



IDENTIFICATION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS
IN NEIGHBORHOOD FOUR, CAMBRIDGE

by

Pamela Daughaday Emerson

B.A., Radcliffe College, Harvard University
(1964)

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE MASTER OF CITY
PLANNING

at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY
September, 1967

Signature of Author

Department of City Planning,
June 26, 1967

Certified by ..

Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by

Head, Department of City and
Regional Planning

IDENTIFICATION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN NEIGHBORHOOD
FOUR, CAMBRIDGE.

ABSTRACT.

Planners and social workers establish priorities, design programs, carry out projects, and otherwise intervene in society in terms of social problems. This thesis raises the question "what is a social problem?", with particular reference to the activities of planners and social workers. Neighborhood Four, Cambridge, will be taken as an area for a case study of how social workers and planners working in a low income neighborhood approach their work in terms of problems.

These planners and social workers are basically concerned with the process of identifying problems in Neighborhood Four. The identification is affected and determined by a number of practical contingencies: by the professionals' licence and training; by their relationship to each other, to the residents of the neighborhood, to the Cambridge politicians, and to national and state bureaucracies; and by the demands, limits and purposes of their agencies.

In operating in Neighborhood Four, planners and social workers do not develop their own analyses of the problems. Rather they apply models of typical problems to practical ends of intervention, defining their clients, justifying their work, applying for funds, and fulfilling and extending the prescriptions of their professional licence. The typical problems they use differ both from the common-sense views of the residents of the neighborhood and from analytic social science models.

The application of this practical view of social problems, with the neighborhood as the basic unit of analysis and intervention to wider areas of national planning now opening to planners and social workers may have far-reaching consequences. This thesis is an attempt to illustrate the complexity of the process of this definition, and make clear the implications.

Pamela Emerson

Thesis Supervisor,
Mrs Lisa Redfield Peattie

June 26, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION...	1
A. A STUDENT VOLUNTEER IN NEIGHBORHOOD FOUR...	1
B. QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE THESIS....	9
II. SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.....	13
III. SOCIAL WORK, PLANNING, AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS..	18
IV. PLANNERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS IN NEIGHBORHOOD FOUR.....	33
A. WORKING PROFESSIONALLY	34
B. LISTENING	45
C. PRAGMATISM.....	60
V. THE AGENCIES.....	65
A. THE SETTLEMENT HOUSES.....	65
B. THE PLANNING AGENCIES.....	81
The Planning Board.....	82
The City Manager's Office.....	92
The Cambridge Corporation.....	98
VI. CONCLUSION.....	108
A. SOME ANSWERS TO SOME PUZZLES FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE.....	108
B. ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS.....	114
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 128
APPENDIX	130

I. Introduction.

Social problems dominate current discussions of cities. Inevitably, city planners are drawn into the debate. This thesis is an attempt to examine the nature of social problems as intellectual constructs and working tools by looking specifically at the way social workers and planners have identified the problems of an area of Cambridge, Neighborhood Four.

Neighborhood Four was the site of my own introduction to the problems of poor people. The view of the neighborhood that was communicated to me highlighted a compendium of psychological problems among the residents. My eventual disillusionment with that view has led me to ask how I came to accept it in the first place, and how it came to dominate one of the most active social service centers in the neighborhood. It appeared that the professionals active in the neighborhood were those who determined the view of the neighborhood and its problems that was accepted so uncritically by us volunteers, academics and other outsiders. This thesis will use a case study of Neighborhood Four to discuss how and why professionals come to identify problems and develop a working view of a neighborhood.

A. A Student Volunteer in Neighborhood Four.

My original view of Neighborhood Four was formed by my experiences there as a social work volunteer. I began work at the Cambridge Neighborhood House in the fall of 1960, and continued to do volunteer work there for four years. I was one of a number of student volunteers recruited from Harvard, Radcliffe and MIT to aid this settlement house in carrying out its programs. In our orien-

tation it was emphasized that we were needed because of the severity of neighborhood "problems". These problems justified our presense, oriented our programs, and filled our discussions with the staff. The definition of the neighborhood was made, and our role set out, before we had met one child:

A tall unhealthy looking Senior pressured a group of us freshmen, who had attended a Phillips Brooks House tea, to accompany him to the Neighborhood House, where we were greeted, somewhat to our surprise, as though we were anxious to work there. As we get out of the PBH bus on Moore St., he paused, and sniffed the air. In a lugubrious, confidential whisper he said, "Do you smell that smell of rubber? In this neighborhood it penetrates twenty-four hours a day. Some times it's even worse." We obediently smelled, as he locked the bus, telling us an anecdote of the fate of an unlocked car at the hands of "these kids".

The neighborhood was set apart as a foreign place, with strange, displeasing and dangerous characteristics. The formal message of the recruiting session was how exceptional the neighborhood was, how ordinary rules did not fit interaction with "these kids". The discussion centered on how to operate as a children's group leader -- for this was what we were supposed to be. In the version of our student leader, we were to be a role model and guide to help these kids avoid delinquency. We were given a new vocabulary to describe their behavior -- "testing" and "acting out". We were told that it was necessary to be "absolutely honest with the kids", and that it was important to be reliable -- to come on time and stay for the year. On a commitment to do this, we were assigned "our group", almost as parent surrogates, with an implicit assumption that we were important because the children's families did not give reliability, honesty, guidance, or models. This role understandably had its effects on our relations with the parents, not all of them beneficial. It also led

us to be very concerned with understanding the "problems of our kids", and to a simplification of the staff's view of the neighborhood so that we could understand it.

From the time of orientation our central concerns were delinquency (in general) and upward social mobility, seen as the two mutually exclusive alternative fates awaiting these children. These concerns were part of our adopted social work view of the kids and their families, a view that emphasized psychological and character disturbances, that saw all as likely candidates for counselling, and somehow, intellectually and emotionally incapable of coping with themselves or the world. We interpreted our immediate problems as reflecting and confirming these views: As a lousy disciplinarian I concentrated on securing attendance at club meetings, keeping the kids in order once they came, and producing visible output. These activities, and our contacts with the parents, provided us with our own experience of the neighborhood's problems. A chaotic meeting became a sure sign of the terrible future in store for the kids. Our analysis of what was "wrong", then, was framed in terms of why the kids were going to be delinquent, and why people were not and would not be mobile. With social work we looked to the family structure and family relations to find the answers.

The elements of family structure that appeared in our analyses as causes of disturbance, or as symptoms pathological in themselves, were those customs, habits and events which we tended to find most shocking, and which we had to explain for our own peace of mind. Deviations from our models of middle class behavior were interpreted as basic problems, as symptoms of deep disturbance.

While I personally participated in long discussions on family structure and psychology, at the same time I was concerned with discovering the causes of people's problems in more concrete -- preferably economic -- terms. During the second and third year I spent at the Neighborhood House, I spent many hours talking to parents, asking rather naive questions about what was really wrong with the project, trying to uncover the real story (from those immediately affected) about technological unemployment, welfare, and other things that I was reading about in school. Over all, I was most concerned with the psychological import of these concrete problems: the kinds of things that scared the kids about themselves -- things that came out in the impromptu plays we had when I couldn't think up anything better to do; the kinds of revelations people would make about themselves, mostly by their emotional tone, in conversations. *

Although "poverty" was drifting around the edge of everyone's perceptions -- it was fairly obvious that fathers of large families could work 70 hours a week in order to make only \$4000 a year, that people were scandalously overcrowded, that the kids had no boots or mittens, and that a quarter loomed large in the financial calculations of every family -- it was generally agreed by the staff that poverty, low wages and long hours were marginal and irrelevant questions. A number of factors underlay this attitude. In the first place, changing the pattern of distribution was not considered a practical goal. Instead the mobility of single families was held up as the answer to poverty. Such mobility required staying in school or being retrained in order to get better jobs. Basic problems therefore centered around factors that prevented mobility, and ultimately

* I assembled notes on these conversations and meetings in a Junior Tutorial paper for the Harvard Department of Social Studies. This has provided a good source to supplement memory.

derived from the psychological abnormalities of particular families.

The second reason was that the absolute level of poverty did not seem to the social workers to be such that things were hopeless. In the projects, the material goods and appliances with which people were surrounded were abundant enough in absolute terms to lend some credence to the thought that 'if they managed better, their poverty would not be unendurable'. People were simply not as poor as people, say, in the South End. The Easter outfits, TV sets, the cookies and the binge parties did what they were supposed to do, creating an illusion of resources and profligacy. This attitude was sustained by the finding that the families where the kids were seriously malnourished were also families where "other problems" accounted for a bad use of income. The level of income was considered a drawback, but the real problem was "something deeper". For the staff an increase in family income was not seen as sufficient to lead to increased social status, better jobs for the parents, or less delinquency among the kids. The "real problems" were not income but people's psychological and family troubles that prevented them from "using the resources that were there" (including those provided by the Neighborhood House itself).

This perspective contrasted vividly with that of many residents, who felt that money was their first need, even though they would hesitate to call themselves poor. While the staff rejected this wider conception of local problems, they did accept as "realistic" many of the more specific "gripes" of residents. These included complaints about the administration of the project and of the welfare system, especially those details that served to undermine incentives to mobi-

* Conversation with Mrs. Karyl Mosesohn Sweeney,
November, 1966

lity (ie, work), the stability of the family (eg, welfare kicking the man out of the house), and good relations between neighbors (eg, Mrs. M told the management Mrs. O kept a sloppy house).

As I stayed on I became increasingly unwilling to accept the social work view of the neighborhood. I came to believe that many of the psychological problems that could be observed were the result of a social situation that was characterized by interference and advice and counselling by too many people with too much power over the families. They were for the most part not psychological problems at all; instead, they were a defensive form of interaction for dealing with social workers. Yet even in this departure, I was still overwhelmed by the psychological view of the neighborhood and its problems. I was still engaged in the favorite activity of the volunteer, explaining shocking behavior in psychological terms, or the same "psychological" behavior in terms of social interaction. *

In addition to this kind of psychologizing, all volunteers engaged in the common activity of imposing the category of "Neighborhood Four" resident on anyone who lived between Main and Broadway, Columbia and Portland Streets. This reflected a demand that they be a community, and led to irritation and study when they were not. This process extended itself to the description of emotional problems by a geographic area, and guilt by residence was imposed on all residents. When people persisted in announcing that they were different from "these people down here", it was regarded as a sign of alienation, and the possibility that indeed they were different evaded us.

Some elementary study into the social organization of Cambridge would have avoided this problem. Cambridge is organized "tribally"

* The Junior Tutorial paper contained this analysis, based to a very great extent on Erving Goffman, Asylums (New York: Anchor Books, 1961)

through local ethnic-kinship bonds, not by residence.* The people in Neighborhood Four included the lowest status members of a number of tribes, and more important, of a number of kinship groups. We were too eager to use it as a prototype of the peer neighborhood to notice this very interesting, and possibly unique feature.

This locating of problems by residence area was functional to agencies that organized their tasks geographically, but made it difficult for residents to rise in status without moving, thus contributing to the "move out to show your mobility" attitude that challenged the people every day. It also served as an easy way of distinguishing the low status members of Cambridge -- by address. The system produced a set of expectations about the behavior and chances of people from that area. The assumption that there were severe problems was applied so as to dominate officials' views of the child or family from Neighborhood Four. This habit of generalization did not mean that everyone was thought to have this or that problem; they were merely considered likely to. As one official stated:

"These girls who go to the Margaret (Fuller House). Some of them are really sick kids. There's one group of 15 year old girls and one of the girls wrecked herself last summer, they say -- aborted herself they mean. These kids are in really bad shape."

(Interview with CEFUET worker, December, 1966.)

This example is crucial as it shows what is operating: a concern for the girls, middle class horror at some aspects of their lives and an urge to generalize, to make some order out of the impressions that besiege and shock the senses.

Volunteers' efforts to define the neighborhood's problems meant not only looking at people as if they must have problems, but also

* This assertion is based on impressions of the Inner Belt Protest group, Save Our Cities, and on the results of a study by Barbara L. Carter that found ethnic, racial and religious ties much closer than "neighborhood" associations, in a study of a Cambridge neighborhood. Barbara L. Carter, "Patterns of Association in an Interracial Neighborhood", unpublished paper, Brandeis University, June, 1964.

searching for data about these problems from individuals in the neighborhood. Families who came to notice often, or vividly, were those which became the basis for generalization, and the sum of the problems of the different families came to equal the problems of the neighborhood. The people who did not participate in activities, or come to one's notice were regarded as being in such trouble that they were unable even to come to the Neighborhood House (ie, they were worse by definition). People who lived up to middle class standards were excluded on a different basis; they were on their way out, and had broken away from the neighborhood. By definition they were not typical of the neighborhood or its problems.

My experience in Neighborhood Four took place before recent changes in the agency's approach were apparent. The kinds of problems the neighborhood is now felt to have differ from this view I have referred to, but at the time it seemed to dominate every contact in the neighborhood. Despite changes, the psychological view persists but with less emphasis. Moreover, this kind of approach to an urban neighborhood was not the unique invention of the Neighborhood House staff. Books and studies have appeared discussing the way the values, culture and family system of poor people produce delinquents and prevent social mobility.

It was the questions that arose out of this experience in Neighborhood Four, frustration with the kinds of definitions of people that were current, and belief that such definitions were not neutral things but affected those defined very directly, that led me to want to examine the nature of social problems as intellectual constructs and the process of identification of such problems in Neighborhood Four.

*Interview with Karyl Sweeney: "The people who came to the Neighborhood House were the upper class of the community. It was coming to the Neighborhood House that made them that."

B. Questions and Methodology of the Thesis.

It seemed to me that in many ways the social workers had misinterpreted the problems of Neighborhood Four. In looking back over that experience I wondered what the process was by which they came to a view of the neighborhood and its problems. I could see how a view, once developed, could be sustained, even in the face of contradictory evidence. How did professionals approach a neighborhood, how did they define a problem? Secondly, it seemed strange to me that they had picked a "neighborhood" as a unit for analysis and action. For Neighborhood Four -- or even the housing projects -- were not self-contained social units. Moreover, problems of low income, or inferior educational system, or inadequate welfare, were neither caused by nor confined to the neighborhood. Why, then, use as a basis for analysis a "neighborhood" that seemed to exist only within the minds of professionals -- a "neighborhood" whose very name was contrived by them?

Finally, it struck me that the social workers had a warped view of the people and the neighborhood because of their preoccupation with "problems" and the pathological. Was the most significant thing about a family necessarily the misbehavior of the children or its emotional dynamics? I felt that a problem-oriented approach left no judgment of the significance or meaning of a problem. There was no way of discovering which problems were important to people, which were better ignored, which were not problems at all.

With these questions in mind I began work on my thesis, focusing on four issues: (1) What is a social problem? (2) How do professionals in social work and planning come to a view of what the problems are in a specific area? (3) Why do they often use a neighborhood

as the unit of analysis and approach? And (4) What happens when they see things in terms of problems?

These questions were relevant to planners as well as to social workers: planners had started to work in Neighborhood Four, and they were working with social workers from the settlement houses. In addition, there seemed to be a national resurgence of interest in urban problems, and planners were involved in this, sitting on committees that attempt to set up "priorities for action", or to redefine what are the most urgent problems, or to lobby for this or that subsidy. Courses were offered in "social planning" and social problems to planning students. Planners seem to be getting into the business of defining social problems.

My practical problem initially was to try to find out more exactly how planners and social workers identified problems. Observations at staff meetings and neighborhood gatherings were impossible because of problems of time and access. However, planners and social workers working in the neighborhood were very cooperative in allowing me to interview them. Interviews generally took about an hour and yielded nine or ten single spaced pages of notes. These interviews, however, have not proved easy to use. I was disappointed to find near unanimity among them on what the problems were, and generally vague remarks on how they went about discovering them. They seemed to assume that the problems simply existed, and that the current list was self-evidently the "important" one. While this unanimity does not facilitate comparison, it does support the contention that a common line does exist and that it is frequently communicated to others.

During this time I also interviewed one non-professional resident of the neighborhood, thinking that I would contrast two sets of views of the area. I abandoned this for another approach, but I think even this one interview will serve to illustrate a few points later on. I also attended, and took notes on, meeting of the Neighborhood Five OEO planning team and other Cambridge groups. Finally, long conversations with Mrs. Karyl Mesesehn Sweeney, who was a staff member at the Cambridge Neighborhood House from 1961 to 1964, have helped me see many things about the operations of social workers in that setting.

Local agencies, especially the planning board, have published many reports describing Cambridge neighborhoods, various programs, and the like. There are also reports of older projects carried on in Cambridge, digests of census data, and the annual reports of the social agencies. These were somewhat helpful. The most helpful reading matter, however, were sociological: Hughes' material on professions,^{*} Seeley on social problems,^{**} Schutz,^{x1} Geffman^{x2} and Garfinkel^{x3} on typification, frame analysis and interaction.

In general, the data could be supplement a good deal. It seemed quite thin to start with, and as work progressed, I wished I had asked more and different questions. It was also difficult to find a conceptual framework for a discussion of something that is an intellectual exercise and at the same time a political process. It was not a subject that could be communicated by the development of a model, or some prescriptive and hortatory advice on how to do it correctly. I hope that I have overcome the worst problems of the data and the subject matter.

* Everett C. Hughes, Men and Their Work, (Glencoe, Free Press, 1958).

**John R. Seeley, "The Problem of Social Problems", Indian Sociological Bulletin, April, 1965.

_____, "Intellectual and Libidinal Dimensions of Research", in Reflections on Community Studies, A.J. Vidich et. al. (Eds), (New York: Wiley, 1964)

were two of the most valuable of his many articles, see footnote below, page 13 and Bibliography for a more complete list. (Many of the points that Seeley makes are foreshadowed in an article by C Wright Mills, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," in the American Journal of Sociology, 49 (September, 1943), pp.165-80.) The second article falls more in the category of a personal account of the process of a community study, and how the intellectual conclusions are related to personal history, mainly with regards to Crestwood Heights.

x1. The most relevant of Schutz' essays include: "Common Sense and Scientific Interpretation of Human Action", in Collected Papers, Vol. I; "The Social World and the Theory of Social Action", and "Equality and the Meaning Structure of the Social World", in Collected Papers, Vol II. Alfred Schutz, Collected Papers, Vol's I and II, (The Hague, Netherlands: Nijhoff, 1962).

x2. Erving Goffman, Asylums, Op cit; _____, Encounters, (Indianapolis; Bobbs-Merrill, 1961); _____, Stigma, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1963).

x3. Harold Garfinkel, "A Conception of, and Experiments with, "Trust" as a Condition of Stable Concerted Action" in Motivation and Interaction, O J Harvey, (ed). The date and publishing house of this are unavailable on the xerox reprint in my possession. In this article he tries to put some of Schutz' theories to work in experimental situations. See also: "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies," American Journal of Sociology, 61, 1956, pp. 420-424. This latter article, while not directly relevant to this study of Community Organizers should be useful in regard to ~~Welfare~~ and other means test operations.

This thesis will proceed with some general notes on social problems, planners and social workers, touch lightly on some local historical background, and then go on to a discussion of the interviews and the problem of social problems.

II. Social Knowledge and Social Problems.

Social science has become increasingly critical of the concept of "social problems" as one aspect of a general concern with the social foundations of knowledge. In this light, the existence of such "problems" becomes problematic: One asks why is X labelled a "problem" as opposed to Y, and why is Z considered a more basic or important problem than X.* One must assume that problems are created with reference to some larger conceptual and social framework. If problems label things that are wrong in society, one can ask why these particular things are considered wrong? Why are some rather than others considered relevant? In our society various professional groups have assumed a predominant interest in working with the society's problems. What I am concerned with is the relationship between these professionals and the problems they identify and emphasize. My concern is to follow the connections and relations between professions as social groups subject to certain organizational and occupational contingencies, and contingencies which embody their relevant "purposes at hand" and which affect the kind and nature of the problems they identify.

Professionals work in terms of an inherited tradition which delimits the kinds of subjects relevant to them and the questions they should and are allowed to ask. But the rules by which professions operate and their rules of relevance also develop out of the contingencies of carrying out

*.See especially C Wright Mills, Op Cit, and Seeley, Op Cit. Other articles by Seeley: John R Seeley, "Social Science, Some Probative Problems", in Maurice Stein and Arthur Vidich, (eds) Sociology on Trial (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1963); and _____, "The Making and Taking of Problems; Toward an Ethical Stance," Social Problems, 14, Spring, 1967, pp. 382-389.

Mills argued that problems were seen in a fragmentary, practical way that tended "to atomize social objectives." This was an approach that centered on deviance, and continually (was) "put in terms of a requirement for more "socialization". He complained that current analyzes of Social Problems texts left the political order unexamined, indeed tended to support it and other current features of the public scene as normal. This analysis was consistently biased against urban working class people because the standards of normal and proper were of the small town middle class, and failed to use the sociological concept of structures, concentrating rather on "situational analysis" of individuals. This approach then, failed to be critical, or even useful in terms of the ostensible goal of "reforming society."

Seeley remarks on the continuation of this class bias, even though the small town approach is much less apparent at this time. Still, he argues, Sociologists study (and applied workers work with) people who cannot fight back. Social problems are still seen in terms of the problems of poor people. (Thus race relations is the study of Negroes, and perhaps, lower class whites.)

Finally, a quote or two used in Mills' article illustrates the traditional approach, without the modern disclaimers that often appear before the same list of problems is served up:

"Perhaps we may be on solid ground through recognition of the capitalist system and its accompaniments as normal. We may then deal with its several parts, treating as problems those which do not function smoothly." C.M. Rosenquist, Social Problems, (1940) Quoted in Mills, op cit p.169. And:

"An ever increasing number of persons living in the giant cities has become completely deracinated, cut off from stable primary ties. They have lost not only their physical home, but their spiritual home as well. Social disorganization breeds in these unattached masses of the urban proletariat. They furnish willing nuclei for robbery, brigandage and revolution." M.A. Elliott and F.E. Merrill, Social Disorganization (1934,41) quoted in Mills p.174.

For modern application, just read "southern Negroes" into the second quote. It is they who are now supposed to have been dislocated from their spiritual home in the South.

the demands of their position as professionals. By the very nature of their position and activities, professionals not only work at solving problems, but also go further and define situations as problems. This is a very significant development; for defining a problem is a political decision about what shall be done to or for whom in order to change or alleviate a situation. This implicitly involves the determination that this situation is both critical and amenable to change. Thus a professional in defining a particular situation or circumstance as a problem is in effect saying "this is something about which I may do something as a professional."

John Seeley has made a number of penetrating analyses of these and other aspects of the phenomenon of "social problems." * To begin with, calling something a social problem sets it off from ordinary events. Moreover, this occurs in such a way as to highlight problems as "being suited to a certain kind of 'treatment', handling or response":

To term something a social problem is (successfully or unsuccessfully) by abstracting and naming, to enact a reclassification or some part or aspect of the common life in order to alter the response it will receive, or the relation in which it will stand to other parts of the common life. To call 'something' (eg. unemployment, population movement) a social problem is thus already, to that extent to reconstitute the society by redefining the activity. Sociologists...create the social problem out of some aspect of the social life... **

But beyond this, a social problem is very close to a moral

*Seeley, Op Cit. See note on preceding page and on page 11.

**Seeley, "The Problem of Social Problems," Op cit. mimeographed copy, p. 4.

condemnation. When we call something a social problem, we mean that we disapprove of it or its results. A social problem is distinguished from moral disapproval, because it is described using a scientific model that relates the phenomenon to the social, and assumes that it has identifiable causes, which in turn suggests that a problem has a solution -- that the social situation or factors in it can be manipulated or controlled to abolish the problem. However as Seeley emphasizes, problems remain enacted or legislated products:

Unfortunately confusion is worse confounded because sociologizers appear to mean at least four different things by their legislative acts: that a problem is a problem "from," "in," "of," or "for" the society. For example, if it were said of neurosis (as it is said of alcoholism) that "neurosis is a social problem" we might mean (any of all) that (a) the genesis of the problem is social, (b) the consequences are social, (c) the remedy is of a kind that only 'society' can give effect to, (d) the problem is nothing but (or is "fundamentally") a relational malfunction, i.e. a social perturbation.

The presence of a legislative element in all four cases should be almost equally plain since all distinctively human problems are social in their genesis, consequence and medium of action, and the question of 'remedy' (which is bound up with questions of cost, and cost for whom) is the most patently judgemental of all...*

Since that which cannot be solved is not a problem, problems tend to be defined to fit solutions, and solutions preferred by the "sociologizer's" perception of what might fitly, or "practically", be manipulated. This in turn devolves from political attitudes and the set of professional skills of the definer of the problems.

* Ibid., p. 5

I have come to believe that in poor neighborhoods, the residents, after the buildings, are considered the most "practical" to manipulate. In Seeley's terms, to manipulate them is least expensive to everyone else. They are seen as the fit objects of manipulation -- their behavior, mental processes, culture and emotional life become the problems.*

Questions of definition pertain to general questions of class position, social control and social domination. Deciding that the problems of a social class may best be dealt with in a "neighborhood," working with individuals or with small groups, also says that the relation of this class as a class to other classes must not be tampered with, because it treats the problematic class as an isolated entity. Deciding that the most pressing problem is juvenile delinquency ~~emods~~ the relationship between the classes by saying that which is most problematic in the lower class is that aspect of their behavior which might infringe on other classes, and it must be changed.

For a particular professional in a particular agency, the definition of the problem contains a second element referred to above. The definition has a direct effect on the status of the profession, as one which may or must concern itself with a given situation and more specifically certain aspects of that situation. This places the problem within his province, and delimits his professional competencies and concerns, protecting them from competing agencies and professional groups. Also, it affects the expectations

* We have only to look at the organization of the MIT advocacy planning class reports on Neighborhood Four of January 1967 to verify this: each report had physical and social programs. Social programs were usually education of the residents with counselling services, health and relocation services thrown in. They usually included a pious wish for neighborhood control, although they set out the main categories and methods of action. None of the social programs treated or dealt with people or institutions outside of Neighborhood Four, except as givens, or as vague entities that were to function as ~~deuse~~ ~~ex~~ machina in the event of a near insoluble dilemma. The social programs, viz., education and counselling and relocation involved change in the local people, their attitudes, and the like.

Purely physical plans, however, are not free from this attitude. The whole set of programs that involve slum clearance of small owner occupied homes functions in a similar matter. An extension of the poor person's (or not so poor person's) self is attacked to solve a declared problem of slums. (For a discussion of the "self" and territory see Goffman, Encounters and Asylums, op cit. Also, Edward T. Hall, The Silent Language (New York: Doubleday, 1963); _____, The Hidden Dimension (New York; Doubleday, 1966).)

and definitions of his own agency. No practical professional is going to present either himself or his agency with a task which will lower its status in the professional or political hierarchy. Neither will he tackle a problem that he might handle badly or measureably fail with. Moreover, a problem that will require too many resources (thus jeopardizing other programs) or will jeopardize the source of resources (such as public and political support) is not likely to be defined as an appropriate professional task. Other activities and priorities might enhance the position of the profession or the agency, and therefore be viewed with more favor, despite obvious uselessness or irrelevance to the majority of clients. For instance, a recent study of agencies working with the blind suggested that they were concentrating on programs to make young men and children employable, in spite of the fact that most blind Americans are women over 55 years of age.*

Some of the factors that enter in to the definition of social problems can be understood by examining social work and planning as professions.

- * Robert A Scott, "The Selection of Clients by Social Welfare Agencies; the Case of the Blind," Social Problems, 14, Winter, 1967, p.248-257.

III. Social Work, Planning and Social Problems.

Social work and planning, as all other occupations and professions, have restricted licence about the kinds of activities they can legitimately engage in. As Hughes has commented about occupations in general:

An occupation consists, in part, of a successful claim of some people to licence to carry out certain activities which others may not, and to do so in exchange for money, goods or services. Those who have such licence will, if they have any sense of self-consciousness and solidarity, also claim a mandate to define what is proper conduct of others toward the matters concerned with their work. *

The difference between an occupation and a profession lies in the extent of the licence and the success with which members of the occupation have claimed a mandate over matters concerned with their work:

Many new and some old occupations have sought for themselves the envied status of profession; some of them succeed in gaining that esteem, that broad licence to control their work and that social mandate over affairs pertaining to it that the term profession connotes. **

There is then an expansionary force within professions toward a broad and basic mandate to determine what the real and fundamental issues are:

Not merely do the practitioners, by virtue of gaining admission to the charmed circle of colleagues, individually exercise the licence to do things others do not do, but collectively they presume to tell society what is good and right for the individual and for society at large in some aspect of life. Indeed, they set the very terms in which people may think about this aspect of life. The medical profession, for instance, is not content merely to define the terms of medical practice. It also tries to define for all of us the very nature of health and disease. When the presumption of a group to a broad mandate of this kind is explicitly or implicitly granted as legitimate, a

* Hughes, Op Cit. p. 78

** Ibid. p. 7

profession has come into being. *

In these terms both social workers and planners share an ambiguous professional status, for neither can successfully lay claim to exclusive licence or uncontested mandate. In the first place, both are severely restricted in what they can properly do. They do not have the freedom to select the areas of intervention to solve social problems. They cannot select their clients; social workers may be hired to end juvenile delinquency, but this does not give them licence to counsel the police, reform the schools, or change hiring practices. Moreover, the work of planners and social workers may be otherwise confined by geography or other accident of hiring. Their freedom of movement and subject matter is to a large extent determined by the powers of the agency, not by the status of the professional.

Secondly, neither profession has been able to claim an unequivocal skill, and hence often find themselves working as auxiliaries and underlings to other professions. Moreover, people without planning or social work training are hired to do (and to direct) planning and social work ventures. Planners thus find themselves subordinate to architects and lawyers, while social workers may effectively end up doing the same things as girl scout leaders, politicians or neighborhood associations.

In general, the licence of planners and social workers has been to work at solving social problems, not at defining them. Broader licence would entail wider control over their

**

* Ibid. p.79.

**Richard Korn argues that in fact the social ~~experts~~ already have a broad licence to intervene in society, on the medical model that is also implicit in Hughes' work. See Richard Korn, "The Private Citizen, the Social Expert, and the Social Problem: An Excursion Through an Unacknowledged Utopia", in B. Rosenberg, I. Gerver, and F.W. Howton (eds) Mass Society in Crisis (New York: MacMillan, 1964), p.577 ff. However, Korn uses the power of psychiatrists, particularly over sex offenders, as the prime example.

work with greater power to define what social problems are. And while there have been concerted efforts in this direction, the definition of problems has largely remained in the political arena and outside the professional competence of planners and social workers. Broadening their licence would be one step in a general process of improving the status of the profession.

The problems these professions gained licence to deal with early in their development were those that formed the intellectual basis of their origins. Both emerged from and reflected criticism of nineteenth century urban life, taking their inspiration from efforts to reform and eliminate city poverty, crime, disease, crowding and ugliness. The "Slum" became the epitome of all that was bad and corrupt in urban life, conveying an image of misery and poverty, along with danger, vice and violence.* Planning and social work both emerged as melioristic enterprises in response to these developments.

Social work developed out of an immediate concern to do something for the poor. Its original licence was that of the philanthropist: a giver retained a right of disposition over his gift, and of inquiry and supervision over the recipient.** Social work distinguished itself from what preceded, however, by its "scientific" commitment: conditions had to be studied as a precondition to successful reform; charity could not be random and one-shot, but had to be rationally planned, if it were to be effective. But social workers

* For a good collection of readings: Morton and Lucia White, The Intellectual Versus the City (New York: Mentor Books, 1962). See especially the chapters on Henry Adams, p.63ff., and Park and Dewey, p.159ff. Also pages 45-48 for Melville's views on Liverpool, a view that exemplified the confusion of poverty, class and crime.

** Sources on social work include:
Frank J. Bruno, Trends in Social Work, 1874-1956 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957) which is as seen through a conference on social work.

Roy Lubove, The Professional Altruist; The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965). A more sociological work.

Sources that give a more vivid picture of the thinking of early scientific philanthropists and settlement workers include:

George C Needham, Street Arabs and Guttersnipes (Boston, 1884) Philanthropist saves his pennies for deserving boys.

Robert Woods, Americans in Process, (Boston, 1902)
_____, The City Wilderness, (Boston, 1898). The second named is less well known and deserves to be. It is a collection of stereotypes (Italians eat greasy food. Negroes have animal natures, Jews live in crummy housing because they are trying to save money, and the "Negro housewife has picked up her skirts and moved" out of the West End.) which are still useful to illustrate the closeness of his approach to the commonsense view of his class. The two are interesting to read in sequence as an illustration of the process of developing a view of poor Neighborhoods.

were ambivalent about how to reform conditions, and which conditions they were to reform. In general, they concentrated on conditions within poor neighborhoods, offering some redistribution of goods in exchange for participation in "self-improvement" programs, lobbying for more and better welfare and housing programs, offering services which have often been supervisory.

Increasing concern with professional status brought about a shift toward more wealthy and higher status clients. This occurred with the growth of psychiatrically oriented social case work. * This not only allowed social work to claim broader mandate in dealing with the psychological problems of all classes of families, but also provided a more esoteric and distinctive professional approach and skill (psychiatric case work). (This change in turn accelerated the changing clientele of social work: the "unmotivated client", unable to benefit from intensive case work, was increasingly replaced by clients who were more tractable and hence more middle class.**) The partial exception to this tendency was the settlement house, increasingly left behind by psychiatrically oriented social workers; that remained in poor neighborhoods and continued to work with the poor. These workers were faced with a contradiction between the demands of improving their professional status and the traditional services they administered. Their response to this was to adopt in part the rhetoric of their more advanced colleagues. They came to believe they were

* " The movement of private family adjustment agencies away from low-income people is...revealed in an examination of their patterns of referral of clients..." The reasons for the shift to middle class clients were that professional status derived from the status of the client~~the~~. Secondly it derived from class difference and the social workers technology. There has always been a middle class bias in case work. The "therapeutically oriented case work technology" substitutes middle class mental hygiene values for traditional middle class moral values and requires more intense, intimate and prolonged interaction between the case worker and the client. This accentuates class differences conflicting definitions of problems and solutions.

From Richard A. Cloward and Irwin Epstein, "Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor: the Case of the Family Adjustment Agencies," Zald, Social Welfare Institutions (New York:Wiley, 1965)-p623-644

** Ibid. Passim. See also David R. Hunter "Slums and Social Work or Wishes and the Double Negative," in Rosenberg, et al (eds) Op cit. P594 ff. Hunter, a community based worker, argues for a retreat from "deep-dish therapy" and "technical service" and a return to social problems, especially problems of poor people, using "interdisciplinary insights" to a greater extent. However he lists delinquency and illegitimacy as two areas which are likely candidates for these reforms. He also discusses the problems of agency management as they effect the clients and the problems: there is a tendency for "delinquency preventing" agencies to kick tough kids out of programs for making trouble, or for unwed mother counsellors to counsel girls who do not represent the greatest group of unwed mothers.

there to deal with psychological and family problems, and they looked at and defined their programs and their clients in terms of psychological problems. The old settlement house programs became "therapeutic", poor people became "emotionally crippled", and delinquency (their prime concern and function) became the product of "disturbed family relations", "ambivalence toward authority figures",* or "acting out". A broken window became a "cry for help". **

The poverty programs, and new interest in poor people, provided settlement workers with the opportunity to change their priority of work, and to concern themselves with a new set of problems -- poverty. The most important change has been the settlement worker's involvement in local politics as representatives of their clients. This political involvement of community organizers has been striking in Cambridge, but not confined to it. Federal programs put a premium on the involvement of poor people -- community organizers have taken advantage of this in their move to increase their status. By becoming the spokesmen -- and strategists -- of poor neighborhoods they have suddenly developed a new and more powerful clientele of city politicians and administrators. They are no longer confined to food distribution, family quarrels, and group work. Their licence has expanded, and with it, their power and status as a group. It has also become possible for social workers to do more that will bring long term benefits to their clients, looking at poverty and powerlessness as well as family dis-

22.

* Interview with Karyl Sweeney: "They were ambivalent toward authority; the toughest kids wanted to be cops."

**Interview with Bruce Levison, Neighborhood Four Alliance staff member, at the Margaret Fuller House, March 20, 1967. "There is a lawyer--legal aid office in the neighborhood now. We (the settlements) had to sit on them. They told a kid who had been crying for help that they would get him off. He had to break into a house three days later to get arrested again."

turbances. This change in the status and role, and in the licence of the settlement worker, is particularly striking in Neighborhood Four. *

Although planners' early concern was for the same set of urban problems as social workers, although seen from a planner's point of view in terms of crowding, dirt, noise and absence of wholesome countryside, the early plans from Garden Cities to new towns seemed to deal directly with the poor but slightly. If anything, the popular manifestation of planning, in the zoning and general plan craze of the 1920's and early 1930's, were designed to keep city problems and poor people out of "nice neighborhoods."

This concentration on the needs and interests of middle income families is directly related to planners' licence. They were limited to proposing physical design standards, and only on occasion, promoting physical change.

New areas were the easiest to plan for and these could only be developed for the middle class; physical improvements needed money in large amounts, not available for the poor families. The exception to this has been the "housers" whose public housing developments were specifically for the poor, (where it was hoped to create a complete new environment that would be able to resist the encroachment of "blight" from the neighborhood) and more recently, the urban renewal planners, whose plans affect poor people whether or not they provide new environments for them.

* See section on the settlements, pages 65-81 below. Also Appendices, which contain the public relations publications and summaries of their work, budgets and the like, put out by the Alliance.

"Physical determination," now losing its popularity with planners, the view that the physical environment is sufficient to mold the social environment can be seen as an effort to make the limited, physical, licence important enough to tackle the problems of planners' early concern.

Planning also differs from social work in its client relationship. Social workers have traditionally been hired by an agency to work with its clients, a served population. For planners, the hiring agency has always been the direct client. This has meant that planners do not face the same status difficulties as social workers, as they generally do not work for low status people or regard them as their clients. Planners are therefore able to present a better front, at least among themselves, as working close to the seats of power. Indeed, a planner who sees as his task to work for the "city as a whole", and who regards the politicians and/or Chamber of Commerce as the legitimate representatives of the interests of the city need have little contact with poor people or any powerless group, except as he appears as a spokesman for the city power structure.

The kinds of concerns that city governments have traditionally considered "problems"- the tax base, traffic, the cost of civic improvements have extended the work of planners beyond their previous licence. Concentrating on these concerns has not, however, increased

planners' interest in defining social problems or advocating the interest of the poor. In many cases the "evils of slums" rhetoric has become the ideological justification for projects that improve the tax base at the expense of the slum dwellers.*

Planning does engage in efforts to improve professional status. One expression of this is the attempt on a national level to get planning put into every new city grant, and planners on national committees and task forces and bureaucratic offices. The attempt here is not only to provide planners with jobs, but also to lay claim to the process of definition of problems for action, to make it impossible for action to take place without the participation planners. Planners have been particularly plagued that the process of planning- the process in which they have license to engage- is not regarded as vitally necessary, or even useful, and is often seen as the peculiar task of the administrators of what is being planned, to be done on the side. By including planning as a prerequisite for a grant or program, planners are attempting to make the task they have licence to perform seen as a specialized task by others.

Secondly, "social planning" has emerged within the field, as a subfield which claims a wider licence to work outside of questions of physical planning and city administration in defining what social problems are.*

Finally, advocacy planning, an entrepreneurial attempt to assume the power to identify problems, and crit-

* The writings of Stuart Chase are a good example of Public Housing Propaganda. Also Charles Abrams, The Future of Housing (New York, 1946)

On Urban Renewal, see Martin Anderson "The Federal Bulldozer" in J. Bellush and M. Hausknecht (eds) Urban Renewal, People, Politics and Planning (New York; Doubleday, 1967), pp. 390-400. Also other articles in that book.

** The emergence of this field is also a response to the existence of more government posts where studies and prediction and problem identifying go on. This opening is possible because sociology, in its efforts at mobility, has disdained "applied" fields, particularly bureaucratic posts; and social work, with whom planners are currently competing for these posts, has no more status or recognition than planning. Social work and planning professors, in a "social planning" seminar open to both kinds of students, made courteous disclaimers of any intention to exclude the other group from this opening field.

icize planning work, has developed rapidly over the last few years. The cases are selected according to the "importance" of the issues involved in them for planners. In Boston it has been low income housing supply, the transportation question, and bulldozer urban renewal. Planners have not succeeded in making any of these questions into public issues, using the ordinary professional methods of communication--speeches and articles. Planners still need clients to lend legitimacy to their claims, to make their opinion into an issue. Their mandate is not broad enough to allow them to decide when something is a problem, without legitimating noise from the unfortunate victims to confirm it. Only advocacy planning allows planners to attack problems that existing political powers do not wish them to identify.*

Both planners and social workers have attempted, with some success to broaden their licence to deal with social problems. A severe limitation however, is being carried over from the past. This is the use of the neighborhood as a base of action and analysis.

Historically, planners and social workers have had to do with neighborhoods. Their activities have taken place in limited geographical areas, usually residential areas. This concentration of their work reflects a variety of factors. The most important of them are a limitation on their licence, and a particular judgment about society and social problems. Planners and social workers' judgments about what social problems are have probably been affected more by this geographical and social limitation than by any other contingency of their work.

* "Listening", as employed by planners and social workers in Cambridge, reflects the same lack of mandate, the inability to define the subject matter of their work. A planner or social worker that rejects the work of the City Council or the agency board, respectively, must search for another legitimate source to define "problems" -- which are the subject matter of their work. He can then translate the wants of the "people" and report on their "needs" as an intermediary voice. In order to do this without challenge, however, he must prove his unanimity with the true source -- the "community" -- whether such exists or not.

These generalizations on advocacy planning are based on my work as secretary to Urban Planning Aid, a Boston area advocacy group, during the summer of 1966.

Concentration on neighborhoods is part of planners' heritage from their days of preventing slums. Planners' main thrust for many years has been for a pleasant place to live. This has been the ideological goal even of the most modest. It has also been the broadest licence planners have been allowed. Planners could not interfere with the economics of the physical design of industry or shopping areas. They were allowed to improve the aesthetic setting of home life and to apply prophylactic measures to prevent or to eradicate that obvious evil, the slum. When their licence in this area was challenged, they successfully defended themselves by threatening property owners with the sudden appearance of tenements and saloons in the suburbs.

Planners' modern involvement with social problems has been principally with the social problems of carrying out neighborhood improvement projects in poor neighborhoods. This has been so much so that "social problem" has come to connote poverty, low education and public welfare to most planners. The public housing programs, urban renewal, and model cities projects have all been centered around slum neighborhoods. They have included progressively more funds for "social programs" to attack, within the neighborhood context, social problems. It is these programs that planners have licence to help design.

As I have argued, the social workers who still dealt with poor people in the late 1950's were those who still manned the neighborhood-based settlement houses. The newer

legislation has increased the number of social workers in the neighborhoods. Their licence to deal with social problems has broadened past family dynamics and the mechanics of redistribution to a whole list of problems of the relationship of poor people to the rest of society. However, their licence is still to deal with the problems of poor people in and through the neighborhoods.

The particular judgment about society and social problems that the concentration on neighborhoods, especially poor neighborhoods, reflects is that slums are a self-contained disease, and any meddling with any other area or institution is undesirable, or impossible and unnecessary. This judgment has obvious political significance on a national scale. It is possibly a necessary judgment for professionals working within the context of government funds and established agencies.

Concentrating on a neighborhood has certain effects for the kind of topics that are available for action. For example, employment and income from employment are irrelevant, except as something you want to get people into; the work life is out of the picture. Nobody but the unemployed, the children, and the people who are watching the children are available -- at home or on the street. * "Neighborhood issues" even for the politically minded turn out to be trash collection, playgrounds, and street lights, efforts to make existing services establish local branches (eg, clinics, libraries, police stations). Psychological counselling and group work

* During the late nineteenth century, and in some current older neighborhoods that were built then, slum neighborhoods were not removed from the work world. Factories were nearby, children worked in them, and many people, especially women and children, worked in their homes doing piecework. Today, there are fewer neighborhood factories, little home work, and the only important neighborhood work ~~are~~ services -- child care, selling cosmetics, gambling, special items. Moreover, when there are nearby industries, they are seen as causing "blight", and there is an effort to be rid of them.. The general program effects of dealing with poverty on a neighborhood basis are apparent also in settlement programs.. For descriptions of such neighborhoods, see the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Reports, especially 1874, which includes raw returns on a housing survey.

can be done from a neighborhood office better than from a downtown center. However, wage levels, welfare, the educational system, and the job market can only be attacked by supplementary tutoring and referral -- individual mobility projects. The system and the rules of its operation are controlled elsewhere, as are the level and kind of basic services such as police, housing and transportation.

Limiting the geographical realm of action for intervention on social problems has limited the licence of planners and social workers by class. They may only intervene within poor people's neighborhoods to solve the social problems of the slums.

Limitation of programs to the neighborhood has not been seen as an entirely artificial, political choice by planners and social workers. There is an active intellectual tradition, deriving ultimately perhaps from the same political choice as the current programs that makes the neighborhood seem important, even crucial, in dealing with social problems.

As I remarked above, Neighborhood Four seemed to have little existence as a neighborhood, outside of lines drawn on the maps, and the terminology of the professionals. Social workers observed this, remarking that people were "alienated" from each other, distrustful of their neighbors, and tended not to have many friends in the neighborhood. This was regarded as pathological -- a sign of a "sick" neighborhood. Moreover, while emphasis has now changed in

viewing the active service area of the settlement houses, Bruce Levinson described to me the "alienated" neighborhood over on Norfolk Street,* where people did not know one another, and Dick Cass was worried because of the poor emotional health of adult males as revealed by his inability to start a bowling league among them.**

There is a strong expectation, not only that a neighborhood is a reasonable unit of description and action, but that the people in a relatively small urban area should have built up primary relationships -- acquaintance, trust, and willingness to share informal moments with each other -- if the residents can sustain such relationships with anyone. There is a presumption among both planners and social workers that physical proximity and mutual physical accessibility should result in the development of a social unit, and a network of "friendships" -- if nothing is wrong with the people. The tendency to analyze and act in terms of neighborhoods is closely tied to expectations that normally, a neighborhood forms a "social unit", a relatively confined social system composed of primary groups, mutual trust, and mutual obligations.

This view and these expectations owe their beginnings to the same set of intellectual antecedents as planning and social work. Slums were quite early unfavorably compared with the happy agricultural villages from which urban immigrants were presumed to have come. Cities, by their scale, and industrialism, by single-minded application of the pro-

* Levison Interview.

** Interview, Richard Cass, Alliance Executive for Neighborhood Four, March 23, 1967. He also commented:
"It worries us when the adults don't function as healthy people in their own right. Bill has tried to start recreation among the adults and failed. He tried card clubs and games and bowling and the response was terrible. (Did you try beano?) But who goes to the beano games -- the women; it's only the women. .. Here we are trying to sell a value system and don't apologize for it."

fit motive, were said to have created slums, crime, disease, etc. The early sociological students of crime postulated a theory of social disorganization (loss of the village) as a cause of juvenile delinquency. Later studies, led by William F. Whyte's Street Corner Society, rebutted the idea that slums were disorganized, and instead, showed the tight networks of friendship and obligation that obtained in the North End. Urban villages were discovered and swiftly romanticized into the stable working-class neighborhood.

The intellectual background left two images. One of the unfortunately disorganized, alienated area, where crime flourished, violence abounded, and the wild gangs of juveniles terrorized the streets; the other of the romantic immigrant village, highly organized, political stable, and non-threatening. Crime in particular was directly related to neighborhood organization.

The result of this latter image for Neighborhood Four was a diagnosis of "sick" because in part it did not conform to the second, revised, image of the cohesive slum that was not really a slum. Much of the work of the settlement houses became and still continues to be an attempt to construct the basis of mutual trust and mutual control that makes a "neighborhood":

"When the House was first founded, it was actually a much better neighborhood. People knew each other.. There wasn't trouble with the kids; it was just an immigrant neighborhood and the House taught English and cooking. Now it's much worse; our people do not have stable relationships." *

* For a general discussion of the social disorganization school, see Mills, Op Cit. See also quote on page 13F from Mills.

Other works include:

Maurice R Stein, Eclipse of Community (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960) .

William F Whyte, Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). This was of course the basis of much of the "village" school. The introduction to this book, also found in Stein (ed) Reflections on Community Studies, Op Cit. contains much that is valuable on the relationship of the settlement workers to the local community, their views of it, and the like.

Herbert Gans, The Urban Villagers (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962) Is probably most familiar to planners, it marks their rather belated discovery of "villages".

Harvey W Zorbaugh The Gold Coast and the Slum (Chicago; University of Chicago Press, 1963) Is one of the better known products of the "Chicago School" of social disorganization theorists and early sociologists. This work, of course is not nearly so uncritical as the "practical problems work" and social work theory that claimed to be based on it:

"As a result of the breakdown of community life and community institutions, the indifference of the local population to local "problems", and the failure of local "problems" to find their way into politics, the greater part of the Near North Side is incapable of political action and self-government. And as a matter of fact, the greater part of this area does not govern itself, but is governed by the police and the social agency.

The relationship of the law to this area is largely one of repression...the values of these outlying communities (that set the laws) are not the values of the population of the greater part of the Near North Side. They have to be forced upon this population by the police. And the police are successful only in enforcing compliance with the negative values, the prohibition of the law...The social agencies, for their part, are interested in setting standards in situations undefined by law...to persuade, cajole or force the population of the district to conform to the values and mores of the larger society, values and mores derived from generations of village life, and often unadapted to the life of the city. Much of this effort is directed at mere physical reclamation...." p195,6

"The Community and the Social Agency" Chapter 9, Zorbaugh, Op. cit.

** Conversation with Elsa Baldwin Spring, 1963 (more or less)

Social work in general took these images to heart. Until recently, a community organizer was not one who organized a political group; it was one who attacked "social disorganization". Planners prescribe a social worker in one part of a plan in order to combat the same ills, and discuss physical arrangements that will create the closeness of a village.

IV. Planners and Social Workers in Neighborhood Four.

The Interviews.

Interviews with planners and social workers active in Neighborhood Four covered the following questions:

- (1) What are the problems of the neighborhood?
- (2) What are your current programs?
- (3) How do you go about finding out what the problems are and devising programs?
- (4) Do you have any problems as a professional in your relationship with the neighborhood?

Generally the person being interviewed responded by delivering a long series of observations that often sounded like they had been given before.

The reaction to the first question was typically of the nature: 'You know the problems; it was what your class gave a report on.' To cite some concrete responses:

"Generally the problems are teenagers, that is, vandalism, assault -- people are afraid of going out of their houses on the weekend. It's really bad. Housing (rents and quality), and recreation and lack of usable open space." *

"Low income -- you learn to live with that of course. Low educational -- abilities and motivation problems. Deterioration and overcrowding of housing -- of course people would fix them up if they had more money. Health -- very much related to income. They would have more doctors if they could pay for them. Health, education and jobs are all tied in together, with income." **

In general, planners tended to emphasize "low income" more and "teenagers" less than did the social workers, but overall both groups were in substantial agreement about what the problems were. Both groups made short references to the housing and rent situations (evictions, rent rises and conversions) and to the physical threats from Polaroid, NASA

* Levison Interview.

** Interview with Constance Williams, Associate Planner,
Cambridge Planning Board, Friday, March 10, 1967..

and MIT. No doubt they considered that a planning student would be familiar with these issues. They did not mention the Inner Belt.

Three themes run through these professionals' descriptions of how they analyze and assess neighborhood problems. First, they emphasize that they work "professionally". Secondly, they say that they "listen" to the community. Thirdly, these professionals stress their use of a pragmatic style of operation. I will deal with each of these themes and some of their implications in the sections that follow.

A. Working Professionally.

To planners and social workers their right to discuss the neighborhood, analyze its problems, and develop programs for its residents rests on being professionals. This professional status distinguishes them from "amateurs" by guaranteeing special technical competence and a general professional approach:

"Those of us who are trained in the business -- we don't operate as amateurs. We don't play prophet. You can predict responses only when you have been through the situation previously. ..." *

Technical competence implies a special wider knowledge of the situation with which the professional claims licence to deal. Social workers and planners communicated their possession of this kind of knowledge by discussing the problems of Neighborhood Four from a general viewpoint of typical low income neighborhoods, with typical sets of problems.

* Cass Interview.

Their right to generalize in this way rested on prior experience and academic training.

Both groups insisted explicitly that these views on local problems did not derive solely from their experience in this one neighborhood, but covered their experiences with a number of different neighborhoods and neighborhood groups. They believed Neighborhood Four to be a typical "low income neighborhood":

Q: "How did you come to your idea of what the problems were?"

A: "Of course I didn't start with Neighborhood Four. It's a very typical neighborhood, like Hull House, Henry Street Neighborhood." *

(They have the) "standard physical needs of a low income neighborhood. ... I have had enough experience with groups, eight years in Dorchester, the South End, Mission, with the BRA " (to avoid any problems in working with them).. **

The social workers did not use the phrase "typical". They gave diffuse lists that showed their appreciation of precise differences. This appreciation, however, derived from experience and training in many neighborhoods:

There are many specific problems -- (eg) families with their kids and bad housing and problems with authority figures. And there is a lack of recreation facilities. Many of the goodies of a healthy neighborhood are not here.

If you want to get institutional about it, the community has no goodies because they have no power; they are not a voting block. They are not big enough. They are not a dirt-down poor, they are not a Negro community nor any solid ethnic community. It shouldn't exist by any physical standard, but it is trying to exist because it is in effect a healthy community. It is not sick. It provides avenues for people who couldn't survive in any other community. It is not as crude as the old melting pot but there is alot of themelting pot idea in the community. Have you read Robert Woods or do they assign that yet, Americans in Process? The settlements responded then for a task in americanization and sociali-

* Williams Interview.

** Interview with Richard Green, Vice-President, Cambridge Corporation, March 20, 1967.

zation. That's not what we do now but the theory is still valid. Society is melting people into it, but the frame of reference is different. Here we do not talk about evolving into the society but rather how to apply power and make needs felt. Earlier in time there were other places to go, but now the barriers are much tighter. Mrs. M. now -- and don't quote me on this -- couldn't move to the suburbs, to West Newton, even if her income were higher. She couldn't survive there. A man where I used to work, head of a local committee in the South End, had a good income, well fixed, but he was straight-line Syrian; he preferred to live in the South End. He said he wanted to live somewhere where he could yell at his kid from two blocks away..*

Professionals also rely heavily on secondary sources and academic sources in their work. These studies help by describing commonsense activities of the clients in technical academic terms, writing everyday life in the language of the professional, so that it becomes part of his "training". Once something has been studied, it may cease to be an irritating propensity of the client or failure of the professional, but becomes an integrated part of the professional's technical image of the "culture" in which he is working. **

This may even extend to a special "professional" view of the neighborhood, as Dick Cass emphasized in his interview. This view rests on the professional's ability to use his academic training and professional experience to understand models of typical problems and situations, to make the distinctions necessary to appreciate Neighborhood Four's unique situation, and to develop the correct response:

"Those of us who are trained in the business have quite an encyclopedia of tactics. ... We don't commit ourselves to any predominate methodology and

* Case Interview.

** See page 46, below, for an ~~exam~~ple of this.

tactic. We can shift as the situation shifts: the overall community, the size of the population, the relative land value, its worth to the city to preserve it as residential use, the industry, MIT, Harvard, the pattern of a city that will not admit problems." *

Technical competence rests on knowledge, training, experience, and understanding of the use of general models to develop specific tactics. This competence is presumed to give special technical skills and outlook to work in a particular area, skills which others without training or training in different areas are presumed not to possess:

"Anyone with community organizer training is different from someone with casework or group work background. The organizers are important. They know how to manipulate the neighborhood." **

Concern with these skills particularly mark the outlook of the settlement house worker, allowing him to distinguish his role from that of volunteers and local people:

"Two years back the fun projects were more the focus for the staff. Now the community and volunteers have taken them over; they are running them. The meat and potatoes is professional service. Why we are here, and what is the technical level of competence? We have to deal with generic problems of a poor neighborhood -- in the family, in academic (and) environmental areas - without a limitation of subject matter." ***

Not only does this training and technical knowledge facilitate adjustment to and performance of certain occupational roles, but they also restrict movement into areas outside these roles where professional licence is less clearcut and attributed technical skills less obviously relevant. Planners moving into more "social planning", for example, are regarded as encountering great difficulties:

* Cass Interview.

** Green Interview.

*** Cass Interview.

"Connie Williams has been involved quite a bit, as a physical planner doing social planning, pushing social planning people into doing social planning. It is difficult for a physical planner to translate social planning into physical terms. ..." *

The difficulty of moving into another area rests on a person's training. Presumably he is unable to see things in terms other than those prescribed by his professional training, and cannot properly identify problems outside his area of competence. Nor does he see these outside problems as anything but marginally relevant to his central concerns:

"Dick Green and I get along well. There are significant differences, but I don't think they are about goals. We have worked together before in the South End. But we do communicate, hammer at each other. He and I are in agreement by now about goals. But I am not very concerned about the physical dimension. That is not my training. I am concerned with physical environment only as it relates to the social environment. Social planning is not "Do you build a new city center?", but: "Is the drugstore open on Sunday?" "Does the market cash your check?" "What lines of produce does it carry?" The last thing we did was get the pharmacy on Main Street to open a section where you can pay your gas-electricity bills." **

The presumption of competence, and a particular area of work from which others may be excluded, is the essence of an occupational licence. We have noted above that the licence of neither planners nor social workers goes generally unchallenged. Indeed, as we will see, civil rights groups in Roxbury did not respect the realm of the professional community organizers. The special emphasis that these professionals gave to "working professionally", having special training and skills, and certain areas where they may legitimately identify problems, was in part an effort to sustain their claim of professional status. By claiming

* Green Interview.

** Cass Interview.

inability to properly give attention to problems in another area of competence because of lack of training, professionals mutually recognize and protect each others licence and competence, and hence ultimately their professional standing. Working professionally, then, clearly requires awareness of the boundaries of one's special competence and a willingness to stay within them to concentrate on the kinds of problems that one is legitimately qualified -- licenced -- to deal with.

To communicate this technical competence professionals adopt a style and stance of objective detachment. This stance both validates the professional's claim to be working properly within his licence, and legitimates decisions made in its name. Many professionals feel that they must remain detached and neutral toward the neighborhood, and not get "involved" in issues outside immediate technical questions. One planner went so far as to argue against drawing "any conclusion on what's right and wrong with the neighborhood". It is interesting that in line with this most restricted view of professional licence he then proceeded to define as "problems" two areas regarded as the most neutral and uncontroversial: (1) questions of physical location, and (2) problems of carrying out the process of physical planning that arose within the organization. In this way the emphasis falls largely or even exclusively on the essentially technical (and again, neutral) nature of local problems:

"I only spotted they had organizational problems; that

was the key to their other ones. These they squared away. Much of the other problems in physical planning -- there aren't many, at this scale at least. There are no other major forces involved. It's not like a highway. Here you are trying to meet the need of the neighborhood at a fairly specific level. They need certain things, and the problem is where to put them, and in doing so, to displace as few people as possible. Anyone else doing a plan for this neighborhood would come up with pretty much the same thing. There are only so many empty sites.

The other problem was whether they would think big -- they thought pretty big." *

Detachment and neutrality may be seen as a stance helpful in dealing with often complicated issues. Hughes has described a profession as one whose routine business is other people's emergencies. Particularly crucial here is showing some emotional distance from the problems one is working with. By behaving with such emotional detachment one communicates skillfulness and familiarity with a situation. This kind of controlled emotional involvement also distinguishes the professional from the well-meaning amateur by giving a guarantee that his actions are not a hobby -- that his decisions are not arbitrarily or ignorantly made; they do not come from the whim of the personal character or situation, but are "objectively" arrived at. The concept of being a professional is related to the idea that professionals wield skills and possess a body of knowledge that may be acquired; that the subject matter with which they deal is possessed of sufficient regularity that training and experience will develop these skills and a knowledge of the regularities of their subject matter. Finally it connotes that one has separated one's activity as the occupant of a parti-

* Green Interview.

cular position or job from personal, familial or other roles not related to the work world and may act in a disinterested manner. The implication is that success of the client will be the only interest the professional has.

From this it is clear that emotional detachment is only one part of the requirement for working professionally. The proper professional attitude also demands that one maintain the proper perspective on the seriousness of any encountered situation, an ability to appreciate its unique character, and choose the appropriate levels of reaction to it. Some of the perceived difficulties and dilemmas become apparent in the following extended comment:

"We supply the strategy . . . (For) the community comes on raw. That's fine if you are in an environment where you can go that way."

You can play it different in Roxbury. (But Roxbury is not scaring anybody anymore, and there are a lot of players, many civil rights groups.) . . . And civil rights are not the problem. For example the Northern Student Movement. When they moved in they made the assumption -- two rather unwarranted assumptions. One was that all groups that had preceded them were wrong, and they assumed they could do something. They went around broadcasting, without resources or experienced people. It was a hungry community, hungry for action, and they made a third assumption, that if they had bodies it meant progress. Motion and progress aren't the same thing. A lot of people rapidly affiliated; they were excited by young people coming into the community. (But) they hit some snags. You can't convince John Collins to see God -- you should read Banfield on how action takes place. Look at the Madison Park situation. It was dealt with exclusively with political infighting. There were already people who worked with different situations for dealing with the subtleties of working with the Council and the Legislature. There is a problem of if you try (~~to get~~) power, like with the threat to get Mrs. Hicks, (and) you lose. Confrontation and marching are the last thing you use because there is nothing left for an encore. If it doesn't work there is nothing left.

Haynes is an example. When the confrontation arose about Washington (Madison) Park, Mike found himself having to shift allegiance in trying to cool the process. People were threatening to burn down schools, unless he brought it into the established leadership. He couldn't cool it. He added respectability, by delivering the ultimatum. Maybe other leadership might have evolved eventually but it was a battle -- war -- situation.

There was a parallel situation in COBI's relationship with Polaroid and the Board of Zoning Appeals. They got stung in August. The situation in Polaroid was that one side didn't know what the other side had said. Our strategic input was to talk strategy -- don't tell where you are going to picket -- they just said they are going to march. A rumor got out that they were going to march on Dr. Lands' house. The reaction was immediate and strong.

The recent impetus of flag waving has very questionable merit. You can't change it over night. The problems are not the result of evil men in dark hats. It's a result of societal structuring. *

The main sins of the civil rights groups from his viewpoint were rejection of "experienced people" and past and proven methods, use of confrontation, and unseemly haste.. He challenged the assumption that the present situation constituted an emergency about which something had to be done quickly. While his first reference to Roxbury was used to compare Neighborhood Four, where "raw" tactics were not appropriate, to a place where they were, reference to civil rights groups brought immediate attack on the unprofessional tactics that were used. NSM was used as an example, probably not because the decisions were theirs, since he refers to activities led by a variety of groups, but because they are no longer in operation.** From his point of view a true professional must have a different time commitment, along with more concern for preserving his institution. He should be realistic about trying to change something big.

* Cass Interview.

** They folded up in the Fall of 1965. Exodus had requested control of the tutorial program, which had been their biggest project; funds were low (that Fall and the preceding summer saw a striking decline in funds for all civil rights groups), and the local chairman (and full-time staff worker) was sick.

From conversations with Mrs. Sarah Ann Shaw, Chairman, Summer and Fall, 1965; and from personal observations.

Incidentally, the decision to take on de facto segregation, which resulted in confronting Mrs. Hicks, was made by the NAACP board before 1963-64 (the first year NSM was active in Roxbury). From conversation with Mrs. Andrea Ballard, NSM executive committee, Summer, 1965.

According to Cass, professional analysis of the situation must rest on technical knowledge of the problems, not on pop culture and hasty conclusions, or precipitous action, which he implied were the bases of the thinking of the civil rights groups. Finally, operations should be conducted with skill and dignity, "political infighting ... dealing with the subtleties of working with the Council and the Legislature" rather than "flag waving".. Again, only a professional has the needed sense of time, of past and future, the skills of political infighting, and knowledge of social theory, all of which licence him to give wise "strategic input".

Similarly, the following comment indicates the long-term commitment and time perspective seen as characteristic of the proper professional attitude:

"Sceptics say we are battling against the impossible to keep the area. I don't believe it. When I came here two years ago everyone said, "In two years there won't be a neighborhood." ... I'm still here and most of the people are still here." *

In addition, one must not become overwhelmed by community feelings of crisis and emergency. Rather the professional tries to deal with these situations in a rational manner, not giving into to demands for immediate and drastic action but fitting the incident into the wider framework of a more general problem":

"There is fear about delinquency. Adults are afraid to go out because they have had tin cans thrown. Pur-ses have been snatched, I suppose. Of course, this is not unique to the neighborhood. People are afraid on Beacon Hill too.

I suppose there may be more of a gang hanging on the street corner, but there are more children.

* Levison Interview.

(Is it still true that the projects have a higher density of children?) The projects might, but East Cambridge and North Cambridge have as a whole more children than the projects. It's mainly large families and elderly -- a family with an income of six or seven thousand and six children just doesn't have much money. The smaller families have been replaced by the elderly. They don't need the projects." *

This resistance to community feeling in identifying problems and taking up action appears in Dick Cass's discussion of Roxbury (above), where civil rights workers are seen as accepting complaints too readily and too quickly assuming that an emergency situation existed and required action. The desirability of resisting and reinterpreting what people say they want underlies the professionals' commonsense distinction between local "wants" and local "needs". Although Mrs. Williams referred to this distinction to refute it ("what people want is what they need in the long run"), professionals generally talked of "needs", ** implicitly characterizing "wants" as immediate, short-sighted and petty desires that bear little or no relation to the "real" problems. Staff discussions at the settlement houses, for example, center on "needs", on the problems it is considered important to solve (according to the professional, technical perspective) for the long-term good of the community.

Client "wants" -- what they say they should have --- are not ignored, however. The proper reaction to what clients say can be considered by turning to the operations whereby professionals engage in "listening" to the community.

* Williams Interview

**Cass Interview:(Here we are talking about)"how to apply power and make the needs felt."

B. Listening.

"There are three views (of the community and its problems): a policy view, developed by the Board and the Alliance, a neighborhood view, which is developed by listening, and a professional view." *

In simplest terms, "listening" means that the patient's complaints are relevant to determining his illness. This is both a position about an "objective" way of defining problems and a value position about the proper voice of the people and the moral obligations of the professional to his client. However, listening is not a simple or easily defined and understood process. It is the professional, not the client, who articulates the position of the neighborhood. The professional, in doing this, does not take the complaints at face value. Professionals recognize that their relevances differ from those of their clients and that they do not share the same commonsense world. There are inherent difficulties in social interaction with clients which the professional must smooth over in order to receive complaints at all. Listening is a complex process of translating gripes to problems.

Moreover, listening is a process of communication to the client, as well as a way for the professional to form his own view. It is a process under the control of the professional, who can set the terms and topics of the communication.

Finally, having listened, developed lines of communication with the clients, and articulated a neighborhood view

* Cass Interview.

of the problems, the professional is in a position to extend his licence into problem-areas which would be denied him on the basis of professional competence alone. The claim of speaking for the neighborhood gives him broad licence to make demands, articulate needs, and carry out programs.

In this section I will describe this process and its functions in detail.

In basic terms "listening" is a process for checking on and complementing the models professionals bring with them into the neighborhood. They can use it to discover particular needs, to analyze why particular programs do not work, to discover or build new models of what is going on:

(Back to listening, how do you listen to determine the community's needs?)

"... you pick it up casually, meet in a store, hear it in a meeting. One of the purposes provided in a meeting is an attempt to clarify a lot of stuff..(We) ask in the meeting, "What does this mean?", in a new block group, say.

(For example) we ran a resident day camp last summer (where) participation was very low. We think the resident day camp was a good thing. Here, we were feeling for a tangible problem, fishing for what is the function of the child in the family. (When you ask (why participation is low) you get ten varieties of reasons: They all come down to say that parents use their children in this neighborhood for baby-sitting, errands, etc. Or more subtly, the focus of the parents' existence is on the children. They don't know what to do if the kids are away; it has chopped out their rationale for existing. In the neighborhood it is not feasible for adults to have fun; they are child- and task-oriented.

John Speigel did a study in South Boston on the role of the child in the family. ... He says great things on how the parents use the kids. It makes us nervous as professionals when adults don't operate as healthy people in their own right." *

Morally, listening in effect reflects the position of

* Ibid.

professionals caught in the middle between the power of the agencies and the desire to work with the neighborhood. Generally these professionals have been hired by outside agencies: the Alliance, CEOC, the City Planning Board, and the City Manager. On the other hand are the "people of the neighborhood" whom they are supposed to serve and who are supposed to benefit to some extent from their projects and programs. There is no necessary correspondance between the interests of the outside agencies and those of the people in the local neighborhood. Planners and social workers active in Neighborhood Four become those most likely to be caught in the bind when these interests do diverge. By listening to the people of the community, by trying to articulate a position for the neighborhood -- a digest of its needs and problems -- the professional is trying to prevent or lessen a conflict of loyalties by persuading his employers to adopt his view of the needs of the neighborhood. Justin Gray touched on several aspects of this dilemma in advocating neighborhood hiring of professionals:

"City Hall can't be trusted... They can't trust me... I want to give money directly to the community to hire their own local professionals -- any kind -- to counteract the City Hall pro's. The question is how you fund it. You go outside of the federal, state and city money to the foundations. A non-profit foundation. Take a lesson from the CIA. Then by contract give a hunk to Neighborhood Four. It would not come through City Hall because foundations can't give to the City. It would enable them to hire their own professionals for a physical plan or a psychiatrist or a lawyer. It would be autonomous. It would give the neighborhood wherewithal -- (to carry things out?) yes -- and to develop ideas and fight for them.... A man like Dick Green can go down there and help but his loyalty is to the Cambridge Corporation." *

* Interview with Justin Gray, Special Assistant to the
City Manager, March 17, 1967.

However, listening would still be a necessary operation even if there were no conflict of loyalties. For to articulate the community's view, the professional has to translate gripes into problems. This entails a complex process of translation whereby problems come to be formulated and programs devised in professional terms. Such translation is necessary because of the difference between the professional's view of society and its problems and the commonsense approach of his clients. One crucial area of difference lies in the professional's different time sense and views of emergencies, as analyzed previously, as they come to constitute a basic part of his unique approach to the process of defining problems.

Terms of relevance differ in part because a professional has a different view of what may be manipulated than does his client. To the professional certain courses of action may appear futile or irrelevant to the "real problems". Thus Mr. Cass objected to personal attacks on political figures in Boston because the real problem was "societal structuring". On the other hand, professionals generally see more areas open to manipulation than do their clients, and reject complaints that do not manipulate enough. Their training, after all, has concentrated on communicating the kinds of manipulation that are possible in the physical environment or within the emotional make-up of the family. By listening the professional can translate gripes about rents into: "There is a shortage of supply to low income

housing." Or, in the case of the resident day camp, how program participation into the problem of the role of the child in the family, and hence into emotional problems among the parents. (In this case, the complaints from the clients were evidently the inconvenience of sending the children to camp.)

In addition to differences in concepts of relevance and manipulability, there is a difficulty of sustaining social interaction between professionals and local residents. Planners and social workers come from backgrounds quite different from those of the people they must work with in the neighborhood. They are generally from middle class families and neighborhoods, receive middle class salaries, and hold high professional status. These class and educational differences are accentuated by professional training and experience. These factors create a deep gap between the professional social worker or planner and the people he has been hired to serve, a gap which listening represents an attempt to bridge.

When planners and social workers say that they listen, they mean that they recognize that their vocabulary and relevances may not be shared, and that they must try to understand where their client is, and what his terms mean to him. Somehow his world and what is important to him must be taken into account:

Q: Do you have trouble talking past each other?

A: I avoided that. You have to spend a lot of time listening. You can bring things up, but if it doesn't take you can't push it. **

* Williams Interview.

Planners who do not talk about listening (and who perceive no conflict of interest) still have noted that "people don't understand what we're talking about". A member of Urban Planning Aid, who had volunteered in Madison Park (a Boston neighborhood), complained that after "sixteen explanations of staged construction of housing they still didn't understand it." *

Such difficulties seem most critical as they appear in the course of various instrumental relationships between professionals and local residents. A professional who presents a complete position at a local meeting, for example, will be met with silence. No questions, little criticism, perhaps even half-hearted applause. Only later will he learn that people misunderstood his position or disagreed violently with it. This kind of reaction derives from the feeling that it is rude to challenge the ideas and thinking of someone with whom one has close or direct association. But in addition, it reflects the social position of the professional vis-a-vis the group: clearly of higher status and superior knowledge, he is largely immune from attack. On account of such difficulties Connie Williams even suggested that a preliminary instruction was necessary in order to make it possible for planners to gather information at such meetings without elaborate proceedings:

"They should have more teaching in the elementary schools and high school on how to use professionals -- teach them it's okay to ask questions. The actual decisions we don't know." **

* Comment by Gordon Fellman, ^{at the} MIT Dept. of City Planning, Second Year Jury, January, 1967. Fellman is Assistant Professor of Sociology at Brandeis University.

For similar reasons, meetings between professionals and local residents have to be carefully manipulated if they are to be successful. When there are "too many" professionals at a meeting, no one but professionals will talk. Thus any possibility of assessing reaction or comprehension will be lost:

"Most professionals were getting in the way by either not understanding what was happening or preventing people from speaking up because they were afraid of being ripped to shreds by someone more educated. Pretty soon a dialogue between the professionals results., (and) the professionals go away saying, 'Boy, that was a good meeting.' But the people aren't listening. You should pick carefully who is working and what they are doing for you. If someone is not needed at a meeting don't invite them." *

Finally, difficulty arises in professional-client relationships because professionals deal with the "hypothetical" in a way that has meaning only within their (and the academic) world. To anyone else, especially to people whose only information about the intention of the powerful are public statements, there is no difference between advocacy and analysis, between a description and intent. Thus it may happen that a plan presented as a tentative proposal will be taken not as a possible choice, but as a definite, irrevocable decision.

A vivid example of this was the public reaction to a press conference held by MIT professor Bernard Frieden, in which he used possible improvements in Neighborhood Four as an example of the kinds of things passage of the Demonstration Cities Act would make possible. Frieden's purpose,

* Williams Interview.

of course, was to aid the passage of the act, but Cambridge citizens leapt to the conclusion that this was a mere irrelevancy, and that MIT was planning to use Model Cities money to take over Neighborhoods Three and Four. This belief is still widely held, and may be backed up by reference to this press conference. *

Thus professionals, if they wish to smooth things over and find out what people are thinking, must control the processes of meetings and their own role in them in order to allow it. Secondly, they must look for alternatives to the formal meetings which still seem, however, to be the major setting in which this occurs. Finally professionals must act to cut apparent signs of social distance and difference in competence between themselves and their clients. In addition to controlling the number of professionals who appear at meetings, professionals take care to make their own role less evident as a major tactic toward this first objective. As one example, COBI meetings are chaired by local residents.

Planners have the most trouble in finding alternatives to meetings. Mrs. Williams expressed a hope for an "office in the neighborhood". Meanwhile, she was trying to get the social workers to agree to a survey "just with people we know" but was encountered resistance to the proposal.

Social workers, with a physical base in the neighborhood, can find many opportunities for informal, private contact, as well as appearing at many more meetings:

"If you are talking community organization, listening

* For example; Proceedings of Neighborhood Five CEOC, May, 1967. William Ackerly, chairman, explained how the model cities proposal conformed to the "MIT plans" for the area.

is done in the least formal way possible. There is a panic every time anyone wants to do a survey. We don't care for that mechanism, not mechanical ones. As the community develops trust in you, you pick it up casually in a store, hear it in a meeting."*

Since they are familiar figures, it can be less difficult for local residents to criticize them especially when it is a conscious policy to encourage it:

"The Seniors only this week were annoyed about several things and they told Bill -- sent a delegation to Bill and told him, and it hurts. But this is structured into the operation and you can't get away from it. Any damn fool who wants to can come in and tell me how to run this place. I might not change anything but I have an obligation to listen to him. It's part of my job here. This neighborhood is fairly unique in this." We encourage this. When Ruthie Ward talks to Dick Franke -- they do it with respect, but they curse each other out. Both can fight back." **

Finally, the social workers seem to adopt certain informal styles of speech and dress which in effect cut down the apparent gap in their incomes and education between themselves and their clients. Bruce Levinson and Dick Cass both sprinkle their speech with "baby", "cat", "dig", "swing" and mild swear words.

It becomes apparent in analyzing the difficulties of listening that this process does not refer exclusively to collecting and interpreting comments of neighborhood people. Listening is also used in another sense, in describing the professional's efforts to get community residents to listen to him. It is the process by which he measures their understanding of his terms, altering them if need be. Listening is shorthand for a means of communication that gives

* Cass Interview.

** Ibid.

a central place to teaching people to understand and use professional terms, and to think about professionally relevant topics. This teaching process goes on in meetings and informal settings. It involves step by step, topic by topic progression until the active members of the community have adopted a viewpoint and relevances nearer to those of the professional. For example:

"(In planning the neighborhood health center, the health task force of residents will), I think, knowing the planning team, request to include mental health services in the center." *

"The COBI steering committee are good strategists." **

The listening-teaching process is made easier because professionals tend not to deal with the neighborhood at large, but with its selected representatives who become "community leaders" (as in the COBI steering committee, the planning team). The community leader in effect serves as an informant on the local situation, helping to interpret the culture and expectations of the various clients. However, as informant the community leader does not confine his interpretation to one direction. It is to him that the professional explains his "thinking" and ideas in detail. The informant then becomes an interpreter of the professional to the clients.

In formal meetings between the two groups people who have this intermediary-informant role may become the formally or informally designated spokesman for one group or another, using the terms of the group to which he is speaking. Dick

* Levison Interview.

Cass played this role with the MIT advocacy planning class. In fact, one of the major roles of the social worker is to be community leaders, intermediaries between the neighborhood and various professionals, agencies and other outsiders. It is in this role that planners most routinely encounter the social workers.

Listening as communication becomes crucial for the implementation of programs, as well as for extending professional definitions of local problems and proposals for their solution. In fact when planners and social workers talk about listening to the community, they are primarily concerned with using communication to justify their own programs and activities. But this use of the process is well within the powers of the professional, especially of the social workers. It is they who call the meetings, invite the participants, announces the topics and generally set the terms for what is to take place. Mrs. Williams complained about the partial and incomplete nature of the consultations and discussions held with community residents:

Dick Cass doesn't think it possible to discuss alternatives with the residents: I think people could discuss what kind of housing they need. Dr. Porter has people on a committee to analyze health needs.. When they take a child up to the emergency ward or one of the special clinics and get a run around they discuss this, and they have decided they need some health services in the neighborhood. The same thing could be done on housing and employment. People could discuss the difference between high density and low density, set up a training program.

.... We haven't figured out how to present choices and have the neighborhood decide what the neighborhood should decide and tell the technical people what they want. Professionals have not presented choices,

nor stepped back to say, "you choose". Dick Green drew up a plan which they adopted -- they like it -- but it was not a choice. He would show them a change in a particular area and they might say, "you can't do that there." They made choices in small areas but there has been no discussion of high rise versus low rise or what kind of housing at what price. There has been no discussion of industry, whether to get rid of it or keep it in. They want to keep Squirrel Brand; they feel it employs many people from the area; I'm not sure it does, or if it does, whether those people can't find jobs elsewhere. *

The social workers defend themselves from charges of controlling too much by referring again to the limits of the (non-professional) community residents' ability to identify problems or make decisions. It is still the professional's duty to interpret what people need:

"There are limits to how complex you get in decision-making. This is a standing argument. Our physical planning friends like laundry lists of programs for getting money. The neighborhood couldn't be less interested. They want to know if it will work or not; let the technician figure it out. We are trying to get away from categorical decisions. We are trying to move people into gray areas of decision-making, listing factors, etc. On the other hand it can get too fuzzy and vitiate the community. They don't care about 221d3 or 312. "How come the technical expert doesn't solve the question?" the community is asking. We want to keep it clean. If they wanted an independent evaluation, they could retain another professional consultant, but they trust the ones they have. Hiring another person is different from going through the urban renewal manual." **

Listening is not giving over control:

"In a value setup, we will back down when we are damn sure we have heard a good reason, but we want a fair hearing for our position too. This is different from OEO citizen participation. OEO was very new and needed political pizzazz. It turned out to be not politically feasible. (First) the mayors wanted control. Second it was not pragmatically feasible. Third, they were not sure they wanted it. If you compare OEO with what we are doing here, we are on the right track of the relationship of the residents to control and self-determination. We are clear about what is to be controlled

* Williams Interview.

** Cass Interview.

and what are the givens that can't be controlled. We we can't influence the dollars from the United Fund. Finances are given. It is not fair to them to ask them to plan a program, and they plan one that is too expensive, that can't be carried out. We have \$106,000 and that is it. You have to start honest about what is controllable and be candid about the rest that you live with.

(What else other than finances is the rest?) Our traditional services." *

These lines are most evident, to anticipate, in the decision-making structures of the settlement houses. For their boards, over the last two years, have become controlled by local residents. However:

"The function of the committees (on the local board) has changed now. They are moving away from finance committee and personnel committee. There are mostly program-oriented committees. There is a resident-oriented program committee. We're even working to get some teens on the committee." **

Hiring (personnel) and finances, under the terms of the Alliance, are under the control of the central Alliance Board, which is not controlled by local residents.

Thus listening is a process of controlled communication between the client and the professional. The professional tries to control the presentation of himself and his ideas in such a way that he is not threatening. This quiet front allows him to collect the complaints and ideas of the residents, and to explain his aims and ideas to them and to their active representatives. But the process is still very much under the control of the professional. He calls the meetings and sets the agenda. He articulates the positions of the neighborhood. He teaches community leaders to appreciate what are "givens" in any particular situation,

* Cass Interview.

** Levison Interview.

to understand what are the available and realistic alternatives, and to think about problems from the proper strategy, physical planning and mental health. Listening very explicitly does not include giving control over to the residents, or "confusing" them with overly complex issues.

There are two possible reasons why professionals go to so much work to begin this process and then to control it. First, listening provides a way of finding out what they local people of the community want and need, and of mobilizing some local grass-roots participation, or at least verbal support and approval, for the projects and programs developed by the professionals. Social workers need this participation for simple things like justifying their budgets. But both social workers and planners need neighborhood participation and the backing of community leaders when they move to identify new problems and to try to develop new programs around them.

In conclusion professional technical competence constitutes one major justification of the licence of planners and social workers to concern themselves in neighborhood problems, and has an important effect on their perceptions and formulations of what these problems are. But as was argued earlier, the status of these professional groups may be both uncertain and ambiguous, and their assertion of licence to deal with neighborhood and city affairs may be challenged and denied by others in critical power positions. Under these circumstances both planners and social workers seek

other sources of legitimation and justification for their activities. One of the most acceptable are the very residents of the community themselves: if the professional can advance the claim that he speaks for the people of the community and produce community leaders to back up his claim, he may be able to extend his licence into problem areas which would be denied him on the basis of professional competence alone. By making the proper motions of "listening" to the community planner and social worker can create this additional kind of justification for his activities.

Neighborhood residents and clients then come to constitute important resources for active professionals. It is particularly important to control access to them, and rivalry often arises over demands for this kind of access. This rivalry is evident in the social workers' resistance to planners' requests to ask their own questions in a survey. It has also appeared in rivalry between different groups of social workers. In Cambridge this spring, one worker claimed she was specifically forbidden to contact adults in Neighborhood Four whom she wished to organize around issues of school improvement.

Controlling access to neighborhood residents to determine problems and set up programs, as we shall see, is one of the main activities of the settlement houses.

C. Pragmatism.

Although aware that different programs can be devised to work in the neighborhood, professionals see themselves as working within the framework of the physical, social, economic and political conditions of the locale. They try to adjust not only to these conditions, but also to forces and circumstances beyond their control -- the labels on the current sources of funds, their terms of employment, the expectations that have built up around the functions of the settlement houses. Under these circumstances pragmatism entails flexibility, and comes to be considered a virtue rather than a constraint.

It is in the values these professionals put on being practical that they show most clearly their relationship both to academics and politicians. "Practical" means that they are willing to submerge the professionally or academically constructed order of problems, priorities, and cause and effect in order to gain immediate ends.

They are quite willing to use the results of academic study, but they disdain attempts to be too theoretical or too general. They are almost anxious to show familiarity with theoretical work, but the social workers especially are quick to insist that they do not follow any abstract or academic framework to determine which problems should be dealt with first.

Q: What are the priorities for activity now?

A: The COBI plan is number one. They stressed it

was open for suggestions, that it was just a suggestion, but there is still going to bring flak. There is a funding hangup (in the plan). Last year everyone wanted to fund multi-service centers; now you can't sell them. This year it is teen centers. You can't have a day-care center since no one wants to fund them.

In general, priorities are very pragmatic -- it's what you can get. Only people who are sitting around not doing much make lists of priorities. ... There is a committee on the Central Square area. Mostly people like me. ... There is not much discussion of priorities there. (Discussion) centers on areas three and four and it is dominated by needs. These are housing, recreation and teenagers. *

The professionals allow their priorities to be set by the money allocated by state and national political bodies.

They adopt an attitude toward politicians which they regard as hard-headed, and which contains a great deal of admiration, along with attempts at emulation:

"Not that I trust good government people... Frank Duehay has got more for this Neighborhood than Gus Solomons." (Local Irish and Cambridge Civic Association men respectively.) **

KLH has a program for its non-English speaking employees with class and a nursery right on the premises, so the mothers can leave their riveting or soldering or whatever they do and talk to the teacher. It's a nonprofit thing. It was being held up downstairs (in the City offices). I have access to Joe (DeGugliemo, the City Manager) and I went in and asked him to let it go. That wasn't the whole reason they let it go -- there was pressure from the State. I don't know if I like my role, but of course it might not be possible to keep it up. ***

Mr. Cass regards his prime function as a strategic function. This means guiding political action, assessing the political situation, and predicting the practical outcome of various activities. Inevitably this means setting demands that the politicians and others in power are ready

* Levison Interview.

** Ibid.

*** Gray Interview.

for, and doing research on problems in order to receive money that is already available. It does not mean setting out to attack some problem, despite its magnitude, where the settlement house would not be able to deliver. Thus he explains that he did not get involved in the Inner Belt controversy (the Inner Belt dislocates about 250 families in Neighborhood Four) because it would be too discouraging for the group to lose, although at a later interview, he remarked that the existing Inner Belt group should fight harder, because "really losing" would be therapeutic.

On the other hand, Dr. Porter at City Hospital planned in October to set up a maternal and child health outpatient clinic in a neighborhood near the Hospital. Federal funds had become available for such clinics. When I interviewed Bruce Levison in March, he gave me a long list on the health problems of the neighborhood, which he had investigated, collected and articulated in order to plea for the clinic. The clinic plans seemed substantially the same when Michael Seltz interviewed Dr. Porter in the fall, and when Bruce Levison gave me a list both of the plans the community task-force were making and of the problems they were discovering in the process.

It is not surprising that professionals should adjust to practical reality in setting up programs, or that they should identify problems to suit the kinds of programs that are available. Particularly since the process of identifying problems involves discussions with the neighborhood

* Social Services Report, MIT Advocacy Planning Class,
November, 1966.

(essentially organizing a group to articulate certain problems -- see above), it is not incomprehensible that professionals should avoid this effort and the moral commitment to the group to deliver if there are not already the mechanisms to carry out the demands. Obviously, this practical commitment does make it difficult and irrelevant to proceed to identify problems with an open mind as to result, cause, or prescription of cure, and impossible to articulate "problems" from priorities of cause or alterability.

What is interesting, however, is that such positive value should be placed on this adjustment, and that politicians, who are seen with some cynicism, should nevertheless be admired, studied and imitated. Much time is spent gossiping about the power, position and intentions of different men in City government. Half an hour of the interview with Mr. Levison consisted of political gossip.

Interest in the politicians is perhaps a reflection of the power that even the local city councillors have compared to the social workers and planners, and the similarity of their interests in the issues given most attention (street cleaning, gas bill payment stations, recreation facilities). Politicians play an active role in the setting of the terms of work for the planners. The social workers are in direct competition with the machine politicians in the choice of issues and the articulation of local community needs. *

Another crucial element of being pragmatic is keeping

* Discussion at Neighborhood Five CEO_C, April 1967. The discussion emphasized going directly to Cowles, the recreation director, rather than to Goldberg, the Councillor, to get the playgrounds improved, in order to build the group's power and local image.

See also: Robert K. Merton, Social Structure and Social Theory (Glencoe; Free Press, 1957), p. 72 ff, "Functions of the Political Machine", esp. p. 74, on the relationships of welfare and service agencies and the precinct captain who also delivered services.

your job. It is the prerogative of the agency and the alliance boards to set policy and to hire and fire social workers. Planners also work for agencies that have commitments to certain policies. For both groups, involvement with inappropriate issues -- looking at the wrong problems -- can lead to the loss of one's position. Moreover, the job carries with it expectations of what the professional will spend his time doing, and this limits his freedom of choice over where he can concentrate his efforts. We will now turn to the agencies and the role of their institutional demands in determining which problems the professionals discuss and develop programs to solve.

V. The Agencies.

In analyzing the role of social workers and planners in Neighborhood Four one must consider not only their general licence and mandate as professionals, but also how these are shaped and modified by official duties and requirements and by informal contacts and functions associated with their occupational and agency positions. In this section I will discuss the activities and functions of agencies active in Neighborhood Four, particularly as they shape the formal and informal expectations of their professional staffs, and in this way influence the process of identifying and defining problems.

A. The Settlement Houses.

There are two settlement houses in Neighborhood Four, the Cambridge Neighborhood House and the Margaret Fuller House. During the past year these have merged their administration and finances under the Cambridge Alliance of Settlement Houses. The Alliance Executive for Neighborhood Four, Richard Cass, has offices in the Margaret Fuller House, supervising the work of Bruce Levison there and of Richard Franke in the Neighborhood House. The full complement of staff and volunteers is some 150 people.

Until the last few years the settlement houses were group work facilities, supplying for the most part recreational programs for children and teenagers.* In addition to these recreational programs, the houses distributed surplus food and carried supplies of used clothing and house-

* See Appendix A

** Appendix A, E.

hold goods. The Margaret Fuller House had an active Senior Citizens program, and helped to organize the Cherry Street Neighborhood Association, a neighborhood improvement association active on Cherry and Pine Streets. ** Group work was organized into cooking, sewing, and woodworking classes.

The Cambridge Neighborhood House had an active teenage program, the result of earlier concentration on delinquency prevention. Active adults were parents of children in the group work programs, and worked to support these programs and devise new ones, for example, a special tutoring program using college students, and a mental health center, which was passed by the Legislature but never founded. Group work was organized on a "club" basis with much more open programs. Parents ran a series of evening activities for children called "lounges".

At the present time, group work continues, but at a reduced volume, mainly with younger children; teenage work has dropped off, and the tutoring program has been transferred to CEFUET.** Work with senior citizens and various educational and recreation classes -- eg, the Newtowne Court art classes -- continue.

The main priority work has shifted, however, to adults: the activities of COBI (Conference of Organizations, Blocks and Individuals of Neighborhood Four) have assumed leading importance. Mr. Levison spends much of his time organizing for this group, and Mr. Cass has described the main work of the House as "performing a strategic function", controlling

** Appendix E

***Appendix A

and directing this group's efforts for neighborhood improvement. But these new programs are still based within the framework of the community's old problems. Mr. Cass, for example, describes the programs of the settlements in these terms:

We should start with the hypothesis that three things are imperative: (1) a proper definition of what the house is and does, as a building with people in it and as an institution. This is a notoriously institutionless community. The settlement house has been the first basis of unity in the neighborhood and it will continue until it is supplanted by something better. Up to now the houses have run massive recreation services with some attack to the more therapeutic needs. There has always been a child focus. It must become family focused -- it is not appropriate to talk about children in a vacuum. You need a complete look, at the income of the man, the relationship between the husband and wife, and between the parents and the child. The housing situation of the family -- how much they are paying and what the condition of the housing is, the academic capability of the family -- the whole tone of the family. What is neighborhood work and how does it impinge on the family? There is a twist in focus taking place within the houses themselves. *

While the focus of the house programs is being broadened to include adults, this is being done within the context of the old problems: "institutionless community", "the relationship between the husband and wife, and between the parents and the child", mental health; but with inclusion of the new concerns with income, education, employment and housing as they effect the "tone" of the family.

Mr. Cass continues:

Our programs aren't what they put down in reports -- so many children attended so many clubs, woodworking programs, cooking classes. (They are) more the structural relationships of kids to leaders and parents to Dick Franke. Attitudes, not activity. What is important to look at is what do settlements do that is

*Cass Interview

different. The common difference of settlements is not providing recreation -- that is what people see our function as, but the schools and the recreation department supply that. What is different is that the settlements are prepared to be coopted by the neighborhood; they can be governed by a bunch of people running around the neighborhood.

To translate into say a youth group -- pick out an activity -- there are twenty ways of running it. Say a talent show that our youth group at the Margaret Fuller put on recently. They ran it, with a lot of help from the staff because our kids aren't very mature -- but they designed it, selected the groups that were going to perform, made their own budget, even developed things like procedures for door control. ... *

The special skills in manipulation that social workers are supposed to have are seen giving a special character to the programs that in fact take very few special skills to run, and which, we have seen, have been turned over to volunteers. These programs are seen to "really" involve developing relationships of "kids to leaders" and parents to Dick Franke", and helping to develop autonomy and responsibility. To justify these programs, it may be inferred that they help with special problems: "Our kids aren't very mature", and set the basis for other important skilled workers by the relationships and trust that they develop.

This view of the recreation program is substantially the same as that I met in the Neighborhood House in 1960. The same set of psychological problems, the same need for intervention, is inferred. However, there is considerably less emphasis on these programs and these problems. A new set of programs have been adopted by the social workers. A new kind of problem has become relevant to their work:

* Cass Interview.

"The other priority is the availability of professional and semi-professionals to begin to talk across the board of community action, politics. You need no building. . . You need to respond to community desire by providing a strategic thought service. And some leg work that community people can't be expected to do. Bruce runs around doing idiot work. You can't expect a group where no one got past seventh grade to write the first draft of a letter . We supply the strategy to make the thing work. The community comes on raw. That's fine if you're in an environment where you can go that way. A community of 4000 wouldn't scare anyone.

The second major service is a strategic one. It is conceivable to close down existing services entirely and use the staff in strategic services, community organization.

The third thing accounts for the institutions given in the second level. We respond to the community's real need to pull themselves together and attack a threat. . . . The third part -- whatevern exists today is only a fraction of what might exist -- COBI, Senior Citizens, small groups -- we service 1000 families in the community in some way. It's a small number but a large group, but it doesn't mean that our service is the best. The third point of view sees the institution for what it really is: X number of talented bodies available to focus on any given problem based on what the need is. Essentially, it is like guerilla warfare. There are 150 people in three agencies; we could respond to, say if MIT hand bought the housing project -- really this time instead of rumors e- we could mobilize them and really raise hell. Tactics have to be variable. The community always feared a meeting of the power elite to carve up Neighborhood Four. That would call for a wild respond instead of a subtle tactic." *

These new programs reflect a decision that the proper role of the professional social worker is not to work with children in "fun projects" but to "deal with the generic problems of a poor neighborhood -- in the family, in academic and environmental areas -- without limitation of subject matter."

In rejecting work with children that used to be considered delinquency prevention work, and denigrating it

* Cass Interview.

to "fun projects", suitable for untrained volunteers and community people the social workers have rejected the older belief that "juvenile delinquency" was the most important and most suitable problem area for them to work in.. In the new image, the settlement houses are there to be "coopted by the neighborhood", the professionals provide the strategy and the leg work to help the community "pulltogether" to attack a threat" and to "talk across the board on community action". In practice, this means to concentrate on COBI. *

The problems touched on by the social workers in COBI are in fact not "across the board". It is a small list, principally of physical planning questions, housing, recreation and parking lots. Even housing, at this point, is discussed principally in terms of preventing housing from being converted to other uses, ie, parking lots. ** When approached by Dr. Porter, COBI undertook health questions as well, concentrating on studies of maternal and child outpatient service problems. They offered some support to the local PTA's interest in establishing a community schools program in Cambridge also. Most of these problems have the virtue, among others, of being confined to the neighborhood's physical limits.

Thus the new problems and programs share a feature with the old delinquency-mobility bundle. They are discovered to be within the neighborhood, their cause and cure very much tied to its specific social, emotional and economic

*More analysis of COBI will be found below, pages 99-106

conditions. They do not threaten good relations with other agencies.

In order to adjust their function to correspond with the new image of the problems that merit their professional competence, that is, in order to extend their licence in fact, the professionals must adjust their work load. They do this by trying to get rid of some of the traditional work of the houses. Having run a recreational program for years, they are unable to jettison it without loss of backing in the neighborhood. Neither can they drop programs that are part of a pattern of cooperation with other agencies:

"Our tradition -- the house has existing programs and functions -- you don't lightly break them down. If you stop something another group would be screaming. ... Service is valid especially when it has stood the test of time. The Art Center, for example, has been in existence for 35 (plus or minus) years. It is the oldest project in the country in continuous association with the housing project. Also we have the most strength when we cooperate with other organizations. In mental health, the Family Society helps us with general workers working out of the houses. We have to start from where we are now. Some of the stuff we do is valid, some is not." *

Instead, they try to get other agencies to take up these programs. Thus they attempted to get the City Recreation Department to agree to accept a grant for detached workers from the Youth Service Board, a grant that would free staff from teenage work.** When the Recreation Department refused to sponsor this program (it would involve recognizing that "Cambridge had delinquency", and the Recreation Dept. and the City Manager's office was in too doubtful a political position, they explained, to do this in an election year)***

*Cass Interview.

The Margaret Fuller House began a "community delinquency control program" that involved trying to get "local people" who were good with teenagers to help other people control the teenagers, encouraging adults to call the police if kids were doing damage, and bringing police officers to neighborhood meetings, to talk about the teenagers. *

The Alliance workers are quietly backing the community school movement: they feel that the recreation department and the schools should take over the recreation function of the houses.** They have attempted to get either Family Service or a new mental health center to take over family counselling, although they are not inclined to stop identifying which families need counselling.***

In transferring programs to other agencies, the settlement houses are insuring that the older programs will continue. The process of transferring takes place in the context of institutional bargaining, a process that is not new, but that is viewed as an increasingly important part of dealing with the needs of the neighborhood. The settlement workers are extending the bargaining to include not only other social agencies, to which they have long had licenced access, but also city agencies (the Recreation Dept. and Planning Board), major institutions and politicians. This is in effect a claim to a different licence, a licence to go into the political arena, and to control the contact between city agencies and institutions, and groups from and representing the neighborhood.

* Levison Interview

**Interview with Miss Isabel Pifer, Executive of the Alliance, March 26, 1967

*** Levison Interview. See also Cass, above, page 67.

In the past, a good deal of time was put into the informal services: referring people to other agencies, helping them cope with the welfare office, the courts, evictions and the like. While this was not part of the advertised program, in the Neighborhood House the staff regarded this contact work as perhaps the most important function of the House, the real purpose for which they were building a clientele.*

The new emphasis and ~~adults and~~ "strategy" is actually an expansion of this previous function, but on an explicit, organized, group basis, in which the emphasis ~~not now not~~ so much to get such and such an agency to help Mrs. X, but to get such and such an agency to increase the volume and kind of services to the neighborhood. Again, this kind of activity is not new, and has been for a long time the work of the agencies, but there is more explicit concentration on this work, and more willingness to use public, political tactics to get it. Symbolic of this willingness has been the organization of COBI.

For years, the settlements have approached other social agencies and attempted to convince them that the problems in Neighborhood Four were severe enough to merit special services from them. For example, they convinced the Family Services agencies that the "sickest" families were unable to appear for appointments and got them to have three workers work in the neighborhood. **

The settlements have expanded the group that is approached

* Sweeney Interview

** Levison Interview

for special assistance to include industries, the universities, the City Council and the School Committee. It is with these institutions that they have employed the threat of militancy. By using a political threat on Polaroid, for example, they were able to slow that company's use of the neighborhood for parking lots, and get land for a tot lot.

The political incident with Polaroid (when there was the threat of a march on the company if Polaroid did not withdraw an application for a variance) has become symbolic of the social workers' and the neighborhood's new willingness to use militant tactics. The details of it were told to me several times. However, it is significant that the march remained a threat; and that it was the social workers who urged and arranged a meeting * with Polaroid and helped work out a compromise that resulted in 36 new parking spaces for Polaroid ** and a house and two plots of land returned to the "community" for other uses. *** For in general, the style of the strategy encouraged in this work with adult groups is not one of militant confrontation; it is one of bureaucratic bargaining, informal institutional exchange, and "subtle tactics".

Even this incident of militancy resulted in a public relations victory for Polaroid and an opportunity to involve the Cambridge Corporation in the neighborhood. For in general, the settlement's approach is not one of demanding services without offering something in return. This can be the withdrawal of threats of poor public relations, as

*Cass Interview.

** Williams Interview

*** Green Interview.

we saw with Polaroid. However, the more usual approach is to bargain with institutions who are already committed to giving certain kinds of services or interventions in Neighborhood Four by offering to smooth their way if these institutions will adjust the style, kind and amount of services..

As their part in the exchange, the settlements provide an appropriate list of problems, local contacts, and a receptive local organization that can be used as the base for social work internships, student volunteer programs, experiments in tutoring, workshops for student planners, the expansion of City Hospital, and recruitment and space for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Headstart. They have been successful in encouraging priorities: CEOC made Neighborhood Four its top priority neighborhood,* which pays off in the number of places available to local children in Headstart and NYC.** There are more outside agencies and services in Neighborhood Four than in other poor Cambridge neighborhoods; more tutoring programs, the only projected outpatient clinic, the only neighborhood family service workers, etc.***

The services of some outside institutions are more valuable, or more needed, than others. The universities provide personnel for staffing programs, and possibly money. Health services have long been lacking in the neighborhood. With the aid of City Hospital the social agencies can deliver a maternal and child health center.. Their new interest in parking lots, housing and public

* Appendix A

** Ibid.

*** Ibid.

facilities makes some kind of alliance and contact with the Planning Board necessary -- the Planning Board will not announce the need for parking or recreational facilities on its own. Finally, the Cambridge Corporation has money, as well as staff to offer. The Polaroid victory would not have been complete if CQBI had received one abandoned house and one parking lot and no resources to do anything with them. Their use had to be investigated, and having a planner from the Cambridge Corporation made rehabilitation possible.

In order to carry out its part of the bargain, the settlements must generate demand for the new services and protect the intervening institutions from challenge or loss of face. In expanding into Neighborhood Four, such institutions might face general suspicion and noncooperation without a local sponsor. This is true especially of the more powerful and interventionist ones such as the Planning Board and Cambridge Corporation and those that have any tinge of the universities. The houses can control this suspicion, and provide some kind of guarantee to the neighborhood that they can handle such groups, understand what they are up to, and prevent them from doing damage to local interests. To the institutions, they can offer clients, information and cooperation, or at least an audience. This is conditional, however, on recognition of certain powers that the settlement-based social workers and their local leaders keep for themselves: a control of access to the local population, a veto on announcements and methods of

* Cass Interview.

operation, a monopoly on local organization, and a consultant's role in formulating policies and carrying them out.

Cooperation with outside groups also rests on a second condition: that the settlement houses are able to maintain their own definition of themselves and the cooperating agencies within the neighborhood. They must continue to be regarded as the advocates of local interest against any designs of the outside agencies; they must sustain an impression of knowing what is up; and they must show the benign intent of any agency they sponsor. Control of access to interviews with people in the neighborhood, censorship of speeches and announcements, and collaboration in presenting a unified public line to the residents about the program and to the outside world about the neighborhood are all techniques which are essential in maintaining this definition. We will see below an incident that involved the disruption of the trust and definition of the settlements' position essential to their maintenance of this intermediary role.

In order to hold to a bargain, it is necessary to have predictability and trust. The social agencies cannot themselves attack an outside group once they have helped get them to intervene, or even if they might potentially intervene. The agencies need control of any forces that might disrupt that trust or throw doubt on their control of any of the actors -- clients or agency. Thus Mr. Cass complained about the MIT planning class's criticism of the

school system, not because of his pride in Cambridge public education, but because such criticism disrupted the bargains he had made:

"Incidentally, Supt. Tobin was very upset about some of the things in the class report. The superintendant sent a letter to us and to Dick Franke. He had received a copy of the central interagency minutes.

We as an agency are in strong cooperation with local groups. Strains between agencies are very real. one of these agencies is the school system. Part of the problems of evolving in the public schools is that it takes place quietly. Many forces are at work in the school system. I had to respond in sympathy with Tobin.

(Did it really hurt you to have him criticized?) I am a worker working in the internal system. Playing both ends. I am giving them clues on how to approach the community -- not to coopt them but to work out common problems -- get a sense of the community's need. Progress occurs in an evolutionary fashion. To do it you need a lot of things. If the taxpayer hears that the schools are bad he is reluctant to pay them more taxes. It is much easier (for us) to say we will help you get more money, because we know your problems. We attempt to help them solve their problems. It is a political strategy.

For example, the schools are a problem in Roxbury and one of the biggest problems is the turnover rate of teachers. They always get the young, inexperienced teachers and they don't last. Every time you blast the schools you discourage some young idealistic teacher from coming to the city.

It is a honey-vinegar thing. I had to respond sympathetically to Tobin. I can't influence the guy if he won't talk to me. You can't influence at sword points if you don't have a sword." *

In their efforts to change the division of institutional labor (eg, get City departments to take over the recreation and children's programs), in playing their intermediary role, the settlement houses' end is to attack the "generic problems of a low-income neighborhood". But in the course of bargaining, the settlement houses implicitly agree not to attack other institutions, or to identify

the kinds of services the neighborhood receives as problems.* Instead, they identify the special needs of the neighborhood as related to the characteristics of its residents, and using this list of problems appropriate to the intervening agency, they try to get more services. We saw this in regards to Family Service above.** It is also apparent in the efforts to improve education: special tutoring is spoken of as necessary not because of the kind of instruction available in the public schools, but because of the special difficulties neighborhood youngsters have in learning. Finally, even the approach to housing has been related to the special problems of Neighborhood Four residents -- income and social characteristics (eg, "Mrs. M. couldn't survive in Newton") --- not to its relative position as a present supply of low income housing in Cambridge.

Indeed, in the housing question we see an instance of the persistence of the old analysis. ~~Where~~ we used to believe that people had not been able to move out of the neighborhood (moving out being the acceptable goal) because of their emotional problems (which were the best target of intervention), now Mr. Cass announces that the neighborhood must be preserved because, socially and emotionally, the residents could not "survive" anywhere else. The problem has shifting to keeping families in the neighborhood, but much of the general image of the neighborhood people, and the need for intervention by trained counsellors, has remained. The general needs and outlook of the social

* An exception to this was the work on the outpatient clinic from City Hospital (see above, page 65ff) where the Hospital itself solicited complaints about its services to prove that existing services were inadequate, and an outpatient clinic near the hospital was needed. Levison Interview.

** See page 71

workers have persisted; they need a neighborhood base for their work, and a set of problems that do justice to their psychological training.

In summary, it is important to emphasize that there is currently a convergence in the activities of the various social work and planning agencies. This is reflected in the recent efforts of Neighborhood Four social workers to redefine their work roles. They have moved away from their earlier preoccupation with the problem of delinquency and from group work with children and teenager. They have increasingly set themselves up as intermediaries between the neighborhood and outside agencies, performing a "strategic function" in shaping the priorities of outside intervention and the cooperating strategy of local groups. This tendency is important not only in understanding the social workers' own conception about what their job ought to be, but also in analyzing the changing location of "urgent problems" from delinquency to "poverty" and the "physical planning crisis". In this new role, social workers have begun to work with planners, and, to a certain extent, to work as planners.

In is in this exercise of a new licence, also, as well as in the mediating role of the agencies, that the relationship to planners becomes apparent. For planners also believe that they have licence to identify needs, and to devise, arrange and expedite new programs. Moreover, in exercising the strategic function, social workers come into contact with

planners and their programs -- as competitors, collaborators, as well as potential clients.

B. Planning Agencies.

There are three planning agencies in the city: the Cambridge Planning Board, the Cambridge Renewal Authority, and the Cambridge Corporation. In addition, with the hiring of Justin Gray, the City Manager's office has taken over some planning functions. None of these agencies has an exclusive or even major interest in Neighborhood Four. With the exception of the Renewal Authority, however, they all are involved to some extent in the Neighborhood.

There are three clear tasks that these agencies carry out. First they gather and assemble information. Secondly, they write applications to federal and state agencies to get funds for city projects, and interpret the prerequisites of those projects to local groups. Finally, in conjunction with both of the preceding, they are informal liaison officers between the City and outside bureaucracies.

In planning ideology, these routine tasks only assist the true function of the planners, which is to identify future trends, future needs, and future problems. It is under this activity that we should expect to find an explicitly recognized process of analyzing problems. With the exception of Mr. Gray, none of the planners interviewed actually claimed to spend much time doing this. Even for Gray, this activity was not part of the formal and public expectations of his work, and he did not expect that his

publishing an analysis would constitute communicating an analysis of problems.

Nevertheless, planners work within the context of identifying and solving problems. They implicitly identify certain problems as important, appropriate concerns in their choice of topics for study and in publication. They make some choice of which programs are needed in the City, which to apply for. And on their applications, when it is called for, they are quite willing to make assessments of Cambridge problems.

This section will discuss, then, agency by agency, the identification of problems in the course of carrying out these tasks and functions. In conclusion I will discuss occupational limits on planners when they identify problems: what does their licence allow them to do, and how does this affect their relationships to other agencies and their role in Neighborhood Four.

The Planning Board.

The Planning Board is the city information center. It has maps, gathers statistics, investigates programs that will impinge on the City. For example it has the only map in the City of the Brookline-Elm route of the Inner Belt; it gathered statistics on the people to be displaced by the construction; it interviewed the large businesses along the route about what taking them would mean. This information is readily available to institutions, groups, and agencies who might use it in their programs.

The Planning Board has drawn up a capital improvement program that also falls under the information rubric. It is a list of everything other city agencies intend to build, a suggested time scale, with work on costs and financing. It makes it possible to see the requests together, and get an idea of the total costs of requested construction.

A second task is application writing. The Planning Board is the city agency that investigates outside sources of finances for city improvements, sees that the city has the prerequisites, advises which program is the best, and writes the application. Miss. Williams was investigating grants for playgrounds when I interviewed her. (Councillor Velucci had just introduced an order to use \$130,000 just paid by Harvard to build a play field in Neighborhood Four.) Tied in with their information gathering and their writing of applications is one of their most important functions: liaison with state and federal agencies. In order to carry on an exchange of information and to get results from applications, it is necessary to keep friendly relations with some representative of these agencies. The Planning Board has been able to keep itself informed of the plans and variants for construction proposed by state agencies. When Governor Volpe announced a "complete restudy" of the Inner Belt route, it was the Planning Board that made inquiries at the Department of Public Works about the timing and probable outcome of the study, and the Planning Board that

* Cambridge Planning Board, Community Facilities for Cambridge (offset, Cambridge Planning Board, 1967)

K

announced that the City should still "hire a relocation worker". *

The Planning Board has kept in close touch with the DPW. They are kept informed of current versions of the route along Brookline and Elm Streets. Thus Mr. Myer briefed me on this route, explaining proposed changes, and pointing to Brookline Street, continued"

"(The Inner Belt) can't go any farther east here because it would take part of Simplex, and Simplexx says if one building goes they will move since they have a continuous process." **

This liaison function may also be involved, along with an attempt to assume a mandate to identify and pronounce upon future trends, in the Planning Board's public stand on the Inner Belt. The Planning Board is almost exceptional among Cambridge agencies in favoring the construction of this highway along the route selected by the DPW along Brookline and Elm Streets.

The Planning Board's stand on the Inner Belt arose in part out of single-minded concern for traffic and the tax base: An Inner Belt with parallel access roads would reduce the heavy trucking along River, Portland and Main Streets. Furthermore the taking of small homes and low rent housing would not seriously affect the tax base. The assumption of a mandate to look at the "long term trends" made the relocation and housing questions irrelevant: low income people were leaving Cambridge anyway.

The planning board's work in Neighborhood Four is

* Cambridge Chronicle, October 28, 1966.
see also following issues for notes on the Inner Belt.

** Interview with Harold Myer, Assistant Director of the Planning Board, August, 1966.

most easily described as liaison. To date, it consists of sending a representative to public meetings, maintaining contacts, and keeping up a flow of information. The work is not primarily the identification of problems, nor the development of programs. Miss Constance Williams has been assigned to this work with COBI.

She does not have a licence to identify problems and discuss them herself. She is dependent on COBI. In those instances where she wanted to change to approach, bring different problems up for discussion, she has approached the social workers or spoken up in meetings. She does not have licence of direct access to active people in the neighborhood. For example, she proposed to conduct a survey* and when this was opposed by the social workers, could do nothing more about it. She complains that they "gripe about rents"**, but are not "really doing anything". In all, she is dependent on the speed and emphases of the local group and of the social workers for such things as the method of work, the kinds of data gathered, and the public definition of problems. She is dependent on COBI for access to the neighborhood, and for data about the local situation, because she is there not to offer any program or service, but to keep in touch. Similarly, she is not able to present her own definitions of needs and priorities, because she cannot lay claim to special local knowledge that conducting surveys or setting the questions at meetings would give her.

* Williams Interview.

** Ibid.

Moreover, she cannot back up any analysis of the neighborhood situation with a program. If she were to attempt to present publically such an analysis, especially one that differed radically from COBI's priorities, her access to COBI would be cut off without much loss.

For example, she disagrees that Neighborhood Four should remain a low income neighborhood: "Cambridge has a responsibility to (the residents), but not necessarily in Neighborhood Four." * However, she cannot offer housing and community facilities anywhere else. For despite a Planning Board report called "A Housing Program for Cambridge", neither the Planning Board nor anyone else has done much to implement any housing program. For her to present and then to accept a picture that showed that Neighborhood Four would not be able to stay residential would leave no action alternative open to COBI within the neighborhood.

Identifying future trends and needs on the city level most closely approaches the identification of problems. As we have seen, the planners lack licence to identify future needs publicly. The questions that arise, then, are what problems does the Planning Board measure, what kind of advice may it give, and what concerns does it consider appropriate? A good index to appropriate matters are the titles of the published (and mimeographed) planning board reports. For these reports provide information from which other groups may draw conclusions about problems and needs. The most

*Williams interview.

important are: Workable Program for Cambridge, 1952, and Community Facilities for Cambridge: A Plan, A Project and A Budget (1967), the capital improvement plan. Other titles include: "The Relation of New Construction to Increased Tax Revenue in Cambridge" (1966), "Estimates of Employment in Cambridge, 1950-to 1964" (1965), "A Suggested Housing Program for Cambridge" (1966), "Suggested Programs to Provide New Recreation Areas, Neighborhood Facilities, and Greater Beauty As Part of A Broad Capital Improvement Program for 1966-1971, for Cambridge" (1966), "Major Population and Housing Characteristics in Six Areas of Cambridge" (1965), and "Excerpts From Report on Public Recreation in Cambridge, Massachusetts, by the National Recreation Association--1962" (1966). There were also two reports on the age, race and income characteristics of the families in the route of the Inner Belt, and a summary of the BRPP trip data on Cambridge.

In general, the topics they cover are appropriate to the making of decisions in managing the City. Most are related to expenditures and income; population trends and age groups, capital improvements, the tax base, sources of outside funds.

Concern for the tax base showed in the Planning Board's stand on the Inner Belt, on urban renewal projects, including the present NASA development, and informally, in conversation about appropriate location for low income housing. These locations were all on underused, vacant or marshy land on the perimeter of the city. It would be inappropriate,

Nr. Myer, the assistant director, felt, to build housing for the elderly on vacant sites on Massachusetts Avenue, near Central Square, because the land was "too valuable". *

This approach reflects the class bias of the Cambridge power structure, and the kinds of concerns traditional in the equation of city problems deriving from a "weakened tax base". It also reflects an attempt by the planners to deal with the limits of their licence as professionals by confining themselves to the immediate interests of their employers, the city government, and to hard, measurable statistics like population, tax income, traffic levels, rents and so on. Here "problems" are discussed only when they are identified by the city government or other interests, and collecting statistics on areas suggested by convention. The planners in Cambridge have confined themselves to technical roles and "technical" problems. They have responded to the limits of their professional licence. What, however, does this licence positively require? What particular unique processes may they carry out?

Part of their special licence may be found in the information they gather. Gathering data, of course, is an operation shared with other groups. Planners, however, have among themselves a model of an orderly process of gathering information, making projections, figuring the specific possibilities of "getting something", and making a report. It is this idea of an orderly process that sets them apart from other city employees. Their licence comes not from the fact

* Interview with Harold Myer, November, 1966 for MIT
advocacy planning class.

that they alone are allowed access to such information, or know how to gather it, but from the fact that they alone are willing to do these time-consuming jobs, that they alone have a ready list of appropriate topics and data for collection. Collecting data for this conventional list is one of the privileges of their occupation, and knowledge of what the appropriate topics are is one of their unique skills.

The data they collect differs from the sort collected by a mere record keeper in its applied nature. They collect because someone needs it, because it reflects on something someone will carry out, because it centers around a problem such as traffic, housing or the tax base -- around a manipulable topic about which something is likely to be done. "Someone" in Cambridge is not anyone, but the city government.

However, collecting data that someone will apply, presenting analyses of problems to get money that another agency wants, does not necessarily include a decision on what other agencies or politicians should want money or data to do. It does not include a licence to identify needs or problems in any general sense. Collecting applied data is in fact a restriction on collecting data of the kind no one is likely to want. Moreover, collecting conventional lists and making the few technical projections they are encouraged to do consumes the time, energy and resources that might be put into identifying problems. Planning Board ^{staff} members are limited by licence and by practical considerations to collecting and presenting a conventional list of data, and to

identifying trends and problems in a limited way, in only a few areas such as recreation and open space, community facilities, traffic, and the physical condition of housing. The conventional list and data is evident, for example, in the "Housing Program" published in 1965. The discussion of housing included census data on the physical condition of housing, and the number of families with incomes under \$3000, who would require special subsidies.. The major recommendations included an "advisory service code enforcement, new non-profit housing, new public housing, especially for the elderly, new social services for displaced residents (relocation), and administrative reorganization of the housing, urban renewal, code enforcement and relocation agencies." Other suggestions were relocation of families out of industrial areas into residential areas,* and reducing the size of the housing projects.** The only mention of students and other middle class people moving in -- a major issue in Cambridge -- was included in a suggestion that high rise apartments be built for them.

Even about housing the major discussion was on physical quality and ways of subsidizing people so they could afford it. There was no attempt to measure the turnover rate, sales, or the rent rise on any other index of the change in the distribution of housing resources. The Planning Board's work really did not attempt to analyze whether there was a housing problem in Cambridge, and if so, what it was. The questions they asked and the programs they

* Cambridge Planning Board, "A **Suggested** Housing Program for Cambridge"(duplicated, Cambridge Planning Board, 1966) p.15 and passim.

** Ibid. p.11.

designed would be equally appropriate to Somerville, Chelsea or Jamaica Plain.

For an agency such as the Planning Board, there is little concern with identifying the nature of problems. There are a certain set that they must routinely examine (tax base, housing standards), and another set which are ~~expected~~ as the normal problems of a neighborhood or city and others, which may be important local issues but which are irrelevant to the series of reports they expect to draw up. There has been some change: it is no longer regarded as a problem if rents are low, but it is not yet regarded as a problem -- to be discussed by the agency -- that rents are rising. Only Miss. Williams who is directly involved with such a neighborhood will discuss such topics.

Earlier we have argued that planners as well as social workers are getting into the game of identifying problems, and examining what is the true nature of this situation or problem. Yet here is an agency quite content not to point out problems and perfectly willing, if it has to point out problems, to use a conventional, traditional bag of tricks without ~~examination~~. It is not that these civil servants reflect a backwater. Their unwillingness rests on the limits of their licence as professionals, and on the restriction of their agency. The social workers, of course, face similar restrictions, but it is the planning agencies that seem to operate within the tightest bounds. They are too dependent on the political employers to move far from

problems as they are defined in the census. And even if they were less restricted, they have not the time or the budget or the freedom to carry out their own survey.

In the same vein, their licence cannot be expanded to deal with other subject matter except on request from the City or COBI or similar group. They cannot identify problems and it is the public acknowledgement of a problem and the definition of it by planners that gives them the right to investigate its nature.

The limitations of the Planning Board serve as a good introduction into the work of Justin Gray in the City Manager's office. A task that he has particularly set for himself is the identification of problems. How he goes about getting the right to do this will help explain the kinds of problems planners discuss.

Justin Gray, Special Assistant to the City Manager

Justin Gray's official title is special assistant to the City Manager. General expectations and understanding of his job are vague. He is supposed to help the city take advantage of the mass of federal programs that are available--the work of his office really depends on his success in getting money from sources outside the city. This spring he has filed, with council approval, applications for CRP funds and for a Model cities Planning Grant. The other program that Gray is carrying out is to commission a series of reports about problems of the city, and ways of dealing with them, from academics.

Informally, Gray is attempting to make and keep a network of contacts among pressure groups and city em-

loyees. This is because he sees his real job as helping to reform city administration, and to mobilize existing talents to solve the city's problems. His increased use of experts is part of this program.

This job was created in dollars and I'm shifting it...to look at total resources and to articulate a point of view,...just to get them to decide whether Cambridge will be a university city in a few years. I'm going into the line departments...morale (there) is low. No one ...has considered coming into a department for their ideas.*

There are three aspects of Justin Gray's role that are of interest for a thesis on social problems and Neighborhood Four. One, of course is his involvement in Neighborhood Four. Second, is his general role in city government, within the political and administrative system. Third, is his own conception of his licence and mandate as a planner, and his attempts to extend them.

Justin Gray's involvement in Neighborhood Four has revolved around that Neighborhood's inclusion in the Model Cities application. Original plans called for the inclusion of Neighborhoods Four, Three, and Five, but communication was received that small cities could only apply for a grant for a certain fraction (5-10%) of their area and populations. The reasons for picking Four and Three are unclear, but an interesting light may be thrown on it by a memo that came out of the Cambridge Corporation advising Gray to continue his work by confining his application to the two neighborhoods where there were existing local organizations**. If this memo hit on the most relevant

* Gray Interview.

** Memo in the files of Mrs. Lisa R Peattie. From Oliver Brooks, President, Cambridge Corporation to Justin Gray.

considerations, any discussion of Gray's role will inevitably include a discussion of his relationship to COBI and to the social workers.

In an interview, Gray made two points about Neighborhood Four. First he remarked that he had difficulty communicating with the residents. Second, he discussed plans for helping neighborhood groups hire professionals and carry out the surveys, although he was difficult to pin down on whether these same groups would design and carry out programs.

What is striking here is his reliance on groups --which in Neighborhood Four means social workers and their contacts--to give local authenticity, to bring in local participation and to identify the problems on a local level. When he relies on COBI for this, it is the picture of the neighborhood brought out by the social workers that he has to use to define the particular nature of the neighborhoods's problems, and it is through the social worker he must communicate with the neighborhood.

He talked about giving away some of his licence to do the local planning and data gathering work. To do this, he needed a presently active neighborhood group that could demand a structure from the City Council that would allow him to give away these powers and funds.

While Gray is giving away some duties and rights on the neighborhood level, he is trying to extend his licence to intervene within the city as a whole. Gray's position

was created by the city manager, Joseph DeGugliemo, as part of a general program of administrative reforms, that have involved professionalizing various parts of city government. This has also been seen in the hiring of an outside, trained recreation director, and in reforms in the City health and hospital system. Gray, a man with experience in many other agencies, and contacts within federal and state bureaucracies, is useful as an expediter. He remarked that he had "heard that if the city did not apply for a model cities grant now, they might not get it at all," in all probability there would not be a second round. Access to this kind of gossip, on what "they" want, what will be available, who is applying, which elements of the application are important, how much money there will be, etc., was one of the reasons he was hired. (For Cambridge, this represents a shift from the use of political contacts to administrative contacts to get things. This kind of competition between planners and politicians is obviously part of the larger picture; Gray's extension of his mandate is a challenge to politicians in other ways.) Gray's function, then, is in part to be a contact man for Cambridge.

Second, DeGugliemo seems to be making cautious reforms in the city administrations. There is a need here for ideas, suggestions, a general shakeup. However, DeGugliemo is not in a very secure position himself, having been appointed as the result of a five to four faction fight in the

*Gray Interview.

City Council, and still being bitterly opposed by the losing faction which has been the most powerful. Gray can become a personal gadfly, carrying out studies, presenting the ideas, challenging old practices, while DeGugliemo himself can keep publicly distant from the process, perhaps eventually allowing Gray to become his scapegoat.

The role of the gadfly-scapegoat involves in itself some irresponsibility--freedom to do unauthorized tasks. It is this freedom that Gray has used to extend his licence. Through it he has licence to control his own work, set his own goals. He has assumed a mandate to analyze the city's problems.

In order to identify problems, Gray does not publish mimeographed reports. He incorporates judgements about them into a program, which the council must vote on in order to get money and which they have the power to change.

The model cities program is good for getting articulation of what we're like and what we are doing, e.g. (in the) relocation provision, (or in the) low income housing provision. It may be rhetoric, but it can force the power structure to articulate what they are doing.

In theory the Model Cities program acts as a good cathartic agent. It's good for the council to know what they are doing. They never had a fulcrum where you could articulate things. (Cambridge) is a fragmented community, but once they are aware of the consequences of policy--no one has had a point of view up to now--for example on housing choice, (they will be forced to take a stand). They have been concerned with the elderly and young people like you who might move out, but no view of what the needs really are.*

Gray, then, realizes that pronouncements do not make something a "problem" to others. Instead, he intends to use

* Gray Interview.

his licence to devise programs and write applications to direct the public debate into his terms. He intends to use his right to submit applications and plans to a vote to convert problems into issues, and to make the issues that are debated be discussed around an accurate presentation of "what the needs really are".

Gray investigates problems that are still within the realm of physical planning and popular discussion--low income housing, recreation, the encroachment of the university, rodent control and the like--but he is open to a broader definition of appropriate concerns related to them ; more so than the more traditionally minded planning board. His basic concern is no longer confined to objective physical characteristics such as blight, mixed land use, poor structures and the tax base. Instead, he has adopted a more sociological, political view of the city as a collection of facilities that may be used in different ways by different groups. Who uses the facilities is a more relevant question to him than what it looks like. This broadening of his view of what it is appropriate for him to look at also allows him to have other ideas about what is "good planning", to consider a non-conforming use a trivial question.

While he is assuming a broader licence, Gray is also changing his view of the nature of a planner's licence and planning problems. To him the licence is not a technical right to look at measurable data in an objective way and come

to a technical conclusion, which is generally the planning view. Instead, he sees such problems in political terms, involving a political choice. Upon assuming a licence to set the terms of his work, he is setting the terms for a debate, not for an administrative decision. Gray, with this view, can feel free to give a vote to Neighborhood Four to judge the Model City plans he and his agency plan to draw up; such a vote challenges no aspect of his technical ability to make the right decisions.

Richard Green, of the Cambridge Corporation, also sees no conflict between his professional work and the COBI steering committee's judgement of it. His view, however does not rest on the assumption that his own role is much broader than the design of specific programs. Instead, he sees himself as a technical designer on hire, who can do the objective detail work, once given the definition of the problems and goals.

The Cambridge Corporation

Richard Green is a city planner, employed as the vice president and full time executive of the Cambridge Corporation. The Corporation was described in a Harvard public relations journal:

Cambridge Corporation--Development of low-rental housing as well as other action for the public benefit in Cambridge, will be assisted by the recently formed Cambridge Corporation. The non-profit group intends to raise, from private contributions, a revolving fund of up to \$1 million for projects to be undertaken in the role of civic catalyst. Funds contributed will be matched by Harvard and MIT.

* Harvard Today, Autumn, 1966. p.4.

The Cambridge Corporation was founded as a public relations effort by the universities, to engage in good works and to help out in the housing crisis. It has some degree of independence, can carry out projects and fund community improvements. It also supplies an extra planner for cooperation in physical planning among larger Cambridge institutions, principally about housing.

At this time, Green has helped COBI draw up a plan, consulted in the plans for Interfaith Housing's projected 300 units of 221d3 in North Cambridge, and done a preliminary study for Harvard's second married student dormitory along the river Charles.

The Cambridge Corporation is a major source of funds for small private agencies in Cambridge, even though it usually supplies them on a revolving basis. In Neighborhood Four it paid for equipment in the new tot lot built on the spoils from the Polaroid incident, as well as temporarily purchasing the land for it and promising to arrange the rehabilitation of the decrepit Reid house which was sold back in the same negotiations.* They have been approached to fund other programs and to act as the sponsoring agency for groups seeking grants elsewhere.

Green has spent more time than other planners in Cambridge at work in Neighborhood Four. In an interview, he described the considerations involved in the building of the tot lot, the rehabilitation of the old house and the drawing up of a neighborhood plan. It was clear that Green had done the detail work on these projects, and spent time

* Green Interview.

on investigations of interest rates and price lists and the plans of owners of small plots in the neighborhood.*

Basically, he has interpreted his licence in Neighborhood Four as that of a hired technician. He has found technical topics on which to spend his time: "they need certain things and the problem is where to put them," and he makes it quite explicit that he was asked into the neighborhood by Mrs. Helen Meehan, chairman (acting) of COBI:

I got involved when they invited me in. I made a speech and Helen Meehan came up to me afterwards and said, "Gee, I like the way you talk." (imitates speech of Helen Meehan). I had said--It was a Brattle Street meeting--"I don't see anyone in shirtsleeves here." Helen invited me to come down,**

Green presents his work in technical terms. He uses his acquired organizational skills and technical knowledge to do specifically assigned tasks for COBI. His main work has been in drawing up a plan for their approval. He sees this as giving COBI what it wants, while trying to give them a technically based view of the matter:

I tried to throw things out as proposals. Some things they tried to get me to take out. I fought back on one issue and convinced them I was right. On most issues they managed to convince me they were right. (Q. What was the issue you fought back on?) A. The location of the teenager recreation center. I wanted it separated from the campus service center. Originally they wanted it all together, but I convinced them the facilities should be separate.***

Green's picture of his own licence is to do detail work on others' grand designs. However, he emphasized how he did not jeopardize his "professional standards" about such questions as the location of the recreation center. Nevertheless, Constance Williams, another planner, sees his plan

* Green Interview.

** Ibid.

*** Ibid.

not as the manifestation of the desires and ideas of the neighborhood group, but as a plan that denied choice to the people in COBI. "At least they could choose between high rise and low rise,"* she says.

In effect, the terms in which the issues are set in the COBI plan have been determined even in very modestly assigning specific questions, and dealing with them. This determination of the issues has resulted in a particular set of answers that have certain desired properties: not offending anyone, not disrupting the internal workings of any agency. However it is not really Green who has not given choice. It is the set of problems made explicit by the social workers that have determined the plan. (Using the same set of problems and questions and constraints the MIT advocacy planning class came up with nearly the same plan with a little more street closing.) It was the decision to organize the problems and programs in physical planning terms in the first place that most closely constrained the neighborhood group.

The social workers have decided that the main problem is to write a plan that will increase amenities and stabilize the population within the boundaries of their service area: The part of Neighborhood Four between Columbia Street (where the Inner Belt is planned) and the industries and Tech Square. This may be a wise strategy, and it is certainly more relevant to the neighborhood than the old delinquency approach. However, we must not ignore the utility of this strategy

* Williams Interview.

to the survival of the agencies as institutions, the role of the social workers in setting the strategy and problem and the cooperation of the planner, who if he has not designed the housing the neighborhoods needs to stabilize the population, has at least designed the green space and tot lots and pointed out where the housing might go.

It is difficult to evaluate how important the COBI plan really is in the identification of problems. Of the projects the Cambridge Corporation and COBI have collaborated on, Green and Cass see one the rehabilitation of the Reid house and the building of the tot-lot as important symbolic victories. With the outpatient clinic, they are the only projects that will see physical results. The COBI plan is still at a hypothetical stage. There are no funds or programs available at this time that will allow it to be carried out.

Drawing up a plan, for COBI, is not making decisions about priorities or the future of the neighborhood. What it has been, is an organizing tool and way of articulating a general position about the neighborhood that a number of groups could agree on, one of them being that there is a neighborhood:

COBI is an amalgam of a lot of interests--Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee planning task force, the Margaret Fuller House, the Cambridge Neighborhood House, the churches, the PTA. They divided themselves up into committees. A steering committee, a map committee, an industrial relations committee, all will with a specific purpose. I saw it as a neighborhood groping for something to do, knowing they were hard pressed on the one hand by MIT, and the other by NASA, and on a third hand by Polaroid and

and other industrial concerns that are making immediate physical encroachment on the lots for parking lots and other uses. There was a sense of frustration.

On My involvement I say that various groups had been fighting among themselves--but they have come to the conclusion that if they dont work together they will hang separately. Despite the usual friction, they are working toward something. In their little manifesto they came out and said, "This is our neighborhood and we want to stay here."*

The general position restricted itself to the postulate that physical planning was important, that there is a physical threat, and that the residents wished to stay in Neighborhood Four. It identified a very vague housing problem, but did not go into details of cause or remedy. It spent a good deal of time on recreation, which has paid off, if you assume they need recreation.**

Now that the plan is written, it can be used as an organizing tool in the process of getting neighborhood approval, and it has been used to communicate the existence of COBI, and their general needs, to the politicians.

They have embarked on a clever system of talking to individual councillors and the City Manager. Without asking for anything specific, they have shown them their plans, and said that they would be in, asking for part of it. There has been a good response from everyone they talked to. It scares the city councillors to see a group this organized; they are not about to say no. They should get a commitment from the city manager as fast as possible. He assigned Connie Williams, a member of the Planning Board, to work with this group.***

While the commitment made by the City Manager did not commit the resources of the city, soon after this visiting, the Council voted to earmark 130,000 dollars to build the recreation center. Although the vote was not legally binding

*Green Interview.

** See page 83, above.

*** Green Interview. Miss Williams is a member of the staff
of the planning board.

on anyone, the Planning Board and the settlement houses were trying to bring pressure to use these funds in this way.*

Green did not identify problems by writing the plan, because the plan was not a plan, but an organizing device, and a means of communicating the existence of an interest group. Many of the proposals dealt with recreation and identified a need for open space:

Studies have indicated that our neighborhood is one of the least served by playgrounds, tot-lots and parks. Is this anyway to run a neighborhood? You bet it isn't! Just take a look at other neighborhoods and see how lacking in open space we are.**

This was done in the guise of physical planning, but it is significant that playgrounds is also the priority issue picked by CEOC in Neighborhood Five, where the leadership is intensely suspicious of any and all planners, plans, or any other "tool of the colleges".

Despite discussion of stabilizing the population, and rent and housing problems, there were no major proposals on housing in the COBI plan. With the exception of the planned rehabilitation of one house, as a symbolic, though economically infeasible event, no effort has been made to increase housing supply in Neighborhood Four or outside of it for local residents. Part of the reason for this became clear in the interview with Miss Williams:

There is no real concern about housing. There has been some grumbling about rents going up. It has been inarticulate. It's mostly been grumbling about rents going up, which rents do. It's difficult to deliver (housing). There are no nonprofit groups really facing it and even then, which we haven't faced, it's

* See page 83, above. Miss Williams remarked that it was a legal order. Richard Cass described a letter that was sent to Velucci, thanking him, and hoping that the City Manager would agree to the plan. In the Cambridge City Manager-Council form of government, the council authorizes all taxes and expenditures, but may not require that the manager spend money.

** Conference of Organizations, Blocks and Individuals of Neighborhood Four (COBI), Ideas for Part of Neighborhood Four (mimeographed, Cambridge Corporation, 1967) p.3.

impractical to do rehabilitation for low rents.
 We need more subsidies, and we haven't faced it enough
 to make a noise. Nonprofit housing is impractical
 for the lowest income--it's a good idea, BUT....*

Even within the housing question, making a problem
 out of increasing the supply of housing would involve taking
 on the subsidy system at a state and national level, or the
 Cambridge Housing Authority. This would mean a long range
 political commitment with little immediate payoff, and pos-
 sibly no eventual payoff within the confines of the neigh-
 borhood. Increasing housing becomes irrelevant not only
 for COBI but also for any other group interested in
 issues that will help them build themselves as an organiza-
 tion and deliver goods to their members. Talking about
 housing, while delivering tot lots, on the other hand,
 at least gives people a chance to "grumble about rents" with
 full assurance that they are discussing matters of importance.**

Returning to the role of Richard Green, it is important
 to note that his severe restriction of what he is willing to
 discuss arises in part from his organizational affiliation,
 As a representative of a private corporation, Green has no
 right to intervene on his own terms. He has been able to
 work in the neighborhood by providing them with the same in-
 formation and expediting services (with regards to the tot
 lot and the Reid house) that the Planning Board provides
 for the city and he provides for the Cambridge Corporation.
 His involvement is probably attractive to the social workers
 not only because he could work on a plan, but also because
 he is attached to this source of money. His contact with

* Williams Interview.

** A Radcliffe student who interviewed me about the CEQC planning team in Neighborhood Five remarked that at a CEQC Board meeting she had attended, the "housing problem" had been raised. The group decided not to work on it because they could not guarantee to deliver. Interview, June, 1967.

the group can make it easier to get money, both because of his interest in carrying out his plans, and because the Cambridge Corporation demanded that the neighborhood plan in order to be given the money for the tot lot in the first place, and he was available to help them do it.

(When Polaroid had agreed to sell back certain plots) COBI and the recreation task force asked us to develop a tot lot on Polaroid property. We said we would, but we would only do it if there was local involvement. That's the way a local neighborhood gets to be responsible, making them do things, not just giving things out. The Board voted \$4,000 for the tot lot equipment but said the local community should buy the land. Because they can't raise the money now, the Board will purchase it for two years, after which time, if the tot lot is successfully located, as I believe it is, it will be purchased by the Alliance, and the Margaret Fuller House will buy the land. Meanwhile Margaret Fuller will provide supervision. We said, "you plan it." The recreation task force, COBI, and certain block groups got together and the result is this. (Brings in a lovely map and shows each item of equipment in 5 discrete areas including spray pool..no moving equipment, we insisted, because of the liability. We demanded supervision...80 children can play in it at one time. A little noisy, but...) *

Green's role is, then also one of liaison--to help the Cambridge Corporation see that specific grants are well spent, to encourage groups to think on planning lines, and to help the neighborhood qualify for more money. It is only in the second, in a very limited way, that he sets the terms in which problems are seen. He exercises a licence to design programs within a very limited list of physical design and philanthropic topics selected by the Cambridge Corporation--housing and civic improvement--which inevitably set problems in terms of "how to do , , . or how to build..." something the usefulness of which, 221d3 housing or playgrounds, he does not question, for general ends which are irrelevant to him.

*Green Interview.

To sum up this section, the institutional demands of the agencies, the professional licence of the planners and of the social workers, the right to identify problems and the kind of problems identified are interrelated. The agency and the job are probably more important for these professionals in this process because of the limits on their licence without association with an agency, a constituency, or a source of funds or services. It is in carrying out other duties, the ~~work~~ing of programs and propoganda about needs, that a description of problems becomes relevant to planners and social workers. To them, then, views of problems are less intellectual constructs than conditions of work, adjusted to fit the demands of the job.

In the final section I will first attempt to explain the view of Neighborhood Four I found so irrelevant as a volunteer in terms of social problems as conditions of work. Finally, I will discuss what a social problem is for a working planner or working social worker.

VI. Conclusion.

A. Answers to Some Puzzles from the Neighborhood House.

Two questions initially posed about the way in which the Cambridge Neighborhood House was operating may be fairly easily answered on the basis of the preceding analysis. These were: (1) why the social workers used a neighborhood for analysis and action; (2) why they were preoccupied with emotional pathology. A third question -- what happens when professionals see things in terms of problems, will be considered in the conclusion. However, a different version of this question, why at the Neighborhood House such emphasis was given to local problems and their acuteness that we came to believe it a "sick" neighborhood, may be answered here.

First, the tradition of social disorganization and expectations built on studies of immigrant neighborhoods led to preconceptions about what constituted a normal neighborhood; it should be a community. Indeed, the continuing use of both of these terms, almost interchangeably, illustrates this expectation. The neighborhood, especially the project, failed to conform to this expectation. To the social workers, the inevitable next question was "what is wrong or different about this neighborhood that it is not a community?"

Secondly the kind of explanation that was hit upon, the "sickness" and "alienation" of the population seen as familial units, was chosen, in part, because at that time, psychological counselling was the dominant approach of most social workers, particularly those with the highest status and most training. As members of a

professional group that had licence to examine psychological dynamics but little else, they would be easily influenced in that direction. Finally, the intellectual approaches to "delinquency", the prevention of which was, after all, the most apparent function of the settlement house, stressed alienation, anomie and family structure as the causes of delinquency and the appropriate area for cure. The sickness approach allowed a clearcut kind of intervention, since it located the pathology in the individual and the family. Defining the neighborhood as special and sick, could allow intervention while confining the activities of the social workers to the neighborhood, freeing other agencies and institutions from challenge.

Emphasis on the acute and emergency nature of the psychological problems of the neighborhood was most evident in the particular sickness approach that was communicated to the volunteers. This stridency was the result of the involvement of non-professionals who had to justify their involvement (similarly to the professionals but more than they) by the urgency of the situation, and construct immediately, under pressure, a view of the neighborhood and their relation to its people. Stridency was most common among the volunteers, but it extended upwards to Miss Baldwin, the director, who continually and publicly asked what were the problems and emphasized the acuteness of the ones she had identified. This questioning and emphasis were used to encourage commitment among the volunteers-- who were necessary to the group work. They also reflected

the relatively nonprofessional status of Miss Baldwin herself, the low level of pay and training of the staff, and the kinds of demands that the understaffing and underpayment of the agency made upon the staff. They could not operate too professionally or the work would not get done; they needed an amateur commitment, not the withdrawn, neutral, detachment of the professional.

The view of the neighborhood in an emergency, as yet imperfectly understood, was not necessarily harmful. It allowed, indeed, impelled change in the House policies and programs, in ways not then prescribed by official views of problems and professional canons. A change was taking place at the Neighborhood House in the early nineteen-sixties that did not become apparent to me until later. The process of change could be seen at that time in a change in the make up of the board of directors and in increased involvement of local adults in house administration. The board had been composed of "old family philanthropists" and other people who were no longer powerful or active. Miss Baldwin took the initiative in bringing in representatives of Harvard, MIT, Cabot Cabot and Forbes, and Polaroid, the people who were later instrumental in changing the nature of the agencies.*

These actions arose out of a crisis in the House and a crisis in the neighborhood. Costs were rising and income was not. It was hoped that involving the industrialists would lead them to help the House out of an impossible financial situation, which they eventually did in arranging the merger into the Alliance. Secondly, the encroachment of Polaroid

* Interview with Karyl Sweeney, June 5, 1967.

and MIT and the threat to the physical existence of the neighborhood was already apparent:

"Elsa saw that the Neighborhood House and the neighborhood were both threatened. She saw this. That was why she started the parents' programs. She also wanted to get the businessmen involved, so they would see the needs of the neighborhood people, and help. She is really an old Yankee Republican, expecting them to take the people's interests to heart...." *

These changes in the structure of the administration, and further changes brought by work by Miss Baldwin, and others, to improve the financial structure of the settlement houses through a merger, were accompanied by a change in House policy toward local adults.

In the early nineteen-sixties the Neighborhood House staff worked to bring local adults into the House programs, not only in the traditional "sewing classes", but also in planning programs for the children, fund raising, and setting policy. By 1965, a "masters committee" of parents, comprised of many of the people who are now active on the COBI steering committee, was meeting regularly to discuss House policy. This committee has physical control of the allocation of meeting rooms.

The increased interest in involving the "parents" (as this youth agency referred to them) stemmed from several goals. One was to build their acquaintance with and trust in the Neighborhood House. Secondly, it was hoped that a group of parents could be brought together around the needs of the children and develop some group sentiment, thus combatting the "alienated" nature of the neighborhood.

* Sweeney Interveiw, June, 1967.

Lastly Miss Baldwin saw in these groups[■] active involvement in decision-making preparation for "coping"* if they were forced to move.

These changes had their cost. The involvement of the parents opened the staff up to charges of being "unprofessional" in allowing "clients" to determine the course of action. The merger of the houses and the involvement of businessmen on their boards inevitably opened up the administration of the houses to changes. For Miss Baldwin the cost was high, for it was clear that she probably could never function smoothly in the centralized, professionalized environment that merger implied. With the merger a woman without a social work degree who, moreover, had always violated certain canons of detachment, would be in trouble. Thus her demotion to teenage worker, unassociated with the settlement house, and her abrupt dismissal in June, 1967 were for her part of the costs of encouraging a change.

The change of structure and emphasis rested on other grounds in addition to the local emergency. As I suggested above, community organizers generally were improving their status by acting as community representatives or intermediaries. In this they took over roles that the political machine was no longer filling, and began to enter into competition with civil rights workers for the right to speak for the poor. Secondly, the poverty program gave a monetary reward for active involvement of adults as employers and planning committees. Their active involvement would naturally

* Interview with Miss Elsa Balswin, October, 1966. "I am now interested in teaching coping--with welfare or anything else--in case they are forced out."

tend to shift emphasis from their psychological problems to their income and education, and the kind of program to include requests for more services from city agencies.

The request for involvement of "local" adults in the poverty program, and the inception of the poverty program at all, came from a confluence of national political factors: the activity and threat of the national civil rights movement, the desire of certain liberals like Walter Reuther to build their own power by mobilizing and making a cohesive force out of the "poor", and designs that slipped through once the executive decided to start a program. This program, which included a political impetus to involve community people, has brought a change in social work ideology, and the possibility of political action by community organizers that the organizers themselves recognize:

"One thing about Elsa -- she did involve people in making decisions eight years ago. This was before the poverty program." *

The need to work in a neighborhood has not changed; indeed it has been strengthened by recent legislation. This has been explained in intellectual terms above, but in addition, the model cities act gives economic force to the tendency. It is cheaper to have neighborhood programs than city wide programs. The same drawbacks -- the difficulty at attacking income and employment or even the school system on a neighborhood basis still remains. The ultimate political implications of doing counselling in a neighborhood, or organizing for playgrounds in the neighborhood, will

*Cass Interview.

probably be identical.

For social workers and planners work within a peculiar view of what social problems are and what problems are appropriate objects of their activity. A large determinant of this view is their backgrounds and the conditions of their work and what these imply: preservation of their agencies, long term delivery of services, keeping their jobs, being accepted as "professional" by their colleagues and by the general public. Their choices, and the breadth of their intellectual analyses when they work within these conditions, are severely limited. In the final section we will review these limits and conditions, and consider how they affect the planners' and social workers' approach to social problems. The conclusion, however, must begin again with the question: What is a social problem?

B. On the Identification of Problems.

Planners and social workers share an image of society that finds "social problems" a reasonable and utilitarian approach to their work. This approach has wide currency, finding strong expression in various social science disciplines, and planners and social workers have adapted it to their needs. But the notion of social problems that they have adopted is by no means that current among large numbers of ordinary people.

A social problem approach rests on three assumptions about man and society that differ from a common-sense view. First, is the assumption that individual behavior and so-

cial conditions are largely determined by external factors and forces. Secondly, these factors and forces are perceived as identifiable, interrelated patterns of collective behavior. Finally, it is judged that behavior and conditions can be changed by modifying these basic deterministic factors or forces. In fact, belief in the possibility and efficacy of intervention underlies the whole concept of "problems" in planning and social work. To call something a social problem at bottom implies that it can in some way be manipulated; that there exists a remedy for it, that it is relevant for study in terms of intervention.

Seeley has said that to call something a social problem may mean that:

(a) the genesis of the problem is social, (b) the consequences are social, (c) the remedy is of a kind that "only society" can give effect to, (d) the problem is nothing but (or is "fundamentally") a relational malfunction, i.e. a social perturbation.*

For all of these definitions, it is necessary to have a concept of "social", and to hold a belief that it is possible to trace cause and effect in society such that "genesis", "consequence", "remedy", and "social perturbation" may be identified in social reality. These concepts must have meaning as part of a perceived pattern of events, situations and forces. The common-sense view of society does not include this identification process or this perception of patterns. Instead, the common-sense view rests on a series of unexamined types that adequately describe society for its members to act in it. These types are adequate for everyday purposes at hand. **

* Seeley, "the Problems of Social Problems," Op Cit., p.4.

**Schutz, Volume II., Op Cit. p 231.--235ff.

"...what the sociologist calls "system," "role," "status," "role expectation," "situation," and "institutionalization," is experienced by the individual actor on the social scene in entirely different terms. To him all the factors denoted by these concepts are elements of a network of typifications--typifications of human individuals, of their course of action patterns, of their motives and goals, of the sociocultural products which originated in their actions. The sumtotal of these various typifications constitutes a frame of reference in terms of which not only the sociocultural, but also the physical world has to be interpreted, a frame of reference that, in spite of its inconsistencies is nonetheless sufficiently integrated and transparent for solving of most of the practical problems at hand....Each problem requires...another kind of typification....

The licence and purpose at hand of planners and social workers differ both from that of the social scientists and from that of private citizens. Social scientists are concerned with analysis and description of patterns in society. It is these men who have the licence, and the interest, to perform the "legislative" act of defining a part of social life as a problem. In contrast, the planners and social workers have a licence to intervene to "solve" social problems. Intervention is their purpose-at-hand.

It is by the legislative act of declaring a problem that an area of life becomes a legitimate candidate for intervention. These legislative acts are not the job of a local planner or social worker. His legislative licence is restricted to showing that this typical problem exists here; discovering cases, not the diseases. This restriction does not make the national identification of a problem by sociologizers (as Seeley calls them) any less necessary to planners and social workers, or the concept of a social problem any less useful. This restriction does mean, however, that planners and social workers, modify these concept of social problems, and social theory, to the ends of practical intervention.

In practice, this means the use of social science descriptions of "problematic" situations as commonsense typifications of problems, and the abandonment of the general analytic descriptive approach in their day to day thinking. Their intellectual work is diagnosis, according to these academically originated and practically adapted types, of cases of "typical social problems."

When they approach Neighborhood Four, planners and social workers do not arrive without preconceptions. They have a model of a "typical low income neighborhood" that comprises a set of expected problems, probable difficulties in carrying out programs, various attitudes and assorted characteristics. The question, "what are the problems of the neighborhood" means to a great extent, "how does this neighborhood conform to the model of a typical low income neighborhood?"

However, neither of these professions has complete freedom to identify even "cases" of social problems, and then to intervene. They are limited by their licence, which does not include intervention in social problems in general, and by their working contingencies. Thus, they may recognize that their own area of action does not include the "basic problem" and yet continue to discuss problems in terms that imply that "their" problems are indeed the basic ones, the ones that should be attacked first, and the ones that, if solved, could lead the way to the remedy of other ills.

The diagnosis of a cases, then is a mere first step. For a planner or social worker to intervene, it must also be a case covered by their very limited licence to intervene and to recruit clients. Thus a general problem must be seen in terms of the planners' and social workers' licence to manipulate in terms of physical changes in the environment or in terms of the social workers' list of counselling, organizing meetings, and setting up neighbor-

hood programs.

This licence is also limited by time, geography and agency affiliation. Planners and social workers do not have a general licence to treat even "their" problems in general, or a licence to move to change any other institution, profession or social situation than those they find on the neighborhood level or among the clients attached to their agency. The professional's employment is specific to a certain group: an organization, a geographical area, and/or certain self-selected or legally determined clients. The licence to intervene in existing powerful institutions does not exist without attachment to an even more powerful institution.

In order to identify a case, planners and social workers often rely on data and observation of the kinds of things that are regarded as signifiers of typical problems. Census data, for example, is collected with these typical problems in mind, and is easily available. A second method, particularly when less familiar or measurable problems are in mind, is the neighborhood interview.

Given their licence, and their specific non-common-sense purpose-at-hand, when these professionals go into a neighborhood or city and ask what the problems are, many of the answers are irrelevant to them. These answers must be disregarded or translated into "technical" terms in order to become relevant to the planners and social workers.

The interview that follows will, I hope, give speci-

fic illustration of what such interviews involve, the use of typical problems by planners and social workers and the limitations imposed by their licence and conditions of work on the possible results of the interview.

In February, I interviewed a resident of Neighborhood Four, and asked her what the problems were. Her answers included that people reported you to the project management or even welfare for even a little babysitting, that the school had no lunches so that the children had to come home at noon, that the teachers did not discipline the children properly, or report their misbehavior home early enough, that young girls nowadays wore their skirts too short to school, that the Headstart teacher insisted on reviewing the equipment for the new tot lot, that other people had problems with their children because they would tell them to be in and they were still out at eleven, that teenagers nowadays couldn't make their own fun and hung around the Neighborhood House instead, where they disturbed the adults, that her welfare worker tried to cut her back for her daughter's Neighborhood Youth Corps earnings, that the teenaged boys broke things and hung around. However, she said, she was a bad person to interview because she did not have any problems, ~~in~~ fact, she scarcely saw her social worker, and in this yard of the project everyone got on and didn't usually report one another's children. She felt there should be some home economics school for girls that didn't like school,; she had gone to one ~~from~~ the Fourth Grade. However, her daughter wanted to go to

college. By turning the conversation, she managed to point out that her children gave her no problems because she let them stay out until eleven, that her husband was a veteran, that she had not liked Madison Park because of all those Southern Negroes moving in, that she did like integrated neighborhoods, that she got on with white people and she was not afraid of them like people from the South, that Roxbury schools had declined from people not having respect for authority and being unreasonably suspicious of whites, and that she wasn't about to purchase a Negro history encyclopedia.*

This kind of interview is probably not atypical of the response that greets professionals coming into a neighborhood and asking what the problems are. From these responses, it is easy to see that her common-sense view of a problem is not at all the same as the concept of a "social problem". Moreover, she seems to be more concerned with avoiding any stigmatized category and protecting her moral character than she is in outlining problems. Indeed, having problems is in itself something to be denied.

Her view is based on a typification of "what happens when I admit to problems." To her, two things happen. First, her moral character will be assailed. She will be assumed not to be able to do things herself. Second, she will be assaulted with recommendations about her homelife: her child-rearing practices and her marital status will be brought into the discussion, and she will be questioned

* This lady was active in the settlement houses, but not in the leadership groups. She had not been socialized into seeing problems in social work or planning terms. These terms allow one to deny a moral judgement (whether or not one is actually made) and to protect oneself against the stigmatizing aspect of problems and proceed to discuss programs premised on having them. When I summarized this interview to Mrs. F, a neighbor of Mrs. L's, who did not know her, her reaction to Mrs. L.'s statement about her children was: "Don't you think she was trying to convince herself?" Mrs. F. has acquired the social work view, and their typification of the neighborhood and its children.

about the misery of living in the project. In order to forestall advice and intervention, she specifically denies any problem in these areas. Her children behave and she is married, to a veteran, no less. Moreover, she has generalized from this view of what happens to a definition of a problem in general. A problem is an offense of morals or consideration of others, of interest to social workers. It is a disapproved public annoyance, relating to the personal characteristics of individuals.

Before we dismiss Mrs. L., it is necessary to see that Mills and Seeley may agree with her: in practice, "problems" can be simply conventional moral judgements, dressed up in social science rhetoric, and playing the same role--exhorting obedience to rules and upholding the current social order.

Moreover, when our reaction is "but of course she has problems; she is on welfare; she is a Negro, a female-head-of household, and she lives in Washington Elms," we are applying to Mrs. L. the typifications current in the common-sense world of planners. Certain demographic characteristics signify problems, regardless of an explicit, point by point, denial of them in an interview.

When planners or social workers approach Mrs. L to find out about problems, then, they find that she sees problems differently than they, and may indeed deny having any at all. However, planners and social workers need to discover problems in order to intervene. In order to use such

an interview, they translate her remarks into terms relevant to ~~them~~. The first process of translation went on when, in the course of remarks, we discovered problem-signifying demographic characteristics. These characteristics signify "typical problems" that allow a quick definition of the clients' character and needs.

Once a neighborhood is identified by this or that typical problem, or once a class or ethnic group has been similarly described, a set of typical expectations of the typical problems of individuals from Neighborhood Four, or of welfare mothers or of Negroes, or of poor people obtains. The professional will "know what to expect" and will feel free to offer generalized programs and a general picture of the problems of the neighborhood*.

The second process of translation is referred to as "listening". This involves selecting and extrapolating from Mrs. L.'s remarks in such a way as to identify problems, relevant to the listener. In order to be successfully translated, into relevant terms, Mrs. L.'s problems must: 1) be perceived to signify the existence of a problematic situation, a typical pattern of social forces and psychological reactions that have been recognized as an important problem situation; 2) be serious. The problems selected by the listener must have current relevance in terms of generally recognized emergencies--in the fifties, delinquency and family disintegration; in the sixties, race relations or poverty. A problem must be part of a syndrome that is currently receiving attention from licenced

* These typifications are ~~often~~ implicitly stigmatizing. At best the people appear weak, incompetent, inept and morally passive. Thus Dick Cass said that Bruce Levison had to do the dog work because there are things you can't expect a group "where nobody got past seventh grade" to do. In fact many of the active adults in Neighborhood Four have high-school diplomas, and many who do not have some high school, and a vocabulary and knowledge of the world that shows it.

problems identifiers and that is currently discussed by academics, politicians, and sources of money. 3) be legitimate subject matter for intervention by the professional. He must have licence to apply a remedy, which should also be possible to apply within limited time, geography and budget. The professional, however, may judge the appropriateness of the remedy to the problem.

Thus "my neighbors have noisy parties" may be translated: "This woman is socially isolated and does not participate in neighborhood festivities. She should be brought into a possible group of friends, and helped to overcome psychological resistance to enjoy herself with them." Or a planner might say, "Clearly the sound insulation in this project was not well carried out. Asphalt yards should be replaced by a more absorptive substance, the interior walls should be re-covered, and a social worker should be hired to help organize parties elsewhere, and/or increase friendly relations. Or, both might say that this complaint was totally irrelevant, that it was not related to the significant problems of the neighborhood, and that some people always gripe anyway if you give them the opportunity.

In the example above, a simple statement about noisy neighbors was scanned with an image of a typical "neurotic socially isolated" woman in mind, and the items irrelevant to this picture (physical structure, noisy neighbors) were discarded. Similarly, it was again examined with a

typical idea of housing projects--overcrowded, badly designed physically, poor social contacts--in mind, disregarding any analysis of her motives for such a complaint. Or the whole was disregarded, and the hypothetical complainer was discredited: she complains because of her nature and not because of any "realistic" problems.

This set of alternate explanations is familiar, even the subject of jokes. However, it is not unimportant. In the first two, technically prescriptive, examples, a simple statement was used to convey the image of a typical familiar situation, a situation that existed in the literature, which conveyed itself as a symptom of a familiar typification of a serious problem (social disorganization--neurotic anomie, the failure of public housing) previously identified in such terms, and finally, a situation that permitted the social worker or planner to intervene within the terms of his licence.

In summary, for planners and social workers, pre-existent need to intervene within a limited area of life, and practical considerations, are major components for deciding whether problems are present, what they are and what to do about them. Moreover, the problems that predominate in the search for problems are typifications of patterns that can be divorced from a structural, analytic view of cause and interrelations. These typified patterns are accepted, relatively unexamined, from current work and current political discussion, and added to an eclectic,

pre-existing potpourri of other recognized problems as "new factors", modified to conform to an interventionist purpose-at-hand.

These predeterminants of what a relevant social problem is are not mere "biases". They have implications in the choice of who is examined for problems and what is done to whom. Mrs. L. is asked about her marriage, but Superintendent Tobin is not asked about his schools. Even when planners and social workers have attempted to extend their licence as a group by participating in the analysis and identification of problems on a national level, with broader definition of appropriate action, they have still implicitly accepted this kind of limitation. Their willingness to criticize local administrators from a national vantage point does not modify their general acceptance of the limits of a neighborhood approach.

Planners and social workers have accepted, for example, a national report on family problems, or programs that treat poverty with national funding of neighborhood based programs and nursery schools, as central, important, and exciting innovations that deal with real problems and are relevant to the needs of neighborhoods where there are working agencies.

Real problems and needs developed by planners and social workers from the "street corner," as we have seen in Neighborhood Four, are not necessarily either those felt by the people on the corner, or those that have great-

est application toward "solving the problems." They are instead, limited and determined by the pressures of agency, licence, budget and training and most generally confined by what is "possible" within these limits to "do with 4,000 people." Blowing these "needs" up to the national scale is keeping as an ideological commitment, practical limits that do not obtain on the national level. When these limits are combined with the considerable limits of national politics, the problems finally identified and programs finally developed will amount to a few more dollars for the same old programs, the same basic approach, recombined with high hopes and little analysis. They will not result in anything new, or necessarily better, because the same set of problems and the same set of practical determinants underlie the whole approach.

Concern with getting a place to intervene, and funds to use in the intervention is found among both planners and social workers along with a feeling that it does not matter where one intervenes or what the "basic problem" is, or how relevant the intervention is to change. "Societal structuring" is used both to point out the impossibility of going after anything big or basic, and to argue the relevance of intervention almost anywhere, since "everything is inter-related" in "vicious circles".

This ebullient innocence, however, covers up the facts that "intervention anywhere" has not always helped, and that programs sold to help a group of clients have often

had the opposite effect, while helping the rest of society by controlling, sequestering and keeping a group in their "proper," stigmatized and powerless role.*

As planners become more involved in identifying problems nationally this pragmatic, eclectic optimism is coming into dangerous contradiction with their avowed purpose of "helping people." In fact, the more that models and approaches to problems, suited to the limitations of the local level, are carried over, even given special authenticity, as reflecting "neighborhood needs", the more the planners fall into a political trap.

Consciousness is not sufficient to avoid this trap, for there will always be the seduction of the possible and the practical, often in the face of the feeling that something is better than nothing. But particularly as planning is increasingly granted licence to deal with local units and neighborhoods, and to set up national programs for these neighborhoods, while effectively denied licence to function in nationwide terms, we should at least begin to examine the implicit assumptions and practical consequences of such a licence.

* See Scott, Op Cit . on the blind.

Also Thomas S Szasz, The Myth of Mental Illness(New York: Harper and Row, 1964). Goffman, Asylums, Op Cit.

Other categories include the poor laws and the welfare system, the juvenile courts, certain parts of the school system (700 schools and their equivalent; see Strodtbeck's work in Chicago) public housing, various institutions for Negroes, especially schools in the South, the work of many early settlement houses (see Zorbaugh, OpCit.) the Job Corps (Interview with Julian Houston, former counsellor at Kilmore) and the like.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES ON NEIGHBORHOOD FOUR.

Conference of Organizations, Blocks, and Individuals of Neighborhood Four (COBI), Ideas for Part of Neighborhood Four (Cambridge Corporation, offset, 1967).

Cambridge Planning Board, "A Workable Program for Cambridge," (Cambridge, 1952).

_____, and the Cambridge Community Services, "Social Characteristics of Cambridge Neighborhoods" (Cambridge, 1953)

_____, "Thirteen Neighborhoods" (Cambridge, 1952).

_____, "Community Facilities for Cambridge, A Plan, a Program, and a Report" (Cambridge, 1967).

_____, "A Housing Program for Cambridge" (Cambridge, 1966).

Peters, James B. "A Basis for Advocate Planning in Neighborhood 4" unpublished term paper, MIT, May, 1966.

II. ARTICLES:

Cloward, Richard A and Epstein, Irwin, "Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor: the Case of the Family Adjustment Agencies," Zald (ed), Social Welfare Institutions. (New York: Wiley, 1965) pp.623-644.

Carter, Barbara L., "Patterns of Association in an Interracial Neighborhood" unpublished paper, Brandeis University, 1964.

Foss, Daniel, "Feh" unpublished thesis proposal, Brandeis University, 1966.

Garfinkel, Harold, "A Conception of and Experiments with "Trust" as a Condition of Stable Concerted Action," O.J. Harvey (ed) Motivation and Interaction (xerox reprint)

_____, "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies," American Journal of Sociology, 61, 1956, pp.420-424.

Hunter, David R. "Slums and Social Work or Wishes and the Double Negative," Rosenberg, et al. (eds) Mass Society in Crisis (New York: MacMillan, 1964)

Korn, Richard, "The Private Citizen, the Social Expert, and the Social Problem: an Excursion Through an Unacknowledged Utopia," Rosenberg, et al(eds) Op Cit.

Levine, Sol, and White, Paul E. , "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1967

Mills, C. Wright, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," American Journal of Sociology, 49, 1943, pp.165-180.

Scott, Robert A., "The Selection of Clients by Social Welfare Agencies; the Case of the Blind," Social Problems, 14,1967, pp.248-257.

Seeley, John R. , "Intellectual and Libidinal Dimensions of Research," A.A Vidich et al. (eds) Reflections on Community Studies(New York: Wiley, 1964)

_____, "The Making and Taking of Problems; Toward an Ethical Stance," Social Problems,14,1967,pp382-389.

_____, "The Problem of Social Problems," Indian Sociological Bulletin, April, 1965.

_____, "Social Science, Some Probative Problems," Stein,M et al (eds) Sociology on Trial (Englewood Cliffs,NJ:Prentice Hall, 1963).

III BOOKS.

Bruno, Frank J., Trends in social Work,1874-1956 (New York; Columbia University Press, 1957).

Bellush, J., and Hausknecht, M. (editors), Urban Renewal: People, Politics and Planning (New York; Doubleday, 1967).

Gans, Herbert, The Urban Villagers (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962).

Goffman, Erving, Asylums (New York: Anchor Books, 1961).

_____, Encounters (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961)..

_____, Stigma (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963).

Hughes, Everett C., Men and Their Work (Glencoe: Free Press, 1958).

Lubove, Roy, The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930 (Cambridge; Harvard University Press, 1965).

Needham, George C., Street Arabs and Guttersnipes (Boston, 1884).

- Rosenberg, B., Gerver, F., and Howton, F.W. (eds.), Mass Society in Crisis (New York: MacMillan, 1964).
- Schutz, Alfred, Collected Papers, Volume I, Volume II (The Hague, Netherlands: Nijoff, 1962).
- Stein, Maurice R., The Eclipse of Community (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960).
- Szasz, Thomas S., The Myth of Mental Illness (New York: Harper, 1964).
- Vidich, A.J., and Stein, M., Reflections on Community Studies (New York: Wiley, 1964).
- White, Morton and Lucia, The Intellectual Versus the City (New York: Mentor Books, 1962).
- Whyte, William F., Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).
- Woods, Robert A., Americans in Process (Boston, 1902).
- _____, The City Wilderness (Boston, 1898).
- Zorbaugh, Harvey W., The Gold Coast and the Slum (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).

APPENDIX.

DOCUMENTS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE ALLIANCE OF SETTLEMENT HOUSES

- A. Administrators Report for the Fourth Annual Meeting-
February 7, 1967Isabel Pifer.
- B. Minutes of the Neighborhood Conference, December, 1966.
Sponsored by COBI.
- C. Board of Directors of the Cambridge Neighborhood House.
- D. Temporary list of the Board of Directors of the Margaret
Fuller House.
- E. Report on Community Development in Area IV.



THE ALLIANCE

Last report
March 22

ALLIANCE OF CAMBRIDGE SETTLEMENT HOUSES, INC.
99 AUSTIN STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139

Telephone 868-0420

Administrator's Report for the Fourth Annual Meeting - February 7, 1967

TRIBUTE: Through seemingly endless deliberations and negotiations under the patient, persistent efforts and leadership of Stanley S. Ganz, three Houses voted in November to merge in the Alliance and AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE MERGER OF MARGARET FULLER HOUSE, INC., CAMBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE, INC., EAST END HOUSE, INC., AND SUCH OTHER SETTLEMENT HOUSES IN THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE AS ACCEPT THIS ACT INTO THE ALLIANCE OF CAMBRIDGE SETTLEMENT HOUSES, INC. was filed December 6, 1966 with the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

DEVELOPMENT: From initial consideration in December 1950, through years of efforts and proposals of House executives and board members, encouraged by Cambridge Community Services who made the initial request to Foundations early in 1962 for funds "to provide central direction to an Alliance of Cambridge Settlement Houses", the ALLIANCE was incorporated June 20, 1963 with the following purpose:

"To participate in studies for meeting social needs in Cambridge particularly with reference to settlement houses; to determine priorities of service; to establish new services; to recommend program standards for settlement houses and to assist in improving their effectiveness; to assist in establishing personnel policies, practices, standards and job descriptions; to interpret the work of settlement houses to the public; to solicit, receive and distribute to Cambridge Settlement Houses charitable gifts and grants for carrying out settlement work in Cambridge, and in general to further the charitable and benevolent purposes of the settlement houses in Cambridge."

The original Board of Directors was composed of three representatives chosen by each board of the four member Houses, Cambridge Community Center, Cambridge Neighborhood House, East End House, Margaret Fuller House (Christ Child House having been precluded by its National Sponsoring Agency in Washington D.C.). An administrator was employed October 15, 1963 with the understanding that three years had been designated with special funding within which a merger of the four Houses should be accomplished, and with first year grants of \$9000 each from the Committee of the Permanent Charities Fund and the Godfrey M. Hyams Trust, and office space donated by Cambridge Community Services in its building at 53 Church Street, the Alliance was under way.

For three years the process has continued of unifying and centralizing the planning, programming, and participating in city and metropolitan-wide activities. Combined bookkeeping, accounting, handling of payrolls, reports and payment of all bills are done in the Alliance office. Uniform personnel standards have been developed. Staff and volunteers have been

AREA I

East End House
105 Spring Street
876-4444

AREA IV

Cambridge Art Center
31 Newtowne Court
864-3840

Cambridge Neighborhood House
79 Moore Street
547-4680

Margaret Fuller House
71 Cherry Street
876-8819

AREA VII

Cambridge Community Center
5 Callender Street
547-6811

recruited and referred to the member Houses for selection. Many special services have been developed and provided through the Alliance, in addition to the important role of soliciting and distributing foundation and United Fund support.

SPECIAL SERVICES: Included among these should be mentioned

- 1) AL-DA-CA, combined Summer Day-Camping for 8 weeks at Camp Ted, Waltham, under leadership provided by East End House and Margaret Fuller House
- 2) Family Society/Alliance project under special funding which provides qualified casework services at each House
- 3) Tutoring-Plus, under special funding, which provides leadership and helps to recruit tutors to serve the particular needs of children in each neighborhood
- 4) Cambridge Mental Health Center/Alliance negotiations through which a proposal for neighborhood-based mental health services known as "GATEWAY" had been submitted to the legislature, but in the meantime a Community Services Unit has been established, headed by a staff psychiatrist who, with other members of the Mental Health Center staff, offers a variety of neighborhood-based mental health services
- 5) MIT Science Day Camp collaboration through which selected boys from each settlement neighborhood are benefitted
- 6) Boston College/Alliance cooperation in the National Teacher Corps Project which provided field placement for a team of 5 trainees in Area IV under settlement staff supervision June 28 through August 5
- 7) Work Study Program in which the Alliance contracts with 10 colleges and universities enables the Alliance to recruit and provide student workers for each House, the Art Center, Al-Da-Ca and other joint projects
- 8) CEOC Child Development Program with the Cambridge School Department and the Alliance as contractors for Head Start classes, based in some schools and in all the Houses
- 9) Massachusetts Youth Service Board consultant for Cambridge, Rindge Jefferson, who works under Alliance auspices, serving all the Houses in matters relating to youth needs; supervising detached neighborhood youth workers as occasions require; enabling all Cambridge youth workers to meet together around their common concerns; serving as liaison between Phillips Brooks House and the Houses and also between TEST and all youth workers; consulting on youth problems in unserved areas of the city; encouraging and instigating efforts to secure more effective services for youth in Cambridge
- 10) A Simmons College class taught by Miss Pifer which has provided 11 field-work students placed in all four Houses and the Art Center

AREA ASSIGNMENTS: Earlier participation in recruiting neighborhood leaders for CEOC projects intensified the realization that settlement staff needed to maintain closer relationship with their neighborhood residents. Area designations in Cambridge, determined some years ago, were being used in setting up planning teams and proposals for OEO projects. It seemed appropriate to use these designations in planning for more effective settlement services begun last summer. AREA I is served by East End House where Chester Zucker became Area I Executive responsible for all outreach into the neighborhood, and Elizabeth Kearns as Program Director assumed full responsibility for all House activities. AREA IV (defined by CEOC as target #1 for OEO services) has three units under supervision of Richard Cass, Area IV

Executive. Also assigned on an area basis is Bruce Levison, formerly Margaret Fuller House Neighborhood Worker. Cambridge Neighborhood House has Richard Franke, Program Director, responsible for all House activities assisted by Joanne Angier; Margaret Fuller House Program Director is William Armstrong with full-time assistant; the Art Center (located in Newtowne Court Housing Project) is directed by Michele Des Verney assisted by Medora Bass. AREA VII (target #2 for CEO services) has Cambridge Community Center with Mrs. Dorothy Scott seen as Area VII Executive and Roosevelt Weaver as Program Director assisted by Cheryl Hirst.

Obviously, there are other Areas needing and wanting services appropriately provided by settlement houses, notably Areas III, V, IX, and XI. The Alliance is involved with other private and with public agency representatives in planning for and collaborating in the development of expanding services to these Areas notably of CCS, Interfaith Housing, Cambridge Mental Health Association, Friends School, CEOC, Wellington-Harrington Citizens' Committee, Cambridge Corporation, Family Society, City Planning Board, Health Department and Redevelopment Authority, Housing Authority and more recently with Justin Gray, assistant to the City Manager for development programming.

CEFUET: (Contracts to Encourage the Full Utilization of Educational Talent, under the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV; Section 408, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.) became a reality in June with a contract for \$51,150 under Alliance auspices. The hours and efforts of former Tutoring-Plus personnel, participants, parents and consultants that went into the writing and rewriting of this proposal cannot be measured. Earlier efforts for funding through CEOC had failed. It was John Herzog who discovered the possibility for funding that finally was fulfilled. The original program and budget to run from September to September were changed to June 15, 1966 to June 15, 1967, with the contract received for signing on June 29, 1966! Harvard Law School students carried the work through the summer following guide-lines prepared by Elsa Baldwin who assumed responsibility on August 30 for implementing the proposal, hiring staff and setting up procedures. CEFUET is limited to Highschool/teenage youth in Area IV. Since Tutoring-Plus, separately funded and primarily for elementary school children was continuing on the basis established last year, the supervision of this program also is being carried by Elsa Baldwin. Full reports of both CEFUET and Tutoring-Plus are available.

SERVICE INFORMATION FOR UNITED COMMUNITY SERVICES is required in December of each year. The following material was submitted by the Alliance for 1966 and is included here for your information.

1. Physical Facilities:

Administrative Headquarters - 99 Austin Street - 4 offices

Area I - Chester Zucker, Executive

East End House - 105 Spring Street - 9 clubrooms, kitchen, woodshop, gym and showers, 2 offices, well-equipped small children's playground

Area IV - Richard Cass, Executive

Cambridge Neighborhood House - 79 Moore Street - 5 clubrooms, 2 lounges, kitchen, woodshop, 4 offices, Educational Annex, large playground with 2 basketball courts

Margaret Fuller House - 71 Cherry Street - 4 clubrooms, kitchen, woodshop, 4 offices, large assembly room with stage and kitchenette, basketball court and separate equipped playground for children

Art Center - 31 Newtowne Court Housing Project - 2 classrooms, office, small library, large store-room

AREA VII - Mrs. Dorothy Scott, Executive

Cambridge Community Center - 5 Callender Street - lounge, 4 clubrooms, library, kitchen, woodshop, crafts room, photography room, 4 offices, large gym with stage and showers

2. Function: To coordinate and provide opportunities for individual, group and inter-group experiences aimed toward strengthening family life, developing leadership, broadening cultural and educational horizons, improving living conditions, helping individuals and groups to relate to one another, and integrating the local neighborhoods with the larger community; to counsel and refer individuals and families to appropriate community resources; to strengthen citizen participation in planning and developing needed services; to cooperate with other agencies in supporting and sponsoring appropriate neighborhood and city-wide developments.
3. Intake Policy: Membership is open to all people living in the neighborhood limited only by available facilities, services and leadership. East End House is primarily Polish, Portuguese and Italian; Community Center serves predominately negroes; the other 3 are inter-racial.
4. Fees: Annual membership fees from October to October are \$1.00 up to 14 years of age, \$2.00 over 14 years or family fee of \$5.00. Fees for camping, day-care, and other special programs are individually determined.
5. Area Served: The eastern third of Cambridge, exclusive of M.I.T., in which the settlements are located but providing consultation and hopefully later collaboration in services to North Cambridge.
6. Service Trends: Services vary with the neighborhoods, their social awareness and indicated needs. In general, mass recreational programs have been discontinued and small group activities developed with emphasis on helping children and adults to understand and adjust to the requirements of society, using neighborhood-based resources provided through Alliance collaboration with the Cambridge Mental Health Center and Family Society as well as through other city and Metropolitan services. Development of neighborhood leadership and their participation with specialists in planning for both immediate and future goals is a major emphasis in Area 4. Such emphasis is seen as basic for all our neighborhoods as institutional, industrial, and metropolitan pressures increase on lower-income residential areas in Cambridge. We are moving toward providing/relating to specialized services sought by our neighbors and helping them to participate effectively in citizen action related to local as well as federally-funded projects. Service Statistics show reduction in total number of individuals served as there is concentration on more effective individual and group services within the agency, but a true picture of wider neighborhood involvement and use of facilities for neighborhood meetings and projects is not reflected in these totals as of December 1966.

	<u>CCC</u>	<u>CNH</u>	<u>MFH</u>	<u>AC</u>	<u>EEH</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Headstart (3-4)	20	60	-	-	20	100
5 - 7	125	60	-	175	101	953
7 - 13		84	80		328	
13 - 18	35	85	42	-	45	207
Adults	<u>284</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>188</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>586</u>
	464	340	310	191	541	1846

PERSONNEL: In the course of the year, Mrs. Dorothy Weitzman, our outstanding Tutoring-Plus Director, left to enter Boston College School of Social Work; Elsa Baldwin left her position as Executive of Cambridge Neighborhood House to complete work for her Master's degree and later assumed responsibility as the Coordinator-Supervisor of the Alliance CEFUET project and Tutoring-Plus; Richard Park left his position as Executive of Margaret Fuller House to join the staff of United Community Services; Judith Greene left as Art Center Director to pursue development of her own talent; Mrs. Doris Dada, Program Director of Margaret Fuller House left with her husband and small daughter for Africa; Mrs. Carol Almasi, family worker at Cambridge Neighborhood House, resigned for the arrival of her baby. Changes in part-time staff were inevitable.

In the Alliance office, Mrs. Ruth Lowry resigned to work nearer home and was replaced by Muriel Wilmot on February 4 as Administrative Bookkeeper, with Laurene Lawrence continuing her fine work as Secretary. At this time, in addition to administrative staff, the Alliance carried responsibility for 8 teachers, 8 teacher-aides, 1 records keeper in the Child Development Program; 2 case-aides for the Family Society/Alliance project; 7 full-time and 10 part-time staff in CEFUET and Tutoring Plus; 45 Work/Study students. The total twice monthly payroll handled by the Alliance covers 114 employees.

The Administrator completed three years with the Alliance on October 15, 1966. Signed "Letters of Agreement" between the Alliance and the four Houses with revision of the Alliance By-Laws had not seemed to clarify the authority of the Alliance Board and role of the Administrator. Authorization had been granted for greatly needed staff assistance but no funds became available to employ the proposed Projects Director. The October letter to the Board of Directors closed as follows, "I will continue to do my very best on behalf of the Alliance, within the limitations of my strength and ability, until my successor has been secured or until June 30, 1967."

respectfully submitted,

Isabel Pifer
Isabel Pifer ACSW
Administrator

CEOC - Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee
OEO - Office of Economic Opportunity
CCS - Cambridge Community Services

2/6/67 - 100

NEIGHBORHOOD CONFERENCE - Dec. 27, 1966
Margaret Fuller House - 10:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.

Sponsored by: Conference of Organizations, Blocks, and
Individuals of Area IV

INTRODUCTION:

The Conference began with coffee and donuts at 10:00 A.M. At 10:30 Mrs. Helen Meehan called the meeting to order. She explained that the conference had been organized to try to establish a limited number of priorities for the next six months for each community group. At present there are a number of organizations working on many different projects--members are torn between using what time they have on a whole range of tasks. Hopefully the conference would establish a limited number of goals for each area of community concern that could be accomplished in the next six months. Each group would be aware of what the other groups were involved in, and lend each other support.

Mrs. Meehan then explained the agenda for the day. The next hour would be spent with Dr. Benjamin Sachs, Medical Director of the Cambridge Public Health Department, and Dr. Phillip Porter, Chief of Pediatrics, Cambridge City Hospital. The doctors would describe the possibilities for developing increased medical services in Area IV and ask for reactions and suggestions from the conference members. Following this hour the members would split-up into discussion groups and establish a set of goals and priorities in their area of responsibility. The groups would return to the meeting hall for a Buffet Lunch from 12:30-1:00 P.M. Following lunch each group would report its list of priorities, followed by a general discussion involving everyone present. Mrs. Meehan then introduced Dr. Sachs and Dr. Porter.

I.. Dr. Sachs stated he had come to the conference to get the ideas of local residents as to what the problems are in present medical services and to get suggestions for programs that would be effective. There are now funds available through the Medicaid program to establish a comprehensive maternal and child care out-patient clinic. Dr. Sachs will draw up a proposal and submit it to Washington--there is no guarantee the program will be funded. He stressed the program would be a complete one; not only medical, but dental services as well as social work and nursing services. All children and mothers in Cambridge would be eligible. He then asked the members to think about whether expanded services and facilities at Cambridge City Hospital would meet the needs, or whether a local facility would be necessary.

Dr. Porter said the facility would be limited to child and maternal care because of restrictions in funding. At present, well-baby clinics see a child only until he is two and one-half years old. School health physicals start at six years, and children are seen only every two to three years. A clinic is needed with full time staff and a director to supervise physical and mental health on a daily basis. At present only fifteen doctors whose average age is fifty-eight years, serve the area east of Central Square.

A satellite clinic in Area IV would be open days and evenings. Regular doctors would see the same children continuously and keep complete medical records. This would avoid seeing many different doctors who have no prior knowledge of the child. The clinic would relate to the Mass. General Hospital, Mount Auburn, and City Hospital. The clinic physician would visit his patients should they need hospital care. Social workers and Public Health nurses would be housed in the clinic and would

work with other social agencies in the neighborhood. Local residents could be employed at the clinic, and help to organize the community in planning for improving health services.

The age limit on services would be eighteen years or the completion of high school. Income guid lines would be very flexible, with patients paying in relation to what they can afford. Diagnostic services would be provided to all residents, but treatment and hospitalization would require a fee. Income levels for treatment would follow medicaid guide lines—a family of four can make \$ 6,000 per year. People just over the income restrictions are still a question. Generally the clinic would avoid the " bits and pieces " approach such as a measles vaccine clinic being open only during the dinner hour.

The city would pay 25% of the clinic costs. However, this includes " in-kind " contributions where present health costs and facility costs could be included in the 25%. State money is also available and Dr. Porter felt confident that the necessary city and state funds could be raised.

A question and answer period followed with local residents asking for futher information, describing current problems, and making suggeststons. People felt strongly that a local clinic was needed because getting transportation to City Hospital and baby-sitters is a tremendous problem. Another suggestion was made to have someone avaiable at the hospital to guide people through the confusing maze of departments. This person could be a local resident who could see that transportation was provided to hospitals when necessary and stay with the patient at the hospital. The need for medical help for senior citizens was pointed out. However the restrictions on federal funds limit service to eighteen years old. Total family attention could be a goal for the future. The need for a supervised playroom to avoid the usual waiting room problems was stressed. It should be as homelike and comfortable as possible with a neighborhood resident supervising. This would avoid the clinic atmosphere.

House calls are a major question. It will be difficult because getting full time staff to make either house calls or night calls will be a problem. It will depend on how forcefully the residents can express this need in helping the doctors apply for federal funds.

The question of using medical residents and interns was raised. Medical schools are reconizing the need for good out-patient services and might be willing to help staff a neighborhood clinic. Particularly medical residents could be used for full family care and home visiting. City Hospital's license does not allow interns to practice outside the hospital, but this could be changed. However it would be hoped the clinic would be staffed by a full time pediatrician.

Transportation problems could be met by providing station wagons twenty-four hours a day transportation services. Possibly an apartment in the clinic could provide twenty-four hour phone and transportation service in return for free rent.

Administration raised a number of issues. City Hospital would administer the program, with Harvard Medical School involved. Federal training programs for non-medical personnel from the neighborhood are available, but the city must guarantee them a job after training, and this is a problem. Setting up a CECC medical task force might not be possible. The city must meet 20% of the cost of training and salaries. This would be increased in later years to 50%, and eventually 100%. Therefore the city is reluctant to commit itself and the CECC Board of Directors might feel there was no point in setting up a training program or task force.

Dr. Sachs raised his concern about the clinic competing with private

doctors. Residents reaction was that local doctors are hard-pressed in Area IV now. Doctors generally can not leave their offices and have to refer people to clinics and hospitals and sometimes diagnose over the phone. Dr. Sachs responded that if competition is not a factor, residents can seek support from local physicians since their approval is necessary in funding the program. He also suggests a C.E.O.C. task force be organized. Mr. Clifford replied this was questionable for the reasons already mentioned, but he can suggest it to his Board of Directors again. Also the Board represents six areas of Cambridge and would question why an out patient clinic should be provided just in Area IV. Another clinic, already referred to by Dr. Sachs, would be the participation of local physicians. This is required by law. The legal aid task force had to include local attorneys. It might be more difficult to involve doctors.

II. Following the discussion with Dr. Peater and Dr. Sachs, the meeting split-up into discussion groups. John Gairachty led the Education section; Janet Rose, recreation; and Pauline Blackstad the Land Use, Housing, and Neighborhood Maintenance. At 1:00 p.m. a Buffett Lunch was served, and then each group reported on their discussions and selection of priorities for the next 6 months:

EDUCATION: Report by John Gairachty.

1. Encourage C.O.B.I. to expand its knowledge of neighborhood needs through use of a survey of all the blocks in the neighborhood.
2. The city should acquire the land on the Boardman St. side of the Roberts School.
3. A tax should increase for future use of the schools.

Mr. Gairachty explained that in discussing educational goals, his group felt there were more basic problems that needed to be settled before educational needs could be met. The group felt they were unable to speak for the neighborhood--no small community group could really know how the total neighborhood felt about any issue. Therefore everyone in the neighborhood must be contacted through an in-depth study and survey. Block clubs would be a means to reach everyone and give them a chance to express their opinion. Also if P.T.A. had a question about policy or local opinion, it could be fed into the block clubs by staff working with the clubs. In a month's time a neighborhood answer could be provided.

A hot lunch program for Roberts School was not a priority since it can't be accomplished in six months. Long range school services depend more on an in-depth survey of need. A survey should also find out what services are available now, and how good they are.

A museum program for Roberts School was mentioned. Materials from museums would be brought into the school to enrich present programs. Mr. Carney is aware of the program and will bring Mrs. Peters in to discuss it with teachers. However, the school tend to be defensive about outside programs being brought in, and there may be resistance to it.

RECREATION: Report by Janet Rose

1. A need for more communication among residents of the neighborhood particularly west of Columbia St.
2. Open Newtowne Court Gymnasium for mothers groups.
3. Day Care Center--No income guidelines.
4. More play space--actually the top priority, but a question.

whether this can be reached in six months, therefore the gym is top priority.

5. Clear up glass in Sennot Park.

6. Include people from Broadway to Hampshire Streets in planning and use of recreation.

DISCUSSION: St. Mary's has a fine gym. We should talk to them about getting together on its use. The Day Care Association in Cambridge has been unsuccessful in looking for funding. However working mothers could help to support it. People have pointed out the need and title V people need it. Senior citizens should have use of the gym two mornings a week.

IV LAND USE, NEIGHBORHOOD MAINTENANCE: Bill. Dilworth.

1. Recommendation for use of The Broadway Baptist Church site within four to six weeks.

2. Completion of the three tot-lots being planned with \$9,000.00 funding available for equipment.

3. Reid's house completed in six months.

4. A plan for the Clark St., Harvard St. property in spite of the financial problems.

5. A multi-level parking garage for industry be planned and a site selected.

6. Use of the Sullivan Post for Senior citizens. C.E.O.C. will work with the Post executive committee. If there is no action in six months the neighborhood will get involved.

V Summary and Discussion of the Whole Conference though not part of the program concern with headstart children climbing on the Neighborhood House roof was mentioned.

There seemed to be general agreement among the people present that the greatest concern for the neighborhood now is to reach out to many more people. Those involved in community work are a tiny fraction, and can't possibly speak for 9,000 people. There are now many more C.O. Workers available. The C.O.B.I. steering Committee should sit down with the settlements and C.E.O.C. and tell them how to distribute their staff. Every group has questions they need a neighborhood response to whether a depth-survey is done or whether block clubs are organized. Block clubs and surveys are not the only ways-we could seek out other organized groups such as churches.

There was discussion of the merits of doing a broad survey or a block club organization. A survey could be done quickly by bringing in outside workers such as college students. Then you would know peoples needs, the services they now get, and could plan to fill the gaps. However block clubs though taking longer, would develop political power and continuing feed-back on issues. Knowledge of needs without the power to demand city services to fill the needs is useless.

Also useful is a training program to develop local leadership. This would help the development of neighborhood strength by increasing leadership for people to develop new blocks.

The conference reached agreement that they would form a committee to decide what they need from the professional organizers in the settlements and C.E.O.C.

CAMBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE
79 Moore St. Cambridge

KI7-4680

Board of Directors - 1967-1968

Officers

President:	Mr. Franklin King, Cabot, Cabot & Forbes	HU2-5440
Vice-Presidents:	Dean Robert Holden, MIT Rm 7133 Cambridge	UN4-6900
	: Mrs. Helen C. Meehan, 51 Pine St. Cambridge	
Secretary:	Mrs. Henrietta McIsaac, 75 Washington Elms Camb	868-1066
Treasurer:	Mr. William Payson Jr, Harvard Trust Co	TR6-1700x7644
Clerk of Corps:	Hon. Haven Parker	

Term Expiring 1970

Mrs. Frances Beaudry, 64 Washington Elms Cambridge	547-8758
Mrs. Anthony Butler, 100 Memorial Drive Cambridge	EL4-0256
Mrs. Henrietta McIsaac, 75 Washington Elms Cambridge	868-1066
Mrs. Helen C. Meehan, 51 Pine St. Cambridge	
Mr. Franklin Phillips, Electronics Research Center Cambridge	491-1500x2251
Mrs. Julie Pina, 93 Washington Elms Cambridge	491-0360
Mrs. Ruth Ward, 83 Washington Elms Cambridge	TR6-3055
Mr. David Warsowe, College Seal & Crest Co Cambridge	547-6210

Term Expiring 1969

Mrs. Oliver Ames, 279 Marlboro St Boston	C06-5346
Mrs. Doris Elder, 95 Moore St Cambridge	UN4-8599
Reverend Alvin Graham, 87 Washington Elms	868-5197
Mr. Franklin King, Cabot, Cabot & Forbes Boston	HU2-5440
Mr. Robert Palmer, Polaroid 750 Main St Cambridge	UN4-6000x534
Mrs. Barbara Paris, 42 Washington Elms Cambridge	491-3145
Dr. Benjamin Sachs, Health Dept. City Hall Cambridge	TR6-6800
Mr. Jeremiah Spilewski, 214 Broadway Cambridge	547-6210

Term Expiring 1968

Mr. Frank Barnes, 151 Clark St Cambridge	491-8519
Mrs. Charles F. Cox, 137 Cherry St Cambridge	TR6-2011
Mr. Richard Evarts, 75 Federal St Boston	HU2-6655
Mrs. Ruth Fahy, 525 Washington Elms, Cambridge	UN4-4255
Mrs. Mary Galvin, 402 Washington Elms Cambridge	491-4969
Mrs. Elsie Harding, 9 Newtowne Court Cambridge	491-3367
Mrs. Lavola Hogan, 813 Washington Elms, Cambridge	876-2958
Dean Robert Holden, MIT Cambridge	UN4-6900
Mr. George Keefe, 120 Tremont St Boston	963-8939
Mr. James Lakis, Polaroid Main St Cambridge	UN4-6000x510
Hon. Haven Parker, Third District Court Cambridge	TR6-9429
Mr. William Payson Jr, Harvard Trust Co Cambridge	TR6-1700
Mrs. James Plaut, 225 Brattle St Cambridge	EL4-3175
Mrs. Corrine Ray, 149 Windsor St Cambridge	354-5579
Mrs. Janet Rose, 36 Newtowne Court Cambridge	491-7851
Miss Dorothy Rowell, Cambridge Court Clinic	UN4-7520
Reverend Daniel Sheehan, St Mary's of Annunciation Rectory Camb.	547-6071

Committee Appointments

Program: Dean Robert Holden
Personnel: Miss Dorothy Rowell
Nominating:
Masters: Mrs. Ruth Fahy

Alliance Board of Directors

Mr. Robert Palmer
Mr. Franklin King
Dean Robert Holden
Mr. James Lakis
Mrs. Helen C. Meehan
Mrs. Henrietta McIsaac

MFH Board of Directors 1966-67 (Revised)

TR6-8819

1	President:	Mrs. E. Kendall Bragg, 17 Channing St. Cambridge	38	TR6-0979
2	Vic-Presidents:	Miss Ruth S. Stone, 7 Alexander Ave. Belmont	78	KI7-1804
		Mr. Robert P. Brown, 16 Avon St. Cambridge	38	IV4-0576
	Treasurer:	Mr. Henry M. Nevin (Pro tem)		547-6637
	Secretary:	Mr. Henry M. Nevin, 3 Concord Ave. Cambridge	38	TR6-8187-C07-8855

Members: Term Expiring 1969

Mr. George Berkley, 179 West Brookline St. Boston	18	KE6-4447
Mr. Charles Blevins, 1 Waterhouse St. Cambridge	38	EL4-5541-876-2263
Mr. Robert P. Brown, 16 Avon St. Cambridge	38	547-6637
Mr. James H. Clark, Jr. 76 Park St. Somerville	43	623-0646
Mrs. Darnley Dottin, 296 Washington St. Cambridge	39	EL4-5532
Mr. Moses Kennedy, 52 Holten St. W. Medford MIT (3566)	55	488-3397
Mr. John Newcomb, 11 Boardman St. Cambridge	39	547-7883
Miss Carol M. Smith, 1200 Mass. Ave. Cambridge	38	KI7-7933
Mrs. Henry Wise, 2 Riedesel Ave. Cambridge	38	876-8303

Term Expiring 1968

Mrs. E. Kendall Bragg, 17 Channing St. Cambridge	38	KI7-1804
Mrs. Norma Greenidge, 51 Washington Elms Cambridge	39	876-6884
Miss Dorothea Jones, 7 Holly Avenue Cambridge	38	TR6-5979
Mrs. Samuel Miller, 44 Francis Avenue Cambridge	38	TR6-8147
Mr. David H. Morse, 17 Buckingham St. Cambridge	38	TR6-4595-TW4-5840
Mr. Harold Myer, 58 Bay State Road Belmont	78	IV4-6433
Mrs. Dorothy Morton, 69 School St. Cambridge	39	864-8845
Mr. Paul Smith, 16 Roosevelt Towers Cambridge	41	864-1475

Term Expiring 1967

Reverend Thomas Fuller, 272 Central St. Saugus	01906	1-233-1242
Mr. Robert Gargill, 130 Appleton St. Cambridge	38	354-2575
Mrs. Frederick R. Grace, 113 Lake View Ave. Cambridge	38	864-8922
Mr. John Hammond II, 17 Gray St. Cambridge	38	864-3912
Mrs. Herbert Levine, 16 Fountain St. W. Newton	65	332-9380
Mr. Henry M. Nevin, 3 Concord Ave. Cambridge	38	TR6-8187
Mr. Clifford Powell, Polaroid 730 Main St. Cambridge	39	UN4-6000x502
Miss Ruth S. Stone, 7 Alexander Ave. Belmont	78	IV4-0576
Miss Sally Stearns, 3 Chauncy St. Cambridge	38	547-8462
Mrs. Barbara Washington, 36 Newtowne Court Cambridge	39	354-6333

Honorary Members

Miss Alice Channing, RRI Box 37 North Chatham Mass.	02650
Mrs. Henry A. Frost, 19 Garden St. Cambridge	38
Miss Dorothy R. Jones, Box 81 Rockport Mass.	01966
Mrs. William Koch, 855 St Clair Avenue St. Paul Minn.	55105
Mrs. Orrin Lilley, 11 Shanley St. Brighton	02135
Mrs. Henry W. Patterson, 70 Conant Weston Mass.	02193
Mrs. Robert Reid, 30 Bowdoin St. Cambridge	38

Committee Chairmen:

Program: James H. Clark Jr.
 Personnel: Miss Ruth S. Stone
 Buildings/Grounds: Mr. Charles Blevins
 Nominating: Mr. Robert Brown
 Art Services: Mrs. Herbert Levine

Alliance Directors:

Mrs. E. Kendall Bragg
 Mrs. Darnley Dottin
 Mrs. Samuel Miller
 Mrs. Frederick R. Grace
 Miss Carol M. Smith
 Miss Ruth S. Stone

ALLIANCE OF CAMBRIDGE SETTLEMENT HOUSES, INC.
99 Austin Street
Cambridge, Mass.

Report on Community Development in Area IV
March 7, 1967

- 1) Structure of Organizations and Staff
COBI - (Conference of Organizations, Blocks, and Individuals) - formed in Spring 1966 to bring together all interested neighborhood organizations in an "umbrella" group for future planning in the area. Participating members of COBI include CEOC Planning Team and Recreation Task Force, Central 4 Neighborhood Association, Block Clubs, PTA, various churches and social groups. Primary staff are provided by the area settlements and CEOC with technical assistance from Cambridge Corporation and the City Planning Board.

- 2) Projects
Each participating group in COBI carries on its own projects with COBI serving as clearing house. Recreation Task Force is presently working on developing two tot lots in NTC/WE, and one on Pine Street. Central 4 recently met with Traffic Commissioner Rudolph to work on street and traffic patterns in the area. The PTA groups are active in cooperative work for Community Schools concepts throughout Cambridge. The Pine/School Street Block Club has been active in an advisory capacity with Cambridge Corporation and Grass Roots Housing for rehabilitation of 16-18 Pine Street. COBI has developed a sub-group to work with Cambridge City Hospital, the Public Health Service, and CEOC in plans for a Health Facility in the neighborhood. The Industrial Relations sub-committee of COBI has had extensive and productive discussions with Polaroid Corporation concerning parking in the area; Central 4 Neighborhood Association and the Pine Street Block Club have worked out night-time use of lots.

- 3) Planning Proposals
COBI is nearing completion on a series of physical planning proposals for distribution and comment within Area IV. Meetings have been held between COBI Steering Committee, City officials, Justin Gray, Mayor and City Manager, and these will be followed up with another series about specific ideas. Mass area meetings for residents to review these planning proposals are being set up now.

The proposals include sweeping changes for settlement services in neighborhood IV, and presentation to House and Alliance Boards should take place shortly.