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"The question ushered in by restructuring is whether nations and localities respond effectively and how quickly they do so. The politics of places, as embedded in their specific histories, remains a key factor in urban change, because it is both a useful explanatory device and a plausible arena for intervention" (Molotch, p.193).

"This is America-the unplanned land, where speculators are subsidized, and where the divide between rich and poor is played out in urban designer's developer-driven deals. It is socialism for capitalists-a free ride in need of the brakes" (Kay, p.694)

These two quotes provide a true illustration of the current state of urban development in American cities. The recent social and economic phenomenon of the globalization and increased mobility of capital has stimulated however a concurrent proliferation of a conventional wisdom and conservative ideology that suggests that this phenomenon is an event that is completely deterministic, devoid of politics, and uncontrollable by local governments to an extensive degree and national governments to a smaller degree (Logan and Swanstrom 1990). American appearance and politics suggests that the market dictates public policy and thus public policy must respond and adapt to the market and its principles on market terms (Peterson; Kasarda and Hicks).

This ideology and wisdom is played out in urban development policies, or "flexible regimes of accumulation" that stress distributive economic development over social welfare policies, lower tax rates over higher services, and lower levels of social expenditures versus higher levels of corporate subsidies in order to help business adapt to new economic conditions (Preteceille 1990).

It is accepted as economic deterministic Gospel that local urban governments and even national governments, to a certain extent, must shun democratic social welfare policies and the importance of democratic controls on the market despite the resulting economic and social dislocations.

However, in essence, the issue of economic restructuring and the phenomena of change within the Fordist regime of accumulation is closely tied to politics and the role of the state, even
the role of the state at the local level (Preteceille:1988,1990). Examples abound worldwide to prove that public policy has a profound effect on economic restructuring through public levels of investment, military spending, and growth policies (Markusen 1987, 106-14; Hill; O'Connor 1973) and furthermore, that the difference in these policies produces difference processes of restructuring and differing social and economic consequences and conditions (Molotch 1990;p.193; Savitch 1988; Evans 1979). Comparative studies of urban development policies in the industrialized world show that the city, the welfare of its citizenry, and its democratic principles don't have to be subverted to the whims of the market (Smith and Feagin 1987; Kuttner 1984; Gurr and King 1987; Dogan and Kasarda 1988; Savitch 1988; Parkinson, Foley and Judd 1989). Within their historical and national contexts, cities and their local governments have the ability, through a mixture of federal and local progressive policies and politics (such as social welfare initiatives and efforts in increased democratization), to redirect capital and the restructuring process, to serve the needs of people over the profit margin (Clavel 1986; Molotch and Vicari; Molotch 1990; Preteceille 1988,1990).

By comparing the examples of policy responses to economic globalization in different urban settings, one can gain an understanding of the true breadth of opportunities that exist for positive responses to the market. The key to this comparison is understanding that it is a definite political choice that is made in terms of using the economy through public policy for more capital-oriented needs or for more democratic, people-oriented, social welfare purposes (Esping-Anderson 1985; Kantor; Korpi 1985; Kuttner 1984; Friedland and Sanders, 1988; Logan and Swanstrom). This process and the resulting economic and social consequences are brilliantly illustrated in looking at the urban development policies of two very different cities in two very different countries (Chicago in the U.S. and Amsterdam in the Netherlands).
In the United States, there is a strong acceptance of the fact that globalization is a process that must be adapted to on its own terms, instead of attempting to fashion it to the needs of people. In the Netherlands, one of the most generous welfare states in the world, there is a strong belief in the use of democracy, truly public policy, and generous social welfare policies to shape the economy, despite its revolutionary changes, to meet the needs of people.

The urban policies of the two cities provide a full illustration. Chicago is a typical Rust-Belt American city fighting the effects of de-industrialization and economic restructuring with a growth regime that follows undemocratic, private-market led, distributive development policies (Peterson, Molotch, p.318; Suttles 1990, Kay, p.693; Grimshaw 1991). Amsterdam, on the other hand, is a city of a generous social welfare state nation that employs strongly democratic, public, and state-led development policies with a redistributive and human-based emphasis (Heisler; Morris, p.3A). They are complete opposites in urban policy working in the same global age of restructuring. Within the context of their own historical and national climates, they produce very different types of results that give insight to the social and economic possibilities of urban areas and progressive politics. By analyzing their policies, the results they produce, and their historical and political climates, one can real solutions and real hope for better cities and better societies.

Development Policy Compared: Chicago and Amsterdam

Any initial examination of development policy must begin with an analysis of the plans or strategies that drive the development process. A progressive and comprehensive urban development policy would fully cover a range of necessary items to ensure a quality life for all citizens in a democratic and balanced manner. These items must include the issues of affordable housing, mass transit, economic development (including jobs, balanced development, industry, and retail), the
environment, poverty, and public services. If a city does not address these issues in its policy and plans and further political actions, it cannot claim to be directing the city towards an end that meets the needs of all inhabitants. After examining plans and strategies, the examination will turn to how well these plans are backed up by financial and political resources and what the resulting social, economic, and political effects of the entire process are on the cities and their inhabitants.

**Amsterdam Development Policies: Plans and Strategies**

Development in the Netherlands is a national process. All development falls under a hierarchical structure that gives ultimate authority over policy issues and ultimate responsibility for funding to the national government with provincial and local governments playing the role of direct democratic implementation. National, provincial, and local planning guidelines direct development, while local zoning plans carry out the specific democratic desires of local citizens (City of Amsterdam: 1994). This entire process is supported by generous national funding that provides 90% of all city budgets, a strong democratic flavor, a culture of consultation between levels of government, business, and citizens, and a strong universal welfare state that ensures a development process that works to better the lives of all citizens (Overzicht specifieke uitkeringen 1996; Municipal Taxes in the Netherlands, p.1).

In Amsterdam, development is a very open, democratic, and integrated process that involves as many components of Dutch society as possible in an attempt to create a livable and sustainable city with adequate housing, quantity and quality of jobs, plenty of recreational amenities, and a strong, linked network of transportation. Development is driven first and foremost by the public sector and the democratic process that surrounds and upholds Dutch society. Spatial planning
involves national, provincial, and municipal involvement in a very interesting mixture of centralized financing and guidance coupled with local democratic decision-making and control.

Development in Amsterdam falls under a decentralized system of legislation that extends in a hierarchial system of overall authority from the national government down to the provincial and local levels. The national government lays down national planning guidelines through a cooperative Key Planning Decision Making process that involves the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment (VROM), the National Spatial Planning Agency, and the National Spatial Planning Commission. These guidelines are not binding on individual citizens, but they do lay a framework that coordinates economic, traffic and transport, housing, and environmental policies into a national framework to guide the development of the country (Hardy, Personal Interview). These planning guidelines, contained in National Planning Policy Notes, are developed in a lengthy and extensive process of consultation and public review and participation that involves the National Spatial Planning Agency, the National Spatial Planning Commission, the Executive Cabinet, and the Parliament (Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment (VROM) 1990, 1995). There is much ministerial consultation at the national level to ensure that the national planning guidelines coincide with and are complementary to national environmental and traffic policies (Hardy, Personal Interview).

The Provincial government is then required to produce a regional structure plan which must fall within the guidelines or parameters set by the national level. These provincial structure plans are also not binding on individual citizens but lay the vision and the guidelines for regional development in a specific area of the country (City of Amsterdam 1994). The provincial plan is developed through democratic and consultative process very similar to that of the national level.
The individual municipalities, in this case, Amsterdam, will then produce a city-wide, and oftentimes regional-wide (depending on cooperation with surrounding municipalities) structure plan to guide development and help determine general areas for housing, employment, environmental, and transportation policies (City of Amsterdam 1983). These plans are not binding on individual citizens and must fall in line with the guidelines of the national and provincial level policies.

Finally, the cities will produce local "bistemmings" or zoning plans that very specifically lay out the development of nearly each and every area of the municipality. These plans must fit into the larger structure plan, are binding on individual citizens and are punishable by law for violations (City of Amsterdam 1994). It is these plans that make the specific and detailed decisions about planning and development on the most local level and with the direct democratic influence of local citizens.

In Amsterdam, the local flavor of development within this national, country-wide framework has a very unique flavor of its own that bears explaining and explicating. Like development in other municipalities, it is extremely democratic and very comprehensive, involving issues of traffic and transport, employment, housing, recreation, and the environment (City of Amsterdam 1991). Like all other Dutch municipalities, Amsterdam has a city council that directs government business under the direction of the burgomaster and 45 aldermen.

However, unlike some other Dutch cities, Amsterdam then is divided into 16 city districts (17 counting the city center) which have their own local district councils of aldermen, separate from the larger city council (City of Amsterdam 1991). These local district councils are responsible for running almost all city business for that local district, including providing city services and producing local zoning or "bistemmings" plans (City of Amsterdam 1991). This structure is intended to bring the government closer to the people and to encourage public, democratic
participation and popular control over decision-making, especially decision-making in the area of planning and development (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview). These local districts insure popular control and a democratic process of development.

A brief look at each type of planning document gives a full picture of the goals and plans of Amsterdam development.

*4th Policy Note:* The 4th Policy Note is the national policy document that lays out the guidelines for national planning in the Netherlands. As stated earlier, it has a profound effect on planning and development in Amsterdam because any and all development in the city must fall within the boundaries laid down by this document (VROM 1992, 1995). The most recent national policy note was written in 1989, approved in 1994, and covers the planning for the country up until the year 2015.

The 4th Policy Note is not a plan, it a collection of interconnected guidelines that lays out a vision for the development of the country and sets goals and priorities. The policy note attempts to respond to social challenges and emphasizes four main policy points:

1. Positive national economic growth
2. Using development to preserve the environmental, transportation, and human resources that might be vulnerable to destruction at the hands of the market.
3. Ensuring spatial quality characterized by:
   * flexible and sustainable development
   * mixed-used development in terms of combining functions
   * diversity and identity of space

The policy note then goes further to break down priorities for planning and development based on the daily living environment and the international context. In the daily living environment,
the fourth policy note specifies five basic values that include infrastructure, a clean environment, safe surroundings through good spatial planning and upkeep of public areas, the provision of basic public amenities that are available and accessible to all parts of society, and mixed-use, diverse development that keeps a clear distinction between urban and rural areas (VROM 1992). Notice the aversions to suburban, dispersed, or free-market driven development. In the international context, planning policies are laid down with an eye to preserving the Netherlands competitive position in the world market, while ensuring sustainable and people-oriented development back home (VROM 1992).

These basic values are to be implemented through improvements in urban areas, mobility, raw materials, environment and waste, and rural areas (VROM 1992, p.13). The main emphases are on using location policy to link up business, residential, and recreational uses in conjunction with public transport, through the designation of areas as "A", "B", or "C" areas, to ensure the continuation of urban, mixed-use, diverse development that tackles common problems in a comprehensive way (VROM 1994). This use of location policy as a directing vision ensures the right uses in the right places, a mix of uses, a democratic control over development, and an assurance that development follows public principles put forth by the community (VROM 1994).

The central government, in coordination with provincial and municipal government has taken a number of steps to see that these principles set forth in the policy note are fulfilled. These steps include allocating 15 million guilders per year, coordinating land-use policy, and publishing a Work Plan containing all the major development projects that will carry out the objectives of the Policy Note (VROM 1992).

*Structure Plan: Under the broad framework which the 4th Policy Note lays, further
planning for development occurs through structure plans at both the provincial and municipal level. The regional spatial plan (streekplan) outlines the major guidelines for the future development of the province as a whole or for certain specific areas. The purpose is to formulate a broad and comprehensive vision of how the province should develop.

Then, at the municipal level, individual municipalities may draw up their own structure plans, though they are not required to do so. In Amsterdam, plans for developing the city have historically been present throughout the 20th century, even before the beginning of national planning policy with the National Planning Act in 1965 (City of Amsterdam 1994). Thus, the Physical Planning Department in Amsterdam produces a structure plan for the purpose of directing city development within the entire area of Amsterdam and, in some cases, the regions extending beyond it. The structure plan is approved by the Municipal Council and Executive and then sent to the Provincial Level to be approved there to ensure that there are no conflicts between the municipal structure plan and the regional structure plan (VROM 1995). The structure plan lays out the broad outlines of how the entire city will develop along major points. This broad outline and these major points are accompanied with maps and with explanations, research, data, reasons, and the level of participation and consultations behind the specific type of developments.

The current structure plan for the city of Amsterdam was written in 1994 and entitled "More quality in the compact city" (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994). This structure plan follows up the 1985 and 1991 plans and continues the policy of the city towards development since 1990 which emphasizes the "compact city" and the importance of sustaining both "livability" and "sustain ability" within a very urban, very high-density type of development (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994). "The final goal is to improve the quality of the city as a whole and its
component parts in particular" (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994). This idea points out the nature of comprehensive development in Amsterdam and the very important shift in the 1990s to a policy of urban regeneration from a policy urban renewal with the emphasis on improving the city as a whole and as a single entity versus improving small, individual areas of the city on their own (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview).

"Urban revitalization is a necessity, because only by improving the quality of the city in an integrated fashion, can the objectives of the compact city be obtained and its residents be offered an attractive environment to live in, an environment that had moreover been coming under tremendous pressure precisely because of the concentration of people and functions" (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.83).

The idea of the "compact city" further means the best possible use of already developed space and the preservation of the urban versus the rural within and around the city of Amsterdam:

"The awareness that society can no longer afford to waste space on car traffic and parking spaces, and thus on further suburbanization, has now sunk home. Suburbanization requires space that is not available, and demands sacrifices of the environment that we can no longer allow" (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.206).

This structure plan, which will guide the city until the year 2005, lays out the broad outlines of development of the city along the 4 issues of environment, morphology, greenery, and public transport. The emphasis is on creating a city that is "sustainable and livable"; that preserves environmental resources and creates a city that meets every citizen's needs (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994). As the plan states:

"Livable surroundings benefit public health; sustainable surroundings are durable and can more easily be adapted to new requirements, enabling future generations to live there as well" (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994).

Environmentally, the plan stresses the use of more tools to ensure environmental preservation through development, the overall decline in the level of city pollution, and the coordination of environmental and spatial planning to ensure environmental quality. Morphologically, the plan
stresses distinguishing between "urban fabrics", which are areas already possessing an urban character, and "fault lines" or transition areas which are ripe for expansion and increased development (City of Amsterdam: 1994, p.214). In terms of greenery, the plan stresses the designation of areas that must be preserved as green areas or historic areas in order to preserve the city's recreational amenities and environmental quality within the concept of the "compact city." Finally, the increased use of public transport, the discouragement of auto traffic, and the coordination of "location policy" with traffic policy is seen as a way to create development that benefits the environment (less cars), living conditions (mixed income and mixed use neighborhoods connected by mass transit and less pollution), and the compact city as a whole (connecting the city center to fast growing outlying areas of the city by mass transit) (City of Amsterdam: 1994).

A number of needs that the structure plan identifies as requiring action by the city include an evening out of the housing stock with more high income housing, an increase in mixed income living with the need for more high income groups in the city, and investments in new infrastructure for public transport through the regional traffic and transport plan with the goal of strengthening the links of different areas of the city, especially that of the city center to the fast growing outlying areas (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994). In addition, the plan calls for a further revitalization of the city center by concentrating activities there (especially cultural and small employment activities). In order to address the issue of unemployment, an improvement in the quality and quantity of employment within the city is called for by creating the proper conditions for business growth through investments in spatial quality, mass transportation, city amenities, and by encouraging mixed-used and mixed-income development and small business growth (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994). The plan also calls for the altering of car traffic to bike and
public transportation in the interest of livability and sustain ability (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994).

Finally, the new structure plan, in its entirety, is geared towards a more regionally integrated approach to planning and development. The reason for this is that Amsterdam realizes that its problems cannot be solved at their root without regional cooperation (von Veenendaal, Verhaar, Personal Interviews). The environment, traffic and transport, economic development, and land-use: these issues and others all have their ultimate solution in planning on the regional and national, and not just, local levels. The goal is to solve problems on a comprehensive level at their root and to create stronger, more equitable, more regional-based economic growth (Hardy, Personal Interview).

The balancing of these criteria and the issues of the environment, economic development, and the compact city are extremely important in preserving the city as a good place to live for all inhabitants. Balancing quality growth with sustain ability and environmental safety and preservation is what the structure plan is all about. In the end, the highest quality of urban life for all individuals within the framework of environmental and economic issues are the number one priority of Amsterdam’s planning process as defined by the structure plan.

*1993 City Policy Plan: The 1993 City Policy Plan is another expression of the priorities of Amsterdam planning policy. The plan is a statement written in conjunction between the Physical Planning Department and the City Hall Policy Department to give an overall plan and vision of how the city center should develop, under the umbrella of the structure plan, and to provide a framework under which bistemmings or zoning plans can be developed. It details the rebirth of the city center within the framework of area-oriented planned, and controlled, selected growth that provides livability and sustain ability.
"The renewed interest in the spatial quality of the city is evident from the extensive reorganization of public open space in the centre and policies which are designed to cut back the number of cars on the streets. The city's public open space and the quality of the townscape are receiving more attention in the city's policies and investments than they have for many years" (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.139).

The main points of the policy are an area-oriented approach, a mixture of functions while bolstering the center's role in the city, a view of the city center not in isolation from the rest of the city, and to achieve the primary objectives of maintaining the city's central position, mixture of functions, and historic townscape, and improving the city's accessibility, open space, and quality of life (City of Amsterdam: 1994, p.144).

*Local Zoning Plans:* Amsterdam has numerous local zoning plans or "bistemmingsplans". The "bistemmingsplan" is the only plan that is legally binding on individual citizens. The municipality is required by the National Planning Act of 1965 to do a local land-use plan for the part of the city that is not built up (VROM 1995). For the built-up area, there is no requirement for a local land use plan. However, most cities do produce land-use plans for each bit of land since it allows the city to ensure that development is a democratic and public process and that unwanted private developments do not take place (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview).

In Amsterdam, they are written by the local district councils that govern the 16 districts that have been set up by the Amsterdam Municipal Council in order to bring the government closer to the people (City of Amsterdam 1991). It is by far the most important land use policy instrument that there is in the Dutch planning process. It lays out specific regulations, building sizes, land uses, and maps of how and where functions should be located (City of Amsterdam 1994). The local land use plan serves as the legal basis upon which the municipality decides whether or not to issue a building
permit, and it designates where and what type of development will take place in each area of the city.

The land use plan provides the legal basis:

- for a construction permit
- for obliging private developers to contribute to the costs of providing certain public services
- for claiming compensation for loss of value
- for compulsory purchase (VROM 1995).

It also gives legal citizens and private developers a formal role in the development process. It ensures that the "public" has control over what the private developer does to land (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview).

"For example, the national government can make it a condition of granting the municipality a subsidy for a certain development (such as building subsidized housing) that there be a valid local land use plan for the area concerned" (VROM 1995).

Under the local zoning plans, development may occur in one of three ways. One, a developer may bring a proposal and plan to the Department of Physical Planning. The developer's plans will then be compared to the requirements laid forth by the local zoning plan which has been publicly written and democratically approved by the people in the immediate area, to see if the development is allowable. If it is, a building permit will be issued and the developer will have to follow a set of very strict regulations and rules and may have to provide certain public services in the process of building. Two, the city may use its unique and public method of land leasing (the city owns a good majority of the city land) to lease land to a developer for the express purpose of building a publicly designed plan for the development of the area which ensures the democratic direction of development, and if successful, brings money back to the community for more public services as land values go up. Three, the city and a private developer may meet halfway and agree to split the
costs of planning and developing the land under the publicly-approved zoning plan. In any of the three cases, no development occurs without heavy democratic, public involvement in the process (City of Amsterdam 1994; von Veenendaal, Personal Interview).

In addition to the land-use policy of Amsterdam and the fact that the process is extremely public and representative of the public will, there are a number of other tools under the local zoning plans that the city uses to ensure that development is a public-driven and public-serving process. One such tool is called compulsory purchase. This practice came into heavy use during the intensive urban renewal efforts of the late 80s as the city attempted to rebuild and replace dilapidated housing and infrastructure. Under compulsory purchase, if there is a legal bistemmingsplan in an area and the publicly-written and approved plan calls for a certain function or new development to be carried out in a specific area, but the city only owns part of the area, then the city can, under the Physical Planning Act, require the property owner, after following numerous legal procedures, to sell his property for a fair market price (VROM 1995). The city will first ask the owner to sell and offer the market price and then, if the owner refuses, may take it to a judge, who will, based on the public zoning plan, force the owner to sell for the market price. Compulsory purchase is a key tool for the successful execution of a local zoning plan.

Another such tool that the city uses often to guide development is a preparation decision. A preparation decision is done for an area that lacks a bistemmingsplan. The city declares that a zoning plan is being prepared and that until it is finished, no development may take place. The preparation decision closes development in that area until the zoning plan is finished and ensures once again that the public has the last, democratic say on how parts of the city are used (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview).
In Amsterdam, the 16 district councils all produce their own local, neighborhood plans through their own councils, plus they handle all their own city services. Each district council develops their own concrete planning policies, zoning plans, public housing plans, management plans, the issuance of permits and lands, etc (City of Amsterdam 1991). Thus, the whole process of development, planning, and government is very close to the people despite the fact that the city of greater Amsterdam claims nearly 1.5 million citizens. This ensures local democracy, an emphasis on development for needs instead of profit, and a process that is responsive to regular citizens.

Thus, the whole planning process is very democratic. All plans, from the national level on down to the local level, are subject to extensive periods of public criticism, periods of public consultation, and at the end, public approval. "Citizens are legally entitled to influence policies by participating in the planning process and objecting to plans they are not happy with" (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.144). The Physical Planning Act and other forms of national and local Dutch legislation require public participation and have created procedures to ensure that citizens are participating. In Amsterdam, the participation is even greater due to the efforts through the district councils which have brought a "neighborhood flavor" to development and government itself in the city. An attitude and aura of democracy and involvement is present and this ensures that development is democratic and takes place in the interest of public and not private interests.

**Strategies**

Without effective strategies, the idealistic plans and policies of the Amsterdam planning process cannot be realized. These strategies can be seen by an examination of how the city's policies attempt to address the criteria that any effective development policy should entail: affordable housing, economic development/jobs, mass transit, environment, poverty, and public services.
**Housing**

In housing, the city of Amsterdam uses close coordination between the Physical Planning Department and the Housing Department to ensure an adequate stock of housing for all its citizens and to meet its future needs. The policy emphasis in Amsterdam now is to build more middle and high income housing (Melger, Personal Interview). In Amsterdam, the city believes that "a good supply of housing is a prerequisite for a health urban economy" (VROM, *Housing in the Netherlands*, p.102) and that the supply of housing must meet the needs of all income groups. Housing is geared towards the creation of a quality living environment in whole and not just a decent building. In Amsterdam, this means a quality, standard dwelling, a good, clean environment, amenities, services, and specific urban qualities such as mixed-income and mixed-use neighborhoods (Melger, Personal Interview).

The goal is to create "market-oriented residential environments" that have a mix of social sector and private housing (the city currently advocates a 50-50 mix between social sector and private housing development), a mix of racial and economic groups, and a mix of business and recreational uses (VROM, *Housing in the Netherlands*; Melger, Personal Interview). After all, businesses will look to locate where they have necessary amenities such as adequate and quality housing (VROM, *Housing in the Netherlands*, p.96; Melger, Personal Interview). This comprehensive approach to housing is indicative of the spirit of urban regeneration which concentrates on the larger picture of the city versus urban renewal which concentrates only on individual dwellings and residential buildings alone.

**Employment/Job Creation**

Along the same lines as housing, in Amsterdam, there is a comprehensive and integrated
approach to employment and economic expansion. The larger goal is to create a competitive urban
economic region in Randstad Holland. Using "well-conceived physical planning policies" to ensure
top-notch infrastructure, quality housing, quality open space, adequate transportation, top-notch
commercial services, and a mix of quality amenities, the city of Amsterdam and its Physical
Planning Department attempts to create the most favorable conditions possible through public
investment to stimulate economic growth and employment opportunities (City of Amsterdam 1994,
p.104). In this process, difficult choices must be made to provide adequate economic opportunities
and growth, to enhance the "compact city", and to preserve the environment and environmental
resources.

"New roads and railways will have to be carefully sited, vulnerable rural areas preserved, and
housing concentrated in and around existing cities. To some extent, these are conflict aims. Painful
choices and compromises are inevitable. That is why Amsterdam now wants to
enhance its attraction as a city that can be lived in, is accessible and pursues sustainable
growth, without unnecessary harm being done to the environment" (City of Amsterdam

The goal is to use all of Amsterdam's resources in an integrated and balanced manner to create the
maximum of quality jobs.

**Mass Transit**

Next, and maybe most importantly for Amsterdam, there is the issue of traffic and transport
and strategies that relate to create a better, more quality city as a whole.

"Urbanization will follow public transport rather than the other way around. Public transport
decisions on a regional scale will determine the urban development of Amsterdam" (City of

The issue of traffic and transport fits vitally into the picture of urban revitalization or regeneration.
Amsterdam has laid out its strategy for traffic and transport in the Regional Traffic and Transport Plan of 1993. In that plan, the city promoted the placement of public transport in key locations to link businesses and areas of employment with public transportation and to promote employment growth.

The 1994 Traffic and Street Layout Plan aims to cut back traffic in the city center by one-third, redesign more space for public transport, bicyclists, and pedestrians, make certain main roads into one-way streets, and replace on-street parking with underground parking in the hopes of ensuring that resident, business, commercial auto traffic, and tourists can all get into city center in safe, efficient, and environmentally-protective way (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.209). Within this framework, essential traffic (business visitors and goods traffic) will have access by car but auto transport will not be allowed to cause congestion, pollution, and suburbanization that creates the low quality of life in the city and eventually, the region (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.135). Traffic and transport also has been promoted as a way of connecting the city center with the fast-growing outer employment areas towards the end of stopping suburbanization and promoting a compact city that contains balanced economic growth and an urban lifestyle (City of Amsterdam 1994).

**Environment/Recreation**

Finally, Amsterdam planning can be viewed from the strategy of recreation and the environment. In Amsterdam city policy, "the distinction between the 'urban' environment and the 'natural' environment is artificial" (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.158). The environment has been a deciding factor in Amsterdam development policy since the writing of the General Extension Plan and continues today as a way to maintain a balance between increasing a concentration of uses and expanding the amount of green space within the city as an amenity that will improve the overall
quality of city life (City of Amsterdam, Draft Structure Plan 1994).

By concentrating activities within the urban area, larger areas of rural green space and the environment may be preserved outside the city limits. However, concentration cannot go on forever and a balance must be struck between higher density and a preservation of a quality urban life (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.159). Within the structure plan, Amsterdam has mapped out major areas of environmental threat and pollution, areas of recreation and environmental expansion, and areas where increased density and development are possible (City of Amsterdam Draft Structure Plan 1994). In the near future, environmental and spatial planning will take on even more integrated character at the local, regional, and national level (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.190; VROM 1995).

**Poverty**

In Amsterdam, as of now, the city government and national government feels that there is not a need for an "anti-poverty" strategy within the context of overall planning and development policies (von Veenendaal; Bodewitz; Hardy, Personal Interviews). The combined and integrated approach to development that includes employment, transport, housing, the environment, and generous social welfare spending works to limit the presence and negative effects of poverty and concentrated poverty. Planning in Amsterdam is geared to ensuring that every citizen of the city has access to employment at a livable wage (or a subsequent government subsidy in the absence of employment), adequate housing, natural amenities, a clean environment, and access to necessities such as transportation, health care, and education (Het Amsterdamse Bureau Voor Onderzoek en Statistiek, 1995).

**Public Services**

Along these same lines, the procurement of public services is automatically included within
the planning process. Although there is no great mention of it as a separate category as might be
done in the city of Chicago, in Amsterdam, the presence and locality of necessary public services
such as schools, clinics, transportation, and other urban amenities such as parks and places of
cultural entertainment are all included in the integrated and comprehensive planning policy that aims
at creating the truly "urban" environment in which every citizen can live, work, and enjoy one's life
with his or her fellow citizen. National location policy and every local zoning plan that is
democratically developed by the citizenry ensures the existence of all these public necessities and
gives citizens a voice in their placement (City of Amsterdam:1994; VROM 1994). Thus, all the
policies of housing, planning, education, transport, and recreation work to ensure that citizens will
have sensible access to all necessary services and "everyday" needs.

The goals and direction of Amsterdam's development policies are clear and they give a
public, democratic, and strategic way to achieve their objectives. The Amsterdam development
process can be best described as a democratic, "open house" characterized by "central direction with
local implementation" (City of Amsterdam:1994, p.220). The development process is driven by
pragmatic idealism and by the desire to publicly and democratically meet the needs of all citizens
in ways that make sense and are financially achievable. However, there is no confusion about what
the goal is: to create the best quality living environment for all citizens. It is not to publicly
subsidize private profit, provide subsidies for private business, or ensure business dominance while
trying to plan for the needs of working class and lower middle class individuals. It is to ensure an
open and democratic process that allows the equal participation of all groups in Dutch society and
to balance the ideals of sustainable economic growth with quality living environments.
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**Chicago Development Policies: Plans and Strategies**

Throughout its history, Chicago has been the epitome of the way urban centers have developed in American history. The city of big shoulders has always been a private-market driven city whose policies have been determined by elites and business interests (Grimshaw 1991; Hirsch 1983; Suttles 1990). In the era of de-industrialization, it has been no different.

Chicago's development process can best be looked at as a potpourri of actors, plans, visions, and policies that seldom coincide, usually conflict, and almost never lead to a comprehensive or people-oriented solution to development dilemmas. The development process contains a conglomeration of actors all involved in the process for their own reasons and with their own envisioned ends without a publicly determined policy or vision directing or controlling the involved actors. Chicago's policy is focused on public-private partnerships, subsidization and encouragement of the market by the government to act in certain ways without infringing on the profit margin, navigating complicated and often conflicting intergovernmental relations and policies, and obtaining limited resources from a whole slew of public, private, and not-for profit sources whose sum total never adds up to a human, democratic solution.

The main parts to the Chicago development process are a number of governmental documents, plans, and policies that govern the mainly private competition and drive to develop the city in the interest of one's own good, whatever that good may be. These parts include the Consolidated Housing Strategy and Action Plan; the Retail Plan for Chicago (which isn't quite yet finished); the Industrial Land-Use Policy and Industrial Corridor Development Plan for the three areas of the city: North, South, and West; the Federal Enterprise Zones; and a number of past government and private planning documents that still exist as references and as existing policy
including the Comprehensive Plan for the Development of the City of Chicago which was written by Mayor Washington’s Administration in 1984 and other private development plans written during the 80s as part of the elite-controlled Central Area Committee that are as yet unfinished.

Any progressive and effective development policy would have an overall guiding vision with large policy statements painting a vision of how the city should develop and work. In reality in Chicago, one is lacking this. However, the 1984 Comprehensive Development Plan for the City of Chicago: Chicago Works Together is the just such an attempt by the Washington Administration. This document still exists but is not heeded to seriously in any sense of the word. Example: the Department of Planning and Development in the city of the Chicago, the public policy arm of the development process, has not one copy available for public review. Obviously, it's not considered a very crucial part of the development program.

Nevertheless, it does lay a framework. It listed five goals and coordinating policies that included: Increasing Job Opportunities for Chicagoans, Promoting Balanced Growth, Assisting Neighborhoods to Develop Through Partnerships and Coordinated Investment, Enhancing Public Participation in Decision-Making, and Pursuing a Regional, State, and National, Urban Legislative Agenda (City of Chicago 1984). These goals were supported by policies that were made up of public-private partnerships, attracting labor-intensive operations to the city, using intensive public investment to rebuild infrastructure and create the necessary environment for business growth, linking downtown development with neighborhood development, evening out the tax burden, and ensuring that economic growth worked for working citizens through higher wages, affirmative action policies, and development of a skilled labor force (City of Chicago 1984). What one sees is an attempt to balance, coordinate, and publicly direct the development process in Chicago involving
all its actors in an equal relationship to achieve democratic and balanced development that would work well for both people and capital, for both downtown and neighborhoods, and for both human goals and people as well as capital and economic indicators.

This plan is still technically a part of the Chicago development process. However, since the death of Harold Washington, Chicago development has returned to its true roots. The real philosophy of Chicago development now is public subsidization of the private market with as little democratic participation as possible. The market vulnerability of the city, coupled with a lack of progressive federal help and the existence of a business-oriented political regime, has led to a fragmented, private-driven development process geared towards corporate interests.

The full summary of this fragmented and destructive development process can now be found in the HUD Consolidated/Action Plan that is a full collection of all the public policies and plans relating to development issues within the city of Chicago. It is a personification of Chicago development: large, confusing, fragmented, and full of many separate and often unconnected parts. Nevertheless, it gives the full range of development policies and plans and gives insight to the strategies used to try to achieve them. In order to better understand all of these many activities, we will highlight the major programs that fall under its jurisdiction.

**Consolidated Plan/Action Plan**

This is a document that is required by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for localities that wish to obtain and use federal funds as a replacement for the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy which was mandated under the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act. It is a statement of community development and housing objectives and proposed use of funds from Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), Home Investment
Partnership Program (HOME), Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA), and Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP). It is the directing document for community development and housing, and in it, can be seen most of the city's policies towards housing, anti-poverty, mass transit, public services, etc. Since so many of the other policies and programs of Chicago development policy depend on some level of federal funding (Industrial Corridors Plan, Retail Chicago, Urban Enterprise Zones), they are mentioned in this document and may be discussed as a part of it.

The Chicago Consolidated Plan for 1996 develops five year priorities for affordable housing and community development based on 4 guiding principles. The plan is based on public/private partnerships in order to "provide decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities" (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.2). It's a comprehensive plan that analyzes key housing and community development needs and presents a five-year strategy and one-year action plan for addressing housing and community development needs.

The goals or priorities laid out by the Consolidated Plan to guide urban development from the public, democratic end over the next five years are as follows:

1. Serve the Full Range of Constituencies Among Low and Moderate-Income Populations.
2. Improve Housing System Production and Efficiency.
3. Promote Community Revitalization and Stability through a Range of Development Activities.

The first goal involves the attempt to provide enough affordable housing for all income ranges through subsidies and incentives in the free market and better coordination in the public housing community that will include efforts to mix public housing in with the rest of the housing
stock. "Primary emphasis will be placed on reversing the isolating nature of public housing within our communities" (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.102). Finally, the city will attempt to free up more public resources and private financing for housing construction through the private market.

The second goal involves attempts to "streamline" the development process and remove democratic, public obstacles or proverbial "red tape" to developers in the hopes that they will respond with more affordable housing (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan). This illusory logic will be supported by the extra funds and financing that will appear with a lean bureaucracy and with less regulations in the way of capital. In addition, the city encourages the use of public subsidies and private incentives to increase the development capacities of CDCs and not-for-profit groups.

The third goal is Chicago's attempt at integrated urban regeneration through economic development, housing improvements, and anti-poverty strategies. It focuses on targeting resources and programs in needy neighborhoods to increase affordable housing, stimulate job creation, insure a quantity of credit lines for low and moderate income families, and provide social services and resources for the citizens living there in order to stimulate future investment and growth (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan). There is an emphasis on mixed-income, mixed used development in these neighborhoods and the expansion of home ownership and business entrepreneurship. The public policies contained in the Urban Enterprise Zones, the Industrial Corridors Program, the Retail Chicago program, and the SNAP initiative all fall under the auspices of this goal. A mix of public subsidies, private incentives, and public-private partnerships are intended to realize this goal.

The fourth goal: meeting special needs populations, involves a plethora of public and social
service programs gauged at aiding vulnerable sectors of the population (homeless, poor, elderly, AIDS victims, handicapped, etc.). Notice that the emphasis here is not on seeing that these individuals are ensured their political, economic, and social rights, but rather that they receive the special "help" from the government that they need.

Notice that there is a strong attempt to link common issues of development such as housing, economic development, and poverty into an integrated response. The Consolidated Plan stresses intergovernmental coordination on a number of issues and consultation and coordination between public and private actors to ensure a comprehensive and effective improvement in the development process of the city of Chicago (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan). There is an admission present in this type of planning that housing or any other one issue (job creation, mass transit) cannot be separated or isolated from the surrounding context and that these issues must be dealt with in coordinated and integrated policies.

The plan thus gives the appearance of being a public, democratic document that integrates the development process of Chicago and attempts to ensure that development works for the city as a whole and for all its inhabitants. However, as the specific policies indicate, and as one will come to find out as we delve further, the plan acts, for the most part, as a subsidizer of the private market and its inequalities and as a weak attempt to coordinate a very disorganized and uncohesive development process.

A further example of this uncoordinated process is another arm of Chicago development policy: Industrial Land Use Policy. This city policy is explained and laid out in the "Industrial Corridors Plan."

**Industrial Land Use Policy: "Industrial Corridors Plan"**: The plan for industry in
Chicago is outlined in Corridors of Industrial Opportunity which outlines three industrial land-use plans for the North, South, and West sides of the city and an industrial land-use policy by the DPD. Run by the DPD and funded to the tune of $12.5 million for projects, the initiative will attempt to assist development organizations to strategically plan and develop these corridors in a comprehensive and integrated way and contribute to the overall economic development goals of the city of Chicago, which is to create more quality jobs for Chicagoans (City of Chicago, Corridors of Industrial Opportunity: A Plan for Industry in Chicago's West Side, 1991).

"The policy is designed to foster the expansion and modernization of Chicago's industrial companies by enhancing the physical environments in which they operate. It provides a foundation for the City's overall industrial development strategy, of which the three industrial corridor plans are a key part" (City of Chicago, Corridors of Industrial Opportunity: A Plan for Industry in Chicago's South Side).

These three area plans form a comprehensive industrial land-use policy that will be implemented through zoning review and targeted public investments as part of a program known as the Model Industrial Corridors Program. There are 22 total corridors: 7 on the North Side, 7 on the South Side, and 8 on the West Side. A corridor is defined as:

"a contiguous, cohesive area that is characterized by a preponderance of active industrial uses and that can be expected to maintain this basic character in the future. In industrial corridors, the parcel configurations, transportation access, separation from nonindustrial uses, local circulation patterns and other physical characteristics lead to a reasonable expectation of continued industrial activity and further development" (City of Chicago, Corridors of Industrial Opportunity, p.9).

Since 1994, the city has funded local industrial groups to develop plans for these corridors and has supported local planning efforts with seed funds and assistance. Notice that these are often private plans written for and by private business, though in some cases, the plans are publicly developed by the DPD.
The policy involves making targeted public investments, providing incentives and subsidies to private businesses, and developing enough worker-training and amenity programs to ensure a lucrative business environment. The goals of the policy are to: 1. Create accessible and attractive environments for industry through transportation, industrial amenity, and industrial property developments and to 2. Assure stable land use within the corridor through improved zoning and land use regulation that preserves the industrial character of an area, discourages mixed-use development, and strips away the public regulations and protections within zoning laws that restrict the activities of industry (City of Chicago, Corridors of Industrial Opportunity: 1995, p.12). The city has numerous programs targeted to achieve improvements in infrastructure, traffic layout (with an increasing emphasis on auto traffic), amenity improvements, and tax incentives to attract the relocation of business to these industrial corridors. The actors in this include private development firms, the Chicago Planning Commission, the City's DPD, the City Council (zoning changes), the Planned Manufacturing District Designation Process (determination of what uses where), and certain community development groups. In the future, the city plans to use an interdepartmental program to identify and carry out infrastructure and transportation improvements.

Notice that the industrial land use policy endorses "separate places for separate uses" and that its emphasis on industrial parks reminds one of suburban-type development. As Daley stated in the opening cover letter to the Industrial Development Plan for the North Side:

"Residential and commercial development in industrial areas negatively impacts upon the city's industrial base, and recommended that additional land-use regulations be implemented to minimize these impacts" (City of Chicago, Corridors of Industrial Opportunity: 1993, p.1).

Also, the type of transportation that is planned for and supported most heavily by the industrial plan is the automobile and the further expansion, rehabilitation, and construction of roads, bridges, and
Retail Chicago Plan: Retail Chicago, which is the new initiative for small business and retail growth in Chicago neighborhoods, is the city's attempt, through the DPD, to revitalize small business in various areas throughout the city in ways "that meets the needs of the market and the community" (City of Chicago, Retail Chicago, vol.1). It is co-sponsored by the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and the Chicago Association of Neighborhood Development Organizations (CANDO) and it:

"is designed to strengthen and support existing neighborhood retail centers, inform retailers and developers about the nature of the retail market opportunities in city neighborhoods, and coordinate the City's position in the development process" (City of Chicago, Retail Chicago, vol.1).

It focuses on revitalizing established retail/commercial districts and encouraging further development in depressed areas. The DPD uses Retail Chicago to work with community groups, neighborhoods, and private developers to determine needs and target new programs through a newly-developed centralized city program that allows all groups and citizens a place to direct questions and needs for development projects. Retail Chicago has conducted a market analysis to determine unmet retail needs and, next year, 1996, the DPD will produce an action plan for meeting these needs. This program falls under the Community Development section of the Consolidated Plan as a strategy towards realizing integrated and comprehensive development.

Retail Chicago plans to act as a way to direct and encourage business development in depressed neighborhoods. However, there is still no specific strategies to direct the development. Until the plan by DPD comes out next year, one will not be able to tell how business will be encouraged, what role citizens and neighborhoods will play in the process, and whether poor
neighborhoods will truly benefit. Whatever the case, there seems to be an emphasis on developing a policy that is truly representative of the Daley administration: business-subsidizing, incentive-driven, and market-centered.

**Urban Empowerment Zones:** The only real federal involvement, in terms of planning and development, outside of meager resources and misguided or lacking industrial and economic policies, is the Urban Empowerment Zone. The UEZ is the centerpiece of President Clinton's supposed "urban policy" and is an example of a market-driven attempt at comprehensive neighborhood development. The City of Chicago's Empowerment Zone effort is led by the Department of Planning and Development and is geared towards corolling and integrating public, private, and neighborhood resources in order to revitalize distressed communities. The program has two major goals: alleviating poverty and reinventing government (City of Chicago, *1996 Consolidated Plan*, p.91). Further actors in the process include a task force of a dozen city agencies, an Empowerment Zone Coordinating Council that includes representatives of State and County government, as well as private sector and community reps. An even larger Coordinating Council is being formed that will include not-for-profits, the CHA, the Park District, etc.

Chicago will receive $100 million in Social Service Block Grants for investment in new services, economic and business investment, and new and improved housing; a $3,000 tax credit to any business for each neighborhood person they hire plus tax abatements and utility cuts for deciding to relocate there; and the use of $100 million to leverage banks and S&Ls to invest money in the neighborhoods in zones (City of Chicago, *1996 Consolidated Plan*).

The City will provide General Obligation Bond proceeds, tax increment financing, and funding under the Jobs Training Partnership Act and Community Block Grant programs. The idea
is to use incentives in three neighborhood clusters to attract new businesses, bring desperately needed capital into the area, and inject a large infusion of direct monies into much-needed services (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan). Decision-making for spending the money is supposed to be made locally by community groups. This is an attempt to address issues of jobs, basic services, health, education, infrastructure, and capital drain all in one integrated program. However, it has a very heavy reliance on the market; its uses substantial public dollars in efforts to subsidize private business; and its "Coordinating Council" has been much under the thumb of Mayor Daley's influence and lacks a true democratic nature to it.

These local and one federal effort make-up the main whole of what are the plans for the Chicago Urban Development Policy. It is a mishmash of plans, interests, directions, visions, and development efforts. They lack a strong democratic flavor and are heavily influenced by and geared towards private market actors.

**Strategies**

In order to better understand these plans and whose interests they serve, one must also understand the strategies behind them. These strategies provide further evidence of how the goals of urban development in Chicago are to be achieved and whose interests they will benefit in the process.

**Affordable Housing**

The city of Chicago relies primarily on the free market to provide housing for Chicago's population. The Consolidated Plan for the City of Chicago makes very clear the deference that will be paid to the market in attempts to improve the situation of affordable housing in the city. Public housing, which in Chicago has historically been an exercise in economic and racial segregation,
inefficiency, and the concentration of poverty, is not seen as playing a large part in these efforts (Hirsch). Public subsidies of private developers and incentives for the creation and aided purchase of low-income housing are seen as more prominent options (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan).

Current and new efforts to improve the housing stock rely primarily on better coordination between the Department of Housing, the CHA, and the free market and incentives to private builders to build more low-income housing. In the end, in Chicago, the free market is the provider of housing and government works as the subsidizer of its profit.

Comprehensive Economic Development/Employment

The city of Chicago's efforts and strategies to address economic development in a comprehensive way, including the issues of jobs, industry, and retail, can be found in the Consolidated Plan and, in more detail, through the Retail Chicago and Model Industrial Corridors Policy. Historically, in Chicago, capital and corporate elites have been the originators and developers of policy for retail and industry to serve their own best interests in bodies such as the Central Area Committee (Hirsch 1983). The Consolidated Plan, and the programs, strategies, and policies that fall under it, is an example of an attempt to give some public direction to this process of free-market development.

This issue is predominantly addressed through the third priority of the Consolidated Plan, which is to Promote Community Revitalization and Stability through a Range of Development Activities. The third policy of this priority is to stimulate economic revitalization and employment opportunities in disadvantaged communities through targeted public investments and financial assistance (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.60). Strategies include neighborhood
revitalization through the federal Empowerment Zone, the Strategic Neighborhood Action Program (SNAP), Redevelopment Areas, Neighborhood Planning Grants, Development Assistance Programs, and strategies to direct industry and small business such as the Model Industrial Corridors Program and Retail Chicago. All these programs are administered primarily through the Department of Planning and Development.

Comprehensive economic development demands the provision of adequate political and financial resources, of both a public and private nature, to neighborhood development to ensure that development occurs along a path that integrates housing, health, education, and infrastructural needs. Chicago's strategies are a mixture of efforts at publicly-funded and directed comprehensive efforts, which still rely primarily on the market (UEZ and SNAP programs), and privately-directed and publicly-subsidized narrow programs that serve the interests of profit first and foremost (Model Industrial Corridors and Retail Chicago).

**Poverty**

The anti-poverty strategies of the Chicago development process can be found in the Consolidated Plan of the city of Chicago. The Plan has a portion that is dedicated to an Anti-Poverty Strategy:

"The Consolidated Plan has identified job creation and economic development as a component in the strategy to increase the supply of affordable housing, while at the same time reducing the incidence of poverty" (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.104).

The Department of Human Services heads up Chicago's anti-poverty strategy and has identified five program priorities and nine basic strategies for achieving these priorities. Taken together with a variety of city, state, and federal programs, it is an attempt to integrate and coordinate an effort aimed at "ameliorating the effects of poverty on Chicago's communities and families" (City
of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan). However, it's hard to make it a priority when you bow to the profit margin and private market mechanisms to direct a development policy.

The five priorities are centered on building up family services, emergency services, youth services, community education, and community services. These priorities are very much focused on providing increased services for people who have special needs (e.g. the homeless, drug addicts, child abusers, etc.). The nine basic strategies pay credence to the ideals of the provision of more affordable housing, more legislative support for the family, the provision of more services to the poverty population through the city government, the improvement of communication and use of resources between city hall and the residents of poor neighborhoods, and the maintenance of citizens' advisory structures to help the DPD meet the needs of poor citizens. Notice that these wonderful priorities and strategies are to be fulfilled through already existing programs and with already existing resources and that very few of them attempt to address the structural needs and/or causes of poverty such as unemployment, lack of health care, low wages, etc.

**Mass Transit**

Mass transit is an issue too largely ignored by policy development in Chicago. Most of the investment and coordination of mass transit within development policy is connected to industrial development and the infrastructure and transportation needs of industrial corridors to make them more attractive for business. But, mass transit is not linked up to housing or housing developments and the investments made by the city have been small. This is unfortunate for the overall development of poor and moderate-income neighborhoods who need to make connections between place or residence and places of work and culture in an ever-more sprawling urban metropolis.

Mass transit for the most part is ignored due to the predominance given the automobile. The
strategies of development of the city have taken on a suburban, low-density, separate places for separate uses character, and as a result, highways and roads have become the dominant form of transportation and industry access. The Industrial land-use policy and the three industrial plans for the North, South, and West Side all give predominance to maintenance, upkeep, and expansion of roads, expressways, and other means of automobile travel.

**Public Institutions/Services**

These issues are very much absent from the main thrust of the development process. From the Consolidated Plan, the Washington Plan, the retail development plan, and the industrial corridors, there is no mention of any coordinated efforts to develop public institutions in concert with the overall development of neighborhoods or communities. Only the UEZ provides for the increased provision of public services in needy neighborhoods. But, overall, if there is some mention of improved public services, it is kept at the structural or implementation level, and there is no mention of increased funding or support for redistributive efforts. Once again, since the main strategies of Chicago development policy are centered around bolstering and coercing the free market, there is little in the way of the increased or improved provision of public services or amenities for city residents.

Chicago plans and policies are a mess. But, one must understand that this confusion, this fragmentation, and this lack of a comprehensive public vision and direction to development is necessary for a market-dominated process. The only interests that are served by this conflagration of programs and policies are the interests of the development business community. Since that is the predominant force in urban planning and progress in Chicago, the plans and policies are set up to reflect those interests (Grimshaw 1991; Hirsch 1983; Suttles 1990). From the evidence that the plans
and strategies provide, it would seem that profit in Chicago is first; the needs of affordable housing, mass transit, employment, the environment, and anti-poverty strategies come in a confused last.

"Putting Your Money Where Your Mouth Is!": Amsterdam and Chicago City Budgets

It is true that both cities have their own form of development plans and planning processes and both claim to address a number of issues and the desire to alleviate certain social problems. The next question is: Are there resources, both financial and political, put towards the realization of these goals? A simple look at the respective city budgets provides us with a sense of how well these cities do in attempting to achieve their so-called development goals.

In Amsterdam, planning and development is geared towards ensuring a quality life for all citizens through sufficient housing, public services, health care, transportation, employment, a clean environment, and amenities and recreation. The Amsterdam city budget reflects the strong commitment to ensuring these needs and seeing to it that development is a process that benefits all citizens and their daily and future needs in a balanced and equitable way.

The city of Amsterdam shows a propensity towards balanced development and towards investing large amounts of resources in both "distributive" and "redistributive" measures of development. By looking at the 1995 Budget for the City of Amsterdam, it is easy to see where priorities lie. The city spent 90,435,230 guilders on police and security, 352,671,010 on infrastructure, streets, and sewers, and 28,933,870 guilders on economic affairs (City of Amsterdam, Summary of Budget Appropriations and City Spending, 1995). At the same time, the city parceled out 137,704,170 guilders for education, 248,900,380 guilders on culture and recreation, 310,227,500 guilders on Public Health and the Environment, 1,086,842,650 guilders on Planning and Housing, and a whopping 2,403,069,920 guilders on Social Welfare (City of Amsterdam, Budget, 1995). As
one can plainly see, the numbers tell the story. In total, the city spent nearly 400 million guilders on distributive measures, while spending over 3.6 billion guilders on redistributive measures to ensure a quality life for ordinary citizens (City of Amsterdam, Budget, 1995).

In Amsterdam, development centers on people and on the quality of life of all citizens. Thus, the largest and heaviest investments out of a 5 billion guilder budget go towards things that improve life for the majority of citizens: social welfare, planning and housing, public health and the environment, education, and infrastructure. These are wise investments that back up the rhetoric of the development policies of the city aimed at creating a balanced and quality living environment for all citizens.

Of course, in the Netherlands, 90% of this funding comes from the federal level in the form of specific and general grants that are spent by the cities to meet the needs of their populations (Dutch National Government, Municipal Taxes in the Netherlands, p.1). On the average, cities in the Netherlands receive approximately 12.6% of their revenue from their own local taxes, 28.2% from the general grants funds of the Municipalities Fund, and 59.2% from specific grants from national ministries (Dutch National Government, Overzicht Specifieke Uitkeringen 1996).

Chicago on the other hand, is a different situation. The city claims to do many different things in development. The rhetoric is often very promising in reference to integrated community development and targeting resources to poor and moderate income neighborhoods. However, is the action and the political muscle just as uplifting? For the most part, in Chicago, that answer is a resounding "NO!"

If one looks at the 1995 City Budget, it is easy to see where priorities lie. By looking at the proposed 1995 Appropriations, one sees a policy that favors distributive measures to ensure
development over redistributive measures. For example, the city appropriated $123,105,00 for sewers, $203,834,814 for streets and sanitation, $269,125,338 for the fire department, and a whopping $798,584,638 for the police department, all distributive measures of development (City of Chicago, Annual Appropriation Ordinance For the Year 1995). However, when it comes to services such as health, housing, and public assistance, one sees a completely different story. The city appropriated $39,215,158 for health, $27,429,000 for general assistance to persons in need, and only a paltry $11,477,778 for the Department of Human Services, the major city welfare agency (City of Chicago, Appropriations, 1995). All in all, the city of Chicago appropriated a whopping total of nearly $1.3 billion in distributive efforts (public safety, streets and sanitation, transportation) while spending only $59,979,628 in redistributive efforts (Community Services: e.g. health, aging, human services) (City of Chicago, Appropriations, 1995).

These budget appropriations are not indicative of a city striving for balanced development or for eliminating large swaths of deteriorating and depressed neighborhoods. The emphasis on distributive development and spending is another indicator of public subsidy of the private sector and support for private-driven development. So, no matter what the rhetoric is, on the surface, Chicago's development actions don't live up to much of their policy rhetoric.

If one digs a little further, the statistics are even more revealing. When it comes to housing development, Chicago had the lowest level of local spending on low cost housing by a far margin out of eleven major U.S. cities according to 1989 figures (Chicago Rehab Network, p.16). Chicago spent sixty-six cents in per capita local spending on low cost housing (Chicago Rehab Network, p.16). Furthermore, in 1987, during the height of progressive local government in Chicago, the city spent the lowest level of its CDBG funds out of six major American cities on housing (Chicago
Rehab Network (HUD figures), p.16). Chicago spent only 35% of its CDBG funds on housing (Chicago Rehab Network (HUD figures), p.16). Milwaukee, who was the next worst, was at nearly 60% (Chicago Rehab Network, p.16).

Out of the money that Chicago has spent on housing, the distribution hasn't exactly been just or progressive. The largest beneficiaries of federal housing programs have been those making $50,000 and over per year, while the smallest beneficiaries have been those making between $10,000 and $20,000 per year (Chicago Rehab Network, p. 11). In addition, out of the many poor people in Chicago that qualify under current federal law for Section 8 housing assistance, only 16% of all these people get any assistance at all due to the meager amount of funds (Chicago Rehab Network, p.15). Finally, only 1% of the housing loans made in the city of Chicago reached low-income African-American communities on the South and West sides and 26.5% of all the housing investment dollars for the city went to three, affluent white lakefront communities (Lincoln Park, Lakeview, Near North Side) (Chicago Rehab Network, p.15). Once again, this is a perfect example of how Chicago has spent very little of its resources or federal resources on affordable housing and even less of their meager funds on affordable housing for poor and moderate income families.

Not only have the public expenditures towards housing and aid to lower and moderate income families been deficient, but the amount of public investment and expenditures in subsidizing business profit has been exorbitant. From 1969 to 1993, the city of Chicago has invested huge sums of money in private real estate ventures that have benefitted the corporate downtown, padded corporate profits, made conditions worse for neighborhoods and poor and working class families (Suttles). In fact, a total of over $731.9 million has been given to just seven private firms for the subsidization of large downtown, corporate projects (Chicago Rehab Network 1993).
When one takes into account the fact that federal funds for cities have been in decline for the past twenty years, in the light of these local city statistics, one can easily see that Chicago has not yet embarked on a progressive path of balanced, democratic, and equal development. Chicago has made no concrete goals for ensuring the construction or rehabilitation of enough affordable housing for all citizens, for decreasing the poverty rate, or devoting resources to ensuring people-oriented economic growth. Instead, these figures show that Chicago development is still very much in control of business interests and at the mercy of the effects of de-industrialization, fragmented government, a lack of federal progressivism, and the market in general.

**Development Projects: Chicago and Amsterdam**

One can look at the plans and policies and budgets of both cities and get a pretty good idea about the goals and the resources directed towards those goals in both cities. But, without taking a look at how development occurs in actual projects and what effects these projects have had on everyday citizens and the overall development pattern of the city, one cannot get a complete understanding of how planning and development proceeds in both cities.

**Amsterdam**

**Urban Renewal: The Entrepotdok**

Since 1990, the phase of urban renewal in Amsterdam development, has officially, and for all intents and purposes, ended. Urban renewal has been a success and the housing stock, which was dilapidated and unfit for the current population of the city, has been suitably replaced and improved (VROM, April 1992). Urban renewal aimed at replacing individual residential buildings and housing units without disturbing the character or overall make-up of the existing neighborhoods
Despite the fact that urban renewal is over, this period of development policy in Amsterdam is an excellent example of the types of policies and strategies that still exist and always have within the new strategy of urban revitalization. One of the best examples of the era of urban renewal was the redevelopment and renewal of the Entrepotdok, which is a complex of old warehouses and duty buildings that were a center of Amsterdam's vibrant harbor industry in the 1800s. The building was built in 1827, and despite the fact that the harbor activities moved on at the end of the 1800s, the warehouses remained in use until the 1950s (City of Amsterdam, July 1988).

After thirty years of standing empty, the city bought up the buildings and rebuilt them from 1985 to 1987 as 400 homes and the site of numerous business premises. The development was an entirely social or public housing development. But, instead of just rebuilding for housing, the development was integrated with the surrounding community and given a more mixed-use character by placing businesses in the ground floor of the warehouse buildings with housing above (City of Amsterdam, July 1988). This idea of mixing housing with businesses and other uses is followed almost religiously in any Dutch development (City of Amsterdam, July 1988; VROM 1992). In addition, communal underground garages were built under the complex to allow residents to have cars without the nuisance of having them clutter up public space.

The Entrepotdok is an example of how urban renewal was tackled on an integral basis with each aspect of the renewal seen as a part of the coherent whole, not in isolation. For example, the quay surrounding the buildings was redesigned in order to provide areas for businesses and shops and to enhance public space and encourage public interaction and community development. The epitome of Amsterdam's urban renewal, like all its development policies, was integrated and
complete renewal that contributed to the already existing surroundings, not just plopping down housing (City of Amsterdam, July 1988). Even though urban renewal didn't aim at complete revitalization of areas, it still contributed to the improvement of the housing stock and dilapidated buildings within the context of larger city development policies and strategies.

Despite the fact that urban renewal was a process of replacing what might be termed "rotten teeth" in the city, instead of attempting to improve the entire mouth, as urban revitalization aims at, it nevertheless, was characterized by the same mixed-use, publicly planned efforts at development that make up what planning in Amsterdam is all about. The Entrepotdok shows how the city of Amsterdam refuses to allow any space that can be used positively to continue to rot or lie fallow when it can definitely meet the needs of the public. Urban renewal took place in Amsterdam with people in mind, with the overall effects on the neighborhood in mind, and with meeting the needs of the public in mind, above business needs or profit motive. Even ten years ago, the priorities were the same: mixed-use development, adequate and affordable housing, the preservation of public space, the encouragement of keeping cars off the streets, and the overall value of people and their needs to ensure a vibrant urban lifestyle.

**The Eastern Docks Development Project**

A very recent and modern development project in the city of Amsterdam is the Eastern Docks Development Project known as the New Deal. The development is a perfect example of public planning with the use of private developers working at the direction of the public will to address the city's needs for new residences within a context of limited space and housing. The docks have been redeveloped by reclaiming a portion of the harbor, building much of the residences on water, and using available space in a very integrated way (City of Amsterdam, July 1995). The total emphasis
of the project has been on mixed-use development in an environmentally-conscious manner (City of Amsterdam, plan Amsterdam, April 1995). For the environment, numerous environmental impact statements were carried out, development was geared in an environmentally-friendly way by providing for public transport, extensive bicycle paths, well-placed waste disposals, building the residential buildings towards the sun, building with environmentally sound materials, and above all, building so that structures will last as long as possible so that new, environmentally-destructive construction doesn't take place again for a long time (City of Amsterdam, July 1995). The development is currently being carried out under the complete direction of the municipality after negotiations between the city and private developers fell through in 1993.

The developments are being built in a 50-50 ratio between private housing and social sector housing (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview; City of Amsterdam, July 1995). The placement of schools, day-care centers, and new business and office space has been done in a very calculated manner in order to ensure that the residents of the new development will have a vibrant and mixed-use neighborhood in which to live. In addition, a lot of time and money has been spent on spatial relationships in terms of architecture and placement of buildings in order to encourage public interaction, contribute to aesthetically-pleasing surroundings, and develop community-enhancing, eye-pleasing architecture.

With all the new construction going into the Eastern Dock area, there was much initial concern from small-business owners who felt that they would no longer be able to function once the new development moved in and, consequentially, raised land values. Though many of these businesses are large "nuisance" producers (such as auto repair shops) and are far from large employers or producers, they are an important part of the character of that area of the city and are
the lifeline of many of its inhabitants. In order to preserve this character and this needed continuance of small business, the city has given all these older, smaller, less competitive businesses a new place of residence within the neighborhood in a subsidized "Veemarket" (City of Amsterdam, July 1995; von Veenendaal, Personal Interview). This building, bought with city money and leased out at minuscule prices to the businesses ensures that the services, character, jobs, and amenities of the old neighborhood are not lost in the revitalization process that will accommodate more residents, bring in more businesses, and add to the vibrancy of the area.

Finally, this project is an extension of the current city policy of the "compact city." Despite the location of the Eastern Docks, in some ways very separated from the city center by water, there are plans to build more mass transit out to the Eastern Docks to ensure that residents can get to the city center easily, not for "everyday needs and amenities", which can be found in their own neighborhood, but for the connection to the rest of the city and community in general and for the cultural and artistic amenities located there (City of Amsterdam, plan Amsterdam, p.18; City of Amsterdam, July 1995). Thus, the new improvements and developments to the Eastern Docks will be a revitalization not only to that area, but to the whole of the city of Amsterdam as well.

As one can see, this development is indicative of the comprehensiveness and overall integration of many different issues within development in Amsterdam. The Eastern Docks provides employment, residences for all income groups, plenty of amenities and services that all city residents need, a plan to ensure more adequate public transportation out of the area, a plan to preserve environmental resources and beauty, and a mixed-use character that encourages a vibrant, diverse, and healthy urban environment.
In Chicago, the age of urban renewal was at its boon during the 40s, 50, and early 60s, during the reign of Mayor Richard J. Daley. During this time, the federal government had allocated large sums of money for slum clearance and urban redevelopment of poor neighborhoods under the 1949 and 1954 Federal Housing Acts and the 1947 Illinois Blighted Areas Redevelopment Act (Hirsch). For the most part, these funds were used in Chicago for the purpose of fulfilling the development agendas of community and corporate elites and to subsidize downtown business development and private profits at the expense of poor and working class people (Suttles, Biles, Hirsch, and Grimshaw). The building of the University of Illinois at Chicago was opposed by the neighborhood where the university was to be built as they feared displacement by urban renewal and the destruction of small businesses and community life (Biles, p.79).

But, Daley and the private business interests chose the sight for its location near the downtown, its proximity to the U of I Medical Complex, and because the institution and the elites behind it were pushing for it. Unfortunately for the people that lived at the corner of Harrison and Halsted, this was a project that was too important for business and institutional interests:

"For Daley and other growth-oriented businessmen concerned with preservation of the Loop, the campus became an island of higher land values close to downtown that slowed the entry of black and Latin populations into the area" (Biles, p.77).

And so it was. Poor blacks and minorities became the tool and the consequent whipping boy of the private developers and Daley's supportive policy.

Daley promised that the city would replace the housing for those who lost theirs as a result of the project. However, in the end the:
"...campus uprooted an estimated 8,000 people and 630 business establishments, several thousand more residents left along with family and friends or departed out of fear of displacement. An adjacent West Side urban renewal program dislodged another 3,500 persons and 170 businesses. The Valley's housing stock fell from approximately 6850 units in 1960 to 3,400 units in 1970" (Biles, p.77).

The UIC development uprooted lots of affordable housing, scattered capital from neighborhood hands, and left poor and working class people, a majority of them black and Hispanic, further impoverished and dislocated.

So, the UIC development became a boon to private developers, downtown business interests, Daley's machine and political "accomplishments", and business elites. UIC is a perfect example of how urban renewal proceeded in Chicago as resources were used to push economic development that centered on Big Projects that benefitted business, institutions, and the political machine at the expense of poor, working class, and minority populations and the ideals of equal, democratic, neighborhood development (Biles; Daley; Hirsch; Suttles). Unlike in Amsterdam, in Chicago, urban renewal funds in Chicago were used to subsidize business, segregate and ghettoize poor, working class, and minority populations of the city, destroy small business at the expense of large institutions and corporations, and fulfill the agenda of political elites at the expense of the rest of the city.

Current Development Effort-SNAP Project

The Strategic Neighborhood Action Program (SNAP) is an excellent example of a strategy that promotes publicly-led comprehensive economic development using both public and private resources. It is one of Chicago's few development efforts that attempts to use public direction and public investments for people-oriented development. Nevertheless, the program still places a large emphasis on subsidizing the market and deferring to business interests. The ultimate goal is to create
a "market renewal" within poor, decaying, capital-bereft neighborhoods (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan).

SNAP has marshaled significant investments in five neighborhoods, with two new ones on the way in 1996. The program attempts to use the investments, both public and private, in a very coordinated and integrated way that positively affects housing, infrastructure, health, education, etc.

Although this plan attempts to use both market and public sector forces in a coordinating way to bring back private and public investment to decaying neighborhoods, it leaves much to be desired. The plan depends on the free market and subsidizes the market's own actions. It fails to recognize the shortcomings of the market or the fact that the market was the reason for the destruction of the central city neighborhoods in the first place. The 1980s proved to a large degree that urban enterprise zones and other measures to try to stimulate private investment through tax breaks and public subsidies to private corporations have only resulted in higher profit margins for private companies, declining tax bases for cities, and no real benefits to the communities or working class people that need jobs and higher wages (Logan and Swanstrom; Clavel; Molotch). In fact, it is estimated that in the 1980s, the majority of companies who received large tax breaks form the regressive tax policies of Reaganomics used them to increase their business profits instead of for greater investment or further job creation in needy neighborhoods (Navarro, p.120).

Thus, despite the initial hope provided for by this plan, one must be wary of its potential. It does provide needed public investment, but how the public dollars will be used is not extremely democratically-controlled and the rest of the program relies on the profit-margin and market principles to rebuild neighborhoods that need less profit-centered forces and more people-centered forces.
Consequences: A Tale of Two Cities

All policy decisions have tremendous consequences for people. Policies of development and planning, due to their broad range of effect on a number of issues important to people (housing, transport, employment, the environment, etc.), are especially powerful in shaping and determining the quality of life for citizens. In both Chicago and Amsterdam, there are definable and very visible effects on social and economic indicators, spatial and physical indicators, the value and quality of public life, and the future consequences and directions for the respective communities. In the end, it is obvious that the very different policies of the two cities and the amount of political and financial resources committed to these policies produce extremely different results for the people that live there.

Amsterdam

Urban development policies in Amsterdam have created a lively, vibrant, and thriving urban environment that is both sustainable and livable and that produces numerous opportunities to live, work, and play. Its economic, social, and physical indicators are among the best in the world and produce a public life that is extremely democratic and just. Despite present and future challenges and difficulties, it remains a city of hope and opportunity and a true home and community for the vast majority of its citizens.

Economic and Social Indicators

In Amsterdam, social and economic indicators are very positive for the overall quality of life for most people. The total population of the city, not taking into account the metropolitan or outlying areas of the Amsterdam area is 722,350 and rising with the total metropolitan population at nearly 1.5 million people (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). The population is extremely diverse
and integrated. 58.1% of the population is Dutch; 9.7% is from other industrialized, European nations; 8.1% is from non-industrialized nations; 2.2% is Suideuropean; 6.5% is Moroccan; 4.3% is Turkish; 1.5% is Antillean; and 9.6% is Surinamers (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995).

Despite all this diversity, the largest minority make-up for any city district is approximately 55% (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). Out of a total of 17 city districts, there are 9 districts with a 30% or more minority make-up and 8 districts with under 30% (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). 4 of the 9 districts over 30% are over 40% and 2 of these are over 50% (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). The average racial minority presence is 32% for a district or city total (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). Thus, there is a low level of segregation and much mixed-racial living in Amsterdam.

In addition to the high level of racial integration, there is also a high level of economic integration and equality. In the city of Amsterdam, there is little economic inequality. The highest level of disposable income in any area of the city is listed, according to 1989 figures, as 28,800 guilders ($17,280) and the average level of disposable income for the average person overall in the city is 22,900 guilders ($13,740) (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). Broken down into city districts, out of 17 city districts, 12 districts are within a 4,000 guilder difference for average income (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). There are 4 districts with over 24,000 guilders for average disposable income (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). There is only one district under 20,000 guilders as level of average disposable income (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). In terms of the region of Amsterdam, including its outlying and metropolitan areas, there is only a difference of 3,000 guilders ($1800) between levels of average income between central city and outlying areas (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). In addition, people in Amsterdam live longer lives with the highest
life expectancy in the world (Morris, p.3A).

Granted, there are areas of higher racial segregation coupled with economic inequality. But, there are on a much lower scale than any encountered in Chicago. The area of highest minority make-up and income disparity can be found in the southeast of Amsterdam, which is mostly made up of large numbers of immigrants from Suriname. There the average disposable income is below 20,000 guilders and unemployment is figured at levels higher than 17.5% (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995).

On a social level, Amsterdam does an excellent job as well. The teenage pregnancy rate is one-seventh that of the U.S (Morris, p.3A). Dutch teenagers have 12-14 less abortions than American teenagers (Morris, p.3A). AIDS infection rate of Dutch prostitutes is less than 1% compared to 30-40% among U.S. prostitutes (Morris, p.3A). The proportion of Dutch teen-agers using marijuana is dropping and is a fraction of U.S. use (Ebert, p.24). Crack use is minimal.

**Physical and Spatial Indicators**

Physical and spatial indicators are also positive. Nationally, there is only a 2% shortage of housing (Social and Cultural Report, p.10). In Amsterdam, there are 2.04 people per each dwelling (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). In the city, the present housing deficit is estimated at 3.5% with a projected decline to 2.5% over the next few years (Het Amsterdam BVO&S 1995). In Amsterdam, 5% of the population is overcrowded in housing and .8% live in conditions that might be deemed "slum" conditions or where there is an acute jobs/housing mismatch (Het Amsterdam BVO&S 1995). Both figures continue to fall annually. In addition, only 3,000 individuals are homeless, which is only .4% of the population, a figure considered still too large in Amsterdam (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.85).
The housing stock is 55% rental and 45% owned and 87% of this rental stock is social sector housing (VROM 1992). New construction is continuing at a 50-50 rate between social sector and private housing as is evidenced by the allocation of a 50-50 split of private versus public building permits allocated in 1992 (VROM 1992). In addition, "the quality of social rental dwellings is better than that of private rental dwellings" (VROM 1992, p.37). Many of these successes can be attributed to a generous individual rent subsidy program plus extensive support and financing for designated housing associations that produce social sector housing for non-profit.

In addition to housing, the city of Amsterdam is free from what would be termed "slums" in the United States. The city Department of Housing in coordination with the Physical Planning Department ensures that physical and public infrastructure remains in good shape and does not dilapidate or crumble. There is visibly a huge difference in the appearance of streets, buildings, and other structures, especially in neighborhoods. There is considerably less physical decline.

**Public Life**

Public life in Amsterdam is vibrant and very active. This is a direct result of the planning and spatial policies that encourage such activity. Each development, whether it be housing or business-related is built with an eye towards encouraging public life and interaction. Also, transportation policies that discourage travel by car and encourage travel by public forms, bicycles, and on foot help to contribute to a public vibrancy. Finally, the level of green space and numerous parks throughout the city provide plenty of public area for exercise, recreation, and interaction.

Furthermore, the level of public life is illustrated by the comfort people have in living in the city. The positive social, economic, and physical indicators of the city show that Amsterdam is a quality place to live, work, and recreate. Crime is low compared to the rest of the industrialized
world: only 51 murders in 1992 were committed in the city and the country has the lowest imprisonment rate in the world (Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995).

The importance of public life and the level of satisfaction with life in the city can be quantitatively seen in the level of political participation in the city and country as a whole. Approximately 65-70% of the city population votes in local elections and nearly 85-90% of the population votes in national elections (von Veenendaal, Hardy, Personal Interviews; Het Amsterdamse BVO&S 1995). The form of government and type of development policy encourages and ensures much public participation on a political level. The local district councils have created a culture where public participation no longer needs to be encouraged and where citizens know and feel they have a direct influence on shaping their lives through public involvement (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview).

Finally, one can see how "public" life is by the amount of activity that occurs in each and every neighborhood of the city. Due to the mixed-use nature of all neighborhoods in Amsterdam, there is constant activity from both residents and visitors in the city. One can actually "see" the vibrancy of the public life in the many public "markets", pleins (public squares), shops, places of employment, and the streets that are always thronged with people.

In short, Amsterdam is still a city where people live, work, play, and grow both as individuals and within the community. It is a quality place to live and visit and its development policies are structured to ensure the continued existence of this quality, vibrant public life.

**Current Trends and Directions**

Despite its clarity, its sense, and its outstanding results, Amsterdam development cannot be looked at as a static or even perfect process. As the economic, political, and social conditions within
and around the city and around the globe continue to change, so must the nature of Amsterdam
development policy. These current trends and directions of development policy are both a result of
the city's need to constantly improve the quality of life in the city and to respond to forces larger than
itself. Major areas that deserve attention include: Housing, Public Transportation, Regional
Government, and the overall feeling of the political climate.

In housing, the nation of the Netherlands is committed to the idea that: "government should
ensure sufficient accommodation...as a social right" (VROM 1992). The city of Amsterdam's current
policy is based on fulfilling this social right, but by ensuring the provision of more higher-income,
private housing and turning over more of the responsibility for providing enough housing to
individuals and the private market (Melger, Personal Interview). Housing policy is now geared
towards quality, availability, and Affordability (VROM 1992, p.10). This change in policy has seen
a concurrent change in the level of funding that the national government has given to localities over
the last ten years (Dutch National Government, Budget, 1996). This is potentially a dangerous
development for Amsterdam and the Netherlands as a whole due to the fact that the need for
affordable, low-income housing still exists, especially due to the increases in poor minority and
immigration groups in the city (Melger, Personal Interview). Turning housing responsibilities over
to the free market and cutting state financial support risks leaving large numbers of citizens ill-
housed and at risk of increased poverty, while encouraging the abandonment of the idea of housing
as a social right.

Public transportation may be the most crucial issue for Amsterdam development at this time.
Much of the type of urban development, or development in general, for that matter, that occurs in
the Netherlands, is determined or driven by transportation. Well-financed and well-planned out
public transportation systems create the environment under which business develops and determines, by their presence or absence, levels of environmental quality, economic equality, the level of mixed-use development, and the mixture of class and race in urban communities (City of Amsterdam, plan Amsterdam 1993(#5), p.9). Without these public transportation systems, development becomes low-density, spread out, auto-centered, and of a separate, as opposed to mixed, use nature which leads to environmental damage, economic and racial segregation, and high levels of congestion, stress, and poor living quality. In fact, the whole Location Policy of the Dutch planning process is aimed at using transportation as a major way to create the right type of development (Dutch VROM 1994).

Unfortunately, currently in the Netherlands, in the midst of the efforts at retrenchment, there have been cutbacks in spending for transportation systems and some privatization of mass transit which has led to a decrease in services. As a result, much of the future of mass transit and its needed extension is in doubt and in danger of leaving development goals unfulfilled. Many officials within the Amsterdam city government see the dismantling or even stunting of the growth of mass transit as a major blow to quality development in the city and a threat to the underlying principles and goals of Amsterdam development (von Veenendaal and Melger, Personal Interview).

Speaking of transportation brings us to another crucial issue in present and future development in Amsterdam and that is the question of regional government. Without regional government, the issue of traffic and transport cannot be solved completely. Neither for that matter, can the environment or a host of whole other issues. Official after official within the Amsterdam and Rotterdam planning departments stated that "planning in the big cities is impossible without regional government" (von Veenendaal and Volk Personal Interviews).

However, regional government, though being mandated by the national government in the
last physical planning policies and recent legislation, has been defeated in local referendums in both Rotterdam and Amsterdam (VROM 1992). The sticking point has been over the nature of the union between city and surrounding municipalities. The surrounding municipalities will only agree to the union of regional government if the cities (Rotterdam and Amsterdam) are dissolved as single entities and made into a large number of districts or individual, smaller municipalities as somewhat already exists under the Intra-Municipal Decentralized government systems of the two cities (von Veenendaal, Hardy, and Volk, *Personal Interviews*). But, the large cities themselves are not in favor of this process.

So, as crucial issues remain to be resolved, reform into regional government languishes in limbo. Nevertheless, the national government has mandated that it will take place and in the next year, Rotterdam will have a regional government after a vote and decision by the national legislature. Amsterdam will soon follow. The only question is how it will be accomplished and what consequences this will have for the development process both in the individual cities and districts and the entire region as well. On a larger level, this question of regional government goes to the very heart of who should control development, how it should be structured and how its aims should be achieved. How these issues are dealt with will have extensive ramifications on the citizens and the living quality of urban communities in the Netherlands.

In addition, the current political climate in the Netherlands and Amsterdam itself will have a profound effect on how these issues: housing, transportation, and regional government, and others, are played out. In the Netherlands, there is cited a current trend towards decentralization, privatization and a reduction in the welfare state as the problems of funding grand social expenditures have met up with the reality of meeting the standards of entrance into the European
Union and the need to attract and keep capital within the country (von Veenendaal, Bodewitz, Melder, **Personal Interviews**). However, most members of the national ministries and many officials in the city government of Amsterdam feel that the major cuts are over with, yet the increasing influence of business and the private market looms as an uncertain cloud in the horizon of future development efforts.

Nevertheless, the Dutch welfare state has claimed its position as one of the most, if not the most, generous welfare states in the world. Here, incomes are some of the most equitable and stable in the world; poverty is minimal; crime is the lowest of any industrialized country; there is little evidence of any ghettoization or large concentration of poverty or racial segregation in Dutch cities; the standard of living for the average citizen is very high by industrialized standards and people feel connected to the political process, as is evidenced by the voting percentages in national elections as they feel that the state does serve their interests (Ebert, p.24; Heisler; Morris p.3A).

The end result of Amsterdam planning is a lively city that provides adequate housing, quality and quantity of employment, that controls and uses traffic wisely, and that provides for plentiful recreational activity in a democratic and public manner.

"The effort to raise the quality of the living environment is both a practical and a moral imperative. The compact-city policies can only succeed if Amsterdam is and remains an attractive city to live, work, and go out in" (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.190).

The 4th Policy Note, structure plans, city policy statements, local zoning plans, and concurrent public strategies coupled with sufficient financial and political resources ensure that this endeavor is successful in the creation of a more "livable" city.
Chicago

The effects of the development policy in Chicago are alarming and very representative of urban centers throughout the United States. Development policies in Chicago have produced a "human misery index" unparalleled by any other city outside of the U.S. in the industrialized world and a quality of life far below that of Amsterdam (Chicago Rehab Network 1993; Blakely and Goldsmith, p.23).

Social and Economic Indicators

Chicago, like Amsterdam, is a large and diverse metropolitan area. Home to over 3 million people, nearly double the size of metropolitan Amsterdam, Chicago is 38.5% African-American, 37.9% White, 19.1% Hispanic, and 3.5% Asian (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.8). However, the level of segregation among these groups is much, much higher.

Chicago development policy has failed, or maybe in the eyes of some, succeeded in its goals of racial concentration, strengthening capital, and separating the classes. Chicago is the most segregated city in the United States with 77 communities making up a very segregated and separated style of living (Blakely and Goldsmith, p.50). 40 of these communities are over 50% white and 14 of them are over 90% white (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.10). 31 of these communities are over 50% black with 21 of them at over 90% black and 14 of these are over 98% black (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.10). That leaves only six communities that are not either 50% white or 50% black. In fact, if blacks make up a majority in a neighborhood, their average presence is at 85% (Goldsmith and Blakely, p.50).

Not only are people separated at a higher rate according to race, but they are also segregated at a very high rate of economic segregation and class inequality. Poverty is widespread and
increasing. According to city figures in the Consolidated Plan, 21.6% of the city lives under the poverty line while 35% of all households are classified by HUD as low-income (incomes less than 50% of MSA’s Median Family Income) (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.12). In addition, 33% of all children in the city live under the federal poverty line (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan). Chicago ranks above the national average in every important poverty indicator by a large margin (Blakely and Goldsmith 1992).

Poverty is segregated and concentrating in a greater number of neighborhoods. Chicago has 14 out of 77 communities where the 1990 median income was less than $15,000 (Chicago Rehab Network, p.12). 27 areas have a poverty rate greater than the city average of 21.6% (Consolidated Plan). Neighborhoods on the South and West Side have extremely high rates and concentrations of poverty (Blakely and Goldsmith; City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan). Meanwhile, the amount of wealth and affluence in the downtown, certain North Side neighborhoods, and especially the outer suburbs is astounding. Unemployment, falling real wages, and the loss of manufacturing jobs have created a "dumbbell" economy that has not served the majority of Chicago citizens (Squires; Blakely and Goldsmith).

Poverty has intensified, concentrated, and segregated by location. The poor live in one area and the rich in another. This helps to further the misunderstandings and the unease between classes and create an even more divided, more unlivable city.

Furthermore, when one adds the two factors together, race and class, one sees a further injustice. Poverty and the effects of the development process are excessively felt by minority populations. The unemployment rate for African Americans is three times that of whites; the poverty rate for African Americans (33.2%) and Hispanics (24.2%) is disproportionately higher than
for whites; the majority of the poorest neighborhoods in Chicago are minority neighborhoods; and the city median African-American household income is $19,897 compared to $24,855 for Latino households, and $31,459 for white households (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan, p.4; Chicago Rehab Network, p.15).

**Physical and Spatial Indicators**

According to physical and spatial indicators, Chicago development policy is failing as well. 38% of all Chicago households experience housing problems (City of Chicago, Consolidated Plan, p.4). The Chicago housing stock is excessively overpriced, full of physical defects due to disinvestment and age, and overcrowded. The largest problem is excessive cost burden. With the population of the city growing poorer with the loss in the value of real wages and skyrocketing housing costs, the city is now facing a housing crisis with at least 19,000 homeless, 31% of all households experiencing housing costs greater than 30% of their incomes and 15% with over 50% of their incomes, 17.6% of all rental units substandard and 6% overcrowded (City of Chicago, 1996 Consolidated Plan).

**Public Life**

Race, class, and economic indicators all show the failures of Chicago development policy. When taken together, they produce a city that is outstanding for creating corporate growth and upper-income wealth, but terrible for meeting human needs. The combined effects of race and poverty have created a fragmented, uneasy city with a poor public life (Bennett 1990). The lack of housing and basic items such as a job that pays a living wage have left the city in decay and torn by race, poverty, crime (850 homicides in 1993), and social and political decay (Suttles; Blakely and Goldsmith 1992; Chicago Rehab Network, p.15).
People feel unsafe in poor, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Oftentimes, white folks dare not to venture into black neighborhoods and vice-versa for fear of crime or violence. Chicago suburbanites come into the city only for the downtown tourist attractions which are segmented off from the life of the neighborhoods and is developed in a fashion meant to keep "undesirables" out (Hirsch 1983). The private-driven development in Chicago has produced a "private-driven" society that is separated by class, race, and location. Chicago is not a lively, urban environment; it is a mistrustful, fragmented array of communities and neighborhoods with a central, corporate, tourist core (Bennett 1990).

**Current Trends and Directions**

The Chicago development policy is too dependent on the market. It uses a multitude of actors, resources, and great-sounding programs to try to subsidize the market into meeting needs. But, the market does not very easily address the needs of poor and moderate-income families or neighborhoods and in the era of de-industrialization and conservative federal politics, it must be coerced and democratically controlled for the purpose of balanced development (Heisler; Kantor 1995; Kuttner 1984; Esping-Anderson 1985; Molotch 1990; Clavel 1986). There is a certain degree of citizen participation in the development process, but not the degree that is necessary to ensure that the market is democratically controlled. Oftentimes, the numerous citizen advisory boards that are appointed by the Mayor and are actors in these development decisions are nothing more than "rubber-stamps" for the elitist, business agenda (Suttles 1990; Ewen, p.11A; Molotch, p.316). Finally, one must remember that much of the development process in Chicago lies outside the realm of the documents that we've been discussing. In the world of private development, there is oftentimes only the matter of zoning and city regulations. If there is further public involvement, as
shown above, it is often in the form of public subsidization of the private effort.

While looking at this complex, diverse, and messy process, one must take into consideration a number of issues. One is the fact that the city is slowing making a transition. Under Washington, the focus of the whole development process was substantially altered in public policy (Grimshaw 1991). Since Washington, although much of what he proposed and made city policy has not been reversed or rejected, it has been ignored, pursued less ambitiously, and slowly reversed through new policies without a downright condemnation of the old. The Daley administration, since the creation of the Department of Planning and Development in 1992, has been slowly developing its own fractured development policies for industry, retail, etc. and turning much of the process back over to the private sector and to business elites (Jimenez, p.9).

Secondly, one must take into consideration the politics of the city of Chicago. The city's politics has always been race-based, elite and business-driven, and geared towards a development of inequality. Even the machine governments were basically just pro-growth regimes that gave the impression of being representatives of working class interests (Biles 1978; Royko 1976; Suttles 1990; Kantor 1995). The machine's sphere of influence was limited to political resources, while the business community remained in control of the economic sphere and used it for the benefit of corporate and elite interests. Washington really did much to change this focus by mobilizing the poor black vote, injecting democracy into the development process, embracing a policy of balanced development, and putting resources into neighborhood and people-based development (Grimshaw).

Now, much of those changes and much of that focus, though it still remains on paper, does not come shining through in actual policy.

The struggle between the public and private sectors is raging in Chicago. The effects of de-
industrialization in an era of decreasing federal progressivism have left Chicago and its development policy at the mercy of free market forces and the power of the profit margin. The policy is becoming more fragmented, more private-driven, less democratic, and more racial even as we speak and write about it.

The Chicago development policy is a big mess. It is difficult to understand, impossible to explain in simple terms, and nearly impossible to count all its fragmented, uncoordinated, and separate parts. In the end, it is still primarily a tool of the private sector. Every economic, social, and indicator of public worth shows that it has served the interests of business and corporate growth without advancing the human quality of life for average citizens. It works well for the intended powers and purposes: those of the market. Unfortunately, it does not do well at addressing the comprehensive needs of cities (affordable housing, economic development, mass transit, environment, poverty, public service).

Chicago is currently the perfect example of the dependent city (Kantor 1995). It is de-industrialized, has a population growing poorer each day, is starving for capital and a tax base, faces increasing demands for a needier population, and all as state and federal governments withdraw from their responsibilities to the city and its needs. Without a large injection of democracy and federal progressivism, only possible through a mobilization of the poor and working class, the city's development policy will continue to be distributive-based, private-driven, and productive of the same disappointing results (Piven and Cloward 1978, 1983, 1993). Chicago is undemocratic, business-driven, fractured development at its best.

What's even worse is that in the current American political debate, this dependancy, for the near future, will be increased and exacerbated in Newt Gingrich's conservative revolution and the
"Contract with America." This "replay of Reaganomics" threatens to leave cities with less public resources, a more meager welfare state to assist needy populations and thereby strengthen the working class, an ending of universal rights, and increased assistance to the rich and to corporations.

At the center of this political climate is the bipartisan drive to dismantle the "evil" welfare state in order to remove all societal barriers to making money and large profit for powerful interests. The rhetoric of this movement has denied the fact that the welfare state has always been meager in the U.S., that it has been in the process of dismantlement for the past thirty years, and has continued to assert that the welfare state, despite its meagerness, is the cause of the whole slew of social problems plaguing American society that have exploded since the end of the 1960s (Gans 1995; Handler 1995; Navarro 1994; Piven and Cloward 1978, 1983, 1993; Quadagno 1993).

Without a strong, city-centered, working class-driven movement to redirect development policy in Chicago, and more ultimately, the social welfare policies in the United States, cities like Chicago will become more dependent on the market and the development process will continue to produce a poor quality of life and a poor urban atmosphere for the majority of Chicago residents (Kantor 1995).

Cities and the Welfare State

The reason for the success of Dutch development policy as opposed to Chicago development policy cannot be attributed solely to the policies dealing specifically with development and planning, but instead must be seen within the context of a generous and progressive welfare state that produces much better results for its people. It is the welfare state in Dutch society that ensures that there is enough affordable housing, a livable and generous minimum wage, a fair and just amount of income supports to ensure a quality of life for unemployed, disabled, or elderly individuals, and universal
health care for all citizens; and this in turn ensures a society that is more democratic, has a higher average standard of living for the working population, and has less poverty, crime, and degradation (Heisler; Navarro, p.59). Development policies are only a part of the larger welfare state that ensures a society that serves people first and the profit margin second.

A simple look at the state of the two societies, American and Dutch, easily points to the differences that are made by the welfare state. In America, in the 1960s, a country that had historically trailed the rest of the industrialized world in terms of the maturity of its welfare state, embarked on a courageous course to expand social benefits and bring about a greater degree of racial and economic equality in American society through the Great Society programs (Quadagno 1993). For seven years, these programs, though in many instances, flawed and poorly administered, were fully funded, with lots of people on the rolls without restrictive regulations and succeeded in lowering the national poverty figures (from 39 million in 1965 to under 25 million in 1972—from 19% to 12%), contributing to the de-intensification and de-concentration of poverty and lowering levels of family break-up and crime (Quadagno, p.178; Blakely and Goldsmith, p.31).

Then, with the advent of the age of Nixon and General Revenue Sharing, helped along by the racial backlash against Great Society programs that was taken advantage of by conservatives and moderates alike, these programs began to be chopped up and watered down, beginning a process of atrophication that would find its complete fulfillment in the Reagan Revolution of the 80s and the Gingrich Revolution of the 90s (Piven and Cloward 1983, Steinberg 1995, Quadagno 1993). It amounted to an all-out class war on working class and poor people that has had profound effects.

Now, after thirty years of abandoning efforts to provide assistance to working class and poor sectors of society and the fight to extend universal welfare rights such as full employment and health
care to the whole of American society, one finds the dire results of such poor policymaking. As a editorial writer in one of America's more conservative/moderate newspapers stated in a painfully obvious and straightforward way:

"The income gap between the top 20% and the bottom 20% is wider than at any time since the U.S. Census Bureau began measuring incomes in 1947. We are now the world's most economically stratified industrial nation, with 40 million of us living at or below the poverty level. Just above on the income scale, the working poor have seen their incomes drift into slow decline. And in the Great Middle- our unique stabilizer in an unstable world- the median wage of $475-a-week, corrected for inflation, has slipped from $498-a-week 15 years ago" (McCarron, p.11).

The wealthiest 1% of our nation now controls 40% of the wealth, more than the bottom 90% put together (Sanders). Over the last twenty years, there has been a continual decline in the average wages of American workers and a concurrent decline in their standards of living; our nation has fallen from 1st in the industrialized world in wages and benefits to 13th; and the value of real wages has fallen by 16% (Sanders; Blakely and Goldsmith, p.68). And, things haven't improved during the recent economic recovery. From 1988 to 1993, worker productivity grew in the private sector by 5.9%, but average hourly wages decreased by 4% and the purchasing power of the average American family has declined by $1,400 in just the last 2 years (Sanders).

Since 1970, poverty has increased (the child poverty rate has increased by 1 million since 1990 alone); the ghettoization and concentration of poverty in American cities has intensified and expanded; levels of family breakup have grown; crime levels have exploded; racial and ethnic tensions have grown increasingly unstable; and people have become more and more alienated from the political process and distrustful of a state that serves only the interests of the rich and powerful.

Currently, nearly 40 million Americans live in poverty with 30 million more just above the official poverty line (150% of it) that have:
"barely enough for the lowest-cost necessities such as food, housing, clothing, transportation, and medical care-and nothing at all for what better-off Americans take for granted—meals out, vacations, child care, lessons or allowances for children, haircuts and so on" (Handler, p.34).

Only 13.6 million of these 70 million very vulnerable and struggling Americans are receiving "welfare" (Handler, p.34). And yet, "welfare" and programs that benefit poor, working class, and lower middle class Americans are constantly singled out as the cause of our social breakdowns and societal shortcomings.

Meanwhile, the stock market booms at record rates, corporate profits are as high as they've ever been, growth rates during the 80s were some of the highest in the industrialized world without visible benefit to the majority of Americans, and the U.S. is still the richest nation in the world in terms of GDP (Navarro 1994). The American upper middle class and wealthy enjoy the best of everything in the industrialized world. Nevertheless the difficulties of the poor and the working class and their failings are blamed on their own behavior and the faults of the non-existent, corrosive welfare state.

In America, the real cause of these statistics is a welfare state for the rich, powerful, and business interests.

"This is America—the unplanned land, where speculators are subsidized, and where the divide between rich and poor is played out in urban designer's developer-driven deals. It is socialism for capitalists—a free ride in need of the brakes" (Kay, p.694).

What is needed is a generous, universal welfare state that serves the interests of working class and poor people and guarantees universal human rights for all instead of bigger profit margins for the few.

The generous welfare state in the Netherlands has created a society that is more just, more
democratic, more equitable, and a better place to live for the average family or individual. The average Dutch citizen has it better off than the average American citizens when it comes to health insurance, unemployment insurance, vacation time, wage levels, standard of living, disposable income, and working hours (Navarro, p.59). The welfare state helps to support and create a strong and vibrant working class political movement that ensures the ascendancy and prominence of democracy and the public sector in making vital societal decisions of an economic, political, and social nature (Navarro 1994; Piven and Cloward 1978; Skocpol 1994). Thus, when it comes to development, the key is not just good planning policies themselves, but the entire state framework that encourages and delivers true democracy and that ensures basic human rights. Within this context, cities become a true creation of the democratic will and locations where people can thrive politically, economically, and socially both as individuals and as communities without first regard for the profit margin or large business interests.

Despite the rosy picture that all the statistics seem to paint of the Netherlands, there are difficulties that come with the generous welfare state. However, unlike the American logic would suggest, they have nothing to do with the erosion of the work ethic, the de-stabilization of the family, or the moral corruption of society (Gans 1995; Handler 1995; Navarro 1994; Piven and Cloward 1993). The major difficulty that the Dutch welfare state has undergone is that of retrenchment, or budget cutbacks (Cox 1993). The universal problem of generous welfare states is that high social expenditures, no matter how effective in society, require high taxes and high levels of democracy and public control over the private sector. Given the fact that capital is already liable to flee at any time for the opportunity of obtaining lower wages and higher profit margins, these high taxes and the strong level of democratic control vs. the market often accelerates this tendency to flee. Then,
the bind is that as capital flees, social costs in the welfare state go up due to higher unemployment and the need for greater spending on entitlement programs.

In today's global economy, retrenchment quickly becomes an issue for any fully-developed welfare state nation. In the Netherlands, it has been no different. In the past decade, the welfare state has been reduced, but the premise of certain "rights" such as health care and a decent standard of living are still present. Nevertheless, business is becoming more and more prominent in the realm of traditional welfare states, old policies of full employment and the state guarantee of housing are coming under attack, and the generousness of the welfare state itself is being debated and often reduced (von Veenendaal and Hardy, Personal Interviews).

However, the retrenchment that has been taking place in Western Europe, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Canada must be kept in context. It is true that there have been victories for conservative, business forces, that in some cases welfare rolls have been reduced, and that there is a certain portion of the political climate geared towards privatization and reduced governmental control and spending. However, there is not a lack of opposition to these efforts in any of these countries; there has been little success in truly dismantling the idea of entitlements or the right to those things provided through the welfare state; and in many places, during these battles, the Left and progressive forces have actually been able to further entrench the welfare state within their own societies (Bodewitz, von Veenendaal, Hardy, Personal Interviews).

The Netherlands is a good example of how retrenchment must be kept in context. A member of the Amsterdam Physical Planning Department characterized the current Dutch political climate as one in which there is a general feeling that there's too much regulation by the government, that there is a strong move to take more of the societal burden away from the government in areas such
as mass transit and housing, and that the future of national funding is very uncertain (Melger, Personal Interview). However, at the same time, this same man still claimed that there was still a strong movement from many areas of society to preserve much of the welfare state (Melger, Personal Interview). Government officials in both Rotterdam and the Hague claimed that the majority of budget-cutting in the welfare state, which had taken place in order to fulfill the requirements for entrance into the EC (European Community), was over and that a leveling out or slight increase could be expected in welfare state spending over the next few years (Volk and Bodewitz, Personal Interviews). Despite cutbacks and adjustments, the main components remain in place and democratic, working class politics and a state that works for those interests remains alive and quite strong.

It is easy to see from the comparison between Chicago and Amsterdam, that the key to producing a society that is truly "people-centered" is to ensure that democracy and the public sector are the guiding hand for the often cruel and inhuman market. If we want healthy cities, just societies, and places where citizens can work, live, play, and develop at a decent standard of living, then we must use the state, the universal welfare state, to ensure that this occurs.

For American cities, what is needed is progressive alternatives and federal help to free them from the slavish dependancy of the market by the installation and implementation of a generous welfare state. Even Mayor Washington, who was very successful in achieving many successes during a time when Chicago was extremely dependent said,

"Cities can't control the economy. Mayors who go around beating their breasts saying that they are doing this and doing that in reference to the economy are kidding themselves. I don't kid people. I tell you categorically, these cities cannot resolve these problems. There has to be Federal guidance, Federal help, Federal assistance, Federal investment in the young
people of this country" (Hearing Subcommittee on Urban Problems, Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, House of Representatives, 98th Congress, 2nd session).

We must stop kidding ourselves. Our cities will never be better places to live (and isn't that the point of economic development to begin with) until our development policies are democratic, balanced, just and supported by a universal welfare states that guarantees human rights for all. The state must be used to implement policies that are truly representative of the interest of the majority of citizens and in the interest of the common good. There is still hope for Chicago, and American cities in general, but that hope lies with democracy, with the working class, and with a generous, universal welfare state.

**A Plan to Save America's Cities**

"That which is patently unjust has become justice. That which is obviously wrong has become right. That which opposes the position of power has always been labeled as radical" (Spence, p.166).

-Gerry Spence

The state of American cities is a huge injustice. The lessons learned about democracy, the universal welfare state, and working class-based politics from the comparison of Amsterdam and Chicago should provide us with a direction for reversing the injustice of American cities and the immorality of corporate welfare state politics. But, what would the plan specifically look like?

Certainly one couldn't simply transfuse all the Dutch policies and programs into American society and politics. As Henry von Veenendaal of the Amsterdam city planning department said himself, "Dutch policies, specifically, would not work in America because they are a result of Dutch culture, society and political institutions, which are unique and distinct from American society, culture, and political institutions" (von Veenendaal, Personal Interview). In other words, the policies are a result of the "politics of place" of the Netherlands and, more specifically, Amsterdam.
Nevertheless, there is no denying the fact that it is the "politics of place" and the resulting policy choices made that determine the shape of cities and that one can learn from the priorities and principles of Dutch policy (democracy, control over the free market, putting the needs of people above the needs of capital, etc) in crafting policies that fit into the environment of American politics, society and culture.

After seeing the comparison of the policies of the two cities and countries and the economic and social ramifications that these policies have had for real people, it should become obvious that we, as a society, can and must do better. There is no excuse for the proliferation and intensification of poverty, degradation, ignorance, and pure human suffering among a greater and greater proportion of our society while we continue to be the richest, wealthiest, most resource-laden country in the world. A plan to save our cities must address the areas discussed in the comparison above, attack societal inequalities not only at the urban level, but throughout our society, and renew the promise of democracy for all Americans by ensuring the political, economic, and social rights of each citizens. A commitment to saving our cities is a commitment to social justice, democracy and a new, progressive America.

My plan would involve three parts and provide three necessities for American cities: Universal human rights through a universal welfare state; dollars and capital through an Urban Marshall Plan to physically rebuild and economically renew cities; and pure and radical democracy to liberate cities from the market and make them creations of the public will, instead of private profit. All three phases will work together to create new American cities and a new progressive America.

The comparison of Amsterdam and Chicago, or the Netherlands and the United States for that matter, within the context of global economic restructuring, should make very clear that the state
is always a "welfare" state; it's just a question of what type of welfare state it is. In the U.S., the state is used to subsidize private profit and business interests; it is a "corporate" welfare state. In the Netherlands, the state is a universal welfare state that ensures the majority of major needs (education, housing, income, etc.) for all citizens. The creation of the universal welfare state in the U.S. should fulfill the social rights of all citizens and would involve:

* a single-payer national health care plan
* a fully-funded, full-employment plan that would be developed in coordination with a Worker's Bill of Rights
* the extension of federally-funded day care for every American family
* extensive education subsidies
* Generous income grants to replace welfare and unemployment insurance payments.

The plan would also advocate a radical reordering of federal resource priorities to pay for a Marshall Plan to Rebuild America's Cities that would infuse huge sums of public capital towards rebuilding the dilapidated housing stock, infrastructure, mass transit facilities, and job base, health services, and schools of urban centers.

The third phase of the plan targets democracy as the key to making cities the creation of people and their needs instead of creations and centers of business and the needs of capital. This phase advocates national, state, and local urban policies, the creation of regional governments, and the legislating of extensive democratic measures of public participation in all development decisions. The plan for democracy would include:

* A National Urban Policy Act
* State or Regional and Local Urban Policies
* The Creation of Regional Governments
* Labor Law Reform (Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act)
* Campaign Finance Reform (Public Financing of Campaigns)
* Progressive Local Development Policies (Mixed-use, mass transit, social sector housing, linkage agreements, land banking, urban growth boundaries, public dollars for public benefit).
Democracy and the will of ordinary people, not capital, should be the compass that points cities to their new future.

*The Universal Welfare State*

"I have the audacity to believe that people everywhere can have three meals a day for their bodies, education and culture for their minds, and dignity, equality, and freedom for their spirits. I believe that what self-centered men have torn down, other-centered men can build up" (King, p.25).

-Martín Luther King, Jr.

Cities are in desperate need of universal human rights for their citizens. The universal welfare state will ensure the economic, social, and political rights of each citizen, and create an environment in which democracy, progressive politics, and people-centered urban planning and development can successfully take place.

**Full-Employment Plan**

America must work to ensure that all its citizens can have a job. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said: "In our society, it is murder, psychologically, to deprive a man of a job or an income. You are in substance saying...that he has no right to exist" (King, p.45). Currently, in our nation, we are telling nearly 17 million Americans that they have no right to exist. Consider the following:

"At the end of 1994, 7.2 million people in the United States were unemployed and looking for work. Another 5.6 million wanted jobs but were not actively looking for work because of discouragement, a lack of child care and other reasons. And an additional estimated 4.4 million workers were employed part time not by choice, but because their hours had been cut or because they couldn't find full-time work. These 17 million jobless or underemployed persons comprised a labor force larger than California's, twice the size of Australia's, and 13 times as large as Ireland's-in short, an enormous pool of underutilized labor" (Harvey, p.21).

This crisis is creating a society with a higher and higher crime rate, a greater proportion of our
population in prison, a severely dilapidated housing, mass transit, and infrastructure stock, an increasingly polluted environment, and a shortage in health care and day care services in needy areas.

There is no reason for these circumstances to exist; especially since our nation, long ago, promised to ensure full employment to all its citizens. In 1944, as a part FDR's "Economic Bill of Rights" and again in 1978 as a part of the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act, our society made a commitment to ensure a job for every able American and to not allow the national unemployment rate to rise above 4% (Progressive Caucus, Sub. To H.J. Res. 1). Currently, however, the federal government with the aid of the Federal Reserve is unofficially keeping the national unemployment rate (through the NAIRU policy) at 5.9-6.2% by manipulating interest rates to slow down the economy and inflation and at the same time stifling new job creation (Thayer, 38). Ironically, this policy, at the same time that it depresses wages and weakens the solidarity and economic security of the working class, keeps stock, bond, and corporate profits up (Thayer, p.41).

It is time for us to fulfill our promise as a society and reaffirm the right of all our citizens to have a humane and fulfilling existence. A Full-Employment Plan accompanied by a legislated "Workers Bill of Rights" could help to address our problems of underemployment/unemployment and crumbling inner-cities. The full-employment program could ensure that every American can obtain a job paying a new national minimum wage of $8.50/hr, with three weeks paid vacation, a 36 hour work week, 20 weeks paid maternity leave, and on-site job-training (Harvey, p.23; Sanders, 1993:17). The program could be used in coordination with other government agencies as part of the Marshall Plan to provide jobs and rebuild our nation's communities, clean up our environment, and
invest in people all at the same time. A commitment to full-employment has recently been called by the Progressive Caucus in *The Fiscal Fairness Act* as a substitute to the Balanced Budget Amendment in the 104th Congress (Progressive Caucus, *The Fiscal Fairness Act*, Sub. to H.J. Res.1).

In addition, due to its future positive effects, a full-employment program could be achieved at a relatively small financial price for our society (Harvey, p.23). It costs us tremendous amounts of resources to leave 17 million of our fellow citizens unemployed or underemployed. A jobs program would increase our nation's tax base; lower the amount of money being paid for income-assistance to the jobless; produce more goods and services and thus real income for our society; decrease the myriad of social problems attributable to severe joblessness; and lower the number of deep recessions that our society has to suffer due to the negative-feedback effect that rising unemployment engenders in economic downturns (Harvey, p.23). In addition, it could provide the financing and manpower for a national day care program and provide the economic means and social stability for the rejuvenation of depressed central city neighborhoods.

According to the figures of Philip Harvey, a jobs program that paid $8.50/hr. in 1986, or about $17,500 per year (in 1995 dollars), could be carried out for ten years at a cost of $200 billion dollars per year on the average (Harvey, p.26). However, according to his estimates, 20% of the program's total cost would pay for itself through the social security and income taxes paid by the people in the program; 60% of the program's total costs would have been covered by funds actually spent between 1977 and 1986 on unemployment compensation and means-tested income assistance provided to able-bodied adults of working age and their dependents; and 20% would have to be paid for in new spending $40 billion in 1995 dollars (Harvey, p.26). But, this is chicken feed compared
to the $265 billion we spent on the military in 1995 or the over $100 billion we spent in corporate tax break and subsidies (Handler 1995). It is comparable to the $40 billion in tax breaks that we gave to the wealthiest 1% of our population in 1995 (Sanders).

For $40 billion in new spending, we could employ all able-bodied adults, put people to work rebuilding our national and urban infrastructures, mass transit systems, schools, health facilities, and environmental clean-up. In addition, it could operate our new national day care centers that are so necessary for ensuring a more secure and affordable life for American families. Promises are meant to be fulfilled. This one is necessary for the revitalization of our cities and the renewal of hope and opportunity for millions of Americans.

**Income Supports**

No American should live under the poverty line. For that matter, based on what has been said above, no American should live at 150% of the poverty line ($21,000 for an urban family of four). Our nation is the wealthiest country in the world, yet it has the highest poverty rate out of 21 industrialized nations and the worst rate of concentration of poverty within urban centers (Blakely and Goldsmith 1992). Our current welfare system does a terrible job at pulling people out of poverty: our assistance programs pull only one in five families out of poverty (20%), while in Canada, 1 in 2 families are pulled out of poverty by assistance programs (50%), and in the Netherlands, two-thirds of all poor people (67%) are pulled out of poverty by assistance programs (Drier and Bernard, p.34; Timmer, p.180). Despite having nearly identical pre-assistance poverty rates, Canada spends considerably more with less stringent regulations, and as a result, has 7% of all families in poverty compared to 12% in the U.S., 26% of single-parent families in poverty compared to 41% in the U.S., and 9.3% of children in poverty compared to 20% in the U.S.
Furthermore, in Canada, the employment rate for single women with children, despite the higher benefit levels and less stringent regulations, is much higher than the U.S. (51% to 31%), thus decrying the argument of work ethic erosion and the encouragement of bad morals in single mothers by welfare payments (Hanratty, p.36).

Federal welfare payments in the U.S. "have never exceeded one percent of the federal budget", have many different requirements attached to them, are run by racist and ineffective bureaucracies, are so severely underfunded that only one-third of the poverty population receives any help at all, and do a poor job of helping the poor (Gans, p.117; Handler, p.34; Quadagno 1994; Thayer, p.35). The key is to change welfare, not eliminate it.

In order to combat this, the current "welfare" and unemployment insurance system will be scrapped and replaced by a generous, universal income security program to ensure that no American lives under 150% of the national poverty line ($21,000 for an urban family of four) (Gans, p.114). In order to simplify the system and do away with the oppressive, racist, and ineffective welfare bureaucracy, there will be one main "income support" program or "social insurance" program that all Americans will be entitled to without stringent regulations and with a universal, working class emphasis. Benefits will be provided both to working and non-working individuals and families, no matter what the number of parents, on a sliding scale to ensure that total income exceeds 150% of the poverty line. These supports will act as unemployment insurance, as assurance that no one lives below the poverty line, and as a signification that those who are jobless or unable to support themselves are victims of the economy's inability to provide jobs, not their own racial or individual shortcomings (Gans 1995).

The cost can be paid for with cuts in corporate welfare and the military, through a more
progressive tax system, and through the use of deficit spending. The extent of this program will be
determined by how effective our full-employment policies are at raising the standard of living of
poor, working Americans.

These supports would ensure that no child or individual will live in poverty or degradation
and that struggling, inner-city communities have families and members that are able to meet all their
necessities. Limitations and restrictions attached to benefits will be eased, not tightened. The
experience of other industrialized nations, plus the past welfare history of our own nation shows that
when restrictions are eased and benefits increased, poverty decreases along with its concurring social
problems, the plight of working class individuals improve, and the resources and benefits of society
are more evenly distributed throughout society (Quadagno 1993; Navarro 1994; Piven and Cloward
1993; Dreier and Bernard 1992).

Despite the initial costs of this program, its effects would help to severely decrease the costs
of crime, prisons, violence, and neighborhood decay that have plagued our cities and our society at
large over the last twenty to thirty years. Depending on the success of the full-employment program,
it may not be that large of an investment. But, given larger political and economic forces, it may be
extremely difficult to employ everyone adequately, and thus, there must be a way for people to be
out of work, yet still be surviving, contributing members of our society (Thayer, p.33; Gans, p.117).
Income supports that preserve life for all American citizens is a human investment that is well worth
making and a moral imperative.

**National Health Care**

All Americans should have comprehensive and adequate health care. One necessity that all
humans need to survive is their health and the means to maintain that health. Currently, in the U.S.,
there are 80 million Americans either uninsured or underinsured when it comes to health care. A large majority of these Americans are poor and working class people that live in major urban centers. Most of these families and individuals are unable to pay for basic necessities, especially health care while working in the low-wage labor market (Bergmann and Hartmann, p. 594). The lack of health care leaves them defenseless against the dangers and uncertainties of the global economy and the low-wage labor market and stuck in a pattern and cycle of oppressive poverty.

Every other industrialized nation in the world provides universal health care of some form, and, as a result, produces better public and individual health indicators with lower overall costs and higher levels of coverage (Navarro, pp.170,185,186). In addition, they do it with less waste, bureaucracy, and intervention into the doctor-patient relationship. The United States spends the most per capita on health care of any country in the world and yet fails to cover its citizens and produces the worst public health indicators, vaccination rates, and personal satisfaction rates in the industrialized world (Sherrill, p.48).

The experience of our neighbor to the North provides a multitude of evidence proving that single-payer health care systems are most cost-effective, less intrusive, less bureaucratic, and more socially just. "Until 1966, Canada and the United States had similar levels of health expenditures and similar health indicators. In 1966 the Canadians established an NHP, and since then their health expenditures have grown at a slower pace than those of the United States, while expanding rather than reducing health benefits coverage, and their health indicators have improved much faster...a health care system similar to the Canadian one would save $70 billion a year while providing comprehensive health coverage to all" (Navarro, p.83).

Canada's entire national health care plan covers 25 million people with less administrative employees than the Massachusetts branch of Blue Cross which covers only 2.7 million people and is only one of the many players in the American health care field (Navarro, p.209; Sherrill). It costs
3 cents in administrative costs to deliver $1 worth of health care in Canada while it costs 34 cents in administrative costs to deliver $1 of health care in the U.S. (Hanratty, p.37). Canada has less administrators, less bureaucracy, more nurses per capita, spends less one-third less per person, covers its entire population comprehensively, and produces much better health indicators with a single-payer plan (Sherrill; Navarro 1994).

America could also cover all its citizens while bringing down health care costs and improving public health indicators and the lives of millions of middle class, working class, and poor people with a single-payer health care system that would provide comprehensive and universal coverage. A single-payer plan could be financed through progressive earmarked taxes, with cost controls and negotiated fees agreed to between doctors and the national health care system. The Cradle to Grave Health Care Act (H.R. 1200), introduced by Representative Jim McDermott to the 104th Congress, is a single payer health care plan proposal that would achieve universal coverage in the first year with the most generous benefit package yet proposed in American health care reform proposals, while achieving $100 billion in deficit reduction, reducing national health care costs by $175 billion, eliminating $100 million in administrative waste, and preserving the autonomy of the doctor-patient relationship (Progressive Caucus, H.R.1200). According to a study by The Johns Hopkins School of Health Care Finance, the McDermott's single-payer bill would allow 80% of all Americans (individuals, families, and businesses) to pay less for health care in the year 2000, than they would without a single payer system (Progressive Caucus, "Progressive Promise").

National health care would do much to improve our national health and the lives of poor and working class people. It truly would benefit us all in a democratic way by making health care a necessity, instead of a commodity. It's good for all of America and imperative for the successful
survival of working class and poor families and individuals in America's struggling urban centers.

**Day Care**

All Americans should have access to adequate day care. In the United States today, there is a severe lack of quality day care that keeps poor and working class individuals trapped in a cycle of poverty and despair and hinders the development of their children, themselves, and their neighborhoods. In central city neighborhoods where jobs are scarce and low-paying, housing costs are high and health care is a prohibitive luxury, working class and poor parents can't afford day care services (Bergmann and Hartmann, p.592).

As a result, they face the false choice of attempting to work and respond to the societal calls to "get off the (mythical or nonexistent) dole" or staying home and attempting to raise their children on draconian welfare payments while being socially and culturally stigmatized as lazy and shiftless. In this situation, the call for "family values" seems a moot and unaffordable point when asked to work 60 hours a week at minimum wage jobs in order to meet necessary costs of day care, health care, and housing leaving no time to raise one's children. Recent studies about the American day care system show that, "child care at most centers in the United States is poor to mediocre, with almost half of the infants and toddlers in rooms having less than minimal quality...not surprisingly, the quality of child care was related to resources (a lack of)" (Handler, p.125).

The establishment of federally-funded day care centers that could provide quality day care and high-paying, benefit-providing jobs to underemployed Americans, would help to put a severe dent in the pattern of oppressive poverty that keeps families and individuals, especially central city families and individuals, trapped between the realization of the American "work ethic" and American
"family values." These day care centers could be funded by the national government, run by local community, church, or private not-for-profit groups, and provide a needed service and needed quality local employment as part of a full-employment plan.

Barbara R. Bergmann and Heidi I. Hartmann, in a proposed Program to Help Working Parents, have estimated that it would cost $54 billion/year to provide a voucher-style national day care program (Bergmann and Hartmann, p.595). However, "child care is an expensive benefit when purchased from third-party providers," and could be more effectively provided through a comprehensive jobs program that operated day care facilities as one of its options (Harvey, p.26). Thus, nationally-funded, community-run day care centers could be operated probably even cheaper than estimated in the Bergmann and Hartmann study that uses vouchers.

French national day care allows 75% of all single welfare recipients to go to work, while in the U.S. that number is 32% lower (Bergmann and Hartmann, p.595). Day care would help poor and working class family get back to work and have the opportunity to progress. The program would be a sensible investment and would provide another tool towards attacking the oppression and inequality of an unjust system that leaves central city neighborhoods in such degradation and disarray.

Education Subsidies

Finally, all Americans should have the chance to obtain college-level education. The current global economy has undergone a severe transformation from a Fordist/Taylorist Production style economy that provided high-wage, high-benefit industrial jobs for working Americans to serve as the bedrock of many central city neighborhoods to a technology and information-driven global economy that depends on increasingly higher-levels of skill and education for a seemingly more
insecure survival for more Americans, especially working class urban dwellers (Editorial, The Nation, p.11). In addition to using the power of democracy and public action to control these economic forces, it is imperative that we, as a society, ensure that all our citizens have the opportunity and option of obtaining appropriate levels of education for employment and successful survival in the competitive global economy.

Currently, inner-city residents, for the most part, are locked out of this opportunity for both economic and racial reasons (Steinberg, pp.149-151). Going to college for many central city residents is as foreign as going to the moon. The obstacles of underfunded schools, violent, crime-ridden neighborhoods, discriminatory, low-wage, and oftentimes nonexistent labor markets, and prohibitively low family income levels all work to keep college a mere dream for the majority of urban dwellers (Kozol 1995; Gans 1995; Blakeley and Goldberg 1992). If our nation is to remain competitive and ensure that its citizens have more options than continual oppression and life-long economic insecurity, then education is a priority. All must have the option to pursue further educational enrichment.

Thus, national education subsidies, or at the very least, extensive and extremely progressive and generous tax breaks for college are an imperative. Our nation must increase the amount of federally-insured loans and provide low and middle-income grants and subsidies to families and individuals to ensure that anyone, if they so desire, can attend college somewhere in the U.S. The majority of Western industrialized nations have already made this commitment for the most part and it is time now for us to do the same (Navarro, p.59). It is a wise investment that once again would work to decrease crime, lower the costs sent to build prisons or deal with social problems retroactively, and help to build on the strengths of local communities, especially inner-city
communities and their residents.

The universal welfare state, seen in total, provides a comprehensive way to address the job creation, income, health care, day care, and educational needs and injustices present in our society that work to create and preserve urban ghettos. It strengthens the working class and poor movement, helps to drive up wages versus the strength of capital, redistributes societal wealth and resources in a more just fashion, reorders societal priorities, and gives impetus to democracy and working class movements to fight productive inequalities in our society (Navarro 1994; Piven and Cloward 1978, 1983, 1993; Skocpol 1993). Most importantly, it would be an important step in terms of social justice towards achieving a society that ensures the social, political, and economic rights of every citizen in the overall effort to rebuild and save our cities.

*The Urban Marshall Plan*

Cities are in desperate need of dollars or capital. The difference between American cities and cities in countries such as the Netherlands is that Dutch cities are supported almost completely, in terms of their need revenues, by the federal government, while American cities are left extremely dependent upon private capital to stimulate their local revenues. Cities need dollars that they can use for the needs of their citizenry, instead of for growth-oriented policies and tax abatements that benefit business and the profit margin first and people last (Kantor 1995; Molotch 1990). The Urban Marshall Plan is a response to the dependency of cities and their resulting poor living conditions.

Our country for too long has neglected necessary public investments and instead has created a "welfare state" that unjustly benefits the wealthy and the upper middle class at the expense of the poor, the working class, the lower middle class, and the political, social, and economic health of our
society at large. Recent information tells us that this is an unacceptable course of action to pursue. Our public health, housing stock, environmental, and educational indicators all lag considerably behind those of the major countries of the industrialized world (Navarro 1994; Skocpol 1994; Timmer 1993). Economist D. Aschenaur of Harvard University claims that a nation gets back 2 to 1 on public investments versus private investments and that the reason for our nation's declining economic performance over the past 15 years is 50% due to a lack of federal investment in urban infrastructure (Squires 1993). Our efforts in the 1980s at investing through tax breaks and subsidies to private companies and public investments in the military and in suburban areas resulted in large corporate profits, higher salaries for CEOs, booming suburbs, growing inequality, dilapidated public infrastructure, and stagnating long-term growth (Navarro 1994). A recent report that concurs with this point of view is one by the U.S. Conference of Mayors that showed that there are currently over 7,200 public works projects planned and designed in American cities but not being implemented due to a lack of funding. If funded, they would produce 420,000 high-wage, working class, union jobs each year and help to rebuild our decaying central cities (Squires 1993).

The Marshall Plan would be a massive intervention on the behalf of federal and regional governments to rebuild urban areas. It would include investments in urban infrastructure, extensive mass transit systems, housing, environmental clean-up, job creation, and schools and health services (Timmer, p.179; Job Creation and Invest in America Act, (H.R.805). A small-scale model for such a plan could be the Job Creation and Invest in America Act which is currently a proposal of the Progressive Caucus as a response to the policies of the Contract with America. The bill provides a renewed commitment to making public investments in job creation and training, education, our infrastructure, child care, disease prevention programs, environmental clean-ups, low-income
housing, and public transportation with the idea that these investments will, in turn, result in real, long-term economic growth and the creation of even more jobs (Progressive Caucus, H.R.805).

The Urban Marshall Plan is a necessity and it is the right thing to do. First and foremost, it would provide cities with the necessary dollars and resources to rebuild, become rejuvenated, and carry out their duties in a democratic way without bowing to the desires of the market. Secondly, it would help to reorder our national priorities and contribute to social justice, equitable urban development, and the economic rejuvenation of our economy in whole towards more balanced and consistent growth benefitting a greater proportion of our society.

*Democracy and Urban Planning*

“But when we have taken back our power, when we again control our airways and our voices can again be heard on every major issue that effects our freedom, when we know that we truly guide the ship of state,...then the presentation of facts (no matter how complex)...will take precedent over the silly, the mundane, the false and the empty. Then...the people will begin a new adventure-the quest for the long-awaited American dream" (Spence, p.154-55).

-Gerry Spence

American cities need democracy. Only democracy can ensure that development is driven by and for the needs of people instead of capital. Our policies, the direction of our economic development, the laws that govern our lives, must be the result of true democratic decision-making and the needs of people, instead of the needs of profit. The third phase of the plan involves democratic national, regional or state, and local urban policies.

At the national level, a National Urban Policy Act should be passed that would mandate the development of a national urban policy every five years to provide the guidelines and priorities under which urban development will take place. Furthermore, this act should legislate the requirement of
extensive public participation and involvement at all governmental levels in the production of planning and development policy and call for the creation of state (regional) and local democratic planning policies with public participation. It should provide a loose framework that would coexist in cooperation with the universal welfare state and the aims of the Urban Marshall Plan and provide a vision under which federal funds would be distributed to municipalities and under which state (or regional) and local governments would develop more specific planning documents.

Furthermore, extensive progressive measures should be taken at the federal level to give rise to democracy and progressive urban policies throughout American society. Three very strong ways to give rise to democratic hegemony would be to enact labor law reform, campaign finance reform law, and encourage the creation of regional governments. In terms of labor law, the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and strikebreaker laws would help to democratize the workplace and increase working class strength against the aims of capital and the logic of the profit margin. In addition, it would allow labor to act as a class movement and thus give it more political power towards the creation of a more progressive and democratic America (Navarro 1994; Piven and Cloward 1978, 1983, 1993).

In terms of campaign finance reform, a system of public financing of campaigns should be set up in order to make our political system more "merit and idea" based instead of "money" based. Such a plan would bring down campaign costs and allow all Americans the opportunity to be involved in the political process based on the value of their ideas irregardless of their economic standing (Clawson, p.206). Public financing of campaigns has successfully existed in Canada and much of Europe for many years and has produced political systems with higher voting participation rates, a range of parties representative of the populous outside of the wealthy and privileged, and as
a result, more just and equitable societies (Schenk and Bernard 1992; Lorimer 1992). A system of public financing of campaigns would allow a non-Wall Street based party to compete and truly represent the interests of working Americans.

Finally, the federal government should use incentives to encourage the creation of regional government. Regional governments must be pushed for and adopted in urban areas throughout the country by offering increased federal aid initially to areas that decide to form regional governments. "Regional" governments can combine tax revenues, zoning policies, and resource powers between cities and suburbs in an effort to create more balanced, democratic, and progressive growth (Timmer, 179). They help to address and alleviate the problems of lacking tax bases and jobs-housing mismatches between suburbs and central cities (Siewers, p.12). Although regional government proposals will initially draw much suburban opposition, the test of time has proven that regional governments improve the economic health of the region for all parties including suburbs (Siewers, p.12; Timmer, p.179). "Regional governments" in some form successfully exist in Louisville, KY; Portland, OR; and Minneapolis, St.Paul.

At the local level, state governments, as provided for in the National Urban Policy Act, will be required to develop urban policies or to ensure that regional governments develop and urban policy for their region in lieu of a state policy. Then, at the local level, each city over 100,000 people would be required to produce an urban policy with local zoning plans for local areas. These plans, as provided for in the National Urban Policy Act, should be developed in close coordination with the public and through politically-accountable, democratically-elected bodies, NOT business groups, development forums, or appointed community bodies that fail to represent the public as has so often been the case historically in American cities (Hirsch 1983; Suttles 1990; Teaford 1993).
In addition, localities could take numerous steps on their own to ensure democratic and progressive urban policies and urban growth. One, local municipalities could establish "community councils" possibly within each city ward or in each district of the city to be run by elected residents of that ward or neighborhood to make all the planning and development decisions that would take place in their own neighborhood. These councils would make all the decisions about where schools would go, what kinds of businesses would move in, etc. Of course, decisions would have to be made within the framework laid down by national and regional urban policies. But, it would bring government closer to the people, give them control over capital and the development process, and provide them with real political power to help direct development in the way best suited for human, democratic needs in their own neighborhood.

Two, localities could legislate and implement further progressive policies to make democracy and not capital the determinant of development direction. The proliferation of mixed-use development supported by extensive mass transit systems that connect vital areas of the city and provide all citizens with safe, cost-effective transportation and environmentally-sound policies that protect families and citizens can all be done at the local level, especially when supported by federal funds (City of Amsterdam 1994, p.45). Measures such as land banking, in which municipalities buy up land to use for public purposes and public-led development, the setting of urban growth boundaries to stop sprawl and unequal economic growth, and the taxing of land speculation and development are all successfully proven ways to ensure more democratic controls over development, and thus, more people-centered growth (Wolfe, p.59). Other measures such as linkage agreements, which require corporations to invest in poorer areas of the city when they locate their business in a
wealthier area, the outlawing of tax abatements or tax giveaways to corporations in lieu of democratically-determined public investments, and the mixing and requirement of social sector with private sector housing would all work to ensure that public dollars are used for public benefit (Grimshaw 1991; Squires 1993; Timmer 1993). With federal resource help, localities can implement a mixed-use, mixed-income, mass transit based, publicly-directed style of development that will produce more livable and more equitable cities.

Democracy at the federal, state or regional, and local level will help to produce better cities. In conjunction with federal revenues and a universal welfare state, democracy acts as the final piece necessary to rebuild, revitalize, and renew our cities. Cities become the creations of people instead of the creations of profit.

Universal human rights, an infusion of public capital investment, and democracy provide the complete package for rebuilding and recreating our cities. The three parts of the plan work interdependently to create a more just, democratic, and progressive urban America. But, the success of this plan is based on policy and politics. Without control of the state and a viable political movement, this plan is nothing but words on a paper. With political muscle behind it, this plan is hope for a new America.
Is It Really Possible?

"Will the...'the principalities and powers' look into their hearts one day in church or synagogue and feel the grace of God and...'be transformed'?...Will they decide...to use all their wisdom and their skills to build a new society and new economy in which no human being will be superfluous? I wish I could believe that, but I don't think it is likely. I think it is more likely that they'll...change the subject to the opening of the ballet or a review of a new restaurant. And the children of disappointment will keep dying..I have never lived through a time as cold as this in the United States...I don't know what can change this" (Kozol, p.230).

-Jonathon Kozol, speaking about the possibilities for change in the South Bronx, the poorest Congressional district in the U.S. The South Bronx is the epitome of decaying urban America.

Can we really save our cities? After all, this plan sounds very idealistic and unlike anything that characterizes current American society. The answer to this most important question can be found in the central thesis throughout this examination: it is political. Politics, policy and the control of the state are the key to saving America's cities and creating a new America. The current political regime, with two Wall-Street financed parties and an electorate made up of wealthy and upper middle-class Americans would never institute this plan. However, a renewal of working class politics based on democracy and social justice for poor, working class, and lower middle class Americans could lead to a new political order and a new progressive America.

Many, in our current, money-based and capital-run political system would dismiss my plan on the basis that:

1. It has no constituency
2. It has no hope of ever existing in our nation's political and social climate
3. It cannot be paid for.

However, one will find that the plan is possible and, with a progressive political movement behind it, is very realizable.
Some political experts will say that this plan has no hope of ever coming to realization because it goes against every American ideal and has no viable constituency to support it in American culture/society. This however is nothing but a myth perpetuated by the Corporate King through both our money-driven political system and business-owned media to gloss over the injustices and oppressions of an unfair and inhumane system. The fact is that this is a change that a majority of Americans would support.

The evidence for this lies in the growing numbers of disenchanted nonvoters in America, most of whom are working class and poor people that left the Democratic Party in the 1970s and 1980s when the party abandoned traditional working class issues (such as national health care and full-employment) in lieu of more conservative issues such as deficit reduction and personal responsibility (Navarro 1994). The current political establishment produces voting participation rates as low as 36% (1994 Congressional elections). In fact, since World War II, turnouts to Presidential elections have been dropping consistently every four years, while the most recent turnouts stand near or under 50% (Navarro 1994). Thus, the current policies, which bash welfare, shy away from full-employment and national health care policies, and value deficit-cutting over providing enough affordable housing, food for children, or education are being validated by a minority of the American populous. With only 19% of the possible electorate voting in favor of the Republican Contract with America in 1994 and just about 25% of the population electing the last four Presidents, it is obvious that there is definitely NOT a mandate for the conservative, regressive, racist, and capital-based public policies that are currently in place on the number of issues addressed in this thesis, namely: urban policy, welfare, tax policy, health care, etc (Navarro, p.24).

Thus, while both political parties become more similar in their policies and their slavish
loyalty to Wall Street and upper-income Americans, there is a large political opening for a mobilization of lower-middle class, working class, and poor Americans that are losing ground on the so-called "American dream" and are disenfranchised and oppressed by the current political regime. The Democrats and Republicans continue to fight over 40% of the population with their talk of deficit reduction, tax breaks for the wealthy, and cuts in popular and very necessary programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Meanwhile, there is 60% of the country waiting for a political party or movement to represent their interests, address the injustices that keep them insecure, and give them the opportunity to rise and progress.

Secondly, many would say that, even if there is much possible support, there is no impetus for the change even if large portions of our society would benefit from it. After all, the constituency it would benefit most, for all intents and purposes, does not go to the polls; and the media and the political system is stacked against progressive politics due to the influence of Big Money and Big Corporations. However, as Martin Luther King once said: "Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever," and the rising tide of inequality and economic insecurity is threatening to provide the impetus for great social and political reaction (King, p.59). Consider the following:

"Noting that 80 percent of the work force has seen its wages fall while the real per capita gross domestic product has climbed by a third, with the richest pocketing most of the gain, Lester Thurow observes, 'Probably no country has ever had as large a shift in the distribution of earnings without having gone through a revolution or losing a major war'" (The Nation: March 96, p.7).

The truth is that internal war has been occurring in this country for the past twenty years (see the exploding crime rate) and that a form of revolution may not be that far off (see militias, rise of Neo-Nazi groups, presence and popularity of figures such as Farrakhan and Buchanan). These
unstabilizing forces of inequality and injustice, if pushed too far, as the Gingrich Revolution threatens to do, can have both positive and negative outlets. As a nation, we must choose whether the outlet will be a progressive, democratic alternative that creates a more just society for all or whether it be a racist, divided, violent, and more Fascist result.

Thirdly, there will of course be the argument that this is just another "tax and spend" program that our nation cannot afford and that will ruin our nation's economy forever if implemented by causing high inflation rates, high unemployment rates, and scarce reserves of available capital. The logic of balancing the budget will be used as a battle cry of public responsibility, when in actuality it is nothing but a tool to keep underemployment up, wages down, the strength of the working class and poor movement weak and divided, and corporate profits and stock and bond market returns going through the roof while average wages for the American worker continue to fall (Eisner, p.745).

To be completely honest and different from the Democrats of recent American history, I will admit that, yes, the plan is a "tax and spend" program. I'll shout it loudly that it is a tax and spend program that benefits working class people, democratic principles, and average Americans instead of benefitting the upper middle class, the wealthy, and corporate powers. Unlike the governmental programs of the past 15 to 20 years that have unfairly taxed working class and lower middle class citizens in order to spend their hard-earned money on the military, to boost corporate profits through tax breaks and subsidies, on tax breaks for America's wealthiest individuals, to fund an unequal school system that perpetuates class and racial inequalities, or to dismantle an already meager welfare state in order to erode their economic security and the power of their wages versus the capitalist class, this program spends tax dollars to provide working class people with commodities and services they need (health care, education, day care) and to strengthen the majority of Americans
against the rich, corporate powers, and the minority elite that would like to use government for their own personal, private gain.

But, have no fear, the plan will be paid for in a very sensible and just way. The budget deficits and injustices of the 80s were caused by large tax breaks and subsidies for corporations and wealthy individuals coupled with exorbitant military spending (Navarro 1994). Thus, it only makes logical sense to find extra resources for righting our societal injustices by cutting corporate welfare, demanding that the wealthy pay their fair share in taxes, and cutting the military budget for the first time in 20 years. First off, the current budget could be cut considerably by eliminating billions of dollars that go to subsidies and tax breaks for "corporate welfare". The Corporate Responsibility Act (HR 2534) which has been proposed by the Progressive Caucus as a fairer way to balance the budget finds enough cuts to save $570.8 billion dollars over a five year period through such cuts in corporate welfare (Progressive Caucus, Corporate Responsibility Act, HR 2534).

Furthermore, large savings could be obtained by slashing the military budget. The 1995 fy military budget was at $265 billion with an even larger budget predicted for 1996. The military is due for large cutbacks. It's budget has increased each year from 1980-1995, including last year during the frenzy to balance the budget, while housing, job training, community development, aid to cities, and anti-poverty budgets have all been cut in total during this same period. If our nation can afford to cut job training, student loans, low-income housing, home heating programs and anti-poverty programs by well over $100 billion in fy 1995, then I think it is only fair, and very prudent according to two "centrist" think tanks, that we chop at least $100 billion out of our military over a five year period (Progressive Policy Institute, p.311; Peterson, p.301).

In addition, additional funds for the program would come through a progressive reordering
of our tax system to shift the burden to wealthier individuals and corporations. According to the Progressive Caucus, such a progressive reordering of the tax system could bring, at minimal, an extra $50 billion plus in new tax revenue (Progressive Caucus, The Job Creation and Invest in America Act, H.R. 805). With even more progressive measures, more revenues could be brought in to pay for a fair and just new program.

Finally, the budget, itself, does not need to be balanced. Remember, the current frenzy over deficit reduction is proposed by a government representing less than half the population of the country. In fact, the deficit spending asked for in the above plan (education, health, infrastructure) is nothing more than smart investments for our future. There is more than ample evidence to show that the federal deficit and debt, if used for the right priorities, will be a boon to our economy and a very useful tool for ensuring the social rights of all our citizens (Whalen, 47; Eisner, p.794). Past and recent history shows us that the deficit acts as a very important supporter of balanced economic growth and that the public sector can work very effectively in filling the needs unmet by the market.

The one question left unasked by the current political debate is: What is the point of balancing the budget? The politicians claim that it is to save our future generations and keep down interest rates in order to boost economic growth. However, asking the federal government to have a completely balanced budget each year is like asking ourselves to go through life without loans for college, mortgages for housing, or other forms of borrowing that we all use to make needed future investments (Whalen, p.45). It is absurd. We don't even require our state governments to do such a thing, because they have separate investment budgets that they do not balance (Whalen, p.45). The current debate over the deficit acts only as a political device for the continuing transfer of wealth which began in earnest in the 1980s from the poor, working, and lower middle classes to the rich in
our country (Eisner, p.745; Piven and Cloward 1983). There is no solid evidence for the connection between deficits and interest rates and the true size of the debt can only truly be measured in relation to the GDP of a nation (Eisner, p.744).

For example, at the end of World War II, our debt to GDP ratio was 100%, and yet this GDP-debt ratio ushered in our nation's period of greatest economic prosperity and growth (Eisner, p.744). Our current debt to GDP ratio stands at 51% and is declining while our society faces a multitude of unmet needs (Eisner, p.744). Public deficit spending allows our society to meet the needs left unmet by the market. The only time deficit spending becomes unhealthy or unnecessary is when the economy has reached full employment or full production, which in our country, thanks to the Federal Reserve and its corporate and capital-based political decisions on interest rates, is when "hell freezes over" (Thayer, p.42).

Ironically, this isn't just a "liberal" argument. Even the founder of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, believed the public debt was a positive asset of our country and that one was crazy not to make the types of investments necessary through deficit spending (Eisner, p.744). Lincoln saw the debt as a type of public property that belonged to the people of the nation and didn't need to be paid back (Eisner, p.744).

On an international level, our debt is small compared to that of Sweden's or Japan's and yet, their economies outperformed ours in the 1980s (Navarro, p.119). In fact, Sweden maintained full employment, a generous welfare state, and some of the world's top economic and social indicators at the same time that it had interest rates, inflation rates, and growth rates comparable to ours (Navarro,p.118). While we were mired in Reaganomics and the myth that one has to sacrifice the human needs of one's society for the goodness of profit and economic growth, they were growing
economically and socially as a nation and providing for the social rights of all their citizens through deficit spending.

Finally, the savings, in human, social, and financial terms, will far outweigh the initial large investments. The experience of the last fifteen years with higher crimes rates, more social tension, decaying communities, etc. should be proof enough that "job creation [and ensuring societal rights] does cost money, but it doesn't necessarily cost more than what we spend coping with joblessness [and the lack of social justice]" (Harvey, p.25). This plan, though financed in part by deficit spending, constitutes, for once, large spending measures that will be extremely useful and responsive to the democratic needs of our society.

The plan, though expensive, can be paid for. And, in the long run, if we truly value equality, justice, and a more peaceful, democratic, and prosperous nation, it will pay for itself. After all, how can one put a price on the health, welfare, and fulfillment of human beings?

Nevertheless, there is a large amount of financial resources that could be diverted to pay for the plan. In just a short glossing over of federal figures and spending priorities, one can find $1.3208 trillion dollars over the next five years in the current budget that could be spent differently.

* Corporate Welfare = $570.8 billion  
* Military Budget = $500 billion  
* Progressive Tax Reform = $250 billion  
* Total 5-Year Savings = $1.3208 trillion

That type of money could go a long way, coupled with other progressive tax measures, new cuts in corporate welfare or other areas, and intelligent deficit spending to pay for a full-employment program ($40 billion a year), a national health care program, the income support program, national day care (a part of the full employment program), education subsidies, and the Marshall Plan (some
of which will be included with the full-employment spending). Keep in mind as well that most of these programs promise to pay for themselves in the long run through lower expenditures to fight crime and social decay, lower health care costs, and a more healthy, more productive society.

However, even though there is a constituency; there is the right type of social conditions (unfortunately) for great change; and the plan can definitely be paid for, there still remains the obstacle of mobilizing a progressive, working class movement within the current political system that is stacked in favor of the Corporate King and wealthy interests. Remember, once again, the key is politics and the use of the state within the given historical and locational political climate for progressive and democratic purposes (Logan and Swanstrom 1990; Logan and Molotch 1987; Piven and Cloward 1978).

Working class politics must come to the fore. In every other industrialized nation in the world that has a generous welfare state and better social indicators than the U.S., it is the presence of working class politics that ensures the existence of more social justice (Dreier and Bernard 1992; Schenk and Bernard, p.40; Navarro 1994). A working class, progressive movement in the United States, centered around New Deal-type, universal, democratic welfare state policies and guided by mass democratic and protest action must develop with support from diverse "progressive groups" such as women, minorities, immigrants, environmentalists, labor unions, and gay and lesbian groups (Navarro 1994, Piven and Cloward 1978, 1983, 1993; Skocpol 1994, Quadagno 1993).

A progressive revolution is not that far off or that out of reach if there is a re-politicization and re-democratization of our society.

"The experience both in the United States and elsewhere shows that the class polarization of politics (which in the United States happens within the Republican Party but not within the Democratic Party) is necessary for active democratic participation. The realization of an
expanded welfare state, centered around the New Deal, has as a prerequisite the political polarization of the Democratic Party and/or other political forces and the development of class practices and discourse by those forces" (Navarro, p.29).

But, how is this achieved and what will it take? Current actions in the labor movement, unions, and in progressive circles in urban and rural centers throughout the U.S. must continue to grow. Grass-roots organizations such as Operation PUSH, ACORN, JOBS for JUSTICE, the GREEN movement, labor unions, the labor party, women's groups, minorities groups, gay and lesbian groups, and socialist groups all must continue to push for change and look for ways to join with each other for the common struggle for progressive renewal.

These changes will not occur through "middle-class" traditional party politics. Although the end result may come through the creation of a new "progressive" third party, the ballot box, and eventual legislation in Congress, the impetus and drive for such change and political transformation must come through mass, democratic action and protest by working class and poor people rallied behind working class interests. Working class and poor people must take to the streets, mobilize their numbers, form a political party that serves and represents their interests, and then use the state mechanism to see those interests fulfilled (Piven and Cloward 1978, 1983, 1993).

Progressive leaders and groups must look to the cities, to broad-based coalitions, and to mass, democratic, mobilizing action as the guiding principle. Organizing workers of the service sector and building on union organizing drives such as the upcoming AFL-CIO "Freedom Summer"; leading protests and rallies in the streets; holding voter-registration drives; using old-fashioned, door-to-door mobilizing to get out the vote and gain control of local political regimes as was done recently by working class forces in Toledo, Ohio; and bringing "progressive" groups together through common policy initiatives at the local, state, and federal level can all lead to positive change. But, the change
must be based on democracy, on protest, and must originate from the working class, the poor, and other progressive movements that will demand social justice now, not accept gradual, non-existent, middle-class reform (Piven and Cloward 1978, 1983, 1993).

**A New Progressive America**

"This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drugs of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy" (King, p.45).

-Martin Luther King, Jr.

Determining what our cities, our communities, and ultimately, our greater societies will look like is a public issue. It may involve many different actors, but ultimately, it is a public decision in which every sector of our society should be democratically involved. We must demand this reality.

Our cities are not just playing fields for business; they are the fertile ground where we lay our human roots, grow physically, intellectually, and spiritually, and develop to the full extension of our being. They are the hope of authentic democracy, multi-cultural, economic, and social diversity, and peaceful coexistence. They are where we live, work, and play. They must be a democratic extension of who we are as individuals, families, and communities. They must be centered around development policies that seek to further human dignity, human life, human community, and a better human condition.

When one looks at U.S. cities, one might say that this is impossible, and that given the global economic conditions, that the free market and its rules are the best that one can hope for. But, the literature on comparative urban policy and restructuring, the comparison of Amsterdam and Chicago, and the truth behind the experience and success of democracy and the welfare state gives us hope for a better future. Our societies can be more democratic, more equal, and more just.

The questions we must constantly return to are what kind of society do we want and what
are we prepared to do to see that society realized? Are we prepared to overcome ideological myths that deny the use of democracy and characterize the public sector as "Big Bureaucracy", "Big Government", and a failed experiment of times past to see the truth, the real essence and hope of democracy versus a publicly-subsidized and unjustly aided capitalist system? Are we prepared to reorder our priorities and subvert the profit margin to issues of equitable economic development and the fulfillment of the political, social, and economic rights of all? Are we prepared to embrace progressive and class-based politics in a concerted, democratic effort against the aims, interests, and policies of a capitalist class elite?

The answer lies only in our nation's, in our communities' political transformation. Politics is the key. We know that we can use the universal welfare state and democracy to ensure a more socially just society. In mass action, popular protest, and democratic mobilization lies the hope of seeing a new reality, of seeing the sun rise on a new progressive day in America. May we all have the courage to fight the night of injustice, the darkness of inequality and the evil of our oppressive capitalist system with the light of democracy and human rights in the hopes that we will one day witness the dawning of American social justice.

"We must accept finite disappointment, but we must never lose infinite hope!"

-Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
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*The Fiscal Fairness Act(Substitute to H.J. Res.1)
*The Corporate Responsibility Act(H.R.2534)
*The Cradle to Grave Health Care Act(H.R.1200)
*The Job Creation and Invest in America Act(H.R.805)


