Citizen participation in urban renewal in the cities of Boston and Chicago

Edwin A. Thomas

Atlanta University
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN URBAN RENEWAL IN THE CITIES OF BOSTON AND CHICAGO

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

BY
EDWIN A. THOMAS

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

ATLANTA, GEORGIA
AUGUST 1964
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Acknowledgment is gladly given to Dr. Joseph Golden for his assistance and guidance in the development of this thesis.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.</strong> INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and Limitations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.</strong> CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE CHICAGO URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal, Neighborhood Conservation: Operational Implications</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Chicago Program</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Organization - Its Structure and Function</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles Suggested by the Chicago Experience</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.</strong> CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE BOSTON URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Redevelopment - No Citizen Participation</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Street - Voluntary Rehabilitation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Neighborhood Association of Back Bay - Conservation of Residential Values</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Washington Park Urban Renewal Experience</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles Suggested from the Boston Experience</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.</strong> REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of Study

Inside the large cities of the nation, swift change is taking place. Many are undergoing urban renewal. In explaining the underlying principles of urban renewal, the writer referred primarily to the cities of Boston and Chicago: Boston because that was where the writer had completed a six-month block field placement in partial fulfillment for the master's degree in social work; Chicago, because the situation has been described very vividly by Peter Rossi and Robert Dentler in their book Politics of Urban Renewal and by Julia Abrahamson in the book A Neighborhood Finds Itself. Both cities are metropolitan centers, have a population over 2,500,000 persons, and are concerned about the exodus of jobs and population to the suburbs.

Few national programs affecting our cities have begun under such favorable auspices as urban renewal. Although public housing was from the very first a bitterly controversial policy, redevelopment and renewal by contrast were widely accepted by both Democratic and Republican administrations and had the backing of both liberals and conservatives, labor and business, planners and mayors. Yet today, almost fifteen years after urban redevelopment was inaugurated as Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the program is beset with controversy and, what is even more
dismaying to its supporters, lagging far behind its construction goals.

Although there are over 1,100 federally approved slum clearance and urban renewal projects scheduled for over six hundred different communities, only a little more than half have proceeded to the point where the cities are authorized to begin assembling and clearing land. And most important, of all the projects authorized, only eighty-six have been completed. In New York, the city which has been the most active in renewal programs of all kinds, all the publicly supported projects undertaken over the last quarter century cover less than one percent of the city's surface. Furthermore, most of the projects completed can be found in or near the central business districts of cities rather than in residential areas, and they have often involved clearing, not slum, but deteriorating commercial and industrial structures.

J. Q. Wilson, Professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, hypothesizes that one of the most important reasons for slow progress in urban renewal is the mounting disagreement over the methods and objectives of urban renewal. The coalition among liberals, planners, mayors, businessmen and real estate interests which originally made renewal politically so irresistible, has begun to fall apart. Liberals, who still see the rehabilitation of the central city

1David Clark, The Political and Social Aspects of Urban Renewal, Remarks at the Pacific Southwest Regional Council National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (Santa Barbara, 1963), pp. 5-7.

2Ibid., p. 9.

as a prime goal of government, have begun to have doubts, particularly about redevelopment that involves wholesale clearance by bulldozers. They are disturbed by charges from many Negro leaders, whom liberals are accustomed to regarding as their natural allies, that they, the liberals, are everywhere demanding that redevelopment (i.e., wholesale clearance) be abandoned in favor of rehabilitation, that is, conserving as many existing structures as possible.

Many businessmen, on the other hand, are not prepared to admit that the liberal's solution, rehabilitation, is the answer. After all, whatever the defects of wholesale clearance, it at least moves a slum and its inhabitants to some other part of the city, hopefully far removed from the central business district, and puts in its place modern high rise apartment buildings which will bring beauty, taxpayers, and customers back to the central city.

Mayors and other city officials in some cities have seen something which began as good politics turn into something which at best is difficult politics. When it seemed possible that a vigorous and ambitious mayor could place himself at the head of an alliance of liberals, planners, businessmen, and newspapers on behalf of restoring the central city, urban renewal became a top priority civic objective. It appears that an initial burst of enthusiasm has greeted renewal in almost every city where the idea has been expressed. But after the first few projects were undertaken,

---

1Ibid., p. 28.
2Clark, op. cit., pp. 5-7.
the hidden political costs began to become evident. Voters who did not
like being called slum dwellers, and who like even less being forced out
of their neighborhoods, began to complain. As the enthusiasm of the
civic supporters began to decline, many mayors began to wonder whether
they were going to be left alone on the firing line to answer for projects
which the civic boosters had pushed them into in the first place.

What in many ways is the most interesting aspect of the controversy
surrounding urban renewal is the growing resistance of neighborhoods to
clearance and renewal programs. Many of the redevelopment projects were
completed with little organized opposition. Somehow, however, people
have learned from the experience of others, and, today, in cities which
have been engaged in renewal for several years, the planners often find
prospective renewal areas ready and waiting for them organized to the
teeth. Let us look at Chicago for example. The Lake Meadows redevelopment
project met with relatively little organized indigenous opposition.
The Hyde Park Kenwood project, undertaken a few years later, was greeted
with considerably more opposition. Presently, plans for Woodlawn and Near
West Side areas have been met with impassioned opposition from many of
the residents of the neighborhood involved. Similarly, the West End
project in Boston had relatively little difficulty in dealing with people
in the area; the project planned for Charleston, begun sometime later,
has been at least for the time being stopped dead in its tracks by

1Wilson, op. cit., p. 28.
2Peter Rossi and Robert Dentler, The Politics of Urban Renewal
(New York, 1961), pp. 69, 71.
organized neighborhood opposition. Today Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, states that in nearly every major city in the country and in many small cities there are heated debates over urban renewal projects that are underway or under consideration.

Mr. Weaver might well be concerned over these debates, for federal policy requires local citizen participation in the formulation of local renewal plans before money can be spent on them.

What is urban renewal and redevelopment? The term is the official name given to a complete community improvement program using local and federal funds. "Redevelopment" refers to the acquiring of substandard homes and other buildings and the assembling of land for subsequent replanning for its best use. This also includes the improvement and addition of streets, sewers, and utilities, the provision of parks and recreational facilities, and the rezoning and reuse of land according to the proposals of the master plan. The repair of homes and buildings that will remain in an urban renewal area is part of the redevelopment process and is done with private money by property owners. Therefore urban renewal is an official plan of action utilizing appropriate private, local and federal resources to assist the city in solving the problems which are prevalent in substandard housing, deteriorating neighborhoods, and central business districts.

---

1 Urban Renewal Newsletter, "Renewal - What's it All About?" (Boston Redevelopment Authority, Boston, Massachusetts, December 27, 1963).

What is citizen participation? The Board of Governors of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials adopted a policy statement on citizen participation in urban renewal. The statement reflected early experience with the workable program requirement established under the Housing Act of 1954 that citizen participation be a part of any local renewal program assisted with federal funds.

The policy statement adopted June 1, 1956 states:

...citizen participation is more familiar under the two names describing the professional skill used in gaining constructive participation. In the United States it is called 'community organization;' elsewhere in the world it is known as 'community development.' In either case the development, organization, or participation consists of a process whereby a citizen's interests and after work energies are brought to bear on a community problem under professional coaching or guidance.¹

Social work skill in understanding and securing participation from those it serves makes the profession quite capable of securing the type of citizen participation which urban renewal requires.

Citizen participation in urban renewal is interpreted differently in each community. The medium for obtaining the necessary citizen understanding and support is community organization at the neighborhood level. Neighborhood participation in this research refers to a group of people


living fairly close together in a more or less compact, contiguous territory, who came to act together in the chief concerns of life in meeting their common needs.

What is an urban renewal plan? When the writer speaks about urban renewal plan he is talking about a specific legal document, including maps, that controls and guides the actual physical carrying out of the project. This is the document which states which property will be acquired, how the land will be resubdivided, the general type of land use to be permitted, the public improvements to be provided, and the controls which cover such things as building height, coverage, and setback. It sets forth the time limit within which the developers must begin construction, the number of years that the plan will remain in effect, and the procedure for amending the plan. However, despite its considerable detail, the plan is not an architectural or site plan. It does not, for example, indicate the exact location of buildings, or set architectural standards. Such detail is eliminated to permit redevelopment of our cities.

One of the difficulties in gaining improvement of our cities is the failure to gain communication sufficient to reassure the residents that renewal can in proper situations be made a reality. The official needs to know how he can reach an understanding of and with the citizen.


for his broad objective. The citizen needs to know how he and his fellow citizens in an area can gain the professional services of the official in remaking their section of the city according to what they would like it to be.

All of the above the writer recognizes is oversimplifying the problem, but it represents the frame of reference upon which the research was based.

Purpose

1 - The purpose of this research was to determine the underlying principles involved in citizen participation at the neighborhood level in urban renewal in the cities of Boston and Chicago.

2 - To determine how these principles tally with the principles of community organization as developed in social work.

Method

The method of research employed in this study was the library method. Documentary sources of information such as unpublished documents, reports, statistics, manuscripts, letters, books, etc. pertinent to the research were examined.

The underlying principles of citizen participation in urban renewal were drawn primarily from the description of citizen participation at the neighborhood level in the cities of Boston and Chicago, and from the general literature of urban renewal.

After determining what these basic principles were, they were compared with the principles of community organization as developed in
social work by Murray Ross. Ross' principles are as follows:

1 - Discontent with existing conditions in the community must initiate and nourish the development of the organization.

2 - Discontent must be focused and channeled into organization, planning, and action in respect to specific problems.

3 - The discontent which initiates or sustains community organization must be widely shared by the community.

4 - The organization must involve leaders (both informal and formal) identified with, and accepted by major subgroups in the community.

5 - The program of the organization should include some activities with emotional content.

6 - The organization should seek to utilize the manifest and latent good will which exists in the community.

7 - The organization must develop active and effective lines of communication both within the organization and between the organization and the community.

8 - The organization should seek to develop effective leaders.

9 - The organization should develop a pace for its work relative to existing conditions in the community.

10 - The organization must develop strength, stability and prestige in the community.

Scope and Limitations

The library method of necessity must resort to selection and interpretation of facts. The description of actual complex happenings in space and time cannot go on indefinitely until all specific details are exhausted. The writer found it imperative to omit a mass of detail and to include only the conclusions which were drawn from the data presented.

In addition, the interpretation of the data was colored by the inexperience of the writer in the field of research. The selection of two cities while a limitation, and permitting no more than tentative conclusions, has provided at least the beginnings of enlightenment and points toward the direction for further investigation.
CHAPTER II

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE CHICAGO URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

This chapter represents a summary of the experience, methods, and techniques of some Chicago neighborhood groups. It is not a history, nor is it a description of the present urban renewal program. The writer has tried to extract from the Chicago experience some of the underlying principles of urban renewal that will have a common applicability at least for cities with populations of 2,500,000 or more that are metropolitan centers.

The fullest accounts we have of citizen participation in urban renewal in the city of Chicago to the writer's knowledge are found in The Politics of Urban Renewal by Peter Rossi and Robert Dentler and The Neighborhood Finds Itself by Julia Abrahamson. Both studies deal with one neighborhood - the Hyde Park-Kenwood area, the renewal site of the University of Chicago.

Urban Renewal, Neighborhood Conservation: Operational Implications

According to Rossi and Dentler, advocates of citizen participation in planning and urban renewal contribute to the planning process in two ways. "First, a better plan is drawn up because the real needs of the populace as expressed through participation can be incorporated into it. Secondly, the plan gains success in execution because citizen participation increases
the amount of popular support."¹ These are the functions which the Conference took as its role.

Within the first chapter the writer referred to the increasing demand from many Negro leaders for wholesale clearance to be abandoned in favor of rehabilitation. This slum prevention approach represents a tremendous,² significant change in operational terms.

Research planning focused on refurbishing of the community's facilities, but residents were sensitive primarily to the housing implications of planning. Yet housing had to give way to provide community facilities. Particular residents who had worked hard to preserve the neighborhood found themselves 'renewed out' of the community.³

Neighborhood conservation is a recent addition to the slum clearance and redevelopment program which were discovered to be 'not enough.' In order to eliminate existing slums, it is necessary to prevent future slums. Neighborhood conservation is the means whereby the lag of a century must be picked up. Slum clearance was given local recognition locally and federally in the Housing Act of 1949. Neighborhood conservation received recognition in the Federal Housing Act of 1954 as an element in the new concept 'urban renewal.'⁴

In the case of redevelopment, project planning begins with an area that is vacant either because it has never been developed or because it has been cleared. The local operating agency has total control (within


⁴William L. Slayton, Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal, Remarks presented before the County Chairman's Urban Renewal Conference (Hilo, Hawaii, 1962), p. 34.
the law) of the area. The number of separate participants in the whole affair in this kind of operation is pretty well limited to the urban renewal administrator, the municipality, the local agency, (if separate), and the redeveloper (if separate). The resident population is hardly in a position to participate. After clearance they just simply are not there.

This is not the case in conservation type renewal. The population remains, and its objective could affect the project development at any stage. Its general concurrence is very necessary for the success of the project. Consequently, as it, in effect, is cast in the role of the redeveloper in this kind of project, not only its concurrence but also its participation are necessary.

It would be difficult if not impossible to carry through a conservation project properly unless the multiplicity of participants is reduced to some form of cohesive system. In short, the population of the project area must be organized in such a manner that the operating agency has something stable and reliable to deal with. There must be a community organization which can speak and act for most of the residents and, as an organization, influence and direct the voluntary participation of the individual owner in the program.

Therefore, it is clear that a prerequisite to successful neighborhood conservation development is the organization of project residents. Their participation and support are needed to bring the area to a desirable level.

---

1Ibid., p. 36.
2Ibid., p. 39.
which is over and above what is attainable under law.

Development of the Chicago Program

The state of affairs was given clear recognition from the beginning of the development of a program of neighborhood conservation for the city of Chicago.

Urban renewal began as a public program in Chicago with the passage of the Illinois Blighted Areas Redevelopment Act, the Chicago Land Clearance Commission was organized as a municipal corporation with authority to designate projects in which buildings were characterized by dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, lack of sanitary facilities and other factors detrimental to the public welfare. Within such designated projects, the Commission was empowered to acquire land and buildings by purchase or condemnation, to relocate families, individuals and businesses, to demolish existing structures, and to sell the cleared land for residential, commercial, industrial, or institutional development as prescribed by a redevelopment plan adopted by the Commission and approved by the City Council and State Housing Board.¹

In 1953 the urban renewal program was broadened to include the conservation of residential neighborhoods by the passage of the Illinois Urban Community Conservation Act. The Community Conservation Board was formed as a part of the city government to administer programs of residential conservation designated conservation areas. In a conservation program, major emphasis is placed on the preservation of structures through the encouragement of individual owners to repair and rehabilitate their property. Clearance is used only to remove elements of blight or provide space for needed community facilities.²


The ordinance establishing the Interim Commission on Neighborhood Conservation charged that group among other things, to seek methods of stimulating and augmenting the effects of local neighborhood improvement groups, especially as concerning liaison between city departments and such groups.¹

The preliminary report of the Commission asserted its emphasis upon a neighborhood conservation program only if it would be approached and carried out as a joint venture between the city of Chicago and its agencies on the one hand, and the city-wide and community civic organizations on the other. The report analyzed other previous attempts at neighborhood conservation and ascribed failure in part to lack of strong community organization and the lack of continuity of interest of property owners and tenants, businessmen, large and small institutions, and the community press.

The office of the Housing and Redevelopment coordinator, which is charged with program development, indicated that experience confirmed the above to be a concrete truth.

The first area selected was a neighborhood in transition to Negro occupancy. A shifting population gave no foothold to a popular program until the coordinator provided staff assistance to the local organization. The second area selected had a stable population but there was a general antipathy to formal organization. So much so was this the case that the local parish priest complained that he could not even get people out for parish societies, and this in a predominantly Catholic neighborhood.²

¹Slayton, op. cit., p. 41.
²Brussant, op. cit., p. 6.
³Ibid., p. 3.
⁴Ibid.
Consequently, sadder but wiser, the coordinator's office required the existence of a sound community organization with its own locally supported staff and office as a requisite to its continuing attention and active cooperation.

The third area it selected was the most organized in the city - the area bounding the University of Chicago on the north. This area included the prototype for the two major types of community organization on which the majority of groups organized specifically for neighborhood conservation have been modelled.¹

The Hyde Park Community Conference is, according to Rossi and Dentler, a grass roots organization, structured on a cellular pattern of block groups on the one hand and integrated by way of a comprehensive committee system on the other. A staff of over seven people coordinated the activities of these elements and provided liaison with other groups and city agencies. ²

The second organizational prototype is the South East Chicago Commission, an organization of the power interest groups of the area, of which the University of Chicago is the major one and the main support of the commission. ³

In 1952 following a series of crimes which had attracted widespread local attention, a mass meeting was called jointly by several organizations to protest the rising incidence of crime in the area. The meeting, held on March 17 in Mandell Hall on the University of Chicago campus, was attended by an

¹Ibid.

²Rossi and Dentler, op. cit., p. 115.

³Ibid.
estimated 2,000 Hyde Park-Kenwood residents. For the first time, University officials met with the general public on matters of mutual concern. Law enforcement and crime prevention were the issues which brought together University officials, community leaders, and the general public. Crime in the area had reached proportions that seemed threatening to residents and institutions alike. Crime prevention was an issue on which the divergent interest in the area could readily converge. At the mass meeting a committee of five was established... composed of prominent civic leaders. This committee undertook to form a new organization to work for increased police protection, to enforce housing and zoning codes, and to represent the community.1

The Organization - Its Structure and Function

Operational Structure

Through the years, the University of Chicago administration had tried in a number of ways to protect and improve its immediate vicinity. It had built or brought housing for hundreds of university employees, helped to finance the purchase of homes for faculty members, tried to control the use and occupancy of surrounding property.... These efforts had obviously been too limited to achieve their purpose. Deterioration had kept spreading, and the community surrounding the university had continued to decline with frightening speed.2

... reaction to the Hyde Park Community Conference within the community, the university administration, and the committee of five was mixed and involved. Some believed it was doing a fine job as far as it went. They felt, however, that the problems the community faced were primarily economic and political and that the money and power needed to solve them could never be attracted by the conference because business, real estate, and major institutional interests did not have confidence in its motives, goals, or leadership. They believed that a new organization could handle the power side while the conference worked at the grass roots.3

1Ibid., p. 72.

2Ibid., p. 189.

Every mode of organization carries with it special gains and losses. The gains implicit in the model on which the Commission was founded were apparent to most community leaders from the outset. This creation of a community organization from the 'top down' guaranteed strong financial support, unambiguous goals, and, most characteristically, great speed in action. The groundwork for the Commission was laid within seven weeks by the Committee of five, and on the morning after a public mandate had been obtained the structure emerged intact and in operation.

The losses or costs are less apparent but no less inevitable. The Board of Directors, meeting after the Commission's temporary staff was already at work, was destined to become little more than a source of financial support, a provider of sanctions, and a sympathetic audience for the Commission staff, in spite of its explicit embodiment of policy-making responsibilities. The Executive Committee meetings became a place for relatively confidential reports on special problems confronting the Executive Director, without becoming a group within which solutions to these problems were devised. The larger Board of Directors tended increasingly to become an assembly through which the accomplishments of the staff could be disseminated and a vehicle for the solicitation of funds.¹

Clear evidence was obtained in interviews that membership on the Commission Board was early defined as a token of community status, particularly as a share in the aura of prestige that flowed from the close participation of University officials and trustees in the activities of the Commission.²

The Board of Directors is generally described as the decision making element; nevertheless, it appears that this (at least, if the above typifies in any way what generally is the case) is more true nominally than actually. The Board may make policy, but it makes it on the basis of alternatives offered to it by the Executive Committee.

¹Rossi and Dentler, op. cit., p. 75.

²Ibid., p. 76.
The base for participation must be broad as the community, but leadership and decision making must be central. This is not, however, to make a case for authoritarianism. In the last analysis the membership always retains the veto power, ever a strong conditioning factor to intelligent decision making.1

Another structural element which the writer discussed earlier is the block organization. These groups were primarily concerned with the problems of their sub-area, but are represented and participate in the affairs of the larger neighborhood organization. This element has been developed and carried to its most effective use by the Hyde Park Kenwood Community Conference. It is precisely this type of organization that has given the Conference its unique “grass roots” character.2

Few community organizations are as widely acclaimed as the Conference. The city-wide and nation-wide prestige of the organization is based largely upon the use of block groups as devices for reaching a mass audience and stimulating self help community improvement. The block groups.... are composed of the residents of a block drawn together on the basis of geography and common neighborhood concerns.

Between 1949 and 1953 the most vital source of Conference strength was the block network. The program of building block groups grew from the two trial groups established by the Conference and the University of Chicago Human Dynamics laboratory, each covering 190 block strips. (A block strip is one side of a residential city block.) Some groups extended to both sides of one residential street; others extended for two and even three block strips in a line....3

The block groups are autonomous, but their activities are coordinated through two channels. Most important is the Block

1Brussant, op. cit., p. 5.


3Rossi and Dentler, op. cit., pp. 120, 121.
Steering Committee, composed of neighborhood block-group leaders and the block directors on the block directors staff. The block directors serve as the other channel; they are group work professionals responsible for organizing new block strips, stimulating activity in old groups, and maintaining close neighborhood liaison between the Conference Executive Director and community residents.1

... we can estimate that at least one in five Hyde Park-Kenwood households was a member of the organization, enrolled in one of the area block groups, or close enough to the Conference to be sensitive to its public statements and to support its position. If we accept this estimate, then the claims of the Conference to be a 'grass roots' organization have greater validity than the claims by any other community organization of its type.2

Through the Conference's "block steering committee," liaison is effected between the block and the whole community. The Conference keeps the block groups informed as to current plans and projects, and seeks their reactions and support. It also speaks with the weight of the total neighborhood on behalf of causes of the particular blocks, assisting them to effect the solution of block problems. For instance, if a zoning violation is noted in a particular block, it is reported to the Conference which confers with the appropriate public officials in an effort to have the violation corrected. Conversely, the Conference is able to keep abreast of the whole area through the "watch dogging" of the block groups and can turn out rather substantial numbers of people at hearings, etc., thus

---

1 Ibid., p. 121.

2 Ibid., p. 124.

increasing its own effectiveness.\textsuperscript{1}

What purpose did the citizen participation program serve? What methods did the conference use to encourage it and make it fruitful?

The system of citizen participation currently being used in planning for the total urban renewal area was designed:

1 - To furnish information on the chief problems of the community requiring planning.

2 - To create recognition of the need for action.

3 - To encourage the formulation of ideas, to be transmitted to the planners, on what people wanted in the community of the future.

4 - To provide a method for the review by the community of proposals made by the planners and the people with a view toward evolving by a high degree of common consent, a generally acceptable and, hopefully, the best possible urban renewal plan.

The system operated largely through regular contact between the Planning Committee of the conference (The Hyde Park Kenwood Community Conference) and the planning unit of the South East Chicago Commission for the purpose of considering planning proposals and community desires and reactions, and through a series of meetings and conferences with the people of the community.

After discussion by the planners and the Conference Planning Committee and the committee of six, first very tentative ideas and subsequently increasingly firm planning proposals were shared with block leaders at meetings of the Block Steering Committee.

The block leaders then arranged meetings of their block groups, where members of the Conference Planning Committee, with the help of mimeographed materials and maps, reviewed the ideas and invited questions and reactions.\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1}Abrahamson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp. 253, 254.
Block organization, however, of itself generally has not been too effective nor, indeed, do block groups without a strong neighborhood group behind them tend to stay in existence very long. In Hyde Park there is, not only a very strong 'roof organization' to coordinate and advise the block groups, but also there is a very sophisticated and civic-minded population. The Human Dynamics laboratory of the University of Chicago has tried very hard to stimulate block organization elsewhere. It has had some success, as has the Urban League. However, too often it happens that as soon as the professional organizer departs, the group disintegrates. In short, the block organization is generally not self-sustaining, even where a modicum of indigenous leadership is available.¹

Julia Abrahamson discusses the importance and limitations of the democratic process in citizen participation which were drawn from the Chicago experience.

We learn from experience the necessity of educating people not only on community issues and their responsibilities but on their limitations as participants in a citizen's organization. In the early days the work of the conference sometimes suffered from the mistaken belief that 'democratic participation' meant everyone had a right to decide everything. The effectiveness of the conference as an organization increased as people learned that, while their informed opinion was an important factor in guiding decisions, final decision making in the conference had to be left to its elected leadership.

At first we failed to recognize the very great power of a strongly knit citizen's group and thought in terms of the people on one hand and the power group on the other. Slowly we came to see that the people of a community united in a common cause could be a force as potent as any in the moneyed or political power structure, and that such a force, used wisely could effect - if not reform - existing power groups, lead them in new directions, and serve as a check on action not in the public interest.²

¹Brussant, op. cit., p. 5.

²Abrahamson, op. cit., p. 333.
In concrete terms this means that the neighborhood organization must depend on a hard core of leadership to make positive decisions and to construct positive programs. But the hard core depends upon popular sanctions to implement the program. Should the mass object, the decisions of the core are vetoed and the programs are lost.

Examination of the functioning of effective neighborhood organization shows that when such failures of programs occur, it is not so much from lack of general support as from the presence of general opposition. Or to put it otherwise, success of programs is not so much due to general approval as it is to lack of general opposition.

That is why, in traditional American style, obeisance must be made to the 'grass roots.' The organization must provide means for the voice of the people to be heard and the popular ear to be reached. When the organization achieves some goals, it is a 'triumph of the grass roots' although some recognition may be given to 'the unrelenting efforts of Mr. X and the tireless devotion of Mrs. Y.' But it is a 'grass roots' accomplishment, so that every John Doe in the neighborhood may swell his chest and feel a glow of accomplishment for what 'his' organization - 'we' - has done.

The instruments and techniques by which citizen participation in urban renewal is conducted vary from city to city, neighborhood to neighborhood.

---


2Ibid., p. 18.
Nevertheless effective participation is always the key to successful urban renewal understanding and the lessening of citizen opposition.

Professional Leadership

Personnel professionally involved in community organization for this program in Chicago have been a very diverse group. There were social workers and sociologist, to be sure, but there were also lawyers, planners, public relations men, a political scientist specializing in Asiatic affairs, an ex-playground attendant, a zoologist, and a sprinkling of jacks of all trades. In other words, educational and professional background necessary for success in this operation seems hard to pin down.

... a complex inter-organization arrangement was developed, through which each organization made its special contribution.

The planning in itself was the responsibility of the planning unit. Jack Meltzer, its tireless director initiated the necessary studies, analyzed them, formulated the plans, and interpreted them to community leaders and public agencies.

Julian Levi, the director of the South East Chicago Commission, was equally tireless in the role of gadfly and expediter. He took leadership with government agencies, initiated discussions with top officials and political figures, went to Springfield and Washington, cajoled and pressured large property interest and businessmen's groups, pushed ceaselessly in every direction to translate ideas into action.

Chancellor Kimpton made himself available for public contacts whenever the power of university prestige was demanded, and the university exerted influence on property through its own real estate transactions, and on community morale through the impact of its own interest and involvement.

The local responsibility for the conduct of the overall

1Brussant, op. cit., p. 189.
renewal program was vested unofficially in a Committee of six representing the University of Chicago, the South East Chicago Commission, and the Hyde Park Community Conference.

Liaison with public agencies was handled by Julian Levi. When problems arose which were too serious for resolution by Levi or which called for the exertion of greater influence, the full committee of six stepped in — for conferences with the mayor, the housing coordinator, or other officials and, in one instance, top representatives of three organizations called on the President of the United States.1

Attorney Levi was appointed Executive Director of the South East Chicago Commission in the fall of 1952.

A corporation lawyer with experience in industrial management and the son of a prominent rabbi, Mr. Levi had been raised in Hyde Park and was well known as an aggressively competent administrator with strong personal attachments to the community and the University of Chicago. Upon his appointment, he promptly established a staff of two full time workers, a community organization representative, and a University — trained sociologist charged with law enforcement.2

The Executive Director of the Hyde Park Community Conference, (James Cunningham) was a professional community organizer who was responsible for the day to day direction of every phase of Conference activity. The core of his responsibility was to direct the Conference staff, represent the Conference publicly, and coordinate work at all echelons.3

One of the aspects of citizen participation in urban renewal is that the wiser one gets, the more he shrinks from being called an expert. He comes to feel, after a time, that the more he learns the less he really

1Abrahamson, op. cit., p. 213.
2Rossi and Dentler, op. cit., p. 75.
3Ibid., p. 116.
knows. Which, after all, is as it should be. For citizen participation, an old timer would tell you, is more of an art than a science, and an art in a relatively primitive state.

Nevertheless when you see such and such a cause, over a long period of time, you come to share the privilege of the Mesers. Boyle and Charles—you can say you have observed a law, a principle, which your colleagues or contemporaries are at liberty to challenge if they can.

Principles Suggested by the Chicago Experience

Although the Chicago urban renewal program is by no means a utopia of citizen participation, it does certainly suggest a few basic principles which may perhaps be utilized elsewhere.

1 - A community organization for citizen participation in urban renewal must have the support and cooperation of the local community. They are generally founded on ground made fertile by popular indignation about local conditions. They are generally established by some of the more vocal and enterprising leaders and with the support of major financial interest in an area.

2 - The neighborhood organization must depend on a hard core leadership to make positive decisions and to construct positive programs. But the hard core must depend upon popular sanctions to implement the program.

3 - Obeisance should be made to the 'grass roots.' The organization of the people must provide means for the voice of the people to be heard and the popular ear to be reached.

---

1 Arthur Dunham, op. cit., p. 278.
3 Brussant, op. cit., p. 5.
4 Daley, op. cit., p. 18.
4 - The effective neighborhood organization should provide channels for participation and communication for the locale. But an effective organization for citizen participation should be so structured as to rely as little as possible on the concept, 'everyone has a right to decide everything,' while providing as much as possible in the way of means of such participation.¹

¹Abrahamson, op. cit., p. 333.
CHAPTER III

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE BOSTON URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

Planning with people - the phrase rolls easily off the tongue and it has a nice democratic sound to it - but let no one be deluded into thinking that all it takes is the waving of a magic wand, the uttering of a catchy slogan, the scattering of a little stardust, and lo! planning with people is an accomplished fact! 1

Complete clearance and total relocation typify one extreme in urban renewal. A project of this sort is perhaps the most familiar to the administrators, because this kind has been their concern since the 1949 Housing Act. Boston's West End redevelopment project is an example of the citizen participation experience to be found in such areas.

Although the Demonstration did not attempt any organization in this neighborhood, it did observe the efforts of the Boston Housing Authority, Urban Renewal Division, to carry out a campaign of public relations and information.

The project area contains forty eight acres and twelve thousand people in about three thousand five hundred dwelling units. The street pattern had become fixed by 1840. Of the eight hundred buildings only one was built after 1920, and two thirds had been constructed before 1900. The average lot areas were thirteen hundred square feet. Most of the buildings cover ninety percent of their lot. Using the American...
Public Health Association inspection techniques, it was found that eighty percent of the structures were substandard or marginal. To any administrator, those facts would clearly point to total clearance as the only treatment of such an area.

The Boston Housing Authority did a thorough job of physical planning for the redevelopment, but neglected to do the social planning for gaining that climate of opinion that is requisite to allow physical plans to be accepted and approved for execution.

West End Redevelopment - No Citizen Participation

Social Planning or community organization for gaining citizen interest and participation until recently had not been a procedure which was felt necessary by city planners and others concerned with revision or revitalization of a city's environment. The first correction in such an official attitude in the West End project case, as elsewhere throughout the country, was to produce a sounder public relations program to give residents more current information through press and local meetings. There was, however, no indication that the administrators in this case, as in many other across the country, realized the value that could be obtained by citizen participation under the guidance or consultation of competent community organization workers. The impersonal type of public relations program does not satisfy the resident who feels his property or his family are in jeopardy or under stress. A more personal medium is made possible through organized groups in which the resident can participate or at least contact friends who participate in the groups.


2 Snowden, op. cit., p. 3.

3 Ibid., pp. 4, 5.
The professional and administrators worked hard but mainly among themselves, and finally happily announced the plans through what, to them, were normal public relations channels - to press meetings. Citizen residents were not pleased to accept, let alone approve, the project plans as the professional administrator had hoped.

.... in their eagerness to rush ahead without being slowed down by consulting with local citizens, they had probably made haste wastefully. There is no question that properly developed citizen participation would have slowed down the time schedule they apparently were working on. But it may be doubted that, given the needed community organization work, their ultimate road from planning onward to project execution would have been any more time consuming.1

The local public agency did improve its formal, impersonal public relations, but it did not use community organization techniques to gain citizen - resident participation.

To be sure, local neighborhood meetings were sporadically addressed, and there has been talk of opening a local information office in an empty store. But one of the three organizations which could have been naturals for starting active citizen participation was allowed to die. Another has become a focal point for the adamant opposition. The third just drifts in a sort of neutral 'Don't help - don't hinder' attitude, which makes nothing clear and allays no fears.2

Bradford Street - Voluntary Rehabilitation

At the opposite pole of urban renewal from the total clearance situation of the West End project is the voluntary rehabilitation program typified by the Bradford Street case in Boston.

1Ibid., p. 7.

It all started with a mother of three children who wanted better playgrounds and other needs filled for her children in the neighborhood. There was no safe place in her area for the children to play. She and her neighbors had often talked about this and felt the city should do something. But as she said, 'Everyone complained a lot about the situation but no one did anything about it.' Through a mother's club in a settlement house she heard about a meeting on playground and recreation needs and decided to see if other areas of Boston had problems similar to hers and to find out what was being done about it. At the meeting she found people with some idea of what should be done but little notion of how to do it beyond turning to the city. She was advised to go back, and with friends in her neighborhood, send a petition to the President of the Boston City Council. After she and a few friends had sent the petition, she read in the paper of a meeting of the South End Joint Planning Council (a voluntary district council made up of delegates from private organizations working in that area of the city). Thinking that her project might tie in with the Council's effort on health and sanitation, she called upon the community organization worker serving that Council. From him for the first time she got professional community organization consultation for her group.1

The Bradford Street Neighborhood Association was brought into being with the advice of the community organization consultant. The Association proceeded to get advice for the homeowners in the area, regarding self-help rehabilitation of their structures, from the health department inspectors and local businessmen. In addition to fundamental correction and repairs, the Association sponsored competitions for neighborhood window boxes to emphasize further the change of the outward environment that had come about by cleaner streets and yards.


2Ibid., p. 3.
Almost without exception the homeowners in the Bradford Street neighborhood made extensive interior improvements of woodwork, wallpaper, plumbing and furniture and modernization of kitchen, bathroom etc. But it was especially noticed by the community organization consultant that they became encouraged to do these things only after the environmental improvements were made by the public departments in those matters which were the 'housekeeping or maintenance responsibilities of the city.'

Important in the Bradford Street story were a series of activities sponsored by the Association which might seem at first to a renewal administrator to have no necessary connection with the physical improvement of an area and therefore to have no proper place in the agenda of a neighborhood association working on renewal. Such were the discussions and activities having to do with living together in the neighborhood.

The cultural changes needed in resident's habits and customs in order for them to use the area to the best advantage during and after the physical changes brought about by renewal were constantly pointed to in rezoning out the need or hope for property rehabilitation and improved community facilities.

The conversations observed especially dealt with leisure time activity possible in the neighborhood outside the home. What do youngsters do? What is there for teen-agers to take them off the street corners and out of local stores? What does the area offer the adults in the way of places to gather for gossip and recreation outside the home and commercial establishments? If urban renewal does finally come to pass in the area, what new or improved community facilities for such outside-the-home activities should the neighborhood association insist on?

What would be the citizen-residents' responsibilities during and after renewal to create the leadership and program events to get real use out of public property and equipment the renewal work of the city might provide for the common use

\[1\text{ Ibid., p. 6.}\]
\[2\text{ Ibid., p. 5.}\]
\[3\text{ Ibid., p. 6.}\]
of the several age groups? To whom would the neighbors turn for guidance in creatively reorienting their activities so as to gain satisfactory leisure-time living adapted to the facilities available in their physical setting? The latter question, implicit in the discussions at many meetings, is of special importance in those areas where dwellings are small and crowded and in which the density of population on the land is considerable. The only probable relation of housing and physical environment to social disorganization and mental ill health occurs in terms of crowding and conflict of family and neighborhood activities and the frustration growing out of failure to develop or adjust the roles enacted in family and group living to what the physical spaces in house and locality make feasible.

Some of these problems the Bradford Street neighbors faced and planned to solve in their voluntary rehabilitation program. First, to get a sociable cooperative feeling among the neighbors, the Committee spontaneously or on advice from the community organization professional established several social events or customs which the Association has since continued. It started simply with a bit of refreshment each time the Committee and any other residents met at a scheduled meeting. It was nothing much. Usually cookies, or cake or something that could be brought into the meeting room in a box. From that there grew the idea that the Association in greeting newcomers to tell them of the Neighborhood Street Rules and of the Association would do so by inviting the new couple, or the new housewife alone if more convenient, to the house of one of the welcoming committee for an evening snack or morning coffee.1

In short, the Association had sprung from the desire of several mothers to find safe play spaces for their children. The small backyards were too cramped for many games, and were in some cases not suited even for toddlers because of the lack of sunlight.

The Association members through their cooperation with various city agencies improved their environmental surroundings as well as considerably improving their homes from within.

1Ibid., pp. 8, 9.
While each of these two cases had its beginning before the demonstration, indeed before the 1954 urban renewal legislation of Congress, they are prototypes of the extremes in the use or neglect of community organization for citizen participation in renewal situations. More usual situations, allowing more city-citizen cooperation, are the subject matter of the next illustrations.

The Neighborhood Association of Back Bay - Conservation of Residential Values

The Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay is an illustration of the rapid growth of a local improvement association in a middle and upper class residential area suitable for conservation activities and having available to it many local volunteer leaders.

The progress of the Neighborhood Association shows how, once organization has been initiated, a citizen's group may move forward in areas where conservation is the appropriate urban renewal theme. The idea for the Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay developed in a series of activities in which the Director of Field Operations for the Demonstration participated non-professionally as a citizen. In the early stages of the organizing effort, he assumed leadership, applying professional skills, but acting largely in the role of outstanding citizen, since he was himself a resident of the area. Finally, when other local citizens took over the Association, the Demonstration community organization worker reduced his activity, although retaining a minor leadership.2

The story of the Neighborhood Association begins with the churches. This Association was a spontaneous by-product of church organization

---


2 Ibid., p. 3.
activity, rather than the result of an organizing effort which planfully involved the churches.

The Unitarian Laymen's League Chapter of the Arlington Street Church in the Back Bay regularly conducts a series of monthly meetings for its members. The Laymen's League Chapter of the First Church in Boston also in the Back Bay, has a similar program. Twice a year, by long established custom, these two chapters hold joint meetings. At the joint meeting in March 1955, held at the Arlington Street Church, the host Chapter had as the main topic of the evening, 'The Future of the City of Boston.' The speaker was a member of the Boston City Planning Board, who was also a realtor. During his talk he described plans which had been worked up for the development of the Boston and Albany Railroad yards in Back Bay as an in-town shopping center, and emphasized the many obstacles and difficulties which had so far blocked the development and improvement of the 30 acre tract. The speaker's facts were so impressive, and so discouraging, that when the First Church Chapter planned its return meeting as host in April, 1955, the topic selected was a local application of the broader theme previously discussed, 'The Future of the Back Bay Neighborhood.' This topic was suggested by the Demonstration Director of Field Operations, who was at the time President of the First Church Unitarian Laymen's League, with the idea that concentrating attention on the local district might produce more fruitful discussion. At the April meeting the guest speaker was a prominent Boston realtor, a member of the Board of Directors of ACTION, and a former president of the National Real Estate Board. The selection of this topic, and the selection of the speaker, who was well acquainted with the provisions of the Housing Act of 1954, were the first organizing steps taken by the Demonstration worker as he looked forward to the possibility of a citizen's organization in the Back Bay.²

The speaker selected as his theme the idea of citizen participation as contained in the 'Workable Program' for Urban Renewal, and laid particular stress on the responsibility of individuals as private

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 4, 5.
property owners to maintain and conserve good property, and to rehabilitate blighted property. A second speaker was the Coordinator of the Mayor's Rehabilitation and Conservation Committee, who described something of the efforts and accomplishments of citizens in other districts of Boston. Discussion from the floor brought out the fact that there were already citizen's groups in adjacent areas, and that the businessmen of the Back Bay had a strong association, the Back Bay Association, but that there was no organization devoted to residents' interests in the central portion of the Back Bay. A willingness to entertain a motion to develop a neighborhood group was expressed. The response was immediate and enthusiastic, and the motion was formally passed that the Chairman appoint a committee from among those present to consider the establishment of a Back Bay Neighborhood Association.

In November, 1955, a business meeting was held for the primary purpose of electing permanent officers and completing the formal organization of the Association. In order to explain clearly the course of events at this meeting it is necessary to digress briefly on the political position of residents of in-town residential areas in large cities like Boston, which in recent years has elected its nine city councilmen at large, rather than from particular geographic districts. People in the Back Bay area and in other similar residential areas feel themselves to be isolated from direct participation in the city's government and individually helpless in making their ideas felt at City Hall. One conception of the function of neighborhood associations is that through the collective weight they can muster, they can provide an audible voice in municipal administration for residents of local areas.

Now it happens that the City of Boston, like the largest cities in other states, is sometimes treated differently.

---

1Ibid., p. 6.
2Ibid.
in State Legislation, so that politically oriented residents are very much aware of the part that may be played in city affairs by members of the State Legislature. No residents of the Back Bay area is a member of the City Council, but one resident is a member of the State Legislature. In this political setting it is easy to understand that residents should call on the State Representative to aid in procuring action on the problems of concern to the area and that he should, in turn, be much interested in the development of the Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay, in which he actively participated from its beginning in early 1955.1

On the whole, the structural linkage between the Neighborhood Association and a locally dominant political party is probably undesirable. 2

Certain advantages of direct access to the political power structure undoubtedly arise from the arrangement; but the potential danger that renewal issues may become confused with partisan politics in the minds of observers who interpret the neighborhood association in terms of its politically prominent President's position probably outweigh these advantages. Indeed, in other parts of Boston, some citizen's groups, such as the Roxbury Community Council, have barred elected political officials from participating on these very grounds. It must, in fairness, be added that in the Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay no such partisan problem had yet arisen at the end of the Demonstration, and the Association had moved forward vigorously and effectively under its first permanent President. The Demonstration director of field operation felt that the group was effectively established after the November meeting, and afterwards was active only in minor roles, as a member of the Board of Directors and committee member.3

One other instructive incident in the early history of the Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay is worth mentioning briefly.

At the meeting of the group on August 8, 1955, representatives of the strong Back Bay Association, a businessmen's group, asked permission to address the membership and proposed that the idea

1Tbid., pp. 6, 7.
2Tbid., p. 7.
3Tbid., p. 8.
of a separate resident's organization be abandoned in favor of
the creation of a new division of the Back Bay Association to
concern itself with residents interests. The spontaneous
opposition of the residents present to this idea - which would
have solved their organizational problems and immediately put
at their disposal the considerable resources of the Back Bay
Association, including its paid staff - was based in the
discerning recognition, frankly expressed and appreciated by
all, that while the residents and businessmen in the Back Bay
had many common interests, they were also separated by fundamental
conflicts of interest, since what was good for business of the
area was not necessarily good for residents. The proposition
was turned down, and instead cooperation on common interests
was made a policy of the Neighborhood Association. This
incident shows that the timing of the organizing effort in the
Back Bay was excellent - Both businessmen and politicians
recognized the potential strength of a citizen's neighborhood
association when the group was scarcely launched. It also
suggests that in the Back Bay, members were clear from the
outset as to the appropriate functions of their own group in
relation to neighborhood conservation.1

The Washington Park Urban Renewal Experience

The experience of the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area
thus far is tangible proof that, given a certain combination
of factors, planning with the citizens of a community is both
sound and practicable.

No words can quite capture the spirit and atmosphere
that prevailed as citizens and planners met week after week
straight throughout a hot and stormy summer. Out of exchange,
presentations, explanations, discussions, and differences of
opinion, a set of preliminary proposals was hammered out.
Equally as important, the groundwork for a healthy, effective
partnership had also been laid.2

"When we talk about planning with people in connection with Washington
Park, it adds up since April 1961, to cover 114 separate meetings of citizens,

1 Ibid., pp. 8, 9.

2 Your New Washington Park a Bold Program in Urban Renewal (Boxton,
of clergy, of businessmen, of people in early land acquisition sections; at least four public hearings, crowded to capacity; 16,000 letters and notices etc."

Otto Snowden, Director of the Freedom House in the Washington Park area, lists the ingredients he feels are essential in the success thus far of planning with the people of Washington Park.

And this report is not hearsay, nor is it the result of somebody else's statistical research, but as firsthand fact. I know because I was there, and my wife was there, at every single one of these meetings. We participated in every single session, and we worked along with other people in the community in hammering out the proposals and changes required for the physical improvement of Washington Park.2

The first essential he discusses is the chief administrator's personal commitment to the concept, otherwise "there will be no planning with people anywhere. And so, here, one essential ingredient; the fact that Mayor Collins publicly stated his position and indicated that he expected more than lip service to it."3

Next, those charged with the responsibility for carrying out the concept have to be equally as committed and dedicated to make it a reality. In this respect he is of the opinion that no one could have asked more of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, of Ed. Logue, and his staff. "They brought to Washington Park a spirit of cooperation and an honest and sincere willingness to do whatever necessary to provide the opportunity for those


2Ibid.

3Ibid., p. 2.
of us living in the community to share in the shaping of plans designed to improve our physical living conditions.

The third vital ingredient Mr. Snowden discusses is the "we the people.".... one has to understand a great deal about us in order to understand the 'how it was done' of Washington Park. This 502-acre section of Boston is an area of great contrast - on the one hand, it includes within its boundaries some of the worst slum property in the city, some of the lowest income families, a great number of serious social problems, and a high degree of social disorganization. On the other hand, it has homes as beautifully maintained and as structurally sound as any in Boston; it counts among its Negro population (which is 70%) many families of high socio-economic and educational achievements; and above all, it boasts among its citizens a vital community concern which cuts across racial, religious, and social lines.2

All kinds of fight-blight efforts have been initiated over the years by Washington Park citizens themselves as people like Mrs. Cass, Rev. Lavignount, and the Snowden's to name just a few, can well testify. In 1947, it was the Council on Community Affairs of Upper Roxbury, succeeded in 1949 by a small group of people who, with the objective of community betterment, founded the Freedom House Civic Center. In turn Freedom House, once established, began to implement its goal by setting in motion a block organization movement in which the Dale Area improvement Association is one of the most actively successful. Between 1949 and 1959, other groups came into being, such as the Warren Neighborhood Association and the Neighbor-

1Tbid.

2Tbid., p. 3.
Washington Park citizens are in the process of developing and strengthening an area-wide Citizen Urban Renewal Action Committee (CURAC). Hopefully, this will be the broad umbrella under which every segment, every interest, every level of the community can be represented as it moves toward the test... that of making the plan work, both physically and socially.2

Although the development of the Boston Urban Renewal Program is certainly no utopia, it does suggest certain basic principles that may perhaps be utilized elsewhere.

Principles Suggested From the Boston Experience

1 - Families, as the occupants of both standard and substandard dwelling units in an urban renewal area, are the most important dominant element in a community contemplating the rehabilitation type of urban renewal program. Their attitudes toward their homes and surrounding environment and the prospect of improvement may well determine the success of a program of rehabilitation.3

2 - Religious groups are usually rooted in specific neighborhoods. In some with localized membership, the neighborhood orientation is clear cut and the institutional self-interest in the elimination of environmental blight is plain. Any congregation which has a substantial investment in a physical plant in a neighborhood threatened with blight has strong incentive to become a rallying point for neighborhood conservation.4


3 People as Partners in Urban Renewal, op. cit., pp. 3, 4.

3 - Since urban renewal is usually a governmental program in which the cooperation of participating private citizens is enlisted, the governmental agencies concerned with renewal constitute a dominant in the total situation. Therefore commitment and dedication to citizen participation in urban renewal by the urban renewal administrators is an essential to the enlistment of citizen support.

4 - A community organization for citizen participation in urban renewal must have the support and cooperation of the local community. They are generally founded on ground made fertile by popular indignation about local conditions. They are generally established by some of the more vocal and enterprising leaders.


Herbert Thelen states:

When citizens get together and share ideas and feelings, they tend to shake off their apathy and become ready for work. When they deal with problems they feel strongly about in their own neighborhood they improve the community and learn what it means to be citizens. The whole political and friendship climate changes. But for success there must be proper leadership and training and the support of a parent organization.¹

In the section entitled "Principles of the Block Program," he endeavors to transfer to more general terms and for use in other areas, some of the experience gained in the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference program in Chicago.

1 - The block works on 'felt' problems. The only matters which people will expend energy are those which they feel are problems, things about which people have feelings which they must deal with.

2 - The kind of leadership required encourages free expression of feelings and opinions, sifts these to help diagnose problems realistically, and guides the group into action. This requires a range of skill greater than most men can provide. A leadership team is therefore far more effective than a single leader; it will make a more objective analysis of how the last meeting went and it will have more information and understanding to use in planning and conducting the next meeting.

3 - Participation depends on reward. For the neighbors to remain involved and interested over a long period of

¹Thelen, op cit., p. 2.
time, they must receive rewards at a sufficient rate. Particularly at the beginning it is evident that the reward for task accomplishments will not be sufficiently great and frequent to maintain involvement. Therefore, the meetings by design should be given a quasi-social character so that through parties, the sharing of hobbies and games, and informal conversations of all sorts people can obtain rewards over and above the rewards of work.¹

Millspaugh and Breckenfield conducted a study in the cities of Miami, Chicago, New Orleans and Baltimore of the attitudes of people toward slums and neighborhood changes.

.... those who administered, analyzed, or advised from afar, however good their intentions, seldom understood the problems. As their distance from the neighborhood increased, so did their chance of misunderstanding it and so did the chance their attitude toward it would remain frozen.²

In some cities (but not in all), politicians have learned they must treat once-blighted neighborhoods with new respect. The extent of this change in attitude seems to vary in direct ratio with the power of the neighborhood organization. Some key questions are: Has it bested city officials in some battles? Has its militant existence persuaded city officials that cooperation will win more votes at election time than hostility or indifference.

.... the pilot program held a dramatic lesson for the city at large. This was proof, repeated over and over again, that many residents of a neighborhood.... have a real though submerged desire for self improvement. As one prominent home-builder put it: 'It has been amazing to see the complete ignorance of many people as to how they can help themselves....'

¹Ibid., pp. 14, 15.


³Ibid., p. 225.
but the people will help themselves, if given the initiative and shown the way.¹

The author concluded that there is a positive correlation between the distance of the personnel of urban renewal from a neighborhood and the extent of their misunderstanding. This leads us back to the principle of communication as discussed in Chapter II.

The second quotation reveals an interesting phenomenon, that is, the direct relation between the power of a neighborhood association and the respect accorded it. This again leads us back a bit to Chapter I and II, to the principle of a neighborhood association having the support of and cooperation of the local community, consequently increasing its strength which in turn increases the respect accorded it.

Taking the third quotation a step farther, the authors are of the opinion that the occupants of both substandard and standard dwelling units in an urban renewal area are the most important element in a community contemplating the rehabilitation type of renewal program. This is discussed under the section "Voluntary Rehabilitation" in Chapter III.

"Developing Public Support for Small City Renewal" by William Nixon sets forth some principles of citizen participation in urban renewal.

.... citizens must have confidence that their local government will act to carry out an urban renewal program before there will be wholehearted citizen support behind that program. At the outset of the Dyersburgh effort many citizens felt the city hadn't progressed very far in community improvements since World War II. Such a feeling was based on what could be interpreted as a widespread lack of citizen understanding as

¹Ibid., p. 62.
to what the city administration had achieved, its program for future improvements....

Some misunderstanding about local government policy, city planning and urban renewal were immediately clarified in talks before civic and church groups. To assure a continuity of contact between us as governmental representatives and the civic groups, each organization was asked to appoint a representative who would attend monthly informational meetings and then report back to his organization....

Another report of the demonstration project in Dyersburgh, Tennessee explored methods of creating understanding and enlisting support and participation on the part of citizens. The author states:

.... another basis for urban renewal movement was laid by getting all kinds of citizens involved in different ways. It was realized that their involvement would enhance understanding of urban renewal problems and promote a commitment to necessary procedures for meeting those problems....

Nixon is implying that one of the essentials of urban renewal citizen participation is that confidence in city government is most certainly necessary before there will be wholehearted citizen support behind the program. He and his associate further emphasize the importance of citizen involvement of all kinds.

The minutes of the "Workshop on Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal" conducted in Baltimore state some conclusions that may be labeled underlying principles of citizen participation in urban renewal.

.... presently Federal assistance is limited to projects, but the implications for the future are that 'short of clearance

---


operations will be done in a way that will involve local people in the planning activity for their area. This is a reflection of the movement away from project thinking to an overall concern for individuals and their housing problems. The Federal effort is being crystalized in the direction of getting people to review their own housing concepts and to encourage a raising of sights and standards. In effect, one of the central problems and major tasks of urban renewal is sensitizing people toward a revision of their values in terms of higher housing standards. This entails the development of ways and means of communicating and enlisting a sustained interest on the part of local people in bettering their housing standards and neighborhood conditions.1

Further the minutes relate:

... local government has come face to face with innumerable stumbling blocks to progress because they have failed to properly inform or heed the suggestions of the local residents. Misconceptions due to ignorance or ill-founded rumors or partial understanding of impending changes in a given geographic area have been rallying points for the opposition. Consequently, the logic of the situation has caused public bodies to engage in the development of programs and practices relative to handling problems of this nature. In brief, government agencies have had to rethink their public relations and community organization methods. Even our limited experience as evidenced in the Eastwood Philadelphia Project, or in Boston has indicated that careful preparation of people for change, over time, is a minimum essential for the success of the program. Nonetheless the idea of simply working with people has proven to be no absolute guarantor of success....

... Actual practice has shown that a plan for a neighborhood must of necessity be a tentative one. It must be flexible and elastic so that it can be reworked consistent with the views of the residents affected by the plan....

---

1Minutes, Workshop on Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal, June, 1962, sponsored by the Baltimore Urban Renewal Authority, p. 4.

2Ibid., p. 6.

3Ibid., p. 8.
Lyle E. Shaller states, in an article concerning the goal of the urban renewal program to erase the housing shortage and eradicate slums, that:

.... whether the organization covers one block, two blocks, or a whole cluster of blocks its membership must include a representative cross section of the population within the area it covers. It should be comprised not only of leaders but followers too. Both property owners and tenants must be represented....

William Slayton, Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration Housing and Home Finance Agency, states:

Community participation here serves a number of purposes....

Second, residents and property owners of the areas adjacent to the new development will be greatly affected by its form and character. They have an interest in the way in which it is planned and carried out, and their participation will be an important factor in the extent to which the new development has favorable impacts beyond its immediate boundaries.

.... one way to achieve or increase a sense of responsibility among citizen groups is to stimulate the development of a real sense of sharing in the planning process.... If citizens feel that final plans are partly of their own making, they are likely to offer support.

Arthur Hillman in the section on the "Role of the Expert and the Citizen in City Planning" cites a study with questions on urban planning made by the Bureau of Urban Research of Princeton University. The report concluded:

---


If Urban Planning is to become a generally accepted and meaningful service directed toward the gradual improvement of American municipalities, public education concerning this process is needed. In terms of the standards of judgment to which they are accustomed, most American city dwellers are reasonable satisfied with their environment as it is today. For them to recognize the planning problems which do exist in their vicinity and the community improvement which can be achieved, some form of education or demonstration will be required....

In the opinion of city folk can be found guides for the most meaningful orientation of an educational effort designed to develop a greater understanding of city planning and more active citizen participation. This effort, like Urban Planning itself, will be most successful if it proceeds from the people up and not from the top down. Those desires for neighborhood improvements which do exist—new or improved streets.... can serve as a cornerstone on which to build a more adequate comprehension and acceptance of planning.¹

In 1958 the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials published a guidebook on why, when, and how social welfare agencies and urban renewal agencies should work together. In the section "Neighborhood Improvement in Urban Renewal," the Association states that there are several principles involved in neighborhood improvement in urban renewal. The principle especially significant for this study states:

Neighborhood improvement programs should seek to achieve the maximum participation by the residents so that they will have opportunity to guide the stabilization and improvement of their neighborhood to meet their own needs. The residents should be brought in from the beginning, not after urban renewal officials have already decided on an improvement program.²


David Clark, Assistant Administrator, Program for Community Improvement Housing and Redevelopment Officials, states:

There must be a sense of dedication and a social consciousness on the part of those who deal with the problems of human adjustment which urban renewal brings to light.

Many conspicuous successes in urban renewal are successes of neighborhood groups....¹

Edward Banfield and Morton Grodzins state:

Virtually every scheme for rebuilding the interior of cities of metropolitan areas can profit by the existence of an organized neighborhood group, aggressively directed. The need for funds will usually be such that the nucleus of the group must be an institution, such as a hospital, a church or a college, or a commercial organization, such as a factory or a department store. With this kind of institutional support, individuals, block groups, and other community forces can make themselves fully effective.²

Donald Webster, Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington, states:

.... citizen groups should be made to feel that they are sharing the responsibility with public officials for achieving the objectives of the urban renewal program.

.... It is most important that citizen participation should be solicited at the outset of the urban renewal planning activities and continued through to the completion of the project. Citizen participation should be organized in a way to insure that all groups are focusing their attention on a common

¹Clark, op. cit., p. 1.

goal and working toward the same end.\textsuperscript{1}

Douglas Haiskell, editor of the \textit{Architectural Forum}, the professional magazine of the American planners, has said:

Citizen understanding and support are essential to the acceptance of the objective of urban renewal, to the enforcement of codes and ordinances, to the finding of rehousing for displaced persons, and to the overall planning for civic improvement. In addition, citizen participation is a part of a workable program, which is the locality’s own program for elimination and prevention of blight.

\ldots Mobilizing and involving the residents at the beginning of the program can spur them into willing participation in a program of action to renew their homes and neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{2}

The question is not whether plans and programs can be made. They must be. The question is rather, on what scale and by what process. Shall the plan be no more than a set of referee's rules, and the program the minimum essential service without which the urban machine would start to slow down? Or shall the plan and program be comprehensive, in the sense that they represent a real investment of capital, of skill, and of local interest: running perhaps a little in advance of ordinary public opinion, but underwritten by the citizens nonetheless.

In a democratic country a plan is of limited use unless it can somehow marshal the resources and the good will that will turn into a reality. An ideal plan may influence men’s thinking in every part of the world and yet be an obstacle to all sorts of improvements in its place of origin.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1}Donald Webster, \textit{Urban Planning and Municipal Public Policy} (New York, 1958), pp. 523, 524.

\textsuperscript{2}Douglas Haiskell, "What is a City," \textit{Architectural Forum}, CIX, No. 1 (November, 1958), pp. 63, 64.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Underlying Principles of Urban Renewal

The purposes of this research were to determine the underlying principles involved in citizen participation at the neighborhood level in the cities of Boston and Chicago, and to determine how these principles tally with the principles of community organization developed in social work by Murray Ross.

In chapters II and III, the underlying principles of citizen participation were based upon the urban renewal experience of the two cities mentioned above. The fourth chapter dealt with a review of the literature of citizen participation. The underlying principles of urban renewal drawn from the data presented are as follows:

1. A community organization for citizen participation must have the support and cooperation of the local community. Such organizations are generally founded on ground made fertile by popular indignation about local conditions. They are generally established by some of the more vocal and enterprising leaders, and are able to function more effectively if the major financial interests in the area participate (see chapter II, p. 26; III, p. 42).

2. Politicians, urban renewal administrators and their personnel must treat "grass roots" with respect. However this obeisance is often
based upon the strength of the organization (see chapter II, p. 26; IV, p. 44).

3 - The effective neighborhood organization should provide channels for participation and communication for the locale. But an effective organization for citizen participation should be so structured as to rely as little as possible on the concept, "everyone has a right to decide everything," while providing as much as possible in the way of means of such participation (see chapter II, p. 26).

4 - Families are the most important element in a community contemplating the rehabilitation type of urban renewal. Many residents of a neighborhood have a real though submerged desire for self-improvement. Their attitude toward their homes and surrounding environment may well determine the success of a program of rehabilitation (see chapter III, p. 41).

5 - Any institution having substantial investments in a physical plant in a neighborhood threatened with blight has a strong incentive to become a rallying point for neighborhood conservation (see chapter III, p. 41; IV, p. 50).

6 - An essential to the enlistment of citizen support is a strong commitment to citizen participation in urban renewal by the urban renewal administrators and personnel (see chapter III, pp. 39, 42).

7 - Citizens must have confidence that their local government will act to carry out an urban renewal program before there will be wholehearted citizen support (see chapter IV, p. 45).

8 - An urban renewal plan for a neighborhood must be flexible so that it can be reworked consistent with the views of the residents affected by
the plan (see chapter IV, p. 47).

9 - Residents should be brought in at the outset of an urban renewal program, not after urban renewal officials have already decided on an improvement program (see chapter IV, pp. 49, 50).

10 - Participation depends on rewards for neighbors to remain involved and interested over a long period of time. The meetings by design should be given a quasi-social character so that through parties, etc. people can obtain rewards above the rewards of work (see chapter III, p. 33; IV, p. 43,44).

11 - The neighborhood organization must depend on hard core leadership to make positive decisions and to construct positive programs, but the hard core must depend upon popular sanctions to implement the program (see chapter II, p. 26).

12 - Discontent must be focused on something specific. It needs not only to be focused but to be channeled into a structure through which something may be done or clarified about the problem (see chapter II, pp. 16, 17).

Comparison of Principles

In this final section, at the beginning of each division is a restatement of the community organization principles developed by Murray Ross, followed by the urban renewal principle it most nearly corresponds to, followed by a discussion.

1 - Discontent with existing conditions in the community must initiate and nourish the development of the organization.
This principle corresponds most nearly with urban renewal principle Number One. They both stress that discontent with respect to certain features of community life may well be an effective springboard for the creation of a citizen's organization. However the urban renewal principle extends itself to include efficiency as strongly related to the involvement of the financial interest in the area.

2 - Discontent must be focused and channeled into organization, planning and action in respect to specific problems.

This principle corresponds most nearly with urban renewal principles Number Six and Twelve. Urban renewal principle number six stresses the importance of a strong commitment to citizen participation by the administrator and his personnel. This principle implies that there would be no planning with people anywhere if there were no commitment to the concept of citizen participation by the chief administrator (see chapter III, p. 39). Consequently the discontent may perhaps not be focused and channeled into organization, planning, and action in respect to specific problems in urban renewal, unless there is commitment and dedication on the part of the administrator and his personnel.

Urban renewal principle Number Twelve and Ross’ principle above imply that discontent per se is of doubtful value. To provide motivation for action, discontent must be focused on something specific. Consequently the discontent needs not only to be focused but also to be channeled into a structure through which something may be done about it. The principles seem to imply further that people involved in
community organization and citizen participation in urban renewal who are aware of and disturbed about a problem need to come together to begin discussion about it; its scope, to begin to plan how to deal with it and, in light of this, to begin a program of action.

Therefore urban renewal principle number twelve and Ross' above principle are quite similar. However, urban renewal principle Number Six emphasizes dedication on the part of the urban renewal personnel, which hopefully, will lead to the focusing of discontent into organization, planning, and action.

3 - Discontent which initiates or sustains community organization must be widely shared by the community.

This corresponds with urban renewal principle Number One. Ross reports that discontent must be recognized and understood by the major part of the geographic or functional community. He continues to relate that some parts of the community may at first be only casually interested, but the problem on which discontent is focused must be one which potentially many members of the community will recognize and wish to attack. This includes the major financial interest although Ross does not equate effectiveness with their involvement as the urban renewal principle under Number One indicates. Nor does Ross imply that a community organization for citizen participation is founded on ground made fertile by popular indignation of local conditions. However both principles do imply that discontent which initiates or sustains community organization must be widely shared by the community.
4 - The organization must involve leaders (both informal and formal) identified with, and accepted by major subgroups in the community.

This principle corresponds most nearly with urban renewal principle Number Eleven. Ross is referring to the identification of major groupings in addition to the informal organization: the little friendship groups, the neighborhood social club, the ethnic group, etc. He is stressing first, the identification of those groups of people in the community with have significance for the participants and secondly, identification of the leaders of the groups. Having discovered the major groupings in the community, the next question is how groups can be brought into communication around some common problem. It is generally accepted that this can be done most effectively through group leaders, but it is of greatest importance that these leaders be accepted by, and positively identified with, the subgroup they are to represent.

The urban renewal principle reports that the neighborhood organization must depend on "hard core leadership" to make positive decisions and to construct positive programs. This is another way of saying that the most generally accepted method for bringing groups into communication around common problems is through group leaders. However, the urban renewal principle further emphasizes the "hard core leadership's" dependence upon popular sanctions to implement the programs formulated by the hard core.

Ross stresses identification of groups and their leaders and the general acceptability of their effectiveness, provided these leaders are accepted by and identified with the group they are representing.
The writer is of the opinion that the major difference between the two principles is the stress placed upon leadership. The urban renewal principle emphasizes the leadership role and its relationship to the construction of positive programs, whereas Ross reports that it is generally accepted that groups can be brought together most effectively around problems by the group leaders.

5 - The program of the organization should include some activities with emotional content.

This corresponds most nearly to urban renewal principle Number Ten. Here Ross has reference to the binding together of diverse groups which require common ideas, feelings, and tradition. He relates that this is not something that can be done artificially nor can it be forced, yet it may be encouraged and facilitated. Far from confining its activities to serious business, the community organization should also seek to encourage and sponsor celebrations consistent with the nature of the community. This tends to be done more effectively on other continents than in North America, where folk festivals, celebrations and even official days of Thanksgiving, have lost their ceremonial meaning.

The urban renewal principle has reference to keeping neighbors involved and interested over a period of time. Consequently they must receive rewards at a sufficient rate. Therefore, the urban renewal principle implies that meetings by design should be given a quasi-social character so that through parties, the sharing of hobbies and games, and informal conversation of all sorts, people can obtain the rewards of work (see chapter IV, p. 43, 44). Both
principles appear to be quite similar.

6 - The organization should seek to utilize the manifest and latent good will which exists in the community.

This principle corresponds most nearly with urban renewal principles Four, Five and Nine. Boss is suggesting that there are probably extensive sources of good will and support in the community which remain to be mobilized in cooperative endeavors. In every community there are numbers of people who are willing to contribute, identify with, and participate in any constructive community effort.

Urban renewal principle Number Four refers primarily to families in a rehabilitation setting, and suggests that attitudes toward homes and the surrounding environment may well determine the success of a rehabilitation program. Consequently, the "tapping of the manifest and latent good will" will be essential in changing the attitudes of the most important element in rehabilitation.

Urban renewal principle Number Five suggests that a possible source of manifest and latent good will may perhaps be found in an institution having substantial investment in a physical plant threatened with blight, thereby possibly becoming a rallying point for neighborhood conservation (see chapter IV, p. 50).

Urban renewal principle Number Nine suggests the importance of mobilizing and involving residents at the beginning of the urban renewal program, hopefully spurring them into willing participation in a program of action to renew their neighborhoods (see chapter IV, p. 49, 50). This entails the development of ways and means of
communicating and enlisting a sustained interest on the part of local people in bettering their housing standards and neighborhood conditions, thus indicating that careful preparation of people for change over time is a minimum essential for success of an urban renewal program. Involving people at the beginning of an urban renewal program enhances the urban renewal administrator's opportunity to utilize the "manifest and latent good will." Consequently, one method of achieving or increasing a sense of responsibility among citizen groups is to stimulate the development of a real sense of sharing in the planning process. If citizens feel that final plans are partly of their own making, they are likely to offer support (see chapter IV, p. 48).

Urban renewal principles Four, Five and Nine imply the utilization of manifest and latent good will. Four stresses attitude changes, Five stresses institutional involvement, and Nine stresses planning with people from the beginning.

7 - The organization must develop active and effective lines of communication both within the organization and between the organization and the community.

This principle corresponds most nearly to urban renewal principles Three and Eight. Ross implies here that communication involves more than the mechanical process of securing and transmitting messages. It consists of a process by which the area of common understanding and shared values is widespread in the community. Ross relates that communication within a group or between groups depends to a considerable
extent on the quality of relationships between the people involved. Where hostility, fear, aggression, distrust, and disrespect predominate in these relationships, communication will be far less effective than where there are friendliness, mutual respect, and trust. This suggests the importance of the creation of a social climate which permits and facilitates communication.

Urban renewal principle Number Eight deals with the flexibility of an urban renewal plan so that it can be reworked consistent with the views of the residents affected by the plan, thus increasing the chances of creating a favorable social climate. The principle appears to be aimed at the reduction of fear, distrust, hostility and the securing of support by presenting a flexible urban renewal plan to neighborhood groups.

Urban renewal principle Number Three stresses the importance of the organization providing channels for participation and communication. However, it further suggests that an effective organization for citizen participation should be so structured as to rely as little as possible on specific techniques of participation, thus stressing one of the limitations of citizens in a citizen organization. The principle implies that the effectiveness of such an organization increases as people learn that, while their informed opinion is an important factor in guiding decisions, final decision-making should be left to its elected leadership. General membership is given its voice through voting on broad issues selected from alternatives chosen by its elected leadership. Should the membership object, the decisions of the core are vetoed (see chapter II, p. 22).
Consequently, effective communication is essential to community organization and urban renewal. The urban renewal principle implies effective communication through a flexible urban renewal program as well as the development of positive programs by the "hard core," thereby hopefully creating a favorable social environment.

8 - The organization should seek to develop effective leaders.

This principle corresponds most nearly with urban renewal principle Number Eleven. Boss here is primarily concerned with the development of those kinds of leaders who will help the organization to become productive and who will help contribute to the development of morale both in the organization and the community.

The urban renewal principle is also concerned with leaders and their ability to make positive decisions and construct positive programs. It implies that decision-making must be central, however not authoritarian. In the last analysis the membership always retains the veto power, ever a strong conditioning factor to intelligent decision-making. Consequently the hard core is dependent upon popular sanctions to implement its programs.

Both principles are concerned with leaders and their production. However Boss is stressing the development of effective leaders in terms of the development of morale both within the organization and the community. The urban renewal principles stresses leadership in terms of positive decisions and positive programs in addition to the leader's dependence upon the popular sanctions of the group members to implement his programs.

9 - The organization should develop a pace for its work relative to existing conditions in the community.
This corresponds most nearly with urban renewal principle Number Seven. Ross is referring to the social worker beginning where the community is at the present time and working at its pace.

The urban renewal principle implies that community improvements and increased citizen understanding as to what the city administration has achieved, its program for future improvements etc. are necessary before wholehearted citizen support can be courted for an urban renewal program. The urban renewal principle implies pace, pace as connected with needed community improvements and citizen understanding, thereby increasing confidence and "setting the pace" for the eventual wholehearted support of the urban renewal program.

Both principles suggest a rate of speed. Ross referring to the social worker beginning where the community is at the present time. The urban renewal principle refers to "pace" as dependent upon wholehearted support which is, in turn, dependent upon the confidence of citizens that their local government will act to carry out an urban renewal program.

10 - The organization must develop strength, stability and prestige in the community.

This principle corresponds most nearly to urban renewal principle Number Two. Ross is referring to an organization's strength both in terms of its involvement of accepted leaders and in terms of its ability to work through difficult community problems. He hypothesizes that such an organization will win participation and support of the people, and will become a symbol which stands for and induces further
community cooperation.

The urban renewal principle implies that obeisance accorded a neighborhood organization by the politicians and urban renewal officials is based upon the stability, strength and prestige of the organization. This obeisance is based upon several key questions. Has the neighborhood organization bested city officials in some battles? Has its militant existence persuaded city officials that cooperation will win more votes at election time than hostility or indifference (see chapter IV, p. 44).

Ross' principle stresses strength, stability and prestige in terms of their relation to the organization's involvement of accepted leaders and in addition, to the organization's ability to work through difficult problems; whereas the urban renewal principle is stressing strength as related to obeisance accorded by politicians and urban renewal officials, which in turn is based upon the organization's relationship with city officials and its ability to persuade city officials that cooperation will win more votes at election time than hostility or indifference.

In conclusion, there are many similarities between the principles of community organization as developed in social work and citizen participation in urban renewal. The involvement of community leaders; the utilization of the manifest and latent good will which exist in the community; the utilization of discontent as an effective springboard for the creation of a citizen's organization; the importance of the quasi-social character of citizen organizations; the significance
of the development of organization prestige; the importance of the organization as a structure through which discontent may be focused; the importance of the organization's work pace being concomitant with existing conditions in the community; and the citizen organization's constant striving for effective means of communication and participation; all of the above, although with varying degrees of emphasis, represent the similar principles of citizen participation and urban renewal.

Behind these similarities are fundamental differences; the involvement and role of the local government in urban renewal, the equating of effectiveness in urban renewal with the involvement of the major financial interest in the area, and the importance of the commitment to the concept of citizen participation by the urban renewal administrator's and their personnel.

The urban renewal principles of citizen participation which were discussed emerged from, and were based upon the Chicago and Boston urban renewal experiences. The degree to which these underlying principles are fulfilled in other localities is dependent on the way the local urban renewal authorities function.

Nevertheless when you see such and such a cause, over a long period of time, you come to share the privilege of the Messrs. Boyle and Charles - you can say you have observed a law, a principle which your colleagues or contemporaries are at liberty to challenge if they can.
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