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This thesis explores the conditions of community control and neighborhood development. The existing theories of anarchy, pluralism and supports, as found in the literature, form the groundwork for the thesis argument. The theories are used to construct conceptual models of community control applicable to urban neighborhoods in the current United States context. These models describe different worlds according to the conditions of social structure, the nature of interaction, the availability of resources, and the tools for control of the building process.

In order to test the usefulness of the models, the thesis analyzes a real case according to the conditions set up in the theoretical models. The thesis presents the story of a recent struggle over the future of the land and its development in the South End neighborhood of Boston, Massachusetts. The South End is a unique case, yet its lessons parallel those of similar struggles in Boston's working class and poor neighborhoods. The analysis of the case reveals insights about the usefulness of the models.

In the conclusion, the thesis considers the value of the theoretical approach. The models are set up to characterize different worlds, but in the end describe different perspectives of the same world. The world appears differently in the models depending on one's relative position, the scale of operation, and the particular stage in a dynamic process of community control. The theoretical framework presented in this thesis, like all rules and supports structures, must be challenged, dismantled, and rebuilt over time to accommodate changing conditions and new experiences.
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I. INTRODUCTION

THE FUTURE AT STAKE

The future of Boston's neighborhoods is a vital issue for the working class and poor residents who are fighting to remain in their homes against the pressure of the private market. In a booming economy such as Boston's, the value of land has risen, prime development sites are becoming scarce, and the demand for housing, especially affordable housing for the working class and poor, is rising. Long ignored by capital investors, inner city neighborhoods are now being viewed as desirable real estate markets because of the availability of vacant land and their proximity to a prosperous downtown.

This thesis will focus on three critical actors participating in the land development process at the level of the neighborhood: the residents, the city government, and private for-profit developers. Each have a separate stake in the development of land.

For the residents, a neighborhood and its land is a place to carry on life including working, raising children, interacting socially, and participating in culture,
recreation, and learning. The improvement and development of land means change, and based on previous experiences, residents are wary of a future that may displace them from their current homes and neighborhoods. Poor and working class residents, in particular, have the least choice over where to relocate, often due to both economics and racial biases. Potentially, they have the most to lose in the change of the neighborhood.

In a capitalist economy, land is not just a place, but a commodity, to be bought and sold for profit. Entrepreneurs produce buildings, but extract and accumulate wealth in the process; their main interest is not in the buildings, but in this potential for profit. Currently, this potential in the Boston market is high, especially in the traditional working class neighborhoods where raw land is still available for relatively low costs.

The land base of a city is a source of wealth for the local government. With the revenues generated by this land base, the city government provides services but also perpetuates itself over time as a large and stable institution. Both residents and private capital investors pay the cost to sustain this institution. The value of business and capital investment leads cities to compete with other cities for these resources. For the city of Boston, the
booming real estate market is a sign of success and prosperity that had been absent for many decades.

Within the city of Boston, land has become a scarce commodity, and the availability of affordable housing for residents is decreasing commensurately in the private market. The inner city neighborhoods are the site of a suddenly valuable resource - vacant land, the product of previous urban renewal policies and capital disinvestment. For the most part, the city and the private investors control the technical and financial resources for development of this land. The residents, however, occupy the land and in themselves are a valuable resource of human energy. The struggle over control of the land will determine not just the future of the neighborhood, but more importantly the future of the residents, and who has a right to live in that place.

APPROACH

In this thesis, I argue that the decision-making process over issues of environmental change needs to become more decentralized. In the move towards decentralization, a dilemma arises over the values of greater local and individual freedom, and the values of cooperation and
interdependence. In the city of Boston, this dilemma is played out within the following context: a capitalist system, where power and wealth is concentrated; poor and working class neighborhoods comprised of diverse and heterogeneous residents; and a strong real estate market. The intent of this thesis is to better understand the strategies for and the dilemmas of decentralization within the scope of the city.

Building is a social act that affects many people, directly or indirectly, especially in a dense urban environment. While the rights of private property are a part of the context of the United States and a capitalist economy, there are many examples of limits which control the use of these freedoms. At a basic level, legal restrictions such as zoning and building codes establish a relationship between building and a social environment.

A social structure defines the relationships between the various actors in the building process. This structure holds within it the relative balance of centralized and decentralized power, and the tension between freedom and equity. Forms of social organization affect who has the power to make decisions, who has access to, and who benefits from the building process.
In order to function in a social context, building involves interaction, and communication to establish limits. In this light, building becomes a political act involving leadership issues, individual responsibilities, power struggles, and strategies.

Physical development transforms materials and the environment, demanding valuable energy in the form of resources. This transformation also generates benefits, however, that can be reinvested or extracted for use outside the community. The origin, use, and extraction of resources is a central issue in the development process, since most resources are concentrated in the hands of private capitalists and the city. Development entrepreneurs often contribute little of their own equity, but rather use the resources of others to generate benefits for themselves.

Control of development at any scale means the power to determine a future (formulate a vision), to establish the means to achieve that future (set the rules), as well as to participate directly in building (direct action). In this thesis, vision, rules and direct action are the tools for control of development.

In the context of land and physical development, I define
'community' as people with common interests living in a particular area. The delineation of any community is relative and subjective, and changes according to position and issues. Similarly, 'neighborhood' is a relative and subjective term, but I use it here to describe a physical environment which has meaning to a community.

In advocating the decentralization of power, one must carefully consider the destination of that power. Community control by elite and exclusive groups is not true decentralized power, but rather an exploitation that is bought at the expense of equity for those who are excluded. This thesis focuses on decentralization of power to working class and poor communities, which have the least access to the centralized power in the status quo system.

In this thesis, social organization, decentralization, and the physical transformation of the environment are central themes. In grappling with these issues, I find it useful to bear in mind the principles of conservation of matter-energy and entropy.¹

These concepts, which derive from the study of thermodynamics, are reminders that the process of building does not produce something new, but rather transforms existing energy and material at the expense of other parts.
of the system. By creating a more highly structured system, which has more economic value (such as a building), energy is dissipated into a less usable state. "In entropy terms, the cost of any biological or economic enterprise is always greater than the product." The benefits of the building process are not the product, but the intangible benefits that flow like radiant heat from the process of transformation.

In general, the entropy "law" states that all ordered systems steadily break down into disorder. An ordered system, such as an institution, requires a constant source of energy. This energy comes at some cost within a closed system.

... every living organism strives only to maintain its own entropy constant. To the extent to which it achieves this, it does so by sucking low entropy from the environment to compensate for the increase in entropy to which, like every material structure, the organism is continually subject.

The cost to sustain an organization may be worth the input of human energy and resources if a community derives some benefit from that organization. If the benefits are extracted from the community, however, then there is some justification for dissolving the organization by withholding their energy.
In the second chapter of this thesis, I develop the theoretical models of anarchy, pluralism, and supports. These models rest on many general aspects of these theories, but generally derive from and expand on the more directed use of the theory to explain modern conditions of building processes. Each model deals with component parts of the building process, which I have broken down into the themes of social structure, interaction, resources, and tools for control of development.

The third chapter tells a story of a recent struggle for control of the land in the South End neighborhood of Boston. In this chapter, I also analyze the case in light of the theoretical models, following the themes of social structure, interaction, resources, and tools for control. The case embodies many current issues facing working class and poor communities fighting for some control over their territory in the face of a strong city government and a strong real estate market that is forcing rapid change. Many of the roots of this struggle over land lie in government policy decisions made a generation ago, which brought in a new middle class population, increased the value of the property and the rents, and consequently
displaced original residents. Over the last twenty-five years, however, not only have the conditions changed, but the experience of the community has evolved through a generation, changing the nature of the interaction.

In the final chapter, I reflect on the value of the theoretical models in understanding the issues of community control and neighborhood development. I present lessons learned from their application to the case, and the implications of the theoretical approach used in this thesis.
II. THEORETICAL MODELS

This chapter presents three theoretical models for analyzing community control and neighborhood development: anarchy, pluralism, and supports. These models derive from existing theories in the literature reviewed. The existing theories originate out of a variety of conditions in different eras and in different parts of the world. I have developed the models presented here based on my selection, interpretation, and modification of applicable concepts in these theories. My goal is to shape the models to better understand conditions of the post-industrial urban context.

The models focus on issues that I believe are central to the process of building in an urban context: social structure, interaction, resources, and tools for control in neighborhood development (vision, rules and direct action). I present each model in a relatively pure form to highlight differences between them and to draw out the distinguishing components. The models represent ideal conditions and difficulties inherent within the ideal conditions. In Chapter Three, I use these models to analyze an actual case involving issues of community control and development in the South End neighborhood of Boston.
ANARCHY

This section shapes some of the basic principles of anarchy into a model that applies to the building process in the urban neighborhood context. I also describe briefly the New England town model to illustrate the application of some anarchic principles, and the trade-offs in their use. Finally, I provide an overview of the anarchic model with a discussion of its inherent advantages and disadvantages.

Social Structure

The building blocks of the anarchic model are self-supporting and autonomous individual units. These pieces are juxtaposed, and together may be considered as some form of a whole, but are not a coherent whole. Anarchy is a "mass of societies all living together as freely as the individuals within them."5

The main emphasis of anarchy is the removal of all forms of authority, whether state, church, family, or neighborhood. In place of authoritative forms of organization, anarchy considers a network of connections and voluntary associations. Such networks are flexible and allow for change as conditions and people change.
The underlying premises of anarchy are that individuals are free, and choose to voluntarily associate in a cooperative manner. Through these spontaneous associations, organization is built up from the base of individual people. Many people associate the term 'anarchy' with chaos and confusion in a pejorative sense. Major theorists such as Kropotkin, however, have stressed the potential for cooperative organization through human solidarity and mutual aid in an anarchic system. This cooperation is possible with a shared understanding of the limits of acceptable behavior.

Originally, tradition rather than authority was the cementing and controlling element in society. The clan and the tribe possessed an inherent set of rules, an ethical code, which was followed by most members of the community.

Interaction

In an anarchic system, everyone affected by a decision makes that decision and puts it into effect. This may be burdensome, but is a trade-off for freedom from authority. The crux of anarchy is the tension between maintaining equity and freedom.
In struggling with the reality of implementation, theorists acknowledged that networks of councils are inevitable, especially to deal with wider geographical associations. Leaders arise out of the people to become delegates. People designate delegates, who are subject to instant recall when they are no longer supported by the people. In this way, delegates and spokes-people are always accountable. The people do not ever guarantee leaders the right to rule (as is the case of elected representatives). In this way, the energy and resources of the people do not sustain a professional class of bureaucrats or an elite class of politicians.

The system is complex because it relies on random action and direct, unpredictable confrontation. Notwithstanding the opportunities for cooperative association and networks, the emphasis on self-reliance and autonomy implies minimal interference with and dependency on others.

Individuals or individual groups rely on external dependencies only for survival needs. The need to interact and communicate is minimized, and when necessary relies on immediate neighbors. Both mutual cooperation and direct conflict promote the exchange of knowledge, but this knowledge is limited to a very local and immediate level. These interactions, however, lead to slow steady progress
These interactions, however, lead to slow steady progress through creative innovation at this intimate level.\textsuperscript{10}

On the other hand, the immediate focus of energies may limit the ability for people to interact in a broader context across space and to exchange ideas with outsiders. In this regard, parochial concerns over immediate turf may eclipse recognition of larger issues shared by many individual groups.\textsuperscript{11}

**Resources**

In an anarchic system, no one accumulates property. Instead, every individual has the right to use property, especially land.\textsuperscript{12} People conserve resources and energy within a smaller autonomous system, rather than draw them from outside or extract them for use elsewhere.\textsuperscript{13}

The anarchic model recognizes that a ruling government can never be in a position to redistribute resources. Rather, this authority is integrally linked to a class structure and has a stake in perpetuating the unequal distribution of resources. Resource redistribution involves not just access to resources, but the decentralized power to make decisions about how and why money is spent.\textsuperscript{14} While this
use of resources may not immediately seem practical, in the long run, the system is efficient by being more adaptive.\textsuperscript{15}

Tools of Development

In the anarchic model, there is not a coherent image of the future. Since each individual acts independently, total action is random and no single person or entity can control the consequences. Anarchy relies on direct action, and focuses on the nature of the action and the process of transformation rather than the end result. The future comes out of social acts over time, including conflict and bonds established between people, and out of the inherent character of a place.\textsuperscript{16}

This does not imply that there is no vision, but rather that each individual contributes their own unique vision to the process of shaping the future. Since no authority imposes an image, every individual is more free to imagine their own vision.\textsuperscript{17}

Because there is no authority, action at the local level is the only way to introduce anarchy, building society out of the mass of people. "The workers sense the incapacity of
the governing classes to control the situation, and [begin] to take affairs into their own hands."18

Direct action moves outside the conventional framework of an authoritative structure. John Turner and Colin Ward have applied this theory to the fundamental unit of the building process, the dwelling. By starting with control over this basic element of their environment, people gain experience and capacity to dismantle other forms of authority.

Action does not rely on broad consensus or leadership to move forward:

[Kropotkin] sees the masses carrying out both tasks - that of destroying the state and of building a new order. All of this is to be done without leadership from above and without a preconceived plan. He instead relies on the instincts of solidarity and cooperation and spirit (of revolution) of the people to accomplish the tasks.19

Each individual pursues his/her own direction, allowing others to do the same. By pursuing direct action, processes are not simplified, but instead become more complex and conflict increases.20 In the anarchic model, large scale decisions that require authority for implementation are not worth doing, given the trade-off in freedom.
Rules that are backed by authoritative sanctions limit the freedom of the individual. If authority is present and establishes rules, people tend to rely on these forms of authority, rather than relying on themselves and on each other. The passive acceptance of rules and authority perpetuates their existence. Instead, people need to challenge the reality of the ruling class rather than accept it as a given.

In an anarchic system, regulation of private actions are by bonds of self respect and public opinion, as well as natural solidarity. Anarchic societies are tightly knit social units, and typically share a basic understanding of the means to achieve the future, although individual visions may vary. Since there is no authority to institutionalize rules, they appear to be absent. In reality, rules are unspoken agreements based on tradition and local realities, and allow for shifting and change over time. Conflict establishes limits to acceptable behavior. Those directly involved in the conflict set the appropriate rules among themselves, without outside authority.
Precedents

While anarchy may seem like an impossible condition to achieve, there are precedents that approach the theoretical model, including the New England towns and the Italian city-states. Actual precedents are useful in conceptualizing the model. I will describe briefly the New England model as an illustration of the trade-offs in the anarchic system. Since progress and change is extremely slow in an anarchic system, many of the descriptions of historical settlement still apply today, albeit in modified form.22

The New England towns have historically functioned as self-supporting autonomous political units. Traditionally, "the family [is] the basic unit of labor and production and the core element in social organization, and the town [is] the unit of settlement."23

Individuals strive for self-sufficiency and minimal interference with their neighbor and his/her rights. Each individual has the right and the civic responsibility to "stand up and be counted" in town meeting, thereby joining in the government of the town affairs.
Elements of cooperative sharing of land and work existed only in the very early periods of settlement, although even then certain members assumed privileged status. Cooperative organization soon dissipated as the desire for individual farms and freedoms began to dominate, given the vast expanses of land in the new territory. The early settlement focused on a "primitive economy of self-sufficient families and autonomous villages." With the rise in capitalism in the eighteenth century, however, individual freedoms meant the right to free trade in a larger economic system, diminishing the true economic autonomy of the unit.

Despite variations in class and origin, most initial town settlers shared basic values, and comprised a relatively homogeneous society. Over time, these insular homogeneous groups became elite in relation to later settlers and immigrants. Town residents have since used their privileges to exclude working class people and minimize growth from outside. While there is some measure of equity within the social and political unit it does not account for the inequities in the larger system. Freedom has been bought at the cost of equity elsewhere in the system.

Between the various town units, there is limited communication, cooperation and sharing of information,
notably in regards to regional issues such as housing needs, transportation, environment, and infrastructure.

This pattern has historical roots:

. . . many towns did not build roads even to connect the villages of one township to its next neighbors. Some towns were too self-centered even to meet their obligation to send representatives to each assembly of the legislature.2s

From an anarchic perspective relying on authority does not justify the resolution of these issues. From an elite point of view, cooperation may threaten the privileges of the group.

Discussion

The anarchic model represents the extreme example of decentralization. It raises the basic dilemma between equity and freedom, and the nature of the trade-offs in seeking their balance. By focusing on individual freedom, anarchy provides only limited mechanisms for ensuring cooperation and equity, and relies heavily on voluntary and spontaneous sharing.

The model rests on the assumption or precondition of equal power among individuals. In approaching anarchy, the structural changes in social organization begin at the local and individual level through individual empowerment,
free choice, and equal access to participation and information. Self-help is a means to begin structural changes, but is not a solution in itself, as suggested by those promoting privatization. Anarchy can only arise from the mass of people, not from any authoritarian mandate. Any proposal to remove authority or rules without first ensuring the preconditions of empowerment, choice, and equal access leads to chaos and the potential for manipulation. "Freedom is acquired by conquest, not by gift," and involves responsibility and risk.

Equity, however, always comes at some cost to individuals. Cooperative organizations and measures of equity require some level of active and continuous energy to sustain them. Without this input, the system tends to break down into a state of disorder, characterized by unequal demands for individual freedom. Focusing on individual attempts to solve larger collective problems, rather than sharing efforts cooperatively, can be divisive. As freedom becomes more of a focus, competitiveness takes the place of mutual support.

The system allows every individual to have a say and promotes interaction, conflict, and direct action to guide the future in a random and inherently uncontrollable manner. Innovation arises slowly in many small steps.
rather than in uneven bounds. Intimate knowledge and understanding of immediate neighbors is the focus of interaction, but may come at the expense of a global perspective.

The emphasis on individual autonomy and self-reliance overlooks the benefits of shared cross-cultural dependencies in a diverse and complex society. Diverse communities, like class societies, are highly structured and take energy to sustain themselves. The tendency for the order in a system to break down leads to more homogeneous groups.

In the anarchic model, it is difficult to absorb or incorporate outsiders who do not share an understanding of the limits. There is an assumption that the individual's interest will coincide with the interests of society in general. In order to avoid the formation of elite groups, however, there must be equity throughout the system, wherein the individuals, at least potentially, have the right to choose to move freely between groups. The extension of this logic leads to more identical individuals, rather than diverse individuals and social groups in juxtaposition.
Where anarchic elements exist within the larger context of society, there is always a threat of outside aggression. Highly organized concentrations of outside power can manipulate decentralized individuals and groups, where there is an intended power vacuum and no sanctioned rules. On the other hand, elite local groups can use their power to exclude less powerful outsiders.

Within a group, imbalances in power occur when some individuals choose not to exercise their rights to participate. Those who do participate can dominate the situation to become local elites.

As always, when the organizational structures are thoroughly fragmented, the actual decisions are being made by a mere handful of people, those who can involve themselves night and day in movement affairs. Since they are hidden decision makers (‘we don’t have any leaders around here’), it is extremely difficult to challenge their powers and methods of operating.  

The anarchic model provides goals of individual empowerment, free choice and equal access, which are directly applicable to the current issues of community control. This model also suggests the danger of replacing one authority with another in the process of decentralizing power. Anarchy puts the burden on the individual to not accept authority as a given, but to take power by direct
action. Furthermore, it requires constant vigilance by the individual to prevent a hierarchy of authority from forming.

The status quo in the current urban context already contains gross inequities, which are based on access to information as well as to economic power. In these conditions, the potential exists for manipulation of fragmented individual action. This leads me to explore the next model, pluralism, which takes account of some of these issues.
PLURALISM

In this study, I use pluralism as a model that stresses a concept of a whole and the relationship between parts. In particular it addresses the building of organization, and the tension between diverse groups that share some common bond. The plural model builds on the anarchic concepts of cooperative organization, but allows for mediating institutions, heterogenous communities, leaders, and a vision for the group as a whole. Although it addresses some of the problems raised in the anarchic model (too much decentralization, fragmentation, and manipulation), the plural model raises its own set of inherent difficulties.

Social Structure

A plural community "allows full freedom of expression and the pursuit of individual goals within the framework permitted by the continuing interest of the whole". This stresses the trade-off between individual and group goals. Furthermore, it takes energy to sustain a diverse community, when society naturally tends toward homogeneity.
The plural model implies association and identification within a group, a common bond between many dissimilar parts. Each individual is part of a whole by being part of a part. There is mutual support and empowerment through the group, and a sense of responsibility to the whole.

A necessary step is to define the whole, and to recognize the distinction of the community from its surroundings. In asserting the right to self-determination, the community realizes that it has need, capacity, and responsibility to work together. The component members identify or delineate the community, neighborhood or binding issue, as opposed to the imposition of a definition by outsiders.

Within the self-defined community, however, individuals have different interests and values. Besides identifying with the community, individuals tend to identify with a more immediate group, which represents and shares the individual's values. The choice of association is voluntary, based on common interests, concerns, tradition, and/or proximity.

A united group of individuals embody a common position on an issue. The group functions as a "mediating structure" between the individual and a larger megastructure, such as a government bureaucracy. Many small organizations,
agencies and institutions serve in this role, including neighborhood block associations, community agencies, churches, unions, tenants' councils, or other voluntary associations.

These mediating structures are a form of institution that provides stability in a community. As long as they remain small and directly in touch with their constituency, they are flexible and responsive to members' needs, values, and individual input. An individual is more likely to be active and have control in a group small enough to be manageable, in which individuals share basic values and concerns.

In order to deal with larger issues and interact with aggressive and more powerful outside interests, mediating structures join temporarily with other groups to form coalitions. In response to a specific issue, the definition of 'community' may redefine itself into a larger whole. Groups that can recognize a common interest or similar fate can overcome parochial "turf" battles between themselves. Coalitions mirror the smaller associations, except that they tend to be larger and more temporary.

Coalitions grow out of relationships of interdependence and trust. Although the coalitions themselves are temporary,
latent connections allow for future regrouping as needed. As an organized system, large scale coalitions tend to break down naturally, unless there are significant inputs of energy and resources.

A hierarchy in scale exists in moving from the individual into mediating structures into coalitions. Maintaining small and/or temporary organizations minimizes the tendency for concentration of power in this hierarchy, however. The need for a hierarchy becomes a trade-off in order to function and coordinate activities, and to deal with the reality of concentrated economic or political power in outside organizations. The community organizations preserve their integrity through the grass roots support of the people.

**Interaction**

The mass of people motivate the mediating structures. These structures may appear and disappear with current issues and concerns, and according to the degree of accountability and representation experienced by individuals. While every individual in the community does
not have to attend every meeting, a responsive community organization should be backed by the majority of the residents. **

Coalitions that bring together diverse peoples can be a vehicle for bringing equity into a community, and reconciling different interests. Rather than focusing on self-reliance, groups join coalitions for mutual support and power. The organization is a mechanism for achieving equity within the group, and for demanding more equity from the larger outside system. It requires constant input of energy to sustain itself, however, and constant vigilance to prevent the relative costs of maintaining it from exceeding its purpose.

The plural model includes structure and leadership, which set conditions for individuals to take responsibility. A group considers individual action in the light of overall strategies and the broader context of a situation. Rather than accepting competing and uninformed requests at face value, the group resolves these issues internally. This group strategy prevents more informed individuals from manipulating a situation of fragmented power. **

In a plural society, the members build community slowly around common issues and trust. The internal structure
allows a forum for the slow process of exposing and resolving conflict to work towards cooperative organization. Engagement, experience, and learning of the mass of people is a means for achieving consensus, but not under the pressure of short term goals.\textsuperscript{4\,2}

Without overall strategies and leadership, the plural process can break down and become unmanageable. Individuals then become frustrated and disengaged.\textsuperscript{4\,3}

Those who attend briefly cannot comprehend the chaos, the lack of clarity in the overall orientation, the long windedness of the meetings, the fact that no effective division of labour takes place and that tasks that are proposed and agreed upon are not performed. Since everyone is 'responsible', nobody is... \textsuperscript{4\,4}

Leadership is central to the model, and the structure is a means of engaging people, not ruling them.

\textbf{Resources}

Community-wide coordination and cooperation allows for sharing of resources and information within a community. This organization maximizes the skills within the community, and builds networks of social and economic support. Coordinating resources ensures more efficient use within the community, with internal dependencies and accountability, rather than the extraction of resources to
outside destinations. A coordinating entity "would serve as a backup resource for the ... larger area by providing a wider perspective of information and insight on various issues".45

Rather than competing for limited resources offered by central agencies, organizations with a strong base can begin to redefine the terms. "We must not accept their version of material reality - as soon as we do we've lost more than half the battle."46 . . .[the oppressed] must perceive the reality of oppression not as a closed world from which there is no exit, but as a limiting situation which they can transform."47

By accepting the conventional notions of scarce resources and allocation, the potential for innovation is already stifled.48 Governments set a framework to redistribute revenues conditionally to achieve their own political and economic goals. By realizing the broader context of a class society structure, a coordinated group can begin to define their own needs and the terms for access to resources.49
Tools for Control

The plural community has many resources in its people. Together they are capable of developing their own vision, and of setting their own agenda. Any vision that is going to support and maintain the community itself must evolve out of the local people. In a plural society where absolute consensus is difficult, strategies become a means for moving forward rather than fixed plans or specified outcomes. The community employs multiple tactics to make structural changes that will open up future choices and processes.

Strategies, procedures, and action are not random, but are founded in and directed by an overall vision of the goals of the plural society. Among other things, the vision includes equity and empowerment within the group, and overcoming class barriers imposed from outside. The vision must incorporate an understanding of the needs and desires of the component parts in the community, as well as a more global perspective. The approach is comprehensive but focuses on a micro-area, which is defined by the members of the community.

With coordination and comprehensive strategies within the community, individuals do not waste energies in unnecessary
competition, but work to a common goal. Direct action and involvement by the mass of people benefit the group by leading to a greater understanding of the potentials and constraints involved in the process.

In this model, rules are few and indirect, and serve to change processes and structural relationships. Using indirect controls to structure situations, there is less need for prescriptive rules, which specify outcomes and demand coercive control to enforce.

Establishing a few indirect controls, however, requires a thorough understanding of both the internal workings of the community as well as a more global perspective. The people affected by the rules, in conjunction with mediating structures who have access to a wider perspective, are the most qualified to write indirect rules. Professional elites who are out of touch with the local conditions will inevitably produce rules with unintended consequences, despite any good intentions. Where rules are few or inappropriate to the conditions, more informed individuals manipulate the rules to advantage.
Discussion

The plural model allows individuals to participate actively at a scale that they can effect. Mediating structures are either small scale or temporary in nature, and thus remain responsive to the people. A hierarchy of scale in organization exists, but control remains rooted in the individual constituents. Through coordination and organizational structure, community groups exchange information with other groups and build on the resource of local knowledge.

The dangers of the plural model are the evolution of multiple layers of organizations and institutions that complicate and confuse the system, and hamper action. In this case, the institutions may bury the individual, who is unable to deal with or bypass the mediating institution in order to communicate with higher levels of organization as necessary.

Large scale, extensive coalitions may solidify, so that the connections between member groups become more important than connections to the constituency. An institutionalized organization that is too large and too entrenched cannot be responsive to each individual. It begins to take on a life of its own with an agenda distinct from the simple pursuit
of the individual members' interests. In order to self-perpetuate, the organization demands more and more energy and resources to sustain itself. In accumulating resources and energy, the institution positions itself at the top of a hierarchical power structure.

Innovation threatens institutions that are too rigid and stable. Instead, the organization begins to shape the processes to meet its own needs, and stifles the potential for individual input and creativity. A coalition or mediating structure that becomes unresponsive removes a critical intermediate level to which an individual can relate.

While allowing for diversity, pluralism also must concern itself with maintaining choice or a measure of equality between distinct groups within the whole. Self-definition at any scale may be racist or have limited goals. A fundamental class approach provides a common bond between otherwise distinct groups. "The basis of organization is the neighborhood ... [which] should attempt to diminish the class differences existing within the working class."

Leadership in the plural model runs the danger of becoming a minority elite, losing touch with its support, and ruling the situation. Bringing reform to a community without
involving the mass of people does not achieve long term structural changes. There is a danger of internalizing the consciousness of the oppressor and reproducing it in turn.

The plural model suggests mechanisms for building cooperative organizations. These organizations provide islands for the individual to identify with, and also provide a means for dealing with larger outside agencies and threats. Cooperative and coordinated actions protect the self-interest of the group and its component individuals.

The risk of this model is the establishment of rigid institutions or elite leaders, which are unresponsive to the individuals within them and which progressively accumulate power. The model also assumes that the component parts will have an equal voice in directing the future and attaining their needs.

In the following section, I present the supports model. In grappling with the inherent problem of unequal distribution of resources, this last model seeks a role for institutions to distribute resources and support action at the local level.
SUPPORTS MODEL

The supports model focuses on the approach of a public organization to provide a framework that maximizes individual choice within that framework. In this model, the public sphere complements the private sphere of the individual. This section presents the derivations of this concept, expands the implications, and considers the problems of its underlying assumptions.

Early Theories of Supports

John Habraken developed the initial theory of supports to address centralized control of housing production. He developed an approach using technological building systems as 'supports' within which an individual can exercise freedom of choice to create a dwelling. The structural framework is a technological means to 'scale up' and expedite the production of housing through the use of a coordinated and mass produced system. The framework has a "rational basis". It sets limits, but does not stipulate what is done within those limits.

Habraken extended his theory to address a variety of scales from the dwelling to the city. At whatever scale it
operates, a support structure is wholly complete unto itself, and is not to be confused with a skeleton, which is designed to accommodate specific details. The support structure is simple, robust, and enduring. The infill, however, can be ephemeral, complicated and endlessly variable, according to individual efforts, creativity, and needs.\textsuperscript{6,5}

John Turner also recognized the problem of centralized authority in housing production. His work in Peruvian squatter settlements focused on direct action, with appropriately scaled materials and technologies rather than mass produced systems. Left to their own means, individuals contribute a great deal of energy and resources into their own housing. The role of central authorities is not to plan prescriptively, but rather to establish policy limits to guarantee equitable access to resources and avoid exploitation.\textsuperscript{6,6}

Both Habraken and Turner were seeking a way to reduce the role of central authorities, and enable individuals to make decisions and to take action at the local level. Habraken's and Turner's early work was significant in changing many of the basic assumptions about the production of housing. While Turner is vague about the nature of the public sphere that establishes supports, Habraken is more
specific: "a team of experts and technicians in collaboration with various local authorities." They assume, or hope, that the public sphere, which sets limits, will be fair and objective, and interested in equitable distribution of resources to those who need them.

Social Structure

The reality of a public sphere, which can control the limits and determine the framework within which the individual operates, shapes the social structure of the supports model.

Whilst, therefore, the provision of support dwellings can remain in private hands, support structures themselves should be part of government or local authority investment; necessary like roads and services, for the growth of neighborhoods or towns.

The model recognizes the variations in individual needs and desires, and seeks to maximize individual freedom within limits. Similar to pluralism, the supports model attempts to increase individual involvement by supplying a structure. In this model, however, outside experts and authorities design the structure, and strive to be as supportive as possible to individuals.
The model is built on the recognition that ordinary people are the best judge of their own environment, based on their direct experience. The value of an environment is difficult for an outsider to judge, and the consequences of even the best intentions to affect that setting may be unforeseen. Decisions about the immediate environment should be in the hands of the users, and include problem solving, setting priorities, innovation, and action:

... the way in which a support structure is filled, the way in which the possibilities of circulation are exploited, the development of the roof and its various additions, will also betray something of the character of a community.

In the supports model, central powers have responsibility for control and coordination of public policy and infrastructure. Individuals and small political units are unable to implement large scale undertakings (streets, telephones, electricity), thereby justifying the more coordinated approach of a large public body. By providing systems of infrastructure, governments facilitate direct action at the local level. Public policy sets a framework for social goals, making processes and outcomes more predictable for the individual, and less subject to individual manipulation.
Interaction

Central authorities seek consensus and resolution of conflict in order to produce results quickly and to "scale up" their efforts to have greater impact on areas of concern. The provision of a supports framework expedites decisions and facilitates the delivery process. The delivery of products is a means for measuring the political accountability of the public sphere.

In providing supports, individuals interact more with their immediate environment and its character. The actions of the individual and the central agency complement one another. The individual reacts to the framework provided, and has little input over the initial formulation of plans and the fundamental design of the structure. 7 2 In "supporting" individuals, the framework reduces their responsibility and minimizes their potential to affect the larger structure. Over time, however, "a new relationship between citizens and authority could develop." 7 3 This would allow the supports structure "to grow, develop and change with what goes on inside." 7 4

Support mechanisms are also a means for central agencies to distribute information and technical assistance to local people. Central authorities are repositories of
information, which must flow through their hands in making large scale decisions and channeling resources. The provision of technical assistance by a central agency to a local group attempts to reconcile local knowledge about immediate environments with professional knowledge about overall systems.

Resources

Supports structures are a way of conserving the expenses of the public sphere. They limit public expenditures to the construction of a simple long-lasting framework, rather than expending resources and energy on small details better accomplished at a local level. In the supports model, central powers are responsible for providing public infrastructure and guaranteeing materials, financial resources, land, and technical assistance to complement the energies of local people.

The supports model operates according to the principle of competition for scarce resources and competing interest groups. In this model, the government is assumed to be in the best position to conduct a "fair and objective" competition for resources, applying standards for the
release of resources. Any direct support of organized mediating structures would imply differences, biases and particularism.⁷⁵

Tools for Development

Since the "experts" and the public sphere design the support system to endure and "withstand centuries," the structure itself becomes a vision of the future. "A support structure, on the other hand, is built in the knowledge that we cannot predict what is going to happen to it."⁷⁶ The sturdiness of the structure absorbs unforeseen, unexpected rapid change and offers an endless range of possibilities within its limits.⁷⁷

The supports model also serves as a system for expanding the structure and provides a set of rules for actions within the structure. As a system, "the supports town does not have to be determined in advance: it can be cultivated." The town can continue to grow by new vertical and horizontal connections without detailed planning, improvising on the requirements of the moment.⁷⁸ In this manner, the system allows for piecemeal extensions, as long as they tie into and follow the system of the original.
The system sets up "game rules," which individuals play out to achieve their own unique results."

A central agency plans for a broad constituency and covers a broad territory. The supports model rejects direct controls, which prescribe methods and outcomes, as too difficult for an authority to implement and too limiting on individual freedoms. Rather, this model employs indirect controls that set limits. Government rely on information gathered from many districts and packaged by professional experts, in order to understand the infinite variety of conditions within their jurisdictions.

A supportive structure established by a central government streamlines action at the local level. It removes barriers for direct action, and seeks to provide a base level of equal opportunities through a rational construct. The structure breaks down the ability of private individuals to accumulate power or property within the framework, and limits the potential for exploitation."
Discussion

The supports model is based on mechanisms for coordination and distribution of resources equitably, with minimal restriction of individual freedoms. The intent of a supports system is to facilitate individual action and open opportunities with a process that supplies technology, resources, and/or information.

The underlying assumption is that a central institution is in a position to counterbalance inequities across groups, counteract inequities in a private market, and improve access and equity by disseminating resources and information. The extent to which they can do this equitably, however, is limited as their stake in local development increases. On the other hand, the further removed an institution is from the local level and the constituency, the more likely a designed supports system will not match the needs of the individuals for which it was intended.

The fundamental concept of supports is a means of conserving the resources of a central agency at any single location for more efficient use in a total system. The implications of this logic are that it can affect, and control, a broader jurisdiction. It assumes that a
public agency is the most capable agent of resource
distribution, without recognizing a central agency's role
as an independent actor with a need to accumulate resources
to sustain itself, especially as its power expands.

A central institution does not necessarily share the values
and interests of its constituents; in fact they may have
directly conflicting objectives. Public expenditures for
improvements to the environment tend to raise land values,
and affect different classes differently. Since decisions
about public infrastructure have such a major impacts on
local decisions, the scale of the decisions does not
necessarily justify relinquishing local power into the
hands of central authorities who hold different values.

Central authorities depend on and support private capital
investment, which in turn controls power that far outweighs
the actions of individuals. The historic alliance of city
planners and the capitalist city belies the concept of a
rational and neutral framework. Master plans and
regulations generated by city planners set a framework
within which development occurred. They were not neutral,
however, but reflected middle and ruling class values. The
"neutral" framework stabilized the environment for
investment, and promoted the trading of land and housing as
commodities.²
In distributing resources or information, the central institution attaches conditions to ensure formalized equity and fair competition. In seeking consensus and expeditious results, differences between groups remain unresolved, however. The competition tends to divide groups rather than unite them toward achieving goals, and sharing information and resources. In struggling for decentralized power, fragmentation leaves local groups open for manipulation by outside controlling powers. People with less time, resources and access to information are at a disadvantage in systems promoting competition, which operate under an assumption that participation will be equal.3

In a dynamic context such as development, access to information is a key advantage in the control and manipulation of the process. Governments who have a stake in local development are unlikely to relinquish all sources of information to the local level.

The danger in this model is the concentration of decision-making and ultimately power into the hands of a professional and ruling elite. In extreme conditions, rules become increasingly meaningless. Disorder and uncertainty prevail to the benefit of those in control, who can
manipulate the situation. While the elite thrive on these conditions, unorganized individuals and the working class are unable to penetrate the system to gain access to information or resources.84

This model does not adequately recognize the alliances between private capital and government, nor the independent agenda of local governments in the development process. No planning is neutral, since planners embed values in every strategy, standard and plan. Conceptually, the design of the supports framework in Habraken's theory may be more significant, and controlling, then any decisions that gets made within that frame. By setting the agenda and defining the terms, the professional or ruling class controls the solution, despite the input of individuals.

A more effective use of supports is to direct central resources not into building frameworks, but into financing supports at the local level that embody overall goals of equity and free choice. Individuals and communities, which must live within the framework, are responsible for defining the limits and determining the nature of the "support." Limits defined at the local level will be fewer and more pertinent to the issue at hand than those defined by a central authority.
III. LAND DISPOSITION IN THE SOUTH END

This chapter presents the case of the community struggle for control of land in the recent South End Neighborhood Housing Initiative (SENHI) in Boston, Massachusetts. The story, which I relate chronologically in the first section, provides background for the subsequent analysis in the second section of the chapter. Together, the purpose of this chapter is to understand the case in light of the theoretical models of anarchy, pluralism, and supports.

This case is significant because of the community approach to control over development on publicly owned land in the face of a city strategy for disposition, and under pressure for private development. In this case, the cooperative and coordinated efforts of the community were successful in wresting some of the power away from the city authority. The community strategies for control of the land included setting their own vision, fighting for rules to ensure that vision, and ultimately gaining rights for development on most of the land in question.

This case also provides insight into the implications of city initiatives, which seek to support the community while at the same time serving the city’s own ends. This is a case about decentralizing control, but not in the
fragmentary manner of anarchy. In the interaction with outside organizations, the community had to first assure a measure of overall, coordinated control to open the way for direct action by individual groups.

The context of this case includes a rich history that provides insight into the current struggle. In order to set the stage, I describe briefly the overview of the South End, including the evolution of the people and the place, and the more recent transformation wrought by urban renewal and its aftermath.

While the South End is a unique case in some regards, it parallels other land struggles in working class and poor neighborhoods throughout the city, notably the communities of color in Roxbury and Dorchester. I analyze the case of the South End with consideration of this broader context and in light of patterns of community control in land disposition in the city of Boston.
CASE NARRATION

Context

The recent struggle for the land in the South End, illustrated by the South End Neighborhood Housing Initiative (SENHI) process, fits into a larger story about land and development in the South End. The vacant land, the city agency, and the booming real estate market all trace back to urban renewal days, which began in the South End in the early 1960s. The current demolition of the elevated Orange Line on Washington Street, which has triggered uncertainty and speculation, was the end result of a convoluted process that began with clearance for a planned Southwest Expressway also during the 1960s.

Many of the current actors in the South End were first involved in community action in opposition to urban renewal in the late 1960s and 1970s. These people include members of the working class and poor, and their advocates. The predominantly white middle class residents comprise another set of actors in the case. They benefited from the urban renewal changes, moving to the South End during the course of the last generation. The more conservative members of this class have become particularly vocal participants in South End affairs. The unique settlement, evolution and
physical characteristics of the South End also bear on the events in the SENHI struggle.

The character of the South End as a place originates from both the land and the people (see Figure 1). The vagaries of the real estate market and class distinctions originate early in its history. In the mid-nineteenth century, speculative entrepreneurs designed and developed the neighborhood for middle class residents, creating much of the land out of filled mud flats (see Figure 2). Soon after the development of the South End, however, the market preference began to shift to the more fashionable Back Bay. With the depression in the 1870s, and the rising tide of immigration, the South End assumed a new and enduring character as a working class neighborhood. Landlords converted the modest row houses into rooming houses and flats, and the South End became an affordable, densely populated, and culturally rich neighborhood.

The neighborhood was a port of entry for new arrivals in the city, who represented diverse ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds, many of whom had limited access to other neighborhoods. These groups maintained their own traditions while coexisting in one area.
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FIGURE 2. THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT OF THE SOUTH END
The territory has physical characteristics that set it apart from other parts of the city. As fill it was originally isolated on three sides by water bodies and railroad corridors. To the south, the Roxbury municipal boundary, and later Massachusetts Avenue, were fuzzier, less distinct boundaries. In the last generation, plans for highway clearance and construction have further defined a distinct territory. Institutionalized by city planners as the 'South End,' the present territory encompasses both the South End and parts of Lower Roxbury.

The current South End Neighborhood Housing Initiative (SENHI) process is a struggle about land and the future of a neighborhood that has changed dramatically in the twenty-five years since urban renewal (see Figure 3). Most of the parcels that are now part of SENHI became city property through eminent domain under the federal urban renewal program. The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) designated an urban renewal area for over 600 acres encompassing all of the South End and parts of Lower Roxbury. The initial plan called for acquisition of 186 of the 600 acres, with the construction or substantial rehabilitation of over 4000 housing units. By 1973, the BRA had acquired 112 of these acres. During the years, unplanned abandonment and demolition in the private sector added to that planned by the BRA. A net decrease in units
FIGURE 3. THE LEGACIES OF URBAN RENEWAL

a. Tent City
b. Private condominiums
resulted as demolition removed affordable housing faster than relocation and reconstruction was occurring. The federal urban renewal program was a means of fostering private investment in the neighborhood, bringing in a new class of professionals and more well-to-do residents. In tandem, the program directly displaced at least 3770 households (8800 individuals) through clearance, most of them working class, poor, and elderly. The conversion of rooming houses and flats into houses, the rehabilitation of privately owned condominiums, and the rising property values and rents have indirectly displaced many more of these residents.

The urban renewal plan achieved its goal of promoting private investment in this inner city neighborhood. The result is that the South End has now become a desirable neighborhood for middle and upper class, predominantly white residents seeking home ownership. The more conservative of these residents have been vocal for many years, directly opposing subsidized and affordable housing, and other community services for the working class and poor. They have a stake in promoting market rate development, which improves property values and is more compatible with their lifestyle.
The working class community, the poor and their advocates were not passive during the era of urban renewal and its aftermath (see Figure 4). Mass protests challenged the actions of the BRA, recognizing that the city's plans did not include a place for them. New organizations and community leaders arose to represent constituencies traditionally excluded from citizen participation, most notably tenants.

Organizations spun off other organizations. Some disappeared as demands changed and funding became scarce in the 1970s; others solidified into more stable institutions serving a small and immediate population. The people involved gained experience with the tactics of the BRA, the successes of organizing, electorate politics, and direct development of housing and community facilities.⁸⁸

Despite their successes in building community, the traditional ethnic and multi-racial, working class families as well as the poor have found it increasingly difficult to find affordable housing in the South End. The housing shortage throughout the metropolitan area in the 1980s raised the demand for middle class housing in inner city neighborhoods such as the South End, while at the same time restricting the options available to working class families elsewhere.
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FIGURE 4. THE RESULTS OF COMMUNITY ACTION
Today the South End still retains a measure of its diverse population, with 46 percent black, 34 percent white, 11 percent asian, and 10 percent hispanic residents (see Figure 5). The tenure of the housing stock remains predominantly rental (80 percent), but accommodates an increasing number of households made up of unrelated individuals, a sign of young professional roommates.9

Trends in income and housing tell the story of the recent transformation of the neighborhood best, however. In 1960, the median income in the South End was 65 percent of the Boston median; in 1985, it was about equal to the city-wide median. Between 1980 and 1985, median monthly rent increased from $148 to $742.90 Table 1 presents a summary of the changes in the population and the housing stock before and after urban renewal. The most significant change is the reduction in number of housing units, and the attendant reduction in population. The low vacancy rate reflects desirability of the neighborhood and the shortage of housing.
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FIGURE 5. A DIVERSITY OF RESIDENTS
TABLE 1. SOUTH END POPULATION AND HOUSING CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>57,218</td>
<td>34,956</td>
<td>22,775</td>
<td>27,125</td>
<td>29,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units (#)</td>
<td>22,000*</td>
<td>20,849</td>
<td>10,885</td>
<td>13,752</td>
<td>13,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant(#)</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant(%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated to account for a change in the definition of lodging houses.

Source: BRA, South End Profile (Boston: BRA, 1986).

By the mid 1980s, the transformation of the South End properties and resident populations had been evolving over many years. The conflict between the increasing number of middle class residents and the original working class and poor residents has been deeply rooted from earlier battles. Over the same period however, the community, its leaders and its organizations had gained a generation of experience in planning, development and interaction with the city. It was in this setting that the recent struggle over the SENHI parcels took place.
Land and the Community Planning Initiative

By 1985, approximately 116 parcels of city-owned land were still vacant or abandoned. The future of these parcels remained unresolved, despite a community participation process in the 1978 urban renewal close-out. This process "reflected extensive input, review and general agreement by the community at the time it was done." Yet most parcels still remained in the hands of the BRA some seven years later.

Meanwhile, the value of land in the South End had risen considerably, and the transformation of the neighborhood into a middle class district was steadily pushing out the working class and poor residents. In addition, the imminent demolition of the elevated Orange Line on Washington Street increased the speculation of the future of the corridor where many large vacant parcels remained (see Figure 6). The lack of affordable housing in the neighborhood, the city's inaction, and the demand for land in the private market built pressure for community action.

In the fall of 1985, community housing activists began planning for action around the remaining land. In the spring of 1986, some thirty organizations coalesced into the South End/Lower Roxbury Ad Hoc Housing Coalition.
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FIGURE 6. THE WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR
(Housing Coalition) to discuss the future of the land and to plan strategies for its development. The member organizations included tenants councils, community development corporations, block associations, political coalitions, churches, and community service agencies. The coalition encompassed a broad spectrum of interests and backgrounds, but was bound together by a working and under-class perspective and a concern about the continual displacement of this segment of South End residents.

The nature of the development of the [parcels] of publicly held land in the South End and Lower Roxbury will have dramatic and lasting impact in the quality of life in this area for current residents, their children, and generations to come.92

The BRA Definition of Land

The BRA recognized the value of land in the strong private market and began to re-evaluate their holdings in the spring of 1986. Out of the 116 remaining parcels, they identified 70 parcels on 53 sites as appropriate sites for development.93 In order to act quickly to capitalize the value of these holdings in the market, the BRA devised an "initiative" for disposition rather than a "plan", which would require city council approval.
The unfolding of their "initiative," which became the South End Neighborhood Housing initiative (SENHI) is an intricate story that I relate chronologically in the following sections. In order to bear in mind the scale of the land and development at stake, this section will describe the parcels as defined by the BRA. Several points are particularly important: 1) the BRA's continual redefinition and changes in information relating to the parcels during a nine month process; 2) the value of a small amount of land in a rapidly transforming neighborhood; 3) the small scale of the projects which caused such a threat to the middle class residents.

While the total area of the South End is over 600 acres (approximately one square mile), the total acreage of SENHI ranged from 15 to 11 acres. This vacant land is a small percentage (2 percent) of the land in the neighborhood, but extremely valuable given the demand for and the scarcity of remaining sites in this dense area.

The BRA's original concept was to sell the smaller parcels to finance affordable housing on the larger parcels. The pressure for action along the Washington Street corridor caused them to fast track the parcels in this corridor in a Phase I package. In this case, the concept was to both sell the land and create some affordable housing. The
first public announcement of Phase I disposition specified ten parcels of vacant land on seven sites along Washington Street.95

The BRA packaged the remaining parcels into 30 or 40 sites, for a later Phase II disposition.96 These sites were scattered throughout the South End. The Phase II parcels were mostly vacant land, although a few sites included abandoned buildings.

From this point, throughout the nine month process, the BRA's packaging of the parcels changed continually. Within two months, the BRA removed several of the major parcels from the disposition list for a special project of the Mayor (Tree of Life). These parcels accounted for 40 percent of the Phase I land (1.6 acres out of a total 3.8 acres). In another surprise move, the BRA transferred all the sites with vacant buildings into the Phase I list in response to the buildings' occupation by squatters.

In the final Request for Proposal (RFP) package of March 1987, SENHI Phase I included six sites of vacant land along the Washington Street Corridor, and six sites of vacant buildings, all but one of which were in the vicinity of Washington Street (a total of 3.8 acres). The vacant land sites ranged from approximately 7,500 square feet (sf) to
45,000 sf. BRA projections suggested a range of 16 to 89 units per site. The vacant buildings ranged in floor area from approximately 5,600 sf to 38,000 sf, accommodating about 6 to 30 units per site. The BRA projected a total of 330 units in Phase I. The remaining sites, which now constituted Phase II, ranged in size from 1,100 sf to approximately 47,000 sf (see Figure 7 and Figure 8).\textsuperscript{97}

The "Official" SENHI Program

During the spring of 1986, the Housing Coalition and the BRA continued to plan and formulate strategies on separate tracks, although there was some informal communication between the two groups. The two tracks collided, however, when the BRA made public their plans for the South End Neighborhood Housing Initiative in June 1986. After this SENHI moved into a more public arena.

The initial SENHI "[offered] a unique and comprehensive plan for maintaining the diversity of the South End." The program included community participation, an open and phased disposition process, and a neighborhood stabilization fund.\textsuperscript{98} The program projected approximately
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FIGURE 8. SENHI PARCELS
700 units of housing with a minimum of 35 percent affordable for low and moderate income families, and a goal of 50 percent affordable.99

The BRA's plan accommodated community participation through the agency of a citizens review committee, appointed by the Mayor. Specifically, the plan allowed for neighborhood review and comment on immediate developer designation for Phase I, and input on guidelines for disposition of Phase II parcels. The plan targeted the disposition of Phase I to non-profits, minority business enterprises (MBE's), and community groups, as well as to private developers that included community and minority groups as 25 percent partners.

The intent of the initiative was to sell the land at market rates, and from the proceeds generate a neighborhood stabilization fund that could compensate residents displaced involuntarily by private development and the relocation of the Orange Line. Additionally, each project was to include 35 percent affordable units, and 65 percent market rate units.

The SENHI process was intricately linked to the Tree of Life announcement in August 1986, shortly after the BRA had announced SENHI. The Tree of Life was the Mayor's special
project for 100 units of transitional housing for homeless and battered women and their children. The plan was to finance the project with Parcel to Parcel Linkage, which obligates a developer to build a neighborhood project in exchange for the privilege of developing downtown. The Mayor and the BRA had planned the transitional housing project without input from local residents, service providers, or women's advocates. Just on the heels of the SENHI Phase I announcement, the BRA and the Mayor designated several of the key SENHI parcels for the Tree of Life. The announcement came as a surprise to everyone, and exacerbated the tensions already forming about the lack of community control in SENHI.

The No-Name Committee

During the summer, the Housing Coalition rejected the BRA's version of the SENHI process, and continued to prepare its own community-wide plan independent of the Mayor and the BRA process. The coalition's position was pro-active and comprehensive. "It is the consensus of the group that a plan for the community is a necessary first step to developing the remaining city owned land."100 Their vision of the South End focused on affordable housing for the working class residents of the South End.
In response to the city's proposal for an appointed review committee, the Housing Coalition demanded an elected council with full control over development, not limited to review or even veto powers over the plans of others.

The Mayor opposed this position, and requested nominees for his appointed committee. In their first show of solidarity, the Housing Coalition was able to carry out a boycott of the Mayor's request for nominee submissions. The coalition represented a diverse pool of South End residents and a constituency valuable to the Mayor. The extent and power of this base was sufficient to shut down the process. The Mayor could not, in good faith, assemble a representative committee without the cooperation of the Housing Coalition.

The city and the community had reached a deadlock. The city had no process with which to proceed. The coalition had the capacity but not the authority to set up a process that would be acceptable to the all the South End residents and other parties involved. The conservative middle class residents in particular strongly opposed to the coalition's agenda of affordable housing. From their point of view, the BRA's call for 35 percent affordable units was already a compromise to their goal of more market rate housing in
the South End. Many of the South End's neighborhood associations became vehicles for the conservative residents to voice their position.

To break the stalemate, the Housing Coalition sought assistance from a local university, MIT. At this point, Langley Keyes, a professor in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning became involved. Keyes is a well known expert in the housing field, and had studied the original South End urban renewal process. Ostensibly he represented an objective and fair moderator in the deadlocked situation. In that the coalition had solicited his help, however, he admittedly had leanings toward their position. Perhaps his single most important function was to legitimize the process of the coalition.

The Housing Coalition announced a community wide meeting, to be moderated by Keyes, where all who showed up would have a voice in the planning process. This strategy ran the risk of being ignored. If a representative body of residents did not turn out at the meeting, then the city and the other residents would not recognize it as a legitimate process. In the absence of any other forum for proceeding on SENHI, the BRA began attending after the first or second meeting. With the coalition, the BRA, and several prominent elected officials in attendance, the
neighborhood associations, and their conservative constituency, and the private real estate community could not afford to abstain from participating. At this point, the forum of a community-wide meeting became the legitimate negotiating body for SENHI. The meeting and all who attended were dubbed the "No-Name Committee."

Defining the Future

At the time of SENHI's announcement, there were a variety of outstanding planning issues in the South End that needed attention. Although initially a program for disposing of city-owned land, SENHI quickly became a forum to address long-standing, community-wide problems. The government planning decisions made in the 1960s had come to bear in the 1980s. Urban renewal had sponsored the on-going gentrification and displacement of working class and poor residents, and the Southwest Expressway plans had ultimately brought about the relocation of the Orange Line.

The debate over the future of the South End had already been simmering when SENHI arrived. Although issues of density, land use zoning, parking, and infrastructure were raised and folded into the SENHI process, the scope quickly focused on the affordability question.
The middle class homeowners and the private developers both stood to gain from market rate housing. They could accept the BRA’s initial call for a minimum of 35 percent affordable units. Market rate housing on vacant lots is a means to raise property values for homeowner and to protect their way of life. Given the strong market at the time, private developers had a clear interest in profits from market rate housing.

The activists in the Housing Coalition, on the other hand, were clear that as many as possible of the units would have to be affordable to have any impact on the ongoing displacement of their constituency. Among themselves, however, it was difficult to reach a consensus position around a single number for the affordability ratio. While all agreed on the principle of a maximum amount of affordable units, the community development corporations and non-profit builders could foresee the difficulty of achieving a financially feasible development with a high affordability ratio. Most of the coalition members took positions between a ratio of 50 to 75 percent affordable, with some suggesting 100 percent affordable units (including both low and moderate income categories).
The criteria for developer designation was another controversial issue. The community activists supported local control through designation of non-profit community developers. The conservative neighborhood associations, as well as the BRA, were concerned about the financial capacity and experience of these groups to carry out the projects in a timely manner. The BRA recommended partnerships between private for-profit developers and the community and minority developers, with offers of technical assistance from BRA staff. The conservative neighborhood associations advocated an open competitive process where no advantages would be given to non-profits, community development corporations or minority business enterprises. Instead criteria for designation would rest solely on financial capacity and experience. (As a later strategy, they proposed that the local neighborhood associations should be designated as developers for the sites within their boundaries.)

Related to the issue of capacity, the city was determined to fast track the request for proposal (RFP) process in order to get the program off the ground while the market was strong, and to deliver on political promises for housing starts. The community development groups needed more time to build support and gather resources for major development proposals, and demanded at least another month
to turn around proposals (120 days rather than 60 or 90 days). The continual changes in the parcels offered, and in particular the sudden inclusion of the vacant buildings, was a hardship to the community groups who were trying to marshal their resources, and plan strategies.

The community gardens were another key element in the SENHI debate. The urban gardeners had claimed many of the vacant lots for gardens years ago, and had been the only ones to use the land productively after urban renewal demolition. Generally everyone supported the gardeners' access to land. The vocal garden organizations eventually aligned themselves with the Housing Coalition, "to stand up for community values and people, not profit-oriented development." Since many of the gardeners were elderly, working class, and fixed and low income, they chose a position that advocated both affordable housing and community gardens.

The SENHI process and the final guidelines address other issues, which affect the future but were less controversial. The BRA urban designers and the historic preservation advocates included architectural guidelines. Given the strong and consistent character of the existing built form, however, most participants generally agreed on or had little interest in issues of scale and architecture.
Similarly, issues of land use and density arose, but the existing fabric and pattern of development narrows the range of possibilities for change.

The remaining housing and parking issues were screens for the basic conflict between the conservative middle class and the working class. The number of bedrooms in the units had implications for family use, and the forms of tenure discussed were a means of ensuring long term control of affordable housing in the neighborhood. A higher parking ratio per dwelling unit would on the one hand, relieve some of the existing parking shortage problems that mostly annoy the middle class. On the other hand, it would cause additional burden on the feasibility of affordable housing.

The Community Compromise

The No-Name Committee meetings continued throughout the fall of 1986. The BRA attempted to regain control of the process, but could not disrespect Keyes as moderator. Throughout the fall, the BRA had to accept the role of participant, while the community set the agenda. At one point, the BRA met separately with the key organizations in an attempt to mediate between the conflicting neighborhood groups. The Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Service also
sought a compromise, and were the main channel of information between the different groups. The community-wide meetings and the media were on-going sources of communication between the opposing groups, while direct contact was limited.

The overwhelming focus of the SENHI debate had become the affordability question. Although some of the underlying definitions were complicated (e.g., the definitions of and criteria for low and moderate income), the basic meaning of 'affordability' was understood by all the participants. A more complex and refined debate over specific issues would have been difficult in the forum of community-wide meetings with hundreds of people participating, and would not have struck so nearly the center of the debate. A position on the affordability ratio became a signature for a class position. By reducing the debate to a discrete number, the irreconcilable gap between the working class and the middle class became apparent.

The community-wide meetings eventually became unwieldy. Any kind of compromise in this forum became increasingly unlikely. The activists, including many of the original Housing Coalition members, formed a Housing Affordability Subcommittee to hammer out their own differences about the affordability ratio. Through the persuasion of the Mayor's
liaison in Office of Neighborhood Services, a few conservative residents participated in this subcommittee. The general response of the conservative middle class, however, was to form a "Non-Affordability Committee", which ultimately became known as the Market Level Housing Committee.

Eventually, the Housing Affordability Subcommittee reached an internal compromise of two thirds affordable, or one third low-income, one third moderate-income, and one-third market rate units. They submitted their unified position in a report to the No-Name Committee. The "one third-one third-one third" slogan began to take hold, although still hotly contested by the Market Level Housing Committee members.

After over 15 community meetings, the BRA announced at the end of the year that the BRA would finalize the SENHI I guidelines. As a last strategy, the housing activists sponsored a press conference in early 1987, with Mel King, Kip Tiernan, Frieda Garcia and other respected community leaders. They called on Mayor Flynn to intervene with the BRA to support the community compromise of "one third-one third-one third". With a mayoral election due in the fall of 1987, Mel King reminded the Mayor of his campaign promises of affordable housing in the neighborhoods. At
this press conference, the BRA representative reaffirmed the BRA's position on 35 percent affordability.

After the controversial announcements in the summer, the Mayor had remained silent throughout the fall of 1986. While often attacking the BRA, the activists had made a point to never alienate the more political figure of the mayor. The activist's press conference in January was particularly threatening to Mayor Flynn, however, who was up for re-election that year. A replay of the 1983 King and Flynn race, with SENHI as a campaign issue, was not a closed possibility at the time of the press conference.

Two days later after the press conference, the Mayor ended his long silence on SENHI with a letter to Steve Coyle, the director of the BRA, supporting the community compromise position of "one third-one third-one third". Shortly thereafter, the BRA announced at a public hearing that the staff would recommend the community position of two thirds affordability to the BRA board, and that the $3.8 million financial gap was "manageable". The BRA board subsequently approved the staff recommendation.
Implementation

The non-profit and community development groups that were original members of the Ad Hoc Housing Coalition coordinated one final strategy for the SENHI I process. They agreed among themselves that each group would submit proposals for different parcels, and resolved their claims internally. This cooperation prevented them from wasting energies in a competitive process. At the same time, they agreed to not form partnerships with private for-profit developers. In the subsequent designation in the summer of 1987, the BRA awarded all but two of the SENHI I sites to the community non-profit groups from the Housing Coalition.

The final guidelines for SENHI I were a request for proposals for 12 sites, announced by the BRA in March 1987. This announcement began a 120 day clock for submission of proposals. Although the publication and administration was formally by the BRA, the guidelines represented a major achievement by the community activists. The guidelines incorporated their position on 2/3 affordability, as well as a lower parking ratio, provisions for community gardens, a longer period for the preparation of proposals, and an allowance for commercial development along Washington Street in accordance with existing zoning.
Other actors in the process got some concessions in the final formulation. The conservative middle class residents managed to change the rules for developer designation from exclusively community, non-profit and minority groups, to a preference for these groups in an open competition. The BRA staff and the historic advocates incorporated their interests in architectural and urban design guidelines. The BRA had the final say in including the vacant buildings in Phase I, thus reducing their liability and political exposure. The parcels for the Mayor's Tree of Life project (now scaled down) remained outside the open disposition process.

Although the guidelines addressed only 12 sites in the South End, they are a meaningful achievement for the working class and poor communities and will have a significant impact throughout the city. The Housing Coalition substantiated the role of cooperative action in challenging the city's framework, and redefining the terms and the process for more community control. The guidelines themselves redefine the meaning of "feasible," setting a precedent for a two thirds affordability ratio in the disposition of city-owned land.
CASE ANALYSIS

In this section, I apply the lens of the theoretical models to describe the conditions and the forces of the South End case. The discussion follows the themes of social structure, interaction, resources and tools for control of development (vision, rules, and direct action).

All three of the models are useful in describing the case, although they each reflect different aspects. The fact that the theoretical models overlap in the evaluation of a given case is a revealing insight into the use of the models themselves. It points out that the models do not describe a static or pure state, and that any single theoretical model is unlikely to ever match a real set of conditions. The models describe different perspectives, different scales of operation, and different stages in a changing system.

Social Structure

At the outset of the case, the community was unable to function as an anarchic society: autonomous, isolated, and bound by a shared understanding. The actions of the city government and the reality of the private market compelled
the community to interact with these outside forces. All South End residents did not share basic values. The middle class conservatives represented an elite and exclusionary group, with different values and advantages than the rest of the working class and poor residents.

In this context, the Housing Coalition recognized that a divided community could not make a significant impact on controlling the process. Acting together, however, the coalition represented a considerable power, rooted in the size and diversity of its mediating organizations and their constituency. The coalition had strength in self-determination, which arose out of specific concerns and personal connections within a defined territory.

Operating as a plural organization, the coalition included many smaller groups representing constituencies and interests, and different territories in the South End. The coalition itself represented a much larger organizational structure, but it was only temporary. It lasted only as long as necessary to build a support framework of SENHI guidelines. Based on their shared efforts in this round, however, the coalition is likely to reassemble in future struggles.
As a unified and coordinated entity, the Coalition was able to dismantle the authority of the BRA by not accepting it. They did not reject the role of the city completely, but merely redefined the city's role as a participant and a source of resources. The coalition increased the legitimacy of their process by also engaging the participation of the conservative middle class. Ultimately, the BRA assumed the "official" role of administrator and enforcer, and the community allowed them to have this role once the guidelines were established. In fact as implementation and development proceeds for SENHI I, all parties are carefully monitoring of each other's actions.

The BRA defined their role as the "public sphere" offering some opportunity to the individual community groups. In this light, they initiated a program which would fulfill the Mayor's political obligations to the neighborhood constituency by facilitating community development. At the same time, however, they designed a program that would also protect their own interests in the development process.

The conditions set by the BRA (such as only 35 percent affordable housing units, selling the land, and fast-tracking the projects) were inappropriate to the community context. Instead they reflected the mixed agenda of the
city, the lack of understanding of the local needs and desires, and the values of a professional class. The main opportunity offered by the BRA "supports" was for individual community developers, and did not consider the existence, much less the force, of a fuller community structure.

The interface of the city's and the community's image of "supports" led to the reconstruction of a more appropriate supports framework, now embodied in the SENHI I guidelines. This framework temporarily establishes a "tradition." With a shared understanding of the limits, the social structure after SENHI I more nearly reflects the anarchic model, where individual groups are free to pursue their individual projects.

Interaction

In the SENHI case leadership was necessary to set strategy, coordinate efforts, and direct the energies of individual action. Community leaders had no authoritarian position or mandate to rule on this issue, but they did offer a direction. Their strategies derived from a broader perspective of class issues and city politics, and an ability to anticipate counter strategies from the other
parties. In the No-Name meetings and in the final press conference, it was apparent that leadership was only powerful if there was a constituency to validate it.

The No-Name meetings resemble the New England town meetings, following the lines of anarchy where every individual has the right to participate in an open forum without political hierarchy. In fact, strategies continued to be made behind the scenes, and the ability of the various factions to "get out their people" indicates a much more plural operation. Open anarchic meetings seem best suited for resolving individual conflicts within the limits of a shared understanding. The No-Name meetings, on the other hand, quickly became too large and unwieldy to deal with the fundamental class differences and a complicated planning agenda. Coordinated strategies set in smaller subgroups focused attention and energies on the real issue of affordable housing.

The understanding of underlying class issues allowed community groups to step beyond smaller differences and internal struggles, and to recognize binding forces. This plural approach led to organizing a base with constituencies that are typically excluded or alienated from the planning process (tenants, working class, low income).
The resolution of conflicts inside the coalition was a means to solidify their position to the outer world. Resolving issues internally, as in the parcel designation pact, involved respecting each other's turf and trading on issues of different value (such as the urban gardens). In the end, the cooperation allowed them all to conserve their energies rather than compete.

The definition of "supports" was characterized by a dynamic interchange between the community and the city. The city government offer of "supports" came out of community pressure and the power of a voting constituency. The community position and their initiatives increasingly led the city to redefine the framework to meet the community's needs in the specific neighborhood context.

In trying to maintain multiple agendas, the city sent mixed and confusing messages throughout, destroying any potential for trust from the community. Without a basis of trust as a separate and non-neutral actor in the development process, the city was not suited as a mediator between the conflicting groups within the community.

The reconstruction of the supports framework involved debate and broad (if not total) consensus, tailored to the
needs and desires of the community, and in particular to the working class and poor community. As a large move, with a great deal of input, the "community compromise" is more likely to endure. This framework is a means to engage the individual community developers, but according to the terms which they established.

Resources

To the extent possible, the community drew on the internal resources of the existing community organizations, in particular their ability to develop the parcels themselves. The pressure of the middle class and the city for performance and delivery set certain standards. These standards limited the community groups ability to take risks on less experienced or untried architects or contractors in the community.

Rather the selection of well known and highly respected consultants lent credibility to community projects in the eyes of the city and the middle class, who were so skeptical. This choice, however, is not without cost implications. It creates an additional burden on community developers to find financial resources and to depend on outside professionals.
Acting as a coordinated plural body in their interactions with the city, the community was able to redefine the definition of "feasible", illustrating the political nature of resource allocation. They recognized the potential for resource availability within the larger system. They were unwilling to accept the proposition that a limited allocation of resources was better than none:

Speaking for SNAP: we are taking the position that if the 1/3 moderate and 1/3 low income cannot be met at this time, then the parcels should be land-banked until such time that the resources can be found for this ratio.103

The city version of financial "supports" was indirect and ephemeral. They offered opportunities on a limited number of parcels and the creation of a Neighborhood Stabilization Fund from the proceeds of land sales. The transformation of resources through a separate fund would dissipate the resources rather than directly targeting the problem of displacement. In the end, the city will finance the community framework of supports.
Tools for Control

The actions of the private market and the city in the development process may appear anarchic because they are piecemeal, random, unpredictable, and lack comprehensive planning. But this is quite the opposite from true anarchy. Rather it is chaos due to the concentration of decision-making by a few elite people, rather than chaos due to many small decisions made by the mass of people.

There are too many class imbalances in the South End to create a shared understanding of the rules, which is a necessary condition for anarchy. The rules of the private market are certainly not accepted by all, especially those with the least access to capital and information resources.

In this context, the plural approach was more useful for the community to gain control over the disposition process. This approach involved overall vision and setting explicit rules, as well as direct involvement in the development. A consensus on the vision (affordable housing) was necessary to focus energies. In this case, the community vision centered around people, more than around a comprehensive image of physical form for the South End.
Explicit rules were necessary to support the efforts of the individual community development groups and to control the indirect effects of city and private market actions. The written SENHI guidelines have many components, but the key is the very simple and compelling rule of "one third-one third-one third." In a sense, this is a very specific rule, which is quantified and measurable. Yet it is also indirect and minimal, proscribing limits, and leaving room for innovation to achieve it. The rules for SENHI I are specific to the twelve sites. Because they reflect a more enduring vision, however, the guidelines will continue to influence events in future struggles both within and outside the South End.

Established through a group process, individuals use the rules in a manner more closely analogous to the anarchic model. Each group follows the guidelines quite carefully in the development process. On the one hand, this is because they have a personal stake in the meaning of the rules. On the other hand, they are aware that the other parties are carefully checking their work. In the end, many groups building relatively small projects, with many people offering commentary through design review, will establish the future of the South End.
Although the BRA's initial program was not a predetermined vision of a physical plan as in the old days, it still set up conditions for affordability, schedule, and process that the community found too limiting. The BRA approach ended up piecemeal, as they packaged and repackaged the parcels. They assumed that if they had the right goal, that would justify shortcuts on the process, but they were out of touch with the workings of the local context.

Rather than accept a BRA offer of "supports," the community demanded a role in defining the future and setting the limits, as well as in direct action in development. They took the position that anything less than the community vision was not worth doing.

While the community framework only addressed the twelve sites, SENHI I has potential as a system for expansion to Phase II or to other neighborhoods. This system of supports structure is not predetermined and all encompassing, but instead is built piece by piece and patched together in an anarchic world.
In this final chapter, I reflect on the value of the theoretical models and on the use of a theoretical approach in general. This chapter draws lessons learned from applying the models to a real case, and explores the nature of the model's similarities and differences in looking at the world. A theoretical approach is a means of teasing out the main issues in a case and anticipating directions in other cases of community control and neighborhood development. The models represent synthetic categories in a more complex and interwoven world. They are useful as a framework to clarify complex conditions, but must continually be challenged and rebuilt.

LESSONS FROM THE THEORETICAL MODELS

The application of the theoretical models suggest four lessons about their use in describing and understanding real cases: the models serve as lenses on the world, describing different aspects of the same reality; the models differ according to one's perspective; the models operate differently at different scales; the models operate
differently depending on the stage of community power in a changing world.

The first lesson is about a single reality viewed through different lenses. A case does not necessarily fit into one model or the other. Rather each version of the world constructed in the three models can potentially co-exist in a real case. For instance, supports do not have to be set by an authority; a plural process can build supports that better meet the needs of individuals. Anarchy, on the other hand, has supports built in, in the form of a shared tradition. The juxtaposition of multiple plural processes, each building their own supports structure, creates an anarchic form of supports built from the "bottom up."

The second lesson relates to one's perspective in the case. The relative value of decentralization and community control depends on whether a person is inside or outside the group in control, and whether a person is operating from the "top down" or the "bottom up." Each person has his/her own agenda in the process, and sees different values in the extent of decentralization. For instance, if you are inside a group, it is plural and holistic. The group joins together for more power in dealing with the outside world. If you are outside a group, and it is one of many groups juxtaposed, then there is potential for an
anarchic patchwork. There is also the potential for imbalances in equity across groups, the lack of choice between groups, the formation of elite groups, and consequently the need for some form of intervention. Supports offered from outside, however, tend to destabilize a local condition, while supports build from the inside tend to engage individuals.

The third lesson relates to scale. Each model works differently at different scales. For instance, supports can be built at any scale. The larger the context, however, the less detail they should contain if they are to engage individuals at the local level. Smaller communities can better tailor supports to their own needs. Without some recognition of the larger context in which they are working, however, they may overlook common problems or a basis for resources. Anarchy, almost by definition, can only function in small units. Besides spontaneous and widespread agreement, there is no possible mechanism for ensuring the stability of an anarchic system. The plural model also seems to work best at a smaller scale. The plural model allows for "comprehensive" planning, but only at a very micro scale. The larger a plural organization becomes, and the more stable, the more likely it will alienate the people.
The fourth lesson is that change is constant. The models operate for different durations and are never static. Organization are either building up or breaking down; individuals are either taking advantage of a framework or challenging it. A supports structure that offers any opportunity increases individual freedoms. With this freedom, and its empowerment, individuals can eventually challenge the initial supports and rebuild it. The more say individuals have in creating their own supports, the more anarchic the system becomes. As imbalances begin to occur, however, the more likely that individuals will need to pull together as a group to counteract more powerful outside forces. Supports define a "tradition" for individual action. In a dense, urban context, however, where change is constant, people need to redefine the limits and challenge the supports continually.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this thesis, I built theoretical frameworks that addressed not just the tools for control of development (vision, rules, and direct action), but also the conditions of social structure, political interaction, and economic resources. Each model describes a complete and
hypothetical world to consider the implications of the building process in this larger context.

The theoretical models themselves are synthetic categorizations to describe a more complex reality. Each case is, in fact, unique and unpredictable due to personalities, timing, outside forces, and the characteristics of the place and the issues. By setting up theoretical models, I have built a framework, a logical structure to understand elements that are complex, interdependent, and irrational.

The use of three models rather than one, however, allows me to be critical of any one model's ability to describe reality. Each one illuminates a different aspect but at the expense of some simplification inherent in the use of models, which are meant to clarify.

By approaching the issue of community control through a theoretical framework, I was able to tease out many key issues:

- coordinated and direct action is a force to challenge both rules and supports when they cease to engage and begin to inhibit;
- supports are never neutral, and therefore should be built by a community that shares the values of the individuals that will use them;

- financial resources with minimal constraints are necessary to initiate the construction of a community support;

- decisions are often made by a minority elite (economic, professional, and/or ruling) that have underlying agendas and values at variance with those affected by the decisions;

- constant change is necessary to balance self-reliance and internal strength within a group, with sharing and dependencies across a broader social context.

The theoretical framework of this thesis, like a supports structure, embodies my own values about what is important and just. If I accept this framework as a rigid and unchangeable structure for looking at the world, it will be less and less appropriate over time and for different cases. Like any set of rules and supports, I must challenge this framework, continually dismantling and
rebuilding it to incorporate new information and experiences. When it is no longer appropriate for the conditions at hand, then it must be discarded.

On the other hand, having built this framework, I have a means to approach the issues of community control and neighborhood development, and am better able to understand the forces at work and the trade-offs involved. In using this framework, however, I recognize that no theory can predict processes or outcomes given the many unique individuals and forces interacting in a case. Instead, a theoretical framework can help to anticipate the many possible turns that events might take, and can enable me to act according to my own values.
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