

Re: New(ed) Urbanism; A 20th Century Tradition of “Building Community” in America

GRETCHEN SCHNEIDER
Roger Williams University

Urban peripheries at home and abroad suffer equally urgent crises of identity. Most cities have grown beyond the ability of the center to hold its coherence, and are now fractured into slums and shanty towns, walled luxury neighborhoods, suburbs, housing projects, industrial parks and entertainment complexes sliced into incomprehensible strips by freeway systems. Some urban revisionists have put forth Seaside, a modern Palmanova, as the solution, while others call for hybridized containers and an end to the distinction between city and landscape. Yet in every city, the traditional meanings of public, community, and citizen are challenged.

— ACSA “La Citta Nuova-The New City”
Call for Submissions brief, 1998

Existing patterns of urban and suburban development seriously impair our quality of life. The symptoms are: more congestion and air pollution resulting from our increased dependence on automobiles, the loss of precious open space, the need for costly improvements to roads and public services, the inequitable distribution of economic resources, and the loss of a sense of community. By drawing upon the best from the past and the present, we can plan communities that will more successfully serve the needs of those who live and work within them.

— Peter Calthorpe et. al.,
“The Ahwahnee Principles,” 1991

Our cities grow by accident, by the whim of the private developer and public...By this irrational process, non-communities are born—formless places, without order, beauty or reason, with no visible respect for people or the land...The vast, formless spread of housing, pierced by the unrelated spotting of schools, churches, stores, creates areas so huge and irrational that they are out of scale with people—beyond their grasp and comprehension—too big for people to feel a part of, responsible for, important in...

There really can be no other right purpose of community except to provide an environment and an opportunity to develop better people. The most successful community would be that which contributed the most by its physical form, its institutions, and its operation to the growth of people...

— Morton Hoppenfeld, “The Columbia Process,” 1970

The urgency of the situation is obvious...Our towns have grown with feverish speed, and with virtually no forethought or control. This growth, in general, has taken two forms. The typical city shoots upward into skyscrapers and tenements, packing the dwellers closer and closer together. At the same

time, it spreads aimlessly into the surrounding country, covering miles of land with uneconomic, half-developed subdivisions. The result, in most cases, has been an ugly hodge-podge of towering offices, mansions, slums, warehouses, hot-dog stands, and decaying residential districts. The by products are congestion, tangled traffic, damaged property values and wasted land.

What the Resettlement Administration is trying to do is to put houses and land and people together in such a way that the props under our economic and social structure will be permanently strengthened...

— US Resettlement Administration,
Greenbelt Towns, 1936

INTRODUCTION

Twentieth century American development is notorious. Vast amounts of landscape are littered by undifferentiated subdivisions, shopping malls, super highways and parking lots. Peripheral growth lures people, commerce and employment away from downtowns, leaving behind hollow shells of what our built and social environment once was. Sprawl is ruining our land and our society. Or so the outcry goes. How to address this “urgent crisis”? The New Urbanists, Seaside’s authors, today propose compact, mixed-use pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods which promote public transit, demote cars, and reserve land for public parks and plazas. Yet as they mask these principles with white-picket-fence imagery, New Urbanists publicly claim to revive 19th c. town-making attitudes this century has forgotten. Don’t be fooled. The critique of sprawl, as old as sprawl itself, is part of an evolving modern tradition. The Greenbelt Program of the 1930s employed virtually *identical* compact, mixed use, pedestrian-based planning principles in their Greenbelt towns. Federal New Communities and private New Towns of the 1960s did the same. New Urbanism is not new, but simply the latest wave. America has struggled with this “urgent crisis” for a century. To successfully redirect future physical development of American cities and their regions, we must first understand recent history. This paper attempts to begin that process.

UNDERSTANDING TRADITION PART I: THE IDYLIC SUBURB BECOMES CRITICIZED SPRAWL

Lewis Mumford characterized American development as a series of migrations. The First Migration, based in land, began as the eastern coastal and river cities achieved maximum development in the mid nineteenth century and cleared the land west of the

Alleghenies. The Second Migration, based on industrial production, created a pattern of “factories, railroads, and dingy industrial towns.” The Third Migration, based on finance, was towards the great financial and cultural centers creating metropolises like New York and Chicago. In 1925, Mumford proposed that America was about to begin a Fourth Migration: the decentralization of these urban centers.

In 1925, Mumford predicted the mass dispersal of people from American industrial centers into the suburbs and the surrounding countryside. Mumford cited the technological revolution of the early twentieth century as catalyst for this Fourth Migration. He described the personal freedom of movement the automobile created, and its enabling of inexpensive nation-wide product distribution. Mumford suggested that modern communication would allow one to travel virtually anywhere and still remain in touch with centers of business. He observed that this modern communication gave all who own it access to the latest, most popular ideas, entertainment and styles. And he foresaw that new methods of power transmission would permit business and industry to locate away from the transportation centers.

To offset this imminent decentralization, Mumford urged designers and policy makers to form the Fourth Migration; “not to create it...but to guide it into positive and fruitful channels.” However, by 1925 Mumford was already too late.

Suburbs will represent “the best application of the arts of civilization to which mankind has yet obtained.”

— Frederick Law Olmsted, 1868

The turn of the century industrial city was dirty, polluted, and overcrowded. Large industries of especially the northeast required vast concentrations of material and laborers. Drove of immigrants and recently-freed African Americans flocked to northern urban centers for a chance to make a wage, seeking the promise of a better life. Unregulated living conditions, especially for the families of these laborers, were notoriously overcrowded and disease ridden tenements. Unregulated heavy industry sent vast volumes of smoke and soot into the air.

By 1925 the suburb was well underway, believed to be a better, more sustainable alternative to this mess. It was intended to create a middle landscape, close-to-yet-far-enough-from the overcrowded, polluted, industrial city. Marketed as a “best of both worlds” alternative, the suburb was to provide cultural and professional advantages of urban proximity, while allowing natural and health advantages of the country. In addition, though modest, the suburb offered the prospect of home ownership. As Mr. Bailey explains in *It's a Wonderful Life*, “It's in the race for a man to want his own roof, and walls and fireplace.” Owning one's home in the city was a luxury only the most wealthy could enjoy. The suburb offered the chance for an average man to work in a downtown factory while his children played in the field of their own back yard. One could strive to have a backyard garden and be CEO: Thomas Jefferson's yeoman farmer for the 20th century. The suburb offered a new embodiment of the American Dream.

Since inception the suburb has been an ideal, fictional construction. Remember that “traditional,” compact cities and towns were defined by functional necessity of defense, shared resources, means of transportation, concentration of markets or collection of capital and personnel for industry. Agricultural areas, too, were dictated by functional necessities of large rural stretches of fertile land. The suburb, on the other hand, was an intellectual construction, attempting to logically combine the ideal condition of each urban/rural extreme.

Don't it always seem to go that you don't know what you've got till it's gone? You paved paradise and put up a parking lot.

— Joni Mitchell, “Big Yellow Taxi,” 1966-69

So without functional necessity for compactness, the suburb

sprawled over our vast American landscape. What was advertised to combine the best of city and country instead caused the physical destruction of both, creating a too-dense-to-be-rural, too-spread-out-to-be-urban condition stretching from Boston to Norfolk on the East Coast and encircling cities across the country. Technological advances Mumford highlighted enabled this condition. Subsequent innovations, like the commercial airline, the personal computer, and the fax machine have only exacerbated the situation, promoting increased dispersal of residences and workplaces by further eroding pragmatic necessities of concentration. Federally-insured mortgages favoring detached single family dwellings, zoning ordinances dictating low density, single use districts and government sponsorship of roads and interstate highways over railroads or mass transit have institutionalized such sprawl, encouraging its propagation to a scale never imagined. Furthermore, the low density, single use district, single family detached home type now recognized as “suburbia” has been blankly employed throughout our nation (not just around major industrial cities) luring people, jobs and life out of the centers of our towns too, making farm communities in Kansas resemble New Jersey. New Urbanists correctly assert that these development patterns have caused America to become a nation afloat in a sea of automobile highway, strip mall, parking lot and subdivision.

Social fallacies of the suburb became clear early on. Though perhaps more dispersed, problems of poverty, inequality, and racism did not go away. Furthermore, vast tracts of low-density single-family detached homes created an automobile dependence, encouraging physical and psychological isolation from stores, school and workplace, extended family and friends. Grossly repeated house types suggested at least a developer's preference for architectural monotony and homogeneity — a monotony the public was willing to put up with for an inexpensive price, an architectural homogeneity which mirrored an economic and ethnic homogeneity too.

Thus throughout its history, the suburb has withstood a deep and extended critique. Writers from Mumford (“The Fourth Migration,” 1925, *The Culture of Cities*, 1938, 1960) to William Whyte (*The Organization Man*, 1957), John Keats (*The Crack in the Picture Window*, 1956) to James Howard Kunstler (*The Geography of Nowhere*, 1994) and organizations from the US Resettlement Administration (*Greenbelt Towns*, 1936) to the Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM) (*Can Our Cities Survive?*, 1947) to the American Institute of Architects (*New Towns in America*, 1973) to the New Urbanists (“The Ahwahnee Principles,” 1991; *The Charter of The New Urbanism*, 1996) have criticized the deep costs of sprawl. The arguments share certain recurring themes. Some arguments cite the placelessness encouraged by current travel, the national propagation of similar housing types, and the monoculture encouraged by television and, most recently, the Internet. Another theme laments the transient nature of suburban communities, the constant drive for upward mobility and the emphasis on social status and individual wealth. Another decries the monotony and homogeneity of both suburban architecture and the suburban population. The most common criticizes the sociological, environmental and physical destruction caused by the dominance of the automobile. Throughout the century, critics have lamented the loss of turn of the century American main streets in favor of arterial roads flanked by strip malls and big box pads. The suburban critique is long, extensive and deep.

UNDERSTANDING TRADITION PART II: DIFFERENT FACES, SAME INTENTIONS; 3 WAVES OF “BETTER ALTERNATIVES”

Phoenix sprawls into the desert at the rate of an acre an hour. Greater New York City stretches clear into Pennsylvania. Strip malls, traffic, fear of crime have wrecked the tranquil 'burbs of Ozzie and Harriet's time. How can we bring civility back to suburban life?

— *Newsweek*, May 15, 1995

Attempts to bring civility back to suburban life, and thus create better communities through design, have been often tried since the suburbs began. Hand in hand with the critique, "better" alternatives have been repeatedly proposed. In Mumford's words, several concentrated attempts have tried to "guide" this Fourth Migration "into positive and fruitful channels."

THE GREENBELT PROGRAM

During the 1920s and '30s, architects Clarence Stein and Henry Wright designed and constructed a series of garden cities, based on Ebenezer Howard's *Garden Cities of To-Morrow*. To address a housing and job shortage, the New Deal took up this initiative in its Greenbelt Program. The federal government acted as developer, designer, contractor, and eventually, landlord.

This was the first widely publicized adoption of more sustainable city-making principles. The Greenbelt towns are a set of three U.S. government-sponsored, carefully planned developments designed to function as autonomous livable, walk able, working towns, linked to local industry and local farming, with transportation ties to larger cities. The Greenbelt towns all share compact, mixed use centers, incorporating retail opportunities as well as civic, institutional, educational and recreational facilities. The Greenbelt towns each include a range of dwelling types of varying densities, from detached single family houses to apartment complexes to demonstrate the possibilities of quality, affordable housing for various income levels. Finally, the Greenbelt towns attempt to illustrate more "responsible" patterns of growth, including more overall compact building footprints, portions of land dedicated to "open space," pedestrian paths and public transit connections. The Greenbelt towns were a federal demonstration of the benefits of careful comprehensive planning.

However, as the Depression waned, the Resettlement Administration was disbanded, the program eclipsed by a shift of attention to World War II. With the towns increasingly perceived as near-communist radical experiments, the postwar private sector never embraced it as a model, and the easier-to-build sprawl continued to spread.

The New Towns

Through the following decades of unprecedented economic and population growth, the American suburb "exploded;" by the 1960's the critique had again percolated to a state of action. In response to the sprawling megalopolis, as well as to the rising violence in cities and the perceived population crisis (at the eve of the "baby boom"), there was public outcry that a new type of city was necessary.

Inspired by private developments of Columbia, MD and Reston, VA, the federal government funded the New Communities program, to finance the construction of 10 new "towns" of 100,000 persons each. These 1960's New Towns were to be much more than models; they were to launch a new era of American building, attempting to construct "another America" by the end of the century. The government incorporated planning principles into a complicated set of loan requirements. In general, both privately- and publicly-sponsored New Towns were carefully planned developments designed to function as full-service towns rather than simply bedroom subdivisions. The New Towns all share compact, mixed use centers, incorporating retail opportunities as well as civic, institutional, educational and recreational facilities. The New Towns each include a range of dwelling types of varying densities, from detached single family houses to high rise apartments, intended to encourage mixed income residents of varying ethnicity's. Finally, the New Towns attempt to illustrate more "responsible" patterns of growth, including more overall compact building footprints and "clustered" sites, portions of land dedicated to "open space," pedestrian paths and public transit to alleviate automobile dependence. Promoters of the New Towns came from a wide range of professional specialties,

including, but not limited to , developers, sociologists, public officials, planners, architects and urban designers.

However, like the Greenbelt Program before it, New Towns, too, never caught on. As the sole entity guaranteeing the large mortgages for these immense projects, the federal government made the developers dependent upon them. When the government failed to meet loan promises, or developers became mired in the government's many additional loan requirements, the developments went bankrupt. And the more easily profitable private sprawl continued to spread.

The New Urbanism

Finally, the critique has percolated again to critical mass, as the New Urbanists took up the charge to design a better model. New Urbanism, a self-proclaimed architectural and urban design "movement," is the name a self-selected group of design practitioners have made for their collective body of ideas. Their basic premise is that for the last 50 years, Americans have been notoriously irresponsible builders. Vast amounts of our landscape have been littered by undifferentiated subdivisions, shopping malls, superhighways and parking lots. This growth has repeatedly lured people, commerce and employment away from the hearts of our cities and towns, leaving behind a hollow shell of what our built and social environment once was. New Urbanists contend that it is time to develop a new pattern. Americans can no longer economically, environmentally or socially afford to build single-use districts; we need to again make towns. The New Urbanists' argument is grounded in the essential belief that architecture and the relationships among buildings can encourage and support certain patterns of living.

Their public message is important, as their popular press explodes. Consider this: Between 1986 and 1996, 592 articles discussing New Urbanism appeared in magazines, journals and newspapers nationwide. More significantly, 317, or over half, were published in 1996 alone.¹ Press coverage continues; Americans are again listening.

New Urbanists espouse physical planning principles promoting development as neighborhood creation, not subdivision. The principles suggest neighborhoods have compact, mixed use centers, incorporating retail opportunities as well as civic, institutional, educational and recreational facilities. They should be of limited physical size so that schools, stores and workplaces are within easy walking distance of the home. New Urbanism aims to include a range of dwelling types of varying densities, from detached single family houses to apartment complexes, intended to encourage mixed income residents of varying ethnicity's. Finally, the New Urbanism attempts to illustrate more "responsible" patterns of growth, including more overall compact building footprints and "clustered" sites, portions of land dedicated to "open space," pedestrian paths, and public transit to alleviate automobile dependence. Most importantly, New Urbanists assert that their compact, mixed-used, pedestrian oriented neighborhood ideology should be applied to regional planning proposals and urban and suburban infill sites, as well as to undeveloped greenfields. The city and the suburb, or the old downtown and the new edge city, are not mutually exclusive entities, but rather symbiotically interrelated.

There are two types of urbanism today: The traditional neighborhood, which was the model in America from the first settlements until World War II, and suburban sprawl, which has been the model since then.

— Andres Duany "Some Specific Principles of New Traditionalist Community Design,"
The American Quarterly

Calling it "Traditional Neighborhood Design" (TND), "neo traditional design," "neotraditional planning," or "Transit-Oriented Development" (TOD), New Urbanists claim to base their design

principles on pre-war models of ideal and actual American towns. In text, form and image, they frequently quote well-known, well-preserved areas such as Georgetown, D.C., Old Town Alexandria, VA, or Nantucket, MA. They also use as precedent more utopian models: the ideas of Ebenezer Howard (*Garden Cities of Tomorrow*), Raymond Unwin (*Town Planning in Practice*), Clarence Perry ("the Neighborhood Unit") and Clarence Stein and Henry Wright (the Radburn Idea). The New Urbanism not only embraces the planning structure of the compact, mixed-use prewar town, but also liberally employs its idealized, white-picketed fence imagery. Unfortunately, in doing so it promotes history as a decorative style to be applied and a time to jump back to, and it ignores a critical understanding of a more continuous tradition. As discussed, the ideas underlying the principles and physical plans of New Urbanism are part of a series of similar proposals of pre- and post-war attempts to build "community" and a "better alternative" to sprawl. History is much more than something simply applied. History is what New Urbanism is part of. The New Urbanism is part of a much longer tradition.

UNDERSTANDING TRADITION PART III: THE WORDS; PRINCIPLES AND INTENTIONS OF EACH MOVEMENT

This tradition is most easily understood when one considers primary source rhetoric contemporary to each movement. Stated design intentions are virtually identical. For example, consider the following:

Regarding balanced complete communities, the New Urbanists write in "The Ahwahnee Principles" in 1991²:

All planning should be in the form of complete and integrated communities containing housing, shops, work places, schools, parks and civic facilities essential to the daily life of the residents...A community should contain a diversity of housing types to enable citizens from a wide range of economic levels and age groups to live within its boundaries.

While in 1970, in "The Columbia Process," describing The Rouse Company's New Town of Columbia, MD, Morton Hoppenfeld writes³:

Our goal is a truly balanced community; a job opportunity for every resident; a dwelling for every job situation: houses and apartments in a wide variety of size and cost, and a chance to live, work, shop and play in the same place, i.e. a new living style...Maximum choice and easy accessibility to community facilities and services are valued as fundamental requirements for a good community.

And in 1936, in their Greenbelt Towns brochure the US Resettlement Administration writes⁴:

[Our goals are] To create a community protected by an encircling green belt; the community to be designed primarily for families of modest income, and arranged and managed so as to encourage a family and community life which will be better...To develop a land-use plan for the entire tract; to devise a system of natural economy coordinated with the land-use plan for the rural portions of the tract surrounding the suburban community; and to integrate both the physical plans and the economics of the rural area and the suburban community.

Regarding a neighborhood of limited, walkable size, the New Urbanists write:

Community size should be designed so that housing, jobs, daily needs and other activities are within easy walking distance of each other.

While Hoppenfeld writes:

We chose to adopt a system of relatively small neighborhoods with schools within walking distance to surrounding residents...

And the US Resettlement Administration writes:

All stores and community buildings are grouped near the center of each town, within easy walking distance of every home.

Regarding mixed-use town centers, the New Urbanists write:

The community should have a center focus that combines commercial, civic, cultural and recreational uses.

While Hoppenfeld writes:

A neighborhood center consists of a K-5 elementary school supplemented by a day care center, a small store and snack bar, and a multi-purpose meeting room. In addition there are typically a swimming pool, park and playgrounds...

And the US Resettlement Administration writes:

The newly designed town plan is adapted to the familiar pattern of American community life. There is the town common, traditional in a thousand New England and Mid-western villages. At the center are grouped stores, post office, bus terminal, film theater, and other business establishments. Here, too, there will be a community building, serving as an elementary school in the daytime and as a town meeting hall at night.

These statements continue, much beyond limitations of this paper. Hopefully the few above illustrate how the basic underlying principles and intentions remain unchanged. In general, all movements begin by criticizing the current condition, introducing their proposals as the base for a "better" model, something more than "just" a bedroom suburb. All propose to include a mix of uses, incorporating residential, employment, commercial, cultural and recreational facilities. All plan for communities of limited physical size, with defined centers and edges. All give preference to the pedestrian, while trying to tame the automobile. All set common land aside for public parks and plazas. All share a fundamental belief in the social power of a comprehensively physically planned community. Each proclaims itself to be the beginning of a new era. Yet none has yet proven more than a fad.

COMMENTS ON THE NEW

NEW: adj 1. having recently been made, developed, or discovered. 2. having never existed or occurred before.

— *Funk and Wagnall's Standard Dictionary*

The New Urbanism is not new; it comes from tradition, not invention. Its principles, though rephrased, have not changed significantly since the Greenbelt Program, or Howard, Perry, Stein and Wright. The diagram of the compact neighborhood with the mixed use center and significant open space, too, remains the same. And the imagery is from American towns before World War II. The significance of "new," therefore, comes not from the movement it describes, but from the culture it appeals to.

Americans have a strong fascination for things that are new, supported by our dollars and our votes. Everywhere we turn, from commerce to technology to public policy, "new and improved" labels advertise this condition. Things that are old become suspect; we associate "old" with "outdated." Think of the 1996 United States Presidential election: candidate Bob Dole had to prove his youth, Bill Clinton did not have to prove his age.

The United States was founded on the notion of the new. Other than few persons of Native American descent, we all come from

somewhere else. America offered and encouraged the prospect of socially or politically starting anew. It has been and will continue to be the tabula rasa for millions of lives.

Throughout this century, this obsession with the new has also been applied to our building programs. The New Towns. New communities. The suburb itself. We started apart, away, a new. We "fixed" cities by building away from them. We "renewed" cities by literally wiping the slate clean, tearing down the Victorian houses and replacing them with the new style, the new technology, the better vision. Our naiveté has since become painfully obvious, yet we still search for answers in things "new."

In a recent newsstand article promoting the New Urbanism, photographs directly pitted the good "traditional" against the bad "modern."⁵ The message this sends suggests that Modern design has failed, we must scrap it and go to new "traditional" neighborhoods. New Urbanists claim to be working to change the course of our development and erase the last half century of American building practices. In making their New Urbanist "neighborhoods" look (and hopefully act) like pre-war towns, they propose that they will correct the problems of Modern architecture and planning. Ironically, in doing so, they repeat its legacy: Modernism notoriously rejected its contemporary architectural context, spurned historicism in favor of the *zeitgeist*, and cleared the slate for a better way of building which would create a better life. In both the public and the private sectors, New Urbanists are **again** in danger of committing this crime, as they reject Modernism's built realities and advocate clearing the slate again. Although the forms they construct look quite different, sensibilities have not changed since the land was cleared for public housing towers in the Urban Renewal of the 1950's, or greenfields taken over for Levittown's tract developments. The message says, "throw out the modern, build the traditional." The inherent sentiment is that what is here has failed; we must destroy it to try the new, better idea. That sentiment is what got us into trouble in the first place. New towns? New communities? New Urbanism? We need revival, not renewal. We need evolution, not rebirth. To reorient, we must refocus our approach to critically and powerfully acknowledge what has been done and address what is at hand.

This constant quest for newness has created a disjunction between claimed power in design, but exhibited lack of faith in it to correct past wrongs. We do believe that architecture and city making can build a better community; the built environment can enable and encourage social conditions and patterns of use, and lead us towards sustainability. Yet we must then carry this same faith in the power of design to consider our existing context. Without doubt, the single story shopping center or the high rise public housing tower has multiple physical and ideological flaws. Yet do we need to tear these down in order to "fix" them? If the problem (or one of the problems) is aspects of their physical structure — their form — then architecture is just as equipped to manipulate, renovate, revise this structure, as well as to start anew. The slate does not have to be wiped clean every time. The inherent critique of each wave of "better alternatives" suggests the built environment around us is bad. However, for better and for worse, there are thoughtful reasons behind much of the existing built condition; scholars, architects, planners and even traffic engineers of the past fifty years did not work in isolation. We need to acknowledge and engage this, not discredit and ignore it. We need to grapple with the physical stuff of the existing context, using design in its strength, not as style but as craft.

Kentlands planners and other architects and planners who adhere to a philosophy known as the 'New Urbanism dismiss [the New Town of] Columbia as an irrelevant period piece.
— *The Baltimore Sun*, October 11, 1995

If we keep insisting on the new, with little respect for a more continuous history, New Urbanism will be doomed to the same fate as the New Towns: an irrelevant period piece. Is this the sign of a

new paradigm? Only by admitting and understanding the past can we heal the urgent crises of identity, and finally cause the end of the Fourth Migration.

For despite the extended and expansive critique, suburban sprawl continues to spread with little interruption across a decentralized America, even through the hearts of our real prewar cities and towns. We need to look no further than to these model places today — the Pittsfields (MA), the Allentowns (PA), the Macons (GA), the Detroit (MI), the New Havens (CT) — and hundreds of others throughout the older East to see that physical design principles cannot possibly be the sole answer. If strong existing compact, mixed use, pedestrian scaled Main Streets and neighborhoods and villages have not been able to withstand the onslaught of the freeway, the industrial parks, the entertainment complexes — how can new, applied rules to new developments turn this tide? Perhaps in the end the most nostalgic piece is the compact, mixed use, pedestrian scaled town itself.

NOTES

- 1 From a Lexus Nexus "general news" database search using keyword "New Urbanism" (December 20, 1996).
- 2 The "Ahwahnee Principles;" Peter Calthorpe et.al., *Western City*, (September 1994).
- 3 Morton Hoppenfield, "The Columbia Process" (1970).
- 4 The United States Resettlement Administration. *Greenbelt Towns* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1936).
- 5 Andres Duany, "Some Principles of New Traditionalist Community Design," *The American Enterprise*, (November/December 1996).

REFERENCES

- Adler, J. "Bye-bye Suburban Dream" [cover story], *Newsweek*, 125 (May 15, 1995), pp. 40-45.
- Bailey, James, ed. *New Towns in America; The Design and Development Process* (*The American Institute of Architects*). New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Charter of the New Urbanism*. From the World Wide Web, December 14, 1996.
- Columbia Maryland Status Report*. Columbia, MD: The Rouse Company, March 1996.
- Calthorpe, Peter, and Judy Corbett, Michael Corbett, Andres Duany, Peter Katz, Elizabeth Moule, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Stefanos Polyzoides, Steve Weissman. "The Ahwahnee Principles; Toward More Livable Communities," *Western City* (September 1994), pp. 4-9, 41.
- "Cures for Lonely Suburbs and Dying Cities," *The American Enterprise* 7 (November/December 1996). A series of related articles, including Carlson, Allan. "Two Cheers for the Suburbs;" Langdon, Philip and Andres Duany. "The New Neighborly Architecture;" Siegel, Fred. "Bulldoze the 60's and Bolster Business;" Zinsmeister, Karl. "A Conservative Case Against Suburbia;" (various) "The City Life We've Lost;" (various) "Making our Hometowns More Livable."
- Fulmer, O. Kline. (Introduction by Lewis Mumford). *Greenbelt*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1941.
- Hoppenfield, Morton. "The Columbia Process," *The Columbia, MD Archives* (1970).
- Howard, Ebenezer. *Garden Cities of To-Morrow* (with an Introduction by Lewis Mumford). London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1898 (England), 1902 (United States), 1951.
- Katz, Peter. *The New Urbanism; Toward an Architecture of Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1994.
- Mumford, Lewis. "The Fourth Migration." Part of a special issue on "The Regional Community," (including articles by Benton

- MacKaye, Clarence Stein, Charles Whitaker and Henry Wright) *Survey Graphic* VII (May 1925), pp. 130-134.
- Perry, Clarence Arthur. "The Neighborhood Unit," *The Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs* VII (1929).
- Stein, Clarence S. *Toward New Towns for America*. Liverpool: The University Press of Liverpool, 1951, 1973.
- Unwin, Raymond. *Town Planning in Practice; An Introduction to the Art of Designing Cities and Suburbs*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- U.S. Resettlement Administration. *Greenbelt Towns; A Demonstration in Suburban Planning*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September, 1936.