

The "Big Cities Are Good" Myth

Written by Dr. John E. Russell Sr - Last Updated Thursday, 07 March 2013 20:15

Many believe that large cities are good. They point to such features as theater, large conventions, big business, good hospitals, shopping, etc.

However, there are some people who do not believe that big cities are good, and have voted with their feet. They saw the problems of big cities and moved away voluntarily.

There are many disadvantages to big cities. Here are some compelling reasons why people should move out of big cities and into towns and rural areas:

1. More people would survive a terrorist attack or war. Scatter people and save more lives in a conventional, biological, chemical or atomic attack. Although we won the cold war with communism, the prospect of war is as real as it ever was. (We could survive an atomic war—see *Essay 47, A Proposed Solution of the Gun Control Problem.*) One of the first principles that soldiers learn is not to "bunch up" and offer a choice target for the enemy to attack. The US had about 40 metropolitan areas of at least one million in 1990. The population of these areas totaled 128.2 million, or 51.5 percent of the total US population. In 1992, the total increased to 54 percent. Multiple targeted atomic warheads would have a "shotgun" effect, with each detonation destroying an area twenty miles in diameter. Russia alone had 25,000 nuclear warheads and some are unaccounted for. There are national leaders who hate us and some have the money to buy terribly destructive devices. Worse yet, atomic devices may have already been smuggled into large cities and could be detonated in place. Planned annihilation would be more efficient for terrorists to execute in large cities.

2. Less people would be injured or killed by natural disasters. Earthquakes cannot kill people who aren't there. Floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, firestorms and infectious diseases do less injury to people who are scattered. The scenario of an asteroid impact has been seriously considered by scientists—we must also. Keeping large cities on a fault seems foolish. Likewise, large cities located in coastal areas where hurricanes impact frequently are flirting with disaster.

3. There would be fewer deaths in vehicle accidents. The heavier traffic is, the more fatal accidents there are. *Traffic rage* would be reduced.

The "Big Cities Are Good" Myth

Written by Dr. John E. Russell Sr - Last Updated Thursday, 07 March 2013 20:15

4. There would be less stress for individuals. When people are less threatened, there is less stress. When the pace of living is slowed, there is less stress. When there is less crowding, there is less stress.

5. People would be more healthy. Less stress means less disease. (See the chapter on worry in my book, *How To Raise Your Self-Esteem Using Proven Biblical Principles*. Download this book free at <http://www.BusterSoft.com/JRCM>

. When there is less pollution, people are more healthy. When I visited New York City in the sixties, just breathing was the equivalent of smoking about two packs of cigarettes per day.

6. There would be less drug abuse.

7. There would be less air pollution. Ozone, carbon monoxide, latex, airborne asbestos and other pollutants are not as bad in less populated areas.

8. There would be less crime. People in small towns and rural areas know each other and recognize strangers immediately.

9. Powerful, positive group dynamics would occur. There is strong group pressure in small communities for individuals to live responsibly.

10. There would be more individual freedom. The more dense the population, the more local laws are needed. Also, laws are more strictly enforced in a big city.

11. More money would be saved. City bureaucracies would be reduced and government would be more efficient. There usually are volunteer fire departments in small towns. Most small town mayors and governments serve without pay.

12. There would be less property damage. War and natural disasters do less damage when

The "Big Cities Are Good" Myth

Written by Dr. John E. Russell Sr - Last Updated Thursday, 07 March 2013 20:15

houses and other buildings are separated by space.

13. Government has a moral imperative and United States Constitutional law imperative to protect each individual's:

- Life
- Liberty and
- Property.

(See Amendments five and fourteen: click on <http://www.jrcministries.org/constitution-of-the-united-states.html> , then click on **[Jump to the Bill of Rights]** when the page comes up.)

Downsizing large metroplexes would help in all three areas. Doing nothing is criminal.

A Proposal To Reduce The Size Of Kansas City

1. *Goal for phase one: reduction of the population by 50 percent.* This phase would be implemented over a two-year period. Assuming the Kansas City Metropolitan statistical population to be 1.7 million, achieving this goal would reduce the population to .85 million by 1999.

1.1 Incentives would be offered for poor people who live in substandard housing to relocate about 100 miles away in rural areas or small towns.

1.2 Young people who have violated the law would be sent to boot camp at the USDB (Army Prison) at Fort Leavenworth. The Army program is one of the best rehabilitation programs for young offenders.

1.3 All commercial buildings and houses would be inspected.

The "Big Cities Are Good" Myth

Written by Dr. John E. Russell Sr - Last Updated Thursday, 07 March 2013 20:15

1.3 All condemned buildings would be either repaired, salvaged or razed. Government buildings would be taken care of by government. Privately owned buildings would be taken care of by the owner (private sector). "Historic sites" sites would be cared for by the private sector. No taxes would be used for historic sites. Convict labor could be used. Active duty military, the National Guard and the reserves could be used, since their pay is already budgeted.

1.4 All diseased trees would be removed. Grass would be planted and maintained by convict labor.

1. *Goal for phase two: reduction of the population by another 50 percent.* This phase would be implemented over a five-year period. Achieving this goal would reduce the population to .43 million by 2004.

1.1 All FHA retirement buildings would be closed. Retirees who chose to do so would be relocated in Rural Development retirement apartments in small towns.

1.2 All HUD housing would be closed. Occupants would be relocated to private sector buildings in rural areas or small communities 100 or more miles away.

1.3 The county jail would be closed. A "tent city" jail would be set up in a rural setting 100 or more miles away. It would be based on the Phoenix model. In addition, inmates would run a farm, and do additional labor for counties, small towns, individuals and businesses.

1.4 All abandoned buildings would be placed in use, moved to another location at least 100 miles away, salvaged or razed by the owner. If the owner would not or could not comply, the city or state would implement the order. If there were monies remaining, they would be given to the owner.

1.5 If the goal had not been reached, a fair price for older buildings and houses would be offered. The buildings would moved 100 or more miles out of the city, or cannibalized and

The "Big Cities Are Good" Myth

Written by Dr. John E. Russell Sr - Last Updated Thursday, 07 March 2013 20:15

razed.

1.6 Unneeded bridges, roads, power lines, etc., would be removed and the areas beautified.

NOTE: Some of these measures have been done in Kansas City. However, "partial surgery" will not cure her ills. Surgery must be completed for the patient to survive.

Essay 84, from my ebook, *Essays Exposing the Myths of Political Correctness*. Download this book free at <http://www.BusterSoft.com/JRCM>

[p://www.BusterSoft.com/JRCM](http://www.BusterSoft.com/JRCM)

© John E. Russell 1993-2013

In Essentials: Unity; In non-essentials: Liberty; In all things: Charity—Peter Meiderlin
1626.

You have permission to copy, email or print *unedited* Power Articles.