

# INEQUALITY AND POVERTY: A MARXIST-GEOGRAPHIC THEORY\*

RICHARD PEET

**ABSTRACT.** Marxists theorize that inequality and poverty are functional components of the capitalist mode of production: capitalism necessarily produces inequalitarian social structures. Inequality is transferred from one generation to another through the environment of services and opportunities which surrounds each individual. The social geography of the city is made up of a hierarchy of community environments reproducing the hierarchical class structure. Change in the system results from change in the demand for labor. Continuing poverty in American cities results from a continued system need to produce and reproduce an industrial reserve army. Inequality and poverty cannot be eradicated without fundamental changes in the mode of production. **KEY WORDS:** *Anarchism, Class, Industrial reserve army, Inequality, Marx, Poverty, Social environment, Wage-system.*

**T**HIS paper is an attempt at synthesizing two concepts: the Marxist principle that inequality and poverty are inevitably produced by capitalist societies, and the social-geographic idea that inequality may be passed on from one generation to the next via the environment of opportunities and services into which each individual is implanted at birth. Hence the objective of the paper is to combine a powerful theoretical explanation of the origins of inequality with some empirically derived generalizations about who is poor and exactly how inequality persists under conditions of "advanced" capitalism. The new insights which such a synthesis provides are badly needed, for earlier inequality theories (culture of poverty, the cycle of deprivation) have received severe academic criticism, although they remain the basis of antipoverty policies designed to change family and individual, rather than social and economic structure, in most western countries.<sup>1</sup> A Marx-based theory is also needed

---

*Accepted for publication 14 April 1975.*

---

*Dr. Peet is Associate Professor of Geography at Clark University in Worcester, MA 01610.*

---

\* The author gratefully acknowledges financial help from the Clark University faculty research fund.

---

<sup>1</sup> On the culture of poverty see Charles Valentine: *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968). The cycle of deprivation thesis is criticized in Bill Jordan.

within the narrow confines of the geographic discipline as the basis of an alternative conceptual viewpoint to those that continue to prevail in the field.

## A MARXIST THEORY OF INEQUALITY

The Marxist view is that inequality is inherent in the capitalist mode of production. Inequality is inevitably produced during the normal operation of capitalist economies, and cannot be eradicated without fundamentally altering the mechanisms of capitalism. In addition, it is functional to the system, which means that powerholders have a vested interest in preserving social inequality. There is little point, therefore, in devoting political energies to the advocacy of policies which deal only with the symptoms of inequality without altering its basic generating forces. Hence the call for social and economic revolution, the overthrow of capitalism, and the substitution of a method of production and an associated way of life designed around the principles of equality and social justice.

## *Intraclass Inequalities*

According to Marx, income inequality is inherent in the wages system. Under capitalism human labor—life-time, effort, thought, and anxiety—is treated as a mere commodity to be

---

*Poor Parents: Social Policy and the Cycle of Deprivation* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974).

bought by an employer for a certain price, or wage. Marx argued that wages must cover not only basic subsistence to maintain the body but also some socially defined wants to keep the worker relatively content and to fuel economic growth. In addition wages contain the costs of replacing "worn-out workers with new ones" or the cost of raising and educating children: that is the development of future laboring power through education and the acquisition of skills.<sup>2</sup> As different types of labor require different levels of education and skill, so wages must differ between various categories of workers. As a first result, therefore, income inequality is necessary to produce the variety of labor needed by the various levels of a multitude of different economic activities. Secondly, by allocating the costs of social reproduction through the wage mechanism, by allowing each "race of workers" to produce its replacement, the capitalist system ensures inequality of access to the skill hierarchy within the working class. Thirdly, inequality of access to education and skills allows groups of wage and income earners to exaggerate the income differences inherent in the skill hierarchy by partially monopolizing, and thus restricting, the labor supply into certain levels of the labor hierarchy. Inequalities of income and opportunity within the class of wage and salary earners are thus built into the wages system. Hence, Marx declared, "to clamour for *equal or even equitable retribution* on the basis of the wages system is the same as to clamour for *freedom* on the basis of the slavery system. What you think is just or equitable is out of the question. The question is: What is necessary and unavoidable with a given system of production?"<sup>3</sup> And the political conclusion for the working class? "Instead of the *conservative* motto, 'A fair day's wage for a fair day's work!' they ought to inscribe on their banner

the *revolutionary* watchword, 'Abolition of the wages system!'"<sup>4</sup>

### *Interclass Inequalities*

In return for wages, the capitalist receives living labor power, the creative force by which the worker not only replaces what he consumes but also produces a surplus, which accrues to the capitalist. In fact, capital itself (the raw materials, instruments, and machinery of production) has been produced by surplus labor power in the past. Capital is historical labor power accumulated by the capitalist class because it has been able to pay labor a sum less than the value of the goods produced by the workers—i.e. it has been able to exploit them. A private enterprise economy, therefore, will inevitably have great income inequalities between the capitalist class, which controls the use of accumulated past labor and receives part of the production of many workers in the form of profit, and the proletariat, "owners merely of labor power," which receives income only in the form of wages.<sup>5</sup>

Over time, as capital accumulates, Marx argued that interclass inequalities will grow. He recognized that the income of the worker increases at certain times, such as during periods of rapid economic development, and that pov-

<sup>1</sup> Marx, *op. cit.*, footnote 2, p. 75. These sentences from Marx were incorporated into the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World in 1905. Apart from the IWW, which was a revolutionary syndicalist union, it may fairly be claimed that American trade unions have sought only the "conservative" objective of "a fair day's wage."

<sup>2</sup> It could be argued that the rise in real wages in the United States since the 1930s has enabled workers to purchase shares, to derive a part of their incomes from profit, and thus, in effect, to join the owning class—"everyone is now a capitalist." Although many people own a few shares, there remains a sharp division, and great inequalities, between the large shareholding families and the rest of the population. Three-quarters of the dividends and capital gains ("capitalist income") still go to two percent of the population. Two-thirds of the income of people earning over \$100,000 a year comes in the form of capitalist income and fifteen percent in the form of wages and salaries, but only three percent of the income of people earning less than \$20,000 a year is capitalist income and ninety percent is in the form of wages and salaries. One-third of all investment assets are owned by 200,000 families, and the richest 1.4 million households own sixty-five percent of investment assets. Hence there is still a deep division between an upper class, which monopolizes the ownership of the means of production, and the remainder of the population.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx, *Wage-Labour and Capital* (New York: International Publishers, 1933), p. 27. *Wage-Labour and Capital* was originally published as a series of articles in 1849. The word "education" is used in its most general form in this paper. It means the provision of all types of learning experience necessary to prepare children for a certain role in life, including various types of social and cultural experience, as well as the more obvious formal educational experience.

<sup>3</sup> Karl Marx, "Wages, Prices and Profits" in Karl Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969), Vol. 2, p. 57. This essay was first presented in 1865 and first published in 1898.

erty tends to diminish during such periods, but he argued that over the long term the accumulation of capital places an increasing share of national income in the hands of the owners of the means of production. The material position of the worker may improve, but this is at the cost of his relative social position.<sup>6</sup> Thus, in terms of class equality, the interests of capital and the interests of labor in economic development are diametrically opposed.

### *The Functions of Inequality*

Social inequality is, of course, extremely useful as a spur to greater efforts on the part of wage and salary earners, particularly in a highly acquisitive, materialistic country like the United States. New trends in consumption are constantly introduced in the upper echelons of the social hierarchy, whence they diffuse downwards through an extremely efficient system of consumption-oriented communications media, until even the very poorest people are infected by the newest commodity mania. The vast majority of people are caught in a never-ending struggle to earn sufficient income to allow them to consume in a style or volume similar to the pacesetters of the consumption group above them. This type of inequality is highly functional in that it ensures that even the dirtiest and most boring of jobs get done, and it extracts the last ounce of effort from the labor force.<sup>7</sup> In the end it is also a source of systemic weakness, for inequality is functional only as long as "the unequals" believe there is a chance they can achieve at least a reasonable facsimile of the consumption of the upper classes. Inequality is the source of enormous frustration and alienation among groups which no longer believe in this chance, and the social problems which result from such feelings represent one of the most fundamental contradictions of advanced capitalism.

### A MARXIST THEORY OF POVERTY

Marx also explained how the normal operation of capitalism necessarily produces a more-or-less permanent underclass of unemployed and, therefore, poor people.

<sup>6</sup> Marx, *op. cit.*, footnote 2, p. 40.

<sup>7</sup> Herbert J. Gans, "The Positive Functions of Poverty," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 78 (1972), pp. 278-79.

### *The Effects of Mechanization*

The drive for profit, Marx argued, leads the capitalist constantly to reduce costs of production through a greater division of labor and the introduction and improvement of machinery. Mechanization raises the surplus exploitable by the owners of the means of production by increasing the productivity of labor, and thus increases the capital available for reinvestment in more machinery, facilities, and raw materials. Production costs are more-and-more the costs of depreciating machinery, and less-and-less the costs of hiring labor as capitalism develops and as machines increasingly are used. Marx called this a change in the organic composition of capital concomitant with the growth of social wealth: constant capital (money used to acquire and depreciate machinery, buildings, and raw materials) is increased relative to variable capital (money used to purchase labor-power).<sup>8</sup> Thus the relative demand for labor falls as capitalist economic development takes place. Faster and faster rates of economic growth are needed to absorb new entrants to the job market, or even to keep existing workers employed. Increasingly a relative surplus population arises.<sup>9</sup> The growth of a surplus, unwanted, unneeded labor force may be postponed by extremely rapid economic development, such as was made possible by the expansion of the North American frontier in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, or the period of suburbanization and mass purchase of consumer goods that immediately followed World War II, but reliance on the frantic buying of consumer goods to keep the economy going has the built-in dangers that people will eventually become bored with consuming, or that pressure on the available natural resource base will become too great, and growth will collapse. There is abundant recent evidence of the latter, and the Marxist economist Paul Sweezy claims that the former has been happening for some years: without enormous military spending, the United States economy would be "as profoundly depressed as it was during the great

<sup>8</sup> Ernest Mandel, *Marxist Economic Theory* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970), Vol. 1, p. 155.

<sup>9</sup> Karl Marx, *Capital* (New York: International Publishers, 1967), Vol. 1, pp. 628-40. Volume 1 of *Capital* was first published in German in 1867 and in English in 1886.

Depression."<sup>10</sup> Marxist theory thus forecasts that the unfettered growth of capitalism generates a mass of unemployed workers, and will eventually lead to widespread detachment of workers from the mechanized means of producing income, an event which will create the necessary conditions for social revolution.

### *The Industrial Reserve Army*

For their day-to-day, year-to-year, operation, Marx said that capitalist economies need an "industrial reserve army," a pool of poor people who can be used and discarded at the capitalist's will. Economic development does not proceed smoothly under capitalism. There are sudden bursts of expansion as new markets open up; even old declining industries bloom again during economic booms. In such a situation the economy needs a quick transfusion of labor; a labor reserve is necessary, to be pulled into the labor force when needed, and discharged just as rapidly when demand slackens or mechanization proceeds. The use of the labor reserve at times of rapid economic development prevents surplus value from being diverted from capital accumulation to labor.

Marx divides this industrial reserve army into three types: latent, floating, and stagnant. First, the latent portion of the industrial reserve army results from agricultural mechanization which produces a surplus rural population "constantly on the point of passing over into an urban or manufacturing proletariat, and on the look-out for circumstances favourable to this transformation."<sup>11</sup> In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the European peasantry formed a latent labor reserve for American industry, and southern blacks and other rural minority groups have performed the same function for the last fifty years.<sup>12</sup> Second, the floating reserve are workers sometimes attracted to modern industry, sometimes repelled, especially children and older people in Marx's day, but now largely recent immigrants to the city and discarded past migrants who otherwise subsist on welfare payments. Third, the stagnant labor reserve is a part of the active labor army which has ex-

remely irregular employment. Hired at minimal wages (because of competition from the pressing masses of latent and floating workers), the conditions of life for this group sink below the norm for the rest of the working class. The stagnant labor force was mainly employed by irregular, small-scale domestic industries in Marx's day, although it was also used as a pool of potential cheap labor by the regular factory economy. Today it is employed in the "peripheral economy" or "secondary labor market," where workers have low productivity, substandard wages, and unstable jobs.<sup>13</sup> Again cultural and racial minority groups form important parts of the stagnant labor reserve.<sup>14</sup>

The essence of the Marxist argument, therefore, is that inequality is not a "temporary aberration" nor poverty a "surprising paradox" in advanced capitalist societies; instead inequality and poverty are vital to the normal operation of capitalist economies. Inequality is necessary to produce a diversified labor force, because of its role in the production of an expropriable surplus, and because of its function as an incentive to work. Unemployment, underemployment, and poverty are inevitably produced by mechanization, automation, and the uneven course of economic development. Inequality underlies our whole economic way of life.

### ENVIRONMENT AND INEQUALITY

Marxist theory argues that inequality must occur in capitalist systems. It is metatheory dealing with the great forces which shape millions of lives, and it means little to the individual unless he can see how his life, and the particular circumstances which surround it, fits into the general patterns which Marx predicted.<sup>15</sup> Environmental, or geographic, theory deals with the mechanisms which perpetuate inequality from the point of view of the individual. It deals with the complex of forces, both stimuli and frictions, which immediately shape the

<sup>10</sup> David M. Gordon, *Theories of Poverty and Underemployment* (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath, 1972), chapter 4.

<sup>11</sup> Harold M. Baron, "The Demand for Black Labor: Historical Notes on the Political Economy of Racism," *Radical America*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (March-April, 1971), pp. 1-46.

<sup>12</sup> Richard Flacks, "Making History vs. Making Life: Dilemmas of an American Left," *Working Papers for a New Society*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Summer, 1974), pp. 56-71.

<sup>10</sup> Paul Sweezy, "On the Theory of Monopoly Capitalism" in P. Sweezy, ed., *Modern Capitalism and Other Essays* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972), p. 27.

<sup>11</sup> Marx, op. cit., footnote 9, p. 642.

<sup>12</sup> Dan M. Lacy, *The White Use of Blacks in America* (New York: Athenium, 1972).

course of a person's life. It is the perfect micro-scale complement to the macroscale Marxian analysis.

### *The Environment of Social Resources*

The individual's struggle to earn income takes place in a certain physical, social, and economic environment. This environment may be thought of as a set of resources—services, contacts, and opportunities—with which the individual interacts. The eventual result of this interaction is the production of goods and services for the society and income for the individual.

The most important components of physical environment are house and neighborhood, which influence the individual's productivity through factors such as physical and mental health. Schools, colleges, technical institutes, and other labor-training facilities are the most important social-institutional influences, although a wide variety of other institutions play a role in readying the individual for work. These "background factors" may be thought of as determinants of a person's "income earning potential," his theoretical income productivity given unlimited economic opportunity. Before this productivity can be realized, however, the individual must have some connection with economic activities. The most significant connections are formed by the people whom the individual knows—the friends and relatives of his social network.<sup>15</sup> Social network provides both information about economic opportunity and a gateway to this opportunity. Background institutions and information networks together form the "social resources" available to an individual. Income is then produced by interaction with economic activities, and the amount of this income in turn influences access to social resources.

Central to the idea of a geography of inequality is the realization that a person may only exploit the social resources of a limited section of space in order to ready himself for

<sup>15</sup> For example, friends and relatives are by far the most prevalent source of information about jobs sought and attained by unemployed people; H. Shepard and A. H. Belitsky, *The Job Hunt* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966). On the importance of friends and relatives for the labor market information of low-income teenagers, see Paul Bullock, *Aspiration vs. Opportunity: "Carcers" in the Inner City* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1973), chapter 5.

the labor market.<sup>17</sup> This idea is best explained by Hägerstrand's time-space model which describes a "daily-life environment" around a person's place of residence, the limits of which are determined by the physical frictions of distance and the sociospatial frictions of class and race.<sup>18</sup> Each age group, each social class, each racial group, each sex, has a different sized typical daily "prism" in which to operate. For the lowest class and most discriminated against groups, the prism closes into a prison of space and resources.

The simple Hägerstrand model includes only some of the factors limiting the extent of a person's daily-life environment. The point here, however, is not to embellish the time-space model by relating it to other interaction models, but to apply the concept to the explanation of inequality transmission. It is clear that an individual must derive services, information, and connections from the social resource complex formed by the people and institutions within the daily-life environment open to him. First, however, the extent of the exploitable environment varies with mobility, which in turn varies with initial income. Second, the density of social resources in different environments varies. Third, and most importantly, the quality of resources also differs: some school systems are better than others, some localized social networks have more information of a higher quality than others, and so on.<sup>19</sup> Thus we can think

<sup>17</sup> Richard Peet, "Some Issues in the Social Geography of American Poverty," in R. Peet, ed., *Geographical Perspectives on American Poverty*, Antipode Monographs in Social Geography, No. 1 (Worcester, Massachusetts: Antipode, 1972), pp. 8-10.

<sup>18</sup> Torsten Hägerstrand, "What About People in Regional Science?" *Papers*, Regional Science Association, Vol. 24 (1970), pp. 7-21; and Allan Pred, "Urbanization, Domestic Planning Problems and Swedish Geographic Research," *Progress in Geography*, Vol. 5 (1973), pp. 36-50.

<sup>19</sup> The most important social services in the United States are provided by local governments supported by real estate taxes. As taxable wealth varies mainly with income, richer areas are obviously able to support higher quality services. State and federal governments are supposed to even out such "variations," but the evidence from school financing suggests the contrary, that they reinforce spending differentials based on local income; Joel S. Burke, "The Current Crisis in School Finance: Inadequacy and Inequity," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 53 (September, 1971), pp. 2-7. J. W. Guthrie et al., *Schools and Inequity* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1971), p. 128, shows that wealthier school districts receive more federal money per pupil than poorer districts.

of an individual carrying the imprint of an environment of a certain size, density, and quality as he ventures into interaction with an economic opportunity surface, which similarly varies in size, density, and quality. Social environment interacts through the individual with economic opportunity surface to produce income. Deficiencies in the quality of either surface produce low income. In its turn low income influences access to, and quality of, social resource environment and economic opportunity surface. A self-reinforcing process thus begins which effectively sets the parameters of income for the vast majority of people.

#### *The Influence of Social Class*

A person's environmental resources and his eventual access to an economic opportunity surface thus depend very much on initial income, or the social class of his parents. In other words, an individual's class position is inherited from his parents via the quality of the social and economic institutional environment into which he is born, or within which he lives for the first years of his life. Parents struggle to improve the environmental context of their children, hoping thereby to provide the means for their upward social mobility. This struggle to improve the family environment may take place in situ, through upgrading the neighborhood (investing in local services), or through migration to a neighborhood which provides daily-life environments with the desired characteristics. Both require the parents sacrificing immediate consumption for investment in the family's future. The family thus has an enormous stake in the local environment, for it represents both the sacrifices of the past and hope for the family's future. The domain (set of daily-life environments) used by a certain group of working-class families, for example, represents a scarce source of upward mobility, and its use is fiercely protected against other groups which might weaken or "pollute" the resource base contained in the domain.<sup>20</sup> This reaction to "outsiders," which in the United States takes the obvious form of racial and ethnic-group discrimination, can be traced back to the practice of reproducing the labor force

by the wage system, and is intensified by a general lack of mobility opportunity. At this point environmental theory needs to be linked back into Marxist analysis which explains the context in which man interacts with socioeconomic environment in capitalist countries.

#### SYNTHESIS OF THEORIES

The normal operation of the capitalist economic system produces a set of social classes which have different functions and are unequal with regard to income, power, and status. Each class, even each stratum within a class, is allowed to reproduce itself using a portion of the income of the present generation to raise, educate, and train the generation of future participants in the system of production. The adult generation invests in the social resource environment used by the growing generation, and as the amount of money allocated to each class varies, so the amount which may be invested in social resources varies, producing unequal environments which perpetuate the class system.

#### *The Hierarchy of Environments*

The hierarchy of resource environments which makes up the social geography of the modern city is thus a response to the hierarchical labor demands of the urban economy. Just as the capitalist system of production must lead to a hierarchical social class structure, so it must provide differentiated social resource environments in which each class reproduces itself. Change in the hierarchy of environments, and thus in the sociospatial structure of the city, occurs under the influence of change in labor demand concomitant with economic development. In times of economic growth, demand increases for certain types of labor, creating a temporary shortage, higher wages, and thus the incentive for an increased supply of those kinds of workers. Development also provides the funds necessary for a reorientation of those labor-supplying resource systems which produce workers with needed skills by money channeled through higher wages. By relying primarily on the wage system to produce new labor supplies, capitalism necessarily preserves social inequalities.

Despite its inherently inegalitarian structure, this process does not necessarily produce great social stress as long as all environments are improving, and as long as there is some chance to be mobile from one stratum to the next and

<sup>20</sup> The fight over school integration in the United States is symbolic of working class white resistance to the use of scarce neighborhood social resources by lower class blacks.

from one environment to a better one. Problems appear only when an economic depression reverses the process (producing lower wages, cut-backs in services, and so on), or when the overwhelming realization of a lack of mobility opportunity pierces the myth that "everyone has a chance if he works hard enough." When whole groups realize they have no chance to improve their lot, that a central city slum or a wornout working class neighborhood is going to be their home and their children's home for life, the potential for widespread protest exists. Such protest occurred during the 1960s in the black areas of American cities. Why?

### *The Origins of Black Protest*

Marx pointed out that as economic development proceeds under capitalism the organic composition of capital tends to change, from an emphasis on its variable component to greater proportions of constant capital. In class terms, this increasing emphasis on constant capital creates new job opportunities for white-collar labor (in organization, administration, supervision, and sales), but causes a decrease in the relative demand for blue-collar labor, and especially for production workers.<sup>21</sup> Since World War II environmental resources in white-collar and even some blue-collar neighborhoods have been greatly improved, to provide the more educated, more "cultured" labor supplies needed. The poorer rural areas and the slums of the central cities have been neglected, because of stagnation in the demand for their labor, hence wages below the modern subsistence level which leave no excess for investment in the improvement of the local environment. Of course the service sector and industries in peripheral manufacturing continue to need raw, unskilled labor, but mechanization has removed the incentive to upgrade this labor in readiness for mass mobility into the regular industrial economy. Reproducing raw labor power needs only an environment capable of barely supporting life, inculcating minimal skills, and injecting a strong dose of the work ethic. Lower class areas are thus deprived of the money needed to provide the high levels of health, education,

and skill of middle class areas. They are internal reservations for the reserve army of the barely employed, areas which periodically burst into violence, and which could form geographic bases of revolution.

### PLANNING FOR AN EGALITARIAN SOCIETY

Achieving social equality will mean far more than the liberal policy of transferring income through the tax system. True social equality can be achieved only by changing the generating forces of inequality: as these are fundamental to the operation of the capitalist production system, social equalization necessarily involves great changes in that system, and especially social control over the means of producing income. The equality revolution will entail even more than this, however. As incomes come to reflect the needs of families rather than the needs of a privately owned system of production, new methods of socially reproducing a skill-differentiated labor force will have to be designed. Socialization of control over labor reproduction and therefore environment is thus a corollary of income equalization.

Geographers can hasten the achievement of equality by producing persuasive, alternative models of environmental control and design. The most obvious alternative model is an increase in central, state control over investment in the social resource environment to ensure that equality is achieved. The problem with this model, however, is bureaucratization, with a resulting lack of sense of control over one's environment. An attractive alternative model, developed in its most sophisticated form by the anarchists, involves decentralized, worker ownership of the means of production and a linked system of community control over environment.<sup>22</sup> A debate between proponents of

<sup>21</sup> Between 1950 and 1973 the number of white-collar jobs in the United States rose from 22.4 millions to 39.9 millions, while the number of blue-collar jobs rose only from 23.3 millions to 29.4 millions, and the number of factory operatives changed from 12.1 millions to 14.2 millions.

<sup>22</sup> The first complete versions of this model were developed by P. J. Proudhon and the anarchist-geographer Peter Kropotkin. For an introduction to anarchism see Daniel Guérin, *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970). Two recent versions are presented in Murray Bookchin, ed., *Post-Scarcity Anarchism* (London: Wildwood House, 1971); and Colin Ward, *Anarchy in Action* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974). For empirical evidence that decentralized, anarchist economies can work effectively see Sam Dolgoff, *The Anarchist Collectives: Workers' Self-Management in the Spanish Revolution 1936-1939* (New York: Free Life Editions, 1974).

these alternative spatial models would help produce persuasive ideas about popular control over environment, work, and life. People develop in *continuous response to the total environment*, and those of us on the left believe that existing environments cripple full, human development. We can best help to fulfill our vision of the "whole man" by designing en-

vironmental models which are, at the same time, egalitarian and liberating; egalitarian in that they provide the base for an inherent equality, and liberating in that they also allow the full development of each individual as a unique person. We are thus confronted by an almost overwhelming task, yet the geography of future equality demands our attention.



Copyright of Annals of the Association of American Geographers is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.