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Communities and locations impel us to negotiate our lives in accordance with local customs, locales and landscapes. These conditions play substantial roles in the development of our lives and personalities. Correspondingly, any particular combinations of community with location bring together individuals into a collective conscience. For instance, many Americans living in a city have, in recent times, felt the strains of existing within the ideal milieu of modernity. Their stress developed from the several urban “amenities” and their accompanied dysfunctions. I analyze several of these urban amenities and dysfunctions and then compare them with the many rural amenities to make clear the differences between these two places. Likewise, I compare an ideal type of urbanite that has moved to a small town with an ideal type of urbanite that prefers the city to show their differences. Finally, I formulate a theoretical model that uses a field of sociological analysis: Urban/Rural—Dispute Resolution. After observing how community members employ conflict resolution, I contrast the differences between urban and rural avenues of operation pertaining to this amenity. Contrasting the city and small town ideal type communities, along with the ideal types of urbanite and ruralite, it is shown how the ordinary community member navigates this local institution and how they work with fellow neighbors to deal with conflict. From this slice of social life it is
demonstrated how people accord with their community and local institutions. It is then concluded that urbanites that moved to the small town, did so in part, by comparing their lifestyles and overall urban existence with that of a more manageable small town existence.
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CHAPTER ONE:

Introduction

We humans cannot peer into one another's "real" or "true" self. Our knowledge of one another is limited to what we can observe. Our definition of one another's self is necessarily, based on each other's appearance, conduct, and the settings in which we interact. In turn, we present a self to one another through how we look and act and where we [want] to go (Cahill, 1998, p. 1).

Driving out of Anaheim on Interstate 5, at intervals of two to seven miles per hour, made me sneer as I went through my daily ritual of calculating how many times I have sat through what urbanites call gridlock. I scoffed because after years of clutching and braking, I finally bought a car with an automatic transmission—just before deciding to move out of the city! Sociologists claim that considering the inner-workings of gridlock is predominant for an urban collective conscience—by virtue of collective memories that "keep alive the sense of affiliation with the group and its purposes during periods of routine activity" (Halbwachs, 1992, p. 25). Interestingly, a specific collective conscience of urbanites has recently developed in the wake of urbanization. The example of gridlock used above, is just one of several factors that has driven a significant portion of the city population from the high seas of urban existence to the calm shores of the small town.

Sociologically and geographically urban and rural existence has some essential similarities and differences. Although similarities are brought to light to expose why some urbanites migrated away from the city, only rural pull factors will be viewed since similar urban and rural amenities are not lost, just modified. These modifications are
addressed for identification only, not as contributing factors to urban-rural migration. In this study, fundamental differences between the city and small town are of primary interest. To study these differences, indicators representing urban and rural existence are presented to contrast the city with the small town. These indicators are emphasized in order to determine why some urbanites favored the small town over the city. In view of the empirical fact that some urbanites took action by moving to the small town, an inquiry into the negative aspects of urban life and the positive aspects of small town life is observed. These city push and small town pull factors, it will be shown, acted together as fragments of motivation that, over the individual lives of the people who decided to move, ultimately rationalized their choice for migration.
CHAPTER TWO:

Methods

Migration has occurred in groups of all sizes throughout the ages as known through such cases as seeking food and employment; the desire for a better climate; connecting with family and friends; exploration, and so on. Migration may be international or interregional; inter-urban or intra-urban; and rural-urban or urban-rural. Other migratory criteria include time, decision-making, numbers involved, migratory mechanisms, organization, political, and so forth. Migration has been enormously influential in determining cultural and social change. Research has concentrated on both empirical and theoretical aspects of the economic and social causes and consequences of migration: its selectivity by age, sex, marital status, education, occupation, and life cycle; spatial patterns of flow and distance; and behavioral aspects of the decision to migrate.

In the late 19th Century, E. G. Ravenstein formulated what he called laws of migration (See; Johnston, 1994, p. 381):

(a) migration proceeds step by step;

(b) each migration current produces a compensating counter-current; and

(c) migration increases in volume as industries and commerce develop and transportation improves.

In any case

... no social movement can emerge until individuals are ready to take part in it, willing to transform what C. Wright Mills (1963) called private troubles into public problems, as well as to enter into a process
of collective identity formation. No matter how objectively necessary a social movement might appear to be, real individuals must make it happen. All of these levels of motivation are significant in the latter stages of social movement lifecycles, as well. The longevity of the social movement is largely the result of how long a society takes it seriously as a political force, and this, in turn, depends on the commitment of individual actors, their creative use of strategy and tactics, the response of the established political institutions, and the willingness and capacity of the entire social formation to absorb, incorporate, or reject the “message” of the movement (Eyerman, 1991, p. 56-7).

Hensher (1981) and Pipkin (1986) use a more quantitative approach through discrete choice modeling. This model emphasizes a cluster of statistical methods that is designed to model the way in which individuals choose between discrete alternatives. A key argument is that any alternative has a total utility to the user that is itself a combination of the weighted utilities of each of its attributes to the individual user.

Stouffer (1940) in particular used discrete choice modeling to study migration flows by examining the options individuals were able to choose from. His concept states that the number of movements from an origin to a destination is proportional to the number of opportunities at that destination and inversely proportional to the number of intervening opportunities between the origin and the destination.

Qualitatively or quantitatively, in the end people maximize “their rewards relative to their costs in selecting [choices]” (Fischer, 1977, p. 44). Thus, just as there are reasons why some urbanists want to leave the city, there are reasons why some urbanists are unable to or don’t want to leave. Either way, all of their personal reasons have social implications since “all individuals do not vote or negotiate their society’s norms, values, languages, and customs” (Fischer, 1977, p. 4). The poor, for instance, are trapped in the
city: casualties of price increase; transforming neighborhoods (gentrification); declining personal circumstances; and what Marx (1955) termed the industrial army reserve.

"Underlying this sense of being trapped are seemingly impersonal changes in the very structure of continent-wide societies" (Mills, 1959, p. 3). Nevertheless, some do eventually escape the city and by virtue of those who have bid farewell to the urban environment, a new social movement began in the form of counter-urbanization. This developed from city push factors: "to escape the congestion, pollution, and high land values of the city" (Williams, 1973, p. 43). These push factors, and many others, were then contrasted with small town pull factors. Williams cites Satire to give a brief bucolic example of a few small town pull factors: "What is idealized is a purchased freehold house in the country, or a 'charming coastal retreat,' or even 'a barren offshore island'" (ibid).

This phenomenon concerning urban to rural migration in the United States has developed despite certain social forces: the rising tides of capitalism, rationalism, and individualistic cosmopolitan values. What makes recent rural mass migration interestingly novel is that through the ages, cultures from every historical epoch and every geographic place, rarely, if ever, migrated away from their own "progress" and thus what their own culture perceived to be an advanced and "modern" existence.

From this, a theoretical question is formulated concerning this particular urban to rural migratory development: What impels a group of individuals coming from all walks of city life, to exchange their own urban communities and ways of life, for a "less
advanced" rural existence in a small town? In attempting to answer this complex question, a theoretical study is created that suggests that people who had resided in U.S. cities may be understood in terms of the type of settlement they chose to live; by understanding why they wanted to migrate; and by identifying the means by which they carried out their migratory objectives.

Due to the fact that the very nature of urban life constitutes a “melting-pot,” this investigation attempts to analyze U.S. urban to U.S. rural migration from a “bird’s eye view.” Accordingly, since social structures are contemplated, the pieces to this rural-urban “jigsaw puzzle” are cut around the boundaries of generalized rural and urban existence, and not around the bits and pieces that focus on the individual accounts of narratives. By putting together a rural-urban “jigsaw puzzle,” a picture will emerge that will portray each “piece” in relation to the others and thereupon show the differences between rural and urban social structures. It can then be determined how these differences affected the Conflict Urbanist. In general, however, any way research is carried out a complete picture is impossible to compose due to the continuous transformation of city life, its inherent cultural variation, and as Nietzsche notes, the value freedom of the researcher:

Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as science 'without any presuppositions;' this thought does not bear thinking through it is paralogical: a philosophy, a 'faith,' must always be there first of all, so that science can acquire from it direction, a meaning, a limit, a method, a right to exist. Whatever has the opposite notion, whoever tries, for example, to place philosophy 'on a strictly scientific basis,'—first needs to stand not only philosophy but truth itself on its head (1967, p. 151).
"Knowledge now, as a rule, remains always subordinate to the service of the will, as indeed it originated for this service, and grew, so to speak, to the will, as the head to the body" (Schopenhauer, 1960, p. 683).

Notwithstanding, several aspects of the urban environment can accurately be compared with the rural environment. Once differences between the urban and rural worlds are laid out, social structures and forces that influence U.S. urbanite's preference for the kind of community they wish to be apart can then be analyzed to determine how and why these preferences for urban to rural migration transpired. To do this, ideal types are constructed and used to extract differences between the urban and rural worlds through conflict theory. To help probe into these different worlds and draw contrasts, an "urban-rural continuum" has been borrowed from various urban-rural sociological and geographical research models:

Whatever we might discover about the city in this manner would manifestly have to be checked against what we know or could find out about human settlements, which are not cities, i.e., against the country. Only after such a comparison was made would we be able to say that we had selected the significant aspects of urban life which made the city a distinctive form of human association. But just as cities differ, so do rural settlements differ from one another. In respect to each ... criteria of urban life—numbers, density, permanence, and heterogeneity—cities represent a vast continuum shading into non-urban settlements. The same is true of rural settlements be they rural nonfarm settlements, villages, or scattered open farm areas (Wirth, 1964, p. 222-223).

For this study, social existence is understood in terms of the type of settlement some urbanites prefer to live in. Sociologically this preference developed from the
“mutual relationship of the individual and the community in which the individual lives” (Mead, 1934, p. 215). Therefore, an emphasis on the classification of the typical communities found in the city and the small town is observed to present a causal relationship: that variables such as population density, the built environment, and community conflict, influence people’s ideologies.

Ultimately, the urban dwellers that moved to a small town were confronted with differences concerning urban and rural existence. For instance, Williams draws a contrast between these two worlds to claim that ideas about places influence ideologies: “The country has gathered the idea of a natural way of life: of peace, innocence, and simple virtue. The city has gathered the idea of an achieved centre: of learning, communication, light” (1973, p. 1).

These directives Williams drew upon, along with others, are examined as independent variables that affected urban to rural migration. Since “[u]rban character and urban roles may be useful indicators of the nature and dynamics of the diverse entities of society” (Murphey, 1967, p. 206), it could be said that various forms of urban characters and roles created a particular group ideology. The built environment, for instance, is constructed to accommodate specific kinds of interaction, that in turn, creates a sense of place, and place plays a part in how interaction is carried out, thus playing a principal role in creating a sense of self. In recognition of this, Simmel (1950) recommends that
inquiring into the inner meaning of specifically modern life and its products, into the soul of the cultural body, so to speak, must seek to solve the equation which structures like the metropolis set up between the individual and the super-individual contents of life. Such an inquiry must answer the question of how the personality accommodates itself in the adjustments to external forces (p. 409).

Harvey speaks of a geographical imagination that is sensitive towards the significance of place, space, and landscape in the constitution and conduct of social life:

"Just as the facts of history are time facts and their association gives rise to the concept of period, so the facts of geography could be regarded as place facts and their association could be expressed by the concept of landscape" (English, 1972, p. 11). He claims that a geographical imagination enables . . . individual[s] to recognize the role of space and place in [their] own biograph[ies], to relate to the spaces [they] see around [them], and to recognize how transactions between individuals and between organizations are affected by the space that separates them . . . to fashion and use space creatively, and to appreciate the meaning of the spatial forms created by others (Harvey, 1973, p. 17).

Harvey used the term both to compare the geographical imagination with and to connect it to what Mills (1959) had called the sociological imagination which he said "enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society" (p. 6). Lowenthal makes a connection with Harvey and Mills by adding that a locale of socialization is a main and necessary condition for the construction of society and of "self." By coupling these social conditions Lowenthal comes full circle: "If place
did not exist in some—and potentially in all—personal geographies, it could scarcely form part of a common worldview” (1967, p. 79).

Likewise, Durkheim in *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1938) grounded his study on the idea that “social facts” must be investigated as “things.” In his landmark book *Suicide* (1951) he espoused that nothing was more fundamental. He claimed that one’s desire, although a feeling, can be quantified and treated as a social fact. Although he never rejected the possibility of individual agency in the construction of social reality, he claimed that a collective consciousness of urbanites could still be objectified. Realism, in this Durkheimian style, has “the assertion that social reality, social structures, social currents, etc., have an existence over and above the existence of individual actors” (Jary, 1991. p. 410). Durkheim’s goal was to establish that social facts were, all in all, external to the individual, and could therefore be examined more objectively, like that found with *patterns of suicide*—or for this study: *the push and pull factors of U.S. counter-urbanization*.

The city push and small town pull factors that affected counter-urbanization are addressed here in regards to the development of a collective conscience of urbanites who moved out of urban society and into a rural community. The collective conscience of these individuals is what I term *Conflict Urbanists*. A Conflict Urbanist is conceptualized as a person who has lived an entire childhood and into adulthood in an urban area and by her or his own “free will,” moved from the city to a small town. Since, as Murphy alleged, “[c]ities can be indicators of the character of the societies and
cultures that brought them into being” (1967, p. 192), Conflict Urbanists are recognized as a specific group within an urban society that represents a slice of city life, enabling the “Urbanologist” to see social forces of the city in comparison with the small town in a different way.

By directly contrasting urban life against images of rural life, social scientific inquiry can explain the identity of the Conflict Urbanist. Primarily, scientists may assert that the identification of the Conflict Urbanist is based on a rejection of the stress and alienation of the city and instead acceptance of small town living; a belief in the health and virtue of a simpler life, and a place where people are united by common values.

As mentioned earlier, to approach this matter, ideal types are established to represent main components of the city and small town and thereby recognize what is most common, distinct, and essential in form and function about them. To do this, representations of bureaucracy, capitalization, community life and so on, are used as generalizations. Wirth claimed that while constructing ideal types of urban structures and life,

[a] sociological definition must obviously be inclusive enough to comprise whatever essential characteristics these different types of cities have in common as social entities, but it obviously cannot be so detailed as to take account of all the variations implicit in the manifold classes. Presumably some of the characteristics of cities are more significant in conditioning the nature of urban life than others, and we may expect the outstanding features of the urban-social scene to vary in accordance with size, density, and differences in the functional types of cities (1964, p. 65-66).
In determining the Conflict Urbanist’s common reasons for fancying the small town over an urban existence, a few aspects are viewed: 1) A brief historical overview of urbanization and counterurbanization so as to specify when and where rural migration has taken place. This overview will begin when the tidal wave of urbanization occurred in the U.S., just after the turn of the 20th Century, so that a rural migratory rip current can be observed in its entirety. 2) An understanding of the capitalist urban environment that Karl Marx and Max Weber theorized about. Aspects of urban alienation and its bureaucratically instituted “urban iron cage” are detailed to present a picture of the entrepreneurial driven, business landscape of the city. 3) A brief overview of how urbanization has affected city people through such factors as urban sprawl and the changing configuration of urban locales. Starting at the turn of the century, the built environment of the city took on a shape of towering steel and glass that expanded in all directions with no break in view. These patches of city that were stitched through time, developed into distinct locales that, through various states of urban technology, helped develop a certain mode of urban life. 4) The modern U.S. City is identified in relation to how the common Conflict Urbanist negotiated urban life. The four main zones of the city (Central Business District, Zone of Discard, Zone of Assimilation, and Zone of Transition) are identified in order to recognize the different components of a fragmented urban existence that created city push factors. 5) Some basic small town pull factors are positively identified. Images portrayed through advertising, for example, create a perception of small town living as the “good life.” These rural images starkly contrast the
city that present images of opportunity for disgruntled urbanites for a way out. 6)

Differences between cities and small towns are then identified regarding the Conflict
Urbanists motivation for migration. These differences are examined through the use of a
rural-urban continuum, but mainly by way of rural-urban comparative analysis. 7) An
understanding of who the Conflict Urbanist is in contrast to its opposing ideology. 8)

Finally, a contrast between community existence of the city and small town is detailed.

A theoretical model taken from the practice of dispute resolution is used to show how the
Conflict Urbanist ordinarily negotiated community conflict while living in the city.

Differences are identified between the city and small town by viewing community
institutions and their roles in community conflict.
In formulating a definition of the city it is necessary to exercise caution in order to avoid identifying urbanism as a way of life with any specific locally or historically conditioned cultural influences which, though they may significantly affect the specific character of the community, are not essential determinants of its character as a city (Wirth, 1964, p. 66).

Over time, urban structures of all characters were created both as a product and process of social interaction. The remnants that have braved time and the products of modern ingenuity have become part of today’s urbanist and as a result, a crossover of social interaction historically developed between urban dwellers and urban things. Historical comparisons are therefore important to make between the city and small town. Although comparisons have existed for centuries between the urban and rural worlds, for all practical purposes, in studying “modern” society, a good place to begin is at the turn of the 20th Century when the city was paving the super-highway for modernity and the majority of U.S. Americans, for the first time in its history, lived in urban areas.

The early part of the present century was characterized by a pattern of centripetal movements, which resulted in a rapid period of urbanization. By 1920 a majority of the population lived in urban areas. The centripetal movement continued not only to urban areas but more particularly to the larger urban areas centers (Zimmer, 1967, p. 81).

In 1930, just ten years after the ground breaking 1920 Census, Sorokin observed two distinct polarized worlds emerge:
In the course of time the cleavage between the city and the country grew, and correspondingly the differences between the urban and the rural social worlds increased. They increased quantitatively as well as qualitatively: many differential traits scarcely perceptible at the initial stages of the differentiation became clearer and more conspicuous, and, at the same time, several differences perceptible at the early stages developed further into several subclasses (1930, p. 186).

By the middle of the 20th Century, the small town had become a marginal form of community in a society dominated by metropolitan cities and suburban satellites. As the 20th Century progressed, the proportion of city dwellers rapidly grew. By “1960, the urban population was 69.9 percent, expanding to 73.5 percent a decade later” (Souza, 1979, p. 45), and as these numbers increased through time, intimate communities became lost within a kaleidoscope of neighborhoods.

The transition from country to city—from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban society—is transforming and significant. The growth of towns and especially of cities and a metropolis; the increasing division and complexity of labour; the altered and critical relations between and within social classes: in changes like these any assumption of a knowable community—a whole community, wholly knowable—became harder and harder to sustain (Williams, 1973, p. 165).

As a result of this 20th Century social condition, counter-urbanization occurred, created by the Conflict Urbanist’s dislike for “unknowable” urban communities and preference for rural “knowable” communities. This reflective process, ironically enough, was first set in motion by the increased scope of urbanization.
A reverse pattern of movement was set as the urban population in large centers began to expand beyond city boundary lines. This was a period of increased scale of local community life. A new type of communal organization developed as the radius of daily activities increased in scope. Villages and opened countryside that had once been independent of the large urban centers became engulfed in an enlarged community. The large city gave way to the metropolitan community. The territorial scope of this metropolitan community is more extensive than the city, but the function it serves is not different. It has replaced the city as both the producing and consuming unit (Zimmer, 1967, p. 81).

At a conceptual level the process of collective consumption has been put to use to define urbanization. For Castells (1976, p. 148) urban areas are a “residential unit of labour power . . . defined as . . . a unit of collective consumption.” Urbanization is both a structural and behavioral process that, over the course of the 20th Century, reached well beyond its physical borders. Through the far reaching scope of urbanization, both geographically and socially, the amenities and resources that were developed in the city acted back to generate an ebb and flow of amenity, resource, and culture carriers, thus cross-pollinating city with small town. As a result, migratory avenues were extended to the urbanist and accepted by the Conflict Urbanist.

Berry (1970) and others have posited a panorama of growth impulses spreading down the urban hierarchy. Analogous to the diffusion of innovation, migratory impulses spread like concentric waves, so that by the later part of the 1970’s a notable migratory cross-pollination was sound. Gunnar Myrdal (1957) calls this concept of circular causation backwash effects, where the ripple in the water has one regional source—the city, and any oscillations from outlying areas are kept at bay or consumed by the overarching tendrils of urbanization.
CHAPTER FOUR:
Rationalization of the Urban Iron Cage

Max Weber (1930, p. 78) says "[r]ationalism is an historical concept," for the character of a group changes as the character of social life historically changes. And with change, movement toward methodical, pragmatic, systemization became dominant within urban groups. Weber conceptualized rationalization as justification for social action toward urbanization. He saw that modern society had rationalized and made calculable what in primitive society had been done by chance. "Efficiency is simply not compatible with particularistic and whimsical rules that fail to provide enough systematic and predictable guidelines" (Weber, 1922, p. 36). Social change from traditional to rational society led to increasingly efficient bureaucratically administered societies. "Its significance for the development of capitalism is obvious" (ibid, p. 170). Once the importance of efficiency as a criterion entered society, it became impossible to uproot at the personal level since "[t]he capitalist economy of the present day is an immense cosmos into which the individual is born, and which presents itself to [us], at least as an individual, as an unalterable order of things in which we must live" (ibid, p. 54).

Weber then shows a link between a component of Protestantism: its ascetic ethos; with a component of capitalism: its rationality. The component of rationality in the capitalist system is reflected in a set of norms for conduct in the business arena that demand accountability. "We provisionally use the expression spirit of (modern) capitalism to describe that attitude which seeks profit rationally and systematically in the
manner that we have illustrated by the example of Benjamin Franklin" (ibid, p. 64) (also see Bellah, 1996). Specifically, the connection established by Weber is between a set of values and norms: the prescription for inner-worldly asceticism and the rules of business. “For it was this idea which gave the way of life of the new entrepreneur its ethical foundation and justification” (Weber, 1922, p. 75).

Simmel makes a connection with Weber’s findings by claiming that “the large cities, the main seats of the money exchange, brings the purchasability of things to the fore much more impressively than do smaller localities” (1950, p. 415). In a township, for instance, goods are produced specifically for local customers, so that the seller and buyer often know each other. In the modern city, conversely, rationality dictates that business is carried out almost altogether by production for the outlet, i.e., for sparse and unknown purchasers who will at no time enter into the personal realm of those whom the producer or owner really knows or will know. By this, urban business has rationalized personal production and barter to its burial. Therefore, unlike the strong emotional tone of trade in the small town, people in the city generally deem business relationships to be of benefit almost entirely because of “professional” dealings.

Monetary calculations became a much more important part of daily life because virtually all economic life was monetized . . . turning life into a series of rational economic calculations, which is what sound market behavior consists of, was deemed boring, and many intellectuals said that robbed the modern world of beauty and poetry, as did the machines produced by the Industrial Revolution . . . Such declines have brought about a series of recurring problems that intensified the sense of alienation (Chirot, 1994, pp. 56-7).
Cities are places where the greatest division of labor is found. Specialization occurs for the capitalist and administrator who perpetually kindles new wants in order to maximize consumption and profit. As a latent function however, the enhancement of capital "development" also developed a place of community differentiation. As a result of the ordered, yet transforming cosmopolitan process, the Conflict Urbanist's sense of what was necessary to negotiate their lives in a consistent manner was in constant flux.

Moreover, "this differentiation of the [urban] social structure and of people's lives within the structure weakens social bonds. People differ so much from each other in such things as jobs, neighborhoods, and life styles that moral consensus becomes difficult" (Fischer, 1984, p. 30). Carlyle diagnosed the separateness of people due to this urban bureaucratic environment: "There in their little cells, divided by partitions of brick or board, they sit strangers . . . It is a huge aggregate of little systems, each of which is . . . a small anarchy, the members of which do not work together, but scramble against each other" (Williams, 1973, p. 215). Within this environment, the Conflict Urbanist was in a constant state of social transformation, fragmentation and isolation. As a result of this creation and re-creation of urban life, a push factor developed for the Conflict Urbanist that suggested migration to a location where overall life was more manageable.

Another urban push factor, several scholars have argued, is that modernity has inaugurated new grids of power and surveillance which in Max Weber's well-known image, confined human agency, consciousness, and creativity within an iron cage of bureaucracy and regulation. The results are human confinement, for as urban amenities
grow in number and possibility, these new freedoms envelop the urban life in a cocoon of responsibilities, obligations, liabilities, and time-schedules.

The analytical precision of urban life filled the day of so many Conflict Urbanists with a myriad of calculations that it transfigured their qualitative experiences to quantitative values. Being driven by monetary value, relations in urban life developed an exactitude in engagements, time agendas, meetings and contracts.

The relationships and affairs of the typical urbanist is so manifold and so complex, and above all, urban relationships and activities are interwoven into an organism of so many parts through the agglomeration of so many persons with such varied interests, and goals that the whole would break down into an inextricable chaos without the most exact punctuality in promises and performances (Sorokin, 1930, p. 109).

Urban punctuality and haste are buttressed by the fragmented and expanding world of the city that forced itself upon the Conflict Urbanist. Beck (1992) likened the experience of living in modern cities to living on the volcano of civilization and identified modern cities with what he called the “risk society.” This analysis draws attention to the disconnected dynamics of modern cities that stands in the most intimate relationship with their money value and urban cultured character. Coming to this realization, many Conflict Urbanists, who had lived and worked in these bustling, yet alienated surroundings, came to realize that their output had “been secured at unconsidered costs and risks by the objective of immediate profit, which has replaced the older attitudes of living with the land” (Sauer, 1967, p. 25).
CHAPTER FIVE:

Urban Alienation

On the individual experiential level, urban life surrounds the resident with a constant bombardment of stimuli: sights, sounds, people, and social demands for attention, concern, and action. In response to this overstimulation, coping mechanisms are brought into play to defend the organism. Basically, they are means of isolation to him from his environment and from other people. The urbanite becomes aloof from others, superficial in his contracts with them, and blasé, sophisticated, and indifferent to the events which occur about him. His relationships to others are restricted to specific roles and tasks in a businesslike way (in contrast to the personal relationships of the small town). Thus, the urban individual, it is theorized, is estranged from his fellow man (Fischer, 1975, p. 207) [sic].

Typically, the Conflict Urbanist felt small, isolated and insignificant in the city. Her or his main problem existed “in the unruly forces of contemporary society itself, with its alienating methods of production, its enveloping techniques of political domination . . . in a word, its pervasive transformations of the very ‘nature’ of [the Conflict Urbanist] and the conditions and aims” of her or his life (Mills, 1959, p. 13). The Conflict Urbanist was “a mere cog in an enormous organization of things and powers which [tore from their] hands all progress, spirituality, and value in order to transform them from their subjective form into the form of purely objective life. The metropolis is the genuine area of this culture which outgrows all personal life” (Simmel, 1950, p. 422). The reason for this, Mills claims, is simple: “[w]ork in modern industry is work within a hierarchy: there is a line of authority and hence, from the under-side, a line of obedience. A great deal of work is semi-routine—which means that for higher output the operations of each worker are slivered and stereotyped” (1959, p. 93).
Mead (1934), as an urbanist himself, spoke of the fragmentation of city life as a byproduct of cosmopolitanism:

A multiple personality is in a certain sense normal . . . Two separate me's and I's, two different selves, result, and that is the condition under, which there is a tendency to break up the personality. There is an account of a professor of education who disappeared, was lost to the community, and later turned up in a logging camp in the West. He freed himself of his occupation and turned to the woods where he felt, if you like, more at home (p. 246).

Typically Conflict Urbanists, like this professor, were fed up with the overall alienation of urban life and wanted to live in a community in which they could control their lives more effectively.

For Karl Marx (1955), the problems the Conflict Urbanist experienced in the city concerning morale that Mills mentioned is more than likely a product of the alienation that is a specific result of urban relations. For instance, within most social systems one can discern connections between workers and the objects they produce: figuratively, the worker's signature is crafted into the product and guaranteed by the individual worker. Under modern capitalism, however, Conflict Urbanists were commonly disconnected, or alienated, from the products of their labor. This arose for a few principle reasons. Workers in an urban capitalist system, like that in which exists in the U.S., do not typically elect when to work; what to produce; how to compose production; or what to do with the products of their labor, these decisions are made by capitalists. Therefore, Conflict Urbanists were unable to identify themselves with the commodities they
fabricated. For the urban capitalist in particular, the separation between laborer and merchandise evaporates: working Conflict Urbanists were seen as input expenses in the same manner as raw goods; as interchangeable elements in the rational computation of commodity prices and profit rates.

Using this logic, Marx concluded that laboring urbanists were objectified under capitalism. With this conclusion, he attempted to show the relationship between the structural features of capitalism and the subjective feelings of exploited urbanists. An example can be found in deskilling: a process of job degradation in which work is progressively fragmented and stripped of its complexity, discretionary content, and knowledge base. Deskilling is an outcome of the labor process in which those with power, using the standards of scientific management, control the labor process, leaving laborers with redundant and mundane chores. Deskilling thus constitutes a substantial contribution to the overall urban blasé attitude.

Simmel continues by stating why a “selfless” self developed from the blasé attitude of urbanites: “If one remains in the same milieu they have no time to gather new strength. An incapacity thus emerges to recreate to new sensations with the appropriate energy.” (1950, p. 414). In response to this urban “selfless” self, Durkheim coined the term “anomie” to refer to a lack of social norms and regulation” that result in problems of identity (Cahill, 1998, p. 162). Basically, anomie is an abnormal social state, “resulting from the failure of modern societies to move fully from the mechanical solidarity characteristic of premodern societies to the organic solidarity that would come to typify
modern societies” (Jary, 1991, p. 21). “[U]nhappiness and social disorders result when society fails to provide a limiting framework of social norms. At one extreme, then, are institutions, with standards and sanctions all neat and orderly. At the other extreme, there is anomie: as Yeats says, the center does not hold . . . the normative order has broken down” (Mills, 1959, p. 29). The Conflict Urbanist may have recognized this breakdown since the more technologically sophisticated a social milieu and environment become, the more obvious are its manifest and latent functions.

Conflict Urbanists fought anomie by escaping the life of an alienated urbanite. They strove for what Berger and Kellner (See; 1964, pp. 1-24) called nomos: the opposite of anomie. Nomos essentially is an “orderly and predictable social experience that renders life meaningful” (Cahill, 1998, p. 162). Rural communities exemplify nomos since “the quality of people’s lives depends greatly on whether they belong to intimate social groups—groups of people on whom they can rely, who provide both moral support and moral restraint” (ibid. p. 169). In the bureaucratic environment of the city, conversely, modernity has brought locales of operation for social and spatial control that is conducive primarily for rational personal interaction.
CHAPTER SIX:
Theories of Space—the Locale

The intimate relationship of the environment and form is something that we need to impress on ourselves, for we are apt to approach the situation from the standpoint of a pre-existent environment just there, into which the living form enters or within which it happens, and then to think of this environment affecting the form, setting the conditions under which the form can live (Mead, 1934 p. 246).

Spatial organization created by capitalism generated specific urban locales, via *modern urbanization*, that in affect helped give rise to the conflict urban ideology.

Spatial organization through modern urbanization involves social mobilization by way of 1) the augmentation of more effectual and unified urban mechanisms (i.e., industrialization, communication, transportation), 2) the approval of scientifically rational norms (Weber, 1930), and 3) the resulting modification of social intercourse as a result of the impacts of #1 and #2. As an example of this transpiration, *urban sprawl* developed, that in turn, helped give rise to the step-by-step migration engaged in by some Conflict Urbanists.

Urban sprawl matured into what Bell (1973) termed the *postindustrial city*, which is defined as the dispersed development outside of compact urban centers along the highways and in the rural countryside. These locales provide jobs in various professions, such as management, administration, and skilled technical areas. To accommodate this enterprise, the built environment is composed of office buildings, architectural monuments, facades of public institutions, and houses. Its middle-class atmosphere may
be mirrored in a peculiar politics that is dependent on a "responsible social ethos . . . the demand for more amenities, for greater beauty and a better quality of life" (Bell, 1973, p. 367). But not infrequently a declining manufacturing workforce identifies such areas.

A small amount of these displaced urbanites rode the ripple of urban sprawl into the crevasses of the small town, while the consumer-seeking masses located themselves near the urban center. This inter-urban migration pattern perpetually assembles large numbers of people within a myriad of locales creating a multitude of social situations and definitions. Thus, landscape, organism, and space meld into a complex fabric that unfolds with social experience as scripts, and the built environment with a sense of place in a locale as the stage. Whether doing business at a bank; sitting in a movie theatre watching a *film noire*; or grocery shopping, specific behaviors are expected according to the setting one finds themselves in. Thereupon, people adjust themselves to and act according not only to whom they're interacting with and its definition of the situation, but also where the interaction is taking place. This being true, it is realized first hand that while in the city, one cognitively and socially adjusts themselves to the particular area of the city they are in. Since this is the case, human landscapes are both shaped by and themselves shaping social and cultural processes.

As a representation, complex architectures of modernity are commonly termed "art" that act as façades for better urban living in more "humane" and civilized surroundings. An example can be seen by looking at the main branches of city banks, legal institutions, and government buildings; they typically show a distinctive
architectural character, in that they are ordinarily fashioned in Greek or Romanesque styles that display power, authority, wealth and opulence in the form of skyward pillars, bold capitals, and embellished friezes. But as of late, “big boxes,” mini-malls, and billboards have lined the freeways of cities, creating for the urbanist an obscure and fragmented sense of place.

Architectural diversity also means functional diversity in that mingled themes represent endless personalities, needs, and interests that interact and overlap. Buildings from the 1870’s may be next to those from the 1920’s or from our own day. History finds a place for its participants by showing how each type of architecture arose through engagement with past generations and how each occupies a place in the broader tapestry. These structures are tangible reminders of the environments in which past generations of urbanites worked and played and lived out their lives. “There is a response of recognition as well as a response toward an object in the landscape; and this response of recognition . . .” (Mead, 1934, p. 83) gave historical-social meaning to the Conflict Urbanist through *communities of memory* (Bellah, 1996).

The endless array of urban architectures had a profound impact on Conflict Urbanists. Yet other urban mechanisms, such as subways, airlines, cruise-liners, and super-highways also had a profound affect on them. For example, the upward surge of an elevator displaces the “self” not only as an individual in relation to others in a vertical physical sense, but gives the urbanist a panoramic bird’s eye view; physical distance and isolation from others; safety concerns; heightened awareness of mobility; and so forth,
that are not experienced day-to-day in a small town. This can be seen through the concept of *hyperspace*, a controlling and often disorientating spatiality of postmodernism. The idea of hyperspace evolved out of Jameson's (1991) encounterings in the Bonaventure Hotel in Los Angeles "as a figure for a postmodern space which transcends the capacities of the individual human body to locate itself, to organize its immediate surroundings perceptually" (p. 184). Overall, urban mechanisms are connected to other urban mechanisms in varied and complex ways. This complicated system is confusing to the urbanist by virtue of the overwhelming number of structures in the city and the corresponding range of their functions. As a result of this modern arrangement, Habermas (1987) has insinuated that the rationalization process typical of modernity over-extended itself to such a scale that urbanites now encounter a multifaceted colonization of the lifeworld within a vast spectrum of locales.

Creator of *structuration theory* Anthony Giddens referred to locales as the characteristic physical location associated with different types of collectives: "virtually all collectivities have a locale of operation, spatially distinct from that associated with others" (1979, pp. 206-7). Moreover, all collectivities have defined locales of operation: landscapes associated with the "typical interactions composing those collectivities as social systems" (Giddens, 1981, p.39). For instance, the identification of urban localities that have been "ountrified" were inscriptions emblazoned by or for the Conflict Urbanist in the form of country restaurants, shops, fairs, and theme parks. Place henceforth becomes a "negotiated reality, a social construction by a purposeful set of actors. But the
relationship is mutual, for places in turn develop and reinforce the identity of the social group that claims them” (Ley, 1981, p. 22).

Constructed for the varied needs and interests of the numerous urbanites, the built environment of the city confronted the Conflict Urbanist in a most fragmented and amplified manner. In order to focus on their daily routines, a blasé mentality was predominant among Conflict Urbanists as an outcome of blocking out constant transforming urban images. Since the representation of urban life as a whole developed into a blurred picture as a result of the melding together of urban architectures for urban lifestyles, other locales could then be identified and contrasted. One aspect for the Conflict Urbanist was evident, the contrasting of urban with rural locales and images.

The city is easily contrasted with the small town since a rural settlement cannot be considered separately from the layout of fields and fences. “These elements are integral parts of the fabric of rural settlement, for the arrangement of farmsteads, hamlets, and villages is, in various ways, dependent upon the systems of fields, boundaries and roadways” (Bunce, 1982, p. 21). The Conflict Urbanist was confronted with opposite images concerning the differences between rapid urban regeneration and idle small town planning. This led to a step-by-step replacement of urban self-images with images of a possible rural self.

Many Conflict Urbanists realized that their individual positions, their material conditions of existence, and the overall layout of the city had controlled their stations in life. This urban blend created a world of transition, and hence confusion for them, and
giving them a primary reason why they rode the crest of "urban expansion" upon the wave of counter-urbanization away from the stormy seas of the city.
CHAPTER SEVEN

The City

The technological developments in transportation and communication which virtually mark a new epoch in human history have accentuated the role of cities as dominant elements in our civilization and have enormously extended the urban mode of living beyond the confines of the city itself. The dominance of the city, especially of the great city, may be regarded as a consequence of the concentration in cities of industrial, commercial, financial, and administrative facilities and activities, transportation and communication lines, and cultural and recreational equipment such as the press, radio stations, theatres, libraries, museums, concert halls, operas, hospitals, colleges, research and publishing centers, professional organizations, and religious and welfare institutions. Were it not for the attraction and suggestions that the city exerts through these instrumentalities upon the rural population, the differences between the rural and the urban modes of life would be even greater than they are (Wirth, 1964, p. 63-64).

The typical U.S. City extends wavelike over enormous areas: “The facilities and opportunities of the metropolis are generated by size, and their ready availability is an intrinsic element of the urban experience” (Fischer, 1975, p. 227). If the city were taken as a whole, the circuit of interchange of elements, in ratio to its inhabitants, is imposing. Look at the maps of the highways and railways; the trajectory of planes and ships; and pipelines and waterways, they all pivot around a city. The extensive numbers of the readers and subscribers of publications, newspapers, books, and magazines, the numbers of letters received and sent, the number of phone calls, voice mails, e-mails, and so on, are all in all, more numerous per capita than in a rural area (Sorokin, 1930). In short, any contemporary city of even moderate size is connected with the whole region and most
notably with its hinterland small town neighbors. In this sense, it would be more appropriate to say all roads lead “from Rome” instead of “to Rome.”

The urban population is more mobile, and methods of communication are more perplexing and dynamic than is communications in a small town. In a city, since there is little place for solitude, one cannot avoid the multitude of people with whom one has to navigate by in the streets, elevators, subways, offices, theatres, concerts, sporting events, parks, beaches—everywhere. Moreover, “as a general rule, it is usually the case that the larger the community, the greater the number of encounters with ‘strange’ people—strange both in the sense that they are unknown and that they are likely to look and act somewhat ‘strangely’” (Fischer, 1975, p. 213). Such a place-specific standpoint of the stranger or the outsider incites identification of what is called the social creation of unreality: a world of alienation surrounded by strangers.

Furthermore, Conflict Urbanists rarely saw thousands of individuals who worked in urban bureaucracies, institutions, departments, and agencies. Trapped in the urban iron cage, their responses were felt only in a roundabout way. For the Conflict Urbanist, only a tiny fraction of the persons with whom they interacted had familiar faces—despite Gans’ report of urban community life (1982). The greater proportions of them were only streetwalkers, drivers, shoppers, patrons, clients, and workers. Innumerable faces were only glimpsed at in traffic jams and store lines and they were looked at in the same manner as the innumerable billboards and business signs inscribed into the urban landscape.
The legion of people encountered by the Conflict Urbanist in subways, trains, buses, airplanes, elevators, and escalators, were only “commuters,” “passengers,” and “wanderers” to her or him and were unfamiliar outside those features. The same is also true of the people who went to the same restaurants; theatres and movies; work sites and conventions; and stores, markets, and malls. The Conflict Urbanist knew little, if anything, the personalities and life stories of the salespersons and cashiers in the shops they visited, and the gas station attendants, bus drivers and delivery people they dealt with. The very multitude of urban interactions and perpetual mobility made it unrealizable for the Conflict Urbanist to know their personalities, or their lives. “Their whole Gestalt, or disposition, remain[ed] unexplored. Hence, the inordinate large function in the urban complex of interaction is engaged by the entirety of meandering relations” (Sorokin, 1930, p. 236).

A mass collectivity of relations forged the circuitry of interaction for the Conflict Urbanist. The typical Conflict Urbanist could not recall, or infrequently if ever, wished to pursue acquaintance with a myriad of people with whom elbows were rubbed in the streets, corridors, and hallways. Countless contacts transpired in this fashion and were overlooked in a wink. Being midst a fluid, abundantly fluctuating, and heterogeneous human current, the Conflict Urbanist was compelled at any moment, to accommodate ones movements according to the flux of the urban tide. Overall daily functions, in this respect, turned into specialized “missions” with strict time schedules. Therefore, as
mentioned, it was necessary for each Conflict Urbanist to uphold a blasé front by ignoring others, except of course, those who served a specific personal function.

From the above mentioned, there is essentiality for standardized half-mechanical, ready-made, pre-packaged ideals of urban interaction. City life in this sense may be compared to a record player that played for the Conflict Urbanist a most superficial, external, and detached song. For instance, the “yes, sir” and “yes ma’am” of a working person in the city is only a regulated salutation for the particular happening of business. This blasé function is like “social fast food” in that; personality has little impact upon the definition of the situation.

The size and anonymity of the city, where no one knows anyone, provides little motivation for mutual concern that results in general indifference to others. The disgruntled fast-food employee takes orders with melancholy assertiveness; a busy business person hurries home, pushing and shoving through the crowded street where abrupt contacts are encountered by a single glimpse; an irritated man flicks through radio stations in his grid-locked cart; a derelict woman roams the street wanting a friend; and anyone in distress or in need of help or assistance is usually approached with empty stares or abrupt and crude responses—particularly in the crowded streets of the inner-city.

Hardy (1972, p. 216) beheld the inner city as a beast whose structure had millions of heads and twice as many eyes:
As the crowd grows denser it loses its character of an aggregate of countless units, and becomes an organic whole, a molluscus [gray] creature having nothing in common with humanity, that takes the shape of the streets along which it has lain itself, and throws out horrid excrescencies and limbs into neighboring alleys; a creature whose voice exudes from its scaly coat and who has an eye in every pore of its body. The balconies, stands and railway-bridge are occupied by small detached shapes of the same tissue, but of gentler motion, as if they were the spawn of the monster in their midst.

Being such a social and spatial complex system, sociologists and geographers have broken the city down into four main zones: Central Business District, Zone of Discard, Zone of Assimilation, and Zone of Transition. Mills (1959) claims that by observing each area of the city, examination of urban life will involve an overall sociological imagination:

What we experience in various and specific milieux . . . is often caused by structural changes. Accordingly, to understand the changes of many personal milieux we are required to look beyond them. And the number and variety of such structural changes increase as the institutions within which we live become more embracing and more intricately connected with one another. To be aware of the idea of social structure and to use it with sensibility is to be capable of tracing such linkages among a great variety of milieux. To be able to do that is to possess the sociological imagination (p. 11).

7.1 The Central Business District—Downtown

The very turmoil of the streets has something repulsive, something against which human nature rebels. The hundreds of thousands of all classes and all ranks crowding past each other, are they not all human beings with the same qualities and powers, and with the same interest in being happy? And have they not, in the end, to seek happiness in the same way, by the same means? And still they crowd by one another as though they had nothing in common, nothing to do with one another, and their only agreement is the tacit one, that each keep to his own side of the pavement, so as not to delay the opposing streams of the crowd, while it occurs to no man to honour another with so much as a glance. The brutal indifference, the unfeeling isolation of each in his private
interest becomes the more repellent and offensive, the more these individuals are crowded together, within a limited space. And, however much one may be aware that this isolation of the individual, this narrow self-seeking is the fundamental principle of our society everywhere, it is nowhere so shamelessly barefaced, so self-conscious as just here in the crowding of the great city. The dissolution of mankind into monads, of which each one has a separate principle, the world of atoms, is here carried out to its utmost extremes (Engels, 1844, p. 72).

There are too many actors on the stage of the Central Business District (CBD), so many in fact that; “crowding has been blamed for a host of social ills” (ibid, p. 101).

“Oft-quoted researchers interpret density as a direct causal force on individuals usually as a force that creates pathologies” (Fischer, 1977, p. 5). Conflict Urbanists particularly, identified the crowding of the CBD as a source of insecurity, resulting in a loss of customary human feelings (Williams, 1973). Carlyle wrote about inner-city life in 1831: “How men are hurried here; how they are hunted and terrifically chased into double-quick speed; so that in self-defense they must not stay to look at one another!” (ibid, p. 215). The hectic pace of the CBD makes people more nervous and less friendly than small town people. This social bearing creates conditions, like transience, which support animosity and thus crime. As a result, “the modern metropolis does not generate the kinds of second languages of social responsibility and practices of commitment to the public good that we saw in the associational life of the strong and independent township” (Bellah, 1996, p. 177).

Primarily, “the predominant school of thought and popular opinion both hold that residing in cities, in and of itself, tends to alter people’s minds and social lives, largely for the worst” (Fischer, 1984, p.1). A
reason is that the metropolitan crowd is one in which urban life is "sharply separated and often contradictory, a world of diverse, often hostile groups, interdependent in ways too complex for any individual to comprehend" (Bellah, 1996, p. 177) [Italics added].

In and around the CBD the relationships and affairs of the typical metropolitan is usually so varied and complex that "without the strictest punctuality in promises and services the whole structure would break down into an inextricable chaos" (Simmel, 1950, p. 412). The CBD is, in fact, the most exciting and threatening social and psychological repercussion of mobility ever formed. "[T]he aggregation of so many people with such differentiated interests, who must integrate their relations and activities into a highly complex organism" (ibid) makes this true. Since the CBD has to manage an abounding number of people in a limited place, it is a heart-less and unnatural system of operations and institutions.

The CBD, in its entirety, is the quintessential representation of the city proper in form and function and where the modern pillars of urban engineering take root. Its skyscrapers display a geometric design of both skyline and social orderliness. These characteristics become lighter as they shade into other regions of the city: the other three zones according to the Chicago Sociologists are 1) Zone of Discard, 2) Zone of Assimilation, 3) and Zone of Transition.

7.2 The Zone of Discard—Skid Row

Warehouses, storage yards, recycling centers, parking lots, run down motels, pawn shops, neglected parks, pot filled roads, and shabby apartments typify the Zone of
Discard. This zone is ordinarily on the outermost periphery of downtown. The tenants whom reside there tend to inhabit the area neighboring the Central Business District at which place the early department buildings, hotels, restaurants, and movie houses and theatres are located. Several of the archaic hotels have become renter hotels that gave rise to one of the principal functions of the Zone of Discard. For example, most hotels became problem hotels; street hotels where junkies, prostitutes, the poor, people who are houseless, the mentally precarious, and of course, the cops abound. Adult stores and theaters, pawnshops and dime stores, and mom and pop burger joints draw in this cultural tossed salad off the streets. The subtle humming of telephone wires and streetlights are barely heard through the hustle and bustle: sounds of screeching brakes, buses, helicopters, car alarms, sirens, jetliners, and thumping “music” all create and recreate a symphonic nightmare. Yet, unless really listened for, the human voice floats away alone.

The Zone of Discard is the area that is also referred to as skid row—the zone of sleazy motels and down trodden eateries like those described in Slim's Table (Duneier, 1992). In fact, the term skid row is interchangeable with the term slum: a poverty-ridden population, unhealthy environment, and a district that is rife with crime and vice from the spinnings of riffraff. Rabble is everywhere to be encountered, from the ordinary huckster, shark, hood, and thug to the professional con artist and grifter. Their conduct is intolerable—from spitting on the sidewalks to tagging their turf. A simple look on the ground reveals their careless attitude. Countless cigarette butts, gum and potato chip wrappers, and aluminum cans are found on almost every street corner and parking lot.
In some cases leaving home landed young Conflict Urbanists onto the shores of this dilapidated territory since it lodges a collection of transient inhabitants, notably those having troubles (the skids). “A few people had moved into the area to hide from the world, and, while visible to their neighbors, could discourage contact, and thus feel anonymous (Gans, 1982, p. 4). The Zone of Discard also lodged those Conflict Urbanists who couldn’t swing it in “mainstream” urban society and who were frequently afflicted by a medley of lamentations, such as alcoholism and drug abuse.

Some Conflict Urbanists who lived in the Zone of Discard are not ordinarily associated with the vagrant or the streetwalker, the pimp or the wino, or those seen pushing shopping carts and filling the nooks and crannies of empty urban spaces; they were steady working, retired, laid-off, or in transition. For instance, Conflict Urbanists who were low ranking military personnel and unemployment recipients were attracted to the low rent these areas offered. Another example can be seen from those Conflict Urbanists who were naturalized citizens. This group actually strove to belong, at least for a while, in the belly of this decomposed district. By occupying run down quarters where bargain rate rooms and a place to master the ropes were accessible, they acculturated the landscape, language, food and so on, and called this destitute realm names such as “Chinatown” or “Little Italy.”

Yet, another class is embedded in this putrid habitat: the owners of the skid row establishments. Some of these “fortunate” few, despite their geographical station, have been granted designated immunity. “A retreat to the country or coast, from this kind of
hell, is . . . a different vision from the mere contrast of rural and urban ways of life. It is, of course, a rentier’s vision: the cool country that is sought is not that of the working farmer . . .” but of the fortunate capitalist (Williams, 1973, p. 46-47). “For many upper-class people, the personal solution to ‘the problem of the city’ is to have an apartment with private garage under it in the heart of the city, and forty miles out, a house by Henry Hill, garden by Garrett Eckbo, on a hundred acres of private land” (Mills, 1959, p. 9-10). The capitalist living or working in the Zone of Discard, in this way, leaves the rat race to become a weekend Conflict Urbanist.

7.3 The Zone of Assimilation

Cities developed into places that are not only allied with crime, corruption, lechery, vice, impersonality, unfriendliness, lack of generosity, and poverty like that found in the CBD and Zone of Discard, but also of faceless people that surround themselves with superficial “toys” and possessions. In the city the “[c]apacity to produce and capacity to consume are the twin spirals of the new age which is to have no end” (Sauer, 1967, p. 24). The term *conspicuous consumption* is used to define this class. “Rather than consuming goods or services for their utility, Veblen suggests that a substantial amount of consumption is for show alone, that is, the demonstration of one’s social status” (Jary, 1991, p. 80). Conflict Urbanists, while in the *Zone of Assimilation*, were commonly turned off by the self-aggrandizement of the people who passed through its streets and department stores. Some Conflict Urbanists felt blase in a fragmented
world of mid-rise buildings—like medical complexes and hospitals; insurance companies and banks; hotels and resorts; malls and emporiums; restaurants and fancy eateries; pubs and night clubs; and movie complexes and theatres, that are intermixed with condominiums and apartment buildings; and large houses and estates.

From both an aesthetic and practical vantage point, the Zone of Assimilation is architecturally diverse. In most circumstances in fact, it is the most diverse section of the city. At this point the Promo Urbanist would most likely point to the charming sidewalk shops, cafes, boutiques, outdoor shopping centers, and marts that all have a suitable ambiance for a sense of street life. Within those places and spaces Conflict Urbanists, however, may have found problems with massive freeways and related on and off ramps that create congestion for street travelers. Traffic lights may have also been a problem for the Conflict Urbanist since they are timed long. Finally, finding parking in sprawling and overcrowded parking lots was a common problem for them. An endless number of cars are crammed into vast parking structures while other cars, as in a procession, clog the streets. Still others line the streets, acting with their vacant shells as porous buffers between the street and sidewalk.

With these enclosing structures of "institutions, in the wonders and comforts of space—conquering technology, in the visible institutions of the state, is offered such an overwhelming fullness of crystalized and impersonalized spirit that the personability, so to speak, cannot maintain itself under its impact" (Simmel, 1950, p. 422). A release from the tension created by these three zones was needed and finally addressed in the 1940’s.
Since a “feature of population concentration is the popular preference for less-dense areas, combined with the desire to be near the social and economic opportunities of the metropolis” (Fischer, 1975, p. 227), suburbanization was planned.

7.4 The Zone of Transition—the Burbs

“Cities spread in tentacular fashion into the countryside, and seem to cover the earth in asphalt and concrete” (Souza, 1979, p. 43). Suburbs are a place with an admixture of concrete, steel and stucco with that of trees, grass, and open spaces. It performs as a figurative wetland—a gateway to two divergent worlds. This area dubbed the Zone of Transition, is also known as the rural-urban fringe. These communities, weather in valleys, along lakes, or near beaches come in many forms. From apartment complexes to gated communities, the suburban lifestyle has been depicted in several ways as the “ordinary” American lifestyle. Many Conflict Urbanists, in different ways, made a comparison between leading an “ordinary” life with that of living a “simple” life. This vision came clearer and clearer as urbanization cross-pollinated the suburbs with the small town.

As urban stepping-stones that lead to rural places, “urban services in outlying areas” developed over time that provided access to the most pastoral of places (Hawley, 1981, p. 4-5).

These included extension of telephone lines and toll free zones, of power lines, of gas and water pipelines; a reorganization of local governments enabling them to provide more effective police and fire
protection, street lighting and maintenance, schools and recreation facilities, and numerous other amenities; and a proliferation of retail and professional services (ibid).

Weiss (1962) claims that this transpired, by virtue of the fact, that social and cultural boundaries are dynamic and fluid. Linguistic, religious, and economic social pockets, etc. are oftentimes intersecting and porous rather than impermeable. This condition fortifies the difference between the built environment and the natural environment within the limits of the city that encompasses the suburbs. The growth of metropolitan organization, which has greatly expanded the scope of urban life, has resulted from "the conquest of distance" as a barrier to community size (Zimmer, 1967, p. 29). The lowering of the barriers concerning urban-rural distance has made possible an extension of the radius of urban community. From this Simmel makes a simple connection between the city proper and the suburbs; the "city consists of its total effects which extend beyond its immediate confines" (1950, p. 419).

By way of illustration, in the compact city of the nineteenth century, the radial scope of local organization rarely exceeded ten miles. By contrast, as a result of the forging together of the "outskirts" of the city to the city proper, the metropolitan community, as early as 1950, had a radial distance of thirty-five miles or more from the central city. In this way, the suburbs are a part of the city as is the solitary cabin is to the small town. In light of this boundary definition, the aim of the Conflict Urbanist was to break away from the metropolitan arena, whether from the inner city or from the fringes of suburbia, and feel free—with a new life and a new view in a small town.
CHAPTER EIGHT:

The Small Town

What we wish to know is not so much how a settlement of 2,500 differs from one of 2,499 inhabitants, nor even how one kind of human settlement as a settlement differs from another, but rather how one mode of human association which may be closely related to a type of human settlement conditions behavior and problems. This general question for purposes of analysis should lead us to ask how numbers, density, and heterogeneity affect the relations between [people] (Wirth, 1964, p. 224).

“Confusion is often associated with the use of the term ‘rural,’ whether referring to areas or populations. Rural is often used in a generic sense to mean those bucolic and less settled areas outside cities and suburbs” (Hawley, 1981, p. 5) where “[s]ocial relationships [are] largely confined to the distance of an easy walk” (Gergen, 1991, p. 7). In addition, in the small town hospitality, fairness, prudence, frugality, and loyalty are most perfected. The whole web of existence concerning rural socialization is therefore tinted with a coat of affection, and concreteness. Since a provincial population is more or less uniform, and stays in tact for several years or throughout an entire generation, the bulk of relations that make up the order of interaction of a rural citizen are authentic, rooted, and stable. The small town person has a relatively open realm for interaction with a modest sum total of individuals. This leads to the reality that face-to-face relations forge a much greater component of ones life than that of the urban resident. For this reason, small town people are not merely abstractions like the people found roaming the streets of the city.
While in the city the Conflict Urbanist was attracted to the "fact" that everybody knows everybody in the small town. Generally, the Conflict Urbanist embraced the doctrine that small town communities are small enough for members to get to know one another. This implies that there are seldom any social barriers to getting to know someone, despite the fact that in most small towns not everybody in all reality could know everybody. What is essential however, is that the Conflict Urbanist may have been drawn to the assumption that anyone could get to know someone if they wished, unlike in the city where "some therapists point out that the very mobility, privacy, and urban living [Promo Urbanists] value rob them of opportunities to get to know each other at a reasonably intimate level in casual, unforced circumstances" (Bellah, 1996, p. 135).

In essence, this and many other conditions of small town living pulled in the Conflict Urbanist. They were attracted by the size and pace of rural communities that supports greater sociability through common activities and interests and to the idea that the small town nurtures a personality that highly values its fellow community members, in contrariety to their urban counterparts. The Conflict Urbanist for instance, may have heeded that the humble size of a small town nourishes ambient factors that invite people to become involved in communal activities; bestow good fortune to other members of their community; and be neighborly. Undoubtedly, while in the city, the Conflict Urbanist became informed about these small town virtues through a variety of social mediums, such as: radio programs, movies, TV, literature, the Internet, travel, myths, stories, songs, pictures, fairs, and advertisements.
8.1 Advertisement

There are definite conditions of push and pull factors influencing a conflict urban ideology via the medium of advertisement.

Every interest and power, every passion and bias, every hatred and hope tends to acquire an ideological apparatus with which to compete with the slogans and symbols, the doctrines and appeals of other interests. As public communications are expanded and speeded up, their effectiveness is worn out by repetition; so there is a continuous demand for new slogans and beliefs and ideologies (Mills, 1959, p. 81).

Rural life like the books and movies that portray it, shape ideologies and hence, aid in the development of a collective conscience, a collective conscience that no longer desired to “sacrifice quality for quantity” (Fischer, 1977, p. 13). Country and small town themes displayed through the media, theatre, movies, commercials, or writings, altogether finesse the conflict urban ideology to counter urban images. Such themes are pervasive in urban America as Weightman (1981) professes: “While country music is achieving new heights of popularity, country fashions, cooking, and home décor are extolled by a variety of media and country settings are successfully employed to sell cigarettes, liquor, automobiles,” and so on (p. 55).

Much of what has been written about rural life and landscape is romantic and at times utopian, thus adding a small town pull factor for the Conflict Urbanist: “If we add to the literature, the large number of paintings, and musical works that portray rural scenes and emotions, we are left in little doubt that, however defined; the rural area has been and remains a fundamental and distinct element in our view of the world” (Bunce,
1982, p. 14). Insofar as it represented the desires of the Conflict Urbanist, modern advertising of even the most mundane of rural character rendered a vivid explication of the symbolic value of small town life and landscape.

As an example, real estate agents, being keenly aware of the strong sentiments that favor the various virtues of country living, commonly pitch the spiritual and physical pleasures of rural settings and counter them with the inconveniences of commuting through traffic and poorly serviced city sectors. They also suggest to their clients that the small town is notably right for families. Through various forms of advertisement, such as the last example, a message is reinforced for the Conflict Urbanist who thereafter identified a pull factor, that: “[f]amilies are important groups in any society, but especially in rural society” (Kolb, 1964, p. 201). They may have come to realize that the small town is excellent for children because the family atmosphere and intimate social scale make it possible for parents to know and control their child’s world. For instance, neighbors commonly form parental networks that commission other community members as surrogate parents. In the city on the other hand, kids freely roam the streets with minimal parental supervision.

Conflict Urbanists were led to believe that small towns were ideal places for families because their natural settings are suitable for the whole family. Several forms of media display small town people riding horses, biking, hiking, climbing, fishing, picnicking, and so forth; as opposed to playing in a fabricated park among druggies and degenerates. This contrast, for parental Conflict Urbanists, presented two opposites—
opposites that created a reaction: to swim to calmer waters, not just to the eddy of suburbia, but to the ponds of rural life.

Being that there are fundamental differences between the city and small town, a picture is drawn concerning these two opposing environmental and social milieux. By this, the Conflict Urbanist rationally measured out the social and psychological pluses and minuses regarding where they wanted to live. In identifying these pluses and minuses “we might have to ignore the statistically defined categories of urban and rural areas and deal rather with degrees on a continuum” (Wirth, 1964, p. 224). Although a continuum will be viewed, detailing the differences between city and small town is the most critical component in determining why a conflict urban ideology developed.
CHAPTER NINE:

Differences Between the City and Small Town

It has been known for some time that the use of the simple three-fold residence categories of urban, rural non-farm, and rural farm without refinement leads to numerous absurdities. On the one hand, the urban population may encompass a metropolis such as Detroit or New York containing millions and a Podunk Center containing a scant 2,500 persons. On the other hand the rural population is a composite which includes persons residing on farms as well as persons in rural areas but classified as “nonfarm.” A large fraction of these people are fully associated with the life of urban areas (Campbell, 1975, p. 95).

For instance, several people who reside in a small town commute to the city for work. This is due in large part to today’s development and accessibility of transportation and communication. For positioned urbanites, there are a variety of avenues that can be taken to escape the crowded city for the countryside. Coincidentally, this process of urbanization has made the concept of most small towns residues on the landscape. Although some rural characteristics have remained over time, these elements have also become evermore obscure over time by urban encroachment:

Because the city is the product of growth rather than of instantaneous creation, it is to be expected that the influences which it exerts upon the modes of life should not be able to wipe out completely the previously dominant modes of human association. To a greater or lesser degree, therefore, our social life bears the imprint of an earlier folk society, the characteristic modes of settlement of which were the farm, the manor, and the village. This historic influence is reinforced by the circumstances that the population of the city itself is in large measure recruited from the countryside, where a mode of life reminiscent of this earlier form of existence persists. Hence we should not expect to find abrupt and discontinuous variation between urban and rural types of personality (ibid. p. 62).
In general, the social and physical makeup of city and small town has no sharp divisions or clearly marked boundaries. Rather there are smooth gradations from one to the other, so that there is no definite point where it can be said that the urban way of life ends and the rural way of life begins. This blurring of boundaries stems in large measure from the impact of urbanization’s ability to reach well beyond the limits of its built environment: “We may infer that rural life will bear the imprint of urbanism in the measure that through contact and communication it comes under the influence of cities” (Wirth, 1964, p. 65-66). Several urban ways have been transferred into rural areas that, in turn, became staples of rural existence. A complex division of labor, for example, has frequently been used as a criteria of what is urban. Yet, logging settlements in the West have occupational specialties within a structured chain of command. In this way and innumerable others, urbanization trickles into small towns, villages, and farms.

As the distance beyond its physical borders becomes greater, aspects of urbanization fade. This phenomenon known as distance-decay shows a decline of urban ways of life. Its general principle is based on the assumption that while everything is related to everything else, nearer things are more related than more distance things. Notwithstanding, the rate of interaction decline with distance varies enormously depending on the particular objects or places and on the particular functional context, definition of the situation, social-psychological circumstances, etc.

Urban ways of life are stitched into rural places, and as Hawley (1981) stated, these urban threads are by-products of the
. . . events in industrial movements, local government changes, the shifting status pattern, and the growing inclusiveness of the organizational structure of the nation toward a convergence of nonmetro and metro sectors. Institutions and life-styles cultivated in metro areas [are taking] fuller possession of nonmetro territory, and in the process [are being] modified by and adapted to nonmetro conditions (p. 20).

Soon after urbanization seeped into the countryside, fundamental geographical and sociological conditions of rural-urban classification became translated into the rural-urban continuum. The rural-urban continuum is a typology of communities, which relates social characteristics to locations. From the 1930s to the 1960s the rural-urban continuum represented the major operating scheme of empirical material in rural and urban sociology and geography. Its claim was that the city and small town blend together with different shades of gray (fig. 1). For instance, while observing different forms of transportation in regards to such factors as overall influence, availability, utility, importance, and so forth, we do not find clear boundaries between the country, hamlet, village, town, suburb, and city since there are several degrees of similarities and differences between them. To put it briefly, whether comparing the Central Business District to its antithetical farmhouse, degrees of urbanization and degrees of small town existence applies to the way people live.

Despite the many similarities between urban and rural environments in regards to a cross-pollination of overall way of life, there are some basic differences between the two. Since urban areas with population growth are the norm it is possible that the people in rural areas which do not have enough population growth to be reclassified to urban
Figure 1. Transportation Variables within Political Boundaries
would stay unique at some level. When dealing with these dissimilar elements Wirth advised to establish ideal types: "in viewing urban-industrial and rural-folk society as ideal types of communities, we may obtain a perspective for the analysis of the basic models of human association as they appear in contemporary civilization" (1964, p. 62).

Since sociology is interested primarily in the differences that are general in space and relatively constant in time—that is, those that appear in a more or less conspicuous form in the past and in the present, and in all the rural and urban social worlds—we shall take only the differential variables that we study are typical not only for this or that particular city and its near-by rural aggregate, but for the city and the country generally whenever and wherever they occur (Sorokin, 1930, p. 23).

By using ideal types it is shown that the city and small town render some general differences. To construct the urban and rural worlds into a composite formalization, examples of some principal social components are needed to give a basic understanding of the differences between them. By far the most frequent attempts of rural-urban differentiation have been comparative theories. The terms are different, as are their measurements, but the idea of contrasting the qualities of an urban with a nonurban society has been a prevailing characteristic. Here is a list of some of the most familiar ones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkheim</td>
<td>Mechanical Solidarity</td>
<td>Organic Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Feudal</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Ascription</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfield</td>
<td>Folk</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnies</td>
<td>Gemeinschaft</td>
<td>Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although each of these dichotomies differs in focus, they all show that distinctive differences between the rural and urban worlds exist. Accordingly, they are less explicit as a means of identifying specific characteristics than a continuum because identification of any distinctive element requires only that some particular characteristic be present. A continuum, on the contrary, demands a specification of amount or degree. The difference is the same as that between whether one object is larger or heavier than another object. Accordingly, it would be more beneficial to examine Conflict Urbanism by determining whether or not a society is an urban one, than it would be to judge how much more urbanized one society is than another.
If, for instance, we were to compare the city with the small town, we would inevitably find that small towns are more homogenous. Socio-psychical characteristics, such as language, beliefs, opinions, mores, gestures, dress, symbols, patterns of behavior, and so on, are clearly uniform and similar. The small town community serves as a proficient example of this lifestyle that has similar types of personalities. Conversely, since the city is akin to a vacuum that uproots its rural dwellers in a regional, national and international scope, the populations of urban communities are less homogeneous than that of rural communities. Being a social kaleidoscope the city exemplifies heterogeneity that is comprised of more diverse and distinct social denominations than found in the small town.

Moreover, city populations further represent heterogeneity in that people have been thrown together from different nationalities, religions, principles, values, morals, customs, beliefs, standards, conduct, manners, courtesies, tastes, and “urbanity.” In this way, the city is a co-habitation of the most dissimilar kinds of human personalities and groups. “A community in which coexists the most opposite and contrasting types of human beings: geniuses and idiots; blacks and whites; healthiest and unhealthiest; millionaires and paupers; . . . saints and criminals; atheists and fundamentalists; radical reactionaries and radical revolutionaries” (Sorokin, 1930, p. 22).

Another standard difference between the city and small town is found while observing employment. In the city the urbanite, as a rule, does not shoulder more than one service. For instance, the businessperson is a businessperson exclusively; the
salesperson is a salesperson, and so on. In a rural vicinity, on the other hand, one and the same individual regularly occupies manifold services. A livestock breeder may be partly farmer, shopkeeper, town hall clerk, and firefighter (Sorokin, 1930). Small towns in the U.S. are often comprised of people resoundingly busy in agriculture or employed in one of its many peripheral or complimentary supporting roles. The nature of agriculture prompt cultivators to work out doors more than do the employees in the plurality of the characteristic urban occupations. Essentially, small town workers are laid open to the oscillations of numerous climatic elements: “they are in much greater proximity to, and in more direct relation with nature—soil, flora, fauna, water, sun, moon, sky, wind, rain, . . . and so forth—than an urbanite. The urban dweller is separated from all this by the thick walls of huge city buildings and the artificial city environment of stone and iron” (ibid, p. 188). Williams draws on rural pull and urban push elements to establish a polarity between the two: “The means of agricultural production—the fields, the woods, the growing crops, the animals—are attractive” to the Conflict Urbanist when “contrasted with the exchanges and counting-houses of mercantilism . . .” (Williams, 1973, p. 46).

Cities and small towns differ in several other ways. For example, the distinction among small town people in respect to class position is not significantly weighty; thus its entire small town constitution is more uniform than that found within the urban aggregate. Although solid class demarcation resides in rural society, this separation is often not the principal reason for the standards of associations, whereas in urban society stratification is more open and up-front. The gap between the corporate money-grubber
to the standard laborer in the city (the range from the top-notch station of the most
desired position to the rock-bottom position of the most uninviting job) is greater than
that which exists in the small town (Sorokin, 1930). Urban-rural stratification also
claims a visual front that is interpreted, for instance, in urban skyscrapers, when
compared with the two floor shops in the small town. In these respects and in
innumerable other cases, cosmopolitan communities are a great deal more stratified and
feature unrivaled contrasts over their rural counterpart communities.

Since a stratified community brings forth alienation and discontent, why is it that
some urbanites subject themselves, nay, indulge themselves in city life, a place where
populations swell in unity—but are divided thereby? Observing the counterpart of the
Conflict Urbanist may help distinguish a distinctive conflict urban collective conscience.
CHAPTER TEN:
The Promo Urbanist

"Knowledge is . . . the product of a series of social encounters, within movements, between movements, and even more important perhaps, between movements and their established opponents" (Eyerman, 1991, p. 57-8) Since "the question of difference is one with the question of identity" (Williams, 1973, p. 3) an antithesis to the much-talked about Conflict Urbanist exists—the "Promo Urbanist." Conflict Urbanists and Promo Urbanists (people raised in the city and are urban "promo"tionists or boosters of the city and claim that if they had any place to live it would be in the city) embrace the view that small towns are easy going—or dull, and that cities are bustling and overwhelming—or spirited and zestful places respectively. Although the excitement of the city is usually preferred over the dullness of the small town, money and position are ordinarily the alluring elements for the typical Promo Urbanist.

Wealth in the form of aristocratic money (the bourgeoisie in the Marxian sense) is centralized via the city. "Everywhere noble, aristocratic in the social sense, is the basic concept from which good in the sense of an aristocratic soul, noble, with a soul of high order, with a privileged soul necessarily developed" (Neitzche, 1967, p. 28). In a call to the utilitarian duty the Promo Urbanist took shape through the rational choice of achieving or sustaining success by becoming urbanized. "In its earliest usage . . . the term urbanize meant make urban, that is, render something or someone polished or refined" (Jary, 1991, p. 536). Polished or otherwise, the Promo Urbanist is inclined to
battle traffic; put up with long lines in stores and shops; and drink dirty water and breathe smog if the pay is viable.

Career and job opportunities are abundant in the city for middle class, upper-middle class and wealthy Promo Urbanists whom value status, money and success over the many urban problems. To neutralize the negative impacts of urban existence and to counter the alluring elements of small town living, the Promo Urbanist may focus on the fact that cities are the point of convergence for social life. As a result, the city brims with prospects from a medley of business opportunities. This is true since "cities exemplify all that seems modern: industry and commerce, technology and mechanization, complexity and commotion, and especially scale—large buildings, large institutions, large numbers of everything" (Fischer, 1982, p. 1).

At heart, this condition of cosmopolitanism provides a variety of business and educational avenues for "[u]rbanites . . . because more are available" (Fischer, 1984, p. 187). This urban pull factor provides the Promo Urbanist with "diversity that is valued both in its own right and as a source of excitement . . . personal enrichment . . . and the educational experience of living amid many distinct cultures" (Fischer, 1982, p. 193). Moreover, "urban areas . . . have a clear advantage" in that, "the larger the community, the greater the availability and diversity of services and facilities" (Fischer, 1984, p. 73).

On the contrary, since small towns are deprived of accessibility or assortment of material things and diverse cultural activities, many Promo Urbanists see small towns as unpolished and closed-minded. In essence, small towns lack opportunities for growth in
relation to the "finer" things of life and therefore lack the utilitarian vision to get ahead. The Promo Urbanist often claims that the sociability of the town is a manifestation, not of friendly intercourse, but of tediousness and pettiness, ceaselessly having to endure the dull interactive "pleasantries" that so often occurs when one leaves their own front door. Since small towns are gossipy and chatty, a Promo Urbanist may say that small town life is best portrayed with living life under a microscope, while the diversity of the city in opposition provides individualism and anonymity. In this manner, and many others, the transitory interaction that is accepted by its people as a condition of city life, in contrast to the time consuming ho-hum conversations in the small town, create urban pull and rural push factors for the Promo Urbanist that ultimately kept them in the city.

Promo Urbanists simply chose a lifestyle that agreed with their belief of what a successful environment is. Other urbanists, on the other hand, value a peaceful environment over a successful one, but remain in the city nonetheless. An explanation may be, that someone who wants to move out of the city, but stays with their spouse by reason that she or he can't leave the city, is neither Conflict Urbanist nor Promo Urbanist. Many situations like this one keep some urbanites from moving to the small town. Thereafter, these conditions become by-products of urban community conflict. All in all, these Disgruntled Urbanists would be Conflict Urbanists if they possessed the means to carry out their missions or their desire to move was greater than the social and psychological repercussions of moving. Conflict Urbanists, on the contrary, took the necessary steps to fulfill their vision of a new life. For whatever reasons each Conflict
Urbanist had personally, a social movement was set in motion by the overarching opportunities of social institutions that connect the city to the small town.
CHAPTER ELEVEN:

The Conflict Urbanist

As country roads turned into city boulevards, a labyrinth developed and with it interaction made of blasé relationships. Hardy (1972) is correct in a sense; we become detached, even removed when our numbers swell and as our environment becomes a complex network. Due primarily to this, Conflict Urbanists shared feelings that ran counter to their own social solidarity and their own people. A key reason why this occurred is that "... in the great city itself, the very place and agency—or so it would seem—of collective consciousness, is an absence of common feeling" (Williams, 1973, p. 215). As a result, the city "attract[s] and retain[s] certain types and repel[s] and lose[s] others" (ibid). As a consequence of being repelled by the city, Conflict Urbanists used distinctions between rural and urban communities to describe and explain reality in a way that motivated and legitimated their commitment for change. Primarily, these distinctions were based on conflicts experienced in the city.¹

Essentially, the Conflict Urbanist was entangled in a web of urban spinnings that was

[m]ore or less in conflict relative to numerous other interests which they possess[ed] only individually, or else share[ed] with one another only in small and limited groups. Conflicts among individuals in a highly developed and organized human society are mere conflicts among their respective selves or personalities, each with its definite social structure—highly complex and organized and unified—and each with a number of different social facets or aspects, a number of

¹ These elements of conflict concerning the Conflict Urbanist will be discussed in chapter 12 when a comparison is made between how urban and rural communities differ.
different sets of social attitudes constituting it. Thus, within such a society, conflicts arise between different aspects or phases of the same individual self (ibid).

What the Conflict Urbanist encountered was fragmentation of urban existence: a weakening of meaningfulness that generated discord. Such fragmentation stemmed from three sources. 1) The supply side echo's the expansion of rationalistic bodies of knowledge. 2) The demand side personifies the buying appetite for instant pleasure, spoon-fed principally by the capitalist media. 3) The cultural side epitomizes both a celebration of modernity and an offensive on history and its heritage. All three portray that global-historical ordering, illustrated earlier here by Weber (1922) as rationalization.² It also hones a systematic buyer mode that nourishes the solicitation for such productivity. As this transpired over time and as each Conflict Urbanist grew older, his or her social and environmental milieu drastically expanded and changed. The Conflict Urbanist, accordingly, lost a flavor for city life by offsetting unstable city living with tales and hearsay of stable small town living.

For example, the Conflict Urbanist may have noted that urban conflicts yield conditions that prompt people to act less friendly than small town people do. They may also allege that factors ranging from the overwhelming complexity of the urban environment to its timely business transactions, are less facilitating to interacting with others in a nonchalant way. Since “punctuality, calculability, and exactness are forced

² In a context of ambitious and competitive commercial drives and the perpetual struggle to build technologies increasingly skilled and efficient
upon life by the complexity and extension of metropolitan existence” (Simmel, 1973, p. 418), Conflict Urbanists may say that urban life is filled with drowning demands.

Furthermore, in the measure in which the group grows numerically and spatially it loosens its internal unity. For example, the briefness and infrequency of the meetings while operating within a system of division of labor spurred the Conflict Urbanist to make an impression in as explicit, clear-cut, and definite representation of ones character on others as one was capable of making. Empirically this is visible by watching dyads, triads, small gatherings, congregations, and all the way up to major assemblages (Simmel, 1950). People, in general, have more body movement, talk louder, and so forth, as more people are added to the milieu. It is certain that the more people added to a social milieu, the matter-of-course for the nature of interaction heightened awareness in the Conflict Urbanist both socially and psychologically. These conditions that urbanization brought into the lives of its people created a situation that actualized for most, a life like that of an impressionist painter, one filled with “impressing” upon others with dabs of gestures in quick strokes. This, combined with the factor that crowd awareness creates a nervous and stress filled life, helped give birth to the Conflict Urbanist.

In this way, the Conflict Urbanist commonly identified urban communities as being exceedingly unstable and socially wavering, furnishing them with an ineffectual realization of place. The mixture of physical urban structures and social urban life actualized a social-psychological footing that stood upon fragmented and alienated
communities. This was allied to and played out with the growth of unstable existence that ripened from the perpetual transition of external impressions. Ultimately, this ushered in a sentiment of little connection to home and neighborhood or as Simmel points to, "what appears in the metropolitan style of life directly as dissociation" (1950, p. 416), a felling of "uneasiness . . . which, if it is total enough, becomes a deadly unspecified malaise" (Mills, 1959, p. 11).

Fundamentally, by observing simple comparisons of urban and rural community life, the Conflict Urbanist broke the chains to the urban iron cage and found a new station in life. To address this phenomenon concerning urban-rural communities and to disclose its relevance in accordance with that of the Conflict Urbanist, a direct comparison using a specific study of sociological analysis is employed. This model exposes the institutional differences of city and small town life by drawing upon community differences in relation to social conflict within two ideal type worlds—city and small town.
CHAPTER TWELVE:

Urban/Rural—Dispute Resolution

Ideals of mutual concern, where relations are personal instead of impersonal in quality, are attractive to most Conflict Urbanists. Basically, they were pulled into favoring small town life, that in a greater degree than its urban counterpart, fended off the impersonality of bureaucratic control. Unlike the city, small town life favors a traditional lifestyle that is drawn from community awareness and action. To show this, a comparison is created to draw differences between the urban and rural worlds by use of Urban/Rural—Dispute Resolution (U/R—DR). By contrasting how people negotiate community problems, it can be determined why some Conflict Urbanists were drawn to a small intimate community over a large complex community.

U/R—DR, coupled with the information detailed in previous chapters, is put to use as a means to discover comprehensive sociological significance. Of course, several other means could be employed, yet when dealing with community conflict and while standing in the shoes of the Conflict Urbanist, U/R—DR is an appropriate choice. The reason being, is that the methodological approach of U/R—DR examines how the typical Conflict Urbanist negotiated urban conflict within an urban community. Ultimately, it will be shown that Conflict Urbanists, in their own individual way, drew upon contrasts between the diverse nature of city community life with that of the simple nature of small town life.
Reports concerning matters of direct observation, unfortunately, were near impossible to uncover concerning social organization of dispute processing of urban-rural sociology. In fact, only three references were available in *Dispute Resolution: A Selected Bibliography* (Hinchcliff, 1991) out of 1,608 possible references. Consequently, in order to furnish a theoretical model, insight came by way of ideal types. By employing ideal types it will be shown how cities and small towns provide social structures that profoundly direct how its members experience and conduct disputes. It will then be demonstrated how both urban and rural community members negotiate their respective social milieu in relation to community conflict, and how the Conflict Urbanist in particular, was conditioned to respond. The ultimate response empirically of course, is that the Conflict Urbanist favored a small town community over that of complex city communities.

12.1 Community

A person is a personality because [she or he] belongs to a community, because [she or he] takes over the institutions of that community into [ones] own conduct. [One] takes its language as a medium by which [one] gets [her or his] personality, and then through a process of taking the different roles that all the others furnish [we] . . . get the attitude of the members of the community (Mead, 1934, p. 162).

*Community* has been defined in widely different ways, in fact Hillery’s (1955) study bares 94 distinct definitions. In practice however, the term community has customarily been analogous with positive images. Ultimately however, Tonnies (1957) made a separation between what he labeled *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* communities.
The former denotes enduring community intimacy while gesellschaft communities give rise to relations that are cold, transitory, and contractual. These associations are rational and calculative rather than affective: all in all, one’s station in life is grounded on merit and achievement but is competitive and distinguished by anonymity and estrangement.

For the “Chicago Sociologists” the idea of community was compatible with their comparison of the impersonality and social dissolution of urban life with that of the intimate social networks of rural life. Rural communities were accepted not only as the standard against which urban culture could be stacked up against but also as the favorable state of being: rural communities are integrated and enduring and not contributory to personal alienation, whereas urban societies are a great deal more in disorder, and are exemplified by anomie. Since social cohesion is fleeting and shallow Wirth (1938) classified urbanization as a procedure leading to the breakdown of the moral order of society; contrary to the state of being of solid family and community relations in rural areas. Finally, Tonnies was concerned by what he took to be the collapse of folkloric society by way of urbanization leaving gesellschaftlich relationships to thrive.

In city communities, these relationships are guided by values that are give and take. Since “the purely intellectualistic person of the city is entirely indifferent to everything that is personal” (Sorokin, 1930, p. 243), urban residents dealt with by Conflict Urbanists were ordinarily handled as if they were commodities in the calculus of benefit-analysis. “In Durkheim’s words, no one in these non-communal settings will do anything for anyone unless it be in exchange for similar services or a recompense which
he judges to be the equivalent of what he gives” (Fischer, 1977, p. 8). In this way, and in others, the city renders a social environment that is facilitative to legal-rational conditions with very little loss of “face” for the disputants. The reason being is that urbanites’ networks of relationships are both restricted to a local area and encompass a wide geographical space. Accordingly, urbanites have few “real” neighbors. Social features contrasting urban and rural communities therefore differ regarding situations in which conflict resolution emerges during a dispute.

On the aggregate level, the concentration of great numbers, in conjunction with economic principles of competition and comparative advantage, leads to a multifaceted differentiation, or diversification. The larger the community, the more divided and specialized is the labor, the greater the number and variety of social groups, and the greater differences among neighborhoods. This fractionation, combined with a psychological fractionation of the individual’s attention, prevents the existence of a ‘community’ in which people are bound by common social ties and understandings (e.g., commonality of values, personal attention, social pressure, tradition). To hold such a splintered society together at all, different social mechanisms are needed and do arise—means of formal integration such as written laws, impersonal rules of etiquette, and special agencies of social control, education, communication, and welfare (Fischer, 1975, p. 207).

12.2 Resolving the Dispute

Dispute resolution practices being used in any society, from the East—West; feudal—modern; or for the Conflict Urbanist: urban—rural, are an outcome of their norms, values, and beliefs; community of memories (Bellah, 1996); and cultural design—governmental, economic, managerial, bureaucratic, and so forth (Smelser, 1994). In any of these societies community organization is intricate, for instance, kinship may either be fixed on expansive lines or may be nuclear; nearby residents are either strangers or
friends; and vocations may or may not transfer across family generations. Basically, communities contain an interconnected social network that is either close-knit (highly interconnected) or loose-knit (loosely connected) (Gans, 1962). These can be seen while contrasting urban and rural communities (Simmel, 1950). By comparing these two opposing worlds from a community standpoint, it is then confirmed why the Conflict Urbanist favored one form of community over the other.

Davidson (1969) in the *African Genius* claims that interpersonal conflicts routinely arise in all societies, and in response every society produces some kind of social gathering to retain an even keel community—for its members “do not just live in society, they produce society in order to live” (Godelier, 1986, p. 1). These meetings are common everywhere from African societies in which kin and community members discuss disputes before a local chieftain to formal courts of the modern industrialized societies. To address community conflict in the modern industrialized city in comparison to the small town, two opposing ideal types are contrasted: a technologically propelled, bureaucratic urban society—and a mechanical, agrarian, rural society—one a city the other a small town. San Diego, California is used as an example of a city, and Julian, California, one of its satellites, is used as the small town example.

In a city like San Diego three worlds are created for social interaction concerning the before mentioned complacency of family, friends, and work. Chombart de Lauwe (1952) suggested a hierarchy of activity spaces for human interaction; familial, neighborhood, economic, and urban sector—where different activities are conducted. In
the ever-moving kaleidoscope of a city such as San Diego, neighbors for example, do not have a great deal of overt say in cultivating and guiding peoples' conduct. Ties of kinship, friendship and employment are few and far between. Since the urban family and community has been splintered, the Conflict Urbanist had little interest for the overall well being of fellow residence and therefore had little inclination to help, intervene, or much less care when a dispute in the neighborhood occurred.

Within the 'noncommunity,' the primary social groups that tie the individual and society together . . . are . . . weakened. The individual's diversified interests, associations, and locals draw him or her away from the family; the specialized institutions of the city usurp family functions; the contracts with different persons and different value systems shake the normative foundations of the primary group (Fischer, 1975, p. 207).

Adults hardly ever reside in the same community as their parents (empty nest), siblings, or grown children. Therefore, ties between family members in San Diego are relatively inconsequential, in that, they are not typical wellsprings of companionship, emotional aid, direction, and thus have little influence for self-definition when compared with the typical family in Julian. Likewise, if we were to compare the small town with the city concerning friendship, the city would display an unstable situation, in that, friends are not typically neighbors and neighbors are not typically friends. In urban centers like San Diego, friendships are usually routine rather than intimate. Furthermore, long-term interpersonal relationships are harder to sustain in a city than a small town. The main reasons are that adults do not commonly live in one house or neighborhood for
life, and they are not employed in one place for their working lives. In fact, working members of the same family typically do not share work sites. Since a small portion of the population is family-employed or self-employed, nearly all workers are stationed in relation to their technologically requisite skills and not by personality, emotional ties, or likes and dislikes. Basically, friendships at work are formed in respect to the shifting tides of socio-economic status resulting in the inability of individuals to proceed up and down the business ladder at the same time or pace.

In a small town like Julian, on the other hand, a bird’s eye view of interpersonal relations reveals intimate networks, in which people are not involved on their own account—drifting alone and unattached—but as representatives of thoroughly embedded kin-based groups and highly integrated friendships. Families are traditionally extended and are integrated with a host of other families. Marriage, work and political alignments are the primary reasons why this is so. The small town is therefore a mixture of family/friend affiliations. Local politics are managed by shifting affiliations of personal loyalties rather than on just ideological similarities and differences. In addition, friends are, as a rule, neighbors and neighbors tend to count on each other for such things as emotional support and economic relief. Similarly, employment may sometimes be with large enterprises, but is generally with hometown businesses; it is not improbable that credit is granted by individual moneylenders and local merchants rather than by international banks; and although malls may exist, purchasing is predominantly carried out in family operated stores and shops. These factors, taken as a whole, bring forth a
close-knit community in comparison to the stretched and withered loose-knit urban environment.

Although urban communities are loose-knit, personal relations among neighbors in San Diego can be courteous, but are oftentimes removed and aloof. Even among the long-term occupant, the interpretation of what neighbor relations should be, does not purpose the much-esteemed ongoing amiable relations that "neighbor" is customarily seen as connoting. Although the nature of the dispute, patterns of acquaintance, and proximity in the neighborhood determine their make-up, community members in San Diego normally do not fancy the city as a place where neighbors are by any means close friends. In spite of that, they do, at least to some degree, value interactions with their neighbors in the course of dealing with particular types of adversity. But since these transitory ad hoc groups, that pacify the role of a community coping network, generally disseminate after the problem has passed, "a neighbor dispute does not put critical relations on the line: one’s family life, one’s job, one’s friendships are usually unaffected" (Beer, 1986, p. 192).

In both the city and small town, "[w]hen faced with several courses of action, people usually do what they believe is likely to have the best overall outcome" (Jary, 1991, p. 407). As a theory of individual decision making, rational choice theory claims that human action is based on getting the most for the least. On the one hand, individuals have a limited set of ends that provide utility and, on the other hand, they possess only a limited means to realize them. The role of the rationality postulate is to ensure that the
best ends are chosen given the constraints. For instance, some problems are hard to deal with—or hard to catch up to, like transience and fencing, consequently, community members living in San Diego neighborhoods are not likely to carry out full investigations into problems or troubles, and hence, are less inclined to recruit community members for unified action, unlike their rural counterparts living in Julian.

Problems crop up in San Diego communities like parking, varied noises, and construction that bureaucratic action therefore handles—and hence there to fill the gaps exposed by the lack of community action that would be handled, in all likelihood, face-to-face in Julian. Community members in Julian are much more likely to seek neighbors when unexplained events occur which might be evidence of trouble, like breaking glass, loud banging noises, and vandalism. Typically rural neighbors assist each other by suggesting strategies, offering ties to people or agencies, and being readily available to provide support for troubled neighbors—as well as to expect support if trouble hits home.

While living in either an urban community or rural community, the relationship between the particular dispute and the community structures that address the conflict occurs at both an individual and collective level. For the individual or group with a dispute, the coping networks, besides offering support, shape the process by which resolutions are conducted. To illustrate, community norms guide action to handle such problems as neighborhood vandalism in both San Diego and Julian. The resident is guided toward shaping the problem in terms that relate with those that other neighbors are using. “Such interpretive schemes inform and constrain ongoing behavior but are
also reinforced and changed by these behaviors” (Scott, 1995, p. 53). This neighborhood effect is a process of local influence, whereby the characteristics of a neighborhood are believed to influence the ways in which people think and act. Neighbors present models of attitudes and behavioral patterns that may conform to others, and thus reinforce their self-identity collectively, but alternatively may contradict them and thus influence some to modify their own attitudes and behavior in order to be consistent with those of their neighbors. This form of conditioning has been called behavioral assimilation, which is a process whereby the members of a group acquire the sentiments and attitudes of other group members.

Fundamental attitudes are presumably those that are only changed gradually, and no one individual can reorganize the whole society; but one is continually affecting society by [ones] own attitude because [one] does bring up the attitude of the group toward [oneself], responds to it, and through that response changes the attitude of the group. This is of course, what we are constantly doing in our imagination, in our thought, we are utilizing our own attitude to bring about a different situation in the community of which we are part; we are exerting ourselves, bringing forward our own opinion, criticizing the attitudes of others, and approving or disapproving. But we can do that only in so far as we can call out ourselves the response of the community; we only have ideas in so far as we are able to take the attitude of the community and then respond to it (Mead, 1934, p. 180).

Communities shape and reinforce common sense of what is worth the bother in pursuing resolution, and thus sufficient to be seen as “real” trouble. Disputing parties in close-knit social networks, like that found in Julian, have a greater social obligation to resolve their contention rather than maintain the confrontation (Einstein, 1969). Conversely, in loose-knit networks, as exemplified by San Diego, the bureaucratic
pressure toward resolution is directly proportionate to the number representing the community members sharing the disputing mechanisms, therefore in the city, pressure to agreeably resolve a dispute is minimal. In this manner, the Conflict Urbanist, by comparing these two dissimilar communities made a distinction between urban norms and rural norms in handling confrontation.

12.3 The Legal-Rational Bureaucracy

In the city there has been a depreciation of community. Urban society has, in effect, destroyed its community rights in favor of the precious benefits of utilitarian individuality. In its desperation to control this mass of urbanites that are now distanced from their families and communities, U. S. urban society rushed headstrong into voluminous legislation and strengthened its bureaucracies further alienating its people. Bureaucratization has happened with extraordinary perseverance in the city as the courts have infringed evermore toward spheres previously left to informal controls. The thrust of formal controls has not only taken over much of the obligation of community, private and even family interests but as these groups have become undermined and ineffective by changes in urban society, new laws and regulations filled the gaps. As a result of this, a paradox emerged: the more emancipated the Conflict Urbanist became from his or her social grouping, the more regulated he or she became by a remote authority which, became unfairly malleable by those with power and authority.
The experience of urbanization and the aggregation into cities are the exercise of class and power and the organization of people, labor, goods, and welfare provision in a specific way. People living in urban communities are therefore brought into direct confrontation with the state and state agencies over scarce resources (Jary, 1991, p. 69).

This urban fight for position to obtain resources and amenities helped to generate struggles from which conflict urbanism advanced.

For settling disputes, most Conflict Urbanists contrasted urban bureaucratic agencies with small town community associations. For instance, they may have noted that while reduction of conflict may be necessary in small communities where disputants are in continuous contact with each other, it is far from being an essential or even desirable objective in urbanized societies where evasion tends to be prevalent, and in fact is a notably common approach embraced by disputants to each other. Provided that a relationship has a lengthy history and future, disputants tend to elect peaceful resolution, though if they can or anticipate to discontinue it soon, as with cosmopolitan relationships, resolution via the court is usually favored. This, as just stated, advantages certain classes of people. By this, the legal-rational system in urban areas echo the well being of the major property holders, legal professionals, and established interests who make use of the courts on a routine basis (Coleman, 1994). And, of course, “[b]y justifying the arrangement of power and the ascendancy of the powerful, images and ideas transform power into authority” (Mills, 1959, p. 80). In many cases, bureaucratic urban authority left the Conflict Urbanist feeling insignificant since a detached authority casts rulings over neighborhood and community conflicts. In the small town conversely, the people
who typically make rulings come from the same community as the disputants.

Furthermore, community members represent their own issues and other indirect community issues that may, in one form or another, affect a great part of the whole community.

To review, dispute resolution for the most part, has been traditionally non-bureaucratic. But as of late, urbanization has "forced" the courts to trample under foot this community based forum—especially in the cosmopolitan area where urban members do battle within organizations to a much greater degree than their rural counterparts. An example can be seen by viewing community mediation centers. In his book *Crime and Community Mediation*, Frederick Snyder (1978) stressed the view that in rural communities (ideal type; Dorchester, Mass.) "... mediators are not professionals operating within a government bureaucracy." However, in Boston, Mass. (ideal type) employees of community centers tend to be drawn from sectors of the court bureaucracy.

Through the use of legal-rational dispute resolution, urbanites have sealed their fate, or in a more Marxian sense: had their fate sealed for them. A non-bureaucratic dispute resolution urban environment becomes harder and harder to sustain as bureaucratic growth floods traditional mediation methods in a sea of red tape wrapped in court mandates that ultimately leaves urbanites trapped behind bars. As urban sprawl continues there are constant dangers of heightened bureaucratization and its attendant rules and formal ceremonies. An accentuation of high caseloads would appear to affirm this as an inescapable by-product. Therefore, bureaucratic-rationality is unavoidable as it
substitutes for legal rules rather than an idealized living law transmitted through voluntary agreements arrived at by seemingly personalized rules of human interaction” (Hofrichter, 1978, p. 49). The bars to the urban iron cage thus grow in number and its metal is forged from the pressures derived from obtainable and sustainable sources of funding and case referral.

As an example, in many urban communities, rules about neighborliness are written into local ordinances that do not generally exist in a small town. “There are laws restricting where one can build a fence and how high, regulations about cutting grass, rules for when a dog can bark, laws governing name calling,” laws about what colors houses have to be painted, numerous parking regulations, and so forth (Beer, 1986, p. 189). Whatever the circumstances, tickets with fines are typically issued with little social loss of face for the offender. Social pressures from the rural community, on the other hand, are generally of significant consequence. The non-compliant disputant faces the risk of gossip; damage to their reputation; diminished political sway; loss of favors from powerful persons that are able to allot credit, title to property, or connections to persons in high positions (Merry, 1981); obstacles in finding a mate; social expulsion; and ultimately banishment or excommunication from the community.

To illustrate, in rural America as late as the 1930’s it was not unlikely for a cop on the beat to simply tie the shoes together and remove the belt from the trousers of lawbreakers and toddle them to the station. Criminals with little homage for fellow community members and even less respect for the law would be far more concerned with
tripping or keeping their trousers raised up than to have the ever-intrusive matter of embarrassment wash over them in front of their home town folk. In today’s modern city, on the contrary, such an occurrence is next to non-existent. The reason is that these kinds of predicaments become a greater part of the “self” in a small town community, in contrast to the city where everyone is among strangers who are mere abstractions and will, in all likelihood, never be dealt with again.

Basically, the breadth and condition of ongoing associations, the personification of common consent and communal values, the need to settle feuds, and the availability for evasion of the courts as a culturally permissible and socially acceptable alternative answer to conflict, earnestly affected the Conflict Urbanist. Responsive to the fact that urban and rural worlds are forged from dissimilar norms, institutional frameworks, and histories, the Conflict Urbanist, in their own individual way, did an U/R—DR comparative analysis, along with several other comparative critiques, and acted to change their life course by changing their life-world.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN:

Conclusion

Every image and idea about the world is compounded . . . of personal experience, learning, imagination, and memory. The places that we live in, those we visit and travel through, the worlds we read about and see in works of art, and the realms of imagination and fantasy each contribute to our images of nature and [humanity]. All types of experience, from those most closely linked with our everyday world to those which seem furthest removed, come together to make up our individual picture of reality. The surface of the earth is shaped for each person by refraction through cultural personal lenses of custom and fancy. We are all artists and landscape architects, creating order and organizing space, time, and causality in accordance with our apperceptions and predilections (Lowenthal, 1967, p. 91).

Locales can cast one’s heart to fancy one form of community over another. Certain people passion after explorations in the hopes of experiencing exciting places, while others have a preference for the couch. Some people have become physically active while still others settle themselves into a cubicle or office. Some are drawn to the barren desert and some to the lush forest. Some people flock to the solitude of remote settings, such as a placid small town street corner, while others desire the mad rushing crowds of the City Boulevard. Due to the fact that some urbanites selected one over the other, an empirical slice of life was considered in this reading.

By comparing the two opposite worlds of the city and small town from a theoretical bird’s eye view, it was shown how conflict urbanism developed and why the Conflict Urbanist chose one style of life over the other. This was done by use of ideal types of city and small town that were formulated to show contrasts between the two. An ideal type of a certain kind of urbanite, attached only by way of U.S. cosmopolitan style
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of life and a full childhood in the city, was also formulated to examine why this scatter of individuals abandoned their own local customs, norms, values, beliefs, built environs, hangouts, communities of memories, and indeed, their family and friends for another notably "less advanced" existence. Geographically significant is that although wars, political unrest, droughts, floods, economic depression, and the like have created migration flows, the Conflict Urbanist interestingly arose despite the fact that throughout history people have been resoundingly faithful to their own subculture. Sociologically significant is that despite the "favorable" modern pull factors of their own cosmopolitan culture the Conflict Urbanist moved to a social locale that was considered "behind the times" and lacking "opportunity."

To find out what motivated the Conflict Urbanist to move to the small town, ideal types of community life were appointed (San Diego and Julian) that offered a visualization of these two contrasting places. By following the wave of urbanization and its undertow legal rational-bureaucracy through a combination of rational capitalistic and urban imperialistic rip currents, it was discovered that the Conflict Urbanist surfaced from an unnatural system of cement, social alienation, and community helplessness. To emerge from this social and physical urban conglomerate, the Conflict Urbanist relied on community ideologies to expound a sense of belonging to a particular model of community; a fondness fixed on assorted ties of attitudes, interests, values, and lore. Such connections may have been small in number and elementary in form and function, but for some Conflict Urbanists they were rich and complex, comprising ample interest
of self in place. By this, the Conflict Urbanist didn’t reside in just any place; they used community ideology to articulate who they were and where they belonged. It was shown as an example that while locked away in the urban iron cage, some Conflict Urbanists contrasted situations of conflict and its practices of resolution regarding urban versus rural community life. It was then determined that the calculus of likes and dislikes concerning urban and rural community conflict, played a contributing factor for their choice to leave the city. Just as well, other elements of social life played crucial roles in regards to urban push and rural pull factors:

There are other elements of the metropolitan experience which are harder to specify but which involve the sights, sounds, and smells of a place, and the activities that one can or does engage in. To some, the buildings, people, facilities, and bustle of cities are attractions; others will gladly forsake them for fewer people and more trees. These are the ‘intangibles,’ hard to measure or even define, which fall within the category of personal taste (Fischer, 1975, p. 216).

On the whole, although every Conflict Urbanist had a personal reason for moving, this was a collective movement. As an example, the mass media has brought the urban and rural worlds vicariously close; and modern transportation has rendered a means to comfortably travel back and forth in a timely manner. Overall, through collective production, modern instruments such as these helped bring forth the development of the Conflict Urbanist. In essence, modern urbanization brought to the Conflict Urbanist all the necessary instruments to assistance a move to a place that was easy to take up culturally—its hinterland small town neighbor. For instance, modernity developed
computer and telecommunication technology that, in turn, inspired more "stay home" jobs. As these forms of social transformations took root, more and more urbanites were placed in a position to make viable decisions regarding a move to the small town.

By making comparisons between these opposing worlds, the Conflict Urbanist, being in a position time had placed them and a place society had rationalized for them, was then suited to make a choice concerning a move to the small town, in contrast with staying in the city. Although most aspects of both places are typically favored by many urbanites, for the Conflict Urbanist in particular, it was shown that while viewing most or a few significant differences, why they favored the small town over the city.

This phenomenon, when seen as shared systems of interpretation, is sociologically and geographically meaningful. It is my contention, that more often than not, these interpretations of community from providing accounts that renders the rural community the source of the good life while demonizing the urban community, constructed a conflict urban collective conscience. From this standpoint it was shown that the cause and affect is reflective of Cahill’s opinion, that “the character of the self changes as the character of social life, and ones community changes” (1998, p. 302).

Can it therefore be said that ones interpretation of “self” uses community as a focal point of attachment for self-actualization? Like other forms of identity, community identity answers the question, “Who am I?” but it also asks, “Where am I?” or more fundamentally, “In which kind of community do I wish to live in?” For the Conflict Urbanist, living in the city was not merely an inactive outgrowth of who they were; it
was also a determinant affecting what they were able to do and who they could become. It identified person with place through the construction of ties to a form of community-identity for self-identity. In this way, today’s urbanist, by recognizing the general differences between urban and rural life and landscape, can transform their “urban self” into a Conflict Urbanist.
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