

tralization of people and power, specialization, especially occupational, and the growth of impersonal and materialistic relationships. Brownell saw that the « public and private tendency toward indiscriminate centralization and mass control of life in fields of economics, corporative industry, technology, art, religion, politics, recreation, education, agriculture, and human affairs in general may well be a tendency toward death »<sup>97</sup>. Nisbet saw the state as taking up the vacuum created by the decline of religious, kinship, and locality groups. The decline of « community » has made ours an age of frustration, anxiety, disintegration, instability, breakdown, and collapse<sup>98</sup>.

Hicks in his *Small Town* pointed up elements of the good life combining both « urban » and « rural knowledge ». Urban knowledge is an awareness of the outside world and a recognition of the similarity and differences among peoples. Rural knowledge includes intimacy with nature and « of human nature based on direct and many sided relationships »<sup>99</sup>. The merits of a decentralized type of living have also been stressed by this writer and others<sup>100</sup>. Morgan has proposed a detailed design for the decentralized community which would realize the good life<sup>101</sup>.

Proponents of the cosmopolitan design stress the variety and creativeness of the urban way of life as well as the limitations of the suburbs. According to one writer, the suburb as contrasted with the neighborhood of the central city has a monotony and a conformity which is summarized by the phrase « suburban sadness »<sup>102</sup>. A recent survey made of urban dwellers in large American cities indicated that there were groups of people, chiefly those without young families, who preferred the neighborhood of a central city to the suburb<sup>103</sup>. On the other hand, it might be contended that the rush to the suburbs represents a return to community. People are interested in surroundings more conducive to family living. These include more space, contact with nature, and the integration of services of schools, church, and retail shops.

Considerable support no doubt can be gained for the position that in present day American life there is room and possibly the necessity for many types of community, ranging all the way from the highly homogeneous to the strongly cosmopolitan. Within any given local society a balance needs to be maintained between what might be termed processes of localization — those which focus on life within the locality and its distinctiveness — and the lateralization processes<sup>104</sup> — those which orient social life beyond the locality and tend to make the participants concerned members of various national publics.

<sup>97</sup> BAKER BROWNELL, *The Human Community*, New York: Harper, 1950, p. 5.

<sup>98</sup> ROBERT NISBET, *The Quest for Community*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1953, p. 7.

<sup>99</sup> GRANVILLE HICKS, *Small Town*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1946; see especially pp. 213-214.

<sup>100</sup> RALPH BORSODI, *Education and Living*, Suffern, New York: School for Living, 1948, p. 259.

<sup>101</sup> ARTHUR E. MORGAN, *The Community of the Future*, Yellow Springs, Ohio: Community Service Inc., 1957.

<sup>102</sup> DAVID RIESMAN, « The Suburban Sadness », Part IV in *The Suburban Community*, op. cit. See also *The Exploding Metropolis*, op. cit.

<sup>103</sup> *The Exploding Metropolis*, op. cit.

<sup>104</sup> For the development of the concept lateralization, see BURT W. AGINSKY, « The Fragmentation of the American Community », *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 26, November, 1952, pp. 125-33.