western, and one in particular, turned my interests in other directions, for which I have no regrets.

American geography was fertile ground for the seeds that began drifting eastward across the Cascades in the latter part of the decade. Most geographers were eager to find out what the quantifiers had to offer, and it was the quantifiers, not the traditionalists, who insisted that we must have a Quantitative Revolution. By the end of the 1950s we were ripe for the 1960s, and the following decade might have been far less tumultuous and far less traumatic if only some of the bright young quantifiers had been a bit better housebroken, and a bit less pugnacious, rude, and arrogant.

URBAN GEOGRAPHY AND CHICAGO IN RETROSPECT

Harold M. Mayer

In the late 1930s, when I was a graduate student in geography at the University of Chicago, I asked Charles C. Colby for his advice on securing an academic post. He said, "You should wait about ten years; meanwhile you could have an interesting career in city planning. Then, later, you will have something special and unique to offer to academia." I followed that advice and, ten years later—to the day—I asked the then chairman of the department, Robert S. Platt, about prospects in academia. A few days later I accepted a post on the faculty of the department, a position which I held until 1968.

When I returned to the department as a faculty member, the majority of my faculty colleagues consisted of those who had been my instructors earlier. Harlan Barrows had retired, as had Wellington Jones, but both were still in frequent contact. Charles Colby had recently retired. New members of the faculty were Chauncy Harris, Wesley Calef, and Norton Ginsburg. During the subsequent few years the turnover was complete as the earlier generation retired.

Several of the specific emphases and traditions of the department were carried on during the 1950s and 1960s. Among them were detailed microgeographic field studies in the Platt tradition, the application of geography in conservation and resource planning, and urban geography.

The emphasis on field work was reflected in several aspects of the department's program. Many of the graduate students produced dissertations which were of interest to, and in some instances partially or completely underwritten by, public agencies, in the United States and abroad, which involved detailed field studies. The required summer field course was continued under Robert Platt until 1951. Allen Philbrick, who joined the department in 1950 and continued for six years, and I took over the course in the following year, and operated it for several years. Because of changing emphases within geography, rising costs, and our own interests, the course was transferred from the northern areas bordering on Canada to the region within one hundred miles of Chicago, but it continued to involve camping—sometimes incongruously within urban areas—and continued to be of one month's duration. The field course on metropolitan Chicago, conducted for many years by Henry Leppard, was modified into a series of excursions. A course given at the downtown campus involved a series of lectures each spring quarter in conjunction with ten all-day Saturday field programs. One, each spring and fall, consisted of an all-day cruise through the metropolitan waterway system, thus reflecting the then current interest in the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway and development of the Port of Chicago.

Conservation and resource planning had always been a major emphasis in the department. Harlan Barrows had served as a consultant with many federal agencies, and had been active in connection with international compacts relative to development of the Columbia and Colorado river basins. Colby had been associated with maritime planning with the War Shipping Board in World War I and subsequently he and a number of his former students influenced planning operations by their association with the Tennessee Valley Authority and other agencies. Wesley Calef, subsequent to his joining the department, had close relations with the U.S. Bureau of Land Management.
Major reinforcement of the department's interest in conservation and land planning policy followed the affiliation of Gilbert F. White with the department in 1956. He had been closely associated, as a graduate student two decades earlier, with Harlan Barrows. In the late 1930s he was Secretary of the Water Resources Commission in Washington, following which he served in wartime relief work with the American Friends Service Committee, eventually becoming its Chairman of the Board. For eight years he was President of Haverford College. Early in 1956, when Robert Platt's term as Chairman of the department was about to terminate, Norton Ginsburg reported a conversation with Gilbert White, in which the latter expressed a desire to return to his interrupted career as a geographer. The department almost immediately offered him a faculty post and the chairmanship, which he accepted.

When Gilbert White was asked what he envisioned as a future program for the department, he replied with a significant statement. He said, "the program of the department should be the sum of the programs of the individual members of the department." This statement reflects not only the philosophy and approach of its author, but also the flexibility and liberal attitude of the University of Chicago.

White organized a seminar, which was in operation for several years, on the problems and management of floods. The nature and scope of the flood problem were outlined in the course of several years of seminar discussions and in field trips which supplemented them. Grants were secured from a number of federal and other agencies. A series of doctoral dissertations and monographs resulted. Among the specific results were the present national program of flood insurance and the program of mapping flood hazards.

The emphasis on urban and metropolitan studies in the geography department at the University of Chicago has been continuous since the beginnings of the department. Its first doctoral dissertation, in 1907, was in urban geography. Throughout the history of the department, a substantial proportion of the theses and dissertations has been concerned with description and analysis of urban areas and their problems.

During the 1920s and 1930s the relations of the Chicago geography department to the "Chicago School of Sociology" were not close. Such communication as there was consisted of ad hoc conversations between individuals. Graduate students in geography during that period would undoubtedly have gained advantage from closer association with the work in "human ecology" in the sociology department at the time, with such notable urban sociologists as Park, McKenzie, Burgess, Ogilvie, and Wirth. In some instances subsequent contacts with these sociologists and others were very stimulating and helpful, but their roots were not set during student days. The urban inspiration came from within the geography department.

John Paul Goode, who died in 1932, was a vivid memory to the faculty, who passed along many of his ideas, especially on planning in Chicago, to the graduate students. Goode had earlier written a monograph called "Chicago, City of Destiny" in which he maintained that the city was destined by its situation to become far greater than it then was. By contrast, at the fiftieth anniversary of the department, I was requested to deliver a series of lectures on Chicago, which I entitled, "Chicago, City of Decisions." This contrast in titles empha-

1 Gilbert F. White et al., Changes in Urban Occupancy of Flood Plains in the United States; Francis C. Murphy, Regulating Flood Plain Development; John R. Sheafer, Flood Proofing: An Element in a Flood Damage Reduction Program; Gilbert F. White et al., Papers on Flood Problems; Ian Burton, Types of Agricultural Occupancy of Flood Plains in the United States; Robert W. Kates, Hazard and Choice Perception in Flood Plain Management; Gilbert F. White, Choice of Adjustment to Floods; Robert W. Kates, Industrial Flood Losses: Damage Estimation in the Lehigh Valley; W. R. Derrick Sewell, Water Management and Floods in the Fraser River Basin. All of these were published as University of Chicago Department of Geography Research Papers between 1958 and 1965. Another in the series was Ian Burton, Robert W. Kates, and Rodman E. Sneed, The Human


4 Harold M. Mayer, Chicago: City of Decisions, edited by Chauncey D. Harris (Chicago: The Geographic Society of Chicago, 1955). At that time the department also published: A Half Century of Ge-
izes the shift in geography from the environmental determinism of an earlier day to the applications of geography in planning and the greater guidance possible, through planning, over future development. Colby’s paper “Centrifugal and Centripetal Forces in Urban Geography,” published in 1933, was the most widely quoted and reprinted single article in urban geography up to that time.5

City and metropolitan planning in the United States, long dominated by architecture, landscape architecture, engineering, and by the legal profession, broadened out in the 1930s with increasing involvement of the social sciences. Several graduates of the Chicago geography department found careers in city and regional planning before World War II, but the number increased rapidly after the war. Geography became recognized as a major contributing discipline to the planning process, and academic geography departments, including the one at the University of Chicago, educated increasing numbers of persons for careers in planning.6 Geography curricula, in turn, were influenced by the increased demand for planning personnel as well as by the growing status and recognition of geography as a contributing discipline.

During the 1930s, with the aid of many federal, state, and local work-relief projects, vast amounts of data were collected, mapped, and tabulated as part of the process of planning. Among the largest of such operations was the Chicago Land Use Survey, which was intended to form the basis of reorganizing planning of the City of Chicago, including not only the formation of a new agency to supplement the thirty-year-old Chicago Plan Commission, but also to serve as a basis for rezoning the city. At the suggestion of Henry Leppard, I applied for a position with the Chicago Land Use Survey for the summer of 1939. This led to a continuous affiliation with the Chicago Plan Commission and its successor agencies until I left Chicago in 1968, and an intermittent series of relations until the present. The survey was aborted by World War II, but it left a tremendous amount of data which furnished a baseline for subsequent planning activities during the following four decades.7 In the course of analysis of the survey, Homer Hoyt served as the Chicago Plan Commission’s Director of Research. One of the major influences in urban geography was his work in interpreting and generalizing the Chicago and other land use surveys in developing the wedge or sector model of urban structure.8 Hoyt understood geography and geographic concepts, and frequently employed geographers in official capacities during the 1930s and 1940s, and employed them ad hoc when he served as a self-employed consultant subsequently. Several Chicago graduates in addition to myself were greatly influenced by association with Homer Hoyt. Between 1948 and 1950, upon return to Chicago from a planning position in Philadelphia and until I joined the Chicago department of geography, I served as Hoyt’s successor as Director of Research for the Chicago Plan Commission. This experience proved very useful in developing insights into the political and educational processes which are indispensable parts of the process of planning.

During the 1950s and early 1960s, two developments greatly affected the Department of

---

7 Among the publications of the Chicago Land Use Survey were: Residential Chicago (1942), Land Use in Chicago (1943), 150 volumes of tabulations, several million IBM cards covering each parcel, housing unit, and business unit in the city, and a set of detailed base maps of the city in various scales and formats. The survey formed the basis of a landmark publication: Master Plan of Residential Land Use of Chicago (Chicago Plan Commission, 1943). Two University of Chicago geography graduates, Robert C. Klove and Harold M. Mayer, were among the staff which prepared the plan, under Homer Hoyt, who was then Director of Research for the Chicago Plan Commission.

Geography at the University of Chicago in its approach to urban geography, as well as to geography in general. One was the constellation of related trends and events sometimes—not quite correctly—called the "quantitative revolution" in geography, paralleling that of the other social sciences. The other was the organization and operation of several concurrent programs at the University, most notably the Program of Education and Research in Planning, and the Center for Urban Studies.

It was in some respects unfortunate that the Department of Geography at the University of Chicago, for about a decade, was known as a department which developed the "Chicago School" of urban geography, characterized by a heavy emphasis upon quantitative methods. It was true that quantitative methods played an important role in geographic studies at Chicago in the 1960s, but the department had a much better balance between traditional and quantitative geography than was generally believed. The dichotomy no longer exists; a fusion of the two approaches—if there ever were two approaches—has taken place.

The adaptation of the Chicago geography curriculum to the increased use of quantitative methods and the "tone" of the department's research output came via the University of Washington. In some respects, the catalyst was William Garrison, who was not directly associated with the Chicago department. Garrison was the mentor of a significant number of young geographers, among whom was Brian J. L. Berry. Berry, with a newly awarded doctorate at age twenty-three, was appointed in 1958 to the Department of Geography at the University of Chicago, where he remained for eighteen years. During that time, he conducted courses in quantitative methods within the geography department, and greatly influenced the department in their use.

Another significant development which affected urban geography at the University of Chicago was the Program of Education and Research in Planning, and subsequently the Center for Urban Studies.

The program in Planning operated for nine years. In retrospect it was extremely successful, because it produced a significant number of planners who now hold important positions, and whose writings have made significant contributions, to the field of planning in the United States and in many other nations. Many of the students in that program were introduced to geography; they took the courses in urban geography and other aspects of geography, and some produced dissertations which were essentially geographica1. Members of the geography department participated heavily in the educational program in planning, and served on Planning dissertation committees.

The Planning program was organized under direction of Rexford G. Tugwell, a prominent member of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "brain trust" who subsequently served as Governor of Puerto Rico. In Tugwell's absence during the first year of the program (he took a leave of absence in England) the actual organization was accomplished under direction of Harvey Perloff, an economist, who later became the program's director. Originally, the program was to have been under a committee, rather than as a separate department of the university but, in fact, it functioned in many ways as a department. Unfortunately, this aroused antagonisms in some departments (not geography) which felt threatened by possible competition in a field which somewhat paralleled theirs. The planning program was administered by an interdisciplinary committee of which I was a member after I joined the university three years after the program began. When the university encountered financial difficulties in the mid-1950s, the program, as one of the newest, was terminated. Chauncey Harris, who at that time was Dean of the Division of Social Sciences, frequently indicated that the program was ended with great reluctance. Its results, however, were outstanding.

The Center for Urban Studies was, in part, an outgrowth of the University's concern for the deteriorating conditions in the immediate neighborhood of the campus, and in part as the result of close relationships between individual members of the university with planning agencies and other organizations within the City of Chicago.

Social scientists at the university, including geographers, had maintained many relationships with official and voluntary agencies within

---

9 One evaluation of the Program of Education and Research in Planning at the University of Chicago, by its former director, is: Harvey S. Perloff, Education for Planning: City, State, and Regional, published for Resources for the Future, Inc. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1957).
the city. My relationships with the Department of Development and Planning and other agencies, including the Chicago Regional Port District, were long-standing and the direct outgrowth of previous full-time employment with the city. The Chicago Community Inventory was a major contractor with the City in conducting surveys and publishing basic research data, much of which was geographically useful. Close associations were also developed with the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. Two sociologists and demographers, Philip Hauser and Evelyn Kitagawa, who were associated with the Community Inventory and other organizations, collaborated frequently with geographers on local area studies.

At the local neighborhood scale, two organizations, the Southeast Chicago Commission and the Hyde-Park-Kenwood Community Conference—the former dominantly protecting the university's interests in the community, and the latter a "grass roots" citizen organization—were occurring in the communities surrounding the campus. The area, of course, formed a convenient laboratory for studies in all the social sciences, including geography. Geographers not only participated very actively in the operation of these and other agencies, but also produced significant research on the community, which has been widely used in a variety of other areas faced with transition.

With support in part from the Ford Foundation and other sources, and with research con-
tracts and grants from other organizations, the Center for Urban Studies was organized, in large measure in order to serve as an avenue for basic research in urban problems, focusing on Chicago, and especially on the university neighborhood. A comprehensive plan for conservation and partial renewal of the university community and nearby areas was developed and partially implemented. Faculty and graduate students in geography and other disciplines were afforded not only financial support, but excellent "real world" laboratories for many significant contributions to knowledge in several disciplines.

It is an interesting coincidence that the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Department of Geography of the University of Chicago coincides approximately with the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Association of American Geographers. In a sense, modern American geography may be said to have been born with the twentieth century. The two organizations, together with the venerable American Geographical Society and the National Geographic Society, were the cornerstones of the discipline. For many years the Chicago department was the only one in the United States with a graduate program. The second generation of twentieth-century geographers, therefore, were virtually all products of that department. An interesting diffusion study could be made tracing the influence of the department on subsequent generations of geographers. From its unique position in the early years, the Department, in large part as a result of its own influence, has become one among many. Yet its standards of excellence, innovation, and leadership continue undiminished.

PLAYING WITH IDEAS*

William L. Garrison

The University of Washington in the 1950s was the fifth of eleven campuses on which I had the pleasure of working either as a student or as a faculty member. Each of those places and times was special; all were intellectually stimulating and collegial. So, when colleagues say that the University of Washington must have been an especially exhilarating place during the 1950s, I have to guard my remarks with the caveat that campuses have all been that way.

* I indirectly take my title and stress on playing with ideas from Paul Feyerabend, a philosopher of science.