

⊗ Mr Harper

Pres.

Mayor Barr
PAT Fagan

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

SECOND ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
URBAN TRANSPORTATION

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

APRIL 18, 1967

Senator Clark

Cong. Moorhead

Pitts
Urban Development

Concun, Roden, cocktail parties

↳ All of us, individually, have an idea in the back of our minds -- a mental picture of what America would be like under the best of all possible circumstances.

↳ One of the great shocks of maturity is the discovery that other persons' definitions of that truly happy society are so much different from our own.

↳ We encounter perfectly law-abiding people whose values are at opposite ends of the scale.

↳ That, of course, is what self-government is all about.

↳ We have to harmonize many discordant views. If we couldn't do that, this society of ours would tear itself apart.

Should it seem to you almost miraculous that ~~that~~ ^{such} isn't happening all of the time, perhaps we should bless the memory of some very wise men who assembled in Philadelphia, in the year 1787.

↳ In transportation terms, there are always strong and valid differences of opinion on what is good or bad for a given city. ↳ In a sense, each transportation investment, with private or public funds, represents the victory of an idea.

↳ But sometimes the opposing ideas are fairly evenly matched. Then what occurs is like a page out of the military history of Ancient Greece, in which it was customary, when two armies had fought to a draw, for each army to erect its own victory trophy on the same battlefield.

↳ Thus, the skyscraper office building downtown represents a monument to public transportation, while the suburban shopping center epitomizes private transportation.

↳ There has been a continuing and unequal struggle between the motorist and the transit rider to determine the character of the city.

↳ When viewed as a conflict of interest between city and suburb, the demands appear irreconcilable.

~~Or,~~ the logic of the highway user would convert downtown real estate into a great parking lot. ↳ And the logic of the transit advocate would require city-like densities of population in the suburbs.

↳ Such extreme positions, if politically sustained, would place your government in the position of supporting contradictory ideas. ↳ ~~Our highway program might then be depicted as giving one group of citizens less and less of a stake in the future of the central city, while, at the same time, our public housing program would be binding another group of citizens ever more closely to that future.~~

I cannot accept this interpretation.

↳ Whatever the short-run divergence of social interests, cities and their suburbs have a long-term community of economic interests. I believe that when public investments within a metropolitan area attempt to meet those interests equitably, they will in time cease to be articles of separation.

↳ The fact is that, in national terms, urban transit is today a declining industry.

↳ It is declining absolutely in cities of under 500 thousand population. It is declining relatively in the larger cities.

↳ Urban mass transit represents a gross investment of approximately 4 and one quarter billion dollars. It would be a tragedy to see that investment dwindle and go down the drain. For great as the economic loss might be, the social loss would be incalculable.

↳ And yet, ironically, I feel that many American cities, large and small, are helping to destroy transit by the way in which they habitually think of transit.

↳ They are helping to foreclose its future by assigning it unreasonable and impossible tasks.

↳ Above all, our cities must first decide what urban mass transportation really is.

↳ Shall we look upon transit as a for-profit enterprise?"

↳ Shall we look upon transit as an instrument for equal opportunity?

↳ Shall we regard it as a service to commerce and industry, in other words, a cost of doing business?

↳ Or again, should we perhaps view transit as one of the fixed costs of living in a city?

↳ The cities of America have to decide this question!

↳ It is not an abstract, philosophical question. For the answer has a direct bearing on decisions as to who shall pay for this service and in what way.

↳ If, for example, a community should decide that public transit is a cost of doing business, then perhaps public transit should be free -- as the elevators in a building are free.

↳ In this case, the expenses might be met by an annual levy on non-residential real estate.

↳ Or, to follow this line of thought a little further, let us say that a community decides that it wants public transit to serve as a social equalizer.

HUD
DEMONSTRATION
TRANSPORTATION
GRANT
IN
WATTS
NOW.

↳ A simple illustration: The Watts area in Los Angeles has poor public transportation to the major employment areas of the city. ↳ Some researchers found that the one-way trip

from home to a job in those areas would usually take 1-1/2 hours via a succession of busses. ↳ According to this study

published in Christianity and Crisis, unless a person had a car — which a lot of poor people don't have -- there was physically no way to get from Watts to one of the major employment areas by the start of the work day.

↳ Now, let's say Watts was given some express bus routes, subsidized so the fares could be very low. Might there be an effect on the employment rate there? I suspect so.

↳ This view of urban transit as a social equalizer is by no means irrelevant to the future of cities.

↳ More and more industry has been moving to the outer edges and suburbs of the city. In the meantime, the people most in need of employment remain in the central city. ↳ How will those people get to those jobs?

and Industry access to habnment

If problems such as this one must be dealt with by transit people, after the fact, then I believe that transit is indeed being destroyed by a habit of thought.

by failure to see the other ways possible

↳ Our urgent necessity is to begin thinking about urban mass transportation in such a way as to make a difference in eventual outcomes.

↳ It would be folly to create the new and wonderful urban transport facilities that are within our technical capacities if, in the end, people choose not to live or work in central cities.

~~We have to get to the soul of this subject~~ We have to find out what people really want, and what people will really use, and what people are really willing to invest in with their tax dollars.

↳ In the future, I suspect, urban travel consumption patterns will vary a great deal more than they now do, from city to city.

↳ I say this hopefully, out of deep respect for the individuality of most large cities, which I would not only like to see preserved but reflected in the transportation policy decisions made by those cities. Consider the variety.

↳ There are cities dominated by a single industry, like Detroit.

↳ There are cities with very diversified industry, like Chicago.

↳ There are ocean port cities, like New York.

↳ There are governmental cities like St. Paul and Albany.

There are health and retirement centers, like Miami.

There are cities with major historic attractions, like New Orleans and Washington, D. C.

└ There are religious communities. There are cities of the plains ... cities of the mountains ... river cities like St. Louis and Memphis ... sprawling cities like Los Angeles.

└ You cannot tell me that these special characteristics will disappear in 20 or 30 years, and that a single transportation scheme will fit all of them.

The more I examine urban mass transportation problems, ~~in this metropolis and that metropolis,~~ the more convinced I become that there are no standardized solutions.

A city adapted to landscape limitations, as Pittsburgh, for example, may continue to use existing trolleys for decades, simply because the town is built in valleys favoring radial residential patterns.

↳ A San Francisco may continue to use cable cars into the indefinite future because they do work on steep hills and they have a high sentimental value.

↳ A New York may stand pat on its subways, because you might as well think of Manhattan as one colossal building with its elevators running horizontally.

↳ Then, let us think of the new cities that are yet to be built in this country.

↳ These could be planted in the wide open plains and grow to a half million population in 10 years if some new economic basis were to be discovered.

↳ Or they could be the new, totally planned communities that are put into orbit around a central city.

↳ Or they could be partially below-ground cities around major airports such as Dulles.

↳ Obviously, when you build a community from scratch, there are opportunities to create new transportation patterns, such as pedestrian towns, or compact, self-contained skyscraper cities.

↳ I think it likely that the new satellite towns of the future will adopt many different strategies to minimize congestion problems of commuters.

↳ I wish them all well, and I think they should always be able to come to the appropriate federal agencies for

technical assistance, and planning grants and loans, ~~and~~

~~hope~~ ^{I do hope} when that happens, that we in the government will have the courage to encourage those new approaches.

↳ Abstractly, the basic reality of transportation is that it is a derived function. - ~~unrelated to~~

↳ And the basic fact of an urban environment is that it is a calculus of rapidly changing relationships.

↳ When you combine the two formulas, you discover that urban transportation is affected by more factors than it can ever hope to influence.

↳ A zoning decision, for example, in a small satellite town may do more to alter the pattern of metropolitan travel than a multi-million dollar investment in new transit equipment.

↳ A slight adjustment in farm policy can drastically alter the characteristics of a city's labor pool, along with its transportation requirements.

↳ The adoption of a local payroll tax or a sizable reduction in property assessments might, in a short time, change the volume and direction of rush-hour traffic.

↳ It seems to me that antibiotics and racial prejudice and FHA loans and birth-control pills can make as tangible a contribution to urban mass transportation as geography, technology, or eminent domain.

That contribution may be largely unpredictable and uncontrollable but not entirely so.

↳ It poses an immensely complicated problem, demanding not intelligence alone but patience as well, and subtlety and flexibility.

and These qualities are not always joined with entrepreneurial skill and civic patriotism.

↳ Yet any city's long-range transportation planning which ignores social factors, or gives them insufficient weight, will be at their mercy. ◦

↳ The Johnson-Humphrey Administration and the 89th Congress responded to the needs of urban areas by two creative and historic measures: The formation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1965 and the formation of the Department of Transportation in 1966.

↳ These two departments have already begun a discussion of how they can best work together in solving urban transportation problems.

This discussion, will be of particular interest to this conference. For it should, and I believe, will lead to the enlargement and refinement of federal resources now available to improve local transportation systems.

Ribicoff
Speech

President Johnson, in his Transportation Message of last year, stated that although HUD bears the principal responsibility for a unified federal approach to urban problems, it would need the counsel, support and cooperation of the Department of Transportation on matters affecting the intra-city movement of goods and people. He has asked

the Secretaries of the two Departments to recommend to him, within one year after creation of the Department of Transportation, the means and procedures by which this cooperation can best be achieved. And ~~President Johnson meant~~ he means

cooperation not only in principal but in practical effect.

Some analysts have suggested that future federal funds allocations to urban transportation facilities should include a new factor --

the encouragement of coordination and reciprocities between the city and its suburbs.

In this connection, I anticipate a very fruitful cooperation between Secretary Weaver and Secretary Boyd. Especially in the great port cities and air-land traffic centers, the two Departments share heavy responsibilities with state and local governments.

As a matter of fact, all our future ^{national} transportation decisions must reflect a more complex involvement in urban ^{development} conservation goals. There is a growing appreciation ~~of the~~ ~~fact~~ that the efficiency of intercity transportation is inseparable from the efficiency of urban transportation facilities.

Airport access is the most conspicuous example, these days.

But long-distance trucking terminals, and rail yards and bus depots, and ports and harbors, are all dependent on ancillary services.

They especially depend on the existence of a rational and smoothly functioning local distribution system.

/ For, if the internal traffic conditions of a community become unmanageable, commerce and industry will seek to bypass the town.

Obviously, the fate of the city and the fate of transportation are closely interwoven.

In the field of transportation, constant change has been the rule of life. Change has resulted from technological innovation.

Change has resulted from competition.

Change has resulted from shifts in locations of people and industry.

Change has resulted from alterations of consumer preferences, from new life-styles, from new aspirations of the individual, from higher standards of expectation.

Like all services, transportation has learned that, in order to survive, it must change.

The cities of America are profoundly involved in the same patterns of change.

Because, historically, our great cities have all arisen at the transfer points of transportation. And they will flourish or decay as urban transportation improves or deteriorates.

It is your responsibility, and mine, to insure that the changes which occur, from this day forward, will continue to be changes for the better.

#

Remarks of

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

At the

Second Annual International Conference on Urban Transportation
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Tuesday, April 18, 1967

- - -

Thank you very much, Mr. Harper. And may I thank the audience for being such a responsive and well-disciplined organization?

. . . Laughter . . .

And to all of our very distinguished fellow citizens that are here at the head table or on the platform, with particular reference to my former colleague in the United States Senate, the Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, Senator Clark, and the Congressman, my long-time friend from this great area of Pittsburgh, Congressman Moorhead, and the President of the City Council who is with us here today, Mr. Fagan.

And of course there is a man that I miss very much, but I just want to say a word about him. I had looked forward to seeing the illustrious Mayor of the City of Pittsburgh. I never feel comfortable coming to this city unless he meets me, because he gives me such a Chamber of Commerce talk all

the way in from the airport down to the hotel that I know that I am in paradise. Today, I just had to surmise that I was, despite the fact that I was well commeced all the way in. They did a good job explaining to me the wonders of this great community.

I have had some reluctance about making a speech at this hour of the afternoon. Somebody once said, when I looked at my watch, "What does that mean?" I answered, "It is only to reassure the audience; it has nothing to do with what the length of my speech will be." But I have been told that a man in public life ought never to make speeches at barbecues, rodeos, and cocktail parties. And I will live up to that; I don't think you ought to. And I think there ought to be a ban on making speeches after four o'clock, too.

But since you have let me in, and I haven't seen quite this many people in such peaceful surroundings for some time -- (Laughter and applause.) -- since you have let me in and under such peaceful and tranquil conditions, I think I will take advantage of the opportunity that is mine.

You know, when I was over in Europe I received a telegram from a friend of mine who sent it, who had been over there some time before, and he said, "Hubert, have you received any peace feelers?" And I wired back; I said, "No

peace feelers, but plenty of eggs."

Today I feel peaceful, and I haven't had a thing thrown at me except some good wishes by everybody that was along the way. I am happy to participate in this Second Annual International Conference on Urban Transportation.

May I just qualify myself for a moment for this meeting? First, I would like to say I am not an expert at all in urban transportation, I don't claim to be an expert in many or any subjects. As Vice President, you are sort of a general practitioner. There are only a few of those around these days, you know. (Laughter.) I have been trying to encourage everybody to just have one.

This is a very unique office that I occupy. It is the one office in government that has its full share of responsibility and little or no authority. So I can take my share of the blame and very little of the credit if there is any due -- and I haven't found much around lately.

But I wanted to come to you as a former municipal official more than as Vice President of the United States. I spent four years of my public life as Mayor of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota. I was Mayor of Minneapolis at the time that a very great Pennsylvanian was Mayor of this city, the late beloved David Lawrence.

And during that experience as Mayor, I think I learned more about the workings of government than any other time in my life, because it is when you are at this local level that you really come in contact with the problems that affect people's lives. I know those of us that are at the Washington level feel that great decisions are being made there and, in truth, of course, great decisions are being made there, but most of the things that affect our lives as citizens, as parents, as neighbors, as people, most of those things happen right in our home town, or right where we live. It is here where you are going to have good schools or bad schools, it is here where you are going to have a well-organized city or poorly organized city, where you have law enforcement or you have lack of law enforcement. It is at the local community that these problems really have meaning. At the Washington levels, we can think of them, we can hopefully be helpful in arriving at some of the solutions to the problems, but ultimately, the decisions have to be made and the actions have to be undertaken right where we live.

That's why I am so pleased that this conference is under way. This is more than an urban transportation conference, this is a conference about people, about how people are going to live, and how they are going to communicate, and

how we are going to build cities in which people can live the good life.

Because cities ought to be the finest testimonial to man's creativity. They ought not to be problem centers. They, above all else, ought to be centers of opportunity, in which the good life, or as our forefathers put it, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, can be a reality.

Now, all of us, all of us individually have an idea in the back of our minds, sort of a mental picture of what America would be like under the best of all possible circumstances. Everybody likes to play president or secretary of state or mayor or something, most of the time. I don't find many that like to play vice president, but they like to play these bigger offices.

We all have our idea of what kind of an America we would like. In fact, some of us even dream of the kind of a world we would like.

One of the great shocks of maturity is the discovery that other persons' definitions of that truly happy society are so much different from our own. You just can't understand how people can have such a different point of view.

We encounter, for example, perfectly law-abiding

people whose values are on opposite ends of the scale. That, of course, is what self-government is all about, that's what individualism is all about. We have to learn how to harmonize many discordant views. That is what we call the capacity for self-government. And if we couldn't do that, this society of ours would be literally torn in shreds and torn apart.

In transportation firms there are always strong and valid differences of opinion on what is good or bad for a given city. I'll bet there are as many views as to transportation policy in this room as there are people. Everybody sort of has his way of working it out.

In a sense, each transportation investment, with private or public funds, represents the victory of an idea. Sometimes the opposing ideas are fairly evenly matched. Then what occurs is like a page out of the military history of ancient Greece. And you recall that; it was customary then, when two armies had fought to a draw, for each army to erect its own victory trophy on the same battlefield and claim the victory for themselves. That's not a bad idea at that; it would settle an awful lot of troubles in this world today.

Thus, the skyscraper office building downtown represents a monument not just to skyscraper architecture, but

to public transportation, while the suburban shopping center epitomizes a victory for private transportation.

I always get a plug in for my family drugstore whenever I see over three people. It is way out in South Dakota, so there isn't really any conflict of interest here. And I might add that to do something for the family business is not a conflict of interest anyway, it is an act of charity and compassion, these days.

But I know that we are always discussing out there how we are going to get more parking space. That's really almost more important than how we are going to rearrange the merchandise or what we do with our window displays or what we do with our new fixtures. And in this day and age, you are modernizing the store just about as fast as women's styles change, all the time. The modernizers have really got something going for them, I want you to know. I was kind of glad to see that investment tax credit moving along there, Joe. I want you to keep that moving in the Senate.

But we talk about transportation as much as we do about the commodities that we sell. In fact, I would say that most merchants today spend as much or more time on how the customer is going to get to them, as they do about what they are going to do with the customer once you get your hands

on him inside of the establishment.

Well now, there has been a continuing and unequal struggle between the motorist and the transit rider to determine the character of the modern city. When viewed as a conflict of interest between city and suburb, the demands are literally irreconcilable. The logic of the highway user would convert downtown real estate into a great and expanding parking lot, and the logic of the transit advocate would require city-like densities of population in the suburbs.

Now, those are extreme positions, of course, and I recite them for dramatic purposes. And if these extreme positions were maintained, why, politically our government would be in the position of supporting contradictory ideas. So we can't accept this interpretation of conflict. Whatever the short-run divergence of social interest, the cities and their suburbs have a long-term community of economic interest.

I thought we ought to do some peace-making here today, because I know how mayors and local officials feel about the Center City and the suburbs. The fact of the matter is that really, what we are talking about today are metropolitan areas more than we are talking about these antiquated, obsolete, outdated legal jurisdictions that we call villages and towns and cities, and specialized

governmental districts.

I believe that when public investments within a metropolitan area attempt to meet those interests equitably, of the Center City and the suburb, they will in time cease to be articles of separation.

The fact is that in national terms, urban transit is today a sick and a declining industry. It is declining absolutely in cities of under 500,000 population, and it is declining relatively in larger cities. Urban mass transit represents a gross investment which you know better than I do, of well over \$4 billion. It would be a tragedy to see this investment dwindle and go down the drain. For great as the economic loss would be -- and it would be a tremendous loss -- the social loss would be incalculable.

I am here to speak primarily of the social factors involved in transportation policies. Yet, ironically, I feel that many American cities, large and small, unknowingly are helping to destroy transit by the way in which they habitually think of transit and transit policy. They are helping to foreclose its future by assigning it unreasonable and impossible tasks.

Above all, our cities must first decide what urban mass transportation really is. What are we talking about?

Shall we look upon transit as a for-profit enterprise, strictly profit enterprise?

Shall we look upon transit as an instrument for economic or equal opportunity?

Shall we regard it as a service to commerce and industry, in other words, a cost of doing business? Sort of like rural free delivery, or of the postal service?

Or, again, should we perhaps view transit as one of the fixed costs of living in a city?

The cities of America -- and that means the people -- will ultimately have to decide this question.

I am not talking about something that is an abstract, theoretical concept, or a philosophical question, for the answer has a direct bearing, gentlemen and ladies, on decisions as to who shall pay for this service, and in what way.

Now, let me give you some examples. If, for example, a community should decide that public transit is the cost of doing business, then perhaps public transit should be free, as the elevators in a building are free. There are people that believe that that should be the case. Well, in this case, then, the expenses might be met by an annual levy on non-residential real estate.

Or to follow this line of thought a little bit further, let us say that a community decides that it wants public transit to serve as a social equalizer, to make sure that there is mobility, equal opportunity to move around. And, after all, freedom of movement is a part of freedom, a very important part. If you don't believe so, live in East Berlin and find out how your freedom of movement is curtailed. Freedom of movement and freedom of choice are at the very heart of a free society.

Let me give you a simple illustration about public transit being used as a social equalizer, or the lack of it, to deny social equality. The Watts area in Los Angeles has poor public transportation to the major employment areas of the city. Some researchers found that the one-way trip from home to a job in those areas would usually take from one and a half to two hours by a succession of buses. You really had to have a rather agile and alert mind, not so much for the job, but to get to the job, to know which bus you ought to take and how many times you ought to change.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has done something about this now, fortunately. A demonstration transportation grant is given in Watts, so that we can start to find out if there is some way that we can improve the

movement of people.

Now, let's just face it, nobody ought to have to travel an hour to get to his work. It took me forty minutes to come from Washington to Pittsburgh today by airplane. And I am here to tell you, it used to take me longer to come from Chevy Chase in Northwest Washington to the Capitol.

A nation that thinks it can send a man to the moon, ought to be able to get somebody from the airport into town about as fast as going from the earth to the moon. I think that is not asking too much.

. . . Applause. . .

Now, let's take another look at this Watts. Everybody likes to talk about Watts, and I thought I would get into the act, too. Let's say Watts was given some express bus routes, subsidized, so the fares could be very low, where you didn't have to change buses every four blocks. Might there be an effect on the employment rate there? I think so. In fact, I not only think so, I know so. Because we have had some trial runs, and we find that when you have the express routes, when you can minimize the amount of time from the home into the job, the employment rate does go up.

And, by the way, the employer might well take some thought of this. He has to have a labor market, and there is

no use in talking about a labor market that is theoretically in your grasp, or at the touch of your finger, it needs to be there.

I noticed when I was in Europe how many of their large factories are literally responsible for building whole cities around their factories, so that the employment force is there, not that they had to reach out 25, 30, 50 miles, and battle traffic in order to have an employment force available.

Now, this view of urban transit as a social equalizer is by no means irrelevant to the future of our cities. More and more, industry has been moving to the outer edges and the suburbs of the city. And there is a reason, to get at people, to have space, to minimize travel time.

In the meantime, the people most in need of employment remain in the central city, and you taxpayers pay for their care in a host of municipal services. So the transportation policy has a great relationship to a host of other things, the cost that you have to pay for municipal services, the availability of jobs, and the availability, may I say, not only of jobs but of workers for the jobs. And I repeat, those most in need of employment in the central city are the very ones who frequently have the least opportunity to get to the job by a form of transportation that is reasonable, economical

and fast.

Now, if problems such as this one must be dealt with by transit people after the fact, if we are going to leave these problems to the transit people, then I believe that transit is indeed being destroyed by a habit of thought or by the failure to see the other man's problem. You can't rely upon a transit system to remodel your city, to change the social habits, to meet the problems of industry and commerce and the availability of jobs and the movement of men and materials. Transit is a part of a much more intricate complex.

Now, it would be folly to create the new and wonderful urban transport facilities that are within our technical capacities if, in the end, the people choose not to live or work in the central cities. So you have to make the central city sufficiently enjoyable and modern and wholesome so that people will want to live there. And if they do live there, that they are the kind of people who can be trained and will be trained for the jobs that can be made available.

We have to find out what people really want and what people will really use, and what people are really willing to invest in with their tax dollars.

I believe that Senator Ribicoff talked to you last

night about this, and he is an extremely competent man, a Senator who has given a great deal of thought to our problems of urban life. I think sometimes those of us that talk about cities and transportation and communications forget that we are really dealing with people, and it doesn't do any good to create a commodity or a product that nobody wants. I have had to hold too many sales at prices that were at less than profitable to get rid of merchandise nobody really wanted, and I don't think that we want to start building systems that people do not want.

In the future, I suspect that urban travel consumption patterns will vary greatly, and much more than they do now from city to city. Now, I say this hopefully out of deep respect for the individuality of most of our large cities, which I would not only like to see preserved, but reflected in the transportation policy decisions made by those cities. And that tells you that you can't make transportation policies for Pittsburgh or Minneapolis or Los Angeles or Chicago or Detroit in Washington. You can't make it down there. You can offer some technical services, you can offer some money, you can offer some help, but the policies ultimately have to be designed for the family or the community or the neighborhood or the city where the

transportation is needed.

And let me give you some examples. There are cities dominated by a single industry, like Detroit. It has a much different transportation problem than many.

There are cities that have diversified industry, like Chicago.

There are ocean port cities, like New York.

There are governmental cities like St. Paul and Albany.

There are health and retirement cities like Miami.

There are cities with major historic attractions, like New Orleans and Washington, D. C.

There are religious communities, there are cities of the plains, there are cities of the mountains, there are river cities like St. Louis and Memphis, and there are sprawling cities like Los Angeles.

Now, you cannot tell me that these special characteristics will disappear in 20 or 30 years, and you can't tell me that a single transportation scheme will fit all of them. It just won't. You can get stretch socks, and there are some things that you can get that will fit almost anybody, but you can't get a single transportation scheme that will fit all these varieties of cities. You have to develop

them on the spot.

The more I examine urban mass transportation problems, the more convinced I become that there are no standardized solutions, and there isn't any instant cure. We are just going to have to do it our way. We are going to have to prove once again that we are an ingenious people. We are going to have to learn how to bring to bear this great, intricate, mechanized system of ours, this great systems analysis approach to our problems, and do something about the individual community problems that we have in these 50 states of ours.

Now, a city adapted to landscape limitations, for example, is this City of Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh may continue to use existing trolleys for decades, simply because the town is built in valleys favoring radial residential patterns. Sure, Pittsburgh is a vastly different city than Salt Lake City. Yet each has its own glory, each has its own beauty, each has its own characteristic, and you cannot develop a mass transportation system in Pittsburgh that will fit Salt Lake; they will be different.

A San Francisco may continue to use cable cars until the indefinite future, because they do work on steep hills, and besides that, they have a high sentimental and historical

value.

A New York may stand pat on its subways, because you might as well think of Manhattan as one colossal building with its elevators running horizontally. That's really what it is.

Then let us think of the new cities that are yet to be built in this country. These could be planted in the wide open plains and grow to a half million population in ten years, if some new economic basis were to be discovered or provided. As a matter of fact, there is considerable thought being given in many places in American life today that instead of trying to repair the old cities, we should go out and build new ones, that it is cheaper. It is sort of like some people say, that there is no sense in fooling around trying to repair an old structure; tear it down and build a brand new one, it will save you time, save you trouble, save you money.

Now, I don't happen to believe that myself; I believe our cities can be rehabilitated, I believe that neighborhood rehabilitation is sometimes even more important than urban redevelopment. I think that we Americans just have an insatiable appetite to tear down anything that's over five years old, and then go at it and build something new. Maybe

sometimes all you really need to do is to kind of fix it up a little bit. And as you grow a little older, personally, you do feel that there is something good in that which has been used over a considerable period of time.

. . . Laughter . . .

Speaking of these new cities, they could be the new, totally planned communities that are put into orbit around a central city, or they could be partially below the ground cities. That, by the way, is something we ought to be thinking about, around major airports, such as at Dulles Airport. There, may I say, you could do a good deal of construction out there without any interference whatsoever. I would like to put in a plug for a nice quiet weekend out at Dulles. (Laughter.)

I think we were trying to confuse the enemy when we were building that. People said that we were building it at the time -- I remember, in Congress when we were appropriating large sums of money for it, it was a matter of national security. And I have reason to believe that there are some folks that had it in mind that this would sort of be a nice rest home for retired government employees, or some occasion.

But it is a beautiful airport and there are many

airports, by the way, that are going to have related to them not just service facilities, but underground facilities. When you travel in certain other countries, as you know, you find vast areas of underground industry, underground plants, people living not as moles, but literally living underground. So the transportation policy we need to think of in those terms as well.

Well now, when you build a community from scratch, there are all kinds of opportunities to create new transportation patterns, such as pedestrian towns, or compact, self-contained skyscraper cities. But the fact is that most of the towns that you are going to deal with are not ones that are going to be new, they are going to be the ones that have been here a long time.

I think it is likely that the new satellite towns of the future will adopt many different strategies to minimize congestion problems of commuters. And I want to wish them well. I think they should always be able to come to the appropriate Federal Agencies for technical assistance, planning, grants and loans, but I do hope that we in the government will have the good sense and the courage to encourage new approaches, new efforts, new ways and means of doing things.

One of the things that always worries me about

government, my dear friends, is that we like to put everything in rectangular packages, so we can systematize it easier, and you can get better descriptions in the GSA Bulletin about it. And I really do worry that there is a tendency in America to try to overly standardize our approach to the multiplicity and the diversity of our problems.

What I plead for, as one officer in your government, is that you remember that we do not have a monopoly on brain power, idea, or creativity on the banks of the Potomac. We have plenty of it, but there is a great deal more of it left around the country from whence we draw, and that we ought to be working with in a partnership relationship. That's why I am here today, not just to talk to government officials, there are very few government officials that we need to talk to. We need to talk to government officials and private industry, we need to get this working partnership in America which is the only way that I know to meet our problems, a working partnership of government, Federal, State, and local, first of all, to quit thinking that they are mortal enemies and remember that they are all on the public payroll, every one of us, whether we are Federal, State, or local, that we have our separate responsibilities but we also have common responsibilities, we also have mutual interests.

And then to remember, as a free society, gentlemen, to remember as a free society that every problem we have today is so massive, so big, that no one segment of our economy can handle it. Private industry alone cannot handle all of the transportation problems. Government cannot handle it, and if it could it shouldn't, in our kind of a society.

What we need to do is to bring to bear the genius and the ability and the resources of the public sector, as they say, and the private sector, without either one gobbling up the other, being able to preserve their identity but getting at the common problem and bringing to bear the resources that will find the answer. That's the way we have got to get this job done, rebuilding our cities, facing up to urban transportation problems, facing up to air pollution and water pollution. There isn't a single problem that I can think of today that can be handled alone by any one element of government or level of government, or by any one segment of the private community.

So what we need is not to wage war with each other and be suspicious of one another. As I say to my friend in Government, "Look, if we can do something to rebuild our cities so that industry can make a profit, three cheers for it. The profit motive has accomplished wonderful things."

And I happen to think that there is a great role for private industry in the rebuilding of cities, in the renovation of slums, in the improvement of the social character of our cities. And if you can invest with that the profit motive, all the better, it will get the job done.

And I want to say with equal candor to our friends in private industry, don't always be suspicious of Government. There are people in Government today, and many of us, who recognize that we are only a part of a team, we are only a small segment and a small fraction of the total vitality and resources of this country, and what we seek to do is to be expeditors, catalytic agents, to get things done, sometimes if only to irritate you enough so that you will go on out and get them done by yourself, with a little cooperation from somebody else. We think that this is the proper philosophy, and I think it is surely, when we speak in terms now of the diversity of the problems that we face in transportation.

Now, abstractly, the basic reality of transportation is that it is a derived function. It comes as a result of some other need or some other related problem. And the basic fact of an urban environment is that it is a calculus of rapidly changing relationships.

When you combine these two formulas, you discover that urban transportation is affected more by factors than it can ever hope to influence. Let me be specific. A zoning decision, for example, in a small satellite town around a big city may do more to alter the pattern of metropolitan travel than a multi-million dollar investment in new transit equipment. Just the fact that a little community over which some of the local officials have no control at all, decides to change the zoning pattern, it affects travel.

Do you want me to give an example? Shirley Highway out of Washington. Today there is a constant line of high-rise apartments which no one anticipated at the time that highway was put in. It has changed the whole complex of travel. It hasn't made it travel, it has made an extra level of steel-over-concrete that you could walk on all the way from Virginia into Washington, D. C., in the rush hours.

When the transportation system was planned, somebody forgot to look at the fact, "Well, do you suppose that we will have high-rise apartments right alongside here?" And the zoning law of a community far removed from any of the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., the zoning policy of that county, said "Sure, build high-rises." And the minute you build high-rises, they demand access roads, and when you

have got access roads, the so-called through highway was the dream of an engineer and the nightmare of the living politician.

. . . Laughter and applause . . .

A slight adjustment in agricultural policy can drastically alter the characteristics of the city's labor pool, along with its transportation requirements.

The adoption of a local payroll tax or a sizable reduction in property assessments might, in a short time, change the volume and the direction of rush-hour traffic.

It seems to me that antibiotics, and racial prejudice and FHA loans, and birth-control pills, can make as tangible a contribution to urban mass transportation as geography, technology, or the right of eminent domain.

. . . Applause . . .

I might add, that contribution may be largely unpredictable and uncontrollable, but not entirely so. It imposes an immensely complicated problem, demanding not only intelligence but patience as well, and subtlety and flexibility. And I should add that these qualities are not always joined with entrepreneurial skill and civic patriotism.

Yet any city's long-range transportation planning which ignores social factors or gives them insufficient weight,

will be at their mercy. So transportation policy is not just a realm of the engineer, or even of the designer of mass transit equipment. It becomes a factor in the total planning of a community, in all of the relevant social and economic factors. So that it is wrong to go around and complain about the fact that the transportation system isn't very good. What you really ought to be looking at is the total health of the civic body, rather than to be looking at one small segment.

Now, I have got to get a little commercial in here. The Johnson-Humphrey administration -- I mentioned my name in this because my friend Everett Dirksen, who is an old friend of mine, the Senator from Illinois, one day in the Senate said, "I don't think we ought to just blame everything on Lyndon Johnson; let's include Hubert, too." (Laughter.) So I included myself.

Well, our administration and the 89th Congress tried to respond to the needs of urban areas by what we believe to be two creative and historic measures, the formation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the new Department of Transportation in 1966. These two departments have already begun a discussion of how they can best work together in solving urban transit problems, what they can do

working with you and working with themselves, and working with Local Government and State Government. This discussion will be of particular interest to this conference, for it should and I believe will lead to the enlargement and refinement of federal resources now available to improve local transportation systems.

(cont'd on following, page 176)

And I want to level with you here, as we say. We haven't done enough yet about this. The amount of money that we have put into this urban transportation problem is minimal. I have two members of Congress here, and I hope that you will see that that part of the budget is not cut. I trust that you will applaud that now, so that Joe and Bill will both get the idea. . . . Applause . . .

The President has asked the Secretaries of these two departments to recommend to him within one year after the creation of the Department of Transportation the means and the procedures by which this cooperation, this unified Federal approach to urban problems, can best be achieved. And he means cooperation not in theory or in principle, but cooperation in fact and in practical effect.

Now, some analysts have suggested that the future federal funds allocated to urban transportation facilities should include a new factor, the encouragement of coordination and reciprocity between the city and its suburbs. As a matter of fact, as I have tried to indicate to you, all of our future national transportation decisions must reflect a more complex involvement in urban development and conservation goals. There is a growing appreciation that the efficiency

of intercity transportation is inseparable from the efficiency of urban transportation facilities.

Let me give again a for instance, an example. Airport access is the most conspicuous example these days of intercity transportation and the relationship to urban transportation facilities. But long distance trucking terminals and railroad yards and bus depots and ports and harbors are all dependent upon supplementary or ancillary services. They are specially dependent upon the existence of a rational and smooth-functioning local distribution system.

It doesn't do any good to have a huge bus or freight terminal, if the roads that lead out or the facilities that lead from it, or the vehicles that are going to lead out from it are totally inadequate to the needs of the community.

If the internal traffic conditions of a community become unmanageable, commerce and industry will seek to bypass the town.

I might add one other thing, that I think from the point of national security we have got to take a good look at our transportation, intra-city transportation. Have you ever thought what one little bomb scare would do to New York? I am sure the Soviets and others have given some thought to it.

4

system. It is not only a target that rears itself in the view of the modern weapons system, but it presents almost unbelievable, insoluble social and economic and physical problems.

Maybe we are going to have to take a good hard look at whether we have overdone what we thought was a good thing, and how we start to undo it, and how we start to relate the social factors of a community we want to live in with the transportation needs of that community and the transportation facilities.

Obviously, the fate of the city and the fate of transportation are closely interwoven. In the field of transportation, constant change has been the rule of life. Change, of course, has resulted from technological innovation, change has resulted from competition, change has resulted from shifts in locations of people and industry, change has resulted from alterations of consumer preferences, from new life-styles, from new aspirations of the individual, from higher standards of expectation.

Like all services, then, transportation has learned that in order for it to survive, it too must change. But its change needs to be related to the social organization that it seeks to serve.

The cities of America are profoundly involved in the same patterns of change, because historically our great cities have all risen at the transfer points, transfer points of transportation; this is why the early great cities were port cities and river cities. And they will flourish or decay as urban transportation improves or deteriorates.

So what we are really talking about today, ladies and gentlemen, are the lifelines of our social life. We are talking about the veins and the arteries and the capillaries that keep this great social system of ours, this urbanized, industrialized system viable, lively and effective. And what we are really letting happen is a kind of sclerosis, arterial sclerosis of our arteries of transportation. And we have done very little, may I say, to do the research that is necessary to save us from this agonizing, disabling disease.

I think it is your responsibility and mine to insure that the changes which do occur from this day forward will continue to be changes for the better. And how do we know what is the better? That which serves the people the better, not that which pleases the architect or the engineer, not that which pleases a department of government at the Federal or State Government level, or local government, but that which seems to facilitate the movement of goods and materials and

men, that which has as its purpose to ease the pressures of life.

I can think of no one factor today that has a greater negative impact on mental health and physical health than the congestion problems that we face in our great cities on transportation. How many a person has come home at night to meet his family, and is in a mood like a bear, by the time he has fought his way through the transportation? It is hard enough to do a good day's work, it is cruel and inhuman punishment to ask a man, after he has done that day's work, to battle his way back to hearth and home, and hopefully, to be a respectable, responsible, wholesome, friendly husband, father and neighbor. I doubt that you can do it.

. . . Applause . . .

Now, I am going to leave you. I want to express to you our thanks for your presence here. I came here as a representative of your Federal Government, as your Vice President, for one purpose. I wanted to impress upon you the importance of your task.

You are here to do a job for your country. Every one of us wonder how we can be of some service today to our country. And we ought to, because this country of ours carries tremendous responsibilities. Now, you are not all

going to be the ones that will sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty; you are not all going to be able to negotiate the Kennedy Rounds tariff or trade agreements, you are not all going to be called upon to decide what will be the next diplomatic initiative with said country, but each and every one of us can do something where we are.

And I think the great strength of America is the fact that its people have known how to take care of their own business. The great strength of this country is that we are a united country, yes, but we are also a country of individuals, and like a great and beautiful mosaic, each and every part is distinct, but each and every part contributes to the grandeur and to the beauty of the portrait or the scene that we wish to have.

I ask you now to go back to your respective communities, meet with your local government people, with your local private industry people. Say to yourself, "How are we going to make this city or this community more livable?" It is just that simple: More livable. "What is it that we want in this city to make it more livable? How can we make this city so that it has greater freedom of choice and freedom of movement?"

Because a free man in a free society must be one that

can move about and can do so without impediment or impairment, and must be one, if you please, who can have a freedom of choice as to his job, his political party, his place to worship, his friends and his neighbors.

Freedom of choice and freedom of movement. I don't think you can have either unless we can make the modern city of modern men a livable, functioning, viable institution. Because it is there where we are going to live, and we can either suffocate or be emancipated. We can either learn to build together or we can just stay there and be just joined together in the conglomerate confusion of massive traffic congestion. It all depends upon what we want to do.

I want to salute the captains of industry who are here, to thank them for what they are doing to arouse public interest in this, and may I congratulate the local government, Mayor Barr, Governor Shafer, the people of this state who have taken such initiative in urban mass transportation policy. I know of no state in the union may I say, that has done a better job over the years of facing up to responsibilities of modern transportation needs and policies than the State of Pennsylvania. And I know of no city that has done a better job of urban redevelopment, of making its city an example for the nation, than the great City of Pittsburgh. And I am

happy to be both in Pennsylvania and Pittsburgh.

Thank you very much.

. . . Applause . . .

MR. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Vice President. We are highly honored by your presence here and by your very fine address on the objectives of this conference. Thank you so much for coming to Pittsburgh.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you, Mr. Harper.

MR. HARPER: I will now turn the meeting back to Mr. Chapple.

MR. CHAPPLE: Thank you, Mr. Vice President. Thank you, Mr. Harper.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes this afternoon's session. We will reassemble at 7:00 p.m. on the other side of the ballroom for dinner.

I would like you to note that there is a change on your schedule. Your schedule reads at 7:30. Dinner is at seven o'clock. Our speaker this evening will be Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

So now, I declare this session of this meeting adjourned.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org