are available. I think there is a great role for the professional, as I suggested earlier, as being a keen advocate himself of what is proper, and himself playing a role, but not as one who comes into the community on some basis of advanced ability by reason of being a professional but as a concerned citizen, that he should play this role of a proponent of what his community should be like. These are a number of alternatives of ways in which I think planners can act in their community in what we have called broadly speaking advocate roles. I don't know that that's the right title, but its in the label of this session. The thing that's closely tied to the whole development of the process and the role we play are the kinds of substantive issues that we deal with. We need a lot of rethinking about

these. There are a lot of myths that have gone on, a lot of thought about how to define issues that are of concern to us that I don't think we have ever properly defined and need a lot of rethinking. Let me give some examples of these. I think some of you have heard me state this before, we make a great mistake when we speak of the sickness in the cities when we speak of the urban crisis. I think we've all been helped by it. Our pocketbooks have been expanded by the concern of the nation with urban problems and the sickness in the cities. But I think we've gone along with the wrong definition, because the sickness isn't in the city, primarily. The cities aren't the sick. The nation, in terms of the way in which it distributes its resources, in terms of the way it maintains patterns of discrimination between the rich and the poor in the society, between white and blacks, I think there is where the sickness lies. The poverty in the nation is as much spiritual as it is material. I think that when we assume that the problem is a city problem or an urban problem, we overlook some very basic social and economic factors as well as political factors about distribution of resources and opportunity in our society and by defining it as urban or city we get back into the hang ups of the physical bias that have harmed us for a long time and we begin to think of problems in physical and spatial terms. We think of community problems and we define communities as physical entities rather than social entities. Model cities speaks of communities as if they are physical, they are bounded physically, they are located in space. But the communities, the population that model cities are concerned with are not space bound in particular neighborhoods of a community, they are communities, social communities, that exist in may parts of a city. But model cities doesn't permit the jointure, the thinking through of the problems of these social communities because it separates out and isolates. In a city like New York it makes a division of one community, one social community, the community of the poor black into three separate communities: Harlem, South Bronx, and Bedford-

Stuyvesant. Bedford-Stuyvesant is then divided up into separate parts. In other communities, smaller cities, only one part is selected as being the model city's community, but in fact, other areas within those communities suffer the same problems, and the social groups that comprise those areas suffer the same difficulties that those in the model cities community do, but our whole approach to it is based on the physical one of dealing with a spatial area. Now, we have problems within physical parts of our cities, there is no question about that. The question is of the definition of the key problems and how we confront them. Four years ago, in addressing this same group, and the need for planners to become social planners rather than physical planners solely, I spoke along these same lines and in recent years there's been great expansion toward what we call social planning, a concern with services as well as with facilities. In concerns with social issues aside from physical issues of development. But here again there have been difficulties in how we've looked at the issue. Maybe we should have stuck, and can still stick, as many of you of course are still doing, to the physical issues of the community, the land use, land development, the capital budget side, we have to bring to bear social criteria in our analysis of the physical community, and if there was anything that was really wrong with our physical bias before, it was absence of social criteria, political economic criteria. We didn't ask the basic distributional question, who gets what? For a long time our plans reflected the basence of that question. We didn't recognize the existence of classes, social, racial classes in our society, economic classes. We are beginning to be more informed of their existence now, but whether we expand into social, economic planning as well as physical planning, or whether we remain within physical planning, drawing upon more social, economic criteria, the fact is we have to look at what I think are, and of course, you can disagree and say they are not, the basic problems confronting life in the city. Those are issues that are national and they do relate to distribution

of opportunity and resources. The fact of the gross injustices in our society, the fact that the top 5% of our population makes about the same amount of money as the bottom 40% is an issue that we have to come to grips with in our cities. The top 5% earns 15%, the bottom 40% now earns 17%, it shot up 1% in the last 20 years. We do have to think about redistribution, not just about making everybody grow richer but of a greater sharing in our society. The social revolution of the New Deal brought money from the top to the middle income group and gave security to that class but it did not bring money down to the bottom, and so the bottom 20% only receives 5% today, 5.4%, its gone up a little bit in 20 years too. But we have these gross disparities in income and its not necessary to talk about racial disparity, except to highlight a fact that came out in a planning law course the other day. Someone pointed out to me something quite ironic, that at the time the time the Constitution was adopted the black man was counted as 3/5th of a man for purposes of determining political weight in different communities and today the black man is still 3/5th of a white man, if we look at statistical indicators, housing conditions, educational opportunity, life opportunity in the first year, we are still in about the same condition. These are the basic problems that afflict our society, and it will do well for us as planners, dealing in our cities, to recognize that these are national problems that have to be dealt with at the local level, and at the national level, and not to speak as if the sickness was in the cities. The cities today take on the major share of the burdens of society. They are the home of the classes in our society that reflect the injustice of the nation toward different classes. But the real sickness is not in the cities.

Now, on the same theme, I want to talk about my campaign for a moment and about what I am doing. I think its the role of whites particularly, and advocates particularly, in the next time period, the next few years. For a

long time we have been greatly concerned with the poverty in the black community not with the spiritual poverty in the white community. So we have gone into the black communities to do our jobs and to help. But if you will, accept the idea that the real sickness in our society is in the white community, by practicing white racism in the terms of the Koerner Commission, is the one that needs help, that what we should be doing is organizing community action programs in the white community so that the rich can come together and ask what are our problems and what can we do to solve them together. This is where we have to be now. I think we have neglected this responsibility. I'm running in maybe the prototype white suburban community of the nation -- Westchester County. But it's no longer what we conceive of. I don't know that it every truly was of the typical white suburban community. An increasing number of blacks live in the community - perhaps 15% today. Welfare roles have grown at a more rapid rate than the welfare roles in New York City - 45% of the population lives in multi-family housing - only 30% or less commute to New York City, to the center city. This suburb is very different from the country club suburb. And you know that about your suburban communities. They are essentially middle class communities and the problems of the city are coming up to the suburbs and the suburbs have a chance to do things the city didn't do because we can get ahead of it now. We still have time, perhaps, to get ahead of the revolution or the civil war that's growing in this country. We still have a chance before there is out-and-out violence in the streets, though there is much of that already with us. To do it in a peaceful manner. But I think it will only happen, and will only preserve our society today, if we as planners, take the lead of going into the white communities and beginning to talk there of the need for redistribution of opportunity, for elimination of discriminatory practices, of a sharing of power, of a willingness to let others in the community, except those who tupically let the community have power, if

we are willing to express the need for decentralization of power, to let the communities of the poor participate in running their own affairs, in giving the black communities power to control themselves. We have to begin to raise this theme, but not only in the black community. It has to be brought out to the whites. We, in planning, if we look through our documents, if you look at what we are putting out now, we haven't taken that burden on. We haven't addressed the problem to the white community of the sickness of the nation, the injustice of the nation, and emand of the white community that it shift, that it begin to share. Now, as a politician I come to the white community and I speak, in part, on the basis of morality. That reaches a few voters, but that isn't the key issue. The key issue is the self-interest of the residents of the white community. The key issue is the self-interest of all of us in this nation. In fact, it can be demonstrated that the nation will, that the middle class will benefit strongly be recreating opportunities in new ways in our society. That by holding an underclass that earns only 17% of the nation's income though comprising 40% of the population we all suffer, because our gross national product does not grow as rapidly as it might. That there are consumers, who are not potential consumers, who are denied the opportunity to consume in our society, who don't buy cars, who don't buy houses, don't buy adequate health care. That by keeping them out of the economic market we all are hurt. That the discrimination that is practiced against the black and the poor by real property tax and fiscal zoning affects all of us. One of the things I've proposed is the elimination of the real property tax. There is no basis for a child in Scarsdale getting twice as much spent on him as a child in Mt. Vernon. They are both children of the State of New York and deserve an equal educational opportunity. I don't really give a damn whether we get rid of the real property tax, or have the real property tax paid into the county and distributed on a per capita basis. But we shouldn't allow one community,

because it has a wealthier tax base to provide much higher service than the other. The real property tax, as you know, has other problems. People aren't always able to pay, their income isn't commensurate with the increase in the real property tax. I do think that we need to think about that.

I want to highlight this issue that our cause, I think in the next few years is to go to the white community. I've been addressing in my campaign, the need for white responsibility to meet the just demands of blacks now, and I think we must do it, and it isn't just the white, of course, it isn't just the blacks who suffers. There are large numbers of whites who are suffering as well. But the job for us in planning is to address that community that't out in the suburb as well as those who remain in the city. And just one last point: I'd like to highlight one issue thats become dominant in my campaign that I think we've neglected terribly: Ith the fact that in New York State alone, more money is paid to welfare recipients for rent than the nation as a whole puts into low cost housing. We are paying over two hundred million dollars,now the figure may be three hundred million. Its indicative of the condition that we don't know how much is spent for it either in the state or in the nation. New York State is paying close to $3hundred million by now on welfare payments for rent and that money is going into the hands of landlords. I don't want to classify all of them as slum landlords, but many are. I just' walked through the slums of one of my communities, Portchester, the other day, and saw the bathtubs filled that don't drain, the toilets that don't flush, and heard of the rats and the exposed wires, the banisters off, or shaking. All of the conditions of deteriorating housing. And that was public housing I walked through. Every penny of rent that went to the landlord was paid for by the State of New York of the federal government. And we are absolutely far behind. We haven't discovered this issue. We haven't exposed the fact that we are spending far more on public subsidy of slum landlords than

ing far more on public subsidy of slum landlords, than we are on public subsidy of low cost housing. And that's an issue that I think AIP can grab on to, and should grab on to immediately.

I want to thank you. I may have gone on too long. I may have deviated a little bit from advocacy, but some of the things as a planner, as an advocate playing the role of politician I do think are very important today. If you have friends in Westchester, in the 26th Congressional district, tell them that there is a candidate who is speaking about the need to end the war now, to end the bombing now, and that the things I've talked about can happen unless the war ends immediately; that it was a wrong war, that AIP should go on record now as indicating that, as it should have the past few years. Let us stand behind it. Let's get the money back home where it can be used for very useful purposes that are still ahead of us. Tell your friends that there is a candidate in Westchester in the 26th district, who needs his support and if you've moved send a check to Davidoff for Congress, to 14 Chatsworth Ave., Larchmont, N.Y. We need all the help we can. Thank you very much.

Having Roger follow me, is like having a truth squad that they send around after the candates. But we've reached some kind of accord now. I was struck by the very thoughtful remarks of both Dave and Roger. I want to speak for just a moment, I spoke too long before, in terms of the problems of centralization and decentralization. There are powers that are central and problems that are central that we do have to arrike a balance which isn't very helpful to say, in between the demands for control of local community, including the control that Dave points out so correctly, when we opt for local control we opt for much more power in the hands of the Wallace contingents that control some of their communities, and that we have to be willing to accept that, and I think its very clear that we must do that in order to bring opportunity in the hands of participants of a community to affect their lives, to have representation. I think we must accept that. It is so central on the school level. We're finding that, those of us in planning education that the clients, the teachers and the students, must share the power. This is the lesson of the revolt at Columbia. It is the lesson of everything that's happ ening around us. That those who are affected by decisions must share the power of making those decisions. It is certainly true in the movement that has stared in New York for control by the tenants of public housing. There are some rent strikes going on in New Rochelle now because the tenants say, "It's ours. We ought to be represented not the wealthy citizens represented on the Board of the Housing Authority." In every area where there is a client group affected by the decisions made, that client group deserves representation and power to make decisions. We start with that. And on the other hand, as you point out so well Roger, the need for central power. Let me deal for a moment with just the issue of local zoning as how it's affected. In no way am I trying to say that a local community should not zone and make

decisions about its own future. But there is pressure that can be placed on that local community that I do believe is proper pressure. The federal government pours a lot of money into localities for all kinds of things: for schools, roads, highways, water and sewer facilities, to create a broad-based infra-structure. The federal government doesn't have to pour all that money into every community. I don't think its improper of the federal government today to demand of localities that they perform certain tasks in response to the nation;s urgent need for equity now, and so I would think that grants to localities could be very much based upon the degree to which localities are providing low cost housing, middle income housing, providing job opportunities for people in the region who need them. Let them make that a condition of the grant. It's both a carrot and a stick. There's also the use of the court system, and many of you have participated in cases against zoning. The NAACP Legal Defense Fund are challenging zoning around the nation in localities. Its most interesting now that a new struggle is going on in the courts, or is about to, I'm participating in this with the NAACP which is to go after, instead of an individual locality zoning, to go after the state enabling legislation. To say that the state enabling legislation by granting broad powers to localities to zone, which broad powers have been abused in such and such manner, and demonstration of the fact of the distribution of population in the region, would illustrate that the grant of power is too broad to the localities and that it has led to discriminatory results, and that the grant should be seen as a denial ofequal kprotection in its broad statement and ust contain in the future, or so the dictum of the court hopefully would read, guidelines to consider social issues which are affected by zoning case. I mention it only to highlight a new area of concern that you might want to give some consideration to in your states, because it may be much more efficient to go after the discriminatory zoning practices at the highest level of state en-

abling legislaltion, rather than trying to attack it on a case by case method in each of your individual jurisdictions.

oOOo

Question: Davidoff

Why no one in this country speaks about public land as many people have done for almost 50 years. They speak about the impossibility to make any kind of plan without public land. LeCorbusier & Co.

Answer: Why are there not planners now speaking about government ownership of land - why is there not more talk of that. Well, I think you will find that many of us are talking about the new city being the major part of America's future. That that has to happen, large parts of our cities were vestigial the day they were developed for the working class and that we have to give up trying to rehabilitate many parts of our older cities. We do have to exploit our land in ways that we have never done before. The only way, in the long run, that is going to happen is through much stronger public intervention in developing those lands for development of cities. As to why more planners here are not speaking on that subject and why you are not speaking on that subject, or perhaps you are, we have Planners for Equal Opportunity, we cah have planners forpublic lands, and I think it needs its advocates very strongly and it might be a good area around to base something.