

LOCALISM AND LAND USE PLANNING

Harvey M. Jacobs

There is renewed interest in land use planning among planning educators. Yet educators and practitioners need to acknowledge the uncertain status of a major theoretical issue in land use planning practice – the level of government which should hold primary responsibility for such planning. Traditionally local units of government have held this authority. Yet decades of experience and research show serious shortcomings with local control of land use planning. At the same time, while experiments to relocate planning authority to regional or state units of government appear successful, the movement for this change appears stillborn. Currently theory in this area confronts a paradox. Critiques of the failure of local control are unrefuted, yet efforts to relocate planning authority appear unachievable. Among authorities the debate centers on calls for renewed attention to the possibilities afforded by local land planning policy. An analysis of the evolution of this debate in land use planning theory is presented, as are arguments for a new theory of localism, as one alternative to resolving the current uncertainty.

~~695~~

346

542 807

384

INTRODUCTION

The field of urban and regional planning is, once again, in transition. Krueckeberg (1984, 1985) has chronicled the rapid rise in the number of academic planning programs in the last twenty years and raised serious questions about their durability in the 1990s. In addition, Krueckeberg and others (Alonso 1986, Miller and Westerlund 1986) have noted a strong resurgence of academic interest in the so-called traditional areas of planning practice, especially land use planning. As a teacher, researcher and practitioner of land use planning I welcome this renewed attention to the root of our professional identities. However, I am concerned that in going back to our roots teachers of the subject acknowledge that land use planning itself is in a time of transition which leaves its future uncertain. It is the purpose of this article to outline the nature of this uncertain future. I will first briefly define it, then develop it historically, and close by outlining two paths I believe are available for bringing some certainty to the current situation.

As a prelude to the following discussion let me first clearly define land use planning. For this article, "land use planning" means public sector planning for privately owned land and privately managed land markets. Included in the phrase "land use planning" are the preparations of plans for cities, city fringes, and rural areas which indicate the future development pattern of those areas. Also included is the development and management of legal mechanisms such as zoning regulations, subdivision controls, and differential tax programs to induce and facilitate private land owners to bring about the land use pattern broadly outlined in the land use plans. In other words, "land use planning" refers to the traditional practice of urban and regional planning.

THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE DEFINED

The uncertain future for land use planning is brought out by several interrelated events. One is the continuing interest on the part of professional students of planning, in masters and bachelors programs, in this area. From talking with people teaching at other programs across the US, my sense is that upwards of two-thirds of entering students identify land use planning as their interest area in the profession (this is especially true if land use planning is broadly defined to include both environmental planning and the relatively new interest in real estate). Second, surveys of practitioners (e.g., as reported in *Planning* September 1984) show that a similar proportion are, to some degree, involved in land use planning. Third, in a time of professional uncertainty, some would say even crisis, the one area of organizational turf that appears easily conceded by competing professionals (such as in policy analysis and public administration) is the practice of land use planning. So, on the positive side, a renewed interest in land use planning is warranted because it is what students want to do, it is what we do as a professional group, and it is what others with competing skills will concede as fully appropriate for us to do.

Yet, I suggest that among those who teach land use planning there is a crisis in theory; that is, a crisis in the ideas held about how land use planning should be done, and thus how students should be taught. In particular, this crisis is centered on the scale issue, the debate over the relative roles of different levels of government in the formulation and implementation of land

~~696~~
7349
~~545 500~~
386

use planning. This is the issue commonly referred to as the local control debate, or the movement for regionalism, or "the quiet revolution in land use control" (Bosselman and Callies 1971).

The crisis has to do with the fact that from the inception of our modern system of land use planning we have operated under a system of local control that has been critiqued as structurally flawed and unable to meet the demands placed upon it. In the words of a modern commentator, "the dilemma of local land use control" is that it is "power without responsibility." While "local governments has the power to plan (they) have the most microcosmic view of society as a whole. They see the world from the ground up...limited by municipal boundaries, tax considerations and a skewed sense of what is good and bad...The hope that individual municipalities will act responsibly to meet larger social needs...is a naive hope. Municipalities have not acted in this manner, and there is no reason to believe that this pattern will change. (Delogu 1981: 14-17, 21).

Professor Delogu reflects decades of thinking on this subject. Prominent commentators throughout the twentieth century have questioned whether fundamental democratic rights were being compromised by localism in land use planning (Williams 1955). The urban riots and social upheavals of the 1960s clearly brought the issue of localism in land use planning to the fore. Three national commissions, those on urban problems, civil disorders, and urban housing all identified the local basis of land use planning and control as a principal contributing factor to the issues under investigation (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 1968, National Commission on Urban Problems 1968, U.S. President's Committee on Urban Housing 1969). According to these and other works, local land use planning was, among other things, parochial, discriminatory, wasteful, and destructive of eco-systems. And, if nothing else, local control of land use planning was administratively unsuited to a modern world of centralized control in government and the private sector. It was and still is argued that if land use planning could be done at the *regional* level, such planning could and would be successful, meaning that it would not fall prey to the shortcomings identified with local land use planning.

Yet, in the 1980s there appears to be an emergent consensus that for various reasons efforts to relocate land use planning policy authority to supra-local bodies of government will not be forthcoming. Instead we are exhorted to learn to live with, even to love, *local* land use planning. But herein is the root of the problem. At the same time we are being told to embrace the inevitability of local land use planning, our past theories, research, and practice tell us that such planning can not work.

Thus, we are asked to return to our roots in land use planning, to accept and embrace that area of organizational turf conceded to us by competing professional groups, and to teach such planning to a significant number of highly interested students, without a clear basis of what to say about one of the most critical issues in land use planning and policy.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE ISSUE

Broadly, the intellectual history of land use planning, that is the history of how we think about land use planning, can be divided into two eras: pre and post World War II.

697

350

549

386

The pre World War II era was characterized by active debate on two issues: the *substance* of land use planning, and the *process* of such planning. The substance debate focused on the object of land use planning -- cities, suburbs, and the countryside. This debate was driven by dramatic trends in rural land abandonment, city growth, and urban sprawl. Widespread public debate existed on topics such as ideal city size, the impacts of technologies, such as the automobile, the telephone, rural electrification, and centralized sewer and water services, on urban form, and more broadly, the inevitability of the changes which were then reshaping the landscape. Did these innovations necessarily mean either a centralized or decentralized city? What about the possibility of a revitalized, modern rural culture?

The substance and tenor of these debates is perhaps best captured in the famous exchange of letters between Lewis Mumford and Thomas Adams over the *Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs* (Adams 1929/1931), and the contrast between the philosophies of the Regional Planning Association of America (Mumford's group), and the Regional Plan Association of New York (for whom Adams worked). The RPAA argued for the possibility of a decentralized pattern of urban form, in concert with re-inhabitation of rural villages and a revitalization of agriculture and forestry. It involved a form of territorial social justice, to use Harvey's (1973) term, spatial equity between rural and urban places, based on an active program of land use planning. Mumford suggested that the contrasting vision of the RPA was for the continued domination of large urban centers, continued abandonment of the countryside, with the accommodation of the character of rural and human places to urban and capitalist/profit demands. In this alternative, land use planning was a passive tool used to accommodate unchangeable circumstances (see the details of this debate and related materials in Sussman 1976).

The parallel process debate was shaped by what can be thought of as an accident of history. Largely because of their obvious, pressing need for authority, it was the most local of governments that were granted state reserved powers to plan and implement policy over land use. The Standard Zoning Enabling Act and the Standard City Planning Enabling Act directed constitutionally reserved state powers to cities, counties, villages and towns to conduct land use planning.

From the beginning, however, debate ensued over whether these governments could effectively engage such policy authority. In challenging the constitutionality of zoning, the Ambler Realty Company raised this point (Fluck 1986). Then, during the New Deal the work of sociologist Louis Wirth (1937) and the regionalism report of the National Resources Committee (1935) focused attention on this issue. Others, including Mumford and his colleagues in the RPAA, seemed more conciliatory to the potential of local governments to conduct land use planning in a responsible fashion (Sussman 1976).

There was a distinct shift in the nature of this debate in the post World War II era. Beginning with the demise of the National Resources Planning Board in 1943, the issue of substance seems to have faded from the agenda of land use planning. Over the next twenty years, it came to be replaced with an emphasis on process, which moved from a minor though important point to being almost the only point of discussion. In the post World War II period the debate in land use planning has been about *how* to do planning, largely absent a strong sense of *why*. This period can be characterized as one which focused on the tools of land use planning -- zoning, TDR, compensable regulations, etc. -- largely absent substantive discussion of the

landscape theory to which these tools were to be applied. This shift is well captured for me by a story told by a colleague trained in the 1950s. He said that he was taught that "the field of urban of regional planning was the art and science of accommodating the inevitable."

As part of this shift, debate came to center on the issue of scale. While it was important to experiment with different tools for land use planning, it was also important to explore the issue of what level of government should have the responsibility for exercising these tools. A not unreasonable assumption was made that tools used at the proper scale would yield good results.

Prominent examples of this approach and philosophy include Reps' "Requiem for Zoning" (1964), which is as much a call for regional land use planning as anything else, and Babcock's *The Zoning Game* (1966), which includes an explicit call for regional authority in land use planning and implementation. This trend in thinking became widespread with the rise of the environmental movement in planning. Bosselman and Callies' (1971) study of regionalism for the Council of Environmental Quality self-consciously declared a "quiet revolution in land use control." The experiments in regionalism in land use planning and control chronicled by them and others in the late 1960s and early 1970s in Vermont, Oregon, Florida, California, and the Adirondack region of New York State seemed to be ushering in a new era in land use planning (Healy and Rosenberg 1979, Popper 1981). Support for this shift in governmental authority appeared widespread. The efforts of prominent studies such as those by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund Task Force (Reilly 1973) and the proposed revision of the Standard Zoning Enabling Act proposed by the American Law Institute (1975) further reinforced the arguments for greatly diminishing the land use planning authority of local governments. These regional and state experiments were themselves fueled by serious efforts to enact national land use planning legislation, a proposal initially supported and cosponsored by the Nixon administration (Plotkin 1987).

An important experiment in creative local control in land use planning in Pennsylvania in the late 1960s appeared to further solidify the need for this revolution (Strong 1975). This was an attempt not to engage in regional planning and control but to encourage and facilitate sound local planning through voluntary participation and equitable compensation for diminished property values and rights, all buttressed by extensive, sound technical assistance. Yet even this effort failed to produce responsible local control.

The empirical evidence seem clear -- local land use planning with unsuited to reform. It was parochial, discriminatory, elitist, destructive of eco-systems, and wasteful of investment capital, in part because it was based on artificial systems of land division and political control. Local control appeared analogous to Garret Hardin's (1968) description of a "tragedy of the commons." While Hardin was concerned with land which no one or everyone owned, and therefore became squandered, local public control of land seemed to some to have the same result. Social goals for equitable land use were squandered in the face of strong personal, economic and social motivations, and peculiarly American ideology. As a response to market failure, local control appeared to suffer from one form of what Lichfield (1980) terms government failure, a mismatch between the needs and the skills and resources of local governments.

Regionalism -- regional land use planning and control -- was posited as a response to the failure of local control. Increases in the scale at which land use planning design and implementation were conceived and administered were supposed to correct local control's shortcomings. At the time, this approach seemed supremely politic. It avoided difficult normative issues.

such as what kind of cities and regions should we have, and instead focused on an administrative issue, regionalization, that seemed, at the time, achievable. Environmentalists were joined in their concerns for sound eco-system management by those seeking social justice, and by corporations seeking to get into large-scale land and housing development (Walker and Heiman 1981).

Yet, a decade and a half after the declaration of revolution there is a crisis. Dissatisfaction with the revolution's results, and critiques from the political right and left have contributed to the movement's collapse. If anything, the declaration of revolution seemed to have been premature.

Popper (1974) was among the first to skeptically observe the emerging revolution. He noted the similarity of its form to other traditional, liberal, New Deal policies, and argued that, as in these other efforts "the key political and economic result ... (would be) to benefit and strengthen established entrenched interests at the expense of weaker ones and to make governmental decisions less accountable to the public than previously (ibid:15). Less sympathetic in their tone and intent were critiques from the political right and left.

McClaghry (1975, 1976) provides the most thorough examination of the movement for regionalism in land use planning from a conservative-libertarian perspective. (McClaghry's perspective seems worth paying attention to since he went on to serve on Carter's Commission on Neighborhoods, and served as one of the eight staff members of the Domestic Policy Staff of the Reagan White House in its first term). Countering the image put forth by Bosselman and Callies, he asserts that rather than the existing system of local public control being feudal in nature, it is the proposed system of regional control which constitutes a "new feudalism" where "land must be used as society prescribes, or, in the very least, in ways not objectionable to society" (McClaghry 1976: 486). He skillfully argues that basic American democratic ideals and political theory specifically draw from a reaction against the idea of social property, especially in the thinking of Jefferson and Madison.

Critics of the left share McClaghry's skepticism regarding regional land use control but interestingly for almost opposite reasons. Whereas McClaghry, Popper, and Bosselman and Callies view the quiet revolution as a liberal movement, in the spirit of the New Deal with a strong centralism tendency of government over business and in the protection of people, others see it as a movement strongly reinforcing the evolution of large capital in the late twentieth century.

Geisler (1980) argues that the quiet revolution is part of a long standing process of transformation essential to the emergence of modern industrial capitalism. He asserts that the continuous process of centralization of private corporate power necessitates a parallel movement for centralization of control over private property. The anarchy of local public control is dysfunctional to the accumulation needs of ever concentrated capital. Walker and Heiman (1981) make a similar argument. While disavowing a strictly "conspiratorial view of history," they argue that:

A quiet revolution in land use controls has been occurring because a small group of liberal reformers, closely associated with large development capital, have been systematically urging adoption of a land use control system suitable to the changing needs of capital. And behind these political actors stand economic forces unleashed by the logic of capital accumulation (Walker and Heiman 1981: 82).

What is suggested from all of these sources, those basically sympathetic but skeptical and those outwardly critical, is that the supposed solution to the failure of local control: regional control, is unsatisfactory because it is less responsive to citizen participation, invites control by other organized interests in society, and is fundamentally un-American in concept. Regionalism as a response to market failure and local control is inadequate due to what Lichfield (1980) calls freedom failure, infringements on individual rights in land without clear, compensating public and individual gain.

As the 1980s dawned, many revolutionaries and their critics reassessed the policy landscape. The imperative of regionalism appeared to many to be either strategically unattainable, or, among critics, undesirable. Important commentators cautiously began to explore a new localism. Healy (1979) openly recognizes the strength of the renewed call for local control. By his own admission this call may not be so misplaced. "Many advocates of better land use have come to appreciate the political resources and potential implementation advantages that local governments have to offer." In any case, "land use control advocates are by now keenly aware of the general public's mistrust of centralized regulation (Healy and Rosenberg 1979: 213-214). Babcock in one of his recent treatments of zoning cautiously offers "a case for local control" which argues "that efforts to whittle away at local decision making responsibility should be abandoned in favor of an effort to correct specific deficiencies of the local decision making process (Weaver and Babcock 1979: 254). Likewise, Popper (1981) suggests that "the deficiencies of the nation's land use...practices are so many and varied that centralized regulation seems inadequate to deal with them." He observes that planning policy in general and land policy in particular are at an "impasse" and that "the local level now appears to be more fertile ground for land use reform than the higher levels" (ibid: 7, 216, 226).

Thus, we are left in the 1980s with wide-spread calls for renewed attention to *local* land use planning but without any substantive basis for this because we have done such a good job of critiquing the inadequacy of such planning. Whatever the judged-to-be political realities, the earlier critiques of localism stand. No commentator has sought to revise them, only to suggest that they do not provide sufficient basis for significant administrative change. The question is then, what of the future?

LOCALISM AND LAND USE PLANNING?

It seems as if there are two possible solutions to the crisis in land use planning theory: either a renewed movement for regionalism, or a new concept or theory for localism. There are supporters for versions of both positions. While I will outline elements of both, I will concentrate my comments on the latter, for reasons that will be made clear in the text.

Delogu (1980, 1981, 1984) represents one of the several authors who, following from the vein of criticism of localism and land use planning from Williams (1955), Reps (1964), Babcock (1966) and others, continues to harp on the shortcomings of localism, the inability to revise

701

354
543

local land use planning, and the need to replace it with alternative regional systems of land use management. "(L)ocal land use control powers are ... not susceptible to...reforms or modifications and thus ought to be...drastically altered or abandoned altogether" (1984: 261). Using as his basis the *Mt. Laurel* case in New Jersey, he argues the unwillingness of localities to act to achieve socially necessary and responsible ends; in this case the end of racially and economically integrated housing, though his examples build upon rather than end here. He therefore concludes that "local land use control powers...have outlived their usefulness and should largely, if not totally, be withdrawn from municipalities" (1984: 263).

Delogu's alternative builds upon the work of the American Law Institute (1975), with a new 1980s twist -- a coordination of state/regional controls over land use with a liberation of unnecessarily constrained market forces. Drawing on one of the main points of the ALI model code, the identification of regional and statewide areas of concern, Delogu suggests a system of statewide performance standards and state and regional development review procedures for land use. However, as important, he stresses the utility of market mechanisms -- "supply-demand factors, along with private control mechanisms (covenants, easements, deed restrictions) ... to shape development activity" (1984: 308-309). In a note, he specifically anticipates a response to this program and argues further that "reform of local land use controls ... presupposes that more local controls, better types of controls and better administration will cure the problems outlined -- nothing can be further from the truth. We need few, not more or better, local land use controls" (1984: 308).

For Delogu and other latter day regional advocates, there is no possibility of constructing a responsible localism. Such an idea is itself an oxymoron. The only acceptable resolution to the theoretical paradox in land use planning is to continue efforts directed at forging a regional system of land use control.

In his most recent treatment of land use planning, Popper (1988) puts forth a somewhat different analysis of events. He argues that the quiet revolution in land use control, the regionalization of authority over land use development, essentially succeeded. "Centralized land use regulation ... continues to expand Its fortunes ebb and flow, depending mainly on the politics of the individual states, federal agencies, or land use fields that apply it; but on the whole it is quietly thriving." (1988: 296). If anything, the revolution's major characteristic may be how quiet it has been.

Popper's point is that in the time since 1970 we have seen a large expansion in the number of single function land use and environmental management programs whose principal authority has resided at the regional (i.e. non-local) level. "there is ... more centralized regulation now than there has ever been, but that regulation is also less likely to be comprehensive, more likely to be specialized, oriented to particular purposes." (*ibid.*) To buttress his argument he cites programs in farmland preservation, wetland and floodplain regulation, groundwater protection, hazardous waste siting, industrial energy facility siting, and sensitive area protection.

Popper concludes that "the liberal impulses that drove the Quiet Revolution...did not decline or disappear. They won out, and nobody noticed" (*ibid.*: 298). He sees more centralized regulation in 1980s than in the 1970s or 1960s, and predicts even more so in the future. Yet, interestingly, he also acknowledges the expansion of activity and interest in *local* land use

planning. His crystal ball suggests a future for land use planning fitted to the decentralized, federalist structure of American government -- experimentation, innovation and expansion at all administrative levels.

Yet Popper's interpretation of events is self-acknowledged to be "revisionist," and I believe outside the mainstream. I doubt whether Delogu and others of his ilk would accept piecemeal regionalization of single function land use and environmental activities as an acceptable alternative to local control, especially if local control continues to any significant degree, or even expands. And it is in the *expansion* of local control, not its restriction, where I believe the resolution of the land use planning paradox lies.

Two points frame my argument of the need for an expansion, not restriction, of local control. The first sets a proposal for localism in land use planning within a larger social movement for localism; the second has to do with the unique nature of land and the importance it has for people in their lives and neighborhoods.

The renewed attention to localism in land use planning and the prospect of a responsible localism is part of a broader movement for local control. For example, in the United States, Kotler (1969), Morris and Hess (1975), and Boyte (1981) use the creative potential of urban neighborhoods as the basis for exploring and advocating the potentials of locally based social and economic change. Likewise, Williams (1976), Goodwyn (1978), and Storing (1981) look at aspects of American history from a perspective that emphasizes conflicts over degrees of centralization in the political and economic spheres, and highlight the progressive political posture of localism. This work is complemented by work internationally. For example, in Western Europe the emergent West German and English Green Parties have as one of their "four pillars" (as the West Germans refer to it) the concept of grass-roots democracy. For the Greens, this entails substantial devolution of political and administrative authority to local units (Spretnak and Capra 1986, Die Grunen 1985, Porritt 1984, The Green Party 1985). In Eastern Europe, Horvat (1982), Yugoslavia's premier post-War national economist-planner, represents only one of several voices expressing critiques of centralized planning and governance, and speculating on the construction of a decentralist-localist alternative.

That all of this dialogue on the scale of governance should be emerging in the late twentieth century, and that there should be such a voluminous literature on the potential of localism (only a sample of which is cited here), should actually not be surprising. Over a decade ago, as mainstream a political scientist as Dahl noted the long-standing literature and ideology about the correlation between the scale of governance and the viability of democratic institutions (Dahl and Tufte 1973). This literature is actually an assertion that democracy can only be effective which functioning in what we would understand to be small, local places. More recently, a social commentator of a much more radical persuasion makes the same point (Bookchin 1987). While clearly an advocate of this movement for localism, Bookchin astutely observes that "(l)ocalism, in fact, has never been so much in the air as it is today -- all the more because centralism and corporatism have never seemed more overwhelming than they are today" (1987: 255).

Counter to the regionalism advocates, I would argue that localism in land use is especially appropriate just because of the unique nature of land and the impact of land policy on the quality of people's lives. The central and crucial role of land in matters of social and economic justice was a major theme at the U.N. Habitat meeting in 1976 (United Nations 1976). In the

703

356
~~355~~

392

following year, in a report for the U.N., Darin-Drabkin (1977) followed up on this theme. Popper himself makes an argument in this line when he asserts that the ineffectiveness of U.S. land use planning is tied to planners unwillingness to recognize the social power and importance of land: "...land is primarily a social weapon. It is a means by which its possessors protect their economic, political and other interests. In some way, it is the most tangible and primitive form of power" (1978: 5). When this is tied to Americans traditional reverence for home and land ownership (e.g. Perin 1977), and the recognition that for many home and land owners, their property is their primary form of material wealth (Ervin et al. 1977), it is not hard to understand the reticence of local people to removing the control of land from the community level.

In part this is the point of the conservative critics of regionalization. Centralization of land use planning authority removes power over a commodity with tremendous potential to affect people's lives, and people intuitively understand this. A recent commentary by a scholar on the left finds agreement with this: "(t)he issue is not whether society will regulate use, but what interests and values are served by it and the extent to which ordinary people have access both to the controls and to the land. In this light, we can see the problem with liberal centralization is that it promises less popular access to controls without more equal access to the land. It accelerates centralization while suppressing one of the few means of effective community protection" (Plotkin 1987: 239).

If localism in land use planning is a concept to be taken seriously, where do we begin in reconstruction of it? In fact, the field of urban and regional planning has a well developed literature which can provide the basis for a new concept of localism and land use planning. It is a tradition in responsible localism pioneered by Kropotkin in his work *Fields, Factories and Workshops* (1899) and more or less self-consciously developed by a set of planners, architects, and social critics of the built environment, including Mumford (1938), Goodman (1960), Ward (1976), Friedmann (1982), Weaver (1984), and Bookchin (1985, 1987), many of whom self-describe themselves as anarchists.

An outline of this approach includes the following elements: 1) a need to revitalize a discussion of both the process and substance of land use planning, 2) relative to substance, an assertion that nothing about spatial/landscape form is inevitable, and 3) relative to process, a framework for the planning process rooted in local institutions, though recognizing their limitations.

Kropotkin, the period's premier anarchist pamphleteer and a prominent geographer, proposed a theory of decentralized urban form rooted to locally based social and political institutions and premised on the possibilities afforded by technological development. Drawing on research he had conducted on English agriculture, industries, and cities, he argued that with the advent of decentralized power, i.e., electricity, and modern forms of communication and transportation, much of the historical justification for large cities, as agglomerations of people with skills and resources, no longer need apply. By creative use of these new technologies, an efficient and humane form of human settlement could be developed. Cultural and technological development did not need to be tied to a process of urban growth, rural decline and personal alienation. Instead, the capacity existed to settle people on the land in communities that were human scaled, incorporated the amenities of modern life, and facilitated community and political development.

704

6357
384
893

Kropotkin's work was quite influential. It was read and acknowledged by Ebenezer Howard (1898) in his book on garden cities, which has become a classic in the planning literature and in building the planning profession. In it Howard proposes his own version of a decentralized scheme of land settlement which melds the advantages of city and country life (his Diagram No. 1, "The Three Magnets," (ibid: 46)). This scheme was premised on the ability of local residents to control land use and actively participate in the management of their own affairs. Through Howard's work and the work of Patrick Geddes, Kropotkin ideas helped shape Lewis Mumford's thinking on cities and city development (1938) and were introduced by him to members of the Regional Planning Association of America. The mid-1920s work of the RPAA, the 1925 special issue of *Survey Graphic* and the 1926 'plan' developed for New York State, and Mumford's chapters on regionalism in *The Culture of Cities* represent the clearest early statement in the U.S. of this decentralist-localist theory.

In the lead article to the special issue of *Survey Graphic*, Mumford defines the historical urban development pattern of the U.S. as having occurred in three migrations. These migrations had resulted in the concentration "...of goods, people, and pecuniary resources from the industrial towns and villages of the earlier migrations" into ever larger cities (Mumford 1976: 60). The fourth migration, that which gives the article its title, is premised on the fact that "(T)he third migration has not produced a good environment; it has sacrificed home, health and happiness to the pursuit of business enterprises designed to produce maximum profits" (ibid: 63). The fourth migration offers an alternative in which efforts would be made "to disperse population rather than to concentrate it." According to Mumford, the feasibility of this alternative comes from "the technological revolution that has taken place during the last thirty years -- a revolution which has made the existing layout of cities and the existing distribution of population out of square with our new opportunities" (ibid: 61).

The following year, 1926, members of the RPAA contributed to preparation of a report on the future development of New York State (Stein 1926). It offered them the opportunity to apply their ideas about cities, regions and governance. Conceptually the report draws heavily upon Mumford's model of four migrations. Settlement is shown to have followed a pattern where it went from being dispersed in a large number of small towns and villages in the middle of the nineteenth century, to the present (mid-1920s) pattern which was much more concentrated. In New York's case, drawing from its topography and social geographic history, this pattern of concentration followed, then as now, the Hudson and Mohawk river valleys from New York City north to Albany, and then due west through Syracuse, by Rochester to Buffalo. By 1920, this 'L' belt, while representing only 20 percent of the state's land area, contained over 80 percent of the States' population.

The specific alternatives offered for New York State is a relatively decentralized pattern of regionally integrated land uses. Recognizing that "modern forces do not portend a return to the widely distributed development of the first epoch" (Stein 1926: 81), the proposed settlement system sought to foster decentralization to the extent possible. Specifically, the report proposes widening the valley or 'L' belt, creating more settlement centers, in the valley belt and elsewhere in the state, and making more creative use of agricultural, forest, and water resources.

In terms of the issue of most central concern here, scale, the RPAA looked to local governments in New York to be the lead authority for implementation of this alternative. While acknowledging their shortcomings and dissatisfactory performance to date, the report said plan-

705

394

358
~~585~~

ning "demands for the time being at least the retention by local governments of all the powers which they now enjoy" (Stein 1926: 67). Yet because they had no illusions as to the adequacy of uncoordinated local approach to planning, the authors urged "experience in cooperation" among local units (ibid), a bottom-up strategy to building a regional and statewide planning program, and the development of a state level planning agency to facilitate inter-local cooperation and bottom-up integration. They argued for a locally initiated process of land use planning which was aware of and sensitive to actions of other localities, and was linked to a facilitative regional and state framework.

By the late 1930s, Mumford at least was left sanguine about the potentials for a substantially local basis for land use planning. In a planning report on the Pacific Northwest he found local controls too subject to local pressures, resulting often in no action at all. Also, he was concerned about the ability of local units to take appropriate action when "the very solution of a local difficulty often demands a control over conditions that lie far beyond the legal limits of a municipality" (Mumford 1939: 19). In his book he takes up the issue of scale as "the politics of regional development" (Mumford 1938). He proposes a federated system of local association built from the bottom up, following, however, a redefinition of areas of local and regional government. He argued for "the restoration of human scale in government, the multiplication of the units of autonomous service, the widening of the cooperative process of government" (ibid: 382). Mumford stressed the need for a social process that originated locally, and yet was cautious in his expectations of what the local unit could do alone. He envisioned larger units of government, at the regional and state levels, acting to facilitate rather than compel social action.

This body of thinking had strong influence on those post war planners and social critics noted above. The Goodmans, Ward, Turner, and Bookchin all note the impact of Kropotkin, Howard, and Mumford on their thinking about the scale issue in planning. In certain ways Turn (1976, 1978) is the most articulate about these classical notions of a responsible local land use planning process would be reshaped to modern times.

Turner uses the phrase "conservative anarchist" to describe his position. While he wants to see a locally based process of social change for land and other resources, he recognizes the structural limitations on local action. According to Turner "conservative anarchists like myself accept the necessity of central planning...[however] I believe that central planning and administration has to be limited to major infrastructures and legislation limiting concentrations of wealth and guaranteeing equitable access to locally scarce resources" (1978: 1136). Turner argues that a modern theory for local planning does not exclude or ignore the role of other units of government, but instead replaces an executive, pre-scriptive, centralized planning process with a legislative, pro-scriptive, decentralized process that seeks to build on local strengths. Land use serves as one of Turner's principal examples. "Direct democratic controls...are essential for the full and proper use of the most plentiful, renewable, and non-polluting resources, and for the best use of many non-renewable resources, especially land" (ibid: 1141).

Taken together this literature offers an alternative approach to the scale issue in land use planning. The recent interest in localism for land use planning can be informed from this literature with thoughts on how to formulate and implement such a planning program. The impasse in theory for land use planning -- the crisis of localism versus regionalism, decentraliza-

tion versus centralization -- can be recast as a discussion on the relative balance in governmental roles, in which local units of government are seen as initiators and key actors, but are not expected to play a solitary role.

This suggestion for a central but not isolationist localism is not mere speculation, but can be rooted to empirical investigations on the subject. In one case, a series of surveys of residents' attitudes on the subject of local versus regional control of land use and environmental resources were conducted in Wisconsin (Geisler and Martinson 1976, Huddleston and Krauskopf 1980). These survey results suggested that local residents were very concerned with retaining responsibility for land and environmental resource management at the local level, but that they were not insensitive to the limitations of local control and the possible need for collaborative administrative relationships with higher units of government. Similar results were found in research conducted in New York State (Jacobs 1984) and Vermont (Ham 1987). Even Bookchin (1987), the consummate localist, broaches the need for this type of locally based, linked process of planning.

The long-standing critique of localism rightly identifies problems and abuses within a system of planning and governance that often ignored extra-local needs, contexts, patterns and responsibilities. Localism's staunchest defenders acknowledge these problems (Bookchin 1987, Friedmann 1982). Yet the solution of centralized regionalism produces both a failure of administration and public confidence. The thinking reviewed above represents an alternative in which issues of both the substance and process of land use planning are addressed. Specifically this body of literature suggests an approach to land use planning in which (1) historic patterns and trends of land use -- such as urban growth, suburban sprawl and rural decline -- are not considered spatial, social or economic inevitabilities, (2) planning for sustainable land use is built upon a locally based federated network of governance, and (3) local action is linked to regional, state and national action that facilitates its work by providing resources, and by limiting the potentially exploitative or domineering actions of local and extra-local actors.

While it is not certain that this framework provides a solution to the current crisis in theory for land use planning, it is a largely dormant, even forgotten tradition which speaks to the concerns which have been identified. As we evaluate how to address the paradox in land use planning, we can, alternately, accept the regionalists' critique of irresponsible localism and seek to formulate a responsible regionalism; or we can acknowledge the conservative and radical critiques of regionalism as itself an irresponsible solution to the problem it identifies, and channel our energies into a reconstruction of a responsible localism. I suspect the effort expended in crafting a responsible localism would be no more than in constructing a responsible regionalism, and the results more enduring and satisfactory, especially given the historical weight of local control.

As teachers and researchers we need to respond to the renewed interest in land use planning among our students and our professional, practicing colleagues. But we cannot do so from old conceptions, because we have done too good a job proving their paucity. Thus I urge serious examination and debate on these ideas and what they imply as we rediscover and reshape our roots in land use planning.

396

707

360
589

REFERENCES

- Adams T (1929/1931) *Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs*. 2 Vols. New York: Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs Committee.
- Alonso W (1986) The Unplanned Paths of Planning Schools. *The Public Interest*. 82:58-71.
- American Law Institute (1975) *A Model Land Development Code* New York: ALI.
- Babcock RF (1966) *The Zoning Game*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bookchin M (1985) Thesis on Libertarian Municipalism. *Our Generation* 16, 3/4: 9-22.
- Bookchin M (1987) *The Rise of Urbanization and the Decline of Citizenship*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.
- Bosselman FP, Callies D (1971) *The Quiet Revolution in Land Use Control* Washington, DC: Council of Environmental Quality.
- Boyer H (1981) *The Backyard Revolution*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Dahl RA, ER Tufte (1973) *Size and Democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Darin-Drabkin H (1977) *Land for Human Settlement: some legal and economic issues*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- Delogu OE (1980) The Misuse of Land Use Control Powers Must End: Suggestions for Legislative and Judicial Responses. *Maine Law Review* 32: 29-82.
- Delogu OE (1981) The Dilemma in Local Land Use Control: Power Without Responsibility. *Maine Law Review* 33:15-34.
- Delogu OE (1984) Local Land Use Control: An Idea Whose Time Has Passed. *Maine Law Review* 36:261-310.
- Die Grunen (1985) *The Program of the Green Party of the Federal Republic of Germany*. Die Grunen: Bonn.
- Ervin, DE et al. (1977) *Land-Use Control: Evaluating Economic and Political Effects*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Fluck TA (1986) Euclid v. Ambler: A Retrospective. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 52:326-337.
- Friedmann J (1982) Urban Communes, Self Management, and the Reconstruction of the Local State. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 2:37-53.
- Geisler CC, Martinson OB (1976) Local Control of Land Use: Profile of a Problem. *Land Economics* 52:371-381.

708

397 361

- Geisler CC (1980) The Quite Revolution in Land Use Control Revisited. In FH Buttel and H Newby (Eds.), *The Rural Sociology of The Advanced Societies*. Montclair, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun. 489-526.
- Goodman P, Goodman P (1960) *Communitas*. New York: Random House.
- Goodwyn L (1978) *The Populist Moment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- The Green Party (1985) *Politics for Life, The Green Party Manifesto*. The Green Party: London.
- Ham ED (1987) Governments for the Future: A Study of Vermont's Institutional Resources for Agricultural Land Protection. Master's thesis, Land Resources Program, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Hardin G (1968) The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162:1243-1248.
- Harvey D (1973) *Social Justice and the City*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Healy RG, JS Rosenberg (1979) *Land Use and the States*. 2nd edition. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Horvat B (1982) *The Political Economy of Socialism*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Howard E (1898[1965]) *Garden Cities of Tomorrow* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Huddleston JR, Krauskopf TM (1980) Further Evidence Concerning Local Control of Land Use. *Land Economics* 56:471-476.
- Jacobs HM (1984) *Localism and Rural Land Planning: A Historical and Case-Study View from New York State*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University.
- Kotler M (1969) *Neighborhood Government*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Kropotkin P (1899[1974]) *Fields, Factories and Workshops*. C Ward (Ed.) New York: Harper and Row.
- Krueckeberg DA (1984) Planning and the New Depression in the Social Sciences. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 3:78-87.
- Krueckeberg DA (1985) The Tuiton of American Planning: From Dependency toward Self-Reliance. *Town Planning Review* 56:421-441.
- Lichfield N (1980) Land Policy: Seeking the Right Balance in Government Intervention--An Overview. *Urban Law and Policy* 3:193-203.
- McClaghry J (1976) Farmers, Freedom and Feudalism. *South Dakota Law Review* 21:486-541.

709

398

362

501

- McClaghry J (1975) The New Feudalism. *Environmental Law* 5:675-702.
- Miller D, Westerlund F (1986) Teaching About Land Use: How Is It Dealt With as an Area of Professional Specialization. Paper presented to the 28th annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October.
- Morris D, Hess K (1975) *Neighborhood Power: The New Localism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mumford L (1976[1925]) The Fourth Migration. In C Sussman, (Ed.), *Planning the Fourth Migration*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 55-64.
- Mumford L (1938) *The Culture of Cities* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javonovich.
- Mumford L (1939) *Regional Planning in the Pacific Northwest*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Council.
- National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968) *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. Washington, DC: USGPO.
- National Commission on Urban Problems (1968) *Building the American City*. Washington, DC: USGPO.
- National Resources Committee (1935) *Regional Factors in National Planning and Development*. Washington, DC: USNRC.
- Perin, C (1977) *Everything in Its Place: Social Order and Land Use in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Plotkin S (1987) *Keep Out: The Struggle for Land Use Control*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Popper F (1974) Land Use Reform: Illusion or Reality. *Planning* 41:14-19.
- Popper FJ (1978) What's the Hidden Factor in Land Use Regulation? *Urban Land* 37:4-6.
- Popper FJ (1981) *The Politics of Land-Use Reform*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Popper FJ (1988) Understanding American Land-Use Regulation Since 1970: A Revisionist Interpretation. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54:291-301.
- Porrirt J (1984) *Seeing Green: The Politics of Ecology Explained*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Reilly WK (Ed.) (1973) *The Use of Land*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.
- Reps JW (1964) Requiem for Zoning. *Planning*. 54:67.
- Spretnak C, Capra F (1986) *Green Politics: The Global Promise* Santa Fe: Bear and Co.

710 363

399

- Stein C [Chairman] (1926) *Report of the Commission of Housing and Regional Planning to Governor Alfred E Smith*. Albany, NY: New York State.
- Storing HJ (1981) *What the Anti-Federalists Were For*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Strong AL (1975) *Private Property and the Public Interest*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sussman C (Ed.) (1976) *Planning the Fourth Migration: The Neglected Vision of the Regional Planning Association of America*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Turner JFC (1976) *Housing by People*. New York: Pantheon.
- Turner JFC (1978) Housing in Three Dimensions. *World Development* 6:1135-1145.
- United Nations (1976) *Report of Habitat: Conference on Human Settlements*. New York, NY: U.N.
- US President's Committee on Urban Housing (1969) *A Decent Home*. Washington, DC: USGPO
- Walker R, Heiman M (1981) Quite Revolution for Whom? *Annals of American Association of Geographers* 71:67-83.
- Ward C (1976) *Housing: An Anarchist Approach*. London: Freedom Press.
- Weaver CL, Babcock RF (1979) *City Zoning: The Once and Future Frontier*. Chicago: Planners Press.
- Weaver C (1984) *Regional Development and the Local Community: Planning Politics, and Social Context*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Williams N Jr. (1955) Planning Law and Democratic Living. *Law and Contemporary Problems* 20:317-350.
- Williams WA (1976) *America Confronts a Revolutionary World 1776-1976*. New York: W. Morrow & Co.
- Wirth L (1937) Localism, Regionalism and Centralization. *American Journal of Sociology* 42:493-509.

Additional information may be obtained by writing directly to the author at the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706, USA.

711

364
~~503~~

100