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Suburbanization is clearly a process of enormous complexity, forming one part of the entire urbanization process, one aspect of the social whole. We approach it as a geographic problem, although it is not 'in essence' this any more than it is essentially an 'economic' or 'sociological' problem. Part of the difficulty in making sense of suburbanization is the power of the myth that it can be defined in a purely geographic fashion, when, in fact, understanding spatial relations necessarily means confronting social relations as a whole.

As a geographic problem, modern suburbanization has three major defining characteristics: spatial differentiation, decentralization, and identification with the waves of urban landscape laid down since the Second World War. Virtually everyone writing on the topic recognizes these three dimensions as empirically valid, with the disputes being over matters of degree and timing. The eminent historical geographer, J. Vance, for example, observes that 'functional decongestion' is 'still the main dynamic force at work in our cities' and that since the Second World War a 'new city' has come into being, which 'differs in both scale and functional structure from the metropolises of pre-war days'. In fact, spatial differentiation, deconcentration and the phenomenon of successive, distinct waves of urbanization have been at work since the capitalist revolution transformed American cities in the nineteenth century and have become, in absolute terms, more pronounced over time. The principle difficulty, of course, is not descriptive specification of the three-shaping forces but in coming up with a satisfactory explanation for them.

Putting space at the center of our analysis necessitates a word on the
Spatial differentiation

Spatial differentiation is a concept that describes the process by which different parts of a city or region develop in distinct ways. This can be due to a variety of factors, including differences in land use, economic opportunities, and historical development. Spatial differentiation can lead to the creation of distinct neighborhoods or districts within a city, each with its own unique character and function. Understanding spatial differentiation is important for urban planning and policy-making, as it can help identify areas that may need targeted interventions to promote equitable development.
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Today, the city center is given over almost entirely to offices, restaurants, and retail space. Large blocks of land are zoned for the exclusive use of large-scale businesses, while the surrounding areas are filled with smaller, more diverse shops. This has led to a separation of functions, with the central business district acting as a hub for financial and commercial activities, while the surrounding areas focus on residential, cultural, and recreational uses.

The rise of these basic economic functions has led to a fundamental shift in the way cities are structured. The central business district has become the primary location for large-scale businesses, while the surrounding areas have become more specialized in their functions.

This has led to a number of significant changes in urban planning and development. The central business district has become the focus of economic activity, with the surrounding areas providing a range of support services. This has had a profound impact on the way cities are planned and developed.
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This may occur simply because the independent occupational requirements of the individual are not as clearly defined as they used to be. But it could equally be due to a greater willingness on the part of individuals to adapt to changes in the environment. In a society where the individual is more likely to be subject to outside pressures, it is not surprising that the individual may be more willing to adapt to changes in the environment. The individual may be more willing to adapt to changes in the environment because the individual is more likely to be subject to outside pressures. In other words, the individual is more likely to be subject to outside pressures because the individual is more likely to adapt to changes in the environment.

The process of urbanization has been influenced by a number of factors, including economic, social, and political changes. Economic factors have played a significant role in the development of urban areas, as the growth of industries and businesses has led to the development of urban centers. Social factors have also played a role, as the growth of the middle class has led to the development of urban areas as centers of cultural and intellectual activity. Political factors have also been important, as governments have sought to use urban areas as centers of political power and influence.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the physical environment. The growth of cities has led to the destruction of natural habitats and the development of new forms of urban space. The development of new forms of urban space has led to the growth of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the social structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the political structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the economic structure. The growth of industries and businesses has led to the development of urban centers.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the social structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the political structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the economic structure. The growth of industries and businesses has led to the development of urban centers.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the social structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the political structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the economic structure. The growth of industries and businesses has led to the development of urban centers.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the social structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.

The process of urbanization has also been influenced by changes in the political structure. The growth of the middle class has led to the development of new forms of urban life, such as the growth of urban tourism.
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Urbanization, and the process of forming a certain form of middle-class life, requires...
Decentralization

The preceding discussion of spatial differentiation is rather a formalistic model, too simplistically capturing the basic mechanisms that are at play. What we have, however, is the basis for the deeper understanding of the role that urban form change processes play in the political economy of cities. One way to approach this is to consider the dynamics of decentralization. What this process does is to create opportunities for new forms of urban development, which can be seen as a result of changes in the political economy of cities. This process involves the shifting of economic and political power from the central to the periphery of cities, leading to a decentralization of power and resources. The process of decentralization is driven by a combination of factors, including the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, the need for new sources of revenue, and the desire for greater democratic control over urban development.
Urbanization and urban planning in capitalist society

396

...a force, but direct need to supervise benefits (at least in part) and improve tenure. The suburban war effort also created a demand for housing, which helped to fuel the growth of the suburbs. This growth was fueled by the desire for homeownership and the availability of federal housing loans. The suburbs became a mecca for those looking to escape the congestion and crime of the cities. The suburbs offered a sense of privacy and security, and they became a symbol of the American Dream.

The suburbs were also shaped by the car. The post-war era saw a dramatic increase in car ownership, and the suburbs were designed around the car. This resulted in sprawling developments with wide roads and large lots, which were ideal for parking.

The suburbs were also affected by the civil rights movement. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 helped to desegregate the suburbs, which had previously been segregated. This led to a influx of African Americans into the suburbs, which was met with resistance from white residents.

Despite these challenges, the suburbs continued to grow. By the 1970s, they had become a dominant force in the American landscape, and they continue to be a significant factor in American urban planning and society today.
A theory of suburbanization...
A theory of urbanization

To begin with, the urbanization process is a complex one, involving various factors and processes. The urbanization process is not just a matter of population movement from rural areas to cities, but also involves changes in the structure of the economy, the development of new technologies, and the transformation of social institutions. Urbanization is also influenced by global forces, such as globalization, which can lead to the concentration of economic activity in cities and the development of new forms of urban governance.

The urbanization process is also shaped by historical factors, such as the rise of industrial capitalism and the development of new forms of transportation and communication. These factors have led to the growth of cities and the development of new forms of urban governance, such as the city-state.

The urbanization process is also influenced by cultural factors, such as the development of new forms of popular culture and the spread of mass media. These factors have led to the growth of new forms of urban life, such as the development of new forms of entertainment and leisure activities.

The urbanization process is also influenced by environmental factors, such as the development of new forms of energy and the transformation of the natural environment. These factors have led to the growth of new forms of urban life, such as the development of new forms of transportation and urban planning.

The urbanization process is also influenced by political factors, such as the development of new forms of political institutions and the transformation of the state. These factors have led to the growth of new forms of urban governance, such as the development of new forms of urban planning and the transformation of the state.
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In the early stages of urbanization, cities were primarily characterized by a lack of coordination and planning. The development of urban areas was largely influenced by the needs of industry and commerce, driven by the desire for profit and efficiency. As cities grew, so did the need for better infrastructure and transportation systems to facilitate the movement of goods and people. This led to the development of railroads, highways, and other forms of transportation that allowed for the expansion of urban areas beyond their original boundaries. The growth of cities was also influenced by the availability of land and the costs associated with acquiring it. As land became more expensive, developers and investors sought out cheaper options, leading to the development of suburban areas and the expansion of cities into previously undeveloped territories. The growth of urban areas was also characterized by the emergence of urban planning and zoning regulations, which were designed to control the growth of cities and prevent the development of slums and other undesirable conditions. Despite these efforts, the growth of urban areas was often characterized by a lack of coordination and planning, leading to the development of sprawling, uncontrolled urban areas that were often characterized by a lack of infrastructure and services. The history of urbanization and urban planning in capitalist society is marked by a balance between the desire for profit and efficiency and the need for coordination and planning to create sustainable and livable urban areas.
systematically backed mortgages in the suburbs while redlining inner city districts and funneling their savings into suburbanization. Such a process is, moreover, self-reinforcing, as poor neighborhoods deteriorate and suburbs prosper. Historically, the lack of new low-income housing in the inner city, which began to be noticed in the 1920s (at the same time that the biggest suburban homebuying binge up to that time was underway) appears to be intimately linked to the rise of large-scale mortgage capital which could, for the first time, successfully bridge the whole housing market of the city. But whatever the adverse impact on the inner city of suburbia, it is nonetheless true that American financial institutions have been uniquely successful in mobilizing savings and funneling them into low-cost suburban housing. The role of the State in facilitating the work of developers has been fundamental. Indeed, the principal mode of intervention by the State specifically addressed to the urbanization process has been through support of the property circuit. Local governments in the twentieth century have been converted into specialists in land development. This includes both general service municipalities and the large class of special service and school districts, which now make up over half of all local government units in the U.S. They provide clear boundaries, infrastructure, police, power to organize space, low taxes, favorable debt and professional administration. And they are readily available to political manipulation by property developers as well as users; partly by direct implementation of the latter, partly out of the political aspirations of individuals in government and partly out of competition among localities to attract development. But manipulation is perhaps less important than that growth booms that (growth coalition) has been the spirit of the time, which looked upon suburbanization as a universal good. The federal and state governments have also eagerly grasped the wheels of urbanization, chiefly by financial aid in construction/redevelopment of the built-environment. The major federal programs involved are certainly well known by this time: highway, mortgage-insurance and housing subsidies (FHAA, VA, GNMA, FNMA, 135-136, etc.); tax benefits (subsidy to homeownership, low capital gains tax limits until 1968, rapid deprecia- tion since 1964, tax-free local bonds, etc.); grants-in-aid to local govern- ments to support capital investment (sewer-building programs, school support, etc.); and urban renewal. The state played a complementary role in most of these federal programs, as well as being immediately respon- sible for the system of local governments. These activities of the government were by no means accidental, nor, for all their importance, can we ascribe to the State a proactive role in suburbanization, since we can discover in the origins of every program a conscious effort to sustain a budding suburbanization process. In sum, the role of land speculation, mortgage finance and government has been to control the dynamics of urban property development in the United States. It is not coincidental that the US exceeds any other advanced civilization in successful private building (and abandonment) and the degree of suburbanization (and central city decay). Stages of accumulation and waves of urbanization We are now in a position to take account of the temporal dynamics of capital accumulation in our model of the suburbanization process. The basic propositions concerning accumulation cycles, developed by David Harvey and myself at length elsewhere, are these: 1. Accumulation takes a cyclical form of growth – pause (or stagnation) growth. 2. Each period of growth requires 'balanced growth ensemble', not only in the economic sense of a 'balanced growth path' but including political, cultural and economic arrangements as a whole: specific institutions, mode of behavior, types of industry, etc. 3. The progress of accumulation necessarily generates crises and a cyclic downturn (or other, lesser forms of adjustment). 4. Crisis produces a response, or 'forced rationalization', of elements of the ensemble, from the conditions of the labor process to industrial organization and beyond, to political institutions and culture. Sooner or later these again achieve a workable balance – a new growth ensembl- e – on which basis accumulation can proceed again. 5. This pattern of accumulation – growth, crisis, rationalization, growth – divides up the history of capitalist development into distinct stages, whose growth ensembles look rather different. 6. Successive stages are, of course, linked by the fact that the features of one stage are forged through a selective process of building on the past, continuing its strengths and transcending its contradic- tions.

The specification of the various growth ensembles and the periodization of capitalist history is an enormously difficult task, which is less clear cut than our simple model makes it sound. Still, the evidence for such a periodization of capitalist history into stages of accumulation is com- pelling. How, then, does urbanization relate to this pattern of accumulation? The basic propositions, again, are these: 1. The city is a 'container' for the expanded reproduction of capital and capitalist social relations, i.e. the built-environment and spatial organization of the city embodies the growth ensemble of any stage of accumulation, 2. There is, then, a spatial dimension to the general development of contradictions and crises – in other words, the crises of social reproduc- tion have one dimension which may be called 'urban crisis'.
The periodization of American urban history is again hardly unequivocal and uncontentious. The process of continuous change in the economic and social fabric of American cities, a process that has been unfolding since the colonial period, has only been summarized by the familiar periodization schemes of the twentieth century. The basic periods are: pre-Civil War, urbanization, and urban development. The urbanization period, which spans the years from 1860 to 1940, is characterized by a rapid expansion of the urban population, a dramatic increase in the size of the urban labor force, and a marked change in the character of urban life. The urban development period, which spans the years from 1940 to the present, is characterized by a period of stagnation and decline. The urbanization period is further divided into three main stages: pre-industrial, industrial, and post-industrial. The pre-industrial stage, which lasted from the beginning of the European settlement of the New World to the early 1800s, is characterized by the growth of small towns and the development of a rural economy. The industrial stage, which lasted from the early 1800s to the mid-1900s, is characterized by the growth of large cities and the development of an urban economy. The post-industrial stage, which began in the mid-1900s, is characterized by a decline in the urban economy and the rise of a service economy.}

This periodization scheme is useful for understanding the development of American cities, but it does not capture the complexity of the urban experience. The urbanization period was not a single, unified period, but a series of overlapping and intersecting processes. The urban development period was not a single, unified period, but a series of overlapping and intersecting processes. The urbanization period was not a single, unified period, but a series of overlapping and intersecting processes. The urban development period was not a single, unified period, but a series of overlapping and intersecting processes.
wholly internal to itself. Because of this, the phenomenon of suburbanization cannot be reduced simply to the sum of its parts or even to this or that relation between the parts, which is how we have approached it up to now. We must step back and see it as a whole—a mutually structured and self-reinforcing whole, which shapes the parts at the same time as the parts shape it.¹¹¹ Literally and figuratively it pays to climb aboard the investment bandwagon; or, as Joan Robinson says, 'the possibility of profits only depends on what the other fellow is doing.'¹¹² Thus, quite apart from individual motives, agglomeration economies, obsolescence problems, etc., once a critical mass of location shift to new territory is underway it tends to become self-supporting and self-exaggerating. With that overstating the importance of this, it must nonetheless be admitted that to some degree there is no logic whatsoever to urbanization: it was just the road down which society and economy headed.¹¹³

Waves of urbanization are waves of capital investment in the built-environment. In the first and second parts we repeatedly emphasized the role of the property circuit of capital in sustaining and propelling urbanization, but without linking that circuit to the dynamics of accumulation cycles. Yet it is precisely the process by which 'overaccumulated' capital pushes into the property circuit which provides the capital necessary to property investment. In order for this to happen there must exist, at the minimum, the requisite financial and governmental institutions to funnel off surplus capital as part of the growth ensemble. But what we observe with every major wave of urbanization is a surge of investment towards the end of the cycle, ending in a peak of speculative excess before the collapse of building.¹¹⁴ That is, overaccumulation comes to affect the property circuit as well.

Indeed, it is impossible to explain the periodic waves of overextension (and underpricing) of transit lines,¹¹⁵ public utilities and highways, housing, mortgage credit, etc. without reference to the general dynamics of the accumulation process and the forcing of too much surplus capital into the secondary circuit in hopes of staving off crisis. This 'push' of capital is helped along, of course, by the 'speculative bubble' atmosphere which eventually overtakes the property circuit, and lures capital into its web of erroneous but mutually reinforcing expectations. Even though speculative phenomena do not pan out, the overextended city is already built and a commitment already made to the use-values put into place. Capital will then have to be written off and funds transferred in the subsequent crisis and rationalization period—e.g. through municipal bond defaults, bankruptcy, consolidation or municipalization of trolley lines, or mortgage foreclosures. But the consequences for the built-environment have already been felt. There is no question that the successive property booms which have marked the history of American urbanization have contributed materially to the hyperextension of the city.¹¹⁶

We should, however, now widen our focus from the property circuit to the secondary circuit of capital as a whole—the overall process of fixed capital formation and the creation of the built-environment— which includes everything from factory construction to purchases of consumer durables. A mass of capital will necessarily flow into the activities in order to enhance labor productivity, consumer buying power, the speed of circula-

Conclusion
This paper develops a framework for the analysis of urbanization as a geographic process. It by no means fills all the theoretical blanks concerning spatial processes under capitalism, nor provides the necessary historical evidence to sustain all that has been said. Moreover, we have closed our eyes to the question of contradictions in the 'suburban solution' and to changes taking place in the suburban process over the last decade. What we have tried to do here is to see the problem from several angles in all its interlocking complexity. It is time that we advanced beyond merely listing the factors contributing to suburbanization—whether coached in Marxist theory or not—and approach the problem systematically, probing the various causal elements and establishing basic principles of analysis.

A theory of suburbanization
Urbanization and urban planning in capitalist society

among private capitals (cf. Harvey in this volume). The division of labor is thus intimately connected to the development of control over the means of production.

The school following Weber 1908 focuses around minimizing production costs, while the school following Christaller 1933 and Lösch 1954 concentrates on markets in space. The neo-classical/on Thunen models are, despite their pre-tensions, chiefly transport-cost models.

This is not to say that Marxists have always done so either; we are still grappling in this direction. An important beginning to the analysis of the geography of accumulation is Harvey 1975a. The dynamics of circulation must be seen in light of the drives and limits set by accumulation crisis and class struggle (see above pp. 384-5).

See here in a micro-locational sense. Crisis and rationalization in the accumula-
tion process and the built-environment as a whole are treated on pages 405-9.

These distinctions are common to both conventional and Marxist industrial location theory. Cf. Castells 1979; Monyey 1977.

19 In rural districts the tie between towns was largely one of similar location requirements rather than functional ones with another, so that 'illegitimate conditions of access could bring different location requirements (Warne 1960: 486).

14 'Collective logic' is used here in a narrow sense, since it intimately subsumes the logic of exchange value/use value, of accumulation cycles, etc.

15 See Walker 1976.

16 At the same time, other supposed 'economies' of agglomeration, being based more on class and monopoly power and access than on competitive cost-reduction, are parasitic in the context of the diffusion of information communications - particularly what is euphemistically known as 'the need for face-to-face contacts' among the highest ranks of capital in the haha.

17 Harvey 1975: 197. Marx's (1967) discussion of the way certain subfunctions (as defined for property developers) is revealing here.

18 Tel. 1969.


21 As an example, it is quite in the test-runs of San Francisco financial district -capitalists to promote the conversion of that city to a parity middle-class, white-collar workplace and residential area, since the residual blue-collar working class and lumpenproletariat present a physical and political threat to the former's hegemony.


While the fragmented forms of local government rests on the unique basis of American federalist tradition, it cannot simply be ascribed to this 'cause' of a mythical continuity with post New England town meetings. The specific forms of metropolitan fragmentation was a specific construction of the twentieth century, which was nurtured in connection with the logic of spatial differentia-

A theory of suburbanization... tion as a whole, by a 'selective use of tradition' in the sense used by Williams 1977.


25 See Harvey 1975a on reducing time of circulation.

26 Harvey in this volume. Investment is just as crucial as technique, and often lags behind the latter. See Walker 1978a.

27 Harvey 1975a.

28 Walker 1978b. Actually it depends on the developing social forces of production and circulation which capital has at its command, in general and by individual capitals (owing to concentration). These forces consist of various concrete elements fixed capital (including past accretions); modes of organization (cor-
porations, financial networks; 5e State); knowledge (science, techniques); an industrial proletariat (with certain capabilities); social norms and mores (consumer power of society). Etc. These 'powers of capital' are, of course, the alienated powers of social labor.


30 The 'category' class is meant in the classic Marxist sense of relations of produc-
tion. The various elements of everyday life and consumption around which people build their lives, such as differences in income levels, status, education and so forth, observers do not transform the underlying class structure. Nonetheless, the ambiguities in production relations of class (see Wright 1978, on 'contradictory class location'), combined with the complexities of everyday life in the sphere of consumption, residence and personal reproduction, are such that, in the American historical experience, perceived class boundaries do not correspond to Marxian theory. The working poor, so many of whom are non-whites, have been dropped off the bottom of the working class to form a strata of 'poor and minorities', while the top of the working class, consisting of professionals, supervisors and better-paid craft workers (and some-
times over-age earning white-collar workers) have been elevated to the status of 'middle-class'. The 'working class' has ended up as a residual: the traditional blue-collar factory workers. These categories of consciousness have then been distilled into the categories of conventional social science.

For the purposes of this essay, I adopt conventional usage of 'middle class' versus 'working class', because I am trying to capture the way suburbanization fits into the formation of an effort by certain ranks of workers to rise to 'middle-class' status, with the eager support of the capitalist class. In retrospect, my use of terms is too casual and the matter is deserving of greater thought from me have given it here. But it must stand, awaiting future revision.

This simplifies the actual instruction of class with race/ethnicity and sex, which are themselves the product of a whole set of antecedent conditions of biology and history. They are integrated into the capitalist structure out of specific conflicts with pre-capitalist and colonial wells, from the household economy to slavery, and subsequently reproduced for reasons of usefulness to a capitalist dominated society (or the inability of capital to break down such distinctions).

Racial differences purely parallels and partly compound class differentiation in space, as has been shown repeatedly. See e.g. Taussig and Taussig 1965,
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Schmitz 1972, Harris 1926, Homs 1926, Kottler 1937. That most blacks are black on both sides of the color line is, in fact, the case. The same is true of the upper classes. In fact, the distinction between the two is often very clear, and it is generally accepted by all concerned. The black upper class is the new, distinctive class, rising rapidly in position, and gaining in status and power. The black lower class is the old, distinctive class, declining in position, and losing in status and power. The black lower class is the most vulnerable group in the society, as it is the group that is most likely to be affected by social change. The black upper class is the group that is most likely to benefit from social change. The black middle class is the group that is in the middle, and is neither vulnerable nor likely to benefit from social change. The black middle class is the group that is most likely to be affected by social change.
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hante to take part in the debate on whether to put a fence around the community tennis court. Society's central issues, on the other hand, seem distant... In a dominantly urban society the previous condemnation of the "idiotic of rural life" is reserved for the suburban provinces. (336) (Cf. Sennett 1976)

One observes a kind of 'social anomie' among students who have grown up in such a world. (Cf. Donaldson's 1968:316 remarks on suburbanites disliking to hear bad news.)

Castells (1977:385) says:

"Differences in cultural style, rooted mostly in social class and family practices, will be symbolically reinforced by the social-spatial distance and by the environmental imagery. The two worlds of the suburbs and the inner city increasingly ignore each other exceptsofar as they develop reciprocal fears, myths and prejudices, often articulated as racial and class barriers."

See above, pp. 397-9, where it is argued that not only is space incorporated in the mode of life, but spatial relocation was essential to its construction.

The literature on traditional urban working-class communities is voluminous. Especially good is Fried 1973. For a comparison of this with middle-class suburban life, see the two studies by Young and Wilmott 1957a and 1960.

I have argued the importance of this middle-class withdrawal in Walker 1977, 1978 (see also Warner 1967).

See Checkoway's (1978) discussion of Levitt.


See Harvey 1972.

Cos 1975:2.

Some areas isolated from the general finance-housing market do exist, typically in traditional working-class areas (Harvey 1977). This provides a different kind of community differentiation based on a "conservative" resistance to the property market itself (zoning is not the only way).

This leads Gaffney to refer to them as 'carpets of landowners', a provocative hyperbole (Gaffney 1973).


Harvey 1977, 1974b, 1975c.


See Walker 1974 for explanation of rent terms.

On industrial parks, see Muller 1975; on industrial suburbs, see Sibbin 1971, Schonber 1965; on competition for industry, see Walker, Striper and Grish 1979; on planning/zoning, Vance points that, for example, land-use planning has helped to do away with the "isolated shop" and has reinforced the economic trends toward integration of shopping facilities (Vance 1962:487).

There are contradictions in the tendency to spatial differentiation, owing to the opposing tendencies of spatial generalization of capital and homogenization of the built-environment.

The term decentralization is somewhat confusing since it refers both to accentuation at the fringe and to deconcentration, i.e. the decline in rent/density gra
dients since the nineteenth century. (Though exactly when this decline began, and when concentration peaked, remains problematic. See Walker 1978a. It is also confusing because both of these aspects are consistent with absolute increase in density at the center. We are mainly interested in deconcentration here, since the passive operation of the land market is sufficient to explain why some activities move to the fringe.

Our model will remain incomplete until the temporal dynamics are added in the third part (pp. 405-9). Obviously the discussion in the second part relies on points somewhat artificially segregated into the first part of the paper. See above, Note 19.

The terminology is confusing because in economics a process which used more space would be called "land intensive."

That is, land is always cheaper at the fringe but this does not mean declining density over time; also more space-extensive uses will tend to move to the fringe, to be absorbed and intensified later, without the whole of the city becoming more space-extensive; and, finally, both cheaper land and space-extensive uses are usually explained in such simple models by transportation improvements and the operation of the land market alone. Transport innovation is generally introduced as deas ex machina (See above, p. 369).

These are the same forces introduced in the first part -- complemented by spatial differentiation itself.

See above p. 386-4. Two difficulties arise in a polar conception of decentralization. Most decentralization does not consist in facilities or people picking up and moving to the suburbs, but on new investments and new families locating at the fringe (Wood 1974:135, 150, Koebbe 1976). This does not negate the connection between center and periphery, which are specifically linked by corpora
tion structures, capital markets, and family ties.

Second, cities on the national periphery, growing up in the twentieth century, have taken on a predominantly suburban form without the bother of a nine
tenenth century urban core. This, too, does not sever the links of unity and consonance between a national urban core and a national urban/suburban periph
er. This forces us not to buy too simple or literal a "push" hypothesis and to incorporate a theory of urban waves/stages. See below, pp. 405-9. (For opposing views which reject "push" theories altogether, see Guterbock 1976 and Wood 1974.)

For details and references, see Walker 1977, 1975a, 1978 ns.

The causes of concentration were, principally: (i) destruction of household economy; (ii) economies of agglomeration among small manufacturers and traders; (iii) powerful employment linkages which kept workers (and managers) close; (iv) poor intraurban transport and ability to pay (but good enough interurban transport to reach large markets); (v) creation of a "housing market" which forced workers to minimize their occupation of space; (vi) steam power -- especially the availability of coal brought by canal and rail (Walker 1977, 1978a).

Wood (1974: 133) is correct but oversates the case for continuity, when he says, 'In summary, the urban fringe has provided the milieu for manufacturing growth since the mid-19th century, so that current developments may be
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regarded simply as a continuation of long-established trends.' Cf. Pred 1966.
34 This occurred just after the climax of industrial centralization from small
towns to big cities at the end of the nineteenth century. See Pred 1966.
35 See above, Note 36.
36 See above, pp. 405–9. This has spawned the 'urbanization of the suburbs' 
literature of the last few years, e.g. Masucci and Hadden 1973, Muller 1975.
While there is an essential truth here, it can be overstated such that the urban
role is so strong as to be necessary (the city as 'sandwich' view) (see e.g. Muller); it glosses over the fact that suburbs have managed to retain an
elite cast and to assume more and more urban functions without becoming
the city as a whole. But Schwartz's provocative exaggeration: 'the suburbs
are becoming industrialized without the bother of an industrial population'
(1976a, 329).
38 Previously the mercantile bourgeoisie lived near the city center.
39 As Vance notes, 'American cities have always expanded in directions
that the wealthy and powerful have pioneered' (1964: 24).
landscape ideology and images of country and city which went into suburbanization.
On banishing the working class from the scene, see Engels 1844 and
41 Summarizing the sociological debate on whether suburbs create a lifestyle or
only reflect it, Schwartz remarks that, if nothing else, residual differentiation
is important, i.e. 'we all know that recruitment mechanisms', that is, a commu-
nity's method of attracting certain types of people and repelling others, is
one of its most important constitutive features' (1976a: 329–30).
42 Control of industrial excesses, the land market and the working class have
all been tried (pollution laws, zoning, urban reforms) but have never been
wholly successful. Moreover, such 'solutions' take a great deal of effort and
class-conscious, class-integrative activity (i.e. major 'reform' movements).
So it has always looked more reasonable to the individual to choose an individualist
solution, or to seek out homogenous political enclaves where some unanimity
can be achieved. The suburbs, then, are not exactly a tribute to a love for
political activity among the middle class, quite the contrary.
46 References, Note 41. The reform mode of government was disproportionately
47 Made possible by a supply of cheap land but not explained by supply conditions.
48 Though the appearance of the mass version of the suburban ideal has peren-
ually stood as 'a cruel joke', as Warner (1962) puts it.
49 The degree of 'bourgeoisification' of the working class—indeed, the definition
of the working class—remains a lively topic in Marxist theory today. See
50 The references here are numerous. See e.g. Schwartz 1976a, Kasarda 1976.
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However, the general overrepresentation of the poor and the rich in the central
city is less marked in the newer cities of the sunbelt, an indication of the
lesser importance of residual nineteenth-century cores there. Castells 1977:
177 and references there. See also above, pp. 405–9.
51 Blue-collar suburbanization away from rail corridors is almost wholly a post-
war phenomenon. The effect of this was that 'prior in the Second World War
American suburbs tended to fall into two classes rather distinct from each
other. There were strictly residential areas of generally high income housing
and there were industrial satellites of the central city with workers' housing'
(Vance 1960a: 496). Muller 1975: 16. See also references in Note 51, above.
52 This accounts for the paradoxical finding (for some) that it is not the middle
class but the working class who have the higher rates of (measurably) political
participation and dissent in local politics (Green and Greer 1976: 211–12).
The middle class has their class in power and class interests served, so 'participa-
tion' is less essential.
54 Berger 1960: 82. CF. Sennett and Cobb 1972. Castells 1977, like many others,
simply repeats Berger's mistake of missing the constitutive element in suburban-
ization of workers.
56 Sennett and Cobb 1972.
57 Braverman 1974. Braverman perhaps overstates the case, but not much, when
he says, 'The apparent acclimatization of the worker to the new modes of pro-
duction in the 20th century grows out of the destruction of all other modes,
the striking of wage bargains that permit a certain enlargement of the customary
toils of subsistence for the working class, the weaving
of the net of modern capitalist life that finally makes all other modes of
living impossible' (151)
60 The whole question of the myth of suburbia and its imperfect realization by
all but the elite is an interesting aspect of the contradictions of suburbanization,
61 See above, Note 10.
62 See above, p. 397.
63 Hence the possibility of a bourgeois ideology of 'modem' versus 'traditional'
modes of living, with the former identified with the suburbs and the latter
with the older inner city. See Castells 1977: 78.
64 Cf. Note 111, however.
65 The following is only suggestive of the key issues. A full treatment would
have to distinguish among types of industries with different locational
requirements. See above, p. 387.
66 In fact, the manuall of industrial suburbanization has been large, capital-
intensive manufacturing, usually within large corporations. Labor-intensive
and small manufacturing, with special needs for support or highly exploitable
(sweetshop) labor have remained in the city, as have certain highly innovative
A theory of socialization

Urbanization and urban change in capitalist society

The basic economic transformation of society caused by industrialization

The forces of production lead to the development of new social relations of production. These relations of production determine the entire social formation, including the political and legal forms, the social, religious, and various other institutions. The existence, change, and development of these social relations are, therefore, the subject of historical study.

In the historical process, as the economic relations change, the social institutions and social forms in all spheres of life also change. This change is the prerequisite for the transformation of the productive forces and the change of the economy. Such change is a reflection and embodiment of the rise and development of the new economic relations of production.

The historical process is a process of history. The topic of history is the development of human society, including its politics, culture, and religion, etc., and the various aspects of human activities.

The scientific study of history requires that one must reflect on and understand the entire process of human history. This is because every historical event is an integral part of the entire process of the development of human society and has its own specific meaning and significance.

The concept of society is a collective concept. It refers to the sum total of the complex interaction of various factors in society, which includes the economic, political, cultural, and social factors.

The relationship between society and society is a fundamental relationship. It is determined by the economic relations of production and the social relations of production, and is reflected in the political, cultural, and social institutions.

The relationship between society and society is a relationship of mutual influence and interaction. This relationship is not static, but is constantly changing. As the economic relations of production change, the social relations of production, political institutions, cultural institutions, and social norms will also change.

The study of society and society requires that one must consider the entire process of human history and the development of the economic relations of production. This is because every historical event is an integral part of the development of human society and has its own specific meaning and significance.
Urbanization and urban planning in capitalist society

This text discusses urbanization and urban planning in capitalist society, with a focus on the experiences and impacts of urbanization in China. The text mentions the work of Malcolm Lowry and other scholars in this field.
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