CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN URBAN RENEWAL -
THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT

by

CONSTANCE WILLIAMS

A.B., Vassar College
(1930)

M.S., Simmons College
(1931)

PhD., University of Chicago
(1942)

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER IN

CITY PLANNING

at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF

TECHNOLOGY

June, 1964

Signature of Author...

Department of City and Regional Planning, May 18, 1964

Certified by...

Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by...

Chairman, Department
Committee on Graduate Students
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN URBAN RENEWAL - THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT
by Constance Williams

Submitted to the Department of City and Regional Planning on May 18, 1964, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in City Planning.

The thesis analyzes citizen participation in urban renewal programs in two areas of Boston. It was found that citizen response to the proposed programs differed primarily because of different reactions to the goals of the programs. The program goals, following the intent of Federal legislation, were to "eliminate blight" and "increase municipal revenue".

In Washington Park, Roxbury, the majority of citizens liked the goal of improving property and upgrading the community. In Charlestown, the majority of the articulate citizens emphasized the need for providing adequate housing for lower-income families before homes were demolished to make way for higher priced homes.

In Washington Park a minority of citizens also wanted assurance of housing that people could afford before the renewal program was undertaken. In Charlestown there was a sizable minority of citizens who wanted the benefits of community improvements, as in Washington Park.

In both areas the citizens made many suggestions about the specific plans proposed for their areas by the Boston Redevelopment Authority. These suggestions referred to the extent of demolition, the number and location of new schools and other community facilities, the location of new transportation routes and changes in present routes. Citizen interest in renewal also helped citizens understand the potentials for planning and become better educated citizens.

The relations of the different citizen groups to each other and to the planners were complex. Several kinds of relationships operated at once. The thesis analyzes the relation of the citizen to the planner and discusses six categories, ranked to assign increasing responsibility to the citizen.

The thesis suggests that citizen participation in each area helped achieve a plan that was wanted by the neighborhood. It is proposed that the test of successful participation should be the advancement of the interests of
the local citizens, not, as some authors hold, the accomplishment of a renewal project. Criteria for successful participation include representation of all citizens in a neighborhood and for the city as a whole, financing independent of the renewal authority, and the development of communication techniques to include all resident groups.

It is believed that, as citizen participation in community improvement is strengthened, the goals defined by the citizens may change. In particular, as the position of the resident-citizen is strengthened in the city-wide program, new programs to supplement urban renewal activities may be promoted to provide a minimum housing standard, more services, and new methods of city financing.

In conclusion, it is proposed that a new type of citizen organization is needed in Boston to assist resident-citizens, both in neighborhoods and on a city-wide basis, in working for the benefit of themselves and the development of the city as a whole.

Thesis Supervisor: John T. Howard
Title: Professor of City Planning and Head of the Department of City and Regional Planning.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writing of this thesis has been made easier by the encouragement, questions, and suggestions of Professor John T. Howard. For his help and tolerance in this exploration of citizen participation in urban renewal, I am most grateful. To have his guidance is a privilege.

Sincere thanks are also given to the many people who took time to talk with me about their experiences in citizen participation or to give background information for this report. I want especially to express my appreciation to Mrs. Muriel Snowden and her staff and to Mr. Noel Day in Roxbury and to Mr. Leo T. Baldwin and Rev. Wolcott Cutler for their reports of Charlestown activities.

I am indebted to the Boston Redevelopment Authority for permission to read the minutes of the Washington Park citizens' meetings.

The typing skill and perseverance of my sister, Mrs. Louisa W. Valley, have brought the required order from much confusion, and I thank her very much.

The names of the persons consulted in the writing of this thesis are listed at the end of the report. From them, from M.I.T. faculty and other graduate students, and from the references listed in the bibliography came the ideas discussed. For errors in reporting or analysis, I am responsible.

Boston, Massachusetts
May 8, 1964

Constance Williams
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. A CONTRAST IN CITIZEN RESPONSE TO URBAN RENEWAL - WASHINGTON PARK AND CHARLESTOWN</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Goals of the Housing Act and the Urban Renewal Amendments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Administrative Requirements for Citizen Participation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. EARLY CONCEPTS REGARDING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. THE WASHINGTON PARK EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Leadership by Freedom House</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Examples of Citizen Participation</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Selection of Key Leaders</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Broader Citizen Organization</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Questions Discussed with the Redevelopment Authority Staff</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goals Underlying the Renewal Plans</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The Opposition</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. THE CHARLESTOWN EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Leadership by SHOC and The Federation</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Examples of Citizen Participation</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The Opposition</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. POTENTIAL GOALS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN URBAN RENEWAL</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Determining the Role of the Citizen in Relation to the Planner</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Determining Who Is the Citizen and Goals for Urban Renewal</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Determining Housing Types, Community Facilities, and Circulation in Urban Renewal Projects</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Interpreting Urban Renewal Procedures</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Educating Citizens</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. A CONTRAST IN CITIZEN RESPONSE TO URBAN RENEWAL -
WASHINGTON PARK AND CHARLESTOWN

The newspaper reader learned in January 1963 that at a
public hearing in the Washington Park area in Roxbury, citi-
zens were FOR urban renewal and at another hearing in
Charlestown, citizens were AGAINST it. The votes reflected
differences in the basic interests of the citizens of the
two areas of Boston, differences in the character of local
organizations, and differences in the relationships between
local citizens and the Boston Redevelopment staff. Do these
experiences also suggest the need for new principles and
techniques of citizen participation in urban renewal if we
wish this citizen participation to contribute as much as
possible to the welfare of citizens?

Washington Park in Roxbury includes some 500 acres where
25,000 people live. About 70 percent of the residents are
Negro. At the hearing they spoke clearly in favor of a
"better community", a desire for "new housing" in the area
and a hope for a community that would be "integrated". Two
earlier hearings within the year had discussed preliminary
questions relating to the urban renewal project. At each of
these three hearings over a thousand people attended and less
than five questioned the plans presented. The vote in
January 1963 approved final plans for the renewal of the area
as a whole.
The area of Charlestown is a bit larger than Washington Park and the population a little less, about a square mile of land and some 18,000 residents. The residents are largely of Irish background with smaller numbers of Canadian and Italian extraction. Catholics greatly exceed Protestants. The January public hearing was preceded by attacks on urban renewal from several sources. Support for urban renewal came from the Directors of the Federation of local organizations and the clergy. The hearing was concerned only with the proposed first step in a renewal program, namely the early land acquisition of several sites to permit new housing to be built before more extensive renewal work was undertaken. Of the 1,200 who attended the hearing, the large majority strongly opposed the proposal.

Citizen participation in urban renewal is part of the much broader question of citizen participation in government. From the point of view of the citizen, the issue is what can urban renewal contribute to the benefit of the citizen. This is very different from the question asked by renewal authorities of what can the citizen contribute to the renewal program. It is a premise of this thesis that judgments about what is of benefit to the citizen should rest on the participation of all citizens. The problem of citizen participation in urban renewal involves both defining the relation of the citizen to the planner and differences among citizens. The ways in which these questions are answered determines
the contribution that citizen participation in urban renewal makes to the overall benefit of citizens.¹

¹As used in this thesis, the term "citizen benefit" means what others have called "the public interest". Carl J. Friedrich has said, "There is no ultimate way of determining what the public interest is, except by consulting the public. But the manifest dangers of a miscarriage of responsible conduct suggest that safeguards need to be maximized to make sure that the public has had an opportunity to learn of all the different implications of a given line of action or policy". Friedrich, Carl Joachim, Man and His Government, An Empirical Theory of Politics, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963, p. 312.
II. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

A. Goals of the Housing Act and the Urban Renewal Amendments:

The Housing Act of 1949 set a goal which all citizens of the country could support. It stated the intent to provide "as soon as feasible .... a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family". The policy objectives outlined by the Act as ways to achieve this goal were, however, more limited. They continued the 1937 plans for public housing for low-income families and added a program for slum clearance.

The urban redevelopment program of the 1949 law provided "governmental assistance to eliminate substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas". The emphasis of this section of the law was on the clearance of substandard residential buildings. The plan identified the act of tearing down substandard dwellings with that of eliminating slums.

The 1954 amendments to the Housing Act provided for policies of "conservation" and "rehabilitation" as well as "clearance". The policy was based on the hope that by improving buildings before they became substandard it could

"prevent" the formation of slums. The 1954 amendments also differed from the 1949 Act by providing that to qualify for Federal assistance, a community must adopt several other related activities all of which were intended to strengthen the program to prevent blight.

The 1954 amendments continued the philosophy of the 1949 act that slums could and should be eliminated by changing buildings. The reasoning behind this objective was spelled out by the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs submitted to the President in December 1953. The Committee was asked for "recommendations to develop a new and revitalized housing program".\(^1\) The Advisory Committee recognized that several types of action would be necessary to meet their twin objectives of "satisfying the demand of the American people for good homes and the maintenance of a sound and growing economy", but they gave primary emphasis to work "to wipe out slums and to check the spread of blight".\(^2\)

A large and experienced group served on a Subcommittee on Urban Redevelopment, Rehabilitation and Conservation, under the chairmanship of James W. Rouse. The Subcommittee

\(^1\)President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs, Government Housing Policies and Programs, December, 1953, p. 1.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 1.
report greatly influenced the 1954 legislation and later administration. Among the causes of slums, the Subcommittee listed "neglect by our city governments", failure to adopt comprehensive planning, failure to enforce zoning laws, failure to enforce occupancy controls, failure to enforce building, fire, housing and health codes, failure to provide and maintain parks and recreation areas, and failure to provide good housekeeping for streets, alleys, sidewalks, street lighting and garbage collection.¹ The effects of the resulting blight were described as "crime, fire, disease, and delinquency". It was clear that they thought slums, in the sense of physical environment, caused crime and disease, and that these, in turn, caused "the need for city services (to) increase".

A special exhibit in the Subcommittee's report cited figures from 14 cities which indicated that the costs per capita of slum areas were considerably higher than the per capita costs of other areas. From Boston, they quoted a 1934 study, from Hartford, a 1935 study, from Philadelphia, a 1947 study, and similar reports from the other cities. In each city it was shown that the residents of the blighted areas were being subsidized from income from other areas.³

¹Ibid., pp. 108-109.
²Ibid., p. 109.
³Ibid., pp. 151-154.
These data appear to be the basis of the recommendations of the Subcommittee for program. In recommending Federal financial assistance to eliminate slums, the Subcommittee stated that "What we hope we are doing is to help the cities help themselves. By clearing slums, removing blight, and checking the deterioration cycle, cities should be able to increase municipal revenues at the same time they are reducing the demand for services." This program would thus "over the long pull . . . reduce requirements for the Federal aid which we now find mandatory." ¹

The Subcommittee did not distinguish between city costs which might be reduced by the elimination of sub-standard buildings or too narrow streets, such as fire protection costs, and other city costs which relate directly to people such as education and welfare. While fire costs may indeed be reduced by replacement by brick buildings of shabby wooden structures, the costs of education or crime would not necessarily be reduced by moving a family to a new location. By emphasizing the need to eliminate poor physical environment, the Subcommittee gave little consideration to how residents would meet the costs of the new housing to which they might be moved. The basic goal of the 1949 Housing Act of a decent home for every family was made secondary to the goal of providing higher tax revenues

¹Ibid., p. 112.
and lowering (some) city costs. While the Subcommittee recognized the need to provide for the relocation of displaced families, it did not face the question of how these families were to pay for higher priced housing, if better housing could be obtained only at higher prices.

By believing that a poor physical environment causes crime and disease, the Subcommittee did not ask whether both poor buildings and the higher rates of disease and crime might be simultaneously due to other common causes, namely low income and different patterns in family living. The Subcommittee's list of factors that contribute to slums omitted mention of the financial limitations of the residents or of possible differences in the values placed on environment by lower-income people.¹

The fact that the Subcommittee was influenced by the reports from the 14 cities linking slums and blighted areas with the costs of "disease, crime, juvenile delinquency and economic waste", was noted by Rhyne in his analysis of the

¹A statement in the 1950 General Plan for Boston, which appeared a few years before the President's Committee made its report, did recognize that poverty was an important factor in causing both poor environment and social problems. This Boston report stated, "The urgency of clearing the city's slums is generally accepted. These are areas that are a liability to the community as a whole in every sense. Statistical studies, in Boston as in other cities, show them to be breeders of juvenile delinquency and crime, centers of social and family disorganization. In large measure, substandard housing and neighborhood environment, along with poverty, have been demonstrated to share the blame for these social evils. High rates of disease and death can also be traced to slum conditions." City Planning Board, General Plan for Boston, Preliminary Report - 1950, p. 39.
workable program\textsuperscript{1} and we are indebted to him for pointing this out. Rhyne appears, however, not to doubt the wisdom of this analysis.

It is believed that the causes of blight listed by the Subcommittee were the basis of the requirement of a "workable program" in the 1954 amendments. In other words, the idea of a workable program appears to be an attempt to insure an end to "neglect" by the city. The 1954 amendments stated that funds would be given to a community only on condition the community had a "workable program . . . for utilizing appropriate private and public resources to eliminate, and prevent the development or spread of, slums and urban blight, to encourage needed urban rehabilitation, to provide for the redevelopment of blighted, deteriorated or slum areas, or to undertake such of the aforesaid activities or other feasible community activities as may be suitably employed to achieve the objectives of such a program".\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Rhyne, Charles S., "The Workable Program - A Challenge for Community Improvement", Law and Contemporary Problems, Urban Renewal, Part II. Autumn 1950, p. 687. Rhyne made a clear distinction between the effect of the 1949 emphasis on "eliminating" slums and the 1954 emphasis on "preventing" slums. He said, "Thus the 1954 Act reversed the order of the congressional directives contained in the 1949 Act, and the Administration was instructed, first, to give consideration to positive programs that aided in the prevention of slums and blighted areas, and second, to consider the effect of a municipality's code modernization on housing cost reductions." This gives further support to the theory that under 1954 legislation more attention was given to creating higher priced housing than to trying to lower the cost of housing, and the goal of providing decent homes for all, was, therefore, made even less important.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 688.
Although the purpose of the workable program was thus stated in the 1954 legislation, the exact requirements were not defined until administrative instructions were issued in the fall of 1954. These instructions, however, also appear to be largely based on the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Urban Renewal of the President's Advisory Committee which reported a year before.

Among the 18 recommendations of the 1953 Subcommittee had been suggestions that the Federal assistance be conditional on the local communities having a "workable program to attack the problem of urban decay", (Recommendation No. 2) reference to rehabilitation of existing structures and the development of "sound, healthy neighborhoods" (Recommendations Nos. 3 and 8), reference to the need for code enforcement (Recommendation No. 14), the need for meeting relocation needs (Recommendation No. 15) and two recommendations (Nos. 12 and 13) which relate to citizen participation.

The 1953 Subcommittee report stated that "There is great need for vigorous and responsible leadership of a national effort to promote the kind of broadscale, integrated urban renewal program envisaged in the report. In order that that effort may join together top leaders in business, labor, trade, civic and religious organizations in a common, nationwide campaign, the Subcommittee recommends:"

"Recommendation No. 12:
That a broadly representative private organization
be formed outside of the Federal Government with congressional and/or Presidential sponsorship to mobilize public opinion in the support of vigorous and effective action by the cities in slum prevention, neighborhood conservation, and other urban renewal activities."

"This recommendation could be carried out by the enactment of a special act of Congress to authorize the formation of a nonprofit privately financed corporation under sponsorship of the Federal Government."¹

Although no action was taken to set up this "privately financed corporation under Federal sponsorship", the idea that private leadership be sought to "promote" the "program envisaged" was made one of the seven points of the workable program as it came to be defined in the fall of 1954.

The 1953 Subcommittee suggested in Resolution No. 13 that the proposed private national organization should "encourage inquiries into the ownership and operation of slum property" by "public bodies, newspapers, or private groups" to alert communities to the nature of the slum problem. It stated that such inquiries were "important first steps in activating public opinion in support of effective slum prevention and urban renewal programs."²

¹President's Advisory Committee on Housing, op. cit., pp. 121-122.
²Ibid., p. 122.
This suggestion of educating public opinion to increase support for the program also underlies the citizen participation requirement of the workable program.

The difficulties and problems which appeared in the citizen participation activities in Washington Park and Charlestown in Boston in 1962 and 1963 reflect questions which were inherent in the plan for urban renewal as defined in the 1954 legislation. The administration of the legislation basically assumed that citizens were to be looked to to support the plan "as envisaged" and primarily this appeared to be that of tearing down, rehabilitating or conserving substandard buildings. The major opposition to the Boston programs has come from citizens who urged that attention be given first to helping the residents of the substandard buildings get more adequate housing.

Possible basic conflicts in the objectives of the housing program had been recognized by another Subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Housing in 1953, the Subcommittee on the Organization of Federal Housing Activities. This Subcommittee referred to "such incompatible elements as grant-in-aid programs and business type activities". It is believed that this referred to the PHA lending program and compared it to public housing and perhaps slum clearance work.¹ Competing goals may also be present within the Urban Renewal program in trying for

¹President's Advisory Committee on Housing, op. cit., p. 368.
both higher tax revenues and lower costs of city services, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, offering to help residents obtain adequate housing. The latter might require higher income, but the problem of paying for higher priced housing was not part of renewal responsibility.

The fact that a primary goal of the urban renewal program is that of helping cities to raise their municipal revenues was supported by David Grossman, Director of the Community Development Branch of the Urban Renewal Administration, in addressing student planners at a Conference in Washington on March 13, 1964. When asked whether urban renewal might consider plans for providing a better environment for residents of a Metropolitan area, he pointed out that programs must be planned in relation to decision-making authorities which at present are local municipalities and that for them the goal of urban renewal is raising the tax base vis-a-vis other communities in the area. This he said is "sad but true".

The goal of the Housing Act of 1949 which proposed adequate housing for families is by no means assured by the emphasis on higher municipal revenues. In Washington Park and Charlestown some citizens supported one goal, other citizens the other goal.
B. Administrative Requirements for Citizen Participation

The first explanation of what was to be officially required by the term "workable program" which was introduced in the 1954 amendment to the Housing Act was a mimeographed statement issued by the Housing and Home Finance Agency October 1, 1954.¹

The seven points of the workable program include (1) "a comprehensive system of codes and ordinances which state minimum conditions under which dwellings may be lawfully occupied", (2) "official recognition of a comprehensive general plan for the community as a whole", (3) identification of blight and "logical patterns of neighborhoods" for "planning of healthy neighborhoods", (4) "firmly established administrative responsibility", (5) "development of means for meeting the financial obligation involved in carrying out urban renewal activities", (6) "rehousing, in decent, safe, and sanitary accommodations, of families displaced by governmental action", and (7) citizen participation (to be discussed presently).²

¹This report, entitled How Localities Can Develop a Workable Program for Urban Renewal, named the seven separate requirements of the workable program which have now become familiar. As suggested above, these were proposed as ways to help a community develop an overall program to prevent blight. Several revised printed statements followed at short intervals, for example, March 1955, December 1955, and December 1956.

²Quotations regarding the workable program are taken from the March 1955 statement on How Localities Can Develop a Workable Program for Urban Renewal, from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C.
Literature discussing the workable program has tended to emphasize most the gains made by urging communities to adopt occupancy standards and comprehensive plans. For example, Rhyne says the workable program has "contributed substantially to the adoption, modernization, and enforcement of municipal codes and ordinances" and "had substantial influence on the adoption of master plans, building codes, electrical codes, plumbing codes, subdivision regulations, zoning ordinances, and other municipal regulations and ordinances." ¹

The early administrative pamphlets on the workable program in 1954 and 1955 contained only a little over a page of text regarding how citizen participation was to be developed. The January 1962 explanation of citizen participation offers almost seven pages of suggestions and discussion of this requirement. In each statement there is emphasis on the citizen participation being "community-wide" and including "representative citizens' organizations". In each statement there is also full recognition that the form citizen participation takes will vary from locality to locality.

It is important to realize that citizen participation is a requirement of the workable program as a whole, and not limited to activities relating to urban renewal in the narrow sense. Citizens are to assist in the other areas of the workable program, for example, code adoption and

¹Rhyne, op. cit., p. 695.
and enforcement, as well as in identifying blight areas and helping to plan slum clearance. The workable program, including citizen participation, was required as a condition for Federal funds for urban renewal.

During the nine years that the workable program concept has been a requirement for urban renewal funds there appear to have been some shifts in the expectations and mechanics of citizen participation. Without far more data than it is possible to gather for this report, these changes can be suggested only on the basis of reading the materials regarding citizen participation that have been prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. By comparing the January 1962 material and that of March 1955 a few differences may be identified.\(^1\)

The major changes include (1) greater emphasis on the objective of getting citizen support for urban renewal, (2) increased expectation that citizens will continue to support planning beyond the period of urban renewal, (3) increasing recognition of business organizations as the major "citizen" group, and (4) greater emphasis on technical know-how in doing the jobs that citizens are expected to do.

A change in the general orientation of discussing

citizen participation between 1955 and 1962 is in part responsible for the greater expectation of citizen support for "The Program". In 1955 the government pamphlet explained citizen participation in a workable program in order to qualify for urban renewal and was entitled "A Workable Program for Urban Renewal". At that time, moreover, the interest of citizens was apparently expected to be primarily in renewal programs. The later pamphlet has a broader title and is called "A Workable Program for Community Improvement". In both periods citizens were asked to support the workable program which in turn was to eliminate and prevent slums, but the earlier pamphlet recognized the relation of the workable program to the urban renewal program more than the 1962 pamphlet. Nevertheless, there is a tendency for the reader to understand by the term "support for the workable program" the words "support for urban renewal", in both pamphlets.

The 1955 pamphlet stated that "Every possible means should be explored, to secure citizen understanding and support, whatever the form of organization. Effective citizen participation should result in community groups feeling a share of responsibility with local officials for carrying out objectives." The importance of "understanding" the program was also stressed in 1962.

The 1962 pamphlet suggested that to get the support of citizens local authorities should develop a program
that citizens will want to support. In 1956 the support of the renewal programs seemed to be more taken for granted than in the 1962 statement. The 1962 statement read "The citizen participation requirement of the Workable Program provides a means whereby citizens can come to understand the Program benefits and can make a positive contribution so that a Program can be planned and carried out to meet their needs and command their support."

An important question is how to work with citizens who are themselves likely to be displaced by a renewal program to eliminate blight. The 1956 statement was so sure that citizens would approve of tearing down buildings that were blighted, that it could say, "Those affected by the program should have an opportunity not only to be informed but to express their views, fears, or apprehensions, which can be properly taken into account by the local administering agency". Although the 1962 material went much further than the earlier material in providing for a Minority Housing Committee and for planning for those who are displaced, it did not include among citizens who are to be consulted, persons who may have "apprehensions" or "fears". It emphasized working with organizations which "can make a positive contribution in the attainment of the goals of the Workable Program" and individuals who "are deeply interested in, and who are able and willing to work for, improvement of the total community".

In the early days of the workable program it was
urged that citizen participation would be sought at the time the planning of urban renewal activities was initiated, and should "continue throughout the execution of each project". By 1962, when the possibilities of developing a comprehensive program had begun to be realized, the suggestion was made that citizen participation be related to total planning. The possibility and desirability of a citizens' group being established for an indefinite time were clearly stated. The 1962 statement suggested that the full advisory committee of citizens on community development will want to have a subcommittee to work "very cooperatively" with the "official planning agency". It added that this subcommittee can "help to formulate and express the citizens' wants, needs and desires, thus developing community acceptance and responsibility for planning activities and providing the planning agency with the policy guidance it must have from the community".

The third observed change in citizen activities, namely the stronger emphasis on business participation, is harder to document. The idea of representativeness, as has been said, is important in all the explanations of the program. The 1956 statement suggested "consideration should be given to the utilization of business, professional, labor, welfare, religious, and educational interests", and also stated "special emphasis should be placed upon
minority group participation". Also in discussing how to provide for rehousing, special mention is made of the possible help of real estate and building interests. The 1962 pamphlet listed in much greater detail the possible sources of citizen interests which might be included on the citizens' advisory committee. First among these were the "economic groups: business; retail, and manufacturing, finance, building, real estate, professional groups, labor groups". Second were the civic groups, but these included some special interests groups, which are often business oriented such as "community improvement groups and taxpayers' groups". A special sentence underscored the importance of working with business groups. It stated, "Some elements will be more strongly represented than others. For example, in most communities business and civic organizations will be prominent in matters affecting the community as a whole. Where this is so, it would be well to enlist their support through adequate representation."

Remembering that the basic objectives of the urban renewal program are to increase municipal revenue and lower the need for city services, there seems every reason

---

1 The idea of business and other organization interests being considered part of "citizen" activities might be questioned on the grounds of definition, as these interests, as such, do not vote. The objective of the HHFA is apparently to enlist nongovernmental participation. To identify the citizen as voter, the term "resident-citizen" has been used in this thesis.
to believe that the support of business groups and large taxpayers has been the primary force motivating the urban renewal programs in most cities. As will be further discussed below, some resident-citizens have found that these interests coincide with their own, while other residents have come to the conclusion that their interests are not served by those who want higher municipal revenues. Business groups may also differ among themselves in their hopes and wishes regarding the renewal program.

Although both the 1956 and 1962 statements emphasized a city-wide Advisory Committee with sub-committees, there appeared to be more encouragement of neighborhood level participation in 1956 than in 1962. The 1956 pamphlet suggested directly that the "selection of a neighborhood for study may well begin with discussion and meetings with occupants of the area". In addition, it suggested that once a project has been formulated, local residents should look to local experts and use their advice as it is appropriate.

Special mention was made in 1956 of settlement houses and churches which "often play a key role in interpreting the program to neighborhood families".

In the 1962 pamphlet there was no detailed discussion of participation possibilities at the neighborhood level. The 1962 pamphlet stated that "where neighborhood organizations exist, they should be included" on the advisory committee, but explained that in large cities, these may
not be able to be individually represented and "might be designated by councils or associations". In addition, among representative groups to be consulted, "neighborhood groups" were listed under "families" after consumer groups and PTA's; they appear to rank much lower in importance than business groups.

It is to be expected that nine years' experience with the workable program would show some areas where the work could become more precise and professional. In this area of know-how the major changes are the shift from suggesting an almost informal committee which is "usually" appointed by the Mayor to requiring a definite Advisory Committee which has official backing from the Mayor and/or City Council, and increased emphasis on professional assistance.

In 1956 it was implied that the citizens' organization would consist of unpaid leaders, though there was reference to the possibility of paid help to assist in making a neighborhood survey. In 1962 there was a definite requirement that "staff assistance is needed to support committee activities". The pamphlet stated, "The primary needs are for a secretary to serve the overall committee plus some qualified staff to gather and develop information for the committee and its subcommittees and to help in preparing reports and recommendations." A citizen program that does not function because of the lack of such assistance "does not meet Workable Program requirements".
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The 1962 statement referred in many places to the technical kinds of jobs that the Citizens Advisory Committee will be responsible for doing. Among these were "determining the ways and means to secure better housing for all ethnic and minority groups", following up neighborhood analyses and "setting up programs of neighborhood participation to support and carry out improvement programs in areas where code compliance is planned", determining limitations for home financing and helping to coordinate community development with public housing plans and with local government officials in developing capital improvement programs. In addition, there was the responsibility, already mentioned, of helping form a comprehensive plan. In short, the Citizens' Advisory Committee in 1962 became potentially involved in all aspects of city planning, not just help on specific projects of urban renewal.
III. EARLY CONCEPTS REGARDING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN URBAN RENEWAL

With the growth of city planning as a part of city government, efforts by citizens to share in the planning process have developed in a rather spotty way across the country. In some cases citizens worked for the adoption of formal city planning by the city government; in most cases, citizens organized to achieve some specific type of local improvement.

Many examples of citizen activity in the past could be described, but it is clear that citizen activities relating to blight and poor environment have been increased by the requirement of citizen participation as a part of the "workable program" which was necessary as a basis for getting Federal financial help for renewal. Of special interest for this report are the activities of resident groups of citizens relating to community improvement.

A citizen effort to improve "slums" began in Baltimore.

---


before World War II. In 1936 reports on slum conditions by a young social worker, Frances Morton, published in the local paper, led to the formation of a Citizens Housing and Planning Association and this group persuaded the City Council to pass "an ordinance to outlaw unsanitary and unhealthful slum conditions".\textsuperscript{1} By the end of World War II, the program had crystallized as the "Baltimore plan" which meant the city would enforce, to the letter, all housing laws on the books, and in that way compel the owners of slum properties to vacate them or rehabilitate them to minimum legal standards".\textsuperscript{2} By 1950, 100 blocks had been done but 2,000 were not done. It was decided to work on an entire neighborhood at one time and in 1951 a pilot area of 14 blocks was chosen, of which 90 percent were substandard.\textsuperscript{3}

The local association worked to educate the residents in what was needed to be done and what it would cost to rehabilitate and found funds to help those who could not meet the costs themselves. After two years it was reported that improvements were carried further than required, but

\textsuperscript{1}Millspaugh, Martin, and Breckenfeld, Gurney, edited by Miles L. Colean, The Human Side of Urban Renewal, Baltimore, Fight-Blight, Inc., 1958, p. 3. The report on the Baltimore plan given here is based entirely on the information given by Millspaugh and Breckenfeld. No attempt has been made to evaluate the plan as a way of meeting all housing needs.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 7.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 9.
overcrowding continued. The blighting influences of traffic, commercialization, taverns, lack of play space and crowding were outside the powers of the city agencies to change. There was no known way "in which taverns and nonconforming uses could be eliminated, streets closed, play space opened up, or crowding reduced in landlords' properties". The residents had learned to deal with problems in housing, and to deal with city hall, but they found housing problems were entangled with other problems—mental care, divorce, delinquency; and the fact that the pilot area had no natural boundary so that the neighborhood was not clear resulted in a lack of lasting morale. The results were "spotty" but had influence in bringing about the 1954 amendments of the Housing Act.

In the Hyde Park-Kenwood neighborhood near the University of Chicago in Chicago a citizen group was organized to conserve good housing and prevent the spread of blight when Negro families began to move into the area. This movement was started by the leader of the Social Order Committee of the 57th Street Meeting of Friends. They developed a "block" organization pattern. The first block

---

1Ibid., p. 20.
2Ibid., p. 21.
3Ibid., p. 21.
4Ibid., pp. 61-63.
group meeting of 15 homeowner families was held in January 1950. A house had been sold to a Negro family and the organization asked Negroes to cooperate in keeping the neighborhood pleasant.\(^1\) According to Millspaugh and Breckenfeld, the organization slowed the flight of white families, but was too late to prevent blight without slum clearance.\(^2\)

Another well-known early citizen attack on slums was in the area of Chicago known as "back-of-the-yards". Here the citizens were led by Saul D. Alinsky to undertake extensive remodelling. Following some 16 years of citizen organization, in two years 2,412 buildings that were once run-down were repaired or remodelled, about 1953-1955.\(^3\) The residents were mostly Irish and German immigrants whose forefathers came to the community about 1865 and included very few Negroes. Alinsky summarized the reasons for his success to include (1) self financing, (2) a "rainbow of interests" to involve all the people of a community, (3) the help of bankers, politicians and business men as well as social welfare people, (4) full time professional staff with an adequate budget, and (5) dedicated leadership.\(^4\) With this kind of framework, Alinsky accomplished

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 95.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 97.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 182 and p. 231.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 218.
an outstanding job of physical rehabilitation.

The citizen activities described in Baltimore and Chicago were limited to work in small parts of these large cities. They were not the kind of citizen participation which was required by the "workable program" specifications. As noted in the previous section, this would require a "city-wide" committee and careful attention to business interests as well as residents.

During the first fall after the passage of the 1954 Urban Renewal program, many cities began to form new citizens organizations relating to urban renewal. San Francisco had a 19-member citizens' committee appointed by the Mayor "conducting an extensive public education program". In St. Louis a 16-man citizens' committee "to study and make recommendations on housing needs for the city" was appointed by the Mayor. In Syracuse "a number of recommendations for redevelopment and rehabilitation" came from the nine-member citizens' "development committee", organized in 1954 by the Mayor.¹

To help strengthen citizen participation work, the Housing and Home Finance Agency made grants to undertake Demonstration Programs. One of these grants was made to the Housing Association of Metropolitan Boston.² The


²The citizen organization program in the Hyde Park-Kenwood area, mentioned earlier, was also studied by a demonstration grant from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
report of the Association on this program gives an interesting account of the development of several neighborhood citizen associations in Boston and suggests points to consider in developing citizen participation in urban renewal at the neighborhood level. The emphasis is on administrative and structural questions and the report does not directly recognize that there may be difficulties inherent in such developments because of differences in goals among local groups or between local groups and city-wide groups, although some of these differences are reported.¹

The Housing Association report followed the tenor of the Housing and Home Finance Agency expectations for urban renewal by stating "From the Administrative standpoint, the basic test of sound citizen participation in urban renewal is to be found in a political atmosphere which allows the carrying out of the final official plans".² Thus the aim was to support official plans. One of the local citizen groups described, the Roxbury Community Council, which included some 65 other organizations, went on record in December 1955, "as supporting any urban renewal program which the City may undertake". Only five of these 65


²Ibid., p. 9.
organizations were clearly neighborhood groups.¹

Citizen participation in renewal activity at the community level in Boston, according to the Housing Association, "started with a report developed by the New Boston Committee, a group of citizens which also operated as a pro-reform political organization interested in improving municipal government".² This report was concerned with "the rehabilitation of existing rundown housing and its environs in the declining residential areas of Boston".³

The report proposed the conservation of buildings by owners, under the spur of citizen participation and code enforcement, and municipal efforts to improve neighborhood conditions, "by bringing public facilities up to standard and providing a high level of municipal services". The Committee recommended that the Mayor appoint a city-wide Steering Committee to coordinate all municipal housing improvement activities, and made other suggestions to implement neighborhood improvement. Among these suggestions were one to seek help from the United Community Services (Red Feather) in developing neighborhood councils and another that the preliminary general plan for the city (1950) be "brought into detailed

¹Ibid., p. 59 and p. 77.

²Ibid., p. 99.

focus for each residential area".¹

The Mayor of Boston, in picking up the program suggested by the New Boston Committee, decided not to establish a central citizens' committee. Instead, he established a committee of citizens in each of the fifteen health and welfare districts to work with his Coordinator, who was appointed to bring about unified action by certain City Departments. Thus, according to the Housing Association Report, citizen participation in urban renewal began at the district level, but it tended to fill the gap between the City Hall and the grass-roots citizenry.²

The District Committees as appointed were heavily weighted by bankers and clergymen with a few businessmen known to have an interest in neighborhood improvement. In some areas, however, South End, Roxbury, and Charlestown, the District Committees made immediate use of existing neighborhood groups as spring boards for citizen participation. Some of these were in areas suitable for rehabilitation. Others were in neighborhoods adapted only for redevelopment. "The clash of interests between the existing associations forced the District Committees especially that in the South End to seek clarification of the city's objectives".³ This problem led to meetings of the committee

¹Ibid., p. 2 and p. 18.
²Loring, op. cit., p. 100.
³Ibid., p. 100.
chairmen from the local districts which gave, for a while at least, a city-wide citizens' advisory committee interested in urban renewal in Boston.\textsuperscript{1}

In presenting suggestions for organizing citizen participation, the Housing Association report stressed the need to obtain the support of "dominant interests in a community whose participation would be needful to represent the community and to increase likelihood of getting any action later agreed on as desirable". Seven important

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 101. A previous, overall citizen organization concerned with planning in Boston was the Greater Boston Development Committee about 1945. This Committee was oriented to the Boston Region, not just the City. It was organized by a group of private citizens in March 1944 under the name "Boston Central Committee", and in 1945, under the new name, worked to revitalize the Port of Boston. In 1947 the Executive Director of the Committee stated, "It supports a program conceived and presented to bring to bear on the legislative bodies of the region the will of the people--voiced through this representative group of leaders in business, industry and community life." It worked "so that eventually an overall physical plan for the long term needs of the Boston Region may stand as the considered guide for future regional improvement." In 1947 it had scheduled the preparation of a book to describe the proposed plan in popular form to stimulate "citizen interest" and "for use in public schools". The Executive Director wrote, "It is hoped that the school children of the Boston region may develop civic pride and a spirit which will be expressed in future years by an informed support for the program." The Committee was composed of "nearly 200 leaders of all walks of life with representatives of both Boston and neighboring communities". Funds to carry on the work were contributed "by principal industries, banks, insurance companies, public utilities and professional firms". Information from report of Theodore T. McCrosky and Charles A. Blessing for the Greater Boston Development Committee of which Mr. McCrosky was Executive Director, "An Action Program for Metropolitan Boston," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Spring 1947, pp. 29-32.
elements in a community were listed and discussed.\textsuperscript{1} The report stated that "families" are not a dominant element at "either city-wide or district participation planes, but (are) the only type of dominant element at the neighborhood level".\textsuperscript{2} Thus the report recognized that both business and family interests must be considered, but did not offer an administrative plan to deal with the differences that may exist between their goals. Families were to have control of neighborhood organizations, but to have only a minor role in citizen organizations representing larger areas.\textsuperscript{3}

These early efforts to find ways to bring citizen participation into a meaningful relation with urban renewal objectives as outlined by the 1954 legislation were weak, it seems to this writer, because they identified differences

\textsuperscript{1}Loring, W. C., op. cit., pp. 156-161. The seven elements were (1) economic, (2) domestic (this corresponds to "resident" in this thesis) (3) educational, (4) religious, (5) governmental, (6) welfare and (7) civic and prestige.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 165.

\textsuperscript{3}Another demonstration grant from HHFA was given to the relatively small municipality of Dyersburg, Tennessee. This study analyzed what the people of the area could do to help in renewal by preparing surveys about the area. This would result in people being more aware of the extent of blight, but does not seem to be expected to yield different ideas about the types of programs wanted to meet local needs. (Nixon, William Bishop, and Boyd, Joseph, M., Jr., Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal, Tennessee State Planning Commission in Cooperation with Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1957.)
between family and non-family interests with differences between local (neighborhood) and city-wide interests. The dilemma of whether families have, in fact, different needs from other elements in the community and the possibility that different families have different needs was not faced.

The more recent dramatic activities in Washington Park and Charlestown continue to reflect these conflicts. Are there differences regarding the purpose of urban renewal or only about the place families and non-families should play in developing urban renewal plans? If residents are to review the plans developed by a central renewal agency, some residents will be happy, others not, depending on the central agency plans. If, on the other hand, residents are to participate in working out the goals of urban renewal, then the problem is even more complex.
IV. THE WASHINGTON PARK EXPERIENCE

A. Leadership by Freedom House

Citizen mobilization for urban renewal in Roxbury has been led by a local organization called Freedom House. Mr. and Mrs. O. Philip Snowden were co-founders of the organization in 1949 and have served since the beginning as Director and Assistant Director. They began by calling together 17 other local residents and as a group agreed to work to stop the growth of blight and to promote interracial understanding.¹

The boundaries of operation of Freedom House, as formally incorporated in December 1949, coincided almost exactly with those that, in 1962, were to become the boundaries of the Washington Park urban renewal area. Among these 502 acres are some of the worst slums in the city.

¹Snowden, Otto and Muriel, "Citizen Participation", Journal of Housing, No. 8, September, 1963, pp. 435-439. This article and talks with Mrs. Snowden are the primary sources of information about Freedom House. The article reports that about 70 percent of the population of the Freedom House area is Negro.

In 1960, 9.8 percent of the population of Boston was non-white. From 1950 to 1960 the number of white residents decreased 129,351, but the number of non-white residents in the city increased 25,958. (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Census of Population, 1960, General Population Characteristics, Massachusetts, Table 20, and Census of Population, 1950, Characteristics of the Population, Massachusetts, Table 33.) In 1950 it is reported only 20 percent of the population of the Freedom House area was Negro.
and also other homes which are structurally sound and beautifully maintained.

In 1951 money to assist in purchasing a building to house Freedom House came from some of the "most influential businessmen and philanthropists" of Boston who supported the goals of "community self-help and in-depth democracy". Freedom House moved to the new location in 1952 and at that time broadened its work. The programs included "a play school for pre-school children, a semi-monthly coffee hour for women, a series of annual international teas, and the use of the building facilities by all kinds of social, civic, and fraternal organizations". As the Snowdens report, these activities left little time for "grappling with the problems of neighborhood deterioration".

Local block organization began to grow slowly. In 1954 a local woman, with the backing of Freedom House, organized some neighbors and succeeded in getting some better city services for her neighborhood, such as street paving. In 1957 Freedom House helped another neighborhood group fight to stop a liquor license from being renewed by a local tavern and was successful. By 1959, 27 other block groups had been organized, largely by using Freedom House Board members to serve as "block organizers".

In 1958 Freedom House received a grant of $10,000 per year for two years from a private foundation to concentrate on a block program and on developing contacts with
Boston's political structure "that would focus attention upon the needs of the Roxbury community".

Meantime other over-all neighborhood groups were working in the same direction in Roxbury, and in 1958 these groups came together with Freedom House to ask the Boston City Planning Board (of that date) for a pilot urban renewal project in the 186 acre tract of Roxbury just south of Dudley Street, which was in the poorest condition in the Upper Roxbury Area. The proposal was approved by the Boston City Council in 1959 as Boston's first rehabilitation project, but no action took place until John F. Collins became Mayor in January 1960.1

In July 1960 the Urban Renewal Administration in Washington approved a survey and planning advance for the 186 acres. Detailed survey and planning activities began the spring of 1961, and by the summer "it had become clear that if urban renewal in the area was to have the maximum degree of success, the boundary should be extended to Franklin Park", which is to the south of the original tract.2 The proposal for the expanded area was approved by the Authority and City Council in early 1962.

A public hearing was held by the City Council in March 1962 to get citizen reactions. The Boston

---

1 Snowdens, *op. cit.*, p. 437.

Redevelopment Authority held a public hearing in June 1962 to discuss the proposal to expand the total project area and a plan for early land acquisition for 35 acres. The Redevelopment Authority acquired the 35 acres in December 1962, and on January 14, 1963, a public hearing in the Washington Park area was held by the Redevelopment Authority on the final plans. All three hearings showed strong support by the local citizens for the program.

Financial help was given to Freedom House in its efforts to develop community participation in the renewal program from a new nonprofit Boston organization, originally called the Boston Community Development Program. This organization had a grant for $50,000 from a local fund (The Permanent Charity Fund) and succeeded in getting a much larger grant from the Ford Foundation.

The origin of the new Community Development Program was conviction by local civic leaders that the "attention given to the physical rebuilding of the city, must be matched by an attack on its social problems". They determined that a new organization was necessary to address

1Ibid., p. 8.
2Boston Redevelopment Authority, Relocation Progress Report, mimeographed, March 1, 1963, p. 1
itself to what was called "the human side of urban renewal". ¹
In July 1962 the initial organization changed its name to
Action for Boston Community Development, and the purpose
was broadened to "encourage and promote the improvement
of community life in the Boston area with special emphasis
on, but not limited to, education, social services, youth,
employment and related fields". ²

The Boston Community Development Program established
a Professional Advisory Committee in Roxbury, including
executives from all social service agencies, which prepared
a statement on "social planning objectives" for the General
Neighborhood Renewal Project area of Roxbury-North Dorches-
ter (some 1700 acres including the Washington Park area).
But special work was needed in Washington Park where the
renewal program was becoming active.

ABCD, therefore, made a one-year contract with Freedom
House to assume "full responsibility for community organi-
ization in Washington Park". ³ Some $8,000 was given to
Freedom House for this work, beginning about March 1961.

When it became clear in early 1962 that ABCD would

¹Ibid., p. 2. A recent Newsletter of ASPO reports
that ABCD was "set up by Mayor Collins and Mr. Logue",
(Charles W. Eliot, Donald M. Graham, and David A. Crane,
"Boston: Three Centuries of Planning", ASPO Newsletter,
April, 1964, p. 47.)

²Ibid., p. 8.

³Ibid., p. 29.
not continue to give financial support to the Freedom House program, Freedom House with the approval of ABCD turned to the Boston Redevelopment Authority for financial help. Freedom House requested funds for one year and received $27,000 in March 1962, and, after consideration, reapplied for funds in 1963 and again in 1964, receiving $42,500 and $39,500 for these years respectively.

The Snowdens have stated that they believed private financing to be preferable to funds from the government renewal agency, but as they said in the Journal of Housing article, lacking private funds, the Authority funds were the "only way open to get the program moving".\(^1\) In answer to accusations that they were serving as an arm of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, they said, "at no point, would Freedom House support BRA proposals that it felt might, in any way, not serve the community in the best manner".\(^2\)

About the same time or a bit later, a new kind of contract was made by ABCD with Freedom House to provide funds to help explore the need for social services in the community. To quote the Journal article, "the contract calls for the provision, through Freedom House of the same kind of opportunity for the citizens of Washington Park

\(^1\)Snowdens, op. cit., p. 437.
\(^2\)Ibid.
to participate in social planning as they had to participate in physical planning". ¹

The experience of Freedom House since 1949 in studying the community and working with citizens in various neighborhoods was a strong background for the work they came to do in leading citizens in the development of urban renewal plans for the area. Yet with all its background, Freedom House was still not equipped to gather and report questions and suggestions from all the residents in the area. No information was available about how to do this, and the Federal administrative rulings were far from clear about exactly how "representative" citizen action was supposed to be.

Leadership by Freedom House has markedly increased citizen understanding of the environment, including both its physical and social aspects. Several new techniques for citizen-planner communication have been explored in the Washington Park urban renewal program. They constitute real steps forward, even though more remains to be done in achieving "community-wide" and "representative" citizen participation.

B. Examples of Citizen Participation in Washington Park

An excellent summary of what has been done by Roxbury citizens in relation to urban renewal is given in the

¹Ibid., p. 437.
Snowdens' article in the *Journal of Housing*. They state that Freedom House, between April 1961 and September 1963, has "organized, been involved in, or coordinated: (a) close to 120 separate meetings of homeowners and tenants, of business and professional people, of clergymen, of people in early land acquisition areas; (b) a series of public hearings, crowded to capacity; (c) production and distribution of over 16,000 letters and notices inviting people in the community to attend these meetings and hearings to express their own views and opinions; (d) the distribution of thousands of newsletters, question-and-answer sheets and bulletins dealing with various aspects of renewal, such as relocation procedures and benefits, the timing of acquisition of properties, where to go for assistance with individual problems; (e) countless professional conferences and briefing sessions required for the development of a working Washington Park 'team'."¹

Illustrations of how some of these meetings progressed have been obtained from reading the minutes taken between April 1961 and March 1963. It would not be possible to describe all the characteristics of the work, but selected aspects will be discussed.

1. **Selection of Key Leaders:**

Freedom House put the main responsibility for discussing urban renewal preliminary plans on what they called the

"Steering Committee". They later brought together representatives from each block, building on their earlier block organization work. In addition, they arranged special meetings for the clergy, business groups, professional social workers, and some "open" meetings.

The members of the Steering Committee were to be "responsible individuals who can come together as thoroughly knowledgeable persons to work with Mr. Sinclair [the BRA Project Director for the GNRA in which Washington Park was located] rather than as representatives of organized groups. However, those selected hopefully would be able to reach large groups of other people". The persons who attended the first meeting of the Committee on May 1, 1961 were invited by Freedom House.

Twenty-three persons were invited to this first meeting, 10 came from block or neighborhood groups, 2 from education, 2 from the clergy (one Protestant and one Catholic), 6 from various special interests in connection with Freedom House, and 3 from other social service organizations. In the final membership others were added making a total Steering Committee of about 30.

The invitation that was sent to Steering Committee members for the second meeting on May 10 stated, "the Boston Community Development Program has officially

---

1Statement by Mrs. Snowden, at meeting of Steering Committee on May 1, 1961.
requested the Freedom House Civic Center Association to assist them and the Boston Redevelopment Authority in reaching the key persons in the Washington Park section of Roxbury." The important point is the attention to "key persons". Whether this approach was the decision of Freedom House, the Redevelopment Authority or ABCD is not known; apparently all agreed to it.

Part of the reason for choosing "key people" undoubtedly was the limited time that Freedom House had to gather citizens' opinions. According to Mr. Sinclair at the May 1 meeting, the Neighborhood had until July 1 to prepare a general plan for the area. In this period they were to decide which areas were to be recommended for conservation and which for clearance and what was to be done on the areas that were to be cleared.

The Steering Committee continued to meet about weekly from May until December 1961. They clearly gave much thought and time to this work. A meeting with the clergy was held May 15, and an open meeting for all residents to meet Mr. Sinclair was held on May 17. It does not appear, however, that open meetings were held regularly during the summer of 1961.

2. Broader Citizen Organization:

The opinions of all citizens in the community were officially asked at an open meeting on January 29, 1962. This meeting followed the many discussions with the Steering Committee. Mrs. Snowden introduced the members
of the Steering Committee to the meeting and indicated that this meeting was "the first step in moving forward as citizens in the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area". After two and a half hours discussion, it was voted that those present "accept the general concepts of the plan as presented to us tonight and that the group recommends that the BRA proceed with the yellow light".

It was on April 9, 1962, that the Steering Committee met with members from the block associations to discuss the formal organization of a block-based organization to work on urban renewal questions. It was announced at this meeting that "beginning April 23, 1962, a series of meetings will be scheduled almost nightly at Freedom House to enable people living in the same block or in a cluster of blocks to see what has been proposed" for that area. Meetings were to be held at Freedom House. It was also proposed that there be established a Citizens Urban Renewal Action Committee to be known as CURAC. Invitations would come from BRA and ABCD through Freedom House to participate in this new organization.

The purpose of the new citizens' organization as presented at the April 9 meeting was "to assure that all citizens have an opportunity (a) to take part in planning for the area, (b) to express their ideas, views, and questions

\[1\]This quotation and others in this section are from the minutes of the meetings, on file at Freedom House.
on the proposals thus far, (c) to assist in reaching agreements on recommendations as to what should or should not be done".

At the same meeting it was announced that Freedom House would open a center for information about urban renewal on April 23 and prepare literature for distribution.

It should be noted that this organization of the new broad citizens' group and the establishment of an information center came just after the BRA had agreed to the contract with Freedom House giving them expanded funds for citizen participation work.

Meetings of citizens by block began April 24, 1962, with a meeting of residents from the Cliff Street Area. About 180 notices of the meeting were mailed, and some 90 persons attended. On April 26 another block was invited to Freedom House and on May 2, another. Meetings of different groups continued at frequent intervals into June. The 19th block meeting was held on June 21, or just before the Public Hearing on June 25, 1962.

3. Questions Discussed with the Redevelopment Authority Staff:

In the early discussions with the Steering Committee, the BRA staff asked for citizen opinions regarding basic planning questions such as the location and types of community facilities, the location of major highways and types of new housing preferred. Questions were also answered about the methods used in the survey and planning work.
The later meetings with block groups were primarily devoted to explaining rehabilitation and relocation, and giving information on new housing to be constructed. It appears that citizens outside the Steering Committee were not systematically asked for expressions of their needs and preferences which might be taken into account in developing goals for the urban renewal plans.

At the first meeting with the Steering Committee on May 1, 1961, members of the Committee asked broad questions common to most renewal areas, such as when will property that is taken be paid for, how will rehabilitation be financed, will there be more space for playgrounds, will there be adequate policing during the change. At the next meetings there were other questions from citizens about how rehabilitation would be financed and considerable, detailed discussion of where a senior playground should be located and how many and where schools should be built. Questions were also raised by the BRA officials regarding the need for other community facilities, fire stations, libraries, a court house, police facilities and a community center.

The minutes show that the BRA gave the citizens information on standards commonly used for community facilities as background for the discussion.

At the June 5 meeting of the Steering Committee there was discussion of how the BRA staff could get replies from business in answer to BRA inquiries. Some 600 inquiries had been mailed, and 150 had been returned unanswered and
only a few with the information requested.

On June 12 a member of the Steering Committee stated that three surveyors came to her home and sat in the living room and asked questions, but did not inspect her home; she wondered if this was the usual practice. This led to a letter being written to the BRA by the Steering Committee reporting this, and a formal "thank you" was received from the BRA. (On July 24 it was reported that a home had been inspected on four different occasions by four different teams. The explanation given was that "the first three surveyors had made an investigation which was felt to be incomplete. The second group was making a 'call-back' with a new team plus an instructor. The third team was the new team back on its own; and the fourth just happened to be a visit from our Freedom House interviewer."

At the June 12 meeting the minutes also record a long discussion about the lack of information the Steering Committee felt they were receiving from the BRA about plans. The answer of the BRA representative was that there were no definite plans as yet.

At the meeting June 26, the BRA official reported that the new private housing to be built would probably rent for about $80 for a two-bedroom unit, and mentioned the need for public housing and housing for the elderly. The Committee's reaction, as reported in the minutes, was that "small housing projects were desirable and that if public housing was to go into Washington Park that it
should be held to 1 or 2 stories high". The opinion to limit public housing became more definite later.

On July 10 there was discussion of traffic and roads. By discussing possible present cross-town (East-West) routes, the group came to feel the need for a new cross-town route. At that meeting most felt that widening Townsend Street as the cross-town street would be an improvement. This meeting went on to discuss parking in detail and then to express a strong desire for better city services for garbage collection, street cleaning and snow removal.

At the July 17 meeting of the Steering Committee Mrs. Snowden suggested a new approach to planning. She proposed that each member of the Committee plan an "ideal" Washington Park Community. The minutes report, "A map indicating only the main streets and the parks in the area was provided along with a set of standards to be used as a guide in placing playgrounds, schools, libraries, shopping centers, etc."

The minutes go on to say, "There was some resistance from members of the group who felt that this was a job for the 'experts' or that they could offer very little that would be constructive. Others thought it would be a waste of time because the minutes of the past meetings show what decisions the group came to on the location of community facilities". The upshot of the discussion was that only those who wished to do so would try to prepare an ideal plan. At the next meeting when the suggested plans were
displayed along with others prepared by BRA members, it was found there was "not much difference in the location of facilities, but some difference in the number of junior high schools and playgrounds planned".

The BRA had preliminary plans ready for discussion with the community by October. The Steering Committee was invited to see the plans October 16. The minutes report that the BRA representative said that "this was the first time, to his knowledge, that a representative group of citizens in a community had reviewed any plans in the process of redevelopment".

Shortly after, on October 24, the Steering Committee had a further meeting regarding the preliminary plans with the Director of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, Mr. Edward J. Logue. The minutes state, "Mr. Logue made it clear that he would submit no plan to the Boston Redevelopment Board, the Mayor, or the City Council without first receiving the full support for the plan from the community directly involved".

At this meeting the BRA reported that the proposed East-West road was to be located just south of Washington Park, where no through street then existed. This new location was believed to give space for new schools, churches, and expanded recreation. The effect of this new road location on some existing homes that were in fairly good condition became evident at later meetings. These homes would have to be torn down, and the proposal led to many questions.
Further discussion of the preliminary plan with the Steering Committee on October 30 led to another major question. The preliminary plan proposed locating in Roxbury a Welfare Home for Women. This proposal brought very strong opposition. The Steering Committee stated they did not want any institution being incorporated in the renewal plans. "It was pointed out," said the minutes "that a basic premise from the beginning was that this was to be a residential area".

4. Goals Underlying the Renewal Plans:

The references to a "residential area" and to putting limits on the height of public housing were clues to the sort of goal that persons who participated in the Freedom House discussions wanted for Washington Park. These desires came more clearly into the open at a Steering Committee meeting on November 13, 1961. It was reported in the minutes that the group felt that the new plan developed by the BRA for the area showed "very little renewal at all". The phrase "a glorified ghetto" was used to describe the result. The members wanted what they called "full scale treatment" to help them change the community. The Committee wanted more "clearance" than BRA staff was planning.

The minutes stated,"The subject of a 'glorified ghetto' was explored at length and it was the consensus of opinion that one of the most important ways to save a community from deterioration was through new housing. The
Committee was very positive in stating that they did not want all low-income housing in the project area and it hoped that the area would be integrated. The group felt this could be accomplished if the housing, both private and public, as well as the neighborhood itself was attractive to people in out-lying communities." In other words the Negro residents were hoping to make Washington Park so attractive that higher-income white persons would be persuaded to become residents.

When the BRA representative explained that rehabilitation of the area was important and that property owners would be given a chance to fix up their property, he was "met with a great deal of opposition". The Committee felt that the owners of the deteriorated housing were "generally low-income families and would find it economically impossible to borrow large sums of money to bring property up to standard". A BRA representative stated that "money for rehabilitation on a large scale was available and that the plan was feasible". (This report was based on a new agreement with banks to lend money--with interest, of course--to persons in the area who qualified, whereas in the past, banks had not been willing to lend to anyone for improving property in this area.)

It appears to be the sense of the Steering Committee at this November 13 meeting that the BRA had changed its plans for Washington Park and were now planning on more rehabilitation and less clearance. In part this feeling
was due to the proposal of BRA to expand the area to be included in the project from the original 186 acres near Dudley Street to include the larger tract further south. In the additional site dwellings on the whole were in much better condition than in the first tract. Thus it was true that the proportion of homes to be cleared had dropped in relation to homes to be rehabilitated. Whether or not this fact was taken into account at the meeting is not clear from the minutes.

There was further discussion of locating the Welfare Home in the area at the meeting November 20. A vote was taken showing the majority opposed. At the meeting November 27, the BRA reported that it had accepted the views of the Committee and would locate the Home elsewhere.

The Committee was also asked to vote on whether the BRA should take a local theater which was believed not to be a wholesome influence, and the Committee approved of the taking. As one of the members said, they should "help to make it a neighborhood anyone would want to live in" and "drive out the undesirable elements one by one".

It is of some significance, as indicating major concerns, that the minutes of the Steering Committee show no discussion about the problem of relocating persons who would be displaced by the redevelopment program. On the other hand, this question was discussed at a meeting of clergy on March 13, 1962. It was said at this meeting that of 6,500 families now living in the Washington Park area,
it was estimated that 1,543 would have to be relocated.

The Citizens Urban Renewal Committee and the block meetings, which began, as already noted, after Freedom House obtained additional funds from the BRA at the end of April 1962, were primarily concerned with discussions of how the program, as planned, was to be carried out. Information was provided telling families not to panic, that BRA would find places for residents to move to, that moving expenses would be paid, etc. The response of those attending the block meetings was to support the general plans for renewal, and again apparently few questions were asked about the extent of relocation.

Evidence that the BRA plans for Washington Park were supported by the articulate persons in the area was indicated at both the hearings before the City Council, in March 1962 and in June 1962. As already noted, there was also support at the public hearing before the Boston Redevelopment Authority on the final Washington Park plan, held January 14, 1963. "A long parade of citizens and clergymen, one after the other, expressed the community's endorsement of the plan. When a vote was taken among the 1,200 persons present, only three indicated that they had some reservations about one or another particular aspect of the proposals."^{1}

---

C. The Opposition:

The important point about the citizen organization work in relation to urban renewal in Washington Park is that there was no organized opposition. There were, however, strong individual critics, for whom the major point of attack was that the Washington Park plan did not adequately take account of the needs of lower-income families and plan to meet these needs.

According to the leader of one social service program in Roxbury and the minister of a local church, who were interviewed separately, Freedom House is a civic center with a middle class orientation and a middle class bias. In their words the Washington Park Steering Committee aimed to help the middle class and to move out the lower-income class. The social service leader said the citizens' program "did not involve those most likely to be dislocated". The minister said Freedom House organized "the most easily organized people".

The social service leader challenged the Freedom House claim that they had contacts with neighborhood associations through the area. This leader had arranged interviews with 100 people in the alleged, largest neighborhood association to try to learn whether they knew of this citizen organization and found 94 did not.

This leader also reported that the Snowdens said there was no way to reach the lower classes. Mrs. Snowden had similarly said to the writer that she wondered how one could reach the lower-income families in the area. The
social service leader also had some doubts about people from near Dudley Street going "up there" to the Freedom House meetings. Mrs. Snowden had raised the question, too, but pointed out that large numbers did come.

The social service leader suggested that the methods used to tell people about the renewal plans were not appropriate for lower-income people. The use of the mails to notify them of meetings or explain renewal did not reach them as they often do not open mail, not being accustomed to receive anything but advertisements in the mail. In addition, they are not used to reading reports, but are more at home with verbal communication. This critic suggested that a traveling van with someone to explain renewal proposals might have toured low-income areas to meet people and get reactions. He said he had suggested this to Freedom House, and had been told that it would be too expensive for the BRA to finance. Written materials when they were used he felt should be easier to read.

The minister reported that some 600 families had been displaced by early land acquisition and of these, 485 were eligible for public housing, but he pointed out that only 40 or 50 public housing units were to be available in Washington Park and these were to be rehabilitated homes. It is also known that many low-income families do not want the kind of public housing that is now available in Boston, ¹

but other forms of subsidies are apparently needed.

The minister also said that in his opinion too much land had been earmarked for clearance. He noted that it would be the planners' orientation to try to improve the physical environment and that the planners had said it was necessary to take all the property designated in order to attract private money for new building. He said in his opinion a great number of homes in good condition would be torn down. His position was clearly different from that of the Steering Committee of Freedom House which asked for more clearance.

Another criticism was that the added staff that are working on the funds from BRA do not spend enough time out in the community talking with individuals. They were criticised for spending too much time in the office. The question was also raised as to whether they were professionally trained for community organization work.

The comment was also made that the relatively quick organization of citizen support in Washington Park was done to support the Mayor. The Mayor, it was said, wanted some new middle-income housing to be underway before he came up for re-election in the fall of 1963, and he helped a Protestant church get a low interest loan under the 221-d-3 program, which might not have gone forward as quickly without his help. The critic recognized that the church wanted the housing, but he was sorry not to have
more lower-priced housing also included in the Washington Park plan.¹

¹It is beyond the scope of this thesis to try to appraise the effect of the renewal program on the lives of those who are displaced. It is understood that many of those displaced are being relocated in Dorchester under conditions of greater crowding and higher rents than they had in Washington Park. In addition, requirements of rehabilitation mean hardship for some. One woman who had saved some $4,000 or $5,000 for the college education of her daughter was persuaded to spend this on her house and as a result the daughter was unable to go to college. (case information from Robert M. Coard.)
V. THE CHARLESTOWN EXPERIENCE

A. Leadership by SHOC and The Federation

Citizen interest in urban renewal in Charlestown was initiated by one man, Leo T. Baldwin. Baldwin had grown up in Charlestown. After the war he and his family lived in other cities for about eight years. Then he returned to Charlestown and, as he said, he "saw how shabby things were". On April 7, 1960, he wrote to the editor of the local paper suggesting that citizens might do something to help improve their community. This was followed by other letters April 14 and 28. He suggested that those interested meet to form an organization. He also talked individually with the three Catholic pastors and three Protestant ministers.¹

The response to this appeal was good. A meeting was called in May. About 400 met in a hall and there were more outside. A new organization was created, called the Self-Help Organization for Charlestown, shortened to SHOC. Baldwin was elected president for two years.

Local citizens seem to agree that the new citizen group "worked wonders in the community". There were many clean-up campaigns with citizens sweeping their streets and cleaning up trash. There were tree planting programs.

¹The information on the early days of SHOC was obtained for the most part from Mr. Leo T. Baldwin, in an interview February 26, 1964.
Three tot lots were established. There were block parties every Saturday night held in different parts of the city each week. A teenage center was opened (Charlestown had not had one before) and a skating rink was started, too.

Of special interest was an organized complaint bureau, where citizens could report their complaints, and then the Bureau would report them to City Hall. According to Baldwin sometimes the Bureau could get help and sometimes not.

By fall there were 1,200 members in SHOC. The organization opposed the renewal of two liquor licenses and was successful. This seemed a "tremendous thing".

When Baldwin heard that Edward J. Logue might come to Boston to head the renewal program, he went to New Haven to learn more about his work there. He reported that he found people on his staff liked him. Baldwin invited Logue to speak in Charlestown in June 1960. At this meeting a secret ballot was taken regarding the idea of a renewal program for Charlestown. About half the 600 present voted, and of these the majority liked the idea. Other meetings followed with other people to discuss community improvement.

The following year in September the private organization, Boston Community Development Program, which was later to receive funds from the Ford Foundation, under the name of Action for Boston Community Development, sent a community organization specialist to work in Charlestown.
(As reported in the previous section on Washington Park, the Boston Community Development Program was established to assist the "human side of urban renewal").

The ABCD representative found that Charlestown had many business, civic and church organizations, but that there was no central organization through which they could work together. He also learned that SHOC was not working with these organizations as organizations, although many individuals from them were members of SHOC. Baldwin did not want to make SHOC an "umbrella organization", but said he would be willing to help to build up a broader agency.1

At a meeting of SHOC in November 1961 Baldwin proposed the establishment of a new Charlestown organization, which would include representatives of organizations. A meeting to elect temporary officers was held in January. A few of the members of SHOC hoped to elect their Vice President, James Sweeney, to be president of the new organization. This group was led by Mrs. Sweeney. At the January meeting, on motion from the clergy, another man, Robert Lee, was elected temporary chairman, and he later became president. A committee was selected at the January meeting to draw up by-laws and a constitution and arrange for a constitutional Convention. The convention took place in May. The by-laws provided that each Charlestown organization

1Interview with Joseph Vilimas, March 2, 1964.
should have one vote and might send two delegates to meetings. Mr. Lee, who was elected president, was a former State Senator and vice president of a Boston insurance company.

During the fall of 1961 and early 1962, SHOC continued to hold meetings and to discuss urban renewal plans especially through its Planning Council. This Planning Council met regularly with representatives of the Boston Redevelopment Authority at the downtown office and then reported what was discussed at open meetings of SHOC in Charlestown. The Planning Council had a representative from each precinct in Charlestown, and the meetings to report on the BRA discussions were held in various parts of the city, but anyone from other parts of the city was also welcome.

According to Mr. Baldwin, after the Federation was formed the BRA dropped its associations with the SHOC Planning Council and held meetings only with the official Federation representatives, not open meetings. (The Planning Council of SHOC ceased to function.)

When Baldwin's term as president of SHOC ended in May 1962, he decided not to run again. The new president elected was James Sweeney, who had been suggested to head the Federation. Since 1962, the membership of SHOC has been split between those who liked Mr. Logue and wanted renewal for Charlestown and those who opposed Mr. Logue.

During the summer of 1962 the Federation discussed urban renewal plans with the BRA through its Coordinating
Committee under the leadership of a local minister, who had previously worked with the SHOC planning Council. There were some 18 or 19 persons on the Coordinating Committee, and they met with about 10 from the BRA staff. Each meeting was devoted to one aspect of the renewal plans, and the BRA staff felt they were giving complete information to the Committee. These meetings continued into the fall of 1962.¹ The members of the committee were responsible for reporting this information to their own organizations, but it was stated by several Charlestown people that it was hard to get local people to come to meetings to discuss these plans. The Federation included some 52 local organizations and claimed to represent some 18,000 residents.

In the late fall the Federation held a meeting of delegates to vote on the tentative plans proposed for renewal in Charlestown. Delegates from the large majority of the member organizations voted in favor of the plans. SHOC was among those opposed. Of the Directors of the organization all except James Sweeney voted approval. A few organizations did not vote either way. As reported in the Charlestown Patriot the vote was 51 to 9 in favor of the proposed renewal plans.²

On January 7, 1963, the Boston Redevelopment Board

¹Interview with Frank Delveckio, Acting Project Director for Charlestown, March 4, 1964.

held a Public Hearing on the renewal plans in Charlestown. The meeting was open to the public. The issue to be considered was whether or not to approve plans for early land taking. The hearing did not seek a vote on the total renewal plans. It was reported to be the choice of the Federation Coordinating Committee to ask the BRA to undertake only a part of the program first and then on the basis of this work to ask for citizen approval of later plans.

The great majority of those attending the hearing were strongly opposed to the proposed early land taking. This opposition was clearly not expected by the BRA staff. As one of them said, "They were stunned". Although the leaders of the Federation were well aware of some opposition, they were of the opinion that the majority of the members of the individual organizations in the Federation were in favor of the early land taking.

Following the January 1963 meeting the BRA distributed to all Charlestown households an explanation of the overall urban renewal plans. Regular meetings with representatives of the Federation by the BRA did not resume, and these organizations have not held local meetings to try to formulate new approaches to citizen mobilization regarding urban renewal.

In the fall of 1963 an office to assist in rehabilitation quietly opened in Charlestown under BRA auspices. Approval had been secured from FHA to make loans for rehabilitation under plans approved by the BRA. The office
has had requests for advice on possible plans and costs for rehabilitation from several property owners and in the spring of 1964 was planning a house to house information service in selected blocks.  

B. Examples of Citizen Participation

The Planning Council of SHOC developed a basic housing policy in the fall of 1961. It was adopted at the November 2 meeting of the Executive Committee of SHOC. This was about a year and a half after the organization had been established and before the development of the Federation. It is believed that the representative of ABCD assisted in getting the statement into form.

The SHOC Statement urged five points: (1) "prevent excessive demolition", (2) "protect the relocation rights of displaced Charlestown people", (3) "make more new housing available in Charlestown to reverse the exodus of the past decade", and "support the development of low and middle income housing", (4) "resist public housing projects except for the elderly" and (5) "ease relocation through proper phasing of the project".  

The position on the sequence of the program is one which has most consistently been given support by Charlestown residents. The 1961 Housing Policy Statement

---

1Interview with Mr. Michel Matt, FHA Rehabilitation Office, March 6, 1964.

explained further that it favored "a planning policy which will be so phased as to provide that persons who may be displaced by necessary demolitions will be given prior opportunity to re-establish residence in Charlestown to the greatest extent possible".

The suggestion that the renewal plans were primarily to help present and former Charlestown residents was supported by several other parts of the full Housing Statement. The statement spoke of "saving as much of the present housing as possible for the existing population and providing new housing for those of our middle-income class whom we would encourage to return". Again they said "we fervently hope that all efforts be made to preserve the status quo of income level", and they spoke of wanting investments in housing that would be "in keeping with its (Charlestown's) present workingmen's character".

In regard to new public housing the statement reflected what appears to be general unhappiness with the public housing project which had been built in Charlestown and to which some problem families had been assigned from other parts of Boston. The Policy said "large public housing projects have proven to be ineffective in solving the housing problems of our low-salaried and public-assistance people. We would prefer to be recorded as in favor of individual, duplex or limited-number row houses designed for low and middle income people". The exception to this was approval of "motel-type or low-rise apartments"
as public housing for elderly people.

In preparation for the January 7, 1963, public hearing, the local paper, the Charlestown Patriot, issued a special edition which was sent free to every home in Charlestown on December 29, 1962. The editor of the paper is known to be friendly to urban renewal for Charlestown. The special issue told of the development of the Federation and listed the organizations and individual directors who had voted for and against the plans. In explaining the proposed renewal program for Charlestown the paper said, "The fundamental objective . . . is to enhance its (Charlestown's) residential attractiveness and create a stable family community. In order to achieve this objective new housing and new community facilities must be built. This means, however, that selected residential and commercial properties must be acquired and that families and businesses (be) relocated". It explained further, "The first stage of the renewal plan is to be an early land taking to provide 500 units of new sales and rental housing on sites with little or no family relocation".

In the community discussion of this program the idea that the first land to be taken would involve "little or no family relocation" got lost. Fear of losing their homes, which they did not want to give up, became strong. A local minister reported that, in spite of all the assurance he could offer, members of his parish became so worried that they joined those working against the plans.¹

¹Interview with Reverend Wolcott Cutler, March 4, 1964. 73
It did not help that the materials distributed at the hearing and a map, said to have been made available before the hearing, showed not only the properties scheduled to be taken by early land taking, but drew black lines around the larger areas in which these lots were located. It was said by several local residents that many people jumped to the conclusion that all the homes within the total areas enclosed by black lines would be demolished. In the case of the Bunker Hill area this included several homes in good condition. In this area the intent of the land taking plan was to take primarily the vacant lots and abandoned buildings on the back side of the hill known as Nanny Goat Hill, not the total Bunker Hill area.

In anticipation of the public hearing the Boston Globe also published a map showing the location of homes that were to be town down in the total plan. This involved some 19 percent of the homes in the community and added to the fears of those who opposed the plans. Although the public hearing was not directed at the question of overall plans, there was strong evidence that citizens felt the demolition planned for the future was excessive.

At the January hearing the opening statement was made by Edward J. Logue, Director of the BRA. He referred to early land taking of nonresident property and to building new housing to rent from $85 to $105 per month with heat and was booed. He introduced the President of the Federation and the representative from ABCD, who were also booed.
Several clergy spoke next favoring the early land taking, and for some there was applause. The chairman of the Federation Coordinating Committee read the Housing Policy developed in 1961 by the SHOC Planning Council. This seemed to stand as the best summary of citizen preferences in regard to housing plans.

Mr. Baldwin spoke later in the evening and made three points: (1) they should support some urban renewal if they wish to prevent further deterioration in Charlestown, (2) early land acquisition and new building will cushion the change and help in relocation and (3) they should revise all the overall plans and demolish as little as possible. He urged that the community go forward with the first stage which was not too extensive, while holding up the overall plans which included too much demolition.

At the hearing there was considerable support in favor of that part of the total renewal plan which called for doing away with the "El". One man said, "If you remove the 'El', blight will remove itself." He opposed the early land taking until the "El" had been removed. Others who followed supported the removal of the "El", but would not commit themselves on early land acquisition.

In February 1963 the Federation rallied local citizens to attend a hearing at the State House on enabling legislation which would permit Boston to support the removal of the Charlestown "El" under the renewal program. According to the ABCD representative, the Federation arranged
for some 1,500 people in 21 buses to attend the hearing and raised $1,000 to pay expenses. The legislation has since been passed. (It is not yet clear whether the Federal government will support such an expensive undertaking as part of a renewal program.)

C. The Opposition

There seem to have been three factors responsible for the lack of agreement in Charlestown in regard to urban renewal plans. First, there were many real fears and questions among large groups of citizens about the renewal plans and the conviction of many that the plans for demolition were excessive. Second, there was an underlying spirit of local political competition, so that individuals opposed to local leaders were more willing to express themselves than those who approved the leaders. A third influence was exerted from outside Charlestown by those who wished to create opposition to urban renewal in order to weaken the position of the Mayor and lay the basis for his defeat in the 1963 fall election. Had there not been some opposition to the plans per se, however, neither local political competition nor outside political pressures could have been effective.

Charlestown is primarily Irish, or at least of Irish background.¹ Political feuding is accepted as a "way of

¹U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing, 1960, Census Tracts, Boston, Mass. Of the 20,147 persons living in census tracts in Charlestown in 1960, there were 3,349 who were
life. Charlestown is proud that this was the home site of John F. Kennedy and that he belonged to the Charlestown Chapter of the Knights of Columbus. One comment about the community is that every other person is a politician. It is also said that as a person rises politically, others rush together to oppose him.

On the other hand, it appears that not all the people in Charlestown really want to be involved in politics. There were complaints from leaders that most people were willing to let others "do it" and that it was hard to get people to come to meetings. The result was, as has happened elsewhere, that those who were opposed to what was going on worked harder on the whole than those in favor.

One of the people who came to be most active among the opposition was Mrs. Sweeney. She was the wife of the person elected to head SHOC in May 1962 when Baldwin decided not to run for a second term. She was frankly critical of the president of the Charlestown Federation and also of the Director of BRA.

Those who opposed the renewal plans at the Public Hearing included many different points of view. Some home owners said they were trying to "save their homes". Some said the Federation did not represent them and urged the BRA to consider a referendum vote. Other opposition was either born in Ireland or children of one or both Irish parents, but it is known that a much greater number were grandchildren of Irish immigrants.
reported from businesses along the "El", or the B. and M. yards, which feared that if the land were improved their taxes would go up and for them prestige land would not be as good as their present situation. There were others who opposed the plan because it was being sponsored by people "outside Charlestown". At the hearing one man stated the plan was being promoted by "big business" in Boston. These people united in opposing the proposals for demolition.

Strengthening the opposition was an active political campaign throughout the City of Boston to try to defeat Mayor Collins largely by seeking to discredit his urban renewal program. Several members of the City Council were looking for support, and it was said that they directly assisted in encouraging the opposition to the renewal plans proposed in Charlestown.

The combination of these factors resulted in opposition materials being distributed before the Public Hearing which exaggerated the dangers that might flow from renewal. In addition, the arrangements for the hearing itself were extremely confused. The BRA and Federation had arranged to hold the meeting in the auditorium of the Clarence R. Edward Junior High School. A gym abuts this auditorium, at a higher level, and as estimates of attendance increased, it was agreed to use both the auditorium and the gym. Then it appeared that the number might exceed the capacity of the school, and the BRA wanted to be prepared to hold the meeting in the Armory. Thus they arranged to have chairs...
delivered to the Armory too. At this point, the opposition sound trucks announced that the BRA and Federation were telling the people one place, but would really hold the hearing elsewhere. Another complaint was that the school janitor, who had been told to open the door to the school auditorium at a certain hour, did as he was told, but local opponents found another way to the gym, and when people waiting at the auditorium were allowed in, there was little room left. One local resident said that members of SHOC were told to "get there early", "grab all the seats", and "save your homes"! At the meeting there were people sitting on the stage behind the speakers, and this increased the difficulty of keeping order.

This was clearly a case where "planning was politics", and those who shouted the loudest and had the most present at a hearing won the day, at least for the time being.
VI. POTENTIAL GOALS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN URBAN RENEWAL

In participating in the development of urban renewal, the citizen faces several kinds of decisions and to some extent the resident-citizen faces different decisions from other citizen groups. The neighborhood-citizen, including the local family group and the man or woman who lives alone, is in general less listened to by City Hall than business interests or other organized groups. For the resident group, the basic question is how to increase their influence in relation to other citizens. For them, as for other groups, there are also questions of working out conflicts among themselves, as in Washington Park and Charleston, and there is a range of questions that all citizens face in seeking to participate in urban renewal.

Each of these decisions in a way defines a goal in the process of citizen participation. The decisions take place simultaneously and also interact on each other. One decision is whether or not to participate in planning at all and how much responsibility to take. This is the question of the relation of the citizen to the planner. Another question is whether to give different citizen groups different responsibilities, i.e., which citizen should take responsibility for what kinds of decisions. The resident-citizen is, for example, often omitted from top decision-making about long run or city-wide goals. Other decisions relate to developing a project within a
broad plan or in implementing parts of the project. There are also decisions about improving the ability of the citizen to participate in planning which might in turn affect the kind of participation the citizen provides.

A. Determining the Role of the Citizen in Relation to the Planner

To some extent citizens may act to influence directly their elected legislative representatives and executives concerning urban renewal questions. This occurs at public hearings, for example. More frequently citizens relate first to the designated planning agency, the redevelopment staff or planning staff. Resident-citizens may have different relations to the planning agency than business interests or other nonresidential groups. The determination of the relation between a citizen group and the planning staff is one of the aspects of citizen participation in urban renewal.

Section VII considers some of the alternative relationships between the citizen and the planner. These relationships have been arranged in terms of increasing independence and responsibility for the citizen in relation to the planner. Independence alone, however, does not mean that citizens are best informed about the possibilities of improving environment by renewal or that they are most comprehensive in considering the needs of all citizens. The roles of the citizen and planner also change
as the citizen becomes more able to take a part in planning by understanding needs and by being able to define new conditions which can be brought into being to meet these needs.

In a broad sense, the more the citizen can take initiative in planning, the more government may be said to be "by the people", but there is also the question of the composition of the citizen group.

B. Determining Who Is the Citizen and Goals for Urban Renewal

The basic political question in citizen participation in urban renewal, as in other government decisions, is "who is the citizen?" What weight should the resident have in relation to business and other nonresidential groups? Are persons who are to be displaced by urban renewal to share in the planning? Can the same resident-citizen help on neighborhood planning and city-wide planning? And what of the people who are not able easily to express themselves?

One answer to these questions is to let the elected officials decide to whom to listen. From the citizen point of view, however, there seems need for citizens to work together to be sure that all important citizen interests are adequately presented to the city fathers for their consideration. This assumes both that citizens who feel their wishes and needs are not heeded will seek ways to
make their wishes seem more important and that articulate and democratic citizens will find some way to help other citizens who are not as articulate to express their positions. It is recognized that citizen participation is an advisory function, advising either the planning agency or the elected officials directly.

Whatever is decided as to "who" the citizen is will affect the decisions made about "what" are the goals he wants in urban renewal. One citizen may choose to emphasize higher tax revenues, another citizen, a minimum standard of housing and others, a balance of both. The process of deciding "who" is the citizen is crucial for determining what are the "goals" the citizen seeks from urban renewal. On this problem the planner can help citizens analyze differences and areas of agreement and must himself decide for whom he works.

The major differences between the leaders of the majority citizen groups in Washington Park and Charlestown and the opposition groups in each area were differences about the basic goals of the renewal program. These differences were primarily between different resident-citizen groups. To summarize, the Freedom House and Charlestown

\[1\text{For a discussion of three recent books which together present some 50 essays on the problems of "public interest" and (citizen) "responsibility" see Herbert J. Storing, "The Crucial Link: Public Administration, Responsibility and the Public Interest," Public Administration Review, March 1964, pp. 39-46.}\]
Federation leaders looked upon the renewal program as a way to achieve a "better community" in the way that the 1954 amendments to the Housing Act proposed, while the opponents seemed to want something more like the goals of a "decent home for every family", as declared in the basic Housing Act.

The different goals wanted from the renewal program in Washington Park and Charlestown reflected different characteristics among the citizens who were the spokesmen in each area. Those who favored the plans for urban renewal as proposed by the Redevelopment Authority were in general persons who looked forward to higher incomes and who tended to put high values on housing per se. This has been summarized by several people as representing a middle-class orientation as compared to a working-class orientation. While this thesis cannot begin to present a full sociological analysis of the social status of the citizens of these two areas, some of the possible underlying reasons for the differences in reaction to renewal plans can be suggested.

In Charlestown, it has been pointed out that there was emphasis on wanting to keep the income level appropriate for "working class people". This group, therefore, did not welcome changes aimed first to raise tax revenue. A program which suggested that some 20 percent of the residents would be moved to higher-priced homes ran counter to the goal of wanting to provide housing at a price local
citizens could pay.

In Roxbury, though data are not available to show a direct comparison with incomes in Charlestown, it is believed that there was at least a larger number who looked forward to higher incomes and welcomed the prospect of better housing and assumed they could afford it. (Again it must be emphasized that this was the position of those who spoke for "the citizen"). Louis Watts, who surveyed about 250 Washington Park households with incomes of about $6,000 or over, in 1962 and 1963 found that these higher-income Negro families did not want to leave the area. The lower-income families who were less articulate in Roxbury, on the other hand, held attitudes more like the majority of Charlestown.

James Q. Wilson has suggested that citizens who "allow urban renewal to proceed" belong to a group which is "public regarding", and those who are opposed, he calls "private regarding". The public regarding ethos is based on "an enlarged view of the community and a sense of obligation toward it", according to Wilson. People in this group are likely to "have a propensity for looking at and making policy for the community 'as a whole'". They are likely

1 Interview with Mr. Louis Watts, January 24, 1964. The survey was done on a grant from the Housing and Home Finance Agency as part of the work for a doctor's degree from Brandeis University. Mr. Watts also reported that these higher-income families also stated a preference for limiting the area to Negro families.
to be high in income or education. The private-regarding, on the other hand, are often from low-income and Negro areas. They are "intimately bound up in the day-to-day struggle to sustain themselves and their families".¹

Wilson's explanation of the characteristics which lead people to support urban renewal agrees with the suggested higher income ambitions for Washington Park, in spite of the fact that the majority are Negro. But Wilson's judgment that those who favor urban renewal are "public regarding" while others are "private regarding" is really a vote by Wilson that urban renewal is for the benefit of the "community as a whole". To the writer, citizens who oppose the program may be saying that other types of programs are needed more, or at least simultaneously, with renewal. From this point of view, either or neither position could be "public regarding". In addition, it seems reasonable that persons who might be hurt by relocation, whether of high or low income, might be expected to oppose the change, and those who have least resources to cope with the new costs have reason to be most critical. Unless the move is planned so that those to be relocated will benefit both financially and socially as well as physically by the change, there is reason for them to be "private-regarding".

Different attitudes toward renewal and efforts to

improve the environment may also reflect different values which are placed on housing and environment. The differences between the values held by professional (middle- and high-income) persons and low-income people are just beginning to be recognized. Herbert J. Gans has said, "Contemporary city planning and professions such as education, social work, public recreation, public health, medicine, and psychiatry, which Erich Lindemann has aptly described as caretakers, use middle-class values to help low-income populations solve their problems and improve their living conditions."\(^1\) Gans states that he personally finds the value judgments of "professional upper-middle class" more desirable than the values of other groups and analyzes ways in which other groups can be helped to move toward similar values.\(^2\) In the meantime, he recognizes that the difference in values, as it affects goals for urban renewal, is to allot "a higher value to housing (as measured by percentage of income to be spent for shelter) and place greater emphasis on the status function of housing" than lower-income families feel is reasonable.\(^3\)

Even if there were no serious differences among the

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 264.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 309.
citizens in the value they place on housing, there might still be differences in their attitudes toward urban renewal based on different conclusions about the effectiveness of this program as a means of eliminating slum conditions. Among those who have discussed the relation of slum buildings to patterns of living, James M. Beshers says, "reform oriented research" has done too little to try to evaluate their action program.¹ He reports that city planners may view the physical features of the city as "ultimate causal factors" and thus might say that "if slums were replaced with bright new buildings, juvenile delinquency would decline".² Clearly Beshers thinks there is a more complicated relationship.

A different kind of attack on slum conditions is suggested by Gans who emphasizes the need for new kinds of educational and social services. He bases his argument for the need for such services on an analysis of the social structure of life in the West End of Boston, which was considered by redevelopment standards to be a slum. Gans describes characteristics of the families of this (former) area which would make it unlikely that they would live differently if moved to better housing. These characteristics also limit the extent to which these citizens could expand their power as participants in urban renewal.

²Ibid., p. 10.
There are four aspects of the social structure of the people who lived in the old West End which Gans discusses. First, they are unable to participate in formal organizations and in general community activities and are thus "deprived of a method of political representation". Related to this is their pattern of being oriented to "people" rather than "objective" goals. In the second place, Gans calls attention to the gap between working class and other members of society in opportunities for income. Third is the rejection by the working class of certain types of social help which seek to take the place of care customarily given by members of the family, such as medical care. In the fourth place, the working class group place greater values on group life and a lower value on privacy and tend to penalize individuals who deviate from the thinking of the group. Thus a leader who wanted to try to define new programs would be subject to severe criticism.¹

In Gans' opinion these characteristics do not mean that the working class does not have a stable and satisfactory social organization. Mixed in the community with working class people, however, are what Gans calls "a lower-class subculture". These include female-based families, alcoholics and the mentally ill. To Gans this lower-class subculture is not just another culture but a

¹Gans, op. cit., p. 265 and p. 266.
pathological part of the community, which needs help.\footnote{Ibid., pp.268-269.}

For the working class part of the slum residents, as described by Gans, there is an implication that it may not be important, \textit{per se}, to change their physical neighborhood, except for individual families who live in unsafe housing. Other kinds of social assistance are needed more than new physical neighborhoods. As already noted, Gans would favor new physical neighborhoods too, but he implies the primary needs (and goals) are to increase work opportunities in order to increase income and to change attitudes toward working with government and using social services.

From the point of view of those in the working class and in the lower-income groups who opposed the renewal plans for Washington Park and Charlestown, there appear to be major alternative goals which would be considered more important than the goal of tearing down substandard buildings in order to "eliminate blight". One of these goals could be met by a different kind of physical planning, namely, a program to insure all families a minimum standard of housing before buildings are demolished. The other alternative goal could not be met by physical planning and would consist of providing more social services. These possibilities are discussed further in Section IX. The point here is that the decision of who represents the
citizen is a crucial goal in citizen participation because it determines the kind of program recommended.

C. Determining Housing Types, Community Facilities, and Circulation in Urban Renewal Projects

The most active discussions between the Redevelopment staff and the residents of Washington Park and Charlestown neighborhoods have been concerned with specific questions such as types of housing, community facilities and the location of new circulation routes. In both areas the Redevelopment staff presented questions to citizen organizations around these topics and furnished some guidelines for standards to assist the citizen groups in choosing among alternative plans.

It is in the area of housing types that the citizens seem to have spoken most clearly on the basis of their own values. On the extent of demolition, i.e., the standard to be used in deciding when a dwelling was to be "cleared" rather than rehabilitated, Washington Park and Charlestown residents showed the greatest difference. As reported earlier, Washington Park wanted maximum clearance and Charlestown wanted minimum clearance.

On the question of public housing the areas differed also. Washington Park citizens at early meetings expressed the desire to limit public housing, but later voted in favor of a plan for the area which provided no public housing except for a few rehabilitated buildings. Charlestown,
which was highly critical of existing public housing in the area, strongly recommended more housing for low-income families, hoping it could be provided by new designs and with greater emphasis on individual choice.

Regarding new middle-income housing, Washington Park was enthusiastic about proposed new homes to be built under church auspices and other nonprofit organizations with low interest rates (under Section 221-d-3 of the Housing Act), which would rent for much less than other privately built new housing. They also favored extensive rehabilitation programs and high standards for improvement.

Charlestown expressed greater fear that rehabilitation would force people to move who could not meet new standards. Their major emphasis was on demanding that new housing be made available before anyone was forced to move. The requirement that new housing be available for people displaced from Washington Park did not appear to be of special concern, though the citizen leaders did assure the residents that the BRA would find housing for those displaced.

On the question of taking homes that were in good condition as part of a neighborhood improvement both Washington Park and Charlestown residents had questions. The Washington Park protest came mostly from families on Banbridge Street where good homes were to be demolished in order to provide for a new cross-town road and an enlarged recreation area. A minority group of Washington Park felt
that the number of homes taken was larger than necessary, but, on the whole, there appeared to be approval of the plans for a new street pattern and increased community facilities.

In Charlestown the plans for taking homes in good condition to provide for a new neighborhood pattern were unfortunately misunderstood. Although in the Bunker Hill area the BRA proposed to take only a few homes in good condition along with deserted dwellings and vacant land on Nanny Goat Hill, the error in showing on a map these lots circled with many other good homes adjoining them was perhaps the most critical item that stirred up resentment against the total plan and specifically against the proposal of early land acquisition.

The size and location of schools and playgrounds were discussed at length in Washington Park. Here there was the underlying question of how to encourage more integration in the future neighborhoods. Citizens urged that some schools be located so as to increase the chance for a larger number of white students. In Charlestown no final recommendations regarding public facilities were reported.

Regarding new circulation patterns, Charlestown concentrated attention on a strong demand for removing the "El." ¹ Washington Park residents moved from consideration

---

¹One citizen reported that the location of the "El" along Main Street in Charlestown was done out of spite to hurt some business interest, whereas the logical place to put it even in 1900 would have been close to the B. and M. yards. Living near the "El" has long been considered a stigma in Charlestown.
of widening an existing street (Townsend Street) to serve the need for crosstown travel, to recognition of the difficulties and to a decision to develop a new, wider street with planned new housing and shopping facilities.

In its discussions about the development of its area, Washington Park citizens became aware also of the need to relate their planning to planning for the rest of Roxbury and for the whole Boston area. They considered this most in connection with choosing new routes for the roads to be improved. The location of schools also recognized this question. On the problem of relocating displaced families in new areas with the result of increasing the concentration of Negroes and adding to the density of the population, the Washington Park citizens have not been in a position to bring about more satisfactory plans.

D. Interpreting Urban Renewal Procedures

The citizens of Washington Park and Charlestown were asked not only for advice on how to develop plans for their areas, but also to help interpret the BRA procedures for executing the plans once they were worked out. In addition to holding meetings, citizen groups in both areas prepared written materials for distribution stating both what the Boston Redevelopment Authority could do and what the citizens could do.

As the Washington Park plans went into the execution stage, the need for information about procedures became
greater. Materials prepared primarily by the Boston Redevelopment Authority were distributed with the cooperation of Freedom House. The releases were in question-and-answer form. The topics included such subjects as "Relocation", "Property improvement you can make with no increase in tax assessment", "How to buy fire insurance at regular rates", and "What happens if the building where I live is acquired by the Boston Redevelopment Authority". The releases were on legal size paper and one or two pages long. They were readable and gave a great deal of information.

As reported above, the critics of the Freedom House leadership stated that other simpler materials were also needed. They would have had the information on relocation start with the sentences "Don't move in a hurry. Wait for help from the BRA". The sheet that was distributed began "Q: Will you have to move immediately? A: No, ordinarily families have up to ninety (90) days in which to move. Sometimes it takes longer, sometimes less time is required. If you cooperate with your relocation worker, you will be relocated into decent safe and sanitary housing of your choice within the prescribed period of time." There were 12 additional questions and answers on this subject.

In Charlestown there were monthly releases issued by SHOC, partly trying to arouse citizen interest and partly interpreting what could be done under BRA. Both SHOC and the Charlestown Federation also relied on the local
newspaper, The Patriot, to carry stories about their work and the BRA. As the Public Hearing approached, those opposed to the early land taking distributed a number of materials condemning the urban renewal plans.

The night of the Public Hearing, the BRA distributed to the audience a booklet which appears to have been intended to give background information. It was in extremely small type and included a series of legal statements, such as a copy of the notice of the hearing and legal definitions of the sites to be taken by the early land acquisition, technical statements on the relocation program and on business relocation, and copies of the forms used in gathering information about the condition of buildings and the need for relocation. It is hard to see how this statement would increase the understanding of the citizens regarding the intent and procedures of the Boston Redevelopment Authority in Charlestown.

E. Educating Citizens

A possible goal of citizen participation which could be significant, but usually is not associated with this activity, is the education of the citizen who participates. Like other efforts to "do" something, citizen participation is likely to enlarge the ideas of the "doer" and in turn may change both his wishes and his abilities to work for them.

The reports available from both Washington Park and Charlestown show real gains in citizen understanding of what
urban renewal might mean and how citizens might participate in the process. For example, discussions of school standards and locations in Washington Park served both to educate citizens and to provide bases of agreements with the BRA staff. The early self-help program initiated by Baldwin in Charlestown resulted not only in new activities, but in citizens wanting to learn more about different things, which led to a new historical association and a new garden club.

It appears that citizen education, where it occurs, has concentrated most on citizens who can learn most quickly. In other cities where citizen participation has not been as far developed as in Washington Park or Charlestown, discussions with citizens are often limited to leaders of civic organizations. In Boston discussion has been fragmented, but leadership appears stronger among business groups than residents. Certainly the BRA has managed to talk more with the organized citizen groups in Washington Park and Charlestown than with the lower-income citizen who may not attend a meeting.

As Gans has pointed out, the lower-income working people do not seek political representation to the same extent as middle-and-upper-income citizens. It also appears true that they do not seek out opportunities to learn about their government and to make known their wishes.

The need for new kinds of technique to communicate
with lower-income people and to help them to feel that their wishes are worth defining and important in the overall planning of the city has been recognized by Noel Day, Director of the St. Marks Social Center in the Washington Park area. He knows that it will take patience and special skills to give these people, who are usually not consulted about anything, confidence in the fact that they can help determine city policy. He sees this as the important job ahead in the field of citizen participation. He calls his goal "an educated public".

If the education of the citizen were recognized generally as an important goal, this would in turn help to change the relation of citizens to elected representatives. At the present time middle-and-upper-class people try in some instances to choose people on the basis of the policies they sponsor. Lower-income people, as pointed out by Gans, tend to elect people for the personal benefits they can arrange. The more citizens move in the direction of choosing their decision-makers on the basis of policies, the more likely are these decision-makers to represent the wishes of those who elect them.

Conflicts among different citizen groups will of course continue, whether or not citizens participate in urban renewal as a way of learning more about how they can get more of what they want. But as more citizens come to take part in the renewal work, the chances will increase that
the needs and wishes to all citizens will be taken into account in developing plans for community development.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\)Professor John T. Howard has said that he would prefer to work with youngsters who are to use a playground in planning the playground even though the result might not be as good a playground as he might design without them.
VII. THE ROLE OF THE CITIZEN IN RELATION TO THE PLANNER

The relationship between the citizen and the planner may be thought of as the process by which planning takes place, as distinguished from specific decisions about the goals of planning or programs or projects. This human relationship provides the machinery by which the work gets done.

The roles of the citizen and the planner vary from group to group and, over time, with differences in the characteristics of the individual citizens and planners involved and with the experience of each. The appropriate or "right" roles may thus differ in different circumstances, but it is believed that there is a direction of growth toward increasing responsibility by the citizen in the planning process, especially in the task of determining the goals and policies of planning. The technical jobs of engineering and administration will remain the duties of the professional. In any area at any time, different citizen groups may simultaneously have different relationships to planning agencies.

If the objective of citizen participation is greater understanding of the planning problem and independence in determining goals and policies, the sequence of different roles suggested here may be interpreted as providing a rough set of criteria for judging the progress of the
citizen participation process. This question of the relation of citizen to planner is closely related to that discussed in the following section of the extent to which different citizens participate in different kinds of decisions.¹

A. Dependent and Caretaker

The term "caretaker" is borrowed from Erich Lindemann² and has its basis in the traditional relation that developed between professional welfare personnel and those for whom they tried to "do good". It carries the implication of the wise parent who arranges for the child who is given only a minimum of responsibility. In this case the decisions are made by the planner; it is assumed that the planner "knows best".

Where there is active citizen participation in

¹The possibility of a range of different relationships between planner and citizen is presented in contrast to the thesis of Margot G. Strauss which assumes that the major problem in citizen participation is that of "communication" between planner and citizen, each of whom accepts his role.

²Quoted by Gans, op. cit., p. IX.
government, it is unlikely that the relation between citizen and planner would be that of dependent and caretaker. In neither Washington Park nor Charlestown does this seem to define the relationship as a whole, though there were undoubtedly some individuals who felt that they "did not know enough" to try to influence the planning agency. Thus when the question asked by the BRA staff in Roxbury about planning an "ideal" community seemed to demand too much, several citizens said "that was the planners' job".

The efforts of ABCD in Roxbury to develop new social services to meet community needs seem to come closer to the old line position of a caretaker in relation to a dependent than does the physical planning situation, in spite of the fact that ABCD is trying to work with citizens in planning social services as BRA works on physical planning questions. It is hoped that as time goes on more citizens will share more actively with professionals in planning new social services. The development of social services has been much less advanced in Charlestown than in Washington Park.

B. Constituent and Political Leader

The planner on a renewal program works for a municipal government. The citizens elect the government officials who in turn hire the planning staff (or appoint the Planning Commission which hires staff). The citizen associates the planning staff with their elected officials and may
look to this staff to give favors if they can be persuaded to do so. As in the previous situation, the planner is the one primarily responsible for making decisions, but in this case the citizen takes more initiative in making suggestions or in exercising a veto.

The planner is also acting in a political capacity when he chooses to promote urban renewal for the benefit of some citizens and against the wishes of others whom he may choose not to consult. Wilson maintains that to try "to obtain the consent of those neighborhoods selected for renewal" may mean that "the central city may have to abandon the goal of recolonizing itself with tax-paying, culture-loving, free-spending middle class". He recognizes that the Mayor may, however, reach out to neighborhood groups to gain support, which he can no longer obtain by old style machine politics. He cites Boston as a place where the Mayor looked to neighborhood support to help assure re-election. (It was in Charlestown that opponents to the Mayor sought to weaken the support by attacking urban renewal.)

In stating that the "crucial problem is how to make attention to these neighborhood demands compatible with city-wide programs", Wilson is quite right, but his assertion that old-style political leaders, when faced with

1Wilson, op. cit., p. 247.
2Ibid., p. 248.
this problem, can no longer resolve this inevitable conflict by "buying off" the neighborhood opponents, may be answered by new techniques. To the writer it might be possible to use modern attractions of higher minimum housing standards and better neighborhoods at prices the lower-income families can afford to win their support for city-wide plans.

C. Junior and Senior Partners

Another citizen-planner relationship might be defined as a Junior-Senior partnership, but where neither side is very enthusiastic about the joint venture and neither side has much confidence in the other. The citizens meet with the planning staff because they hope to have a little influence, and the planning staff meet with the citizens because they must to get political acceptance of the plans they propose. This seems to describe the relation between the BRA staff and the leaders of the Charlestown Federation.

It also seems to describe the relation of SHOC in its early days with the BRA, although SHOC was much more clear about its wishes than the Federation appears to have been. However, the BRA seems to have been less sensitive to the citizens' wishes in Charlestown than it was in Washington Park. For example, the clear statement of the citizens' Planning Council in Charlestown that new residences be built before any homes were demolished and their demand for a minimum of demolition were not heeded in the plans

\footnote{Ibid.}
presented at the January 1963 hearing. The BRA seemed to favor more demolition than the community wanted.

In this relationship the citizen may be called in only after the basic plan is already determined. This kind of relationship between citizen and planner was expressed by NAHRO President Ira S. Robbins in a recent issue of the *Journal of Housing.* He said, "Where a project or a program is initiated by a public agency, citizen participation begins when the agency is in a position to present in writing an outline of its proposal, with the clear understanding that it welcomes the study of the proposal by citizen groups and will carefully consider their recommendations." In defining "citizen participation" Robbins says, "What I refer to is the activity of groups that are informed, intelligent, and constructive--the groups that do their homework; that oppose shortsighted, badly planned proposals; and that support sound housing and renewal programs for the community as a whole."

D. Client and Professional

The attitude of Freedom House toward the BRA planners can be defined as a fourth kind of relationship, that of a client toward a professional. Freedom House had long wanted to improve the neighborhood. Its goals were fairly well known even before the BRA began to think about a renewal program in Roxbury. When the BRA came along Freedom

---

House looked upon the BRA staff as a way to help them move the neighborhood in the direction they wanted it to go. They needed the technical help of the BRA staff in the same way as a person drawing up a will needs the help of a lawyer.

Because Freedom House had faith that the BRA could help them get the "better" community they wanted, they were willing to look to the planners for guidance on such matters as standards for community facilities and measures for estimating the needed width of future streets. Because the BRA appeared to be in fundamental agreement with the kind of plan Freedom House wanted for Washington Park, they could proceed with maximum coordination in the development of procedures for execution. These roles require able local leadership and well organized channels for communication among citizens. It usually implies also a largely homogeneous group of citizens.

The citizens' responsibility for the development of social services may also move in the direction of client-professional relation from the present dependent-caretaker relation. ABCD while trying to develop "preventive" services seems to be trying both to be a caretaker and an agency to help citizens define their own wants.\(^1\)

\(^1\)As the term "client" is used in social work it means a "dependent"; as it is used here it means the "independent" decision-maker. It is recognized that the individual in need of social services may not be able to make a decision, but the group or neighborhood in which he lives could initiate plans for services to meet local needs.
E. Collective Bargaining

In contrast to the client-professional relationship where the citizen relies directly on the advice of the planner, but also has a clear idea of his wishes, there may be a situation in which the citizen is much more critical of the planner's proposals, especially the basic goals proposed. This might be termed a relationship of collective bargaining.

In the Washington Park area, the few leaders who were most concerned about the effect of the renewal plans on the lower-income families of the area felt that citizen participation with the planners was essentially a program of collective bargaining. They used the term in defining their role. As noted, the planners were working with the support of the articulate majority; thus the minority group was really bargaining with the planners because they were at odds with other citizen groups.

In Charlestown there appears to have been some element of collective bargaining between the Federation leaders and the BRA staff, though the idea of a Junior-Senior Partnership, on the whole, describes the situation better. To some extent the resident-citizens seem to have developed a program which they wanted to persuade the BRA to accept.

F. Citizen and Educator

As citizens become more definite about the kinds of changes they hope to accomplish by physical planning and
more analytical about the difficulties in achieving these goals, a new sort of relationship may develop between them and the planner. They may come to look to the planner as a source of information about how a program might be developed as well as for the manpower that will carry out specific projects that are agreed to. But the decision about what should be the program and the project will rest more with the citizen than with the planner.

This position on the part of the citizen is similar to that of client and professional except that the citizen is less passive and looks to more information, not just to solve the immediate problem as would a client, but to help him come to understand broader issues and more alternative courses of action among which he may choose. The process might become cumulative, for as the citizen becomes more educated, he would be able to ask for more information and thus take an even more active part in planning his environment.

This relationship would require changes in the attitudes of planners too. As Elmer Foster, Director of Mayor Collins' Citizen Relations Department,¹ has said, the planner would have to be "less of a decision-maker and more of a technician".² Foster recognizes that until

¹By legislative order, this Department is operated under the general direction of the Administrator of the Boston Redevelopment Authority.

²Telephone talk with Mr. Foster, December 18, 1963.
citizens are further educated the planner is also useful as the initiator of suggestions for new physical planning.

In his role as educator, the planner would present to citizens various alternative solutions to specific questions, as he would also do as a professional with a client or in the role of a collective bargainer. The difference between the role of educator and the previous roles would lie in his having less responsibility for a decision and more responsibility for helping the citizen see the issues which must be taken into account in making a decision. It is also clear that the planner cannot take this role until the citizen is educated enough to make decisions (really recommendations to the City Council or Mayor) and motivated to take this responsibility. The timing of the shift from role of client-professional to citizen-educator is itself a joint decision for the citizen and the planner.¹

As technician and educator the planner might be considered to fill the place in physical planning for the community that the psychiatrist plays in relation to an

¹The idea that planners should try to educate citizens about planning problems was suggested by Mel Scott in 1947. The objective of his proposal is the same as that described in this section, but he expected the planner to take a more active part in "making the plan" than is suggested here. Scott said, "I would combine investigation of community problems and needs with group discussion and training in the techniques of political action. I would not only inform citizens but equip them to act upon their convictions." The work is to be directed by a "planning educator" who is to be trained not only as a planner but as an adult educator. On the basis of surveys made with the help of civic leaders, this planning educator "would first develop an interpretive picture that would enable
individual. Thomas S. Szasz has written, "what psycho-
analysis (and some other therapies) can offer him (i.e.,
the citizen) is a better knowledge of himself, which may
enable him to make new choices in the conduct of his life."¹
The physical planner also can offer the citizen knowledge.
He would be responsible for labelling the bottles and ex-
plaining the labels.

everyone to see clearly the community as a dynamic entity". The object would be "to develop a body of citizens who
thoroughly understood the picture and through them to com-
mmit the community to a program of planned reconstruction
and development". Mel Scott, "Roots for Democracy," Jour-
nal of the American Institute of Planners, Spring 1947,
pp. 11-16.

¹ Thomas S. Szasz, M. D., "What Psychiatry Can and
VIII. STRENGTHENING PARTICIPATION BY ALL CITIZENS

How to get a clear picture of what "the citizen" wants is the basic problem of a democratic government. On the one hand, there are special interest groups which seek programs to their own advantage; on the other hand, there are great numbers of citizens characterized by apathy and lack of know-how, but who still look to the government to provide benefits they cannot gain individually. The process of citizen participation in urban renewal, as in other government decisions, involves the balancing of these different citizen groups.

The preceding sections have indicated that there were in both Washington Park and Charlestown different citizen groups which had an interest in urban renewal. Primarily these were resident-citizen groups, but there were also business, church, civic, and social organizations. Other neighborhoods also are known to have citizen groups working on renewal with varying degrees of strength.

There are in Boston a few strong, central business and civic-citizen groups such as the Committee on the Government Center and the Chamber of Commerce Committee on the Development of the Waterfront. Only recently has the Mayor appointed a city-wide Citizens' Advisory Committee for urban renewal to meet the requirements of the workable program. Subcommittees of this large group are just
beginning to try to define their roles. It is not clear at present whether this very large city-wide committee will be primarily a way of channeling information from the Re-development Authority to citizens for their comment or will also be able to serve as a means to formulate citizen wishes and thereby help to guide the Boston programs of planning and renewal.

"Success" in citizen participation in community improvement, to the writer, should be defined in terms of the contribution made in advancing the interests of citizens. Criteria for promoting "success", it is suggested, include such factors as the degree to which the participation provides for representation of all citizens, is free from the control of any one group of citizens and of the planning agency, and has found means to communicate with all citizens. These tests of success are quite different from those suggested by others who look to the accomplishment of a renewal project per se.

The idea that citizen participation may be considered a success when it aids the accomplishment of a renewal project has been supported by Rossi and Dentler and, by implication, by Wilson. In their study of the urban renewal program in North West Hyde Park in Chicago, Rossi and Dentler conclude that the local citizen Community Conference "made its greatest contribution in its passive rather than its active roles. That is to say, the Conference obtained for the idea of planning and for the plan itself a mass
base of support which facilitated the planning process and the acceptance of the Final Plan in the local community and 'downtown'. The authors explain that had the organization tried to be less of a "transmission-belt" they would not have had the popular support they did, would have slowed up negotiations by increasing local opposition, and might have been accused of being a pressure group, which might have jeopardized their funds from a private foundation.

The means by which this "successful" participation was advanced included strong local leadership, the support of the local leaders by a broader community organization, and the ability of the local organization in directing the planning effort toward "public use" planning rather than "private use" planning.

From the Rossi and Dentler point of view, the citizen activities in Washington Park would be considered a "success" and those in Charlestown a "failure". But the situation is really more complicated if one attempts to judge what was in the interests of the citizens. From the latter point of view, both Washington Park and Charlestown had some good and some poor scores.

---


2 Ibid., p. 287.

3 Ibid., p. 217 and p. 219.
A. Representation at the Neighborhood Level

Although the instructions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency regarding citizen participation in preparing the workable program urge that the citizen organization be made "representative", they do not discuss the many different circumstances that may arise. They recognize that each locality is different, and perhaps that is all that the Federal government can do in terms of policy, but citizens, planners, and community organizers need to give more attention to how to deal with these conflicting interests. One important point seems to be the need for increasing recognition that all citizens should be represented in making recommendations on what government should do.¹

Within a neighborhood or area such as Washington Park or Charlestown the question of representation means finding a way to weigh the wishes of different groups in relation to each other. The different groups include residents vs. nonresidential interests, middle-and-high-income families vs. lower-income families, owners vs. tenants, big business firms vs. small business firms, education and charity organizations vs. taxpayers, long-time residents vs. newer residents, white vs. nonwhite, and all the complex

¹The recent ASPO Newsletter refers to early examples of "citizen participation" which include an exhibit of plans in 1909, showing Boston in 1915, and a contest in 1944 for programs for the future Boston. These were highly desirable activities but, to the writer, hardly qualify as "representative". (Eliot, Graham and Crane, op. cit., p. 44.)
variations of the "in's" vs. the "out's".

Closely related to the question of what groups in the community are to be represented in the citizen movement is that of who is to serve as leader. There is no doubt that a strong leader from whatever group he comes makes a big difference in the weight that his group will have in the overall citizen activities. A strong leader from a small minority group can challenge a large majority, whereas, if the leadership of even a large minority is weak, the opposition will not be effective.

The kind of skill needed in a leader may also vary according to the character of the types and experience of citizen groups in an area to be organized. Where there are strong differences of opinion among the citizens the arts of persuasion, compromise and patience become more important than where a group is largely homogeneous.

In Washington Park it appears that both the Steering Committee and CURAC did in fact represent the opinions of the majority of the citizens. For both, Freedom House personnel offered strong leadership. The families who were to be displaced, on the other hand, did not have strong leadership, and there is serious question as to whether they were adequately represented in making plans for the area, especially at the beginning of the program. (This is not necessarily to question the decision not to include more lower-priced housing in the renewed area, but to suggest that, had the lower-income families been more strongly
represented, more effective plans might have been developed on a city-wide basis to meet their needs.)

In Charlestown the problem of representation was more difficult than in Washington Park as there was no long experience with a central agency, like Freedom House or the Roxbury Community Council in Roxbury. SHOC did not try to represent nonresidential interests, and the Federation was a loosely knit organization without strong leadership. It is doubtful if the Federation spoke as truly for its members in Charlestown as CURAC did for Washington Park citizens. In addition, there was strong leadership among "splinter" groups. The arrangement to hold the hearing in January 1963 was also probably timed earlier than desirable for full discussion of the proposal among Charlestown citizens. It is believed that there were, in fact, serious divisions among the citizens regarding urban renewal even though the proportion opposed to renewal may not have been as high as appeared at the public hearing.

If one accepts the idea that citizen participation should include representation of all citizens, a difficult question arises in regard to how to deal with citizens who do not easily express themselves or who are not very much interested in participating, or even opposed to taking part in any discussion of city activities. One answer might be that all groups must be "taken into account", but need not directly participate. This may be the most that can be done under some circumstances. However, to the writer it
seems important to try to get as much direct response from as many citizens as possible on choices of government action, especially those that affect the conditions under which they live.

Another answer to the question of how much to try to involve all citizens would be to decide action on the basis of the kinds of questions that are to be asked and an analysis of whether participation would be important to individual groups of citizens. Thus an effort might be made to reach all citizens who may be required to move in order to help them understand clearly what choices they have for relocation and to get their help in planning for the move. These would be questions of implementation. Less effort would be made to get the opinions of potential relocatees regarding the location of new public facilities and transportation or in deciding what standard of housing is to be accepted as not requiring demolition. These are problems of project development. Citizens who found it hard to discuss these questions, or who were likely to be disturbed by discussion of what to demolish, would be (by kindness) left out of the process of this participation.

The basic question of whether to consider urban renewal as a way of raising revenue is of less interest to individual neighborhoods than it would be to a group of citizens advising, for example, on city-wide revenues and might not be asked of a neighborhood-citizen group, although the neighborhood group would be consulted about the
question of whether to consider renewal for the neighborhood. Thus the neighborhood group might reject the renewal plan, as was done in Charlestown, though it might also recognize the need for new city revenue if asked to consider this question.

A third kind of answer to the question of who should participate might be to rank citizens and citizen organizations by their influence on the growth of the city. (Granted this would be a rough scale.) Citizens who do not own any property would probably be given least attention. Owners of their homes would be more important to consult. Owners of several homes or of a business which employed many people would be even more influential. On this scale bankers, educational organizations, or large civic groups would be perhaps the most important to consult. Yet these large organizations do not usually have identical interests with resident-citizens or with the development of a neighborhood for residential purposes. In general they are more concerned with the overall image of the city, most probably the Central Business District, but they may also include organizations, like a university or ethnic organization, which has a primary interest in one section of the city. In contrast to these large, concentrated power groups, resident-citizen interests are relatively fragmented.

The choice of what is desirable representation will, of course, rest also on the choice made about what is the goal of citizen participation in urban renewal. If the
goal is the accomplishment of an urban renewal project, then it would be logical to consult only those citizens who will most readily approve the program. Wilson supports this position when he says, "citizen participation is not an end in itself but a means to other ends, and it should be judged in terms of the ends it is likely to serve. There is nothing but confusion to be gained from insisting that urban renewal and grass-roots democracy are, and always should be, compatible".¹ To the writer, it appears more likely that we will obtain plans that will serve the neighborhood and city best by consulting all people, rather than encouraging a small top group to make the basic decisions and letting resident-citizens consider only the somewhat lesser questions of how many parks to construct and how to handle relocation.

At the neighborhood level it appears then that citizen participation can contribute most to the probable welfare of the community by seeking to represent all citizens. But for a city to work out programs to help all citizens of the city, there is also need for a citizens' organization that will find a way to relate the interests of different neighborhoods as well as different citizen groups to each other.

B. **City-wide and Metropolitan Representation**

Perhaps the most difficult question in developing citizen participation in community improvement is how to relate neighborhood groups to city-wide citizen organization. The workable program requires a city-wide citizens' advisory committee. As already noted, the HHFA instructions about citizen participation are much less definite in requiring neighborhood citizens' activities. Yet to get meaningful response from citizens about a neighborhood project, it is essential that there be a local neighborhood organization. Certainly the kind of comments made in Washington Park and Charlestown would not have been made by a city-wide committee.

One of the problems has already been suggested in the report of the Housing Association of Metropolitan Boston, namely the assumption that families (or the resident-citizens) are most important on the neighborhood level and nonresidential interests most important on the city-wide level. To the writer, this assumption is responsible for discouraging the development of a city-wide program that is concerned with the living arrangements of the residents as well as with the prosperity of the businesses. Only at the city-wide discussions can the resident-citizen reasonably present the needs of his group in relation to transportation, shopping areas, industrial development or regional educational interests. It seems to the writer, therefore, essential that there be an effort made in the
city-wide citizens' organization to know and understand the wishes of resident-citizens in their respective neighborhoods, and resident-citizens should see that they are so understood.

It is recognized that both at the city-wide level and at the neighborhood level, as already illustrated, there will be more than one point of view. The city-wide citizen organization can help to summarize these points of view, to evaluate them and to begin to work out compromises or ways of meeting different interests simultaneously. If citizen participation is to represent the interests of all citizens, both city-wide and neighborhood groups must be developed and some way found to relate them to each other.

At the present time the Boston citizen participation program is split between the neighborhood organizations, on one hand, and the new large city-wide organization on the other hand. The neighborhood groups developed following the emphasis on renewal projects which are limited to specific neighborhoods. The city-wide Advisory Committee of some 300 well-known citizens was established to meet the Federal requirement, but does not have adequate staff to do any active research and analysis.\(^1\) It serves a function as a channel of communication to these leading citizens about the major features of the renewal program.

\(^1\)The Mayor invited some 300 citizens from neighborhood citizen organizations and from major city-wide interests to serve on this new committee by a letter of August 16, 1963. The group has met approximately monthly since September 1963.
One of the facts that makes it difficult for resident-citizens from different neighborhoods to work toward a combined city-wide plan for all residents and a comprehensive relationship with nonresidential interests is the lack of a recognized city-wide plan for future land use and development. Neighborhood plans cannot be related to each other without a general plan to show overall needs and resources, and neighborhood citizen groups cannot relate intelligently to other interest groups without information both about other neighborhood plans and city-wide development. The Freedom House leaders were well aware of such a need, but without city-wide goals and related, city-wide citizen organization, there was little they could do to insure a sound relationship between the development of their neighborhood and other parts of the city.

Just as there is need to relate different citizen interests to each other on a city-wide basis, so there is need for relating city needs to those of surrounding suburbs. The newly formed advisory Metropolitan Area Planning Council is a step toward this goal and may well serve as a nucleus for sharing citizen hopes and fears over the metropolitan area.

It should also be said that the mechanics of providing for greater citizen participation might be worked out in several different ways. The logical way seems to be to develop a new city-wide citizen organization with staff, but only a couple of the very largest cities in the
United States seem to have managed to keep such an independent citizens' group going on a city-wide basis. Another way to meet a part of the need for more communication with citizens would be to expand this kind of activity as part of a planning agency. As pointed out in the following section, it would, however, be important for this planning agency to be free from direction by the Redevelopment Authority if it is to help citizens formulate suggestions for changing plans proposed by the BRA. A third way would be to expand a research and counselling service related to the City Council.

C. Financing

For either a neighborhood or a city-wide citizens' organization, the greatest problem for continuing operation appears to be largely that of raising money to support staff and office expenses. The major alternatives seem to be funds from the renewal agency itself, funds from some other city source, funds from the Red Feather organization of the municipality and funds from other private sources. There is, of course, no reason why several sources might not be used at the same time.

If the major goal of citizen participation in urban renewal is to help interpret given plans and assist in implementation, then it is logical for funds to come primarily from the renewal agency. Even if the objective is to get suggestions from citizens about the types of housing,
number and location of community facilities and patterns for circulation, financial help from the renewal agency would be appropriate. If, on the other hand, the citizens' organization is to criticize the renewal program from the point of view of its benefit to citizens as a whole, then financing by the renewal agency is likely to curtail effective action.

In the recent interpretations of citizen participation activities in connection with the workable program, Federal funds are made available to assist in providing professional help with citizen organization. This implies that the Federal government leans toward having citizen groups serve primarily as assisting and promoting groups for the renewal programs.

NAHRO (the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials) clearly backs the workable program statements regarding financial help for citizen participation. In the 1963-65 policy resolution NAHRO stated: "NAHRO repeats its 1961 recommendation that, as part of the costs of housing renewal programs, there be included the cost of training neighborhood organization leaders. It also reaffirms its belief in the need for citizen participation at the neighborhood level, but repeats the caution that such participation must arise from groups that are informed, intelligent, and constructive and that operate in support of programs that are consistent with a sound housing and renewal effort for the community as a
whole."¹ They favor the Federal government giving money, but want to give it only where citizens are constructive (it sounds a lot like saying they will help those who basically agree with them).

In 1957 William Brussat, in writing an information bulletin for NAHRO, urged strongly at least in a conservation neighborhood the citizen organization should be independently financed. (In the writer's opinion it is too bad NAHRO did not keep this position.) After including in the "ground rules" for a coordinated citizen approach, "full time professional leadership . . as early in the organization as possible,"² he urged a central group to serve as a clearing house and advise new groups and said, "While the municipality may offer assistance in one form or another to neighborhood groups, they should have a creature of their own. The program desired by the neighborhood groups may not always meet with the approval of the municipal government and vice-versa. An independent citizen group is a free agent and represents the most feasible way of welding the neighborhood groups into a real city-wide


force for the renewal of the city. Such a group would have a pressure potential for urban renewal unequalled in the history of local development, city planning and civic improvement.\footnote{Brussat noted that something in this direction was already operating in Philadelphia in the Citizens' Council.}

A more recent statement, also in contrast to the official NAHRO position that funds to train local leaders should come from the renewal agency, was made in 1962, at a Conference on Social Work in Housing and Urban Renewal sponsored by NAHRO. Albert Rosenberg, Director of the Community Organization Division of the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency said, "The autonomy of local citizens groups is essential; they must not be set up as 'creatures' of the agency charged with responsibility for urban renewal". He reports that in Baltimore the mayor had appointed a committee, which proved to be suspect, and only after the professional staff had helped to get local leaders elected, could citizen participation work.\footnote{Ibid., p. 7.}

In Washington Park the financial help making possible Freedom House leadership of citizens is coming mainly from the Boston Redevelopment Authority, although, as already stated, Freedom House leaders have stated they would prefer

\footnote{National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, \textit{Change for the Better}, 1962, p. 15.}
private funds. In Charlestown a representative of ABCD was assigned to the area under ABCD's grant from the Ford Foundation, but his assignment seemed also to involve responsibility to the Boston Redevelopment Authority as well as to the citizens of Charlestown. Thus in both Roxbury and Charlestown, the financial arrangements seemed to make it hard for a local citizens' organization to stand for goals that differed very much from those desired by the Boston Redevelopment Authority.

D. Communication Techniques

A fourth important criterion for promoting successful citizen participation is the development of methods to communicate with citizens of different backgrounds and interests. This is needed both for neighborhood and city-wide planning. This approach has not been given serious attention by many city planners, but has been discussed by some groups of sociologists. The HHFA literature and NAHRO reports seem to suggest that the citizens who are most important to communicate with are those who are already in positions of leadership in the neighborhoods where renewal work is being considered.

The ways in which other citizens can be brought into the process of participation will vary widely. It is to be expected that early steps will result in clumsy and exaggerated opinions from citizens who do not have background to know how to participate in working from one stage to
another. James G. Banks when he was Assistant Commissioner for Relocation and Community Organization in the Urban Renewal Administration said, "most planners are exasperated by the efforts of citizens to inject themselves in planning considerations" which they generally consider the "prerogatives of the professionals". They look at citizens as "uninformed nuisances". He states that citizen participation "must be conceived as a developing process, developing citizen sophistication and understanding." As a method he suggests meeting with groups of from 3 to 5 families at a time, or block groups, long before larger meetings are held.

In the Hyde Park-Kenwood area in Chicago a questionnaire technique was used to try to learn the reactions of individual citizens. The questions asked included "Generally speaking, do you like or dislike living in this neighborhood? What things about living here do you like? What things do you dislike? For each thing liked or disliked, do you feel strongly about this or is it not too important to you?" The results showed that "more people were more concerned about rising crime and street disorders than were anxious to have their houses improved. More people


2Ibid., p. 185.

3Ibid., p. 185.
complained about the dirt and the changed (deteriorating) condition of the public schools than did about the shopping facilities which were scheduled for major replacement. More complained about poor street lighting, poor police protection, poor traffic control, poor parking conditions, than about the livability of their own homes.\(^1\) Donald Bogue, who reported this technique at a NAHRO meeting, said "the investigation was not initiated by planners and welcomed little".\(^2\)

Bogue suggested that further research might inquire "why" citizens answer the way they do to the questions asked. He commented "many plans go hay wire simply because people fail to behave the way the planners predicted they would".\(^3\) He added also that another way to avoid costly blunders would be to try to assess the reasoning that people will go through when confronted with the situation the planners intend to produce. He predicted that planners will in time "not only tolerate" this kind of inquiry but "will welcome it".\(^4\)

The introduction and development of new techniques of communication will require new types of professional staff. To some extent persons trained in community organization in schools of social work have this skill, but many of these people look to community organization

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 27

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Ibid.
work as a form of therapy for individual members of society rather than as ways to help citizens express what they want and find ways to make these wants known. Persons trained in workers' education seem to come closer to the kind of skill now needed in providing citizen education for participation in planning. Workers' education differs from the usual adult education program in putting more emphasis on seeking to draw from the adult students their own points of view and the goals for which they want to work, rather than merely reporting to them information about what others have done.

The need for new kinds of techniques to communicate with some citizens was clearly seen by Noel Day in Washington Park. He emphasized that lower-income citizens need much encouragement to believe that their ideas are wanted. They need to have people meet with them in small groups and to talk rather than try to communicate by printed matter. Information from these lower-income people might be quite different from that received from more educated and sophisticated groups. If their preferences could be taken into account in planning to meet their needs, it might be found that entirely new types of environmental arrangements would be developed in the process of urban renewal.\(^1\)

\(^1\)A pilot study undertaken at Princeton in 1942 considered several questions which are important in the area of citizen communication and was well ahead of much done today. The objects of the study were (1) to determine whether a survey could be part of planning work, (It stated that "the attitudes and desires of the citizenry have been
E. Summary

This section on strengthening citizen participation in urban renewal is based on the assumption that citizen participation is desirable as a means of defining what citizens want, rather than as a way of obtaining citizen approval of a particular renewal program. It is felt that success in defining planning goals and in giving a valid citizen reaction to renewal proposals can be increased if the citizen organization seeks to represent all citizens both on the neighborhood level and on a city-wide level, if the organization is financially independent of the renewal authority and if the organization develops new techniques for communicating with all citizens.

In both Washington Park and in Charlestown, the organized citizen groups appear to have spoken for majority groups, but in both areas there were minority groups whose

---

(2) to determine "the extent to which the average citizen is interested and informed concerning his own neighborhood town and local government; his familiarity with the idea of city planning; an indication of what his behavior might be if his daily life were disrupted by planning programs; and lastly whether he would rather live in the city or in the country." and (3) "to outline in simple form the technique utilized in making the survey . . as an aid to planning commissions . . which may wish to conduct surveys of local public opinion as a part of their planning efforts." Two persons interviewed 246 people in two weeks. The results showed especially useful information on parking. Bureau of Urban Research, Urban Planning and Public Opinion, A Pilot Study, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., 1942.
interests do not appear to have been adequately represented and for whom no appropriate program was considered. In Washington Park the majority wanted renewal; in Charlestown, the reverse. In Washington Park the minority were the lower-income families who were being displaced. For them a city-wide program to assure less loss of housing space and family income might have been appropriate. In Charlestown there was a minority group which wanted property improvement, and for them a small program covering only a limited part of the area might have been proposed.

For neither area was there the support in planning and in citizen organization that might have come if there had been a city-wide comprehensive plan for Boston and an active, well staffed, city-wide organization interested in getting a comprehensive understanding of the needs of all citizens.

In neither Washington Park nor in Charlestown was there enough effort to learn the wishes of the citizens who are not usually consulted. In both areas, and in other parts of the city, there is great need to develop these techniques further.
IX. RELATION OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION
TO GOALS FOR URBAN RENEWAL

If it is true, as suggested in Section VI, that the goals of the urban renewal program reflect both the identification of the people who contribute to making the choice and the values of those who participate, then it is to be expected that, if the composition of the citizen group and others who share in deciding urban renewal goals and programs in Boston is changed, the goals and programs may be modified. The question is whether strengthening the participation of all citizens in urban renewal would affect the present urban renewal program of Boston.

Time has not permitted the discussion of the suggestions made in this section with resident-citizens of Washington Park and Charlestown in the same way that their experiences in the renewal program were discussed. Perhaps they would not agree that, if given a broader choice in what they would like done in their communities, they would recommend some basic changes. The chance that they would, if adequately informed, express preferences for some new goals seems high to the writer, and some of the possible developments have been suggested in this section.

It has been suggested in the previous section that neighborhood groups and especially the resident-citizen have had little to do with the decision of whether or not
to undertake a renewal program at all. The introduction (or rather, expansion) of urban renewal is believed to have been primarily a political decision by the Mayor in the face of great pressure to find ways to lower the tax rate of Boston. By accepting the strategy offered by the Federal government of promoting an urban renewal program, he was able to offer to Boston citizens a hope for higher tax revenues, a "renewed city" and the "end of blight and slums". The initiation of the renewal program was a strong political move and, in the opinion of the writer, sparked new confidence in the central city and new citizen activities of many sorts. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to consider the political aspects of this executive act of leadership.¹

In Boston the resident-citizen has been consulted about urban renewal plans almost exclusively in connection with consideration of how the program might be worked out in his neighborhood. This was the experience in both Washington Park and Charlestown. In both areas some citizens reached out for the Mayor's help. Washington Park leaders took initiative asking for a renewal program because they wanted just what the Mayor and Federal government offered, namely, higher valued properties, the

demolition of substandard homes and the prevention of the spread of "blight". Charlestown too had a strong group, SHOC, seeking ways to improve their area but with a difference; from the beginning they wanted help in providing better housing for lower-income families.

In neither area, at the time renewal was first proposed, did there exist a citizens' organization which met the criteria suggested in the preceding section for strong citizen participation. In neither area had there been developed a citizen group that attempted to represent all citizens, although this criterion was one with which both areas were sympathetic. At the early stage, funds for citizen organization work were raised locally and independent of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, but with increasing demands for more time and professional techniques in organizing, the help of ABCD became important and then, in Washington Park the help of the BRA. Although ABCD is privately financed, it appears that it was originally closely tied to the renewal program and established in part to help "promote" the program as well as provide services to those whom the program affected. Certainly in neither Washington Park nor Charlestown had techniques been developed that are needed to communicate with lower-income persons and those not used to organized activities.

In addition, the fact that there was no recognized city-wide plan for Boston nor agency actively working on such a goal, at the time that urban renewal programs were
first being considered, made it impossible for the neighborhood groups to relate their individual needs to overall city needs and goals. Thus local needs for residents were not related to an overall city-wide housing program or to overall city development.

Had there been a different pattern of citizen organization at the time that urban renewal was being proposed by the Mayor, how might this have affected the urban renewal activities of the city? If a citizen program that came closer to meeting the criteria of representing all citizens, having financial independence and using techniques that promoted communication with all citizens, were developed now, how might this influence the urban renewal goals and programs in the future?

It is in helping to determine the long range goals for planning, including urban renewal, that citizen opinion seems most essential, and it is at this level of recommendation that the resident-citizen of Boston seems least well organized to act. Thus efforts to work toward citizen participation that would meet the criteria for stronger participation by resident-citizens would mean changes both in neighborhood-citizen organization and activities and in the city-wide organization and activities.

The ultimate goals of city planning are social,¹ and

while the city planner limits himself to plans involving physical things, many of the goals also require planning regarding services; and often the choice of program by the citizen is a matter of how to relate physical and social programs. To the citizen, recommendations on goals for community improvement may involve a choice between physical plans and plans for services as well as choices among different physical plans. The citizens' choice whether or not to adopt urban renewal is a little like a decision on a capital improvement program; should money be spent on a capital improvement or for increased operating expenses for a current program, and this decision in turn involves knowledge of what kind of capital improvement might be undertaken.

It is recognized that the final choice between expansion of physical plans and services must be made by the elected representatives, but it seems important for local citizen groups and for a city-wide citizens' organization to provide means for discussing these alternatives before they come before the city council for decision. Only by helping people see the alternatives in the broadest perspective, can honest opinions and choices by obtained. It is realized that not all citizens will in fact participate in these discussions, but it is believed that more effort should be made than at present to get small group meetings and recommendations from small groups about choices between physical plans and services, as well as choices among
different physical plans as is now urged in citizen participation under the workable program. Choices made in small groups should then be brought together for overall evaluation by a city-wide citizens' agency, before the legislative body makes a decision. (Various ways of providing for the citizens' citywide agency have already been mentioned in Section VIII.)

This report cannot begin to explore all the alternatives that might be considered to the present renewal program if a citizens' organization came into existence that met the criteria suggested to strengthen citizen participation. The point has been emphasized that, with a change in the composition of the citizen group, the goals and programs would be likely to vary. Two of the major alternatives that might be recommended either as priorities ahead of present programs of renewal or as simultaneous programs have already been suggested. They are a minimum housing standard and new social services. Another supplementary goal would be new methods of raising revenues for the central city. These goals would not be obtained within the urban renewal program, but they might be considered by citizens within a new and broadened context of a workable program.

A. A Minimum Housing Standard

It appears that the citizens least well served by the Urban Renewal programs made possible by the 1954 legislation
are the lowest-income members who live in substandard housing. While the urban renewal program provides that in promoting higher priced new buildings, displaced persons shall be relocated in standard housing, the program does not provide for creating the housing needed by the lower-income families, nor for assisting them to pay for this housing. Both the objective of what should be a minimum standard of housing (and how it might vary for different groups) and how to establish such a level, need much more attention. If the kinds of housing desired by lower-income families were determined with their help, new neighborhood patterns might develop.

Greater attention on providing adequate housing would be a part of the general objective of eliminating poverty. It is this aspect of poverty that the 1949 Housing Act aimed to attack by its goal of a decent home for every family, but specific programs failed to recognize the importance of raising incomes. The objective seems to have taken a low second place to programs that aim first to provide new homes for those who can afford them. If the goal of eliminating poverty is given greater attention, then renewal and housing programs would be judged by the question: "Does this housing program or policy give a

1The elimination of poverty may be approached either in terms of raising real income by providing goods, including housing, or in terms of providing more money income which in turn will buy more housing.
hand up to those who are most deprived?  

As resident-citizens come to have a stronger influence on city planning, it seems logical that more attention should be given to those families who have the greatest need for help in getting a decent environment. Where there is not enough standard housing to meet the needs, it appears that it should be built before substandard housing is torn down.  

The Charlestown opponents to the renewal plan were motivated largely by their fears that substandard housing would be torn down before new housing was made available for evicted families. Assurances from the BRA that they would be relocated in decent homes did not convince them. In Washington Park, citizens who are being displaced are almost entirely being rehoused outside the area and contributing to overcrowding and new Negro concentrations in other neighborhoods. A city-wide housing plan is needed, and since this has not been developed by present planning agencies, citizens should take more part in getting the planning agencies to provide such a plan.  

---


2 This position was strongly proposed by the Housing Authority in Chicago in 1949. Myerson, Martin and Banfield, Edward C., Politics, Planning, and the Public Interest, The Case for Public Housing in Chicago, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955, p. 129.
Finding vacant land to build on may not be possible in the same neighborhood where substandard housing exists, and where this is the case, it may take longer to develop an educational policy that will prepare residents to accept new housing in other parts of the city. Once the movement starts, vacancies should enable a sequence of moves, so that eventually substandard buildings can be demolished without as serious trauma as present renewal programs create for many citizens.

An effort to provide standard housing for all residents either by new housing or by rehabilitating substandard housing without extra cost to low-income families, might attract many low-income families from other parts of the country. A city which undertook such a program would have to be assured of Federal aid to meet the extra demand for its services, or there would have to be an equal effort made by all cities to counteract the special attraction of one city as a center for lower-income families.

B. New Social Services

Early citizen organizations were as much concerned with social services as with physical planning. The Baltimore plan is an early example, and a Roxbury organization in the 1950's worked for better trash collection and health care as well as new pavements and more playgrounds. As already stated, ABCD was started in Boston to provide services to persons who were hurt by the renewal program.
The attention to people relocated by renewal has shown needs for social services that existed before relocation and that appear to be likely to continue after relocation. ABCD seems to be facing these needs by developing broad community programs of services and is promoting several new programs aimed at specific problems, such as unemployment, delinquency and education. Since Ford support of the program is granted for only a limited time, ABCD is also trying to stimulate existing social agencies to expand their services.

The social services ABCD has provided in Washington Park seem better related to the community than the services provided in Charlestown. Perhaps this is due to the fact that Freedom House was already established and could accept a contract for community organization work relating to social services as well as physical planning.

The development of social services may help to keep the interest of a citizen group during the periods when action on physical planning is slow. It is also true that often results can be obtained much more quickly in the field of services than in physical planning.

The major lack seems to be any machinery by which citizen preferences for new services can be recorded and evaluated and related to other citizen wishes for new physical planning. It is the opinion of the writer that the overall community service organization of Boston (the United Community Services) follows the philosophy of
"dependent and caretaker" as outlined above. This means that, although there are "lay" people on its committees, there is really no effective channel for citizens to suggest new services or to help in promoting them. Citizen education is needed as much in the area of possible new social services as it is in the area of possible new physical planning.

C. New Methods of Raising Revenues for the Central City

Another program citizens might consider to supplement Boston urban renewal programs would aim to obtain a larger share of Boston's revenues from State or Federal sources. As explained above, a major motivation of the urban renewal program was to help central cities increase their revenues by improving real estate. An alternative source of city revenues would meet this need and allow quite different patterns of community development over the metropolitan area.

The need for new sources of revenue becomes greater if citizens choose to emphasize the goals of a minimum standard of housing and more social services. These costs for lower-income families seem, to the writer, not to be under the control of the central city. Their increase in central cities reflects the choice of the middle-and-higher-income population to move out of the central city, leaving behind those who cannot afford to move or who come to the central city from other areas where standards are even lower.
The possibility of getting more funds from the State for central city expenses seems to rest on the development of an educational program to help citizens in the state as a whole realize the needs of all citizens and the potential financial resources of the suburbs in comparison with the central city. Per capita costs of health, welfare and education need to be compared with per capita income and property assets for different municipalities. Citizens could recommend the extent they wish to share the costs of poverty and housing needs. Possibly the new Metropolitan Area Planning Council can provide some of these data along with serving as a clearing house on physical planning.

If public revenues came from a wider geographic area, planning might promote lower densities in the central area and a wider geographic distribution of lower-income families, as well as some new high-priced housing in the central city. In general there would be more variety in the environments developed in each municipality.
X. POSSIBLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN BOSTON

Do the experiences of the residents of Washington Park and Charlestown in participating in urban renewal developments suggest new steps that might be taken to bring greater benefits to themselves and other citizens of Boston? The answer is "yes"; a new organization appears to be needed to help the resident-citizen both at the neighborhood level and at the city-wide level.

The development of a new citizens' organization would require first, general agreement among many people about the goals of such a new organization and second, agreement as to how these goals could best be achieved. Primary interest in this thesis lies in the resident-citizen and ways in which citizen participation in community improvement can bring better living arrangements and a more attractive environment for residents.

The goals which a resident-citizens' organization might seek to promote have been suggested. They include greater responsibility for the citizen in relation to the planning agency in defining the kind of environment wanted. The questions considered by resident-citizens should include broad city-wide plans for development and housing as well as specific questions about the location of new facilities or the demolition of individual homes.
Resident-citizen participation in community improvement can be strengthened by seeking to include all citizens, by providing financing independent of the planning agency with which the citizens share in reviewing programs, and the development of techniques for communicating with all citizens, especially those who do not easily express their wishes. These goals assume that strengthening the participation of citizens in recommending city improvements will bring increased benefits to citizens.

These goals might be discussed with both individuals and organizations which might be interested to support the development of a new citizens' organization. There are currently many committees which are concerned in one way or another with improving living arrangements. These include the many small neighborhood and local interest groups working on questions of urban renewal, such as the neighborhood units and civic and religious groups known to exist in Roxbury and Charlestown. In addition, there are many semi-public advisory committees interested in housing on a city-wide scale, including the Massachusetts Committee on Discrimination in Housing, the UCS Advisory Committee on Public Housing, the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Housing for the Elderly, Fair Housing, Inc., Senior Living, Inc., and the Mayor's Citizens' Advisory Committee for Community Improvement. The opinions of some broader agencies might also be asked, including the Center for Community Studies, Action for Boston Community Development, the
Boston Municipal Research Bureau, and the League of Women Voters of Boston. Finally some public agencies might be consulted including the Boston Finance Commission, the State Legislative Reference Bureau, the Boston Housing Authority and the State Housing Board.

From these discussions, it is hoped would come a definition of major goals which a large majority would agree should be the focus for new work by the proposed citizens' organization. Hopefully these discussions would also bring forth a small group of individuals who would be willing to explore alternative ways of how the new organization could best be established. This would be the second major step.

Whatever the specific goals chosen for the new organization, there will undoubtedly need to be some central administrative staff which can coordinate the programs of local resident groups and city-wide activities. Among the types of work that the new organization would undertake, or arrange with other public or private agencies to undertake, would be (1) research on the needs and preferences of resident-citizens, (2) education of resident groups regarding the kinds of alternative programs affecting environment they might wish to consider, and (3) giving information to individuals and groups on specific questions relating to housing or neighborhood improvement.

The cost of the new organization will be reduced, the more that staff work can be turned over to other private
and public agencies. It is hoped that independent funds can be obtained by membership fees and private contributions sufficient to employ a minimum staff. If such financing is not possible, it is believed a citizen's group could have influence by working as an unpaid group in close association with a planning agency, if this planning agency could be established independent of the Redevelopment Authority and Housing Authority of the city, so that it was free from operating responsibilities. Without these conditions, the first job of the citizens' group might be to urge the establishment of a city planning agency which was free from operating agencies.

If such a sequence of discussions could be developed, it is believed that past citizen experiences with urban renewal programs in Boston would furnish some guidance for new work that might be undertaken. Especially important seems to be the need to help collect and compare citizen recommendations in different areas, so that these may be taken into account in recommending city-wide policies for community development. As suggested in the thesis, it is hoped that these citizen recommendations will not be limited to programs for urban renewal, but may also consider the need for a minimum housing standard, new services, and new sources of city income.

Citizen participation in urban renewal which focussed on physical improvement for specific neighborhoods has suggested possibilities of citizen participation not only
on the whole program of community improvement, as outlined by the workable program, but on a still broader range of activities which affect the life of Boston residents. By increasing the scope of citizen activities and strengthening the process of participation, it is believed that further benefits to resident-citizens could be achieved.
XI. CONCLUSIONS

This study of citizen participation in urban renewal has given a glimpse of new work that is needed in city planning--new processes to be tried and perhaps new goals to be developed.

In the past, professional city planners have taken major responsibility for recommending to city governments zoning and subdivision policies and capital improvement programs. Resident-citizen participation has in general involved only a limited number of citizens mostly at the neighborhood level. In the future, it is hoped that planners will find new ways to work with more residents to define and advance the interest of citizens. From closer collaboration, it is believed, will come new awareness of what standards could and should be promoted and new ideas of how to implement them.

Only a beginning has been made by this thesis in suggesting how citizen participation in renewal might be expanded to be of greater benefit to citizens. But the work has convinced the writer that more resident-citizen participation in city planning is important and possible. It is also believed that the city planner can help to increase contributions by citizens and that new techniques of communication will, in turn, add to the value of city planning.
XII. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

For Washington Park:

Mrs. Dorothy Abramson, ABCD Representative, Roxbury - North Dorchester
Reverend Edward B. Blackman, Minister, Eliot Congregational Church
Mr. Noel Day, Director, St. Marks' Social Center, Inc.
Mrs. Joyce Harby, Assistant to Mrs. Snowden
Mrs. Muriel Snowden, Associate Director of Freedom House
Mr. Thaddeus Terzyak, Deputy Project Director for Washington Park
Mr. Louis Watts, former Graduate Student from Brandeis University

For Charlestown:

Mr. Leo T. Baldwin, former President of SHOC
Rev. William A. Burnett, Minister, First Congregational Church
Rev. Wolcott Cutler, retired minister, St. John's Episcopal Church
Mr. Frank Delveckio, Acting Project Director for Charlestown
Mr. Michel Matt, FHA Rehabilitation Office
Mrs. James Sweeney
Mr. Joseph Vilimas, ABCD Representative, Charlestown

Others:

Dr. Walter Ehlers, Director of Department of Urban Affairs, United Community Services
Mr. Elmer Foster, Director, Citizens' Relations Department of Boston
Father W. Seavey Joyce, President, Citizens' Advisory Committee of Boston
Dr. Robert Perlman, Program Director, ABCD
Mr. Russell M. Traunstein, First Realty Company
Mr. Anthony Yudis, Reporter, Boston Globe
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