

expand the community beyond the original plan accepted by Osceola County. In each case, vocal groups of residents were notable for being sophisticated in their organizational acumen by opposing Disney in arenas outside the CDD, most notably in the Osceola County Board of Education and the Osceola County Commission.

Resident organizing also has been complemented by the fast emergence of strong voluntary institutions of civil society that frequently articulate concerns of various constituencies. These include the bimonthly newspaper, *The Celebration Independent*; a local Rotary Club; and other groups organized around common interests.

Celebration's perceived success has influenced scores of other new urbanist developments that mimic Celebration's architecture and marketing strategies, making New Urbanism one of the most popular approaches to planning large-scale communities in the late 1990s and the early part of the 21st century.

—Hugh Bartling

See also New Urbanism

Further Readings and References

- Bartling, H. E. (2002). Disney's Celebration, the promise of new urbanism, and the portents of homogeneity. *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, 81(1), 44–67.
- Foglesong, R. E. (2001). *Married to the mouse: Walt Disney World and Orlando*. New Haven, CT: Yale.
- Frantz, D., & Collins, C. (1999). *Celebration U.S.A.: Living in Disney's brave new town*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Ross, A. (1999). *The Celebration chronicles: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of property value in Disney's new town*. New York: Ballantine.

CENTRAL PARK

Central Park, in New York City, is the first great urban public park constructed in the United States. Extending from 59th to 110th streets and from Fifth to Eighth avenues, the park occupies 843 acres, 153 city blocks, and 9,792 standard 25-by-100-foot Manhattan building lots. The park's design was determined by a public competition, won by Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., and Calvert Vaux in 1858. Olmsted was appointed architect-in-chief and superintendent, and Vaux was

named consulting architect while directing the construction of the park.

Central Park is completely a humanly created landscape. Images of the park prior to construction reveal a treeless, scarred landscape. A small African American community, Seneca Village, extended from 82nd to 88th streets on the park's west side, while clusters of dwellings occupied by German or Irish immigrants stood elsewhere on the site. More than 1,600 residents were displaced when the city acquired the land, removed or demolished 300 houses as well as a number of factories, slaughterhouses, and other nuisance uses, and commenced construction of the park in 1857.

Olmsted and Vaux's challenge in designing the park was to transform an unattractive site into a place of seemingly natural beauty. Olmsted later calculated that between 1857 and 1870 workers handled 4,825,000 cubic yards of stone and earth during construction, which, if placed in the standard one-horse carts then in use, would have extended from New York to San Francisco and back again five times. So much stone and earth was moved during construction that Olmsted estimated that it was equivalent to changing the grade of the park by four feet. As many as 3,800 men were employed during the peak of construction: In addition to the dramatic reshaping of the landscape, workers dug the ponds and planted acres of grass as well as some 270,000 trees and shrubs, creating, in every sense of the word, the park. Olmsted and Vaux's "Greensward" plan gave the park its most distinctive landscape features—broad meadows, water courses and ponds, rocky outcrops, and heavily forested hillsides—as well as the complete separation of traffic within the park and the sunken transverse roads that carry city traffic across the park. Vaux and his collaborators designed more than 20 bridges and underpasses to separate pedestrian paths from bridle paths and carriage drives, as well as several buildings and dozens of structures to meet the needs of visitors to the park.

Construction of Central Park took place within the tumultuous political culture of New York City in the middle decades of the 19th century. As the city's Democratic Party grew in power, the state legislature, dominated by upstate Republicans, enacted a new charter in 1857 that severely limited the city's ability to govern itself. That charter, a patently undemocratic document, replaced the Municipal Police, whose members were appointed by the mayor, with a

Metropolitan Police force controlled by five state-appointed commissioners. The new charter created several other state-appointed commissions, including one to regulate the harbor and, fearing that park construction would become a source of patronage to city Democrats, another to build Central Park. The Board of Commissioners of the Central Park was dominated by Republicans and exercised stewardship over construction and use until 1870, when a new city charter (often called the “Tweed charter,” after Tammany Hall political boss William Marcy “Boss” Tweed) replaced it with a Department of Public Parks, whose members were appointed by the mayor.

As superintendent of construction, Olmsted had to organize a disciplined workforce. New York’s working class in the 1850s was experiencing pressure from industrialization, which increased work discipline, and from record high levels of immigration, which produced a surplus of labor that depressed job opportunities and wages. Workers were fractious and attempted to protect their interests through rallies and strikes. Olmsted and the park commission determined to hire laborers as public employees and to regulate their work closely, which conflicted with the expectations of many of the city’s workers. Olmsted organized the workers into teams of 30 to 40 men, each with a foreman who was responsible for taking roll, directing the work, and preparing a daily report on the work accomplished. Eight general foremen supervised the foremen to ensure that all laborers were complying with park policies and Olmsted’s expectations of efficient work. Between 1857 and 1870 Olmsted estimated that the park commission spent \$8,900,000 constructing Central Park.

Managing Central Park—educating the public in the proper use of the park, overseeing maintenance and ongoing improvements, and ensuring the public’s safety—was, Olmsted recognized, equally important as design and superintendence of construction. Prior to construction of the park, a number of newspapers expressed what Olmsted called false, craven conservatism. This was the belief that democracy was a decivilizing process that would establish the lowest common denominator in American political, social, and intellectual life. Any recreational or cultural institution open to the public would effectively be defined by the behavior of the rudest, least reputable members of society, with the result that the middle and upper classes would not frequent such places.

Olmsted realized that maintaining order and ensuring the public’s safety in the park was essential to its

success. In February 1858, he assumed responsibility for training and administering a force of keepers to maintain order in the park. Olmsted envisioned that the principal responsibility of the keepers would be to educate the public in the proper use of the park. He shaped the keepers into a highly effective force, and their impact on the park was obvious: One writer told of encountering in the park one of the city’s most notorious saloonkeepers, who had come there one Sunday to visit former customers who found the park a more attractive place than his bar. The fears of social conservatives notwithstanding, Central Park was a safe, well-ordered landscape.

The keepers were essential to Olmsted’s vision of the park as a democratic, social space. He saw it as the one place in a city stratified by class, race, and ethnicity that welcomed all residents. In 1859, when describing his vision for the park, he insisted that it would be the primary or sole source of recreation for residents of all classes. In 1870, when urging citizens of Boston to establish a large park in their city, Olmsted observed that Central Park and Prospect Park, in Brooklyn, were the only places in their respective cities where there was equality, without competition or jealousy. His was a vision of the park as a civic space that included, indeed welcomed, all residents of the city.

Central Park was a creative response to New York City’s dramatic growth in the middle decades of the 19th century, a remarkable act of stewardship that set aside 843 acres for public recreation. Olmsted and Vaux designed the park’s curvilinear paths and naturalistic landscape to stand in striking contrast to the straight lines and sharp angles of the expanding city. Through boundary plantings, transverse roads, and the complete separation of traffic throughout the park, Olmsted and Vaux minimized the degree to which the city would intrude upon the landscape. But the park was, and remains, an urban institution: It was conceived not as a withdrawal from or repudiation of the complexities of the city but as part of what Olmsted later characterized as the complex physical fabric and the general economy of the city.

Central Park has experienced shifting fortunes in its 150 years. During the Tweed “ring,” park administrators, in Olmsted’s estimation, compromised the original design and failed to ensure proper maintenance and public safety. Cuts in funding for maintenance have occurred whenever the city faced straitened financial conditions. Robert Moses rehabilitated the park in the 1930s but also widened roads to accommodate the

automobile and added playgrounds and facilities for active recreation that brought the noise, energy, and competition of the city into the park. The park again suffered deferred maintenance during the fiscal crisis of the 1970s but was renovated and restored in the closing decades of the 20th century.

Central Park inspired the creation of similar large parks in other American cities in the second half of the 19th century. Recognition of its importance in the history of landscape architecture and city planning came in 1965, when Central and Prospect parks were the first landscapes entered in the National Register of Historic Places. For more than 150 years, the park has been an incalculable resource for residents of New York City.

—David Schuyler

See also New York, New York; Olmsted, Frederick Law, Sr.

Further Readings and References

- Beveridge, C. E., & Hoffman, C. F. (Eds.). (1997). *The papers of Frederick Law Olmsted. Supplementary Series: Vol. 1. Writings on public parks, parkways, and park systems*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Beveridge, C. E., & Schuyler, D. (Eds.). (1983). *The papers of Frederick Law Olmsted: Vol. 3. Creating Central Park, 1857–1861*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Board of Commissioners of the Central Park. (1863). *Sixth Annual Report*. New York: Author.
- Miller, S. C. (2003). *Central Park: An American masterpiece*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc. in association with the Central Park Conservancy.
- Reed, H. H., & Duckworth, S. (1967). *Central Park: A history and a guide*. New York: Clarkson N. Potter.
- Rosenzweig, R., & Blackmar, E. (1992). *The park and the people: A history of Central Park*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

that consumers must absorb when purchasing goods, as noted by Masahisa Fujita, Paul Krugman, and Anthony J. Venables in 1999.

As an introduction to the basic concepts within the theory, imagine a hypothetical, topologically neutral plain uniformly inhabited by wheat farmers. One of the farmers decides to produce beer and sell the product to other farmers. The neighboring farmers decide that traveling to buy the beer is more cost-effective than producing it themselves. But, for the neighbors of the neighbors, the time away from the farm and the cost of traveling some distance, x , outweigh the cost of producing their own beer. So, beer is produced in a “central place,” as some farmers choose to enter the beer-producing market and serve other farmers who do not; furthermore, there is a spatial uniqueness as to who chooses which option, depending primarily on the price of beer.

The origins of central place theory (and location theory more generally) come from a long tradition of German intellectual thought. Its roots began in the 1850s, but because of the language barrier, location theory did not enter the American discourse until Walter Isard began his writings a century later. Johann von Thünen is considered the father of the field with his book, *The Isolated State*, in which he articulated a model analyzing rent differentials (what has become known as bid-rent analysis) that accounted for the different types of agricultural land uses around a monocentric city (von Thünen’s work was revisited in the 1960s by William Alonso, Edwin Mills, and R. Muth, who replaced farmers with commuters and the central city with the central business district). This body of work essentially became known as the New Urban Economics.

Refinements to central place theory itself came from Walter Christaller’s book, *Central Places in Southern Germany* (published in German in 1933), in which he presented evidence that the “laws” governing the number, sizes, and distribution of towns in space emerge into a hierarchical urban landscape. To begin his analysis, Christaller defined an inner and outer range of an economic good. The *inner range* consisted of the minimum radius from a location that if the entire population within the ring purchased the good, the costs of production would equal the revenues. The *outer range* of any good or service was the farthest distance from the central place that buyers would be willing to travel. If the outer and inner ranges were not equal, the difference between the two rings would represent the potential profit for the good. The relative

CENTRAL PLACE THEORY

Under the broad aegis of economic geography, central place theory attempts to offer some explanation as to why economic goods and services are offered only in some locations and not homogeneously distributed across space. The basic essence of the theory suggests that a spatial economy emerges from the trade-off between the economies of scale that sellers face while producing goods and the transportation costs