

Organization & Environment

<http://oae.sagepub.com>

Ebenezer Howard And The Marriage Of Town And Country: An Introduction to Howard's Garden Cities of To-morrow (Selections)

Brett Clark

Organization Environment 2003; 16; 87

DOI: 10.1177/1086026602250258

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://oae.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/16/1/87>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Organization & Environment* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://oae.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://oae.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 2 articles hosted on the SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://oae.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/16/1/87>

EBENEZER HOWARD AND THE MARRIAGE OF TOWN AND COUNTRY

An Introduction to Howard's *Garden Cities of To-morrow* (Selections)

BRETT CLARK

University of Oregon

Ebenezer Howard advocated the construction of garden cities to reduce the alienation of human society from nature. The social world was to be reorganized and integrated into the surrounding environment to ensure sustainable interactions. In Garden Cities of To-morrow, Howard provided an outline of a garden city that promised a clean environment, free from air and water pollution, and an abundance of parks and open spaces. Social production was organized for local demands with the goal of creating self-sustaining communities, thus reducing the need for long-distance trade. Howard insisted that the long-term sustainability of garden cities was founded on abiding by the law of restitution, where all wastes were recycled back to the soil to ensure the continued productive potential of the land. In this, Howard's garden cities dissolved the divide between town and country and provided a model for an ecologically sustainable society.

Keywords: Ebenezer Howard; garden cities; metabolic rift; urban planning; urban reform; sustainability

Suppose people lived in little communities among gardens and green fields, so that you could be in the country in five minutes' walk, and had few wants, almost no furniture for instance, and no servants, and studied the (difficult) arts of enjoying life, and finding out what they really wanted: then I think one might hope civilisation had really begun.

—William Morris (as cited in Morton, 1978, p. 203)

Lewis Mumford (1972) maintained that Ebenezer Howard (1850-1928)

laid the foundation for a new cycle in urban civilization: one in which the means of life will be subservient to the purposes of living, and in which the pattern needed for biological survival and economic efficiency will likewise lead to social and personal fulfilment. (p. 40)

Mumford asserted that Howard's book, *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, "has done more than any other single book to guide the modern town planning movement and to alter its objectives" (p. 29). Yet Howard has slipped into historical obscurity, and the heart of his garden city proposal has been bypassed in urban planning. The promise of a sustainable future has been sacrificed for the pursuit of profit and urban sprawl. Howard's work regarding the construction of new cities provides an avenue for assessing the viability of urban society and its relationship with nature.

In *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, Howard (1902) provided a detailed discussion for social and urban reform. In building garden cities, town and country would be married, allowing for the integration of the social world into the surrounding environment by reorganizing social production and human interchanges with nature for long-term sustainability.

By the age of 15, Howard had already left school and was drifting between jobs as a clerk in London (Osborn, 1972, pp. 18-19). At the age of 21, Howard moved to the United States. He tried starting a farm in Nebraska, but when this failed, he moved to Chicago where he worked as a reporter for the courts, using the shorthand skills he previously acquired as a clerk. Howard returned to England in 1876 where he worked as an official parliamentary reporter the rest of his life. This work cultivated his mind for planning garden cities because as a government reporter he constantly came into contact with people involved in social reform work and various projects to address social ills (Buder, 1969, p. 391). Howard was a humble, practical individual. Away from work, he was an inventor, working on typewriters and printing presses and creating the outlines for the construction of new cities (Purdom, 1963, pp. 105-107).

The social climate of the late 1800s provided Howard with an opportunity to grapple with a wide range of social problems and radical alternatives. Howard associated with socialists, anarchists, and other nonconformist freethinkers. He joined the Zetetical Society, a debating society, where he became friends with Sidney and Beatrice Webb and George Bernard Shaw (Beevers, 1988, pp. 13-14). Although Howard was rather meek in person, as a public speaker he was engaging and his loud voice demanded attention. As with the generation before Howard, the abject poverty and unemployment of the urban population, the pollution of waterways and the air, and the impoverishment of the soil and farmers increasingly became central topics of discussion and action among those interested in revolution and social reform.

The rise of industrial capitalism and the expansion of the global capitalist economic system depopulated the countryside and brought down the price of agricultural goods on the market, further undercutting the ability of small farmers to survive. Industrial and agricultural production increasingly became concentrated into larger operations, ushering in new social relations of production in both the countryside and cities. Labor, lacking access to land, sought employment in the cities. But a shortage of employment opportunities in the urban areas created a surplus population that allowed capitalists to keep wages low as workers competed for the work that was available. In Engels's (1950) classic work *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844*, he described the consequences of industrial capitalism on the urban poor. Dilapidated buildings, filthy alleys without drainage, housing without means to rid human waste, and coal-stained walls characterized the physical setting. Poorly ventilated houses and factories exposed people to toxic substances, fibrous dust, and carbon gases. Low wages prevented people from being able to purchase enough food to meet their dietary needs, causing vitamin deficiencies. Together, these conditions caused infectious diseases, as well as skeletal deformities and stunted growth (Engels, 1950). In *The Housing Question*, Engels maintained that unemployment, squalor, and the overcrowding of big cities were tied to the capitalist mode of production (Marx & Engels, 1975, pp. 330, 337-368). Only the abolition of this economic system could bring forth the possibility of a rationally organized city, free from the poverty necessitated under capitalism.

Like the cities, the countryside experienced an ongoing impoverishment. In the 1850s and 1860s, Justus von Liebig (1859), the great German chemist, explained

that the intensive methods of British agriculture were a system of robbery, opposed to rational agriculture. Food and fiber were shipped over long distances from the country to the city. As a consequence, the nutrients of the soil—such as nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium—were transferred from the soil to the city, where they accumulated as waste and pollution rather than being recycled into the soil. The soil continually was depleted of its necessary nutrients, decreasing the productive potential of nature. The degradation of the soil led to a greater concentration of agriculture among a small number of proprietors who adopted even more intensive methods of production, including artificial fertilizers.

Recognizing the brilliance of Liebig's critique of modern agriculture, Marx ploughed through the chemist's work to further his own critique of political economy. Marx (1984) elaborated that capitalism created a metabolic rift in the interaction between human beings and the earth, one that is only intensified by large-scale agriculture and long-distance trade, causing the accumulation of toxins and pollution in cities (pp. 474-475). The pursuit of profit sacrificed reinvestment in the land. Marx (1991) argued that the existing conditions demanded a rational agriculture in which production included the recycling of the soil's nutrients, but this was possible only under a system of associated producers (pp. 911-916; also see Foster, 2000). Thus, according to Marx, the distinction between town and country must be abolished as agriculture and industry are combined under a system in which the soil is improved for future generations (Marx, 1991, pp. 911-916; Marx & Engels, 1964, p. 94).

Inspired by Marx and Engels, William Morris (1962) wrote *News From Nowhere*, envisioning a society in which the division between town and country was eliminated, workshops were integrated with nature, and the population dispersed throughout the countryside (also see Foster, 1998). Consistent with this line of thought, Morris argued, "We must turn this land from the grimy back-yard of a workshop into a garden. If that seems difficult, or rather impossible, to some of you, I cannot help it; I only know that it is necessary" (Morris, 1999, p. 93). He held that

there is no square mile of earth's inhabitable surface that is not beautiful in its own way, if we men will only abstain from wilfully destroying that beauty; and it is this reasonable share in the beauty of the earth that I claim as the right of every man who will earn it by due labour; a decent house with decent surroundings for every honest and industrious family. (Morris, 1999, p. 91)

Morris sought to protect nature from needless exploitation, while promoting a sustainable interaction with nature.

Although there is no evidence that Howard read Marx (Beevers, 1988, p. 24), Marx's critique of political economy, the metabolic rift, the impoverishment of the countryside, and the social ills generated by industrial capitalism informed and influenced those with whom Howard associated and read. In particular, Howard was "appreciative of the works of William Morris and Peter Kropotkin (both of whom he met in London in the 1880s and 1890s)" (Hardy, 1991a, p. 24). Of course, Howard's influences were wide, as he collected pieces of ideas and assembled them together carefully, providing a new synthesis for city organization and planning. In particular, the work of Thomas Spence, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, John Stuart Mill, Alfred Marshall, Edward Bellamy, Henry George, Peter Kropotkin, as well as William Morris heavily influenced Howard (Beevers, 1988, pp. 17-24; Hall & Ward, 1998, pp. 7-15; Hardy, 1991a, pp. 22-27; Hardy, 2000, pp. 60-61).

Given the structural crisis of British agriculture with falling prices, poor harvests, declining soil productivity, and competition from the Americas, the land question occupied public debate. Howard became a fervent land reformer after seeing Henry George lecture in 1882 (Purdom, 1963, p. 1). In *Progress and Poverty*, George (1938) argued for the nationalizing of all land so that ground rent could be used for public purposes. Howard incorporated this position, although he did not agree that the state was the appropriate agent to allocate benefits. From Spence, Howard took the idea of common ownership of the land as well as the notion of having a board of directors elected from the people to supervise social projects supported by ground rent (Aalen, 1992, pp. 33-36; Hall & Ward, 1998, pp. 9-10). As far as how to appropriate the land, Howard drew on the ideas of Mill, Wakefield, and Marshall (the latter two he had not read when he first wrote *Tomorrow*, later revised and republished as *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, but they were widely discussed within his social circle) regarding planned colonization of lands through migration and settlement, allowing for the combined advantages of town and country. Howard saw no reason that this process could not take place within his own nation.

Also, Howard read Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, which was a utopian novel that depicted a planned city where the people owned the land and society was organized along cooperative principles. He first encountered it shortly after it was published and helped arrange for its publication in England. Influenced by Bellamy, Howard joined the short-lived Nationalisation of Labour Society, which worked to promote the nationalization of land. Yet, once again, Howard was not comfortable with the idea of state control of land, so he shied away from fully embracing this organization. Howard's uneasiness was overcome with direction from Kropotkin's concept of decentralized, industrial villages. For Kropotkin, town and country were married, and regions of a country could become largely self-sufficient through diversified production, provided that industry and agriculture were practiced side by side (Aalen, 1992, p. 39; Fishman, 1977, pp. 36-37; Kropotkin, 1913). Howard increasingly became captivated with the thought of creating new cities to build a new world. Morris's desire to transform the grimy cities into a garden where a just society thrived resonated with Howard. Borrowing from the aforementioned people, Howard managed to create a unique combination of ideas in his proposal for the construction of garden cities through organized migration, collective land tenure, planned cities, land values that were internalized by the community, and the marriage of town and country (Hall & Ward, 1998, p. 15).

"Howard clearly understood," noted Hardy (1992), "that concern for nature could not involve any rejection of humanity; rather it was to be a harmonious reconciliation of environmental and social needs" (p. 207). Thus, in 1898 Howard borrowed money to print his book, *To-morrow*, proposing a reorganization of society as a network of garden cities that would break from the dictates of capitalism, allowing for the growth of cooperative socialism (Fishman, 1977, p. 25; Hardy, 1991b, pp. 10-11). Eight months after publication, Howard and his supporters met to form the Garden City Association to promote the ideas that Howard had outlined (Hardy, 1991a, pp. 16-19). Howard was determined to actualize his proposed city, so the association set out to obtain the financial resources to undertake the construction of a new city. Howard desired to appeal to as wide of a population as possible, so for practical purposes *To-morrow* was revised and republished as *Garden Cities of To-morrow* in 1902. It provided an outline for the building of a garden city, with the hope that its example would inspire a revolution in how towns were organized and planned.

Howard contended that garden cities were the solution to the problems confronting both the cities and countryside. The cities were experiencing massive growth—driven by the dissolution of farms in the countryside—causing overcrowding and urban sprawl. The urban population lived in squalor, lacking sanitation and adequate water supplies. Housing was expensive and unemployment was high. These conditions, as well as air and water pollution, caused immense human misery and degradation (Harris, 1906, pp. 18-20). In the countryside, farmers lacked proper drainage for their crops, the soil's fertility was declining due to long-distance trade and the failure to recycle human and animal wastes, imported fertilizers were expensive, and the prices of agricultural goods were falling. The homes were old and moldy. As a result, the countryside was being depopulated.

Garden cities were the key to “how to restore the people to the land—that beautiful land of ours, with its canopy of sky, the air that blows upon it, the sun that warms it, the rain and dew that moisten it” (Howard, 1902, p. 13). Howard argued that both town and country had qualities that attracted people to them. For the countryside, the beauty of nature, fresh air, sunshine, and the fruits of the earth were the magnets pulling people to the land. Cities attracted people to them due to the opportunities for employment, hopes of advancement, social enrichment, higher wages, and cultural activities. Thus, Howard (1902) proposed a third magnet—garden cities—that combined the “energetic and active town life, with all the beauty and delight of the country” without the negatives of either town or country (pp. 15-17). Howard opposed the increasing alienation of human society from nature. “Human society,” argued Howard, “and the beauty of nature are meant to be enjoyed together” (p. 17). To make this possible, Howard insisted, “town and country *must be married*, and out of this joyous union will spring a new hope, a new life, a new civilisation” (p. 18).

He proposed that garden cities be sited on newly purchased, undeveloped land, to obtain the land at a cheaper price. *Garden Cities* provided a physical plan for the organization of the new city. Similar to the cities of utopian literature, the garden city was circular, consisting of an extensive zoning plan of concentric circles. Although Howard (1902) demarcated the acres of land that a city would cover (1,000 of 6,000 acres), the population size of a garden city (30,000-32,000 people), and the specific zoning, he noted that this was merely suggestive, recognizing that each city would be socially, historically, and ecologically organized in accordance with the needs of the people and the environment (pp. 20-22).

At the center of town, covering 5 to 6 acres, a large, well-watered garden was located. The public could enjoy their days in this peaceful social setting. Beginning at the edge of this garden, six wide boulevards radiated out from the center to the circumference of the city, dividing the city into six sections. Larger public buildings, such as city hall, libraries, museums, hospitals, concert halls, and theatres, encircled the garden at the center of town, providing a central point for the public to come together. A large public park was reserved for the space following the public buildings, providing grounds for recreation. Immediately bordering the park, the Crystal Palace, a glass-covered, open-air market and exhibition space, was to be constructed for the trading of manufactured wares and agricultural goods. Moving further outwards, a series of roads in concentric rings provided avenues for several blocks of residential housing. The streets were to be lined with trees and bushes. Each home had ample space for privacy—but not so much that it was a detriment to social interaction—and ample amounts of sunlight and fresh air. Garden space was available at each home for personal enjoyment and the production of food. The architecture and design of the homes were varied, allowing for personal expression

and satisfaction, rather than enforcing a lifeless uniformity in structure (Howard, 1902, pp. 22-24). The hope was to integrate the homes into the natural setting of the garden city.

Surrounding the series of residential rings, a wide Grand Avenue circled the city, providing an additional zone for gardens, schools, and parks. The outer ring of the city consisted of factories, warehouses, dairies, markets, and timber yards. A railroad circled the outskirts of town operating to transport goods between industries and warehouses as well as reducing traffic through the city. Outside of the city, an extensive agricultural belt existed. On this land, small landholdings, allotments, pastures, large farms, forests, orchards, open space for recreation, and charitable institutions existed. No extensions of the city could be developed in the countryside. This agricultural belt had to be maintained for the health of the land and the people (Howard, 1902, pp. 24-26).

Howard envisioned a constellation of garden cities, connected by a planned railway system to facilitate the trade of diversified goods within a region, as well as to enhance cultural production and exchange, such as art and symphony orchestras that may require the shared populations of garden cities to perform (Mumford, 1964, pp. 31-32). The agricultural belt surrounding each garden city could not be intruded upon by other cities. Each garden city had to have a countryside of its own, meaning no overlapping of countrysides, to sustain the social relationship of cities with nature (Howard, 1902, pp. 126-132).

Given that the population of a garden city was to be regulated, a web of garden cities provided the means of dispersing the population across a country in smaller, planned settlements rather than allowing the continuation of unplanned, explosive population growth in cities such as London. Garden cities were to act as town-country magnets that would attract people to them because of the healthy environment, contact with nature, low rents, high wages, and social and cultural opportunities. As a result, the establishment of garden cities would cause a decongestion, through out migration, of large cities. Eventually, it was hoped that the decongested cities would be transformed into new garden cities.

Given that Howard (1902) was trying to appeal to a wide range of people for the establishment of garden cities and that he wanted to avoid conflict, he was ambivalent when describing work relations in the new cities. He saw potential for the large-scale production of wheat, through united action, organized under either a capitalist or a body of cooperatives (p. 25). Howard attempted to provide ground for both individualism and municipalism to govern business operations within garden cities, noting that this may vary between locations. But given that Howard saw garden cities as an avenue gradually to supercede capitalism, an emphasis on social justice dominates his discussion of work relations (p. 90). He advocated an end to capitalist oppression. In the long run, he hoped that cooperatives would dominate the spheres of production and exchange (p. 82).

To transcend the division between town and country, the industrial and agricultural production of a garden city was integrated into the immediate environment. Howard visualized garden cities that were largely self-sufficient; in fact, he hoped that each section within a garden city would be a complete town in and of itself. Given that industrial and agricultural production was geared primarily for the garden city, the people would have greater say over the working relations within a factory and at the market. If the population was dissatisfied, it could exercise its power through withdrawing its support from a particular vendor or industry. And given the dependence of these realms on the local population, in such an arrangement, busi-

nesses would be influenced by the will of the people. Howard believed that democracy could thrive in such a setting, allowing workers to achieve comfortable and fair working conditions while receiving good living wages. Production had to take place under conditions that ensured the health of the workers and community as a whole. The public had the power to ensure that no vendor would dare to sell “sweated goods” (Howard, 1902, pp. 78-84).

The public, having ownership of the land, would have the power to determine what industries were allowed to operate within their cities and under what circumstances they would be allowed to operate. Restrictions would be placed on imported goods, so they did not undercut local production that was valued by the community. This guaranteed a market for local producers; however, if a local producer failed to meet the public’s expectations for providing a safe work environment, fair wages, and a favorable product, imported goods would be allowed in as a way to check a local producer and prevent the “evils” of monopoly. Howard remained optimistic in regards to the power of people to assert their community interests if provided with a favorable environment.

G. Montagu Harris (1906) promoted garden cities, noting that to maintain the health of the community and land, smoke pollution would have to be kept to a minimum by requiring the use of the newest technologies and strict enforcement of pollution controls. In addition, objectionable industries would be excluded from operating as part of the garden cities (pp. 38-39).

Howard’s most profound ecological insights came from his recognition of human beings’ dependence on nature. In regards to nature, he stated,

All that we are and all that we have comes from it. Our bodies are formed of it; to it they return. We are fed by it, clothed by it, and by it are we warmed and sheltered. On its bosom we rest. Its beauty is the inspiration of art, of music, of poetry. Its forces propel all the wheels of industry. It is the source of all health, all wealth, all knowledge. (Howard, 1902, p. 18)

Thus, Howard (1902) insisted that human interactions with nature needed to take place in accordance with the law of the land (p. 26). According to Mumford (1961), Howard’s garden cities promoted “the essential biological criteria of dynamic equilibrium and organic balance: balance as between city and country in a larger ecological pattern, and balance between the varied functions of the city” (p. 516). In this, Howard advanced the construction of cities that abided by the law of restitution.

To completely marry town and country, Howard (1902) insisted, “The refuse of the town is utilised on the agricultural portions of the estate” (p. 25). In other words, as Liebig and Marx advocated, Howard proposed an organization of society that would decrease the metabolic rift. The nutrients of the soil would be returned to the land. Howard noted that this material exchange was necessary not only to maintain the soil but also to improve it (pp. 32-37). Furthermore, enriching the soil would increase the potential production of the soil, increasing the value of the land. Howard observed how human and animal wastes in large cities simply became pollution at the expense of depleting the soil in the countryside. Thus, he declared that the foundation of the garden cities plan

embraces a system of sewage-disposal which will return to the soil in a transmuted form many of those products the growth of which, by exhausting its natural fertility, demand elsewhere the application of manures so expensive that the farmer becomes sometimes blinded to their necessity. (p. 35)

Howard believed that it was through improving the soil that the value of land increased, so he made ground rent the basis for acquiring the revenues for the operation of a garden city.

The division between town and country was also transcended by the integration of industry and agriculture. Fibers, foodstuffs, and raw materials would be processed in the same locale, reducing the waste associated with shipping and trading over long distances. Furthermore, production and consumption were integrated within garden cities because goods were produced for the immediate market, and given the requirement that human and animal wastes must be returned to the farmlands, consumption became a form of production as it enriched the soil. To further reduce waste, living space was integrated with working space, as employment was to be found within the garden cities themselves. Howard despised suburbanization. So, factories, markets, and residential zones were all located within a close distance to reduce the wastefulness and expense of transporting goods to markets as well as the travel of workers to their jobs. In addition, Howard (1902) believed that producing for the local market would eliminate the waste and need for advertisements (p. 82). Thus, the overhead for businesses would be kept low within these planned cities. Howard's proposed garden cities offered balanced urban communities of high culture with "the infusion into the city of the life-sustaining environment and life-directed interests of the countryside" (Mumford, 1970, p. 401). He firmly believed that all people were entitled to the use of the earth, so long as it followed the laws of nature.

Organizing around Howard's proposed city, the Garden City Association mobilized like-minded people to finance and participate in this social experiment. By Howard's efforts to appeal to a wide range of people, the association ended up being composed of freethinkers as well as many businessmen. In 1903, a rural site, 35 miles from London, was purchased and Letchworth, the first garden city, was initiated (Osborn, 1972, p. 12). Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker, two architects influenced by William Morris, were commissioned to develop an overall plan for the design of the individual buildings (Fishman, 1977, p. 67; Hardy, 2000, pp. 67-68). Letchworth was planned in accordance with the contour of the land without the destruction of standing trees (Harris, 1906, p. 60). In 1905, Howard moved into the newly constructed Letchworth (Osborn, 1972, p. 22). Although Howard was appointed as the managing director, he was marginalized by the other directors of Letchworth, who felt their obligations resided in serving potential shareholders, rather than transferring power and resources to the community as a whole (Hall & Ward, 1998, pp. 32-36). George Bernard Shaw had predicted that capitalists, although willing to invest in the establishment of the new community, would be unwilling to relinquish their control within the enterprise. Nevertheless, the first garden city became a bastion for nonconformist freethinkers.

At this time, Howard continued to lecture and promote the idea of garden cities to audiences around the country. Despite the retreat of the Garden City Association from the proposed direction that Howard had laid out, Letchworth became a model city for city planners around the world. Garden City Associations were established throughout Europe. Howard had proposed building a single garden city as an example of what could be done, hoping to inspire the construction of other cities along the same lines. His vision was always of a constellation of garden cities. He knew that in the long run, regional development and social transformation were necessary for the survival and full development of garden cities along the lines that he laid out, meaning the common ownership of the land and the eradication of the divide between town and country in all its forms. Furthermore, Howard was an interna-

tionalist, believing that through garden cities the alienation of human society from nature could be ended within industrial capitalist nations.

In 1919, Howard initiated the establishment of a second garden city, to be known as Welwyn Garden City. By 1921, Howard moved to Welwyn, where he remained until his death in 1928. Howard was widely known and honored and was even knighted in 1927 (Osborn, 1972, pp. 13-14, 22). After the Blitz of 1940, the government used fragments of Howard's proposals in town planning to decongest the big cities through the construction of new towns (Mumford, 1964, p. 33). Although Howard's proposal of garden cities has been transfigured (dropping the most important characteristics), his book reshaped town planning throughout the world.

Howard met resistance to his ideas along the way. The Fabian Society dismissed him as creating utopian schemes. They noted that the building of new cities was not a useful venture and insisted that people had "to make the best of our existing cities" (as cited in Purdom, 1963, p. 2). Nonetheless, George Bernard Shaw, a Fabian, wrote, "He [Howard] was one of those heroic simpletons who do big things whilst our prominent wordlings are explaining why they are Utopian and impossible" (as cited in Hardy, 1991a, p. 211). Furthermore, Shaw saw fit to include a reference to a fictional garden city (Percivale St. Andrewes) in his play *Major Barbara*, as the town is described as a near smokeless city, beautifully situated within the hills of Middlesex, with numerous libraries and museums (Fishman, 1992, p. 148). H. G. Wells, a prominent Fabian, also broke ranks and joined the Garden City Association (Hall & Ward, 1998, p. 30).

More recently, Bookchin (1974) has argued that Howard, obsessed with design, failed to give proper attention to social conflicts in productive relationships, issues of income, and social intercourse with nature (pp. 116-124). Aalen (1992) has noted that Howard's belief that social transformation could emerge from a new physical environment may seem a bit shortsighted but reflected how Howard hoped that garden cities would be part of the social reform movement itself (pp. 31-32). Of course, we would be wise to consider Engels's declaration that the transformation of big cities is only possible through organized class struggle that abolishes the capitalist system (Marx & Engels, 1975, pp. 330, 337-368). Yet Howard hoped to reconcile differences and avoid conflict, while at the same time he desired to displace the landlords and capitalist exploitation through alternative means. Howard was committed to social reform and social justice. He called for the establishment of cities without slums, employment for the people, gardens instead of polluted lands, a rational system of distribution rather than one based on greed, pensions for the old and infirm, and peace rather than war and destruction. In regards to how he saw the building of garden cities, he declared, "Here is a task which may well unite a vast army of workers to utilize that power, the present waste of which is the source of half our poverty, disease, and suffering" (Howard, 1902, pp. 139-140).

Garden Cities stands as a dynamic approach for organizing human society. Rather than a rigid, uniform model, Howard asserted that the exact characteristics of garden cities would vary in accordance with the geography, climate, social needs, and historical conditions facing local actors. He recognized that communities evolve, so a city must undergo change as well. As greenbelts of land between cities are swallowed by concrete, *Garden Cities* provides a reminder that alternative paths of human development are possible in the face of destructive forces. Human society is not doomed to old patterns of life (Howard, 1902, pp. 133-134). Reprinted here are Howard's introduction and the first chapter of *Garden Cities*, in which he outlines the importance of restoring people to the land and his proposed plan for the organization of a garden city.

Although lacking the depth of Marx's critique of capitalism, Howard advanced an outline for transforming the interaction of human society and nature. In this, the law of restitution operated, as wastes were recycled back to the land to close the metabolic rift. Howard advocated a rational, scientific, industrious society in which people held control over the means of production through public ownership of the land and the internalization of social wealth (Mumford & Osborn, 1972, p. 440). Howard's work remains a model for a sustainable relationship with nature, as garden cities offer a possible direction on the route to creating a future in which human society and nature can successfully coevolve.

REFERENCES

- Aalen, F. H. A. (1992). English origins. In S. V. Ward (Ed.), *The garden city: Past, present, and future* (pp. 28-51). London: E & FN Spon.
- Beevers, R. (1988). *The garden city utopia: A critical biography of Ebenezer Howard*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Bookchin, M. (1974). *The limits of the city*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Buder, S. (1969). Ebenezer Howard: The genesis of a town planning movement. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35, 390-398.
- Engels, F. (1950). *The condition of the working-class in England in 1844*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Fishman, R. (1977). *Urban utopias in the twentieth century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, and Le Corbusier*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fishman, R. (1992). The American garden city: Still relevant? In S. V. Ward (Ed.), *The garden city: Past, present, and future* (pp. 146-164). London: E & FN Spon.
- Foster, J. B. (1998). William Morris's letters on Epping Forest: An introduction. *Organization & Environment*, 11(1), 90-92.
- Foster, J. B. (2000). *Marx's ecology: Materialism and nature*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- George, H. (1938). *Progress and poverty: An inquiry into the cause of industrial depressions and of increase of want with increase of wealth; the remedy*. New York: Modern Library.
- Hall, P., & Ward, C. (1998). *Sociable cities: The legacy of Ebenezer Howard*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Hardy, D. (1991a). *From garden cities to new towns: Campaigning for town and country planning, 1899-1946*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Hardy, D. (1991b). *From new towns to green politics: Campaigning for town and country planning, 1946-1990*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Hardy, D. (1992). The garden city campaign: An overview. In S. V. Ward (Ed.), *The garden city: Past, present, and future* (pp. 187-209). London: E & FN Spon.
- Hardy, D. (2000). *Utopian England: Community experiments 1900-1945*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Harris, G. M. (1906). *The garden city movement*. London: Garden City Association.
- Howard, E. (1902). *Garden cities of to-morrow*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
- Kropotkin, P. (1913). *Fields, factories and workshops: Or industry combined with agriculture and brain work with manual work*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Marx, K. (1984). *Capital* (Vol. 1). New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, K. (1991). *Capital* (Vol. 3). New York: Penguin.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1964). *The communist manifesto*. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1975). *Collected works* (Vol. 23). New York: International Publishers.
- Morris, W. (1962). *News from nowhere and selected writings and designs* (A. Briggs, Ed.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Morris, W. (1999). *William Morris on art and socialism* (N. Kelvin, Ed.). Minola, NY: Dover.
- Morton, A. L. (1978). *The English utopia*. London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.

- Mumford, L. (1961). *The city in history: Its origins, its transformations, and its prospects*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World.
- Mumford, L. (1964). *The highway and the city*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Mumford, L. (1970). *The culture of cities*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Mumford, L. (1972). The garden city idea and modern planning. In E. Howard, *Garden cities of to-morrow* (pp. 29-40). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mumford, L., & Osborn, F. J. (1972). *The letters of Lewis Mumford and Frederic J. Osborn: A transatlantic dialogue, 1938-70* (M. Hughes, Ed.). New York: Praeger.
- Osborn, F. J. (1972). Preface. In E. Howard, *Garden cities of to-morrow* (pp. 9-28). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Purdom, C. B. (1963). *The Letchworth achievement*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
- von Liebig, J. (1859). *Letters on modern agriculture*. London: Walton & Maberly.

Brett Clark is a sociology doctoral student at the University of Oregon. His areas of interest are ecology, political economy, and imperialism. He has published pieces on Henry S. Salt, William Stanley Jevons, George Perkins Marsh, and Helen Keller in past issues of Organization & Environment. blc30155@darkwing.uoregon.edu