

SIXTY YEARS OF TRANSITION IN A PLANNED COMPANY
TOWN, WITH A PORTRAYAL OF CURRENT RESIDENT
EVALUATIONS¹

Arnold R. Alanen

Department of Landscape Architecture
 University of Wisconsin, Madison

ABSTRACT

Most company towns in the United States, because of their paternalistic overtones and rather minimal design standards, receive scant attention in reviews of previous new town and new community development efforts. At the same time, however, it has been noted that certain similarities exist between these previous corporate-sponsored entities and many contemporary planned communities. In an effort to consider the processes that one of these older developments has experienced over a span of sixty years, this paper traces the evolution of Morgan Park, Minnesota, one of the few company towns which has received favorable attention for certain design and planning-related criteria. The partial results of a recent resident survey are also discussed so as to determine the extent to which some of these initial inputs are still recognized and appreciated by present day inhabitants.

1. INTRODUCTION

Imperfect though they may be, new towns and planned communities continue to attract attention as one, albeit partial, alternative to contemporary urban development patterns. Until recently, however, relatively little empirical evidence has been available which provides insight to actual levels of resident satisfaction within such environments. It is only during this decade that several research efforts have begun to explore a host of issues ranging from evaluations of specific design components to analyses of community planning and governance mechanisms (e.g., Lansing, *et al.*, 1970; Zehner, 1971; Godschalk, 1973; Keller, 1973; Marans & Rodgers, 1973; Burby, 1974).

A major factor underlying many of these research endeavors involves the amount of control a developer can or should exert in the process of creating a new community. Proponents of strong developer rights contend that centralized controls are necessary if certain innovations are to be realized and standards maintained;

on the other hand, opponents of this view argue that new communities should truly be democratic and serve as vehicles for the engendering of greater public participation and involvement (Burby, 1974). In essence, the questions are somewhat similar to those posed decades ago when various industrial enterprises were establishing company towns in the United States. Certainly the degree of paternalism within America's former company towns was much greater than in today's planned communities; but yet, parallels exist between the two situations, even as evidenced by the use of the term "company town" to describe certain contemporary suburban developments (Brooks, 1971; Godschalk, 1973).

Given this evidence, it would appear that the actions, procedures and results relating to the transition from corporate to individual ownership might provide some insights to design, planning and management decisions for today's planned community situations. For example, did the character of the socioeconomic and physical environment in these company towns change noticeably after corporate (i.e. developer) controls were terminated; and was the transition period a traumatic one, or did it occur with relatively little difficulty? Of even greater interest are questions relating to perceptions and evaluations of the current community milieu. In other words, are the features of a planned environment still evident and/or appreciated by residents after such a community has existed for many decades and has already achieved maturity?

1.1. Approach and Procedure

The following discussion and analysis will seek to address the above questions by focusing upon the planned company town of Morgan Park, Minnesota. During its initial quarter century of existence as a U.S. Steel Corporation company town and subsequent three decades as a non-corporate entity, the community has undergone several transitional phases which range from changes in management and ownership practices to problems of local economic stability. Although a study which deals with a single community may appear overly idiographic, Morgan Park is one of the few company towns in the United States which has received positive evaluations from several observers (e.g., Magnusson, 1918; Reys, 1965; Glaab & Brown, 1967). Since Radburn, the

¹Research support for this paper was provided by the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin.

Greenbelt towns, Columbia, Reston and a few other similar examples often serve as case studies for the analysis of different planned community eras in the United States, it can be argued that Morgan Park stands out as a company town model which merits further inquiry.

The ensuing study begins with a description of the community through its company and post-company town phases, and follows with a brief discussion of events which recently led to the closing of the adjacent steel manufacturing complex. (Ironically, this same industrial facility was responsible for the initial development of the community during the early part of the century.) The latter portion of the paper is devoted to an analysis of community evaluations and perceptions as expressed by Morgan Park's current residents; these results, in turn, are compared to findings derived from studies of more recently built communities.

1.2. An American Company Town Context

Whereas relatively few company towns are built in the United States today, their development was a relatively commonplace occurrence during the 19th and early 20th centuries.² Such communities generally emerged in remote, resource oriented areas of the country where normal housing supply channels could or would not satisfy local needs and requirements. Unfortunately, however, the company town story in the United States is hardly an attractive one. As Porteous (1974) has stated: "Physical planning in company towns has often been conspicuous by its absence; entrepreneurs are characteristically oriented toward production and profit, rather than the onerous task of housing their employees." Although there have been any number of such developments in the United States, one of the classic negative examples is provided by Gary, Indiana, a city once characterized as "...a complete example of what not to do in future developments" (Comey & Wehrly, 1939). In other cases where planning was tightly structured, as at Pullman, Illinois, the resulting social controls were so strict that dissension and conflict eventually erupted (Buder, 1971).

Between these two poles, characterized by Pullman's highly regulated situation on the one hand and Gary's haphazardly planned environment on the other, were some company towns which appeared to provide a relatively humane milieu

²More recent manifestations of the company town theme can be found in Canada, especially along the nation's northern resource frontier. There also is the possibility that company towns may once again emerge within the U.S. if large-scale exploitation of coal and other energy resources in the Great Plains and Rocky Mountain regions should occur.

for resident-worker existence. To determine if this indeed was or is the case, the following discussion will focus upon the sixty year evolution of one such community.

2. MORGAN PARK: PAST TO PRESENT

2.1. Community Origins

Unlike many company town endeavors where the rapid exploitation of a resource meant that housing for laborers was built quickly (and often poorly), Morgan Park's development took place quite slowly. The major reason behind this languor was the hesitancy of U.S. Steel even to become involved with steel production operations in Northeastern Minnesota. In fact, it was not until the State of Minnesota, during 1907, threatened to impose a tonnage tax on U.S. Steel's vast iron ore holdings that the corporation reluctantly agreed to establish a steel production unit proximate to the city of Duluth (White & Primmer, 1937). Various manifestations of this arrangement, entered into by America's first billion dollar corporation and a state with enormous, but nonetheless finite mineral wealth, would continue to mark the course of events that affected the community during ensuing decades.

When U.S. Steel officials first announced their plans to construct a steel production unit in Minnesota, it also was stated that the corporation would not build homes for employees, but would leave this task "to others" (Duluth News Tribune, 1907). By 1910, however, plans were being made to develop a company town which would "...include strictly modern homes, beautiful as to architecture and commodious of arrangement, business houses, paved streets, a perfect sewer and lighting system, and halls for public meetings and places of amusement" (Duluth News Tribune, 1910). Apparently the major thrust behind this change in plans was the corporation's perception of Northeastern Minnesota's labor situation. Since most employment opportunities in the region were highly seasonal, a large portion of the labor force was quite foot-loose; hence, it was surmised that a dependable work force could be provided only if certain inducements were used. In the case of Morgan Park the major inducement was the provision of housing and services qualitatively better than that offered in the surrounding area (Iron Age, 1913).

By 1918, a national architectural journal was reporting that Morgan Park's planning and development "...had been along systematic and orderly lines, correct principles of town planning have been followed and the educational and recreative elements necessary in a development of this character have been provided in a most modern and satisfactory manner" (American Architect, 1918). When compared to the monotonous grid pattern of most company towns, Morgan

Park does stand out as a rather positive contrast. A curvilinear street pattern was utilized, not so much for novelty's sake, but especially to enhance the relationship with the adjacent wooded terrain, lake shore and ravines. All wires were placed underground and efforts made to preserve as many trees as possible. The housing, largely constructed during the 1915-18 interim, provided accommodations for about 20 percent of the local work force (Magnusson, 1918). Since the residences were built of concrete, the units proved to be durable but somewhat drab; however, the "bomb shelter" appearance of the exteriors was mitigated by various architectural features such as gables, eaves and pitched roofs. The interiors of the residences were likewise designed to provide each house with a simple but unified appearance. "Family areas flowed into each other, eliminating dark, wasteful hallways and small isolated rooms" (Scott, 1974).

While the vistas, broad streets and rather dominant public and commercial buildings provided Morgan Park with some modest properties of the City Beautiful, it was the attempt to promote social policies through physical design which brought most attention to the community. Morgan Park, as noted by one U.S. Department of Labor analyst, was both a physical and social planning experiment (Magnusson, 1918). Although some of these efforts displayed evidence of social enlightenment, others were no more than paternalistic gestures couched in seemingly altruistic terms.

Much of the corporation's social planning was referred to as "welfare work." As noted by one local observer, the corporation was interested in its employees "...not only during their hours of labor, but (also) during their hours of rest," and was likewise concerned with "...questions of how the employees live; how they obtain their recreation; how they spend their money; and how their children are educated" (McCarthy, 1916). The same observer, however, pointed out that such practices were related to sound business principles; and another spokesman claimed that the corporation's welfare work was not "sociological meddling," but only an attempt to increase worker efficiency through better living conditions (Stowell, 1918).

Within the community some homes were provided for all socioeconomic levels, ranging in scope from multiple and row houses for lower income laborers to large substantial residences for managers. Whereas residents generally were selected in order of application, other considerations also were used: the character of the applicants' services, his general desirability as a tenant and the likelihood of his becoming a permanent employee (Magnusson, 1918). Nevertheless, a certain amount of "weeding" apparently occurred in the process of selecting applicants. One observer stated that while housing was available in adjoining, less attractive townsites, it was "the skilled workmen and the families of

their high grade, permanent class (who) have the privilege of Morgan Park homes" (The Zenith, 1915).

Although there never have been large numbers of blacks living in the Duluth region, those employed in steel plant operations were excluded from the Morgan Park residential community. Likewise, certain facilities and events based within Morgan Park but which had a constituency larger than the community itself, were limited to white participants alone. Such practices were defended by stating that separate events could be held for non-whites at some later date; or that the large number of general community events simply utilized all available facility time and could not be used by smaller (i.e., minority) groups (Good Fellowship Club, 1920 and 1923). Perhaps these were isolated examples, but they do nonetheless point to the ease with which social, economic and racial homogeneity could be maintained within most company towns.

The employment-residence relationship, which often made employee completely subservient to employer, always has been a consistent criticism of company town life. When coupled with their usual monotony and lack of services and amenities, it is no wonder that company towns came to be regarded as no more than utilitarian living environments at best. On the other hand, in towns such as Morgan Park where the full force of corporate planning and sponsorship was applied to the community setting, a myriad of local organizations and activities were developed for and by workers and their families. By 1919, for example, some 36 organizations, most of them housed in a central facility donated to the community by the corporation, had emerged in Morgan Park. The amount of direct company involvement in Morgan Park never even approached that of Pullman, but it is quite obvious that with the provision of so many free-time opportunities in the community, outside (and perhaps antagonistic) influences could be held to a minimum.

Finally, it would be remiss if one very specific regulation were not mentioned: the complete ban on the sale of any alcoholic beverages within Morgan Park. This form of prohibition, which only served to move the dispensing establishments outside the town limits, was practiced in several company towns throughout the country. Hence, not only were there company stores and company housing in towns such as Morgan Park--there also were "company morals."

2.2. From Company to Private Ownership

During the 1920's and most of the 1930's, Morgan Park's status as a company town remained unchanged. Interestingly enough, however, it was the corporation and not the residents that initiated action to bring company ownership to an end. During 1938, the company announced that the residents could buy their homes if they were interested (MacDonald, 1942). This action at the

local level reflected a broader U.S. Steel decision to sell much of its property throughout the country. The reasons behind this plan were listed as increasing taxes, plant relocations, operating and selling charges, unused land and depleted mining properties (Iron Age, 1938). Other reports, however, stated that the company actually was concerned with the relationship between corporate paternalism and labor conflicts (Architectural Forum, 1951).

Overt paternalism did not appear to be of exceeding concern to Morgan Park residents since only two individuals purchased their homes between 1938 and 1942. The company, during 1942, then announced that because of the hesitancy displayed by residents, a real estate sales approach would be adopted. Acknowledging that the steel corporation was not equipped to engage in such activities, the company proceeded to make plans to sell its residential holdings to a nationally-based realty firm. Although it was stated that the firm would sell or rent the dwelling units to occupants who wished to remain in Morgan Park (MacDonald, 1942), a group of residents responded by protesting that "turning us over to the tender mercies of a real estate outfit doesn't exactly appeal to us" (Morgan Park Community Club, 1942). Nevertheless, the transaction was completed by the end of 1942, and the disposal of individual properties began thereafter.

For several years the relationship between the realty firm and Morgan Park residents was rather strained. Since the operation and maintenance of the community had formerly been undertaken by a subsidiary arm of the steel corporation, the sale brought many services to an immediate end. This transition caused considerable consternation within the community. Several residents, for example, expressed dismay when the realtor discontinued heating and lighting within the large community garages, and some inhabitants were rankled when certain services such as sidewalk snow removal were terminated (Morgan Park Community Club, 1945). It was not until a larger number of residences had been sold to individual owners that such administrative and management problems were finally resolved.

2.3. The Community Today

Because of their solid construction, residences in Morgan Park have consistently ranked higher than neighboring areas relative to value, condition and number of facilities (U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970). Apparently because of the community's residential attributes, Morgan Park, during the 1960's, was the only older area of Duluth to display a total population gain³ and experience very

³ Nevertheless, Morgan Park's 1970 population was only 2,461 residents--334 more than in 1919.

little decline in the number of younger family residents (City of Duluth, 1969).

By the early 1970's, however, the relative tranquility of Morgan Park was once again interrupted. Because of the pollution emissions discharged by an increasingly antiquated manufacturing plant, environmentalists began to focus their attentions upon the steel production unit. Although the State of Minnesota, during 1970, gave U.S. Steel three years to determine its future plans for the plant and two additional years to meet pollution standards, the corporation proceeded to shut down the blast furnaces during late 1971 and early 1972. (The fabrication mill was closed two years later.)

U.S. Steel's actions obviously created a new set of conditions that had to be faced by many community residents. Even though the plant had never been much more than a marginal facility within the U.S. Steel production framework, its relatively minor national role did not reduce the actual local impact of the closing. A number of employees transferred to various U.S. Steel operations in Minnesota and the United States, others were able to retire or qualify for pensions, and the remainder either pursued altogether different employment options or attempted to cope in some alternative manner. Whatever the case, one fact was indisputable: Morgan Park was a steel town no more.

3. RESIDENT SURVEY

Whereas some observers expected that Morgan Park would turn into a ghost town overnight, the community appeared to retain its relative stability. Given this observation, an effort was made to assess resident attitudes and perceptions some three years after the initial plant closing. To undertake the study, a telephone survey was made of 341 Morgan Park households (45 percent of the community) during June 1975.⁴ Questions asked related to current perceptions and evaluations of the local community environment, actions following the steel plant closing, attitudes toward U.S. Steel and its procedures, and normal demographic information. Only the results which have greatest relevance for this study are discussed in the following section.

3.1. Resident Turnover Rates

Whereas there were no exact data available which indicated how many residents actually left Morgan Park because of the steel plant closing, it was possible to derive some idea from the resident survey. Just over 12 percent of the respondents had moved into the community during the three and one-half year period following U.S. Steel's phasing-out operations. By way of comparison, the turnover rates during the two three-year periods preceding the steel plant

⁴ Assistance was provided by the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory.

closing were 8.3 and 8.5 percent respectively. Thus, there undoubtedly was an increase in resident turnover following the closing, but it was not as inordinately high as might have been expected. (A later part of this discussion will focus upon former steel workers who decided to remain in Morgan Park.) As far as future residential stability was concerned, 69 percent of the respondents stated that they intended to remain in the community for at least ten years or more.

3.2. Morgan Park: A Planned Community?

To determine if present day residents were even cognizant of the community's rather unique genesis, respondents were asked whether Morgan Park could be considered a "planned" community or not. About 82 percent answered affirmatively, four percent said no, and the remainder stated that they did not know. Hence, it appeared that at least an image, if not definite knowledge, of the community's origins still persisted among a large majority of Morgan Park's residents some 60 years after initial development efforts began.

3.3. Community Features

Table 1 depicts the evaluations of certain community features made by Morgan Park residents when asked to compare their community to other nearby neighborhoods. The only feature considered to be roughly equivalent in both Morgan Park and adjoining areas was the amount of useable outdoor space. (The somewhat higher housing densities in Morgan Park probably contributed to these perceptions.) More than one-half of the residents considered Morgan Park's community facilities to be superior to adjacent areas, but 12 percent of the respondents, when asked to name the community's most serious shortcoming, listed the inadequacy of such facilities. (Over the 60 year period, few facilities had been added to the initial array provided by U.S. Steel: a community building, two churches, a school and a small commercial center.) Finally, local community maintenance was perceived as being superior to other neighborhoods by 57 percent of the respondents. However, a much larger proportion considered maintenance to be at least satisfactory. (Only three percent listed maintenance shortcomings as a major problem.) This is a rather important factor since other studies have noted the strong relationship that exists between neighborhood maintenance and resident contentment (Lansing, et al., 1970; Marans & Rodgers, 1973).

3.4. Community Evaluations By Length of Residence and Age of Respondent

Cross tabulations were made to determine if length of residence within Morgan Park or age of respondent were related to community evaluations. As indicated by Table 2, tenure within Morgan Park was accompanied by progressive increases in favorable perceptions of the local environment.

TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SELECTED MORGAN PARK CHARACTERISTICS WITH NEARBY NEIGHBORHOODS, AS EVALUATED BY MORGAN PARK RESIDENTS

Characteristic	Better in M.P. %	Same in M.P. %	Worse in M.P. %	Total %	n*
Quality of Housing	74.5	25.2	.3	100	330
Presence of Landscaping	70.4	27.7	1.9	100	358
Community Facilities	58.5	40.1	1.4	100	354
Community Maintenance	57.4	41.5	1.1	100	352
Useable Outdoor Space	46.2	48.7	5.1	100	351

*Total figures vary since all responses were not useable.

Similar findings were also revealed when the age of respondent was considered. Although the table with the cross tabulations has not been included here, over 76 percent of the 18 to 25 year old residents preferred Morgan Park to any other area of Duluth, while 94 percent of the group over 64 years of age evaluated the community in a similar manner. These findings are similar to those of Marans & Rodgers (1973), who determined that younger persons are generally least satisfied with their local environment, while older, retired individuals are the most contented.

TABLE 2: PREFERENCE FOR MORGAN PARK AS A PLACE TO LIVE, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN COMMUNITY

Length of Residence in M.P.	Prefer to Live in M.P. Rather Than Any Other Area of Duluth			Total n
	Yes %	No %	Total %	
0 - 3 years	55.6	44.4	100	45
4 - 10 years	78.1	21.9	100	73
11 - 20 years	90.1	9.9	100	81
Over 20 years	94.4	5.6	100	162
Total	85.3	14.7	100	361

Chi-Sq. = 47.14 with 3 DF; Prob. = .001

3.5. Housing Quality By Socioeconomic Background

Table 1 indicated that a sizeable proportion of local residents considered Morgan Park's housing to be of higher quality than that found in adjacent neighborhoods. In an effort to offer further insight to such findings, a cross tabulation (Table 3) was made between the socioeconomic backgrounds of respondents and evaluations of housing quality. As with the community environment, the retired persons (86 percent) were most likely to consider Morgan Park housing to be of superior quality.

TABLE 3: MORGAN PARK HOUSING QUALITY COMPARED TO ADJOINING NEIGHBORHOODS, BY SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF MORGAN PARK RESIDENTS

Socioeconomic Group	Better in M.P. %	Same in M.P. %	Worse in M.P. %	Total %	n
White collar	71.3	27.7	1.0	100	94
Blue collar	72.5	27.5	-	100	109
Retired	86.2	13.8	-	100	94
Other	57.6	42.4	-	100	33
Total	74.5	25.2	.3	100	330

Chi-Sq. = 10.82 with 6 DF; Prob. = .094

Over 70 percent of the blue and white collar residents also expressed the belief that the housing was of a higher standard, but only 58 percent of the "other" group (comprised primarily of students and women not working outside the home) held similar opinions. Since the socioeconomic breakdown was derived by considering the occupation of the major wage earner in each household, financial constraints might have relegated many members of this group to the community's poorest housing. While these responses likely were conditioned by personal involvement with the lower end of the community's housing continuum, it is important to note that none of these respondents expressed the belief that Morgan Park's housing was of poorer quality than that found in other neighborhoods.

3.6. Residential Desirability and Former U.S. Steel Employees

The final tabulation was limited to former U.S. Steel employees who had decided to stay in Morgan Park even after the steel plant closed. The members of this group were asked if the desirability of Morgan Park as a place to live had influenced their decision to remain in the community. Although the cell sizes in Table 4 are somewhat small, it is interesting to note that 87 percent of the respondents indicated that Morgan Park's positive attributes had influenced their decision to stay either very much or somewhat. Even the blue collar workers, whose outlook might have been expected to be conditioned more strongly by job-related criteria, displayed a rather decided affinity for the community.

4. CONCLUSION

Keller (1973) has stated that meaningful advances in residential design will be possible only if "post-mortem" studies are done on planned communities and other similar environments. Such studies, she argues, are necessary before the success and actual outcome of initial planning and design proposals--especially in the eyes of residents and users--can be determined. Likewise, the national surveys of planned environments conducted by Marans and Rodgers (1973) and others provide a broad data base to which

TABLE 4: RESIDENTIAL DESIRABILITY OF MORGAN PARK, AS EXPRESSED BY FORMER U.S. STEEL EMPLOYEES STILL RESIDING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY

Socio-economic Group	Extent to Which Desirability of M.P. Influenced Decision to Remain in Community After Steel Plant Closing				Total %	n
	Very Much %	Some-what %	Not at all %			
White collar	77.8	-	22.2	100	9	
Blue collar	60.0	34.3	5.7	100	35	
Retired	80.0	-	20.0	100	15	
Other	75.0	-	25.0	100	4	
Total	68.2	19.1	12.7	100	63	

Chi-Sq. = 7.96 with 6 DF; Prob. = .241

findings in specific communities can be compared. This study of Morgan Park, a planned company town in Northeastern Minnesota, was undertaken so as to trace the temporal evolution of one such community, and to determine resident evaluations of the local environment some 60 years after initial planning and design proposals had been initiated.

In looking at Morgan Park's early history, the reviewer is struck by an immediate dichotomy: the praiseworthy qualities of the physical plan and related facilities on the one hand, and the paternalistic character of the community on the other. Perhaps it might be argued that corporate ownership and guidance ensured the perpetuation of many attractive features within the community; but such paternalism, benevolent though it might have been, undoubtedly influenced the lives and actions of residents in both direct and subtle manners. Social and racial homogeneity were ensured, and the close linkage between home and steel hearth was a constant reminder to any worker who might have questioned or challenged certain corporate practices.

Nevertheless, when company ownership of the community did come to an end in 1942, it was the residents and employees who expressed greatest dismay. Of special concern to the community's inhabitants were: 1) the procedures that were followed in selling all residential properties to an intermediate agent who then resold the dwelling units to individual buyers, and 2) the ensuing actions of the agent in phasing out and downgrading many community services. This period of instability and difficulty, however, is indicative of the problems faced by many past and present communitarian ventures: i.e., the question of how to make the transition from singular ownership and management "...to a thriving and democratic polity" (Brooks, 1971).

While the issue of paternalism is a matter of past history in Morgan Park⁵, a more immediate question involves the community evaluations made by residents currently living in such a "mature" planned development. The findings of the resident survey described in the previous section indicated that most inhabitants still appreciated the legacy of physical features, structures and facilities originally provided by the U.S. Steel Corporation. Overall satisfaction with the community was quite high, with most residents placing greatest stress upon Morgan Park's housing qualities. While such evaluations of housing and related maintenance attributes conform to studies undertaken elsewhere in the United States, it also has been pointed out that the local social setting is an additional and important factor in determining overall levels of satisfaction with one's immediate environment (Marans & Rodgers, 1973). Once again, Morgan Park's citizenry appeared to be quite satisfied: When asked to name the single most attractive feature of the community, the greatest number of respondents (30 percent of the total) listed the positive qualities of their neighbors and fellow residents. Only two percent indicated that the presence of "undesirable" residents constituted a major community problem.

The above findings are more interesting when it is recognized that Morgan Park consists of an almost equal proportion of blue collar, white collar and retired residents (see Table 3). Although the older residents gave Morgan Park the highest overall ratings, a majority of members in the other groups were also quite satisfied with their community. Hence, it would appear that not only can many of the physical qualities of a planned environment be perpetuated over a span of several decades; but that such communities, at least at a limited scale, can also provide a framework which nurtures social heterogeneity and diversity. Granted Morgan Park is but a small example, but it might offer some indication of what today's emerging developments can be like a half century from now. If this is the case, perhaps we should not render final judgments on planned communities until they have achieved maturity.

references

- American Architect, 113, June 1918, pp. 743-758 & 761.
- Architectural Forum, 95, November 1951, pp. 136-143.
- BROOKS, RICHARD. Social Planning in Columbia. Journal, American Institute of Planners, XXXVII, November 1971, pp. 373-379.
- BUDER, STANLEY. Pullman: An Experiment in Industrial Order and Community Planning, 1840-1930. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- BURBY, RAYMOND J. Environmental Amenities and New Community Governance: Results of a Nationwide Study. In Proceedings, EDRA 5, ed. by Daniel H. Carson. Kansas City: Environmental Design Research Association, Inc., 1974.
- City of Duluth, Department of Research and Planning. Community Renewal Program: Population Profile. Duluth: Department of Research and Planning, 1969.
- COMEY, ARTHUR C. & WEHRLY, MAX S. Planned Communities. In Urban Planning and Land Policies, Vol. II of the Supplementary Report of the Urbanism Committee to the National Resources Committee. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939.
- Duluth (Minn.) News Tribune, April 2, 1907, pp. 1 & 5; and March 24, 1910, p. 10.
- GLAAB, CHARLES N. & BROWN, A. THEODORE. A History of Urban America. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.
- GODSCHALK, DAVID R. New Communities or Company Towns? An Analysis of Resident Participation in New Towns. In New Towns: Why--And for Whom?, ed. by Harvey Perloff & Neil C. Sanders. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- Good Fellowship Club (Morgan Park). Minute Book, August 6, 1920 and November 13, 1923.
- Iron Age, 92, September 18, 1913, pp. 603-605; and 142, November 3, 1938, pp. 162 & 163.
- KELLER, SUZANNE. Friends and Neighbors in a Planned Community. In Frontiers of Planned Unit Development: A Synthesis of Expert Opinion, ed. by Robert W. Burchett. New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1973.
- LANSING, JOHN B., MARANS, ROBERT W., AND ZEHNER, ROBERT B. Planned Residential Environments. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1970.
- MACDONALD, J. G. Letter to Morgan Park Good Fellowship Club, August 10, 1942.
- MAGNUSSON, LEIFFUR. A Modern Industrial Suburb. Monthly Review of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 6, April 1918, pp. 729-753.

⁵It might be argued that Morgan Park's single industry orientation, which continued until the 1970's, constituted a form of economic paternalism. Discussion of such a point, however, is beyond the scope of this paper.

- MARANS, ROBERT W. & RODGERS, WILLARD. Evaluating Resident Satisfaction in Established and New Communities. In Frontiers of Planned Unit Development: A Synthesis of Expert Opinion, ed. by Robert W. Burchell. New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1973.
- MCCARTHY, GEORGE D. Morgan Park--A New Type of Industrial Community. The American City, XIV, February 1916, pp. 150-153.
- Morgan Park Community Club. Minute Book, August 29, 1942, and January 16 & 20, 1945.
- PORTEOUS, J. DOUGLAS. Social Class in Atacama Company Towns. Annals, Association of American Geographers, 64, September 1974, pp. 409-417.
- REPS, JOHN. The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- SCOTT, JAMES A. Duluth's Legacy: Architecture. Duluth: Department of Research and Planning, 1974.
- STOWELL, C.R. Industrial City of the Steel Workers of Duluth. Realty, 4, March 1918, pp. 27 & 28.
- U.S. Census of Population and Housing. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970.
- WHITE, LANGDON & PRIMMER, GEORGE. The Iron and Steel Industry of Duluth: A Study in Locational Maladjustment. Geographical Review, 27, January 1937, pp. 82-91.
- ZEHNER, ROBERT B. Neighborhood and Community Satisfaction in New Towns and Less Planned Suburbs. Journal, American Institute of Planners, XXXVI, November 1971, pp. 379-385.
- Zenith, The (Duluth, Minn.), November 1915, pp. 25-63 & 113-143.