



INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTER 7

Cities, architecture and urban planning: from aesthetics to ecology

Before beginning Chapter 7, I want to discuss now one more subject that I think is a serious problem that I did not talk about in Vol. I of my book, namely the built world, particularly the effect on the Americas of the European image of what should constitute the built world. This discussion which begins primarily with aesthetics will ultimately lead into the discussion of ecology in Chapter 7. The built world is so much a part of life that it is taken for granted, yet we should realize that all colonized or developed parts of the world including the Americas did not always look as they do today, nor is there anything inevitable about how it looks, as we will see as we discuss this subject. It is important to keep in mind that the built world we have today is the final legacy of all the problems which I discussed in Vol. I of my book: inequality, racism, sexism, the criminal justice system, law, education, war and leadership, structural violence, genocide, colonialism and imperialism, slavery, and most of all, the displacement of the Native Americans and taking possession of their land. There is also the question of the psychological effects of all of the above problems and their legacy including cities. I think this subject is also worth a look later.

Ultimately, I believe that the question of “home” is a very important question that needs to be examined. It is fundamental to everyone’s

life: the most basic needs are referred to as food and a roof over one's head. As I discuss this subject below, we will see that "home" is not just one's personal residence but extends further into neighborhood, and the larger surrounding area all of which affect our lives.

I am going to introduce another feminist writer now since among her many writings on various subjects, she writes about what "home" means, which makes for a good introduction to this subject for further discussion below. Iris Marion Young, in Chapter VII: House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme, in her book *Intersecting Voices : Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy* (Princeton University Press, 1997) says the following:

"... we can learn what it means to inhabit a space as 'home' by thinking about forms of shelter that are not home ... A hotel room has all the comforts one needs – heat, hot water, a comfortable bed, food and drink a phone call away. Why, then, does one not feel at home in a hotel room? Because there is nothing of one's self, one's life habits and history, that one sees displayed around the room. The arrangement is anonymous and neutral, for anyone and no one in particular. A home on the other hand, is *personal* in a visible, spatial sense. No matter how small a room or apartment, the home displays the things among which a person lives, that support his or her life activities and reflect in matter the events and values of his or her life." (p.149)

"Feminist analysis reveals that this feeling of having a home as a bounded identity is a matter of privilege. ... In the feminist texts I am exploring here, the privilege of home the writers refer to is less a specifically gender privilege, and more a class and race privilege. ... the sense of home as a place where one is confident who one is and can fall back on a sense of integrity depends on a vast institutional structure that allows such a luxury of withdrawal, safety

and reflection for some at the expense of many others who lose out in the global transfer of benefits. Home is here constructed in opposition to the uncertainties and dangers of streets and foreign territories where various riff-raff hang out in less than homey conditions. ... To the extent that home functions today as a privilege, I will argue later, the proper response is not to reject home, but to extend its positive values to everyone.” (p.157, 159)

Nel Noddings, whose book *Happiness and Education* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), which I discussed in Chapter 4 of Vol. I of my book, also placed importance on “home”:

“In Western society, many people move about but, at any one time, all but the homeless possess a physical location they call home. ... This observation leads us to wonder about what makes a home. Although home is rarely listed as a basic need, ... it should be. Home is the place where all of the other basic needs are gathered under one roof and where, in addition, many wants are satisfied.” (p.98)

“There is a civics lesson, for example, in recognizing home as a basic need, and there are history lessons in tracing the development of the modern Western home. The discussion of home as an extension of our bodies and selves is filled with possibilities for the examination of class differences, individual taste and authenticity, self-knowledge, and conflict. Even comfort, so highly valued today, has a history, and it too is a concept holding much potential for self-analysis.” (p.117)

The idea of “home” as an extension of our bodies is perhaps the key to understanding what is wrong with our cities in general and with modern architecture in particular, i.e. that they can be psychologically damaging. Recognizing “home” as a need does not

mean that everyone needs the same level of housing, but that the built environment should not be destructive. I will explore this idea further below. A good place to start would be to try to identify some of the problems with the built environment by studying the book *Urban Theory : a Critical Assessment* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), by John Rennie Short. The quotes below are from the First Edition:

“If we plot any urban population data statistic the trend is the same: a relatively flat line before 1800, with the line becoming steeper and steeper after that. But the urban revolution is not only a redistribution of the world’s population: it is also a fundamental change in the spatial organization of society and the social organization of space. The growth of cities goes hand in hand with the seismic shift in economic structure, from a reliance on agricultural production to economies that hinge around the manufacturing and service sector. The rise of cities is intimately connected to the social change from the local to the global, from close-knit immediate social relations to the more dispersed anonymous transactions, to the development of new and antagonistic social classes.” (p.1)

“The encircling frame for any understanding of the city is *power*. The operation of power and the struggle for power are the principle organizing features of the city. The city embodies the tensions of power relations and expresses the struggle for power. From the exercise of brute force to the more subtle internalization of power relations that we carry around in our own heads, power is the determining element of the urban experience. Issues of power and its contestation, from the arena of formal politics to the more everyday sense of self-actualization ... The city is also a place where *difference* is created, maintained and sometimes undermined. Social differences are connected to power relations. Differences in class,

gender, age, race, ethnicity and stage in the life cycle, to mention just a few of the sources of difference, are all expressed in urban patterns and urban processes. Take one dimension: gender relations are expressed in and through and by urban social space. Urban space is gendered, and gender is spatialized in cities.” (p.3)

John Rennie Short, as do many other writers, talks about the effects on cities of globalization beginning in the 1970s and 1980s. For example, the loss of manufacturing jobs from cities to rural areas or to foreign countries and the loss of power of the working class. This is undoubtedly true, and life for the workers in those cities has become much more difficult. But some cities have maintained their economic power, so it would be logical to assume that those cities would retain or even improve their quality of life, but have they? What is the quality of life in the so called successful cities and for whom? I quote further:

“A compelling image is of the offices of successful financial services housed in global cities. By day they are full of highly-paid people on life’s fast track. At night, low-waged workers (often immigrants) clean them with little job security and few benefits. The offices are a metaphor for the city: the same place is populated by people with very different life chances and experiences.” (p.72-73)

As we will see, in some ways cities are a symbol of primarily corporate triumph (although cities did not begin that way), but in other ways it is also the means by which primarily corporate but also government power is maintained, for without the armies of employees, the systems they maintain could not continue. For more on the idea of how the “knowledge elite” in successful cities worldwide make successful globalization possible see p.100-101 of *Urban Theory*. Why cities appear the way they do is very similar to one of the primary reasons for inequality which I discussed in

Chapter 1 of Vol. I of my book: they are both a conscious choice, and require massive effort to maintain. They are in no way unintended. The goals of urban government have shifted from a focus on housing as many as possible at an affordable level to development:

“...there is a widespread agreement that what lies behind the shift in urban governance is the growing competition between cities for local economic growth. Globalization of markets, production, technology and finance, global economic restructuring and the high mobility of capital is the broader context of the increased competition between cities. ... To cope, city governments have been attempting to solve fiscal problems by chasing local economic development. ... Even though cities are still planned, specific private sector needs trump notions of the public good. ... The real issue is not whether urban planning is a good thing, but who is planning, for whom, and who benefits.” (p.157, 168)

While the above partly explains why cities look the way they do, I want to go into more detail, specifically about modern architecture. All the books that I have chosen to discuss in my book were chosen on the basis of being well written and well researched in my opinion. Of course the ideal book to find is the definitive work in a field, but it is not always possible to know whether it is or not. Some subjects have more than enough books to choose from. Others, like law, I found more difficult to research. In the case of law, I believe the reason for the difficulty is that lawyers do not like to criticize their profession. Architecture is another example of a subject I found difficult to research probably for the same reason. Here are some comments on modern architecture by Miles Glendinning from his book *Architecture's Evil Empire? The Triumph and Tragedy of Global*

Modernism (Reaktion Books, 2010) which addresses some of the issues about cities that I want to mention:

“...what we seem to be faced with is a veritable global ‘Empire’ of architecture. Its parts are superficially different, but all seem to share a common dependence on values of individualism and competition, and veneration for the symbols of capitalist commercialism. This Empire, like those before it, has set about breaking down all barriers to the spread of its values and power, and has pushed aside any alternatives. Architecture’s fundamental role has also been swept away in the process, throughout the centuries, as a stabilizing and anchoring agent.” (p.13-14)

By “stabilizing and anchoring”, the writer is referring to how impressive buildings, which were much fewer in number than today, and contrasted with ordinary buildings, used to be symbols of religion, as in churches, or of government, symbols of stability and continuity. Of course, one could make the argument that such buildings were of no more use to ordinary people than skyscrapers are today, but today’s buildings have a different purpose, namely the promotion of the brands of their owners and designers, and the creation of “icons” (see below):

“Architects’ own efforts at self-promotion have also seemed to reflect closely the outlook of the media, with increasing emphasis on the driving force of their individual egos. With the disappearance of the old frameworks and narratives, all that seems now to matter is individual personalities and buildings. Architects have begun to aspire to the celebrity role of pop stars or avant-garde artists. A new generation of internationally feted architects has begun to cultivate an exaggeratedly sensuous individualism. ... As with everything inspired by the market economy, these new, spectacular reputations seem unstable and constantly under threat.

Every starchitect knows that their work and reputation needs to be differentiated from extreme blob-exponents lower down the branding hierarchy.” (p.85-86)

Miles Glendinning’s reference to “blobs” is to reliance today on computer assisted forms and use of materials that never would have been possible prior to computers, as the mathematical engineering calculations would have been impossible to do by hand.

“...the reality of today’s architectural patronage and practice is rather different. It is highly confused and fragmented, with public and private initiatives mixed together in an unstructured way yet at the same time divorced from everyday life. The state is still deeply involved in today’s most prominent building projects, but its efforts are now motivated usually not by social reconstruction but by a mixture of competitive economic regeneration and straightforward nationalistic and civic self-aggrandizement.” (p.93)

“More typical of the landscape of fragmentation is that each building just simply makes its own egotistic statement, with its own set of metaphors. In previous phases of architecture, the constraints of hierarchy and convention imposed reassuring and stabilizing limits on architects’ stylistic originality. ... The paradoxical result is that the architectural scene starts to look like a jumble of advertisements, with each building shouting for attention but the overall scene looking increasingly the same. Likewise, the word ‘icon’ has been debased within the space of a decade from an original meaning of almost jewel-like, religious preciousness, to its present-day connotation of repetitive coarseness.” (p.106-7)

“One could even go so far as to argue that city after city across the Empire has been turned into a giant theme park, by a mixture of egotistic new interventions and heritage commodification within

the existing fabric. ... In their very different efforts to look different, to mix images together in unique recipes, their surface appearance diverges but their inner essence comes closer together, as cities and places turned into spectacles.” (p.126)

An argument can be made that there is no turning back since buildings last a long time (although not forever) and there is no indication of any attempt to do anything different, but I think it is useful to consider at least in basic form the history of urban planning which shows that there were entirely different ideas of what cities should look like as recently as the early 1900s. *The Modern Urban Landscape* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987) by Edward Relph ably covers this history. Space does not permit me to go into further detail, other than pointing the reader in particular to the ideas of Ebenezer Howard and his “garden cities” in Chapter 4 of Edward Relph’s book. See also Garden City Movement and also New Urbanism entries in Wikipedia.

The subject of the history of cities prompted me to consider the question: what if the design of cities could be determined by the people who had to live in them? What would they want? The people who live in cities rarely get the chance to give their opinions whether or not anyone with the power to design and build is willing to listen to the people who have to live in those cities. However, before I begin that topic, I want to say something about bias. There seem to be very strong opinions about whether cities are a good or bad thing. Are these opinions merely a kind of prejudice? For example, it has been said that Frank Lloyd Wright favored low and flat buildings that fit into the landscape because he grew up in rural Wisconsin where that was what he was used to seeing. Perhaps when I see a large, built up city full of skyscrapers, I think of it as inhuman because I grew up in a low rise suburb. Morton White, in his book

The Intellectual vs. the City (Harvard University Press, 1962), has looked at this question and concludes:

“How shall we explain this persistent distrust of the American city? Surely it is puzzling, or should be. First of all, because we think of the city as a place in which intellectuals habitually congregate. Secondly, because we know that urbanization has been increasing constantly in America for the last one hundred and seventy-five years, and many wonder why our most celebrated writers have so often shown animus toward it, why representatives of some of our most distinctive intellectual movements have been so critical of one of our most distinctive social developments. ... Why, we may reasonably ask, is there so much criticism of the American city in American thought from Jefferson to Wright? When one asks this question, one often hears in reply that something called ‘romanticism’ is responsible for the phenomenon. But if the previous chapters show anything, they show that this is a mistaken view.” (p.221)

“As we have already suggested, the tradition of anti-urbanism in American writing is at its best when it conveys esthetic, psychological, and moral ideas, and impressions of the city’s defects. Whatever one’s opinion of the metaphysics of the American city’s critics, from Emerson to Mumford, one must acknowledge that they have often reacted to the city with sensibility and insight ... Therefore, the city planner would make a grave mistake if he were to dismiss that tradition, if he were to treat it as a point of view from which nothing could be learned, if he were to forget it or disregard it. ... There are, therefore, still many reasonable doubts about the psychological environment of the modern city in America.” (p.236-37)

Independently of male intellectuals, it is also interesting to consider the views of feminist scholars on the built environment. Leslie Weisman, in her book *Discrimination by Design : a Feminist Critique of the Man-made Environment* (University of Illinois Press, 1992) notes that there has not been a lot of attention paid by feminists to the subject of the man-made environment as a form of social oppression. She attributes this to the fact that such criticism should logically come from women architects and urban planners, but there simply are not many of them. Hence the need for her book where she says:

“... the spatial arrangements of our buildings and communities reflect and reinforce the nature of gender, race, and class relations in society ... the power of some groups over others and the maintenance of human inequality. Architecture thus defined is a record of deeds done by those who have had the power to build. It is shaped by social, political, and economic forces and values embodied in the forms themselves, the processes through which they are built, and the manner in which they are used.” (p.2)

“To the limited extent that professional architects and planners, be they women or men, have anything to say about what gets built, where, how, and for whom, men do most of the talking. Women are typically clustered in the lower-paying, lower-status jobs. These decisions are more frequently made by investment builders, engineers, developers, governmental agencies, city managers, the real estate industry, corporations, and financial institutions. Few women are in important decision-making positions in these occupations and businesses either.” (p.3)

“Our buildings, neighborhoods, and cities are cultural artifacts shaped by human intention and intervention, symbolically declaring to society the place held by each of its members. The wealthy live

in penthouse apartments; the poor live in housing projects. Each group knows on which side of the tracks it belongs. ... Logically, those who have the power to define their society's symbolic universe have the power to create a world in which they and their priorities, beliefs, and operating procedures are not only dominant, but accepted and endorsed without question by the vast majority. In patriarchal societies where men are by definition the dominant group, social, physical and metaphysical space are the products of male experience, male consciousness, and male control." (p.9-10)

"If ancient obelisks and columns were built to celebrate the military conquests of departed warriors, twentieth-century skyscrapers were built to celebrate the economic conquests of the 'captains of commerce,' with unabashed competition among the corporate giants to build the tallest building as a symbol of ultimate superiority. ... No single architectural form better incarnates the union of social roles and sexual anatomy than the American skyscraper, the pinnacle of patriarchal symbology and the masculine mystique of the big, the erect, and the forceful." (p.14, 16)

In a future chapter I will return again to the question of what a world would look like if decisions were made by women. I return now to the question I asked above: how would people live if they could choose and what kind of built environment would they want? First, I want to mention that people who like living in cities should certainly have the right to do so, but what about those who don't? Should people have the right to choose where they live, especially if where they live now is having a negative effect on them? We will see in the next chapter that aesthetics and social problems are not the only defects of cities, and the fact that the developing world is imitating the west in general and the U.S. in particular by creating its own massive cities suggests great danger for the future as I will

try to show later. Of course, even non-city environments are not without their problems, e.g. sprawl, increasing density, increasing cost, etc. Perhaps the answer lies in neither more large cities nor more suburbs but a different approach, starting with simply asking people what they want.

In 2011, much of the central business district and other areas of the city of Christchurch, New Zealand were seriously damaged by an earthquake (this is a geologically active area and there have been other earthquakes before and since), and one of the things that the city authorities did after the earthquake was to hold several public forums and other methods to ask for public opinion about rebuilding. They got 106,000 responses. I would like to discuss those results now, but before I do I would like to address a possible objection that might occur to some readers of this subject in my book, namely that the opinions of the residents of a small city in a small country like New Zealand might not apply to large cities in larger countries. Now that may or may not be true, but let's see first what they said to see whether it is representative of other places.

The survey results which were over 200 pages long were organized by category, i.e. comments that were on the same subject were grouped together. I don't know if other surveys like this in other places have ever been done, but this is the only such survey I have seen. In order to avoid adding dozens of pages to this volume of my book, I have created several links on my website, bookaboutbooks.com, to the original survey and documents related to the survey. Also, to make the survey easier to study, I have condensed the survey and created an additional link to the condensed survey. The first six pages are a summary of the survey results. The remaining pages are detailed comments on each

subject. The survey is presented in its original order, except categories only of local interest are omitted.

The survey strikes me as a pretty comprehensive list of concerns. I believe the above results agree with my own assessment that building height and green city are major architectural concerns of the people that have to live in cities. As for social problems, these have deeper causes than architecture or urban planning. As for such infrastructure issues as water, sewerage and rubbish, I wish to discuss them again in Chapter 7 of my book as part of the most important, but nearly unrecognized, urban problem: the ecological effect of cities. For the reader who wishes to do further research on cities and urban planning, I recommend three other books:

The Blackwell City Reader (see chapters 8, 37, 40 and 43 in particular)

The Blackwell Companion to the City (see chapters 2 and 47 in particular)

The City Reader, edited by Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. There are 5 editions of this book. The editions are substantially different. Many important names in architecture and urban planning, with excerpts from some of their work, are included.

See also the PBS documentary *10 Towns That Changed America*

I will discuss in Chapter 7c of this volume of my book one chapter from each of the Blackwell books above. Finally, to conclude this Introduction to Chapter 7, I would like to return to the work and ideas of Prince Charles as someone who I think could have been included in the book *In the Footsteps of Gandhi* which I mentioned above and is included in the book *Visionaries* mentioned earlier in this book. As I hope to show, among his other interests including

running several charities, Prince Charles writes about architecture and urban planning as well as practices urban planning, and I believe his writings confirm what I say above about these subjects.

There are several biographies of Prince Charles which I'm sure in part discuss his work, but for my purposes I chose to look at several of Prince Charles' own writings as well as the book *Radical Prince : the Practical Vision of the Prince of Wales* (Floris Books, 1993) by David Lorimer. Perhaps the title Visionary Prince would have been preferable. One book about Prince Charles, *Speeches and Articles 1968-2012* (University of Wales Press, 2014), contains a compilation of his writings as indicated by the title. I have not read the book, but I do have a copy of the contents which gives a good idea of Prince Charles' interests:

- (1) Harmony (see explanation below)
- (2) Farming, fisheries and forestry
- (3) Climate change
- (4) Architecture and the built environment
- (5) Medicine and health
- (6) Society, religion and tradition
- (7) Education
- (8) The Prince's Trust and business in the community

Harmony is the name of a book written by Prince Charles in which he says:

“... it is of such profound importance that we understand we are not what we think we are. We are not the masters of creation. No matter how sophisticated our technology becomes, the simple fact is that we are not separate from Nature. Just like everything else, we *are* Nature. Recognizing this fundamental fact should help us to adopt a much more coherent approach that may begin to shift our

outlook from one that is reductive and mechanistic to one that is more balanced and much more integrated with Nature's complexity. Such an approach would recognize not just the build-up of financial capital, but the equal importance of what we already have: environmental capital and, crucially, what I have called here 'community capital'." (p.322)

Another of Prince Charles' books, *A Vision of Britain : A Personal View of Architecture*, describes his principles of architectural design and planning, however before listing them, I would like to quote from his introductory remarks:

"Before I go any further I would just like to emphasize that my particular interest in architecture and the environment is not the result of my trying to find something to fill my day and then settling on this subject. For a long time I have felt strongly about the wanton destruction which has taken place in this country in the name of progress, about the sheer, unadulterated ugliness and mediocrity of public and commercial buildings, and of housing estates, not to mention the dreariness and heartlessness of so much urban planning." (p.7)

"... we ought to consider the adoption of a kind of code based on ten principles or suggestions ... a few generally agreed rules – if you can ever reach such a thing as general agreement! Later in the book I try to spell out in more detail what I mean by these 'ten principles' ... more like pieces of folklore drawn from our inherited experience: rules which we put into practice for centuries without thinking too much about it ... It is often forgotten that the idea of a code goes back to the ancient classical world." (p.13-14)

"... I became increasingly aware of the failure of the current planning rules and regulations to create a better environment. It is

not that there is any shortage of red tape: after all, every building that has been put up since 1947 has had planning permission, except for those associated with agriculture and Government activities. It's hard to believe sometimes, but the whole contemporary, built world has been through a mill of bureaucracy, committees, negotiations, often long expensive public enquiries. To what end, I often ask myself?" (p.76)

Surely, if Prince Charles' observations are correct, there is something fundamentally wrong with how the built world has already been and is being created. Of course, this goes well beyond aesthetics, and I hope to discuss in the next chapter in this volume of my book what I believe is the fundamental problem, but these are Prince Charles' principles:

- (1) The Place: "New buildings can be intrusive or they can be designed and sited so that they fit in." (p.78)
- (2) Hierarchy: "... the size of buildings in relation to their public importance ... [and] the relative significance of the different elements which make up a building" (p.79)
- (3) Scale: "Buildings must relate first of all to human proportions and then respect the scale of the buildings around them." (p.82)
- (4) Harmony: "Buildings boast too much and forget their neighbors. We have lost that desire to fit in which was once so natural to us ...Whatever happened to ... humility?" (p.84)
- (5) Enclosure: "... a recognizable community of neighbors" (p.87)
- (6) Materials: "To enable new buildings to look as though they belong, and thereby enhance the natural surroundings." (p.89)

- (7) Decoration: "... living in a factory-made world is not enough." (p.91)
- (8) Art: "Art should always be an organic and integral part of all great new buildings." (p.93)
- (9) Signs and Lights: "... aspects of the visual world that need to be kept under control." (p.95)
- (10) Community: "... we all need to be involved together – planning and architecture is much too important to be left to the professionals." (p.97)

David Lorimer's book on the interests and projects of Prince Charles is divided into the following sections:

- (1) Sustaining the web of life
- (2) Organic agriculture and gardening
- (3) Alternative or integrated medicine
- (4) Religion: the sense of the sacred
- (5) Architecture and historic preservation
- (6) Education
- (7) Business, community and leadership
- (8) Philanthropy

Since I have already mentioned some of Prince Charles' architectural ideas above, let me say more about his charities before discussing his other beliefs about the web of life and the sense of the sacred:

"... the Prince of Wales does more than just talk about his ideas. He puts them into practice right across the board. ... He has made his estate at Highgrove into a famous organic garden and has also converted the Duchy of Cornwall home farm to organic production; he founded Duchy Originals to market the produce and the company now turns over more than £30 million, giving away more

than £1 million of its profits to charity; he has worked tirelessly through the Prince's Trust to give young people better opportunities to fulfill their potential; he has supported the regeneration of local communities through his Business in the Community schemes and is now applying the same principles to rural life; through the Prince's Foundation he has been responsible by means of the Phoenix Trust and Regeneration through Heritage for the preservation or restoration of many historic buildings; he set up his own Institute of Architecture (now a part of the Prince's Foundation), has inspired the building of Poundbury in Dorset and is Patron of the Temenos Academy to encourage arts and the imagination; at the Prince's Foundation he has also set up a drawing studio and a degree course in Visual Islamic and Traditional Arts; he has established the Prince's Foundation for Integrated Health to encourage research in complementary medicine and forge a coherent future for healthcare ...” (p.23)

“I happen to believe we live in dangerous times, and I think it is worth listening carefully to all those intelligent observers of the natural environment who are increasingly speaking with one, agitated voice. The difficulty, of course, is that to the vast majority of lay observers everything seems to function perfectly happily in our immediate environment. On the whole, we cannot smell, feel, hear or sense anything particularly wrong with the world about us. We have only the scientists' word to go by ...” (p.55)

“The Prince of Wales is often charged by his critics of romantically yearning for a vanished past, implying that his ideas are out of date. As we have seen, he is at pains to repudiate such a charge ... he states explicitly that he is not interested in returning to the past, but he does passionately believe ‘that we should learn from the past, accept that there are such things as timeless principles, operate on a

human scale, look firmly to the long-term, respect local conditions and traditions, and be profoundly skeptical of people who suggest that everything new is automatically better.’ ... Part of the confusion arises from the Prince’s insistence on timeless principles, which some people identify with the past. However, the timeless is not in the past, it is a perennial source; the so-called ancient wisdom is in fact timeless and perennial – meaning that is relevant to all times. ... The Prince takes exception to the one-sidedness of rationalism with its emphasis on the outer, the quantifiable, the measurable and its neglect of the inner dimension of life. ... Do we pursue our own or our national interest or do we seek the higher ideal of the welfare of the whole planet and its inhabitants?” (p.371-72)

In Vol. I of my book, I tried to describe what I consider to be major problems in the world in general, and our society in particular. I looked to books, arranged by library subjects, as a way to explain these problems. Some of those books may offer solutions to particular problems, but I believe that what plan of action to choose and the details of implementing those plans should be decided by the professionals who work in those fields. For example, I believe leadership should be left to those most qualified which is why I spent considerable time in Chapter 5b of Vol. I of my book pointing out fatal defects in how we choose our leaders and some methods by which we could do a better job. However, there were two subjects which I deferred to this volume: philosophy and psychology because I want to give them extensive discussion. I also want to look to these two fields as guidance for deciding what goals, policies, etc. should be pursued since knowing how to accomplish a goal does not tell us what goal to pursue.

But before I can do that, just as I had to discuss cities in this Introduction, there is another subject I want to discuss. In the next chapter, I will discuss what I believe is the greatest problem of all: how the way we live affects the earth, why we cannot ignore this problem as some of our leaders believe we can, and that a failure to attempt a solution will have fatal consequences. The subject of cities also leads me into the next chapter because it is a part of that problem. Lest the reader think I am just being rhetorical, there have been countless times in history where large percentages of the world's life forms have died. It can happen again. Even with good government leadership of the type we had during World War II including crisis measures, or leadership from the type of persons as I described above, I will try to show in the next chapter that the prognosis is not good and the solutions, if there are any, will be unacceptable to many, but I am just trying to tell the truth here as I see it. Whether the reader believes me is up to the reader.

(this chapter did not appear in my book due to space reasons)