

"Metropolitics for the Twenty-First Century"

from *Place Matters* (2001)

Peter Dreier, John Mollenkopf, and Todd Swanstrom

Editors' Introduction

This team-authored selection by Peter Dreier, John Mollenkopf, and Todd Swanstrom, is an excerpt from their book *Place Matters: Metropolitics for the Twenty-First Century*. They draw urgent attention to the distressed inner city and, like Logan and Molotch, draw attention to the power of "place" or geographic location, in determining future life chances for urban residents through differential access to quality jobs, resources, and public services. Greater inequality in contemporary U.S. society has deepened the importance of place, trumping the benefits brought by new communication technologies and the advent of the Internet. They cite the Nobel Prize-winning economist Amartya Sen, who calls for the abolition of inequality as a means of achieving the full potential of all of humanity.

They foreground the national problem of urban sprawl, which has deepened the socioeconomic and political divide between city and suburb, worsened economic distress and segregation in the inner city, and further degraded the environment. The exodus to the suburbs appealed to urban expatriates searching for middle-class privacy and exclusiveness, who were increasingly divested from public commitments to rental and subsidized housing, parks, schools, transit, and other urban services. Meanwhile a new environment of competitiveness among central cities means public officials are favoring new gentrified neighborhoods attractive to the professional-managerial classes amidst long-term decline in the manufacturing workforce. Dreier and his co-authors trumpet the ongoing relevance of cities as "engines of prosperity," evident in the rise of Sun Belt cities, urban technology and innovation centers, and command centers of the new global economy.

The authors argue for "smart growth" and regional planning policies to combat the political fragmentation that is rife in the suburbs, to help overcome central city-suburban divides, and to improve overall metropolitan quality of life. They observe that the "new regionalism" of the contemporary era has its early twentieth-century precursors in the "garden city" movement of Ebenezer Howard in the UK, and such initiatives as the Regional Planning Association led by Lewis Mumford and others in the New York City metropolitan region. They present several arguments addressing how the new regionalism can promote economic efficiency, competitiveness, environmentalism, and social equity. They contribute to a "metropolitics" through practical suggestions for building new political coalitions.

A sociologist by training, Peter Dreier is the E. P. Clapp Distinguished Professor of Politics, and Chair of the Urban and Environmental Policy Department at Occidental College. John Mollenkopf is Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Sociology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and Director of their Center for Urban Research. Todd Swanstrom is the E. Desmond Lee Endowed Professor in Community Collaboration and Public Policy at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

PLACE STILL MATTERS

Place matters. Where we live makes a big difference in the quality of our lives, and how the places in which we live function has a big impact on the quality of our society. The evidence shows that places are becoming more unequal. Economic classes are becoming more spatially separate from each other, with the rich increasingly living with other rich people and the poor with other poor. The latter are concentrated in central cities and distressed inner suburbs, and the former are in exclusive central-city neighborhoods and more distant suburbs.

This rising economic segregation has many negative consequences, ranging from reinforcing disadvantage in central city neighborhoods to heightening the cost of suburban sprawl as families flee deteriorating central cities and inner suburbs. This trend in the spatial organization of American metropolitan areas is not the simple result of individuals making choices in free markets. Rather, federal and state policies have biased metropolitan development in favor of economic segregation, concentrated urban poverty, and suburban sprawl. We need new policies for metropolitan governance that will level the playing field and stop the drift toward greater spatial inequality. We also need a political strategy for uniting residents of central cities and suburbs in a new coalition that will support these policies.

It may seem odd to argue that place matters when technology appears to be conquering space and Americans are so mobile. Cars and planes have made it possible for us to move about more quickly than ever before. More importantly, cable television, telephones, faxes, computers, and, above all, the Internet enable us to access many of society's benefits without leaving our homes. With a satellite dish or cable service, we can choose from a menu of entertainment options ranging from tractor pulls to Tolstoy, from rap to Rachmaninoff. Distance learning is growing rapidly, with "virtual" universities enabling students to pursue college degrees from their homes. With e-commerce, we hardly even need to drive to the mall anymore, and more people are working at home instead of commuting to the office every day. Where you live, in short, seems to have less and less of an effect on the type of person you are and what you do. Technology has eclipsed the traditional reasons

people gathered together in cities: to be close to jobs, culture, and shopping. Cities, it seems, are becoming obsolete.

In fact, this idea is nonsense. As places of intense personal interaction, cities are as important as ever. If technology were truly abolishing the importance of space and place, real estate values would flatten out. Soaring house prices in Silicon Valley, Boston, and New York City are proof positive that people will pay dearly to live in certain places. Indeed, the vast majority of Americans, over 80 percent, have chosen to live within metropolitan areas and have not spread themselves across the countryside.

It is true that mass ownership of automobiles has made it possible for people to live farther away from where they work within these metropolitan areas than they could fifty years ago. If they can afford it, Americans generally prefer to live in low-density suburbs. But people still care about where they live, perhaps more than ever. Higher-income professionals have geographically dispersed networks that transcend their neighborhoods and cities, sometimes extending to the entire globe. They use these "weak" ties, or dispersed networks for gathering information, seeking opportunities, and finding jobs. But where they choose to live still affects how much they pay in taxes, where their children go to school, and who their friends are.

Place becomes more important as one moves down the economic ladder. On the wrong side of the "digital divide," poor and working-class families are less likely to own a computer, have Internet access, or send and receive e-mail. They rely more on local networks to find out about jobs and other opportunities. Often lacking a car (and adequate mass transit), they must live close to where they work. Unable to send their children to private schools, they must rely on local public schools. Unable to afford day care, lower-income families must rely on informal day care provided by nearby relatives and friends.

In short, whether we are highly skilled professionals or minimum-wage workers, where we live matters. Place affects our access to jobs and public services (especially education), our access to shopping and culture, our level of personal security, the availability of medical services, and even the air we breathe. People still care deeply about where they live. The adage still holds true: the three

most important factors in real estate are location, location, location.

[...]

Place-based inequalities

Missing from the debate about rising inequality has been an understanding of the critical role of place. The Nobel Prize-winning economist Amartya Sen provides a broader way of understanding inequality. He argues that we should understand inequality not simply in terms of income or wealth but in terms of our ability to achieve the good life, by which he means being active members of society and realizing our full potential as human beings. According to Sen, "relevant functionings can vary from such elementary things as being adequately nourished, being in good health, avoiding escapable morbidity and premature mortality, etc., to more complex achievements such as being happy, having self-respect, taking part in the life of the community, and so on." Sen adds that we must also be concerned about "capabilities," or our ability to choose different activities or functionings. For example, a starving person is very different from one who has chosen to go on a hunger strike.

Other things being equal, people are better off if they have real choices in life.

Sen would be the first to admit that having money, or access to jobs, services, and credit, is essential to free choice and a high quality of life. But he argues that equality of income cannot be equated to true equality. A focus on income or wealth confuses the means to the good life with the good life itself. People's ability to convert income into the good life, Sen observes, varies tremendously. A person who suffers from severe kidney disease, for example, cannot enjoy the same quality of life as a perfectly healthy person with the same income, because of the daily monetary and emotional costs of dialysis. Thus, Sen argues, we cannot look at inequality simply in terms of income; we must take into account the actual situations and activities of people. Health, age, gender, race, education, and many other conditions besides income affect our ability to function effectively.

The thesis of this book is that where we live has a powerful effect on the choices we have and our capacity to achieve a higher quality of life.

Following Sen, we examine inequality in light of how place shapes and constrains our opportunities not only to acquire income and convert it into quality of life but also to become fully functioning members of the economy, society, and polity. As one example, the increasing devolution of public functions from the federal government to state and local governments means that geographical location has become more important in determining what we pay in taxes and what public goods and services we enjoy. The segregation of income groups into different local governments means that supposedly equal citizens have unequal access to public goods such as schools, parks, and clean air.

[...]

Cities as engines of prosperity

Because we emphasize the concentration of poverty in cities, readers may get the impression that cities are basket cases – like sick people with so few resources that they only serve to burden society. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, cities are economic dynamos that provide extraordinary benefits to society as a whole. Cities are both reservations for the poor (with all the burdens that entails) and centers of economic productivity and innovation. The contradictory nature of American cities is reflected in the fact that most cities have daytime working populations that are significantly higher than their nighttime residential populations. They export income to the suburbs. Ultimately, we argue, the residential concentration of poverty at the core undermines the entire regional economy's economic efficiency and ability to innovate. Greater regional cooperation, aimed at less economic segregation and sprawl, would benefit the entire society.

Over the last half century, suburbanization, deindustrialization, and the rise of new cities in the South and West have dramatically transformed the older cities of the Northeast and Midwest. In the process, metropolitan areas became far larger, encompassing four-fifths of the nation's population, but central cities became less dominant within them. A few old cities lost half their populations, and others remained roughly the same size but lost population relative to the surrounding suburbs. Some new cities such as Phoenix and San Diego, mainly in the Sun Belt, grew dramatically. Even in

these cities, however, much of the growth took place on the periphery, leading some observers to claim that cities are now "obsolete." In their eyes, the "old" industrial economy required dense cities with many factories and much face-to-face contact, whereas the "new" information economy is more comfortable in the suburbs, where computers, the Internet, and cell phones have made the dense face-to-face interactions of the older cities unnecessary.

This view profoundly misreads the key functions that most central cities continue to play in our national economy. Regional economies are integrated wholes, with different parts of the metropolitan area specializing in different economic functions. For routine goods production and distribution activities and even many corporate headquarters, suburban locations may be economically preferable; however, older central cities continue to provide large pools of private assets, accumulated knowledge, sophisticated skills, cultural resources, and social networks. Cities house most of the leading global, national, and regional corporate services firms, such as banks, law firms, and management consultants. They are still centers of innovation, skill, fashion, and market exchange.

Urban density enhances economic efficiency and innovation. What economists call "agglomeration economies" are still important in the global economy. The density of employment in cities reduces the costs of transportation and increases each business's access to skilled and specialized labor. The geographical clustering of industries in certain cities further enhances productivity. In many industries, understanding ambiguous information is the key to innovation. It cannot be communicated in an e-mail message or even a phone call; it requires the kind of face-to-face interaction that cities are good at fostering. The cultural production of these cities has been just as important as their economic role.

[...]

THE PROBLEM

The competition among metropolitan jurisdictions to attract higher-income residents and exclude the less well-off has been a powerful factor promoting the concentration of poor people in central cities. In the typical metropolitan area, dozens, even

hundreds, of suburban towns seek to establish their places within the metropolitan pecking order. A "favored quarter" houses upper-income people and businesses that pay taxes but do not demand many services and do not lessen the quality of life. These places use zoning regulations, high prices, and even racial prejudice to keep out the unwanted, or at least the less privileged. Elsewhere, less exclusive residential suburbs, suburban commercial and industrial areas, and aging inner-ring suburbs seek to carve out their own places in the hierarchy of municipalities. Even those aging, economically stagnating working-class suburbs on the city's edge often try to keep out inner-city residents. For those with limited means, living in the central city may be their only choice.

A similar but less keen competition takes place among central-city neighborhoods. Here, neighborhoods do not have their own formal authority to exclude some residents and attract others, but factors such as housing quality and price, neighborhood amenities (particularly a good neighborhood primary school), and city zoning and land-use regulations can serve the same purpose. Unlike exclusive suburban towns, however, even well-off central-city residents pay into the city's common budget. As a result, higher-income central-city residents who do not want to pay for services for the less fortunate, or who do not use the central-city services for which they are paying (such as schools, public transit, and parks), have a strong incentive to move to a more exclusive suburban jurisdiction.

Federal policies heightened this competition and made the suburbs attractive by building freeways, fostering suburban home ownership, and encouraging central cities to specialize in social services for needy constituents. Many suburbs reinforce this arrangement by regulating land uses to maximize property values and tax revenues, by customizing their services for middle-class professionals, and by declining to build subsidized housing or sometimes even any kind of rental housing. Central-city public officials have also contributed to this state of affairs by relying on the growth of social services to enhance their budgets, provide jobs for constituents, and build political support. They are no more willing to give up responsibility for, and control over, these activities than exclusive suburbs are to embrace them. Defenders of this system draw on

widely held beliefs that localism, private property, and homogeneous communities are sacred parts of the American way of metropolitan living . . .

Although this deeply embedded system may seem rational to suburban residents and public officials, it has produced dysfunctional consequences for the larger society. Metropolitan political fragmentation has encouraged unplanned, costly sprawl on the urban fringe. It has imposed longer journeys to work on commuters, allowing them less time for family life. It has undermined the quality of life in older suburbs, hardened conflicts between suburbs and their central cities, hampered financing for regional public facilities such as mass transit, and encouraged disinvestment from central cities. Countries with strong national land-use regulations and regional governments have avoided many of these problems. Indeed, the United States could have avoided them if we had chosen a more intelligent path for metropolitan growth over the last fifty years.

As these problems became increasingly evident, they drew criticism from scholars, planners, and good-government groups. These critics have focused on how metropolitan political fragmentation undermines administrative efficiency, environmental quality, economic competitiveness, and social equity. As early as the 1930s, administrative experts promoted regional solutions in ways to address the overlap, duplication, lack of coordination, and waste in the provision of public services. Concern today is becoming widespread. Even longtime suburban residents have expressed concern over the environmental costs of sprawl as they see their countryside being gobbled up by new development and find themselves in traffic jams even while doing their Saturday morning shopping. They have made "smart growth" a hot-button issue across the country. Executives of large firms, transportation planners, and economic development officials most often express concern that fragmented metropolitan areas undermine the economic competitiveness of urban regions.

Finally, those who crusade for civil rights and racial desegregation, who care about the plight of the inner-city poor, and who champion greater civic participation have criticized the ways in which metropolitan fragmentation has hurt the social and economic fabric of our communities. They argue in favor of fair housing and housing mobility programs, tax-base sharing, and metropolitan

school districts. Indeed, metropolitan fragmentation, sprawl, and inequality are major causes of the decline in community and civic participation . . .

ORIGINS OF THE NEW REGIONALISM

The current debate over regionalism echoes earlier concerns. At the end of the nineteenth century, New York, Chicago, and many other cities moved to annex or consolidate most of the adjacent territory likely to be developed in the next fifty years. The formation of the Greater New York from New York City, Brooklyn, the hamlets of Queens County, the Bronx, and Staten Island in 1898 was a grand and highly successful experiment in metropolitan government. Indeed, much of the current vitality of cities such as Chicago and New York stems from these early actions. By the 1920s, however, middle-class urbanites, dismayed by the rapidly increasing density and inequality of their industrial cities, and frustrated by their inability to continue to dominate their politics, increasingly fled to the suburbs. Once they established themselves as suburbanites, they persuaded state legislatures to pass laws hindering cities from further annexation. Metropolitan growth would henceforth take place largely outside the jurisdiction of the central city.

Responding to such trends, an early group of regionalists foresaw, as early as the 1920s, the need for new forms of metropolitan planning and cooperation. Echoing the "garden city" idea first promulgated by Ebenezer Howard in England, Lewis Mumford and his colleagues in the Regional Planning Association of America, formed in 1923, hoped that coherent regions would gradually emerge to dissolve the problems of the industrial city. "The hope of the city," Mumford wrote in 1925, "lies outside itself." Other radical (though less utopian) thinkers called for regional land-use planning as an antidote to fragmentation. In 1927, the Regional Plan Association's magisterial plan for metropolitan New York called for knitting the region together with a comprehensive system of highways and rail transit that would concentrate economic growth in Manhattan and in a few suburban centers. In 1937, the New Deal's National Resources Committee called for federal efforts to foster regional planning, including the establishment

of multistate metropolitan planning agencies. In the face of resistance from those who saw such measures as abrogating private property and local democracy, however, none of these visionary blueprints had much impact on the post-World War II evolution of American cities. As a result, many of the problems they anticipated did indeed come to pass.

Efficiency arguments for regionalism

The negative consequences of unplanned metropolitan growth triggered new strains of regionalist thinking and new political constituencies that favored the creation of new regional institutions. Public administrators, city planners, and municipal reformers viewed regional planning as the best way to promote regional economic efficiency and maintain a sound environment. Writing for the National Municipal League in 1930, Paul Studentski criticized metropolitan fragmentation and called for a framework that would support "real, democratic, comprehensive, and permanent organization of the metropolitan community." Prominent academics and planners such as Charles Merriam, Victor Jones, and Luther Gulick elaborated on these themes in the postwar period. Robert Wood's 1961 classic *1400 Governments* argued that postwar suburbanization in metropolitan New York was irrational, inefficient, and unaccountable. The federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, created by Congress in 1947 and eliminated in 1996, recommended ways to broaden the urban tax base and improve the regional distribution of services.

A common theme was that fragmented metropolitan governments promoted wasteful duplication, uneven standards of public service, and wasteful competition between local governments. These trenchant critiques were not more effective than the work of earlier metropolitan visionaries had been in restraining the construction of freeways, suburban shopping malls, and tract housing in the 1950s and 1960s. It nevertheless remained a key doctrine of public administration that regions required some level of metropolitan planning in order to function well. The 1960s saw the creation of many regional councils of government (often called COGs) and single-purpose regional agencies such

as water and sewer systems, garbage disposal, and transportation. City-county consolidation took place in Miami, Nashville, Jacksonville, and Indianapolis, but voters in many other areas rejected proposals to merge city and suburban governments into regional governments. Bucking this trend, in the November 2000 election, voters in Louisville, Kentucky, and its suburbs approved (by a 54 to 46 percent margin) the consolidation of the city of Louisville with Richmond County. This is the first major city-county merger to win approval in thirty years. Fast-growing cities of the South and Southwest, such as Phoenix and Albuquerque, also annexed surrounding territory long after that practice ended elsewhere in the country. Finally, voters and public officials sought to streamline and modernize the governance of suburban areas in the postwar period by enhancing county government and consolidating school districts. All these efforts, however, fell short of the goals espoused by the first and second generations of regionalists.

Environmental arguments for regionalism

Concern for administrative efficiency motivated the early advocates of metropolitan governance. Beginning in the 1960s, a new generation of regionalists emerged, concerned about environmental protection, sustainable development, and "smart growth." Development rapidly swallowed the metropolitan countryside after World War II, and the freeway construction of the 1960s and 1970s increased traffic congestion to new, more disturbing levels. Confronting these realities, suburban residents and those who represented them became less enthusiastic about unbridled metropolitan growth.

In 1974, the Council on Environmental Quality issued a report titled *The Costs of Sprawl*, calling for greater regulation of suburban development. Today, several national environmental organizations, including the Sierra Club, are campaigning against sprawl, Oregon and Maryland have adopted state legislation for "smart growth," and many other states are actively discussing similar measures. Some approaches call for the establishment of regional growth boundaries monitored by the state; others merely provide incentives to channel new investment toward already developed areas while attempting to preserve agricultural land uses

or otherwise protect undeveloped areas. Regional groups are active in the San Francisco Bay Area, Washington, D.C., Pittsburgh, and Suffolk County, New York. A movement for "new urbanism" has emerged among architects and city planners who favor denser, more pedestrian- and transit-oriented forms of neighborhood development. Despite naysayers who see an adverse impact on housing affordability and consumer choice, a growing consensus has emerged in many places on behalf of rethinking older growth policies. Residents of Cook County, Illinois (an old urban area), and Santa Clara County, California (the high-tech Silicon Valley), both showed overwhelming support for regional approaches to solving urban problems. Voters across the country have approved ballot measures to limit suburban sprawl and preserve open spaces. Responding to such sentiments, Vice President Al Gore made smart growth a central theme in the Clinton-Gore administration's "livability agenda," which focused on preserving open spaces, redeveloping brownfield areas, mitigating congestion, and improving urban air quality.

[...]

Economic competitiveness arguments for regionalism

Contemporary regionalists have also argued that metropolitan areas divided against themselves cannot compete successfully in the new global economy. In particular, business leaders and regional planning organizations have recognized that regionally oriented planning and development policies could make metropolitan economies more competitive. Although business-supported regional planning groups have existed at least since the Regional Plan Association was established in New York in 1923, groups like San Francisco's Bay Area Council and Pittsburgh's Allegheny Council for Community Development became more common after World War II. The radical changes in technology, business organization, and global competition since the 1980s gave this perspective new force. The high-technology companies of Silicon Valley took the lead in supporting regional approaches to the South Bay's housing, transportation, and development issues. One scholar, Annalee Saxenian, found Silicon Valley entre-

preneurs' ability to collaborate in this way made that region more successful, over the long haul, than the similar technology complex along Route 128 around Boston.

Social scientists who examine the interrelationships between central-city and suburban economies find a high correlation between the two, though in some cases, substantial central-city decline has not prevented the surrounding suburbs from prospering. Nevertheless, there are obvious linkages in the economic conditions and income growth rates of central cities and their suburbs. Central cities continue to perform functions and provide services that are critical to regional growth. The evidence suggests that cooperative regions are more likely to prosper than are more competitive, divided regions.

These realities have given new impetus to certain efforts to form regional public-private partnerships to promote regional growth. Syndicated columnist Neal Peirce, who has given visibility to all forms of new regionalism, and his colleague Curtis Johnson have been particularly active in inspiring and advising a new generation of such organizations. They have not promoted any particular organizational forms, stressing instead the general need for collaboration, trust, dialogue, and leadership. These collaborations have produced many Web sites and a journal, *The Regionalist*.

Closely associated with this perspective is the growing focus on industrial clusters as a basis for urban and regional economic development. Advanced by Michael Porter's *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, this perspective argues that a region's competitiveness is based on the quality of networks and interactions among related and often physically close firms. Even though they may compete against one another in some ways, they share technical knowledge, a skilled labor pool, and support services and spur one another to rapid technological innovation. This has led some policy makers to promote clusters as a way to address such regional needs as better-paid jobs, more rapid innovation, and a better quality of life for industrial workers. This perspective was given national prominence in the 1996 report *America's New Economy and the Challenge of the Cities*.

Many state and local agencies hoping to emulate Silicon Valley's success have embraced this way of thinking about economic development, such as the Regional Technology Alliance organized

by the San Diego Association of Governments. San Diego has also surveyed employers in these clusters to understand their workforce needs and has developed programs to address them.

Equity arguments for regionalism

The spatial concentration of urban poverty is another concern motivating many new regionalists. As Michael Schill observed, "although segregating themselves in the suburbs may serve the interests of large numbers of Americans today, the long term costs of doing nothing to alleviate concentrated ghetto poverty are likely to be tremendous." Distinguished public intellectuals, including Anthony Downs of the Brookings Institution, former Albuquerque mayor David Rusk, Minnesota state legislator Myron Orfield, and Harvard professor Gary Orfield, among others, have concluded that regional approaches are the only way that the problem of inner-city poverty can be solved. Increasingly, they have been joined by officials representing the inner-ring suburbs who are facing the growth of "urban" problems that they cannot solve within the limits of their own jurisdictions. With foundation funding, Orfield and his associates have launched initiatives to document and remedy "growing social and economic polarization" in twenty-two metropolitan areas.

Increasingly, planners are arguing that there need not be a trade-off between equality and efficiency, or growth. Indeed, regional strategies that lift up the central city can make regions more competitive. The Center on Wisconsin Strategy at the University of Wisconsin has advocated that workforce developers and regional employers cooperate to train central-city residents for high-wage jobs in technologically innovative firms. This "high road" approach to regional economic development would simultaneously enhance wages, upward mobility, and employer competitiveness.

[...]

THE POLITICS OF REGIONALISM IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

Historically, many forces have worked against a regional perspective in urban governance. Suburbs

have been happy to benefit from being located in a large metropolitan area while excluding the less well-off and avoiding the payment of taxes to support services required by the urban poor. Central cities, for their part, have made a virtue of necessity by increasing spending on social services as a way of expanding the employment of central-city constituents. This spending has become an increasingly substantial part of municipal budgets and an important form of "new patronage" in city politics. As federal benefits have increasingly flowed to needy people, as opposed to needy places, it has helped to expand these functions. Legislators elected to represent areas where the minority poor are concentrated develop a stake in this state of affairs.

This dynamic is gradually but steadily shifting. The first wave of inner, working-class suburbs has long since been built out, their populations have aged, and their residents' incomes have stagnated since the early 1970s. These suburbs have developed increasingly "urban" problems that they cannot solve on their own. Black and Hispanic central-city residents have increasingly moved to the suburbs. Although minority suburbs have significantly better conditions than inner-city minority neighborhoods, they still have higher rates of poverty and disadvantage than white suburbs and may face some of the same forces of decline that operate on inner cities. Even as metropolitan economic segregation has increased, metropolitan racial segregation has declined and suburban diversity has increased. As Orfield has pointed out, these inner suburbs are coming to realize that they share significant interests with their central cities. And as Juliet Gainsborough has shown, voters residing in more diverse suburbs are substantially more likely to vote like their urban neighbors.

[...]

It has thus become clear that many powerful players, including corporations, foundations, unions, political leaders, and community organizations, think that regional collaboration offers the surest route to competitive advantage in the new global economy. Regions divided against themselves are least likely to be able to undertake the necessary investments in physical, human, and social capital. Emerging metropolitan governance institutions should carry out functions that make the most sense from economic, environmental, and equity viewpoints.

These include regional capital investments, transportation, land-use planning, economic development, job training, education, and tax-base sharing. This form of cooperation can generate more widely distributed benefits if they follow a high-productivity, high-wage "high road" instead of engaging in a "race to the bottom" that competes for low-wage, low-value-added jobs in highly mobile industries.

To be truly effective, metropolitan cooperation must develop a broad, democratic base and the

organizational capacity to articulate the common good, not merely to sum up the aims of the individual parts of the metropolis. Cooperation of the region's constituent elements must be secured through consent, not through unwanted mandates imposed on resistant local jurisdictions. To achieve this consent, the new regional form must provide tangible benefits to its constituent jurisdictions, and its actions cannot be subject to the veto of an exclusive "favored quarter."