



PAUL YLVISAKER

Professor of Public Affairs and Urban
Planning
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and
International Affairs
Princeton University
New Jersey

PAUL YLVISAKER was born in St. Paul, Minnesota, and received his doctoral degree from Harvard University. For 7 years, he was a member of the faculty of Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania. His experience in urban affairs began in 1954 when he became executive secretary to the mayor of Philadelphia and was continued later when he served as commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs.

In 1955 he joined the Ford Foundation to direct its public affairs programs. He became the director of the foundation in 1956 and served in that post until 1967.

During his professional career, Mr. Ylvisaker has been appointed to several governmental commissions, both foreign and national, and has served in several visiting professorships.

At present he is Professor of Public Affairs and Urban Planning in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University.

Although I must disagree somewhat with Mr. Turner, I do so with a great deal of respect for the man and for the position that in essence he has taken. If anybody would have to prove his case, I would have to. History and technology are with his prognosis that there will not be major changes in the transportation landscape of this country in the next 20 years. Take technology first. Charlie Zwick and his colleagues at Rand taught me 12 years ago, that the lead-time development of any new or exotic form of transportation is easily 10 to 20 years. Therefore, I do not think that one can contradict easily the proposition that transportation modes and mix will remain roughly the same for that period of time.

Also, I think, history pretty well shows that, during the past 50 years, even the past 10, in which we have had rapid social changes, certain basic things like modes of transportation do persist. If one is going to be realistic, one does not easily indulge in science fiction. Nor does one easily indulge in social criticism, telling someone who has to build highways that he is socially obsolete and that he is going to have to mend his ways if he survives.

The facts are that when one deals with reality, with legislatures, with legislators who must be elected and re-elected by a real and not a fantasized public, and with the hard questions of how to get people to work or really to accommodate the diverse demands of a family for transportation, one does end up pretty much with, at best, an incremental change in the present system.

There is something gnawing in me, however, as I read Mr. Turner's talk before and listened to it again—something gnawing at the same part of me that would have given the same speech. It is feeling down deep that perhaps this speech is a bit like one that

would have been given in the 1920's by a railroad man who ignored the automobile, or in the 1950's by a mayor who talked about physical renewal of his city and never mentioned the word "Negro." Something is missing; somebody has his eyes closed.

If we are going to work in a complex system, and that is indeed what we are in with a vengeance these days, we have to think about those "other things"—the reciprocals, the mutuality, the backlashes, the reverse twists, the reverberations, and all the other factors as they impinge on us and as we impinge on them. We ignore those things at our peril, in both action and prophecy. The point at issue is not so much the remaining strength of highway and automobile as the growing strength of countervailing forces and contrary reactions in the system. More and more people are going to have to internalize within their own spheres of action a concern and a calculus of the things that are going on outside. The changes highway administrators will have to contend with will not originate in their own bailiwick. They are going to come as a reaction and a response to the things on the outside.

If you were to read Mr. Turner's talk again very carefully, you would discover that, in spite of some general words about social planning, social consequences, and the rest, he assumes that the nation will continue as is—with its central cities in trouble and swiftly moving toward bankruptcy. Newark is there already; others are soon to follow. By Mr. Turner's projection, we would still have the ghetto and vast differences in the economic conditions between central city and suburb.

He also assumes, implicitly, that citizens will act by leave of the highway builders rather than on their own agenda and initiative. Nothing is said about the growing shortage of housing and the rising public temper about it. No mention is made of the problems of automobile insurance and the accumulating bill that the policyholder is stuck with or, for that matter, of the whole back-breaking cost to society of living with the automobile. From his silence, one would assume that we had also solved all international problems and had not had to face the competition of nations who, with less land space, may yet choose public transportation as their economic base rather than the automobile, which then becomes an international dinosaur.

These are big questions to leave unanswered. Again, history and technology will argue that in spite of these externalities there is such a vast consumer demand and momentum that present trends will persevere. That nagging part of me, however, wants to address those externalities rather than assuming them away.

The love affair of the American with his automobile may never stop. However, his love affair with what goes with that automobile—its increasing cost, the problems of getting and paying for insurance, the fact that 50,000 people still die every year on the roads, the fact that it gets him into conditions and constraints that he cannot extricate himself from, the fact that it does not solve his housing problem—these "other things" are beginning to be weighed in his balance, and he is capable now of asking those questions before and not only after going out and buying the car.

Let me make another more subtle argument. Even if the half of me that "wrote" Mr. Turner's speech is right and we continue to be a nation of cars and highways, we will be better off if we internalize the costs and concerns that we characteristically allow to grow and fester as externalities. Economically, it makes much more sense if you draw into your accounting the true costs of your operations. It is also better from the point of view of mental health. Doing so cuts away at our social escapism and schizophrenia.

Let me take some of these outside concerns one by one. The main problem of the 1970's in terms of hardware is going to be housing. The nation's housing shortage is of crisis proportions. This present Administration, if it is unseated by anything beyond Vietnam and economic slowdowns, will be defeated because of its failure to solve the housing problem. It has not bit the bullet. The controversy between George Romney and the rest of the Administration has shown that the national government is not ready, like governments in other civilized nations, to take on the national responsibility.

ity for providing or ensuring adequate shelter. The only way to solve the housing problem, given the numbers involved, is to go into large-scale development, and this means having the power to take over large areas of land and systematically to plan whole communities rather than isolated housing projects. This means changing a tradition that has long been with us of local control over land use.

We have come to the point where we can no longer continue to be a society essentially of single-family homes; the costs of such housing is becoming prohibitive. We will be moving probably simultaneously in 2 directions. One will be to apartment buildings, a trend already obvious. In my state of New Jersey, as in most urban regions, multi-family construction in recent years is accounting for most of the new housing units coming onto the market.

The second direction is toward the mobile home. I would predict that, because the national and state governments have been so slow and delinquent in taking on their housing responsibilities, we will probably see an explosive growth in mobile home development. That will lead to further sprawl, and sprawl with a vengeance. One can already see it in the South, the Southwest, and the West. We have been able to resist it in New Jersey, but we cannot do so for very long. About 90 percent of all single-family housing costing less than \$17,000 now is accounted for by mobile homes; 400,000 units were produced last year. As one goes South and West, one sees this kind of housing sprawled over every part of the environment.

If government will not accept its housing responsibility and if mobile homes become the dominant type of American housing of the future, this does mean more automotive transportation. Such a sudden explosive increase in highway needs, however, may be far beyond the system's financing capacity. So the mobile home will not easily let us escape from a complex system. We are bound to see the reverberations come zinging back from other costs it will incur: sloppy zoning, sloppy utility development, and the highway costs that accompany it.

The multiple-family home and planned-unit development are probably more desirable, but this pattern is going to be extremely difficult to work out in the short run. To the degree we work it out and to the degree multiple homes and higher density living become the pattern of urban development as it has historically been for most of man, then the role of the automobile becomes more questionable. I am not going to adopt the romanticism of the European-oriented planner of the nineteenth century who thought that if you build high-density communities you will not need the automobile. On the contrary, when one visits the high-density communities of Europe, one discovers that not only do they have public transit but they are still stuck with the automobile. This does indicate, however, that the transportation planner and the highway administrator will have to contend at the growing margin with a new mix of community development problems symbolized by the movement toward new towns and planned-unit developments. We will not see as much as we have seen in the past when the Federal Housing Administration and private developers suddenly spawned housing here, there, and everywhere. There will instead be concerted efforts to bring the transportation planner into a team situation that will focus on more balanced development.

The 1970's will see another kind of controversy and crisis. The dominant element in the economy has changed from manufacturing to services. The new power structure and the new power struggles that are emerging are in the service sector. We have perfected mass production, distribution, and consumption in the manufacturing sector, and we have kept a rather stable price level.

Services in this country are not so well organized. They are still medieval and monopolistic in their traditions; guilds and unions control the production of services. Service costs are rising faster than the general price level by a factor of a third. The battles are looming. How will one get delivery of health services? It means practically a revolution in the health industry, the fastest growing industry in the United States. How are we going to get legal services spread out among the population as they should be? As we urbanize, law becomes essential in everyday life and more

important to the lower income than to the higher income. The legal fraternity, however, is only slowly accommodating to a mass market. Engineering, philanthropy, the arts, day-care, and all the other services are now in trouble. They do not cater to the mass market; they are self-regulated, and they are slow to accommodate.

The confrontations of the 1960's and 1970's are concerned with the service sector. We watched the blacks in the early 1960's take on the service sector, particularly the governmental services of health, education, police, and welfare, saying that they were not structured to deal with consumers having low incomes but free choice. Then the students took on the educational establishment, saying that education is not organized as it should be. Nader was next to move on the service economy, with his exposes of bureaucratic foibles. Pressure is mounting on the medical profession to rationalize health services.

We are going to be relieved to a degree by this shift of pressures toward the doctors, the dentists, the plumbers, and all the rest who are now being confronted by a new populist movement. This new populism is going to demand eventually a mix of services equally and easily accessible to the average person who sees a basket of services like health, law, day-care, and education as necessary to quality of life in the city.

The communities of the future will have to be service-oriented. Transportation planners will have to think simultaneously about locating people and locating services. This may or may not pull away from the automobile. I think, to a degree, it will because it begins to amass functions rather than to spread them out, as they have been in the past.

Consumerism will force other changes. Planners will have to contend with it regularly in every plan that they draw up. They will not get away with tokenism; public participation will be for real, and it will be rugged. Of course, those of you in highway transportation are used to that; if anybody has been toughened up in the past 20 years by citizen participation and rowdy hearings, you people have. My hat is off to you for the cool with which you have taken it. You have now begun to discover, however, that there is a much longer checklist of considerations and complaints to which you are vulnerable as the system grows and complicates. That checklist is as long as the one a 747 pilot has to go through at take-off. You will have to answer questions such as whose culture are your highways going through, not just whose home; how will replacement housing be built, not just who is to be relocated; have you increased a citizen's access to a whole mix of services, not just sped his journey to work.

I want to say a little bit more about race. Clearly, you are going to encounter more of the minorities and their concerns in the suburbs. Suburban zoning is under attack along a very wide front, and it looks as though that attack is going to be successful, at least in the courts. In New Jersey, Justice Hall of the State Supreme Court just this last year said that, because housing is now at such a critical state of need, a housing project has the same standing as churches and schools and, therefore, presumably gets favored treatment for zoning variances. The zoning "game" is also under attack in the federal courts, and I would expect suburban exclusion will be outlawed during this decade. You will then be dealing with a different constituency. Even before that time, blacks and mayors of central cities will be appearing at suburban hearings and challenging plans and presumptions that formerly went unquestioned. All this points toward a mobility of the population, socially and legally, that we have not had to contend with before.

Another set of constraints will flow from the public's growing concern with the environment; clearly, that adds to the intricacy of the checklist. Also, it will show, I think, the rate at which technology is going to be pouring its produce into our system. The effect will in one way reinforce Mr. Turner's projection of the status quo. Technological innovations, leading away from what we have, may come more slowly; but the increasing surveillance by environmentalist is far more likely to center on highways and the automobile, forcing some major changes in the way highway people do business.

The competition for resources, I expect, is going to increase and accentuate until the year 2000 and beyond. I am not an optimist. I think we have gone through our period of affluence and that, had Joseph been interpreting the dreams of our President, he would have told us back in 1945 that we would go through a period of the fat cows and then a long period of the lean. Unfortunately, we were not listening to a Joseph at that time, and we have in many ways squandered our resources during a period of affluence that we may now see was short-lived.

Even if affluence were to continue, however, rising aspirations and swarming choices will weigh heavily on our resources forcing a competition for housing as against health, as against education, as against the arts, as against travel, as against assistance for foreign nations. The competition among advanced nations for internal capital is going to be extremely rough. In short, we may or may not find it possible to continue at presumed rates of highway and automobile spending.

My last point has to do with mental health. In order to play out the scenario that Mr. Turner has written for the next 20 years, we will have to keep our emotional balance; and keeping one's emotional balance in a growingly complex system will not be all that easy. What is happening in this society right now? People are on the verge of losing their emotional cool. One can see the signs in the rapid exit of people in public office. Mayors in the last 5 years who have left office voluntarily are an ominous number. Even worse is the rate at which voters are now speeding up the exit of public officials, if they will not go voluntarily. It seems that now in the United States we are coming to a one-term presidency. Presidents begin calculating in the second or third year of their first term whether they can possibly make it a second time round and end up deciding they cannot.

This kind of mood is really overcoming us. I was with a taxicab driver in New York the other day, and he said, "That guy Lindsay must have holes in his head. Why would a man voluntarily take on a job where he knows that even if I understand what he's trying to do, I hate him. You know, he doesn't have a chance for my support because, statistically, inside of six months, he'll be making decisions which will be against me, even when he's right. And so, I'm going to vote him out, you know. I think it better if he'd stood at home."

Another person, a philosopher, echoed this same sentiment: "I now understand why the Roman Empire fell apart at its height. It got so complicated that the best citizens couldn't take it anymore, and they began checking out."

How do you solve that one? How do you counter that mood? This, I guess, is the most subtle point that I will make, but the most important one. It is not by avoiding the accumulating complexity of our times; it is by moving into the center of it, taking on directly those gnawing concerns that troubled me as I read Mr. Turner's straight-line projection of a simpler past.